	Page 1
1	COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
2	MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION
3	PUBLIC MEETING #144
4	
5	
6	COMMISSIONERS
7	James F. McHugh
8	Gayle Cameron
9	Bruce W. Stebbins
10	Enrique Zuniga
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	February 5, 2015 10:31 a.m.
22	BOSTON CONVENTION AND EXHIBITION CENTER
23	415 Summer Street, Room 107B
24	Boston, Massachusetts 02210

PROCEEDINGS

2.1

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. It's my pleasure to call to order the 144th meeting of the -- public meeting of Massachusetts Gaming Commission. Chairman Crosby is not with us today. He's en route to a well-deserved break, and so the four of us will proceed in his absence. But, of course, he's here in spirit.

The first item on the agenda, as it customarily is, is approval of the minutes. The minutes, this time of the January 22, 2015 meeting, those minutes are in the book. And I take it we've all had a chance to look at them, and I would move their acceptance in the form in which they appear in the book, subject to the usual reservation of the power to correct typographical and other mechanical errors. So I'd make that motion.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Is there any discussion, any thoughts, any corrections, any

substantive issues with the minutes? All right, then. All in favor of approving the minutes in the form that they appear with that reservation, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes have it unanimously. That brings us to Item 2 on the agenda, which is administration. Executive Director Day. Good morning, sir.

MR. DAY: Good morning, Commissioner McHugh, fellow commissioners.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good morning.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good morning.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good morning.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning.

MR. DAY: I actually just have a very short couple of items just to share with you relative to administrative update. I wanted to let you know that, pending completion of background, we've hired an experienced candidate for our gaming agent

2.1

supervisor. We're real excited about that, at the slot parlor. As well, we have started the recruiting efforts to form the rest of the team that will work with him. So we're moving forward on that to be -- make sure we're prepared when the slot parlor's ready to open.

In addition, pending background, we've also added a revenue agent to our finance and administration team, and are in the final stages of interviewing and selecting positions for -- two positions for our licensing unit.

Another quick note is, our licensing management system is in production within the agency. We are entering applications, and we are looking forward to being able to move to outfacing, public facing, probably, in early March.

And, finally, after all the discussion, we are continuing contract discussions with GTECH, and we are looking toward, hopefully, the February 19th meeting to be able to come back to the commission with a contract.

And that, unless there are any questions the commission might have, brings me to end of my short report, and to our ombudsman, John Ziemba.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.

Thank you. February 19th is the next meeting so you anticipate being able to come back with the GTECH contract, or at least a substantive update on that next meeting?

MR. DAY: Yes, we do.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good. All right. All right. Thank you, very much.

Let's turn, then, without further adieu, to the ombudsman, Mr. Ziemba.

MR. ZIEMBA: Thank you, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good morning.

Mr. Robert DeSalvio, president of Wynn Mass, LLC, to join us to today to update the commission regarding the status of its

MR. ZIEMBA: We've asked

upcoming Massachusetts Environmental Policy

Act submission. Its supplemental final

24 environmental impact report.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

As the commission is aware, every gaming licensee issued by the commission, both Category 1 and Category 2, has been conditioned upon the completion of the MEPA process. On August 15, 2014, the secretary of energy and environmental affairs required Wynn to submit a supplemental FEIR, but limited the scope of the filing to traffic and transportation issues, and a response to comments.

Consistent with this directive, the Wynn team has been working on this filing. Mr. DeSalvio will detail its efforts in this regard.

In addition to the commission's requirements relative to MEPA, the commission also imposed a condition on the Wynn license, that it continue its public outreach, including in Charlestown. In response to this condition, and as part of the continuing outreach efforts of the Wynn team, the Wynn team has a meeting next week in Charlestown to present relevant details of its latest plans, which -- which will include in the upcoming S -- SFEIR submission. With that as a

Page 7 1 context, I welcome Mr. DeSalvio to come and 2 join us. 3 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. 4 Good morning, Mr. DeSalvio. 5 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning. 6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good morning. 7 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good 8 morning. 9 MR. DESALVIO: Thank you, John, and 10 good morning, Commissioners. 11 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good morning. 12 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning. 13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good morning. 14 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: 15 morning. MR. DESALVIO: Thanks for the 16 17 opportunity to give you the update. Ι'm 18 pleased to report the progress Wynn Resorts 19 has made on the supplemental, final 20 environment impact report. Late last week we 2.1 met with MassDOT and provided them with some 22 additional information, which will assist in 23 their review of the overall filing. 24 addition, both MEPA and MassDOT have requested

additional time to review our filing to ensure a thorough analysis. We plan to share a draft with them in response to this request in an effort to ensure a successful completion of the MEPA process.

The project is already the subject of a comprehensive FEIR that resulted in the EEA secretary certificate on the final environmental impact report last August. At that time, the EEA secretary concluded that our FEIR satisfied MEPA's requirements with respect to 10 of the 11 topics covered, including wetlands, air quality, greenhouse gas, sustainable development, stormwater, water supply, waste water, solid and hazardous waste, historic resources and construction management.

However, the EEA secretary did request further analysis and consultation with other state agencies on specific traffic and transit topics. We are now in the final stages of completing the SFEIR to address this request. The SFEIR will include a summary of the project, including a discussion of

2.1

refinements to the project design since the filing of the FEIR, including the new hotel tower design presented to you at the last public meeting, and a comprehensive evaluation of any impacts of those refinements.

The filing will also contain a materially-enhanced transportation analysis for the project, prepared in consultation with MassDOT, the MBTA and the Boston Transportation Department. That includes additional data collected since the FEIR and significant additional analysis of the transportation impacts of the project, and alternative means of mitigating those impacts.

The analysis includes new evaluations of all potentially-affected roads, new parking evaluations, the new evaluations of public and private transportation options. All of the data and the analysis have been shared with MassDOT, and the data and analysis relevant to the MBTA and BTD have been shared with them. We've continued to consult with the BTD regarding traffic and transit issues relevant to Boston, meeting with them seven

2.1

times since November of 2014 with the last meeting being held on January 26th.

In the course of those meetings BTD requested initial -- additional analysis, which has been completed, including additional traffic counts, which were conducted in December along Broadway, Alford Street, Route 99, and in Sullivan Square to ensure that the completion of the Alford Street bridge and the Tobin Bridge projects did not materially affect traffic.

In addition, at the request of BTD, we completed a sensitivity analysis of transit ridership to ascertain the impacts of projected transit usage on the road network and reanalyzed anticipated parking utilization to confirm the validity of those estimates, including by comparison to other identified casinos.

There was also extensive

consultation with BTD regarding our plans to

mitigate the impacts of the project on

Sullivan Square. A number of the BTD's

requested modifications to the plan were

2.1

incorporated, including the installation of conduit from Sullivan Square to Austin Street, to tie that part of the traffic signal network into BTD's command center, adjustment to the lane geometry along Route 99, and a reconfiguration of Sullivan Square roads to better integrate the MBTA's bus operation at Sullivan Square Station with general traffic. We will continue to meet with BTD as the design of the project, including Sullivan Square mitigation, progresses.

The SFEIR will also include a comprehensive description of the project's mitigation commitments. We don't believe the MEPA process will affect our schedule. We're continuing to move forward with project design and our remediation plans, in the meantime. And with that, I'll be happy to answer any questions.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.

Thank you very much, Mr. DeSalvio. Questions, comments?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Mr. DeSalvio, you're planning, in the next couple of weeks,

2.1

to file; is that accurate?

2.1

MR. DESALVIO: Yeah. I'm reticent to actually pick a date. We supplied some information to the DOT this past -- not only at end of last week, but at the beginning of this week. And, quite honestly, with what's going on with the weather, I think everyone at MassDOT's had probably more important things to worry about, including public safety during the storm. So they said they would get back to us, if they need additional information and, if required, even another meeting, but nothing's been scheduled as of yet.

So we want to make sure they've had a opportunity to look at it. I mentioned earlier that we're going to do a draft filing and give that draft to the MEPA folks and MassDOT, and if they have any additional questions, then we'll pick the filing date.

So I don't want to peg a date, and I certainly want to -- I understand that they've been going through a lot this week.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

MR. DESALVIO: Mm-hmm.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Others? We have made a commitment to the Charlestown community that we would post the relevant portions of the SFEIR on our Web site so that they could all see them. So as soon as simultaneously with that being filed, we would

8

additions and changes highlighted so we can quickly get that up on the Web site so that

9

folks can see it and talk about it.

like to have it, and like to have the

1112

when -- what your plans are for providing us

In addition to that, I wonder

13

with the additional information about the

14

revised design? We have the two renderings,

15

but, at the moment, that's all we have. So I

16

know there's much more behind the new shape.

17

And what are your thoughts about when we'll

18

get a chance to look at those?

19

think I mentioned at the last meeting, I was

MR. DESALVIO: Well I spent -- as I

20

heading out to Las Vegas. And I spent the

2122

entire week last week with all of the

23

different departments going over, virtually,

24

every square inch of the building. We got

tremendous input from the departments, but that necessitated, yet again, going back and

looking at certain aspects of the building.

So it is a -- it's an evolving design process that, in reality, I'm not sure it serves us well to rush it. I want to make sure that all the departments get an opportunity to provide their input. We have a wonderful team of professionals out there. And I don't think I can pick a date because I want to make sure that we go through and we give those opportunities for the architects and the Wynn design development team to do what they do. But the work is going on at a very, very quick pace, I want to let you know, out there. And, literally, I spent the entire week out there on this topic and doing nothing So I, probably, at another meeting I'd be able to give you a better idea of date, but right now we're in full-fledge design mode on the interior of the building.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, I appreciate that, and I assume that you are.

And you can see, visibly, what the changes are

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

already made comments about that, and others have made comments as well. But we do need to take a look at the remainder -- at the -- at what's behind this. And we would -- I would, and I think the commission would like to have in mind a date, or at least a range when we might be able to see that and take a look at it, and examine, in more detail, the backing for it. So I look forward to getting that from you. And, perhaps, Mr. Ziemba and you can work together to figure out when that date will be.

MR. DESALVIO: Be happy to work with John on that.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. Good. Thank you very much. All right. Any other questions or comments?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: One real quick. I know John mentioned you have a meeting coming up in Charlestown.

MR. DESALVIO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Can you share with us any past or planned, future

2.1

outreach events and activities you have going on?

MR. DESALVIO: Absolutely. There's been quite a bit leading up to this meeting.

A lot of more informal meetings going on in Charlestown right now. I know most of you have met John Tocco, who is our director of community relations. He's been spending a lot of time there, as well as in our other surrounding communities and host community.

A lot of preparation has gone on through the assistance of residents in Charlestown. They have an engaged Charlestown resident group that's been very active. So we're currently -- we had a meeting the other night, about a three-hour meeting to plan the agenda for the meeting on the 11th. It's going to be held at the community college from six to nine on February 11th. We're going to cover a wide range of topics. Everything from the update of our plan to what the aspects of the environmental mitigation are to transportation and traffic, and public safety and responsible gaming.

2.1

We tried to ascertain, from the community, what were the topics that they were interested in so we could design our presentation accordingly and have it be relevant. And the outcome of that is that we're going to ask some of the residents who are more engaged, if they would sign up to actually participate in smaller group discussions on specific topics.

So we're going to allow this -first of all, a large opportunity to present
the plan, but then a much more -- a much more
focused opportunity for each of the major
components. If we're going to look -- for
example, we're talking about transportation
being one, environmental being one and -- and
then other community-related issues.

2.1

So we're going to give some of the residents that are interested an opportunity to sign up, and then we're going to continue to have follow-up meetings. We're considering this the big kickoff to the start of a process, not the end of a process. And so far

it's been well-received. We're getting good

feedback that we're coming and we're making ourselves available, and we're going to have an open and honest dialogue with the residents.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, that sounds like a good plan. I know that, from talking to some Charlestown residents who've attended these meetings, and who are active in this process, that they're eager to have it go forward. It sounds like a good framework for further discussions, and so that's -- that's what the -- that's what we anticipated when we put that commission -- condition on the license, and we'll look forward to hearing the results of it.

I think to put all of what we've been talking about in context, it's important to understand that the license that every licensee received was subject to a whole range of conditions, including getting permits from other -- from permit-granting authorities.

The commission doesn't grant the permits to do a lot of things that have to be done in order

2.1

for these facilities to be built. And so, the MEPA process is one, but there are many other permits that need to be obtained, and that's what's transpiring now for all of the licensees. So it's important to understand the limitation of the commission's powers with respect to that, and why those conditions are in, and why those conditions are in, and why those conditions are in the statute. Because, of course, the statute does require that all local and state permits, and federal permits necessary, be granted by those permitting-granting authorities. So thank you for that report. It —

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I do have one question, maybe for your next update. But you mentioned in your initial remarks that you are still trending on schedule, the outer dates being somewhere around 2017, if I remember correctly. As some of these activities continue to evolve, I'd be very interested in getting an update, at some point, on the detailed schedule as you -- as you move forward.

MR. DESALVIO: Sure. We would be

2.1

happy do that. But the real good news there is that we had parallel tracks going on.

While we're working on the SFEIR, we're still moving forward rapidly on the design phase, and, certainly, on the remediation front as well. So -- and since that's the front end of the work that has to be done, this filling is not getting in the way of that, and the work continues.

Even -- even with the -- I checked the -- even last night with the GZA that's working on the site doing the soil characterization. And with the snow, they're able to continue on as well. Slowed them down a little bit for a few days, but they're able to do borings and just keep on going, so the work continues.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Great.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.

Good. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.

Mr. Ziemba, back to you, sir.

MR. ZIEMBA: Commissioners, as you're aware, Monday was the deadline for the community mitigation fund applications. In total, we received 24 applications, including 21 reserve applications and three applications for specific impacts.

