	Page 1	-
1	THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS	
2	MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION	
3	PUBLIC HEARING	
4		
5		
6	CHAIRMAN	
7	Stephen P. Crosby	
8		
9	COMMISSIONERS	
10	Lloyd Macdonald	
11	Bruce W. Stebbins	
12	Enrique Zuniga	
13		
14	RE: PUBLIC INPUT - MGM DESIGN CHANGES	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20	December 3, 2015 2:43 p.m 3:50 p.m.	
21	MASSMUTUAL CENTER	
22	1277 Main Street, Room 4 & 5	
23	Springfield, Massachusetts	
24		
		ļ

PROCEEDINGS:

_

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon. Today is Thursday, December 3, 2015. This is a public hearing before the Massachusetts Gaming Commission. I am Chairman Steve Crosby. Present also are Commissioners Macdonald, Commissioner Stebbins and Commissioner Zuniga. Commissioner Cameron had to leave.

We are here today to accept public comment on the proposed design changes to the MGM Springfield casino project. Before we begin, the Commission would like to thank you all for being here today. This is a public hearing and it's critically important that all of you, the public, be a part of the process to ensure that the Commission achieves the best results possible.

The purpose of this public hearing is to offer any interested person or group an opportunity to comment on the proposed design changes. This is not a question-and-answer period or a debate. Once we begin, anyone who

wishes to comment may raise their hand, or actually they should go ahead and sign up in 3 There's a sign-up sheet in back if you haven't already signed up on this sign-up Then we will recognize you to come before us. And we will hear from all of the folks who sign in.

In order to use the available time efficiently, the Commission asks that speakers limit their comments to three minutes. will be a clock that Amy is using here to the right of the speaker's podium and that will be set at three minutes for each speaker. We hope you'll be respectful of that time and respectful of everybody else's time and adhere to the three-minute rule.

The Commission requests that all speakers identify themselves prior to commenting and please be sure to keep your voices up as this hearing is being recorded audio and video. It is not being streamed live on the web, but it will be archived on our website in video and there will be a transcript prepared.

2

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

With that we will now open up the floor for comment. We have I believe two city councilors here including Councilor Fenton, the Springfield city council president. He is invited to be our first speaker as we routinely respect elected officials, especially ones that have dentist appointments.

MR. FENTON: Yes. Thank you, members of the Commission, Mr. Chairman for hearing me first. I do have a dentist appointment.

I'm joined today by my colleagues on the city council, Councilor Tim Rook, councilor from Ward 7 Tim Allen and council vice president from Ward 8 Orlando Ramos.

First let me start for thanking the Commission for hosting this hearing and public comment section of your meeting here in the city of Springfield. The council and the residents and surrounding communities to the city of Springfield obviously have an interest in these design changes and are very grateful for your trip out here and your willingness to hear from us and make yourself available for

public comment.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I should note that it was President Fenton who wrote us and asked us specifically if we would be willing to have this hearing and we agreed.

6 MR. FENTON: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. The last time that I addressed this body at a public hearing was over a year ago in West Springfield at West Springfield Junior High School. I spoke in favor of the project.

I spoke to the credibility and integrity of MGM

Springfield and the design in the plan that they had brought forward to the voters of Springfield, our fine Mayor and the city council and subsequently to the MGC.

I still support MGM in their overall vision and mission for the city of Springfield.

I think that this is a once-in-a-lifetime economic development opportunity for our region and really for Western New England.

However, I also stand before you opposed to their design changes. The city of Springfield, our taxpayers and our Mayor have endeavored and have spent a great amount of

resources on negotiating our host community agreement. In that agreement, it calls for certain designs.

Those designs always included a 25-story high-rise tower. Many referred to it as the marquis aspect of the project or "the wow factor". And the surprise announcement to myself and many others in leadership in our community that this component to the project would be eliminated was met with resistance. It can speak for myself in this respect in that I have great concerns about the elimination of this aspect of the project.

While I recognize that circumstances change and I appreciate MGM's long-standing commitment to the city in light of subsequent referendums and presentations required before historical, MGC boards and other agencies, the fact of the matter remains that we have a legally binding contract with this entity.

And in that contract, it calls for a high-rise tower and other amenities that are promised. And I stand before you today unwilling to compromise. I stand before you

2.1

today as I have indicated to MGM Springfield in recent discussions that the city of Springfield and myself and the city council want to be reasonable parties.

We are not immune to changes in the marketplace nor are we ignorant to them. We recognize that accommodations ought to be made. But I have reservations and strong concerns about allowing what was a bilateral contract to be subsequently negotiated in a unilateral way.

So, insofar as the HCA agreement had really four parties to it MGM Springfield, the Mayor, the Springfield city council and the voters of the city of Springfield, those same four parties ought to be incorporated and consulted as changes come forward. These type of very substantial and material changes to the project warrant that type of discussion. Not unilateral presentation.

So, I want to thank MGM for their recent cooperation and discussion but the fact is that this change was announced to me and many others as a surprise. And if the project from my perspective is to effectively move

forward in a way that's in the best interest of the city of Springfield and the surrounding communities we need to do so through a fair and deliberative negotiation process.

If the tower is to be eliminated and as I heard MGM present earlier facts that indicate \$50-\$75 million worth of savings, the city and the Commonwealth ought to be compensated for allowing that type of a change. As I said, this is a contract. There needs to be consideration to entice us to do that.

So to that end, MGM has been open to contemplating alternatives with me that would go above and beyond what was originally in the HCA. Some examples include expanding potentially their residential market rate apartment footprint. They've currently committed to 54 units. I'm asking them to look at expanding that in terms of the number of units that would be a part of the HCA through the amendments.

I've offered up compromising positions saying that perhaps there could be a component that would include in those market-

2.1

rate units condo ownership as opposed to market-rate apartments to help offset some of the risks for the company.