As a reminder, when the commission

established the guidelines for the 2015 community mitigation fund, it established two different categories of funding. Number one, funding for specific construction related impacts that have occurred or are occurring by the application deadline, February 2, 2015. And second, a one-time \$100,000 perk community reserve for each surrounding community, community that reached the nearby community agreement with the licensee, and all

The reserve could be used for specific impacts when those impacts are determined, or could be used for planning-related activities, either planning to avoid or minimize potential negative

communities that petitioned to become

surrounding communities.

impacts from a facility, or planning to take better advantage of the opportunities that may arise from a facility.

In regard to the one-time reserve, once a planning need is determined, or a specific impact found, communities will contact the ombudsman's office to utilize the reserve, application materials will be completed at that time and put before the commission for review. Communities may use the reserve fund in 2015 or thereafter.

I must note that we still have to review even the reserve applications for their compliance with our guidelines. As you remember, the reserve application was a very simple form with the check the box, but we still need to review those reserve requests for compliance and will make an official determination at a later date.

In regard to the specific impacts, staff will expeditiously begin its review of these applications. The applications will be forwarded to the respective licensee for their comment. In the 2015 community mitigation

2.1

fund guidelines, the commission estimated that decisions could be made, approximately, by July. Potentially, the reviews could be completed prior to that date. As we begin to review the materials, we'll provide an update to the commission, but we'll try to work as quickly as we can. We'll also review any comments we receive from other interested parties, such as comments from regional planning agencies. And, further, we'll evaluate the submissions in the context of any host and surrounding community agreements that were executed.

Commissioners, we received one request for an expedited review, given some pending deadlines. We received a request from mitigation from Sheriff Ashe, who joins us today, regarding the Western Massachusetts

Correctional Alcohol Center. We -- Sheriff

Ashe will provide us a little bit of some of the background regarding the facility and the situation with this current lease.

In summary, however, the sheriff's successful regional program is currently in

2.1

jeopardy because of the potential cost of relocating the facility to a new location. As you know, his current facility is in the middle of the proposed Springfield MGM site.

MGM's has expressed concern regarding its ability to move forward with its building plans, given the fact that the sheriff has not yet been able to relocate to a new location.

By way of background, a number of parties have been working with the sheriff to review his situation and determine potential solutions, including commission staff. Those discussions have continued in earnest. Given the productive discussions, we invited Sheriff Ashe to provide the latest information to the commission, and to explain his community mitigation fund request.

This effort received some very difficult news just late yesterday afternoon, and I'm going to ask Sheriff Ashe to give us a little bit about that very difficult news.

But even with this difficult news, we're very pleased that Sheriff Ashe has agreed to continue to join us today and explain to us

2.1

his request and give us a little detail about his very successful facility. The sheriff understands that the commission is not going to be in a position to make any determinations regarding the request, especially given the news that we just received. But we're very pleased that the sheriff is here.

And on a personal note, we really have appreciated the opportunity to work with the sheriff and all of his staff. It's been a very good dialogue, and we're very impressed with their commitment to their mission and look forward to continuing to work with them. So in that regard, Sheriff.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good morning, Sheriff. Welcome.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good morning.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good morning.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning,

MR. ASHE: Yeah, good morning. And a real honor for me to be here. And thank you, John, for that summary, and thank you for

2.1

sir.

allowing us to be here. And, again, my name's Sheriff Mike Ashe, and this is my chief financial officer, Billy Christofori is here as well.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good morning. Welcome.

MR. CHRISTOFORI: Good morning. Thank you.

MR. ASHE: So just by way of background is that, you know, I've been sheriff for 40 years. Started in 1975.

And -- and one of the things that has been focus, really, is bail corrections versus warehousing inmates. And we were presented an opportunity, in 1985, under the guidance and direction of Governor Michael Dukakis, to launch, if you will, Western Massachusetts Correctional Alcohol Center.

If you think back of 1985, he personally had a history of alcoholism in his own family and saw the issue, and he stepped up and wanted to provide a treatment facility for people that were -- committed their third offense on the DUI. And there was a real

2.1

surge in our community at that time, and I'm very pleased to say that we stepped forth and -- and put together a plan, and we ended up siting this facility in the south end of Springfield, and it's the old YWCA building on Howard Street, and we've been there now for 29 years.

And it's a regional facility. It's coed. And, approximately, about 15 years ago we expanded it to also include substance abuse and co-occurring, you know, along with the alcoholism and so on. It's an open facility. And when I say "regional," it includes the four counties in western Mass. The Berkshire, Franklin, Hampshire, Hampden, and it also includes Worcester, so we have five counties. You're looking at a population around 182 people that come there from their respective county jails, where they are detoxed, classification occurs, and movement to, quote, an open setting.

So most of the offenders there suffer from addiction, if you will, but not violent type of offenses. And I'm very

2.1

pleased to tell you that since we've been there, there's been little or no occurrences of any upsetting things that have occurred in the neighborhood. And you can imagine, when we first sited the facility there was a great threat in terms of the neighborhood and so on. But again -- but we're very pleased with that.

We have been able to impact 17,225 offenders with the treatment we provided there. There's a 90-percent program compliance there. And the recidivism rate is -- is clearly shows that when you challenge people, raise standards and provide educational, individual and group counseling is what occurred there in the first seven weeks of the program, and then following the seven weeks they then are involved in community restitution programs, working on behalf of, quote, cities and towns, and housing authorities and the county, as well as working with nonprofit agencies like the Salvation Army, police departments and so on.

In addition, is that we have an escort service and are very tied to, quote,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

the NA -- or AA and NA program. That's the real foundation and basis of the program, is that an isolated fortress-in-the-woods kind of facility. That's a recognition that all of these people are coming back to the community, and the question is -- is how do they come back? But more particularly is, they're coming back with what we call a continuity of services, a continuity of services. And it's a regional as well. In other words, we have what we call -- this goes on as well as in Pittsfield and Greenfield, and Northampton, and Worcester, et cetera as well, in terms of whole --

Now, we've been a -- a cooperative partner, you know, in recognition of the casino being there, and that we've been all working in a very steadfast way to be responsive and work in a cooperative manner, you know, regarding, quote, this new economic engine, which I think is terrific for our area.

And, you know, I've lived in Springfield my whole life, and particularly I

2.1

know the south end very, very well, and I think it's going to be a tremendous asset to our community and complement all the other great things going on. Our city being led by Mayor Albano and so on. I'm very, very proud.

I'd like to feel we've been a vibrant part of the -- of the city and of the region. And from the standpoint of -- I'd like to feel really stepping up and looking at a new paradigm in criminal justice, and being very integrated regarding working with police, parole, probation and so on, on behalf of public safety. And -- and I'd like to feel that that clearly shows.

For example, back in 2007 and 2008, our census in Hampden County Sheriff's

Department was in the 2,200 category. But because of our work over the years on the whole reentry reintegration, we've been able to reduce our population to around 1,500 inmates, so we're down in the neighborhood about six, 700 inmates. So it clearly shows that we're on the right path of challenging inmates, establishing credible, evidence-based

2.1

kind of programming, and -- and establishing housing, jobs and supportive services. And we were the first in the nation establishing day reporting, which is now adopted by the federal government. And we also have a cutting-edge, after-incarceration support service program that we have right at Winchester Square. Which means, simply, is that, at anytime when an offender leaves us, he's no longer under the sheriff's department or parole, probation. He can go to seven and 36 State Street and receive help, you know, regarding housing, jobs and supportive services. And as we know, in substance abuse, or in alcoholism, you're always subject to relapse and so on. But the big thing is not judging that, but being there in terms of providing support and help, and so on.

John mentioned about where we are today. And I'm -- regrettably tell you is that we had a facility up on Mill Street, which is really just about, if you will, a mile-and-a-half from Howard Street, and it's a wonderful facility. When I say "wonderful,"

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

it was an old nursing home on Mill Street, the Ring Nursing Home. At one point, I -- it served as well as a halfway house, if you will, for some of our offenders over the years. And this met our specifications, and we thought this would be a very nice move for us.

We had a developer that we were working with, who is our present developer on Howard Street, and he announced to me yesterday that -- that he is pulling out.

Okay. So, which simply means is that we have to start the process all over again. And -- and I have been informed by DCAMM, division of capital planning, that just with the advertisement that would go on, that would be at least 45 days that we'd have to -- you know, this request for proposal. And so, I'm looking at it's going to take, at least, anywhere from 65 to 90 days and so on. So that's -- that's not good news.

On the other hand, anybody that knows me, I have the helmet on, and every day we're working hard trying to make this happen,

2.1

and I really feel that we will. So we've already talked to DCAMM because they -- again, their requests for proposal go out very quickly. We are going to try to, again, see if we can get another developer for the Mill Street site, but also we're going to expand and look at the greater Springfield area in terms of trying relocate the facility.

We have been in touch with the governor's office. I wouldn't want to speak for the governor, but my sense is he is very open to wanting to help us with this project. And we recently did have a meeting, and his deputy financial person from A & F, Rachel Madden, was there and mentioned that she would do everything she could to help us, particularly with Governor Baker's posture on opiate epidemic and so on. I know DCAMM has been very, very supportive, and I know, obviously, the gaming commission was also at the meeting. Been very, very helpful and so on.

And so, that's really where we are right at this point. And with that, let me

2.1

just have my chief financial officer just talk about our request, at least give you a little background of the finances and so on that we were looking for based on what I'm paying now for rent, and just trying to project out as to where we were going as to why we were coming back, and seeing if we could get some help.

And I realize that -- I suppose it's like MGM, when they were first trying to do their work in the community, everyone's looking to think that they're going to be able to get into one's pocket, and I'm sure the commission is no different regarding the mitigation money. I know you're limited, you know, as to what you can do with so many needs and so on. But any help that you could provide for us, it would be very, very helpful and so on.

MR. CHRISTOFORI: First of all,

Sheriff - I don't know this is on - if you

wanted to talk about the eviction notice, I

think that would be an issue that the sheriff

would want to speak about that we have also

received from, I think, MGM.

2.1

1 MR. ASHE: Yes, yeah. Well, as you 2 know, I mean, they have a time schedule. 3 again, according to the statutes, have to meet 4 those, and we understand that, you know. we have received an eviction notice for 5 6 March 1st, is our date. And I --7 MR. CHRISTOFORI: March 31st, I 8 think, was given to us. 9 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: March 31st. 10 MR. ASHE: Okay. Yep. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. 11 12 MR. CHRISTOFORI: Sorry, Sheriff. 13 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yes. We're aware of that so thank you for -- for putting 14 that on the table. 15 16 MR. CHRISTOFORI: The fiscal piece, 17 Commissioners, really came down to, our 18 present rent is \$666,000, which I think you 19 see in the letter. The new proposal would 20 have been about 1.7 -- 1.7 million, which is 21 about 1.1 million than we have in our budget. 22 We did request to A & F, originally, about 23 600,000 in fiscal year 2016's budget. But,

unfortunately, that number came in higher,

about a half-a-million dollars higher.

First of all, we don't know if we have that money from A & F, obviously, with the fiscal situation that's occurring in the state. But there were two options that I think we presented in the -- in the mitigation form.

One would have been a lump-sum payment towards the build-out, which, in this case, in the present, bid that one out, which, obviously, is gone now, the build-out was about seven-and-a-half million dollars. We were looking for about \$4 million from the mitigation fund to help offset the -- the lease, which would have brought it down to a more reasonable number, which would have fit inside our budget.

The other option that was brought to us, thanks to John Ziemba and the gaming commission, was to potentially go out and have a -- basically, a loan, a 10-year loan of \$500,000 a year for 10 years. And then, I think at that point the loan would be paid off at a certain point beyond the 10 years.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So those were the two options that we were looking at. One would be a lump-sum payment, which would, obviously, reduce the lease over the life, and the other would be \$500,000 for 10 years to help keep that cost down. The only thing that I would say, which would have been different prior to yesterday in the news that we got, is that one of the things that would be helpful is that, if -- if the gaming commission does see, in their infinite wisdom, to help us out in some way, that we could at least have that information to us before the bid comes back. Because that would be part of the process, I think, with any other vendor, that if they knew there were certain monies in hand, and not only the gaming commission money, but, obviously, money that might be placed in our budget for FY '16 when we would, you know, hopefully, eventually be relocated. So I don't know if you have any other financial questions for me.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: No. Thank you very much for that presentation. Nobody's ever accused us of having infinite wisdom

before so I'm very grateful for that as well.

All right. Questions or comments?

commissioner zunigh: I do. And -so it's -- from -- from your remarks and since
yesterday, it looks like you have to go out to
bid for -- for a new facility regardless,
correct?

MR. ASHE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And you had limited the area in the past, because I understand this was your second bid, the most recent, to the downtown Springfield area; is that correct?

MR. CHRISTOFORI: What we wanted to do, because it was a community-based program, we were looking at keeping it in the greater Springfield area. And the -- I think the demographics that we may have -- may have given them was a mile-and-a-half radius, because most of our clients are from the inner city. So in terms of transportation issues, it makes it easier for people to get to their jobs because it is a community-based program.

So now what we are going to do is,

we're going to increase that scope to actually include some of the abutting towns or cities, potentially, West Springfield, Chicopee, Holyoke. That'll be determined by DCAMM, eventually.

MR. ASHE: But the key aspect is the siting difficulty you have with these particular facilities. And this is why this particular facility was very acceptable, because we have a good relationship with the neighborhoods. And it's already, if you will, been encouraged by the siting of this because we already have a track record, if you will, of being a sheriff's department that was a good neighbor in the community.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right.

MR. ASHE: So that, we have a track record there.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I understand.

I guess what I'm trying to get at is, what indication may -- may you have, may we all have relative to the new rent, the new rent amount? Whether we will be contemplating a similar, smaller or larger gap between what

2.1

you currently pay and what you are now --

O

. _

MR. CHRISTOFORI: From a financial standpoint, I think what happened was, if you take a look at the rent that we're paying for the 666,000, there's a lot of history there. So there wasn't --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I understand.

MR. CHRISTOFORI: -- in terms of the build-out portion. So if you take a look at 43,000 square feet, it comes out to about \$15 a square foot. You people might be more educated in terms of square footage, but you'll find out that the new one was \$25 a square foot, which I think is pretty reasonable.

I would say that, depending on how big the build-out is, you're probably looking between a 20- and \$30-square foot lease, at least. Because you got to remember, this is a 24-hour facility, seven days a week, 365 days a year. It includes plumbing, individual rooms. A lot of people look at it and they forget it's not an office space that you're looking at. You're actually looking at a

housing space, which increases the per square footage.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Tell me those figures again.

MR. CHRISTOFORI: The present -- the present lease that we pay now is about \$15 a square foot. The new lease came in at 29.64 without utilities. If you include the utilities, it brings us to up to about \$35 a square foot.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And you have the same square footage?

MR. ASHE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yeah, yeah.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Is that

something you would contemplate modifying?

MR. ASHE: Yeah, we would -- this would be fine, if could to do that because it would be --

MR. CHRISTOFORI: I think a downward modification wouldn't be acceptable, just to the point that we are -- we're probably at about 160 of 182 right now, in terms of the

Page 42 1 capacity is 182. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 2 Is that 3 individuals or --4 MR. CHRISTOFORI: No. 5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thousand 6 square feet? 7 MR. CHRISTOFORI: How many square 43,000 square feet. 8 feet? 9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. Right. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Individuals. 10 11 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. 12 Individuals. So you were talking individuals? 13 MR. CHRISTOFORI: Yeah. Yep. 14 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yep. 15 MR. CHRISTOFORI: And most of those rooms, just so you'll know, they're -- if you 16 17 went into it, it's like a college dorm in 18 terms of, there's bunk beds. It's not 19 individual rooms. I think in certain rooms 20 there's actually six -- six individuals to a 2.1 room. 22 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So those are 23 the numbers for the development that was 24 proposed --

1 MR. CHRISTOFORI: Yes. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: -- but now 2 we're probably on a new track, and that's a --3 4 those are ballpark numbers. MR. ASHE: 5 Yes. MR. CHRISTOFORI: Yes. 6 7 MR. ASHE: That's right. 8 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Without being 9 precisely geared to a specific location. 10 Other thoughts, comments, questions? COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah. 11 12 Sheriff Ashe, first I just wanted to commend 13 Tremendous program. I was very 14 interested in listening to your thoughts on 15 recidivism, the low rate, and the reduced incarceration. I just wanted to commend you 16 17 for your efforts there. 18 Secondly, you did mention that there 19 was a chance that another developer could come 20 in for that same property. So -- did you 21 mention that, sir? 22 MR. ASHE: Yeah. I mean, I would 23 just say is, these are the things that 24 we're -- we're trying to do everything we can

to hold on to the Mill Street site, and that's what we're trying to do.

Now, we'll have to see what happens because right now the -- and I think John might have some insight in this, John, would -- that the present owner is in financial trouble. And, basically, it's because of the goodwill of MGM, has been helping us with the mortgage in behalf of that. But my sense is, is that there's a deadline of early February, and it could be within a week that again that mortgage will -- they'll be faced with that. And unless there's somebody who can help with that, it could very well be that he will lose the building.

And then -- then now we're faced with another event of that it will evolve from a legal standpoint that it could also further delay this. Okay. But, again, this is something that -- that I'm sure I'll be talking to MGM and so on in the coming days, okay, trying help, as they have been, okay, with this building as we continue, if you

will, to target this building as an area that we wanted to relocate.

So we're going to -- so -- so yes, we would like to hold on to this building, but, also, I think we also look at it trying to look at options as well. You know, on this RFP.

MR. CHRISTOFORI: Commissioner

Cameron, I guess what's important about the building is, because it's -- it was set up as a nursing home, the build-out was seven-and-a-half million for 180 beds as well. I think, if -- if someone from a construction area would come in to build a facility like that, you know, you're -- I mean, I know we just -- we just completed a women's facility for 140 beds, and it was in the 20 million area to construct from ground up.

So I think when you're looking at -I think if a vendor were to look at it, it's a
nice building, probably, to do the project
from their standpoint, in terms of, you know,
their fiscal austerity in terms of having a
good building. But not only the location, but

the way it's set up, it almost fits the program, is how it sits right now in the Y -- the old YWCA with the multiroom -- the multibedrooms.

So I think from a -- someone who is going to look at as a -- as a -- to bid on it, I think that would be an ideal spot for them.

important to note and -- first of all, I want to also join Commissioner Cameron and talk about the success of your programs. Growing up in western Mass, I just figured that this is what every county sheriff did, until I got out into the world and recognized that Sheriff Ashe was a quite a remarkable pacesetter for -- for his colleagues.

MR. ASHE: Thank you.

OMMISSIONER STEBBINS: You've been out to bid twice on this parcel. The second time you wind up with the property that we have -- or the property on Mill Street. And, you know, from what you've just stated, even if you go to another round, or you have to go out to a new round and you expand your search,

2.1

I think you covered the issue of going out and reaching out to that community to make them feel comfortable about this program coming into the community. And even that kind of community involvement and community communication phase can add time to --

MR. ASHE: Right.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: -- even though, you know, it's a --

MR. ASHE: Right.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: -- kind of a statutory deadline, you're adding days.

Getting out and talking to those neighborhood groups and making them feel comfortable about the program.

MR. ASHE: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Whereas, now we have a spot where the neighborhood's used to. And, you know, it's -- just driving around you see folks from that center who are out, you know, doing yardwork, community cleanup work. So, you know, it's certainly been accepted. So you're just -- your eviction date from the current site is?

2.1

MR. CHRISTOFORI: March 31st.

MR. ASHE: March 31st.

MR. CHRISTOFORI: March 31st.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. And it's, obviously, a property that is still going through some type of historical review and oversight process with MHC and the local preservation -- local historical.

MR. ASHE: Commissioner, I think as we go forward, and again -- again, trying to work in a cooperative way with everybody, because I know, too, everybody has this time schedule. Okay. And, of course, at least, I was just looking as sheriff, in terms of the staff and the programmatical (phonetically) aspect that -- that if, at least we've got a commitment, you know, in terms of where we were going, that that's really key. Okay. And then, I would do everything I can to try to help, you know, with -- with the time schedule. Okay. And that's what I find.

I find, right now I'm just, on one hand have the pressure of the March 31st date,

1 and yet I don't have any actual or crystalized 2 plan. And I guess this is where we are right 3 now, so that's what I'm trying to make happen. 4 And -- which I know everyone understands. 5 But -- but you're right, Commissioner, that --6 that's a key thing. But, again, these are all 7 things -- these are the unknown, you know, as 8 we go forth and what we have to deal with. 9 But I'm ready to -- whatever we have to deal 10 with, I can only tell you that we've got the 11 helmet on trying to make it happen. Okay. 12 That's all. 13 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: What's the 14 condition of the building right now? 15 MR. CHRISTOFORI: The present 16 building? COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: 17 Yeah. 18 MR. CHRISTOFORI: It's in good 19 shape. Obviously, one of the things we have 20 is we have a lot of inmates who do a lot of 2.1 great work there. That building, we've been a 22 real partner with the present -- with the

present vendor and, you know, we maintain a

lot of it ourselves.

23

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: No. I mean, the Mill Street property.

MR. CHRISTOFORI: Oh, Mill Street?

MR. ASHE: Well little -- it's okay.

MR. CHRISTOFORI: Yeah.

MR. ASHE: Okay. And but, again, nothing's been done to the building, to my knowledge, 15, 20 years. But, again, compared to where we are, because we're not looking for any Hilton or anything else, you know. But I think, too, I'm just looking for some reasonable accommodations, and so there is some work that needs to be done. And, of course, that was all part of the build-out. You know, that they were going to do some upgrade of that, and, of course, the jail staff was going to work with all of that as well.

And I had said earlier, one of the key cast aspects that we have at our present facility is an auditorium. This lacks an auditorium so you can imagine about the educational sessions that take place, that that's very much necessary. It's an essential

2.1

aspect. So we want to go -- and this was the -- part of the renovations that were going to be done, the addition, yeah.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, this is a model program for the kind of forward-thinking corrections -- approach to corrections. You've been a pioneer in this. There's been a great deal of conversation in the press, in the public, in the legislatures about a smarter way to deal with the problem of addiction in the criminal justice context. And this is -- this is the kind of program that really needs to be preserved. And I join the others in congratulating you.

In my former life, when often ran into problems and issues with people who really had addiction problem, rather than a criminal problem, the difficulty in finding beds was overwhelming to get the treatment programs. You've got one. You've got a successful one, and it's in everybody's interest to keep this program going for that region.

There are a lot of moving parts and

2.1

a lot of players, but I can assure you that, as John Ziemba has been in the past, he will continue to be a representative of the commission in helping to try and find a solution to this, and helping to try to find a solution with all the other parties that are needed for the solution to occur as quickly as we possibly can.

So we look forward to having John keep us up to date on what's proceeding. We look forward to hearing from you again directly, if that's necessary.

MR. ASHE: Right.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: But you have our full support in the effort to keep this very valuable and very important program alive, so thank you very much.

MR. ASHE: Well, thank you, too.

It's an honor to be here, and thanks for your support and help. And, again, John has already been helpful. We look forward to working with John. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Thank you very much. Thank you --

2.1

1 MR. CHRISTOFORI: Thank you, 2 Commissioners. 3 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Thank you both 4 very much. MR. CHRISTOFORI: Your office has 5 6 been great to us too. Thank you. 7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Thank you. 8 MR. ZIEMBA: Commissioner, if I 9 could just get one final -- one final point. 10 Obviously, this is a very complex -- complex 11 endeavor involving many, many parties. 12 thank the sheriff for -- for noting the 13 constraints that we're under in regard to the fund. We did come up with some constructs of 14 15 how it could be orchestrated with a -- more of 16 a longer term. We're open to discussing all opportunities. We obviously -- or I obviously 17 18 did not put together a dollar amount. That's -- that's for the commission to 19 20 determine. 21 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. 22 MR. ZIEMBA: But we're going to 23 continue to work with -- work with the 24 sheriff.

1 And, in general, there's been some 2 short-term constraints on the mitigation fund. 3 After the facilities are up and operational 4 there'll be much more funding available to 5 communities and others that need funding to 6 deal with mitigation requests. So in that 7 construct, we thank the sheriff for 8 recognizing all --9 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The 10 constraints that we're under, yeah. 11 MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah. 12 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yeah, surely. 13 Surely. And -- and -- so we look forward to 14 supporting your -- whatever -- whatever role 15 we can play constructively in this within the 16 constraints that we have as well. Thank you. 17 Thank you very much. 18 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you. 19 MR. ASHE: Thank you. 20 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. 2.1 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thanks. 22 MR. ZIEMBA: So that concludes that 23 portion. 24 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. Did you

have more, because I had one question about the -- about the pending requests? But if you have more to --

MR. ZIEMBA: I don't.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. I -you said that with respect to the applications
for mitigation funds, you gave a ballpark to
when we'd have decisions on those. The
reserve funds, though, are those decisions
going to be made earlier, or what's your plan
for those?

MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah, much earlier. We have to check compliance issues. But even though it's a simple form, for example, we have one community that we have been in contact with that noted that it mailed an application, and whether or not it was received or postmarked we just need to doublecheck on that. But --

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.

But those will be decided --

MR. ZIEMBA: Very, very soon.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: -- very

24 quickly?

2.1

Can I mention

1

MR. ZIEMBA: Yep.

2

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay.

3 4

something on that, which is something that you

5

alluded to and we have not finalized, and

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:

6

that'll be part of the review?

7

But to the extent that we can avoid

8

duplication of planning efforts would be --

9

would be ideal from -- needless to say.

10

have a number of adjoining communities doing

11

this same kind of planning, I would really

12

exhort you to look at opportunities to do that

13

regionally, where it make -- make more -- more

That's not the prism that each of

14

sense for everybody.

15

one of these applicants for planning monies

16

necessarily by necessity have to view this, 17

an important thing to consider.

18

but as we get into the details of what scope

19

of work they're contemplating, I think that's

20

2.1

I couldn't agree more. MR. ZIEMBA:

22

When we rolled out the community mitigation

23

fund application guidelines, we anticipated

24

that some of the planning activities could be

done regionally at the regional planning agencies. We met with regional planning agencies, talked to the regional planning agencies when we put together our guidelines, and we would hope that communities take advantage of these regional approaches through the regional planning agencies, or through -- through other endeavors, but we'll work on that as well.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I -- go ahead.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: My default would be, as we get -- as we're near approval of some of these planning monies, that whoever has regional approach would get, you know, more favorable consideration for their -- for their grants because it's -- you know, it's a two-for every time somebody's thinking regionally.

MR. ZIEMBA: Right.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I also was happy to see you're going to have the RPA's involved. I am a little concerned about -- and we talked about this, about a July 2015

2.1

deadline. And I know that's probably at the outer end of the decision and review time frame, but your -- your plan calls for, also, in -- including gaming policy advisory committee, community mitigation, subcommittee, even the local mitigation subcommittees. Are they all -- all seats filled, when you take into consideration, you know, when their meeting dates are going to be; is that kind of why you have a July 2015 deadline out there?

MR. ZIEMBA: Now, what happens with the local committees regarding the current funding round, I think that remains to be

determined at those committee meetings.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.

MR. ZIEMBA: But that's a very good point. Specifically, with community mitigation fund. We anticipated that the first year funding program would not necessarily be the funding program for future years.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Right.

MR. ZIEMBA: In that, we will get a

lot of valuable input from those local

2.1

committees in constructing the future-round programs. For example, this program was limited to construction-only specific impacts.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Right.

MR. ZIEMBA: As we get closer to operational date, necessarily, we will have to expand to operational impacts. But they -- as you'll see when we review each of these applications, they'll be many, many thorny issues that we'll experience in our reviews in trying to make determinations how to use all of these funds wisely.