They also have to their credit been proactive about looking at how they can redesign the skyline in light of the elimination, proposed elimination I should say of the tower.

So, I wanted that testimony to be on the record before the Commission. I do not support the plan as proposed. I think there is a world in which the city of Springfield could benefit from a design that did not include a tower, but I think that that necessitates a thoughtful deliberation and negotiation not a unilateral discussion based on MGM telling us that they needed to remove the tower and here's why. So, I wanted that on the record.

I also wanted to impress upon the Commission two more final points. And I appreciate you allowing me some extended time here. The first is Attorney Stratton correctly pointed out earlier that it is the council's intention to take up a vote on the overlay

district later this month in December. That is because we want to cooperate with the company.

They have an interest in continuing to build their infrastructure in the downtown and tear down buildings. And to that end, we have agreed to schedule on an expedited basis an overlay hearing to allow them to do that ground work with the understanding that they are proceeding at their own risk with that development. And they will not be binding themselves with infrastructure outbuilds that impact the future design.

And secondly, I want to articulate to the Commission in addition to my concern about the tower and the reduction of the capital expenditure of somewhere between \$50 and \$75 million, I'm also very concerned about the lack of specificity with respect to the location, ownership model and amenities provided for the 54 guaranteed off-site market rate units.

We know not yet where they will be located. I recognize that there are business reasons for why it is not feasible at this time

2.1

for MGM to have an alternative site located, but from my perspective that is a problem that MGM has created for themselves. By moving their 54 units from Main Street and Howard to some to-be determined location, they have put the city council and the city in a real bind in terms of how we amend our HCA agreement.

Any amendments that we make to our exhibits that discuss specifically where these units will go are going to have to subsequently be amended when MGM tells us where they propose to put the market rate units.

And of additional concern is the ownership mechanism through which they will take title and subsequently manage these properties. There have been discussions about collaborative and coownership models, if you will, between MGM and other entities for these future units.

Obviously, the city has concerns about those types of arrangements. There are worlds in which they may work but again I think the city needs to be incentivized to get to that position.

1 I thank you for your time Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission for 2 3 holding this hearing here in Springfield. I want to stress in conclusion that myself and I 5 know many of the residents of the city of 6 Springfield and my colleagues appreciate MGM's investment and commitment. 8 And we remain committed to them to 9 finding a good project that we can all be proud 10 of. We were all proud of the project that we 11 were promised over two years getting on three 12 years ago with our HCA and the referendum that 13 was held. 14 But I'm hopeful that through a more 15 deliberative process we can secure a more 16 favorable agreement to the city of Springfield 17 than the one that is currently proposed. 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you, 19 President Fenton. We do cut city council 20 presidents slack, but I hope the rest of you 21 will please adhere to our three-minute rule. 22 City Councilor Ramos, welcome. 23 MR. RAMOS: Good afternoon, Mr. 24 Chairman, Commissioners. I would first like to

thank you for accepting the city council's request to hold this meeting here in the city of Springfield.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Excuse me,

Councilor, all of the speakers please identify
yourself for our reporter.

MR. RAMOS: Sorry. Orlando Ramos, vice president of the Springfield city council.

Thank you for holding this meeting in the city of Springfield and giving our residents an opportunity to speak on this very important and historic project in the city of Springfield and in our region.

I will be brief. I know that there will be some people that will talk about the process of which MGM proposed these changes and there'll be some arguments made as to the aesthetics of the project.

What I want to do is I want to make an argument from the economic development point of view. Being the chairman of the economic subcommittee on the city council, I'm here to address the economic development component.

When I initially heard about the

2.1

changes that were being proposed for this
project, I'd be lying if I said I wasn't
disappointed. I was disappointed because of
the way that these changes were proposed to us,
the lack of communication. And I was
disappointed because of the elimination of what
I believed was the wow factor that was a
prerequisite for application for approval from

But I was also disappointed because I think that if it is built the way it is being proposed now we'll be missing an opportunity, a major economic development opportunity, because there is correlation between cities that build up and signs of a local economy.

If you look at the history of our country you look at the beginning of when the cities began to construct high-rise buildings, you will see that the construction of high-rise buildings is a sign of a healthy economy and invitation for new businesses, a symbol of a community on the rise and a way to attract new residents.

Columnist and researcher David

2.1

the Commission.

Holmes put together a very detailed research project on high-rise construction in the last decade. In this study, he determined that there were four major factors and four major reasons why communities and cities continue to build up after the turn of the century.

And some of these are very commonsense but there is one that I think that really applies to the city of Springfield that will apply to the city of Springfield once this economic development project is completed. It states that the business centers driven by their status as significant regional business centers as well as cities with high quality downtown and near downtown urban environments. And I believe that's where the city of Springfield will end up once this project is completed.

This is not new information the fascination with high-rise buildings is something that goes back centuries.

I cited a book from 1959 in a council meeting when this was first proposed. This book was written by Earl Schwartz and

Walter Simmons called Offices in the Sky. And in the book the authors state that the character and quality of any city can be told from a great distance by its skyline.

But these buildings do more than just advertise a city, they show the faith of many in its destiny and they create a like faith in others. They are evidence of a community's spirit of life, the hallmark of progress, the importance of sustained development and growth.

They are a standing notice of the world that a particular -- to the world that a particular city has arrived amongst its elect and it possesses those indispensable qualifications, location and transportation for a community's continued growth.

So, it's not just aesthetics. There is an economic development component to it.