We will benefit greatly from the advice we receive from the local committees, the subcommittee, the community mitigation, and the Gaming Policy Advisory Commission.

The good news on the local committees, we have received the designees for each of one of these local committees, and we recently sent out letters, or I think they should have been sent out in the last day or two, unless the snow prevented us from doing that, to each of those members.

And the plan is that the ombudsman's

2.1

office would meet with each of those individual members to get their understanding of the -- of the act, what their role will be as the local committee, what suggestions they have going forward regarding the mitigation fund, other issues regarding surrounding community issues, host community issues, and we will bring that experience into -- into a joint meeting shortly thereafter. I'm not certain when that meeting will be. But our goal is to have those individual meetings within the next three to four weeks, and then join to have the larger meetings.

We still need some representatives for the subcommittee on community mitigation. Some of those appointments are commission based. We've done some analysis on who we could recommend. At a future meeting I'll bring those names to you for -- for consideration, and then we'll work with the governor's office and other appointees that are gubernatorial appointments.

And then, finally, we have to check with a lot of agency representatives and other

2.1

representatives that are noted in the -- in the statute that are -- obviously, we've just had a change of administration, so names that we had previously, we have to doublecheck on those names. It's just been a matter of days since the change to the administration so -- and I know that there's been a lot of things on everybody's plate. But we'll follow through with them to try to get some finality to all of those names.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.

MR. ZIEMBA: But it just -- it goes along with the -- the earlier remarks, that almost everything that we do involves point of contacts very, very far and wide. And although that's very complex, at the end, after these conversations, I think the goal will be to have a community mitigation fund that grows and changes over time and that adapts to needs as circumstances demand.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. Good.

MR. ZIEMBA: Long answer. Sorry

about that.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: No, no. No,

2.1

it's helpful. I mean, we haven't touched on those -- the community mitigation groups, and it's important for everybody to understand that the mitigation effort and the mitigation grants that we ultimately make are, in part, going to be a determined and advised by groups from the local communities that have applied for -- for the -- for the funds. And we really haven't touched on that yet. And we're now in the process of putting those groups together, of getting people from the communities, getting all the representatives from the various constituencies that the statute requires. And that is, as you say, a complex process.

But, in the end, what we're going to have is a statewide group to advise us on how these funds should be distributed, and a statewide group that will be from the communities that are in the areas that are going to receive the funds. That's a terribly important part of this well-thought-out piece of legislation that we're now in the process of implementing, so that's a very helpful

2.1

1 discussion, so thank you. All right. 2 Anything further? 3 MR. ZIEMBA: No. 4 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. Great. 5 Thank you. 6 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. 7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. 8 The next item on the agenda is Workforce 9 Supplier and Diversity Development, Director Griffin. 10 11 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can we take a 12 short break before that? 13 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That'll probably take us half-an-hour or 20 minutes. 14 15 Do you want to take a break now? All right, 16 yeah. 17 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Are you still 18 planning to go through lunch -- without lunch, rather? Can we take five? 19 20 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yeah, yeah. 21 All right. Before we start that, feel free to 22 be seated, but we are going to take a short 23 We'll take a break for five minutes break. 24 and then resume.

Page 64 1 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you. 2 3 (A recess was taken) 4 5 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. 6 We're ready to resume now with agenda 7 Item No. 5, Workforce Supplier and Diversity 8 Development, Director Griffin. Good morning. 9 MS. GRIFFIN: Good morning, Commissioners. 10 11 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good 12 morning. 13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good morning. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning. 14 15 Yes, you can pull it up. 16 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Pull it a little closer. 17 18 MS. GRIFFIN: I'm joined by 19 representatives from Wynn Resorts. We're here 20 today to present the diversity plan for design 21 and construction for Wynn Mass, LLC. Mr. Robert DeSalvio is here, president of 22 23 Wynn; Jennie Peterson, manager of development; 24 Ulrico Izzaguire, vice president of government

and community affairs; and -- is Jacqui here?

Oh, Jacqui is here. And Jacqui Krum, senior vice president and general counsel at Wynn Resorts.

So I'm going to make some brief comments outlining the process that we undertook, the public comments that we received, and highlight key points in the plan, and then I'm going to turn it over to, I think, Bob DeSalvio, who will present a short presentation, and then at the end of discussion I'd be glad to present my recommendation.

So as you're aware, the

Massachusetts gaming legislation that the
commission is charged with implementing
highlights a goal of maximizing economic
opportunities for both residents and
businesses in Massachusetts, and makes
diversity and inclusion a priority. So as
part of the commission's agreement to award
the Category 1 license to Wynn Mass LLC, the
gaming establishment is required to submit
four plans for commission approval. We're

2.1

here to talk about those that focus on the design and construction period, including a provision of a plan for affirmative marketing program to identify contracting and casino purchasing opportunities for MBE, WBE and VBE vendors for design and construction, and an additional plan for the workforce, including an affirmative action program for equal opportunity.

So as part of the process, the commission staff notified the licensees, both licensees, on November 17th, that these two plans were due to the commission on January 12th. Wynn submitted the plan as required, and staff sent the plan out for comment to groups such as the vendor advisory team, the Mass Gaming Vendor Advisory Team, The Gaming Diversity Coalition, the Policy Group of Tradeswomen's Issues, and the Action for Regional Equity Local Coalition. Many of whom are here in the audience today.

So included in your materials today is a red-line version of the diversity strategy, which illustrates any clarifications

2.1

or changes that were made after the original submission as a result of feedback from both commission staff and any of the groups I mentioned above.

So we received four written comments from members of those groups, and I'd say all four comments were positive, and all of the responses indicated that Wynn has consulted their organization for input and best-practice information.

One group in particular, you'll note these comments are in your packet, the group, Action for Regional Equity advocated for Wynn to set higher diversity standards during the construction phase due to the higher diversity in greater — in the greater Boston region as compared to the state. They also urged Wynn to identify sources of funding for community outreach in the plan. So I'm just going to go on and talk a little bit about the plan now.

Wynn's diversity strategy is detailed and concrete regarding both the implementation and, for example, they incorporate diversity goals into relevant

2.1

contracts and agreements, and they have established mechanisms to remedy shortfalls during this process.

Wynn has committed to robust, regular oversight and reporting, and Wynn's plan is to monitor workforce and vendor diversity during design and construction from the highest levels of the organization, including President DeSalvio and a diversity coordinator, who will report directly to him.

On the ground, monitoring appears strong as well. The diversity coordinator will review overall compliance, monitor effectiveness, and make recommendations to modify the program. This diversity coordinator for Wynn will work directly with the construction monitor. And it appears there's also staff designated for the construction monitor as well. And the diversity coordinator will participate in the commission's access and opportunity committee, which is our internal monitoring committee.

Wynn has committed to monthly diversity meetings involving the president,

2.1

the Wynn design and development team, the diversity coordinator, the local architect and construction manager. Wynn has also outlined the partnership roles and diversity expectations relative to their relationship with the building trades.

One point to note is that, during the design phase Wynn has not set a goal for the veteran business participation. During the construction phase, their supplier diversity goal for veterans is 1 percent.

Supplier diversity goals for the combined minority women business enterprise are equivalent to the state combined goals of 17 percent during the design phase, and 10.4 percent combined goal for the construction contracts. In the case of minority business enterprises, Wynn reaches higher in both the design and construction phase.

For the construction workforce, Wynn adopted the state diversity goals for the construction period, which includes 15.3 percent for minority, 6.9 percent women and 3

2.1

1 percent veterans. 2 So unless you have comments or 3 questions for me at this time, I'm going to 4 turn the floor over to Bob DeSalvio. 5 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. 6 have some questions, but I'll save those for 7 you, Director Griffin, but I'll save those 8 until we've heard from the Wynn team. 9 MS. GRIFFIN: Great. 10 MR. DESALVIO: Good morning again, 11 Commissioners. 12 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good 13 morning. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good morning. 14 15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good morning. 16 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning. MR. DESALVIO: I just want to 17 18 introduce the team that's here with me that 19 put a lot of effort and time into the plan. 20 But before I do that, I would be remiss if I 2.1 didn't -- did not acknowledge Jill's efforts

in helping and guiding us through this

process. She was a great partner, and really

did put a lot of time and effort to guide the

22

23

team in the right direction. So thank you, Jill, for that. Appreciate it.

Jacqui Crumb, as you mentioned, is here with us. Jacqui has always been our trusted business adviser through the compilation of the plan, and helps me a lot with -- with good business insight and historical framework for the Wynn Resorts programs that we've got back in Nevada.

You know Jennie Peterson. Jennie's been on the project with me from day one. As Jill mentioned earlier, the diversity coordinator. And Jennie has volunteered to be the diversity coordinator for our project.

That is a -- that is a very significant role. It will require a lot of effort and integration with the commission staff and with us, and with our contractors and designers. So we thank Jennie for that, and for the tremendous work that she put in in getting this plan together. It's really, truly been a pleasure working with her on this.

And then, Jill mentioned earlier about Ulrico joining our team. Rico's been

2.1

with Wynn Resorts for about three months now.

And before I turn the presentation over,
actually, to Rico, I think it's important that
I give you a little bit about his background
since this is the first time that he is here
in front of the commission on behalf of Wynn
Resorts. So I'm going to -- if you wouldn't
mind, I'd like to tell you a little bit about
Rico.

Rico brings with him more than 15
years of high-profile experience in government
relations, communications, corporate social
responsibility and development fields. Most
recently, he served as a national political
director for Caesar's Entertainment, Inc.,
where he was responsible for managing
political affairs efforts and advocacy
communications for Caesar's Political Action
Committee, and overseeing political efforts
relating to legislation.

Prior to that, Rico held several high-level leadership roles in various state department and state and federal campaign management roles. He served as an aide in

2.1

1 vice president Gore's west wing office in 2 1999. Rico holds a bachelor of arts degree in 3 political science from Trinity University, and 4 a master's in public administration from 5 Arizona State University. And he's been a 6 great addition to the team. He's helped us a 7 lot here in Mass. He had some great 8 background that he was able to share with the 9 team. And on behalf of Wynn, he's going to 10 handle the executive overview of this 11 presentation, so take it away, Rico. 12 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Excellent. 13 MR. IZZAGUIRE: Thank you, Bob.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good morning.

Welcome.

MR. IZZAGUIRE: Thank you. Thank you. Good morning, Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning.

MR. IZZAGUIRE: Director Griffin, thank you so much for the introduction.

Commissioners, good morning. It's an honor and a pleasure to be here with you today, especially on the heels of a Patriots Super Bowl win, which was very exciting to see here

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

1 yesterday downtown so --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Lifted everybody spirit.

MR. IZZAGUIRE: Yes, it did. Yes, it did. Thank you. I guess we can go to the first slide. Thank you so much. We have put a lot of work into developing our Wynn design and construction and diversity strategy, and we're very excited to present it to you here today. This is a topic which is near and dear to my heart personally, and it's an honor to be able to speak a little bit about it this morning to you today. It is a plan that we have developed, and not only that reaffirms our commitment to diversity and inclusion that has been a core business function of our DNA, but has also a plan that's been developed by listening, speaking and engaging with our community partners and the diverse community organizations that we have, in the last several months, been working very closely with.

We feel it's important to provide a little bit of background and context regarding

Wynn's historical commitment to diversity. Our diversity commitment is among the strongest of any gaming company in the U.S. We are very proud of our diversity among our management-level employees in Las Vegas, where we employ over 12,000 people. 36 percent of our managers, directors and executive-level employees are minorities, and 42 percent of our managers, directors and executive-level employees are women. We're also very proud of our commitment to providing opportunities for growth and advancement within Wynn Resorts, and we promote over 66 employees every month to new opportunities for new jobs and new advancement career opportunities.

We also provide a variety of opportunities in training and development for our employees, which include opportunities for English language learner classes that we cover the cost to, as well as citizenship classes, which we also cover the cost for both the classes as well as the course fees and the exam fees for citizenship exams for our employees as well. Next slide, please.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20 2.1

22

23

24

We also have a very strong commitment to working with diverse vendors. In Las Vegas alone we have relationships with over 400 diverse businesses. In 2013, we channeled nearly \$30 million to minority-, women- and veteran-owned business enterprises, which, roughly is 12 percent of our procurement spent. And that figure is most likely greater, given that many of the diverse businesses in Nevadas are not formally certified as such. However, we're very proud to provide assistance to organizations, to minority and disadvantaged businesses to help them receive their certifications with -- with our procurement teams. Next slide, please.

We've engaged with the community and community groups, and partners to develop our goals for strategy and reaching these goals during the design and construction phase of the development. Among them, there are few up here on the board. We are grateful for the support of the local partners, including the MGC Vendor Advisory Committee, The Greater New England Minority Supplier Development Council,

The Hispanic American Chamber Institute, The Massachusetts Supplier Diversity Office, and The Policy Group on Tradeswomen Issues and others. And we look forward to continued engagement with these partners as we look to implement our strategy and to reach our goals. Next slide, please.

As I mentioned earlier, we are thrilled to be -- to be in Massachusetts, and very eager to bring our commitment to diversity to the commonwealth, as well as support the vision of diversity created by the state and this gaming commission. We realize that we are new to the region, and we need to build our diversity capability. We are a leading company in the hospitality industry, setting the gold standard. And we expect to set a similar gold standard for other large-scale developers and operators within the commonwealth.

As we finalize our design and embark on the site cleanup this spring, and the construction for the resort in the summer, we expect to build a regional diversity capacity,

2.1

working with diverse business partners and contractors, and a diverse workforce to provide opportunities, to participate in this large-scale, five-star development.

It is our hope that the businesses and workers that we work with will go on to participate in one of the many new developments underway in the region over the next many years, taking with them their expanded capacity and skill set. Next slide, please.