You need 12 stories to qualify for the national registry of high-rise buildings. And according to studies you need 18 stories to make any significant impact on the city skyline. MGM's current proposal calls for no more than six

1 stories. To me that means that we're missing 2 out on a major economic development 3 opportunity. 4 I've said this privately to MGM and 5 I've said it publicly before and I'll say it 6 again, I don't support the current proposal. And I'm not willing to support it until we 8 address and MGM addresses how they will change 9 the skyline of the city of Springfield. 10 It doesn't necessarily have to be a 11 25-story glass tower. But I do believe there 12 are things we can do to change the skyline and 13 I'm hopeful that we can get your support on 14 Thank you for your time. 15 CHAIRMAN CRSOBY: Thank you Councilor. Councilor Rook. 16 17 MR. ROOK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 18 My name is Tim Rook. I live at 63 Woodcrest 19 Drive in Springfield, Massachusetts. I'm one 20 of the longest serving members on the 21 Springfield city council. And I'm here to state that I am in full favor of the amended 22 23 plan as presented by MGM.

I think what happens sometimes as we

go through a difficult process that this has been and you have all experienced it is it's an enormous project. And any project that we've had in the city of Springfield, including the school buildings that we built, there has always been changes and amendments made and agreed to.

If you talk about the wow factor that so many people are hung up on, the wow factor to me is that there's over two million square footage that's going to be developed in the city of Springfield that hasn't seen the size of the project -- It's the largest project in the city of Springfield's history.

There are going to be changes. And I think everybody has to check their ego at the door and realize that the people that are proposing this, this is their livelihood.

I would much rather see the walkability of Main Street like it used to be back in the 50s and 60s than to have a tower.

I would take pedestrian traffic over a pedestal any day. We had a tower in Springfield. It was called Bay State West. When it was built

2.1

that's what everybody thought was going to be great. A lot of the businesses along Main Street dried-up because they moved up into the tower square.

Then the Holyoke Mall was built, and guess what, all of the businesses went to
Holyoke. What they're proposing is what works in every other city, to have walkability on
Main Street. That's what's going to be the wow factor.

Right now at 4:30 you can throw a bowling ball down Main Street and you're not going to hit anything. Where they're anticipating eight million visitors a year that's going to be a boost for every small business downtown.

Since they made the change of the hotel and laid it down on Main and State down to Howard, each of the properties on the opposite side of the street have been acquired. They've been vacant for years. There's been no activity. There's been very little interest in the city of Springfield.

This is a good project for the city

of Springfield. It will put people to work.

It will bring back by viability to downtown. I

think that's what we have to look at. Now

since MGM has talked about it, let's revisit it

again is the baseball stadium. And some of the

members on your board were big supporters of

baseball including myself.

resurrected.

You're going to have MGM on one side, you'll have hopefully baseball on the other. And we can visit a third issue that was brought up over 20 years ago that was an aquarium along the riverfront.

That now has been

MGM alone isn't going to save the city of Springfield but there are a lot of other elements. This a catalyst for change.

And I think that's what Springfield has been stale with for so many years. People living in the past and wanting to talk about what could have been, what should have been, what may have been.

The time is now. And these gentlemen are willing to spend \$900 million of private monies which we have never seen in the

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

city of Springfield before.

2

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So, I support the project. I have 3 found MGM to be extremely cooperative throughout the entire process. availability and their candor has been tremendous. I have met with many of them and had many questions answered. I would urge you to please approve the plan as amended and give Springfield an opportunity to get back upon its

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you, Councilor. All right. We will go to the list in the order of sign-up. Karen Ford.

Thank you very much for your time.

MS. FORD: Good afternoon. My name is Karen Ford. I'm a longtime resident of the city of Springfield, taxpaying citizen stand as an opponent to MGM in any other casino coming to our area.

When I look at the MGM presentation, it is not impressive at all to me. It is a monster and it is a demon that will destroy our city. I attended the meeting on the 18th that was held at City Stage. When MGM broke down the entities that would be reduced from 10 bus

birds to three that's a strong indicator that they don't expect the same patronage.

They also spoke about the movie theater and the bowling alley and various entities of this project being reduced. However we look today and we see where we are being more concerned about saving MGM than we are about saving Springfield. That's a sad day in the land.

When we look at the health impact study, I attended a forum maybe just over a month or so ago. And they spoke at this forum -- This is done through UMass via Bay State. -- that anytime a casino comes into a social economically deprived community, it destroys. We continue to hear about Detroit, filing bankruptcy let me add. That's not a plus. That does not add as a positive attribute for one of something of this nature to come to our deprived city already.

It's amazing to me that we have absolutely no safeguards. None of our leadership -- It was good to hear President Fenton say today that he's opposed to any

2.1

design changes however flexible. I'm opposed to the unit coming here, period.

No one is saying that this is what we need to bring in because it's not a pro for our city. There are other things that can be done. When they were talking with health impact study that people who live in these communities, and it will not only affect Springfield because gambling has no boundaries, the addiction has no boundaries, it will flow out into all of the neighboring communities. And if anyone chooses to travel a great distance, we may find them on the road dead too.

I would also like to add, it's amazing to me that we no longer hear anything about Blue Tarp, which MGM Mike Mathis made it very clear sink or swim MGM is out of here in two years. So, they don't even put great stock in their project.

And now who is the head of what's called Blue Tarp, Mike Mathis. How amazing. I hope that you all will take your position serious and think about the fact that this is a

2.1

socially economically deprived community that 2 does not need the ills of a casino by any 3 Thank you for your time. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you very 5 much. Rhonda Latney. 6 MS. LATNEY: Good afternoon, Mass. 7 Gaming Commissioners. I'm Rhonda Latney, a 8 lifelong resident of Springfield and anti-9 casino advocate. I find it ridiculous Mayor Sarno was dumbfounded over the reduction of the 10 11 proposed casino and how the residents of 12 Springfield, our elected officials and Mass. 13 Gaming Commissioners finding out about the 14 reductions over a three-month period and not 15 all at once. 16 I'm under the impression that all 17 correspondence should have been in writing and 18 channeled to the necessary departments. 19 evident that Mayor Sarno, city solicitor Ed 20 Pikula and our elected officials are not 2.1 attentive to the information they are 22 responsible for and have access to.

In an article from Business West

dated March 11, 2014 entitled Region Trades

23

People Anticipate Casino Construction 2 Opportunities state the following for instance, 3 landscape architectural opportunities might be limited in an urban casino says Steven Roberts, 5 president of Steven A. Roberts Landscape 6 Architecture and Construction in Springfield. There might be some exterior construction in 8 regard to pavers and maybe water features but I 9 don't see there being a lot of green space 10 available to create parks, he said. From the 11 plans I've seen there's not a whole lot of 12 landscaping. It's mostly a kind of an urban 13 cityscape. End of article. 14 After I viewed the current design 15 proposal, I noticed the adjoining building to 16 the South End Community Center has been 17 eliminated and replaced with a (INAUDIBLE) 18 Therefore this changes the urban design 19 and leads to drastic material costs and 20 reduction in material changes. 2.1 Another change is a pedestrian 22 bridge across State Street and Main Street that 23 has been eliminated also. For MGM and city

council to deem the site plan complete at this

time seems incomprehensible considering there has been no mention of the location of the market rate apartments in its detailed construction plans or justification of the removal of the adjoining building the South End Community Center and the removal of pedestrian bridge. Thank you. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you very much. Mark Checkwicz.

MR. CHECKWICZ: Mark Checkwicz, resident of Springfield. Thank you Mr.
Chairman and Councilmen. Thank you to my fellow residents of Springfield. I really appreciate the passion with which the previous two speakers spoke. They love our city. And they look out for the best.

It is difficult to face a decision about design changes coming from an entity who really put their best effort forward in their first proposal. They did however face something very unexpected, and this cannot be eliminated from the discussion. They were given a set of rules from which to play from. We had a democratic process which allowed for

three casinos in the state.

2.1

They came here using the forum or the platform of that democratic process with the investment of time and money and with manpower. They put their best effort forward among many other companies who also did the same. They came out victorious. And I might add, all the other companies who endeavored to come into the Western Massachusetts area all failed to get their referendums passed in their communities, host communities.

With a referendum on an issue that had already been decided democratically. I do believe that they were blindsided by this. I certainly was because it seems to me if somebody decided to have a referendum on barbershops, we could have that and eliminate all barbershops immediately across Massachusetts if you could get enough people to stop haircuts, which maybe I might vote for.

But truthfully, it was an unfair process. Even though it is democratic, the opportunity for people in the democratic

process was prior to the investment made by this company.

I appreciate -- I have always appreciated Mr. Mathis' willingness to meet with me when I've had problems and issues. I spoke out of order at a previous meeting when there was no public discussion, you may remember. And he immediately came out and was willing to meet with me after that. And he did. And we spoke.

I do have no concern about the design changes because most importantly they are making a commitment to the city of Springfield in dollars and they have to make decisions that amount to success. The city has to have them be successful.

One last thing I want to say, I know I'm running out of time, very quickly. There is a \$2.4 billion glass tower sitting at the end of the boardwalk in Atlantic City, the former Rebel Casino. It is two years old. It's now bankrupt and empty.

Despite being the most beautiful building on that boardwalk, it is empty and has

been purchased for \$85 million.

We cannot afford to have an empty tower sitting in Springfield two years from now — or two years hence from their opening. They must be successful. We as community citizens have to hold them to their promises but more importantly we are the holders of the keys to success of our children in the future endeavors in this city. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you very much. Carol Kerr.

MS. KERR: Good afternoon. My name is Carol Kerr and I am resident of Forest Park Heights. Thank you for allowing me to speak here today.

I completely disagree that a new skyscraper is either essential or even a particularly desirable thing. The new hotel is an excellent layout because the hotel complex is much more in keeping with the feel of the downtown area. It integrates not dominates. It doesn't steal the thunder of the existing skyscrapers. They still hold pride of place.

MGM doesn't dominate the skyline of

our downtown nor should it. I like that. It doesn't become MGM city. We still get to keep our unique personality. Guests are less isolated in a lower hotel than a big tower.

People are more likely to walk an attractive surrounding area. People watch at an outdoor café, shop, walk to shows and such rather than hold up in the glass tower.

Regarding the apartments, I love the idea of the off-site building being used as apartments. Great buildings, great location, near to downtown, near to the museum, library and entertainments, Mattoon Street, art venues and the casino but not part of it. The people who live there will feel a part of our community not part of an entertainment complex.

Did MGM miss an opportunity by not communicating effectively, absolutely. Shame on them. Every project has changes that need to be made along the way. There's nothing nefarious about it. It's just how large-scale building projects work.

Sometimes change necessitated by legal issues, environmental or financial

issues, space constraints, material or structural problems, efficiencies in any manner of unforeseen issues. For the most part, the general public sees only the finished product.

This is not MGM's first rodeo. They are spending a lot of money and will ensure that they will build an entertainment complex that is the best it can be. That would be true wherever they build. It isn't in their best interest to build something less than spectacular.

They want to draw as many people for as long as possible. I think it's counterproductive to micromanage something they do very well all over the world already. Hold them to their contracts, financial obligations, hiring goals and community commitments. But don't examine everything that changes every time under a microscope.

These guys are experts. Let them build a world-class complex. The people of Springfield should be concerned and want the council members to make sure that they meet their commitments and how we use the income

that we get wisely, not approve what color
marble is used in the foyer. Thank you very
much.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you very much. Perfect timing. Vera O'Connor.

MS. O'CONNOR: Greetings

Commissioners, Mr. Mike Mathis, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Vera O'Connor, a resident of Springfield.

I really thought that all of the discussion about Springfield MGM plans were over before the host agreement was signed. And MGM would not try to change horses in midstream. At the last hearing before the host agreement was signed, I told Mr. Mathis that we in Springfield would hold his feet to the fire to make sure he kept his promise and that the agreement would be kept.