Our goals are the result of research that we've done, supported by the disparity study conducted by the Division of Capital Asset Management, DCAMM, and we reflect the state goals for large-scale public projects set by DCAMM. We've taken into account the availability of minority, women and veteran business enterprises, and the workforce diversity of our region. We took an opportunistically aggressive, but realistic approach to ensuring that we would be able to achieve our goals. Particularly, given the competition for work -- for workers and

2.1

contractors that will be driven by the high volume of development projects over the next several years. We will strive to achieve, and aspire to exceed these goals. Again, these goals are -- we view them as a -- a base and not a ceiling.

For participation goals, as far as the consultant and the contractor participation goes on the design contracts for minority business enterprises, we set a goal of 7.9 percent. For women business enterprises, 10 percent. For contractor participation on the construction contracts, we set a goal of 5 percent for minority business enterprises, 5.4 percent for women business enterprises, and 1 percent for veteran business enterprises. And our workforce participation for construction phase, we've set a goal of 15.3 percent for minorities, 6.9 percent for women, and 3 percent for veterans.

When we set these goals we applied -- and as applied to a project of this scale, that will, obviously, be a significant

2.1

economic benefit and -- to these diverse vendors. Next slide, please.

Similar to setting the goals, the implementation and strategies of reaching these goals has been informed by our relationships and discussions with the local community groups, who will be instrumental, and have been instrumental in helping us to reach and develop these goals. We have also looked at examples set by the successful UMASS Boston Campus Project. The Best Practices document created by the UMASS Access and Opportunity Committee, and the Best Practices for Diverse Workforce as outlined by The Policy Group on Tradeswomen's Issues. The implementation of this plan can be described in five broad categories.

The first category, clearly communicating our standards. We've met with Brian Doherty, the head of the metropolitan area building trades, to communicate our goals, as well as help broader meetings with other building trades groups. We will include our goals in all of our RFPs, and in our

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

conversations with potential consultants and contractors. We also recently held a briefing with -- with the mayor of Everett to discuss these goals as well.

The second phase includes diversity goals within the relevant contract agreements to ensure that the goals are written into our contracts, as well as into contracts with subcontractors as discussed by our plan. And, secondly, of course, a -- to work with organizations and subcontractors, and contractors that have a record of -- of positive engagement and diversity, and have a positive track record will be given serious consideration in subcontractor selection process.

Second will include -- I'm sorry.

The third will be to engage diverse businesses and workforce populations. We will host vendor forums and vendor work fairs the first half of this year. We will continue to engage regularly with the community groups, and will participate in the access and opportunity committee meetings that are happening every

2.1

other month, and provide that continued forum for engagement.

Fourth, we will support the development of women-, minority-, and veteran-owned businesses, and a diverse workforce through the Building Pathways program, as well as preapprenticeship programs, and expanded access to those preapprenticeship programs.

In addition, we want to expand our database of diverse contractors, expand access to the project for small and disadvantaged businesses, and support programs that support access to capital for minority-, women-, and veteran-business enterprises, through the Minority Business Development Agency and others.

Finally, we commit to a robust, regular oversight and reporting. The diversity coordinator will oversee these efforts. We will take a proactive approach to working with contractors to ensure that the goals are met. And, finally, the compliance officer will work closely with the diversity

2.1

coordinator and reporting on a weekly and monthly basis.

That is the presentation -- as -- as we have it. We are, of course, now open to answer any questions you may have, or any follow-ups that you would like us to address individually. Again, thank you for the opportunity and the honor to present to you today.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. Thank you. Questions, comments?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Couple of comments and a couple of questions. First of all, very -- I was impressed with this plan.

I was impressed with this plan by, again, what I call the meat that was behind it.

Identifying groups you've had an opportunity to work with, look forward to continuing that relationship as you go forward, I thought that was helpful.

I do like the fact you kept the plan limited both just to this design and construction phase, knowing that we have a longer window out in which we can, you know,

2.1

come back and work with you on a operational and diversity plan.

You know, as Jill pointed out, you know, I would like to see just some measurement of a goal towards veteran business inclusion in the design phase.

One of the things that I was impressed with in your RFA2 application was the close work that Wynn has done with some of the armed forces bases in and around Las Vegas, and how you've actively worked with both enlisted servicemen and retired servicemen and women.

You know, we continue to push out
the message that if you're a veteran in
Massachusetts, and you're a veteran who owns
your own business, that might have an
opportunity to benefit from doing work with
you, that we want you to step forward, and we
want you to raise your hand. Be proud of the
fact you're a veteran-owned business and that
there might be some opportunities available to
you.

I was also impressed in your plan

2.1

through what I'd say were some of those things that kind of go above and beyond maybe what was required, or what folks might have accepted as required. And that's the one holding up any of the best practices you undertake, and sharing that out with the broader business community in Massachusetts, I thought that was impressive and important. And I also, even though it was -- it was referred to in the slide on your implementation page, on page four, supporting the development of MWBEs, WBEs, and VBEs, which is, again, kind of taking it a step further to do more hand-holding with those segments of the business community and the workforce to kind of, again, keep moving that forward and make this an opportunity to grow some of those businesses and enlarge that construction workforce, which we've talked about on a number of occasions, for projects down the line, and being a leader in that. I greatly appreciate that.

But, again, one of the things that just jumped out at me again was, you know,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

it'd be great if we could find, as you've said, a floor, at least, something that you want to attain with respect to, you know, again, VBE participation in that design phase of the -- of the -- of the construction period. But, again, overall I was very I know Jennie is, as reported from pleased. Jill, did a lot of spade work talking to a lot of the groups that you've engaged. We've had a chance to see her out making presentations to the Greater New England Minority Supplier Business Council. So it's -- happy that a lot of thought has gone into this. It's -- it's a great plan, it's -- I'm impressed.

MR. DESALVIO: Thank you, Commissioner.

MR. IZZAGUIRE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Why no

veterans in the first phase?

MR. DESALVIO: One of the issues that we struggled with on the design phase, is the fact that we have this incredible resource in Las Vegas under the Wynn design development team that does so much of the work. And in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

reality, that group themselves is a very diverse group of individuals. However, they're Wynn employees. And so, in a sense they don't fall under any of the calculations that would be required. However, you know, in seeing the operation out there, you'd see how diverse it was.

So we -- with that much work being done by the home office, we struggled a little bit in that area. We certainly note your comments, and we'd be happy to just go back and take a look at this and see if there's any opportunities that we can take think of.

The other half of that is, of course, as we've gone around the community and you meet with vendors, whether they're construction or not, part of the battle, and that's why you see this mentioned in our plan, is getting folks to step up and identify themselves so that they can be counted. I'm not going to mention any names, but there's some businesses that we found that were actually run by veterans who -- they said, you know what, we just assume be a great business

2.1

partner and don't want any special acknowledgment or recognition. Some service members feel like that, that they just want to -- they feel like they did their service to their country and now they want to go out and do their business, and they want to leave it at that.

So part of this is getting some folks up to the table, and that's why we might -- we might really try to work on outreach to see if we can get folks to identify themselves so they can certainly get the just-credit acknowledgment and opportunities that we'd like to offer them. But duly noted on the request, and we will take a look at that.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. Good. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Just to follow up on that, so the design phase enterprise participation that you have now, 7.9 percent minority and 10 percent women, how -- how is that calculated? Is that calculated to include a lot of the folks that

2.1

are currently involved in Wynn projects, or is this a new target for Massachusetts?

MR. DESALVIO: You know, that is something that I think we've had some discussions with Jill about that, about how could we include the Wynn design development. I think that's still an open item. And so, I'm not sure. I think that would require some further work with the staff. Certainly, there will be outside contracts as well.

So we're going to work as hard as we can to get those goals obtained. But I don't know if you've -- I don't think we've faced yet, Jill, the provision of trying to work with the in-house team and how that could be --

MS. GRIFFIN: I don't think we've talked about the in-house team. This -- this focus is external only.

MR. DESALVIO: External only.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.

MR. DESALVIO: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, similar

to Commissioner Stebbins' comments, I found this to be a pragmatic, concise but substantive plan. I commend you for it. Your record in Las Vegas, in your workforce, is remarkable. If you came close to that when we got to the operations phase here in Massachusetts, I would argue, you know, we've done really well. The demographics may be a little bit different. But, you know, in some ways there's a lot of opportunities, we believe, here, to reflect just what we have here, which is a very diverse population altogether.

Some of the comments that we received you may have seen, you know, that maybe even the other applicant should -- the other licensee should look at your plan, because I think you address a lot of the -- the points that we want to see. But, of course, the proof will be in the pudding and -- as -- as we -- as we actually look at these numbers over the course and at each given point, and I'd encourage you to do that.

MR. DESALVIO: Thank you,

2.1

1 Commissioner.

MR. IZZAGUIRE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Same

comments. Solid plan. And, also, firsthand knowledge of on-site visit to Las Vegas. And I do believe that you have the commitment, and we look forward to you meeting your goals.

MR. DESALVIO: Thank you.

MR. IZZAGUIRE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.

Back to Director Griffin.

MS. GRIFFIN: So I would like to recommend that Wynn take an additional look at the design phase for veterans. Chapter 23K, Section 15 does indicate that the licensee needs to set a goal. It doesn't specify what that goal should be. But, you know, that may be something that they can take a look at and come back to. So the question is, are you comfortable voting on the plan with a condition, or would you like --

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, this -- what would you -- what would you recommend?

MS. GRIFFIN: I would recommend that

you approve the plan with a condition that Wynn reconsider and come back to the commission with a diversity goal for the design phase in terms of veterans.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. I too, as did the other commissioners, looked at both the plan and the comments from a group of very hard markers, and was impressed by both the plan and the response from the community that you've assembled. So I -- I think that's a -- a good suggestion.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I agree.

And some of it just may need further clarification as to what consists of this design phase and the role that, you know, the team out in Vegas has, and how those goals can match up for, you know, local business inclusion in it as well. I think it's a simple conversation to have.

MS. GRIFFIN: One of the comments -I did want to highlight one of the comments
from that group Action for Regional Equity.
They requested that Wynn set higher goals that
are based on the regional diversity of greater

2.1

Boston. And I just wanted to comment that the goals that Wynn set are based on a disparity study set by DCAMM for design and construction. So I don't think that we can require any higher goals, although I liked what they said about this is the floor and not the ceiling so --

seen with others that the goals were set, and then exceeded as they went to work, and really went to work to ensure that those were floors. And the results have been — the results have been terrific. So given the track record here, we'd anticipate that kind of effort, and I'm sure we'll get it. But I hear what you're saying.

MS. GRIFFIN: Great.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH:

With that, then, perhaps, Commissioner
Stebbins, you'd be prepared to make a motion?

All right.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Sure. I move that the gaming commission -- let me find the proper title for it. I move that the gaming commission accept the Wynn Mass, LLC

2.1

diversity strategy for design and construction as presented, with subsequent details to be discussed and negotiated with respect to the design phase and MBE and WBE, and VBE participation. And as an additional part of that motion, to have you come back and kind of clarify the comments and any updates on that category and that question at a future meeting.

MS. GRIFFIN: Well, I'd be glad to bring both plans forward. You'll remember that we -- that you approved MGM's plan with conditions. So I'd be glad to bring both plans forward.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: But the condition here, Commissioner, is -- I think it would be helpful for them to be specific.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: It's further clarification of the components of the design phase and minority women and business participation as they've had it outlined, as well as including a goal for veteran business participation as well.

2.1

MS. GRIFFIN: Okay. Can you clarify what the MBE and WBE clarification that you're looking for, just for the record?

mean, they've set goals, and they're -- I think they're aggressive goals, and we'd like to see that part. We also understand that, you know, there's, you know, a very accomplished team involved in the design phase of Wynn property. It's already based out in Vegas. And they're going to have a role on this project as well going forward. And clarifying what those roles are, and then, again, what the vendor opportunities are for these three categories in the design phase going forward.

MS. GRIFFIN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: As I under -let me see if I -- I'm trying to put some -some sharp edges -- a little bit sharper edges
on that so that they know what we're expecting
them to do, and we know whether they've done
it. We certainly want another look at and a
report about the opportunities for veterans in

2.1

1 the design phase.

2

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Right.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: We certainly want to know about the way in which the

interior design team at Wynn can be
accommodated within the goals that apply to
veterans, as well as overall, I suppose; is

8 that right, or is that not right?

MS. GRIFFIN: So, typically, with these plans, we're looking for external vendors.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.

MS. GRIFFIN: So -- but if you would like something different, we'd need to just clarify that.

commissioner McHugh: Well, I understood, in the discussion that you were having back and forth, that you were going to explore whether and to what extent the interior design folks could be incorporated in reaching any of these goals. If I misunderstood then I -- then I misunderstood it.

MS. GRIFFIN: Okay.

1 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Or do we -- do we just leave that -- is it your 2 3 recommendation we just leave that alone? Work 4 on it, but not make it a goal or a requirement? 5 6 MS. GRIFFIN: Right. 7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. 8 MS. GRIFFIN: I think it's worth a discussion. 9 10 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. A discussion, but not a goal or a requirement. 11 12 So we put that to one side, we look at 13 approving this plan with the condition that they take a look at the ability to reach some 14 15 goal for veteran participation in the design phase. And by definition, we're now talking 16 17 about exterior veteran business participation. 18 And that would give us an approval with a 19 condition; is that -- is that what you'd 20 recommend? 21 MS. GRIFFIN: That's what I'd 22 recommend. 23 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. 24 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Very good.

	rage 50
1	COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Would that
2	would that make sense to you?
3	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: That gets
4	right to the heart of the matter.
5	COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. So the
6	motion as as refined, is that we approve
7	the plan as presented by Wynn with the
8	condition that they reexamine the role of and
9	goals for veteran business participation in
10	the design phase.
11	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Very good.
12	COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. Is
13	there a second to the motion as recast?
14	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So I second
15	that amended motion.
16	COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. All in
17	favor?
18	COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
19	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
20	COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
21	COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The ayes have
22	it unanimously. Thank you very much.
23	MR. IZZAGUIRE: Thank you,
24	Commissioner.