Since then, there have been many changes. First the opening date was pushed back. The design with the glass tower has been changed. The straw that breaks the camel's back however is their most recent proposal to decrease the size of the building and make the

parking garage smaller.

The last proposed change was announced just before the last municipal election, a bombshell. It could not have happened at a worse time. Although in my opinion, at least one city councilor benefited from it by getting a lot more votes than he would have.

I have received a lot of flak from some people who oppose the idea of Springfield casino. And they never cease to remind me that they told me that MGM would not live up to the host agreement.

Those same people have no control over their kids either, so don't always try to tell people what to do. It is my hope that there will be no more changes to the plans. I still would like to see plans that include the glass tower that was promised and give Springfield casino the wow factor just like Malaysia and Las Vegas. That's a wow factor. So, thank you for your time. Respect all.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you very

much. Mario Fiore.

1 MR. FIORE: Good afternoon 2 Commissioner Crosby and members of the 3 Commission. It looks like everybody's had a long day. So, I'm going to keep my comments short and brief. 5 6 My name is Mario W. Fiore. I'm 65 7 years old born and raised in Springfield's 8 south end. And I've been a resident of the 9 city of Springfield for my entire 65 years. 10 I am neither an expert at 11 construction or finance, so I'm going to talk 12 about my experience with MGM. A little over 13 three years ago I saw somewhere that there was 14 going to be an informal meeting at a community 15 office hosted by MGM. I said, wait a minute 16 MGM, the world leader in hospitality and 17 entertainment right here in my hometown of 18 Springfield? 19 I just had to go and I liked what I 20 heard at that informal meeting more than three 21 years ago. And I like what I've seen since 22 that meeting. Civic groups and organizations 23 knocking on MGM's door. Examples such as

\$20,000 towards Fourth of July fireworks,

1 \$60,000 toward improved lighting for downtown 2 Springfield. Most of all the millions of 3 dollars towards a brand-new Springfield rescue mission to house our city's homeless. 5 So, MGM has certainly worked with 6 our city over these past three years. So, I would hope that both the Mass. Gaming 8 Commission and our city of Springfield would 9 work with MGM on these proposed changes to the 10 original hotel casino plans. That's just my 11 Thank you for your time. opinion. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you very 13 much. Jeffrey Ciuffreda. 14 MR. CIUFFREDA: Mr. Chairman, 15 Commissioners, good afternoon. I'm Jeffrey 16 Ciuffreda, the president of the Springfield 17 Regional Chamber of Commerce. 18 I've had the pleasure or distinction 19 of appearing before you before. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Welcome back. 21 MR. CUIFFREDA: Thank you. 22 deference to your time and to those behind me 23 who want to testify, I have handed in some 24 written testimony for you. And I'm sure you

will consider that.

So, I am just here really just to personally reconfirm the Springfield Regional Chamber's support for MGM Springfield and that includes given their design changes. The board has looked at those, have been briefed by those and recommitted it's support for MGM with the modifications.

In my comments, I talk about the commitment that MGM has really shown to this city. And clearly, much of what they are doing is based upon their great experience that is certainly good for them. But I know from working with them so much that every consideration is given to make sure that that's also good for the city of Springfield.

Clearly recognized MGM in our early support for them as a world leader, not just a national leader in gaming and entertainment.

Even though we have architects and lawyers and bankers you name it on our board, it's very difficult for us, quite frankly, to second-guess an entity with their reputation and their ability to spend \$950 million into the fine

points of architecture.

2.1

As I said to you the last time I was in front of you, not only does MGM have to open up this resort and we want them to open up this resort, it has to be sustainable for a long time into the future. So, I think some of the changes they perhaps were not ones they necessarily wanted to make but in order to make sure they're sustainable I think they did.

So, they have shown a commitment to local vendors. I just want to leave you with that. That's one of the things the chamber really insisted upon. They have had some construction, as you know, going on at that site.

They've got some contracts out to bid right now. And I know not from MGM but from my members that many of my members have been working on that site. They've kindly incorporated many of our members both in the construction and vendors in the bid package they put out.

And I know that my members have gotten back to me that some of the contractors

interested in bidding on them have been 2 contacted by those. So, I think they made a 3 commitment to that. And I just want to let you know that they have lived up to that commitment 5 and it's one that I see only strengthening 6 going forward. So, in summary the Springfield 8 Regional Chamber continues to support MGM 9 Springfield designs. We would ask for an 10 expedited approval on this so that we can get 11 this great project underway and get those 12 construction jobs and permanent jobs which we 13 so sorely need in this area. 14 So, Commissioners, thank you for 15 your consideration of this and my written 16 testimony. I appreciate your time. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you very 18 And thank you for your written 19 testimony. We do have all of the 20 correspondence, every email, every letter that 21 we get is in our books. We do read it all. 22 So, please feel free to comment that way as 23 well. Tom Lott. MR. LOTT: Good afternoon. 24 My name

is Tom Lott. I live in Forest Park Heights. I am an avid supporter of the casino.

I and most of the people in my sphere of influence are okay with the design changes. We see the changes as very minute. The casino project, from our perspective, is the most significant development in the history of Springfield. And we should do whatever we need to do to facilitate and expedite the completion of the project.

MGM is investing \$950 million in a city. Obviously, they are not going to make any major changes that would negatively impact their projected revenue stream.

Getting rid of the tower hotel and placing people closer to the street and expanding the area where people will congregate is no-brainer. It just makes good sense.

I am not a gambler, but I want
Springfield to be a place where there's plenty
to do. For instance, entertainment, shops,
events, activities and more. This will attract
more foot traffic and help all of the
surrounding businesses.

2.1

1 We have been promised \$25 million 2 per year and 2000 and 3000 construction and 3 permanent jobs respectively. As long as we are getting the revenue and the jobs, these minor 5 design changes should have no impact on us. 6 Let's let MGM decide what's best for their business and do what we can to expedite the 8 entire process so that we can get this 9 development open for business prior to the fall of 2018. 10 11 And I want to thank you guys number 12 one, for taking the time and thank you for your 13 concern for the city of Springfield. 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you. Thank 15 you for your comments. Jeffrey Burstein. 16 MR. BURSTEIN: Commissioner, 17 Chairman, thank you. Jeffrey Burstein, I own 18 property at 1317 and 1343 East Columbus Avenue, 19 which is in between the entrance and the exit 20 to the proposed development. 2.1 Not long after the unsuccessful 22 repeal referendum, Michael Mathis stated this 23 is where we go from promises made to promises 24 kept. Shortly thereafter, MGM came to you

requesting additional time to complete their project on the premise that they had to coordinate with the viaduct reconstruction.

Soon thereafter, they announced that they no longer wanted to build the glass tower. And yet again just a short time after that, MGM filed a notice of project change making additional changes and reductions to the retail space, the bowling alley, movie theater, the parking garage and other areas, along with the bus and traffic pattern.

They also previously made a change that wasn't very public that was to eliminate the designated turning lane recommended by their experts, which is the roadway widening on East Columbus Avenue which would help traffic flow onto Bliss Street and into their parking garage.

That decision was made when they chose to default on the contract to purchase our property between Howard and Bliss Streets.

That decision has consequences on the safety of the motoring public which will be weaving lanes to access the parking garage and proposed bus

depo. Safety of pedestrians as well as the safety of the residents, employees, occupants and visitors of our building.

Our building has five residential apartments along with two businesses. In addition to the great risk to public safety, the consequence of MGM's decision is that we will have no parking. There will be no access to the building as it will become landlocked.

The project will create a nuisance for the owners and its occupants and guests.

The proposed project does not protect the built environment which is a requirement of the city of Springfield zoning ordinance.

Moving the garage entrance on Bliss Street 50 feet closer to East Columbus Avenue will cause busses and other traffic to back up onto East Columbus Avenue causing traffic snarls. The new bus pattern will also cause emission and noise pollution along with severe vibration and shadowing in front of the building.

The proposed parking behind the building for extended vans and limousines will

cause excessive emissions as those vehicles will need to warm up in the cold New England winter.

There will also be noise 24 hours a day from people in vehicles immediately behind the building disturbing our residential tenants. The proposed signs on the parking structure if allowed to be illuminated will shine into our apartments causing a nuisance to the tenants.

Our apartments are the only residences on the casino and retail block. The elimination of parking on Howard Street, which is less than 10 feet from our building, should be replaced by parking that is equally as close. Our residential tenants need to be able to park overnight and close to there residences to bring up groceries and other items.

The generators that are proposed to be located behind our building in between the parking garage and our building will create excessive noise and emissions that will result in a nuisance to our occupants and tenants.

Those generators if run at night will

potentially keep my tenants awake.

The transformer that was installed on the property behind our building is not depicted on any of the plans and will result in elimination of parking spaces that have been represented.

Surely, if MGM can turn a hotel on its side and reconfigure its plans for its benefit in such an expedited manner, then they should be able to accommodate the built environment.

I respectfully request that you reexamine the risk presented arising from not
widening East Columbus Avenue to add a turning
lane, and that you require MGM to keep
designated parking immediately behind my
building for the benefit of the occupants
including overnight parking for the tenants.

Provide an area next to our building to keep our trash and recycling that is accessible for garbage trucks to enter and turnaround. Provide the designated drop-off space adjacent to the building.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Mr. Burstein, are

1 you about done? 2 MR. BURSTEIN: I'm pretty close, 3 Install an elevator in the garage at the west side of the garage abutting Howard 5 Street to promote walkability to the 6 Riverfront, East Columbus Avenue businesses and the courthouse. 8 Restrict MGM from illuminating their 9 signs that will shine into the tenants' 10 apartments and relocate the generators which 11 should be able to be relocated away from the 12 only apartments in the Main Street, Union 13 Street, State Street, East Columbus Ave. block. 14 I also ask you --15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Sir, why don't you 16 submit the rest of this. This is pretty 17 technical stuff. Give this in writing and 18 we'll take it from there. 19 MR. BURSTEIN: I have, Chairman, but 20 can I just wrap it up? 2.1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If it's quick. 22 MR. BURSTEIN: It is. I also ask 23 that you consider requiring MGM to build the

garage as promised as well as the residential

apartments as promised. I believe that the residential apartments will help promote a safe environment.

MGM to grant a recorded easement to the abutters and to the city of Springfield for parking that has been promised by MGM. Let's make sure from now on promises that made are promises kept. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Dr., is it Gloria
-- I don't want to take a risk on the last
name. I can't read it.

DR. CABALLER-ARCE: I don't blame you for not wanting to take a risk. It's a mouthful. It's Dr. Gloria Caballer-Arce.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.

DR. CABALLER-ARCE: Good afternoon to all of you, Commissioners. As a citizen of Springfield for over 30 years, I have watched this great city evolve, struggle and become a force to be reckoned with as a result of its people, their hard-work and commitment to a better Springfield for all.

We are and proudly a very diverse

2.1

1 community. And for the most part we work 2 together for our common causes. We have a rich history as a city of firsts. Founded in 1636 3 by English Puritan William Pynchon and named 5 Springfield in 1641. We are the first 6 Springfield in the New World. We are the city of homes, Victorian 8 in style second only to San Francisco. 9 Basketball was created here. Dr. Seuss known 10 worldwide was a product of Springfield. 11 Mulberry Street was made famous as a result of 12 his books. 13 St. John's Congregational Church 14 founded in 1844 played a pivotal role in the 15 abolitionist movement. John Brown attended 16 services there. Springfield leads in trade and 17 transportation, education and health services, 18 manufacturing, tourism, hospitality and 19 government. 20 We are considered as one of 21 America's top emerging cultural markets. A 33 22 percent Latino population with buying power 23 that has increased over 295 percent.

impressive when one considers we arrived a

little over two decades ago.