Page 99 1 MR. DESALVIO: Thank you. 2 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. 3 Good job. 4 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. Next on the list is Item 6, which is the legal 5 6 division. General Counsel Blue, and 7 Deputy General Counsel Grossman, good morning 8 to you both. 9 MR. GROSSMAN: Good morning -- or 10 afternoon. 11 MS. BLUE: Good morning. 12 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning. 13 MS. BLUE: Good afternoon. 14 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good 15 morning. 16 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Oh, it is afternoon. Well --17 18 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good 19 afternoon. 20 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: We're on the 21 cusp. 22 MS. BLUE: Just barely. 23 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. 24 MS. BLUE: Commissioners, I have

today, for you, the first -- the draft of the ABCC regulations, which Deputy General Counsel Grossman will speak to. And we also have the first draft for your review of the protection of minors regulations. We have IEB Deputy Director Lillios to speak to you on those as well. So I think we can start with the ABCC regs, and I give you Mr. Grossman.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. Now this, if I understand it correctly, is the beginning of the informal comment process. We're not putting these out for -- for the formal review process that will follow at some point; is that right?

MR. GROSSMAN: That's what we will ask you to do, that's right.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. All right. So if we could hit the highlights of these, that would be very helpful, and we look forward to that.

MR. GROSSMAN: Sure. By way of background, do you recall, back at the beginning of our regular -- regulation promulgation process, you discussed a number

2.1

of policy questions. One of them was how to approach the regulation of alcoholic beverages within the gaming establishment. And the commission, back then determined, preliminarily, that the approach would be to at least ensure, to the extent possible, that the service and consumption of alcoholic beverages was treated the same inside the casinos as it was outside the casinos, and that we would look to Chapter 138, which is the state alcoholic beverage control laws for direction.

In Massachusetts, under the gaming law, Chapter 23K, Section 26, requires that a gaming beverage license be issued at the commission's discretion to each casino licensee. So what we have done here in consult -- we've begun consultation with the ABCC on these regulations, and perhaps Mr. Day can speak to our discussions, or I can get into some of that as well. They've seen these on a preliminary basis.

So what we set out to do was to incorporate what's required by Section 26, and

2.1

some of the principles that are set out in Chapter 138 and the ABCC regulations. what these regulations do is, they establish one casino beverage license per property. They would require that the licensee submit, as part of their application, the location of each licensed area in which they would like to serve alcoholic beverages. There's a number of other pieces of information that would go along with the submission outlining each licensed area. And that, ultimately, each licensed area would be overseen by a manager or other principal representative, who would be subject to the commission's licensing regulations, and is ultimately responsible to ensure that all the alcoholic beverage control regulations are properly enforced.

We also set up provision for the idea that a third party may come in and be asked, or under agreement, to oversee a particular licensed area, a restaurant or otherwise. And we have termed that process to be the jointly-responsible-person process, whereby the gaming licensee would identify,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

under their beverage license, a jointly responsible person who would oversee the service of alcoholic beverages within that particular licensed area. But, ultimately, the gaming licensee would be responsible for the service of alcohol within the gaming establishment. So that's the administrative side of things in a nutshell.

As far as the particulars are concerned, we incorporated what we believed to be the applicable provisions of Chapter 138 and 204 CMR that specifically relate to the distribution and service of alcoholic beverages into these regulations. And those are the provisions that we will need to discuss further with the ABCC. To -- and those provisions ensure that the rules are the same inside the casino as they are outside the casino.

They include basics such as the fact that you can only serve two alcoholic beverages to any one person at a time, but they also get into the forms of identification that would be acceptable in a casino, and this

2.1

is an area that we're going to need to look at very carefully and discuss further with the ABCC because it's an area where the state alcoholic beverage control law differs a little bit, in our estimation, from the gaming law. And we have incorporated what we believe to be the requirements of the gaming law within here.

So, ultimately, I mean, that's a broad overview of what we have here. I'm certainly happy to get into any specifics or particulars, if there are any questions about that.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: No. That's very helpful, and we need to take a look at carefully, again, at these regulations. Where are we with respect to interaction with the ABCC on this, either -- either of you?

MR. DAY: Commissioner McHugh, I can probably update. Actually, there is a first set of comments we had from ABCC that Todd has incorporated many of those already in this draft. And then, we are anticipating as we move forward with this draft, we are going to

2.1

again communicate with ABCC, as a matter of fact have that set up to make sure we have their comments as we move forward with the final draft for the formal process.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yeah. I think it's important, just speaking as one commissioner, but I think it's important that we be in close synchronization with the ABCC here. I'm not telling you anything you're not working toward. But I would hope that by the time we get ready for the formal promulgation process we would -- would be as close to lockstep as we could get.

We have some different requirements this license -- one licensee with, in effect, jointly responsible licensee -- jointly responsible people is different from what exists elsewhere, I gather. But apart from those kinds of differences, I would hope we could be as very closely aligned with that.

MR. DAY: That's our goal.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yeah, great.

Great. I suspected it was.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Just for -- on

2.1

that topic, just recently I've reached out to former colleagues of treasury who oversee the ABCC, and, you know, and have kept apprised Director Day of this effort. Just on that note, they renewed their attention to -- to these matters. They've provided feedback in the past, but given their transition period, they've now renewed their attention to this matter and will -- will, hopefully, get that done very quickly.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good. Good. We need to move forward.

and they need to be at -- a party to the conversation with us as well. I had three, kind of, quick comments, or just notes reading through this. This special event beverage permit, I know our slots parlor licensee has talked about having craft beer festivals, or some types of events like that. Is that the process you would expect to use to allow them to host such events?

MR. GROSSMAN: Not necessarily.

It's certainly possible. The reality is the

2.1

slot parlor and all the gaming establishments can identify any areas within the gaming establishment as a licensed area, whether it's a function hall, or any other kind of public space, whether they plan on using it on a regular basis or not. So it's possible that, for that type of event, it could be held in an area that's, perhaps, not frequently used, but is part of the original license. So they have a plan in place as far as who's responsible for oversight, what types of beverages will be served and the like. So they wouldn't necessarily have to come back and get the special event license.

We built that provision in as a catchall to ensure that we can accommodate any requests like that that are reasonable and well thought out.

commissioner stebbins: On page seven on letter E, everything in that category is about prohibited distribution, and E just doesn't start off with a may not. It just jumps right into they can increase the volume of alcoholic beverages. So just a point to go

2.1

back and look at but -- and then, just jumping down to page number nine, you know, cleanliness, aren't there regulations cited under somebody else's authority that requires a clean glass? Do we need to incorporate that as well?

MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's a judgment call that, ultimately, will fall to the commission that we will have to talk about. There are certain provisions that are in the ABCC regs that we did not incorporate here that go in that area, like having a bathroom available and things along those lines that we didn't incorporate because we --I think we felt they fell a little too far outside. But, at the same time, we tried not to make any judgments relative to the wisdom of the ABCC regs or statutes, or what have you, and just said this is what the law is, and this is what it's going to be in the casino, at least at this juncture.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yeah. We need to keep in mind the fact that, if it's our regulation we've got to enforce it, and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

whether we have the expertise to enforce some of these things.

MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we will. It's important to bear in mind, the statute gives enforcement authority to the gaming enforcement division from the ABCC who have that expertise, along with our folks as well.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. Right.

Right. That's a good point. Right.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And that's the other part of our conversations with the ABCC --

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right, right, right.

Other thoughts? Okay. So at the moment, all we need to do is put these out for the informal public comment and get that process started, and continue to work with the ABCC and move toward the formal promulgation process. Another set of well-crafted regulation. Thank you. Ms. Lillios.

2.1

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

MS. LILLIOS: The next set of draft regulations is numbered 205 CMR 150, and these deal with the protection of minors and persons under the age of 21. And, similarly, this is the first time that you are seeing these provisions. They are -- they stem from Sections 521 and 25 of Chapter 23K, and you will notice that some of them are drafted in a way that requires the gaming licensee to create policies and procedures with respect to the substance. And, as such, it may, in the end, make more sense to place certain of these provisions in the internal controls, but we wanted to get the substance of these out to you now, and to the public, for informal

131415

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

comment.

statutory exception.

The first provision, as drafted, requires the gaming licensee to have policies and procedures to prevent persons under 21 from gambling, and to prohibit them from entering a gaming area, with the exception of licensed employees who are acting in the performance of their duties, which is a

22

23

1

2

3

4

5

The second provision, 150.02 Subsection 1, is actually a licensed condition under the statute, and provides that the gaming licensee requires its security personnel to regularly check parking areas for

6 7

8

9

The following Subsection 2 requires the gaming licensee to have policies and procedures to ensure the safety of minors on the premises, including for the monitoring of

10 11

150.03 stems from Section 25H of the

unattended minors -- for unattended minors.

statute, and it addresses advertising and

13

12

14 marketing concerns with respect to minors and

15

those under 21. And it sets out the

minors in motor vehicles.

16 17 requirements under -- in the word of the statute incorporated in the reg for the

18

operation and conduct of gaming, that no

gaming licensee or gaming establishment

19

20 authorize or conduct marketing and promotional

2.1

activities relative to gaming to target 22 persons under 21. And there follow nine draft

23

24 advertising and promotion relative to gaming

provisions that specify the types of

1 to be avoided.

2.1

And, finally, the last provision addresses reporting requirements relative to the above minor provisions, and the gaming licensee would be expected to report monthly to the IEB on the designated topics, which now number six.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.

Again, very helpful, comprehensive. Comments, questions?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: The one thing that, you know, I'm -- I'll be interested in seeing what plans our licensees come back with monitoring. You know, primarily parking areas or other areas for children.

But looking into the advertising and marketing guidelines, the one that would seem to cause some confusion would be No. 2. You know, there are lot -- lots of entertainers that our licensees may engage for promotion, who have an appeal to somebody who's under 21. I just -- that one just kind of jumped out at me as requiring, maybe, some additional

1 cons

consideration or discussion.

MS. LILLIOS: And I expect that that would be the area where we may get a number of comments that would be helpful as we think through our regulatory actions moving forward as well, but noted.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: One of those things, hard to define, but you kind of know it when you see it. I mean, the hook here, as I see it, is the design to appeal specifically to minors, not in conjunction with others.

But I -- I think that's -- that's an important notion.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.

We'll get some comments on that when we -when we go out, and some -- undoubtedly, some
good ideas. Any other thoughts or comments?

All right. Well, thank you both, very much,
for another set of comprehensive regulations.

We'll put these out for comment. And do we
usually -- I've forgotten. Do we usually set
a time limit here, or do we just do that
informally?

MS. BLUE: Usually, we -- we put it out for comment to almost two weeks, 'til, roughly the next meeting. So we could, if the commission would like, we could say we put them out for comment for 10 days, and that would give us time to look at them, and if they're ready to come back at the next meeting or the meeting after, we can go through the comments.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, why don't we do that and plan to bring them on at the next meeting. And recognizing that the next meeting -- the next step in the next meeting will be to put them out for the formal comment period. So that this is not the last shot that everybody will have, but it typically produces the -- some very helpful thoughts before we put them out for that process. So put them out for comment for 10 days and take them up, hopefully, at the next meeting. That may change, depending on what else is on the agenda, but that would be the Okay. Great. Thank you very much. target. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. 2 Now, the next item is investigations and 3 enforcement, seven. And we'll start with 7A, 4 and then we'll figure out where we go from 5 there. 6 MS. WELLS: Good afternoon, Commissioners. 7 8 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good afternoon, Director Wells. 9 10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good 11 afternoon. 12 MS. WELLS: So the -- on 7A, the 13 first thing we have for the commission this 14 morning, and I'm joined by our CFO -- AO Derek 15 Lennon, deputy general counsel is with us, and 16 the chief -- the gaming agents division. And we have for you this morning two of the sets 17 18 of regulations that I believe are going out 19 for formal comment; is that correct, Todd --Mr. Grossman, if they approve? 20 21 MR. GROSSMAN: (nodding up and down) 22 MS. WELLS: With a vote. So the 23 first matter is the gross gaming revenue tax 24 remittance and reporting, 205 CMR 140, which

you have in your packet for your consideration. And we did go through another revision process, interval discussion, and address some comments.

And then, also, we have the continuing disclosure and reporting obligations of gaming licensees and qualifiers, 204 CMR 139. Similarly, that -- we did engage in the same process with that, as well as the invest -- financial investigation unit provided input on those, as this would be part of their workflow going forward.

So those matters are before the commission. I have the team available, if you have any questions, or any comments for the team.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So we have -these are regulations we considered in -- in
the informal context --

MS. WELLS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: -- and they've now had the benefit of the public comment informally, and so we're ready for the next

2.1

step. Okay. Questions, comments about these?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I have a very minor one. I've been involved in a number of the updates, and I think they're -- they're the product of a great set of discussions and revisions.

There's one recent update, based on the decision that we had last week as we referenced the central monitoring system. I would just ask that we include, or alternative as -- or as alternatively selected by the commission. I think it's important the way it's written here, but I wouldn't want to codify the central monitoring system only as what will be the -- the final say in the -- in the calculation of the tax. I'm specifically referring to number three.

MR. LENNON: Correct.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Or wherever

MR. LENNON: I tried to address that. And you might be right, where we've put it may be better after that. Under remittance, however, in section -- under

2.1

else.

Section 140.03, numbers three and four actually allows for estimated drops, as well as in the absence of a central monitoring system that estimated drops will be used. But you're right, it may be better to put it up, just for clarification purposes, under there.

And one of the reasons that we put the definition under No. 3 for what the actual drop will be, is so that during the reconciliation process we're not relying just solely on the estimates from our central monitoring system, but there is a formula. There is something that backs up these numbers. And we tried to take a shot at that with the Excel spreadsheet that's attached to this, to show how you would do a quick worksheet for both table games and slots to come up with the backup documentation. But that's a -- that's a good point. I'll try and move that for clarification.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.