The citizens of Springfield are an intelligent, creative, highly motivated, hardworking, honest people of integrity.

Historically, we take a backseat to no one in terms of accomplishments.

We have had a great impact on all sections of our society from education to politics, to arts and sports. I want to keep this momentum going. That is why we came out in strong support of MGM's casino resort. I see MGM as transparent with clear communication regarding every phase of this project and resort casino.

Despite recent media sensationalism to the contrary, they recently addressed our concerns by coming forward with sound reasons for the changes that may or may not be approved by the Gaming Commission.

These changes will hopefully benefit the community now and in the long run. In my opinion, my support for MGM is based on the fact that it will create 3- to 5000 jobs at every level from entry to executive levels.

These jobs are direly needed by our community to keep us on the fast track to the future Springfield deserves.

MGM has taken into consideration the geographical layout of Springfield with its residences, small businesses and entertainment venues, and have tried to maintain the integrity, character and charm of our Springfield.

I believe the revised plan will work for the city of Springfield especially in the area of employment. I also believe that the building of MGM casinos will catapult us into a brighter future for all of the citizens of Springfield that are so deserving of this.

I say put aside the recent past and move forward with the confidence in MGM. A brighter future in all sectors of our society depends on it. As an addendum, I'd like to say I too wanted a tower but still want jobs more. I want a better infrastructure. I hope that as a revamping of this proposal that this is exactly what happens. I want to thank you for your time.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you. Ray 2 Caporale. 3 MR. CAPORALE: Good afternoon, 4 Chairman. I am Ray Caporale. I grew up in the 5 south end where this project is going to be. 6 have seen its highs. I've seen its lows. I heard a lot of negativity. Down 8 the street there is a facility called --9 for the homeless shelter. They built this. 10 was Sterling Cadillac. It was a sore eye. 11 They tore it down. The rebuilt the facility 12 I go by it on a day to day basis. It is 13 presently in my backyard. It's a beautiful 14 facility and you wouldn't even know what it is. 15 The charitable contributions they've 16 made since they've been here to various 17 organizations, I don't hear anybody turning 18 that money back because it's coming from 19 gaming. 20 This tower, let the dust settle. 21 know when I go out of town and I stay in a 22 hotel, the first person I call is the fire 23 department. I want to know what the highest 24 hook and ladder is, because I ain't taking a

room above it, God forbid something happens.

This thing will get done. I don't see jobs construction wise being lost. I don't see permanent jobs being lost. I don't see money going to the city being changed. I don't see revenue going to the state being changed.

Let the dust settle.

Down the street there's the basketball Hall of Fame. Mayor Mike Albano is a friend of mine when he was the mayor of the city. That's design number four that final project, four. It's there. Everybody's happy with it.

We've gotta stop worrying about this and let this thing go. Let it settle out. The smoke will settle. As you probably have seen the presentation, a lot of their project has taken bigger sizes not smaller sizes.

People are getting too big on a tower. It's a tower ladies and gentlemen. It ain't going to change this city. And when they get done building this facility, I'm sure they're going to have it designed in a way that if you are coming down the highway, you are

going to see it, because it's only going to better them to make people stop there. If I don't see it, I don't go in it.

I'm sure they're going to do something to make it so the people coming down the highway or coming there to find it will find it. This thing will be done. Just let them do their jobs.

You people are doing your due diligence. I hope the city council, yourself and the historical society will all take a deep breath and write off on this project. Thank you for coming. Have a safe journey back to Boston. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Some of us go back to Boston, not all of us. Thank you for your time. Bill Devlin.

MR. DEVLIN: Greetings. I'm Bill
Devlin, an architect in Springfield. I live
and work at 235 State Street in what we
optimistically call downtown Springfield.

And I've been there for several years. I grew up in the area, was out for 15 years and came back about 30 years ago. And

there have been a lot of changes. But I still must be pretty naïve because my first thought that MGM -- Where are they? -- MGM was a large worldwide sophisticated organization should understand that large projects have changes. Should understand that there are always delays, things happen. Things hit the fan.

If they have a 40-year commitment I hope you can hold them to that through whatever financial security is required. We pessimists tend to put them in the five years or so range. Before they even came here, the surrounding casinos in Connecticut and elsewhere were already in trouble.

But thankfully to MGM's presentation at the City Stage they apparently have it down to two years for some of them. They seem to think -- Basically, with the finances they are complaining about the fact that we have a casino boom. A casino comes in prices go up. And they're complaining about prices going up.

Sensibly somebody would budget in extra time. And if you're going to spend \$800 million, design something that prices out now

at 550 or 600. If you're going to price it out now at 800, you know it's going to be 1.2 or whatever around there when you get around to building it. That's just commonsense which isn't that common.

The underground delivery that they had initially discussed sounds great. And only Bay State West did a similar thing. The semis go down there and they actually drive around underneath that building. But that two-story underground parking was tried by the Sheraton, by the federal building and Columbus Center had other issues when they were building. And it didn't work out to have two stories below grade.

This is bottomland. That is no secret. We have a big river. We had floods seven feet, 10 feet high on South Main Street in the 1930s. This is bottomland. It's mud and muck. You have trouble. It's saturated with water. This is not rocket science. In the 60s and 40s, planners of Springfield labeled this whole downtown area the hasiky (PHONETIC) marsh. That's what they're building

in. They should be able to figure that out.

The hotel, I don't really miss the tower all that much. I think the low-rise on Main Street maybe is a good idea. We've had skyscrapers for well over 120 years. It's no secret that a smaller floor area in a tower because you want to make the floor small make it tall, make it sexy.