Any other comments, questions? Have we sent the small business impact statement out for

2.1

Page 119 1 these, or do we have to before we start this? We will have to as we 2 MR. GROSSMAN: 3 start the formal process. 4 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: But that doesn't come until later in the process? 5 6 MR. GROSSMAN: No. We can probably 7 bring that back to you at your next meeting to 8 take a look at. 9 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. We can 10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. 11 start the formal process today and then have 12 the --13 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. Right. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- later on. 14 15 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. Right. 16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good. 17 All 18 Then, if there are no further 19 comments, I would accept a motion to -- to 20 start the process. Commissioner Zuniga, do 21 you have to start the motion? 22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yep. I'd be 23 happy to move that this commission approve and

start the formal promulgation process for

regulations 205 CMR 140 for the gross gaming 2 revenue tax remittance and reporting, as well 3 as 205 CMR 139 for the continuing disclosure 4 and reporting of obligations of gaming 5 licensees. 6 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. Is 7 there a second for that motion? 8 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second. 9 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Further 10 discussion? Hearing none, all in favor? Aye. 11 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: 12 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Ayes have it 14 15 unanimously. Thank you very much. Thank you. 16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 17 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That process now will start. 18 19 MS. WELLS: Shall I continue to 20 Section B? 21 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Now, what 22 we're left -- we have a decision point here. 23 What we're left with is Region C, Item 7B, and 24 I know we have a number of people who would

1 like to speak. What is the commission's 2 pleasure about proceeding forward or taking a 3 break at this point? 4 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: My own 5 preference would be to let's just move right 6 through it. We've -- have some people here 7 about three hours but --8 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Director 9 Wells, do we have an idea of how long you 10 think this may take? 11 MS. WELLS: As far as my briefing 12 for the commission, I can do that in the 13 matter of, you know, 10 minutes, just to give 14 you an overview. 15 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: But the 16 presentations? 17 MS. WELLS: The presentations, I 18 have members from Mass Gaming Entertainment, 19 KG Urban, Somerset, Sun Moon and Crossroads. 20 If you give them five to 10 minutes each to 21 speak, that can be --22 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: An hour. 23 MS. WELLS: Correct. So --24 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: We could take

a 30-minute real quick, since there's food 2 right here. 3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The food court 4 is open, isn't it, today? 5 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And the food 6 court's open. That's right. It's unusual. 7 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I'd be 8 inclined to take the 30 minutes. 9 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. 10 Why don't we do that. Why don't we -- I would 11 really like to, particularly given the weather 12 conditions outside, and the fact that some 13 people have traveled distances and everybody's got to get home, I'd like to hold this to 30 14 minutes. And we'll take a 30-minute recess 15

because it's easier to remember quarter hours

and then come back at one -- well, 35, 1:15,

18 than it is minutes. And so, we'll take a

19 break now. We'll resume at 1:15. The food

court is open, and we'll be back then.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

That works.

23

24

16

17

20

21

22

(A recess was taken)

1 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I'm ready 2 to -- we are ready to resume with the 144th 3 public meeting of the Massachusetts Gaming 4 Commission. What is left on our agenda is 5 Item 7B, Region C update and requests for 6 extensions. And, Director Wells, I'm going to 7 ask you to lead this off, if you would, 8 please. 9 MS. WELLS: Thank you, sir. 10 afternoon, Commissioners. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 11 Good 12 afternoon. 13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good afternoon. 14 15 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good 16 afternoon. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: 17 Good 18 afternoon. MS. WELLS: As the commission is 19 20 aware, the commission set a January 30th 21 deadline for submission of the RFA1 materials 22 for Region C, so I'd just like to give the 23 commission an update of the universe of what 24 the situation is for the Region C applicants.

We also have a -- a request for extension, and I believe the applicants want to be heard on that issue.

The four issues, which I'm going to address for each of the applicants are, A, whether or not they participated in the Region C scoping process; B, whether they submitted the \$400,000 application fee; C, whether they filed a substantially-complete application; and D, whether they filed a request for extension.

Massachusetts Gaming and
Entertainment, as you may recall from the
slots parlor process, they were found suitable
by the commission already. They did
participate in the Region C scoping process.
They also had previously submitted the
400,000 fee for the application.

Originally, when they had been part of the process earlier, they did -- we did submit a scoping letter to them. They had provided the materials and the organizational chart to us of what their project is going to look like, who their partners are, what the

2.1

equity is, and who the operator is. And then we received materials sufficient to determine that they had filed a substantially-complete application. And they did not file a request for extension, obviously, because they had complied with what the commission had set forth as the process. So Attorney Donnelly is -- is here today.

We also have KG Urban. They also participated in the scoping process. They had actually done that back in August of 2013, and their -- the status of their organization had not changed to this date. However, as you can see from the letter that I sent to KG Urban, based on the information they had provided to us, they had not identified an operator, and they expected another equity partner so the IEB could not complete a scope of licensing process, could not determine who all the qualifiers were. And while they had submitted the \$400,000 application fee, they did not file a substantially-complete application. They have filed a written request for an extension. And I believe Attorney Conroy's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

going to be available to be heard on that request before the commission. They had some updated information, some of which has been provided to the commission.

The next applicant, potential applicant that I'd like to speak about is Somerset on the Move, LLC. Mr. Hanlon is here. Dave Hanlon's here to address the commission on that matter. We had spoken at length. He had -- with his team, participated in the scoping process, but like KG Urban, had not put the entire deal together, been very forthright about the status of what they have planned, but because they hadn't identified the -- all the qualifiers, the IEB was unable to submit to them a scoping letter identifying all the entities and individuals that would need to submit the forms in order to submit a complete application to the commission. did not, at this point, file a \$400,000 application fee, and they have filed the request for an extension.

Also have Ms. Wheaton from Sun Moon Casino application. She did participate in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

the scoping process, and similar to Somerset, has not filed the \$400,000 application fee. And based on the materials that were submitted, had not identified an operator, had not identified the equity interest, and not identified a number of the parties the IEB would require in order to determine a complete application. Had filed merely an application on a BED for a trust, and one EHDF for herself. So I did indicate to her, in writing, that the -- we'd need more information in order to file a substantially-complete application. We don't have that at this point, and I believe she has an oral request for extension, in part, because she had not submitted the \$400,000 fee at this time.

And the other entity before the commission, I do have Bob Allen who had -- representing Crossroads earlier, when they had been part of the Region A process. I am -- I'm going to ask him to address the commission on the issue. We did receive from David Nunes' widow, a request for an

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

extension. However, I'm learning that that interest may have actually been sold, and I'm not sure what the status is with that. So I don't know if there's anyone here for Mrs. Nunes. Okay. So I'm not seeing anyone here today so I'll let Mr -- Attorney Allen address the commission on that.

Crossroads did not -- while Crossroads had participated in scoping for the Region A process, Crossroads had not participated in the Region C scoping process, meeting the January 9th and January 16th deadlines, while they had submitted the \$400,000 fee previously for Region A, and, at this point, based on their suitability report, which we had previously done where the IEB had indicated that we couldn't complete it because it was not a complete application, and they're still in that same position. So we do not know what the deal is, and they have not provided the information to the IEB, and I believe they would like to be heard on that as well.

So that is the universe of where we

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

are with the commission. And the commission's aware with the other deadlines that we set, the 9th, the 16th and the 30th, and the status of those. I think it would make sense, if the commission is amenable, to begin by hearing from Attorney Donnelly from Mass Gaming and Entertainment to hear where they are in their process, and their position on the request for extension, and then we can go through the other people that are here today.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, let me ask you -- that's an excellent suggestion, and that's what we'll do. Tell me, though, about Sun Moon. I know we'll get to them in a second. Was a personal history disclosure form filed?

MS. WELLS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The letter that's in the packet says the 400,000 -- it says, "Payment of the application fee of 400,000 is hereby made," but that didn't happen.

MS. WELLS: That is not -- that is not, correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay.

Got it. Let's turn -- and what I'd like to do is hear -- we have -- all who would like to be heard are going to be heard, but I'd like to keep the presentations for each entity, however many speakers they're going to be, to 10 minutes apiece. We have the documents, we understand the primary issues, and we welcome comments, but I'd like to keep them to that length of time. Good morning.

Thank you. MR. DONNELLY: afternoon, members of the commission, John Donnelly is my name, D-O-N-N-E-L-L-Y. I've been before you before, but it's been some time. We were -- Massachusetts Gaming and Entertainment, who I represent, was found suitable in July 2013. Seems like not too long ago, but it's been quite awhile for this process, so I'm glad to be back here. back with a different project.

I'm here with George Carney, who is the partner of -- one of the partners with Mass Gaming and Entertainment. Mass Gaming and Entertainment is a conglomerate of a -- of

a group associated with Neil Bluhm. It was a developer and a real estate developer, and a casino operator from Chicago area, who operates now -- has developed and operated casinos in Philadelphia, in Pittsburgh, and in -- right outside of Chicago in Des Plaines, and operates one in Canada.

The other partner is George Carney, who is with me standing here and is a lifelong resident of Brockton and a prominent citizen of the commonwealth. And I think persons on the board are probably familiar with him by both reputation and maybe by -- even know of his many accomplishments.

The third partner is a company called Clairvest, which is an entity that -- is a Canadian entity that is a partner of Mr. Bluhm's outfit in the Chicago casino and, oftentimes, provides additional equity in some of Mr. Bluhm's projects. They, too, were in this process some -- back in 2013, and looked at some sites, and ultimately determined not to go forward. But they are licensed in other jurisdictions, namely, in Des Plaines, and are

2.1

a -- a well-known equity group out of Canada.

We're here to oppose the extensions. Now, I learned long ago as a young lawyer, when I would get requests for extensions, I never knew what to do, and I'd weigh them back and forth, and I made a decision about five years in that I'm never going to oppose an extension just to oppose it. I'm only going to oppose it if there is a reason for my client to oppose it. Other than that, I need extensions, they need extensions, stuff happens and everyone will -- you will have people come before you as your tenure goes on needing, wanting and -- and having extensions, and I'm not opposed to those. And I certainly don't want to say anything negative about any of the persons who are asking for the This is very hard, putting one of extensions. these projects together.

My client, my principal client,

Neil Bluhm, was -- has -- was the first

developer of a casino after the financial

crisis, and we went through enormous

difficulties in Philadelphia and -- in getting

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

a casino developed, because what happened in Philadelphia was there were two applicants in a -- kind of, a beauty contest. One was Foxwoods, and one was our group. The applicants won, there were appeals to the Supreme Court, which permitted, and during that period of time the economy collapsed. And with that delay of a year, while waiting for the Court, both projects fell apart. Foxwoods never got back up on its feet again. And because of that, there's only one casino.

Neil Bluhm and his group out of Chicago, because of his financial strength, was able to finance a casino and get it operating. It was the first stick-built casino after the great recession. He then went into Pittsburgh. And he went in there for similar reasons. The developer there, a man by the name of Don Barden, who other people in this room know and has now passed away, had tried to develop the casino in Pittsburgh, he too got tumbled by the recession. And Mr. Bluhm took that building out -- that project out of bankruptcy and

2.1

1 rebuilt.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

Now, I say that not to beat the drum for Neil Bluhm, but to say that the reason we object to this is that -- I think one of the commissioners said before, there are a lot of moving parts, and a lot of people involved, and a very complex process to get to a casino. You have to have -- you have to have people, and we're very happy that we've got people. We've got people that have the integrity, have been licensed everywhere else, Mr. Carney and his group has been licensed and found suitable before. So we've got that. You have to have a site. And I'm going to ask Mr. Carney in a moment to address the site. He knows far more than I know about it. You've got to have an operator. And we have an operator that we've -- we've operated casinos successfully throughout the northeast, and without difficulty. And you have to have financing. And I don't think you could have a stronger financial group coming before yous.

The other groups that are asking for the extensions, and not to be critical of them

at all, have not been able to put those pieces together, and I don't blame 'em, because they're very difficult to put together. And, especially, in today's economic situation, and today with what people see in the gaming industry is saturation and so on, it's becoming more and more difficult.

I say all that to say, we've got it.

We're here. We're ready to go. We want to
go. And we want to get operating as fast as
we can. And any delay is fraught with danger
and uncertainty because we don't know what the
future holds. We do know that today, as we
sit here, we have those four elements,
including what I think is a great site and a
host community that is favorable to our
position. And before I go on, and I will be
brief, I'll be less than 10 minutes, but I'd
like to ask Mr. Carney to just address the
host community for a moment.

MR. CARNEY: To members of the -- to members of the commission -- to members of -- I can talk loud enough. Anyway, to members of the commission, I've been before you before.

2.1

The only thing I'd like to say is this, that I feel that I came up with people that have got a good reputation, got plenty of money, and we got a great location in the city of Brockton. I've been a lifelong resident. I understand the city. I know that the jobs are at an all-time low. And as far as I think is concerned, the city needs help. It's a great I've lived there all my life. I have scheduled on this coming Friday to meet with the different city councilors so we comply with the -- where there's not too many at one time to go with the -- there's a law that you can't have, you know, three -- three or four, or whatever it is. I'm not up to date on that. But, anyway, we have it scheduled for Friday and Saturday. We have the three state -- three state representatives, I believe sent in a letter into the commission supporting our -- our application, as well as Senator Kennedy -- Kennedy's office, I believe, sent in a letter, also, to you They said they'd have it in by people. Wednesday so you'd have it for your --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yes, it's been received.

MR. CARNEY: So, anyway, the city is very much behind us. I feel very comfortable we'll get a good vote from the city council, more than we will need, and the city is a hundred percent -- and this is the last opportunity to help the city of Brockton. And that's -- at my stage of life, I think this will be something, if I could put it together and have something that people would be proud of, and something that the city needs and would employ a lot of people. That's about all I can say.