That's never been a secret that that requires more space for stairs and more space for elevators but they discovered that when they made the last presentation. That's why they had to do the low-rise hotel.

That hotel that glass tower for better or for worse was a great advertising banner for people and anyone especially the ones coming in from the south. That was a grabber, a real eye-catcher was a wow factor and I just hope you will keep their feet to the fire in the finances, because when you give up a flag like that that tells me you are in major, major trouble. That is not something you part with easily.

all set?

MR. DEVLIN: Almost, on historic especially is my pet peeve. The rotunda, they showed this ridiculous little drawing here.

They wrote so-called dome in 73 State Street.

73 State Street is their best asset. They had to move the dome because the hotel was there. When the hotel is gone they're still moving it. Every place they've put it, it's butchered.

entrance in the front of 73 State Street which was approved by Springfield Historical Commission, but I don't recall that anything was even shown to the Commission. They are butchering that building, but they love that render view from across State Street which somehow in the rendering is 150 or 200 feet wide.

I just think it is a terrible shame what they're doing to the history. They claim to love our history. Their original pitch coming here was we love your history and we love your character. Now watch what we do to

it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: David Ciampi.

MR. CIAMPI: Thank you for giving me an opportunity to talk in front of the Commission today. I am going to keep this very short. Basically, I am completely for the changes and the plans that MGM has put forth. I just want to comment on something that's been going on.

About a couple of years ago, I tried to get Whole Foods and Trader Joe's to come to Springfield. They wouldn't come. The reason is because the area is economically depressed, profoundly economically depressed. South end, as I'm sure you know, has a 66 percent poverty rate. Back in 2012 that's a statistic for 2012. People aren't going to come here.

MGM on the other hand is willing to put a lot of risk capital down in this city. I think it's very important for the people of the city of Springfield to be very mindful of that fact. That MGM is going to come in here, do some economic revitalization that's really so important for the city, something that we

really haven't seen in Springfield for many,
many years.

The city has been on an economic slide for many decades. I've lived here since '54. So, I've seen quite a lot. And what I've seen hasn't been really good.

So, this is a great opportunity for the city. And I think that MGM coming here is really something really important. And I think we have to cut some slack. MGM is in the process of doing some fine-tuning. It's a very, very big economic project for the city. And it would be expected. I anticipated that there would be some fine-tuning along the way. That's my take. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you very much. That is the last name on our list, I believe. Is there anybody who didn't sign up that wanted to speak? Yes, Sir, three minutes.

MR. ALIKTA: Good afternoon. My name is Muwakkil Alikta. I live at 55 Foster Street here in Springfield.

What I wanted to say Commissioners is that when this process was going on about

the selling of the casino to the citizens of

Springfield, they had this image that they

projected. And this image they projected was

high-rise office building, this 25-story

building. And in this roadshow that they went

to the city to sell it, it would grace the

skyline of the city of Springfield and make it

a new paradigm.

And now they have changed course.

And the people in my neighborhood, they feel they've been cheated. They've been cheated to the fact that this is not going to happen now. It was going to change the image of the city for years to come.

In this case, it is tantamount to almost like a Ponzi scheme, if I'm not being disrespectful. Other members of my family across the country when they saw this advertisement, it gave the image that it was going to change the image of the city forever hopefully. And now, this is not going to happen.

These people down in Las Vegas who run MGM, they are among the most sophisticated

and savvy investors of the world. So, these people they know what they're doing. They're not little children in a candy store. They are not at a craps table. They know what they are doing.

In that case, I may make a bold statement. And the bold statement I'm going to make is that why not revoke their license in this case because not being truthful to the citizens of Springfield.

In this roadshow, they went around the city almost a year and half ago, gave this image that this was going to happen. This beautiful tower was going to grace the skyline of the city of Springfield and make a change. And that's all I want to say. Thank you very much.

much. Anybody else? All right. It's about 3:50. I want to thank everybody who took the time to come and talk. We appreciate it very much. They will be an important part of our considerations. We will be back here, I'm sure, many times in the future.

		Page	61
1	Do I have a motion to adjourn?		
2	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So moved.		
3	COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Second.		
4	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor, aye.		
5	COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.		
6	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.		
7	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.		
8	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Unanimous.		
9			
10	(Hearing closed at 3:50 p.m.)		
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

Page 62 1 ATTACHMENTS: Massachusetts Gaming Commission December 2 3 3, 2015 Notice of Meeting/Hearing and 4 Agenda 5 6 **GUEST SPEAKERS:** Michael Fenton, Pres. Springfield City Council 8 Orlando Ramos, Springfield City Councilor 9 Tim Rook, Springfield City Councilor 10 Karen Ford 11 Rhonda Latney 12 Mark Checkwicz 13 Carol Kerr Vera O'Connor 14 15 Mario Fiore Jeffrey Ciuffreda, Springfield Regional Chamber 16 17 of Commerce 18 Tom Lott 19 Jeffrey Burstein Dr. Gloria Caballer-Arce 20 21 Ray Caporale 22 Bill Devlin 23 David Ciampi 24 Muwakkil Alikta

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I, Laurie J. Jordan, an Approved Court
4	Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing
5	is a true and accurate transcript from the
6	record of the proceedings.
7	
8	I, Laurie J. Jordan, further certify that the
9	foregoing is in compliance with the
10	Administrative Office of the Trial Court
11	Directive on Transcript Format.
12	I, Laurie J. Jordan, further certify I neither
13	am counsel for, related to, nor employed by any
14	of the parties to the action in which this
15	hearing was taken and further that I am not
16	financially nor otherwise interested in the
17	outcome of this action.
18	Proceedings recorded by Verbatim means, and
19	transcript produced from computer.
20	WITNESS MY HAND this 7th day of December,
21	2015.
22	aurig Jordan
23	LAURIE J. JORDAN My Commission expires:
24	Notary Public May 11, 2018