If you have any questions to ask me, I'd be more than happy to answer them, if I can. But I wouldn't be sitting here, if I didn't think I had something we could produce and everybody would be happy, and wouldn't be ashamed giving us a license. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.

Thank you, Mr. Carney, Mr. Donnelly.

MR. DONNELLY: Well, that's it.

This isn't a complicated issue, or one that

requires any great argument, thank goodness.

But the point is, stuff does happen. And
we've got a bird in the hand, and we'd like to
go forward with it.

Of course, you know your statute and your duties, and your responsibilities far better than I do, and I'm not here to suggest what you should or shouldn't do in your judgment. I just do say that the quicker that we can get operating, the more certain it becomes that this will happen, if we're ultimately selected. And until it happens, we can't start doing what this whole thing's about, which is, breaking it down to its simplest form, it's about revenue and jobs.

And until we can get into the process economically and understand that -- and hope that this license will actually be issued, because there's some uncertainty with regard to that, too, I'm aware of, but as soon as we can get into this process and start the design, as you spoke with the Wynn people today, that's when we start hiring people, and that's when we start hiring construction

2.1

firms, and that's when we start actually bringing those economic benefits.

And those economic benefits really start to flow when we start putting the bricks and mortar down and then get operating and hire people. And those are the happy days, when you see that kind of activity. We want to get there. I know you want to get there. And I leave it to your discretion, which you have on this, but I hope that there's not a delay. We -- we're ready, willing and able to get -- get moving. And we thank you for your time.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.
Thank you, Mr. Donnelly. Thank you,
Mr. Carney.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

MS. WELLS: I'd ask that

Kevin Conroy from KG Urban --

20 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Oh, wait a

21 minute.

MS. WELLS: Unless you have a question. Pardon me.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I'm sorry.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1 I'm sorry.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Before we got

3 there, just a question for Director Wells.

MS. WELLS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: There's at

least two parties that have been prior --

MS. WELLS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: --

investigated --

MS. WELLS: Right.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- but a third

one that has not?

MS. WELLS: Clairvest. So you'll --

we'll go through the submissions as to the

complexity of what we need to do, but it's not

as if this is already a done deal. We would

need to update both the Mass Gaming and

18 Entertainment piece, the Mr. Carney piece, and

19 then we would have to start on that Clairvest

20 piece. So there would be that section of the

21 deal which is -- this was a newer addition in

22 the -- in the last few weeks, so that

Clairvest investigation would need to be done

24 from the beginning.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But are they 2 close to preparing those forms and submitting 3 them to you? 4 MS. WELLS: Well, they've submitted 5 the document. 6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: They have. 7 Okay. 8 MS. WELLS: And we'll review for 9 completeness and all that, but they were very 10 accommodating to our request that materials 11 should be in by the deadline. 12 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. 13 Good afternoon. 14 MR. STERN: Thank you, 15 Commissioners. 16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good afternoon. 17 18 MR. STERN: My name is David Stern. 19 I'm the CEO of DJS Global Advisors, and I'm 20 advising KG Urban in connection with its 21 development of a casino in New Bedford. And 22 I'm here, obviously, in support of the 23 application for a 60-day extension of the 24 deadline. And thank you for the opportunity

1 to present.

years. They've incurred costs well in excess of \$10 million. They've considered other cities in the southeast, but they landed in New Bedford, where they considered the golf course, where they believed, and I think the facts demonstrated, it would have virtually no impact on the downtown area of New Bedford. In fact, it would detract from the businesses there. They considered something known as the Hicks-Logan site, and that too was distant enough from the downtown area that it would add nothing, and it would detract.

The Cannon Street site is adjacent to downtown. It's been in private hands for over 105 years and had to be -- the right to acquire it had to be -- had to be negotiated through a series of very complex transactions over a couple of years, and it is a contaminated site requiring an environmental cleanup that's going to cost \$50 million that the City of New Bedford does not have. That sort of sets it.

1

2

13 14

11

12

16

17

15

1819

21

20

22

23

24

We -- we estimate that there'll be construction jobs in the neighborhood of 4,500, operational jobs beyond that of another 8,000 and a -- you know, a construction impact of \$547 million, and an operational yearly impact of something approaching a billion dollars, and a clean up of a environmentally, badly damaged site. I guess what I would say is that -- and -- and the owner of that site will only part with it under the terms of a long negotiated cleanup plan that has been documented with more books than we could bring into this, and doesn't want to have any continuing liability. They want the company buying it to take on the liability, which we have agreed to.

With respect to an operator, I can report that we're in discussions with three, but I've been authorized to tell you that Foxwoods, which has already been qualified in Massachusetts, is in discussions with us about a -- an operation management agreement, and we would hope that by the extension period we would both have a final deal for operation

management, and a -- the equity funding that we're now in discussions with many about. But this has been a interesting process as the referendum was on, and as various other deadlines have been extended, et cetera. But we're now focused on a laser -- laser-like basis.

I guess all I would add is that a letter that we attached, I won't read you the whole thing, from the town -- the city council sent us in August and we annexed it. It says, "An urban casino, as you have proposed, presents a unique opportunity to grow and promote our downtown businesses, and will induce overall economic development and revitalization by creating thousands of job that generate millions of dollars in tax revenue."

Skipping along, "We appreciate the strong and effective efforts KG's project design team has taken to develop plans that allows the proposed location on Cannon Street to coexist with and complement current maritime uses while opening the waterfront to

2.1

public use as well." Because, as you -- as we've told you in other documents, we have an entire plan for blending this in both with the downtown and with the waterfront.

And, finally, "We further recognize and understand that given the substantial cost to remediate and rehabilitate the NSTAR and Sprague sites, a casino development represents the only true opportunity to transform those obsolete brown field sites. Sites that are now off limits to the public, and to a vibrant waterfront amenity, open to and enjoyed by future customers and guests at the casino, as well as the general public."

We think this overall development is right in the sweetheart -- sweet spot of what the commission has been trying to do, and we urge you to grant us an additional 60 days to make it come to fruition. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Thank you,
Mr. Stern. Do you have any response to, or
thoughts about the mayor's letter?

MR. STERN: Well, what I didn't say

2.1

Page 146 1 is that we are in the process of joining with 2 the mayor in a study being done by 3 Sasaki Associates, which the -- a design firm, 4 which the mayor has --5 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well-known --6 MR. STERN: -- suggested. 7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. 8 MR. STERN: And it is our hope, not 9 a guarantee or not definite, that, that will 10 be a catalyst for the series of discussions 11 that are necessary leading to a host committee 12 agreement -- host community agreement, excuse 13 That's -me. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. 14 15 MR. STERN: That's my response to 16 that. 17 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Is that study 18 anticipated to be done within the time 19 frame --20 MR. STERN: Yes. 21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- that you're 22 requesting? 23 MR. STERN: Yes, yes. Yes.

architect has spoken with Sasaki's design

team, and we expect it to be, perhaps, a three- or four-week, at most, study.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay.

Questions, comments?

MR. CONROY: I just want to make — this is Kevin Conroy from Foley Hoag. I just want to make one point clear. We're asking for an extension of this substantially-complete requirement that — that the commission set out for Region C. We have paid the \$400,000. We've submitted our RFA1 application for two — three individual — two individual qualifiers and three entity qualifiers. What we're short is the documents related to an operator and equity. But that's the extension we're looking for.

mentioned, briefly, the equity piece. And this is usually all of the redacted information into these kinds of proceedings, but how would you characterize your progress relative to that equity participation?

MR. STERN: I would say -- I would

2.1

say the equity participation is -- has had people express interest in asking us who is our operator. And I can report that we're in discussions with three operators, but one in particular that has now been qualified. And we believe that that -- that agreement, if it's pushed, will head to completion, successful completion of equity -- of equity raise.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Just to pick up on Mr -- Attorney Conroy's remarks, would you -- in your letter you seem to allude that there would be additional time required to complete the investigations prior to the RFA2 deadline --

MR. CONROY: Well, so --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- that we currently have.

MR. CONROY: Excuse me.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Sorry.

MR. CONROY: As I understand it, the reason the commission introduced a substantially-complete requirement for Region C is that it wanted to ensure that the

investigations would be completed by the time that the RFA2 applications need to be submitted. So only those who have been found suitable could submit their applications. And so, what we wanted to make clear is, yes, we need an additional 60 days to bring in an operator and bring in equity. We assume that if that — if you do grant us that extra 60 days, that the RFA2 deadline may also need to move out 60 days in order to allow the IEB to do the investigations and complete that investigation before the RFA2 deadline.

That — that's the reference.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Unless you required a waiver of our regulation that states suitability has to be done prior to the vote of the host community, correct?

MR. CONROY: That is correct,

Commissioner. If that was a course of action,
we could definitely -- we could consider.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Or I could put it another way. If we -- if we entertained your -- we're entertaining it. If we granted the 60-day extension to the completion, to the

2.1

substantial-completion milestone, if you will, that would put us well into March, let's say, right?

MR. CONROY: Mm-hmm.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: At which point, you would have between 60 to 90 days to have a favorable vote of the host community, which puts us right up against the vote -- I'm sorry, the current deadline of RFA2.

MR. CONROY: Yes. Although, I would say we're moving very, very quickly to identify an operator and reach an agreement.

And -- and we're also trying moving as quickly as we can with the host community agreement.

Obviously, we've got to do the -- the Sasaki study, and the mayor would like us to identify an operator, but we're trying to move very quickly on those things, and I -- I hope -- we'll see how long that takes, but we're -- we're not going to wait 60 days, if we can do it sooner.

MR. STERN: And in deference to Attorney Donnelly, I think it's fair to say that it will be a nice problem to have, to

2.1

have some robust competition for the 2 commission to consider, having come to this 3 point in the journey, and we would like, very 4 much, to be one of the those robust 5 competitors for the license in the southeast. 6 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. 7 Thank you very much. I -- I would note, 8 though, that our existing regulations always 9 contemplated a substantially-complete 10 examination -- application before we made decisions about suitability. Section 115 of 11 12 the regulations deals precisely with that. 13 And that's what we're aiming for. So thank 14 you -- thank you all very much. 15 MR. STERN: Thank you for having us. 16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you. MS. WELLS: Just ask -- Mr. Hanlon. 17 And I think that they're working with 18 19 Mr. Allen, so maybe the two of them could come 20 up to the podium next. That would be most 2.1 efficient. 22 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. 23 Good afternoon. 24 MR. HANLON: Good afternoon,

Commissioners. I'm David Hanlon. I'm with a project that we're -- we submitted, Somerville on the Move. I have had over 30 years experience in the gaming business as a developer and operator licensed and operating in multiple jurisdictions. New Jersey, Nevada, Illinois. And I'm new to this project because I was only recently asked by, or invited by the Town of Somerville --

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Somerset.

MR. HANLON: Somerset, excuse me.

To get involved in this process. So as a result, I've gone as quick as possible as we can on this, and I think we've accomplished a lot. I had the pleasure of filling out my personal history disclosure form, which I hadn't done for awhile and learned a few things I'd forgotten.

So we did that. We put in the submission. We have a letter from a major investment banking firm about providing the debt. We're in discussions with a number of -- of entities to provide the equity on the process, and we have full support of the city

2.1

-- or the town, excuse me, down there. I met with them as recently as this morning on that. They believe that they have full support of -- of all the people down there to go through that. They have an excellent site and good location. And recognizing very late in this process, I do think that I had the ability and the experience, and the ability to put together a project very quickly that could be a significantly-positive competitor and alternative to other sites being proposed.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right, Mr. Hanlon. Thank you.

MR. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, members of the board, nice to see you all again. My name's Robert Allen. I have a law practice in Brookline. It's been awhile since I've been before the commission. I've been representing Crossroads in the past. You may remember we came here, found us suitable, and we failed in the referendum in Milford through a tremendously, and hopefully you can remember, exhaustive effort we spent in Milford. We spent a lot of time and a lot of money in

2.1

Milford trying to convince them that this was a proper location. However we -- we were not successful.

We did identify, when we were here last for our suitability hearing, our equity partner. We -- quite honestly, after the Milford experience, it was a -- it was a little bit of hiatus there to collect our collective breaths and wait for another opportunity.

I personally have been involved in a number of locations down in the -- down in the southern part, down in Region C, and just very recently Somerset which -- which this board, I think, knows is -- is about to experience a tremendous loss with their largest taxpayer leaving in 2017. Crippling affect on the community. They are desperately seeking somebody and they -- they basically came to us and -- and talked to us, see if there was an interest.

Mr. Hanlon is familiar with -- you may -- Scott Butera, who was -- we sat here with before, he's no longer with Foxwoods but

2.1

continues to be on Crossroads as an -- in an advisory capacity. I spoke with him today. He's familiar with Mr. Hanlon from his long experience, and -- and we think this is a nice team to put together.

We feel -- we've paid our \$400,000, and we've been very involved in this process. We believe that the 60-day extension would be appropriate for us in order to -- basically, what we'd be looking for is to look at our table of organization, finish our negotiations with us -- with -- with Mr. Hanlon and his We do not anticipate a significant addition. Maybe, two or three qualifiers. I've spoke with Ms. Wells a little bit about it, but it's a little bit early in the -- in the negotiations. We'd be very excited. believe competition is important for Region C. We have a very, very good understanding of this process. We have a very good understanding what it takes to convince a community.

Here we have a community that is very supportive of it, which is a little bit

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

different than what we had last time. Here I think we have identified some partners. We've identified two operators. Our equity piece is — is still in place. We've already reached out and had some preliminary conversations about that, and we believe with a 60-day extension, we can — we can put the pieces together.

I know Ms. Wells spoke of a letter you received from the widow of Mr. Nunes. do want to represent to the commission that while I'm not the transactional attorney for Crossroads, I was provided with a complete release from Crossroads of Mr. Nunes that he had taken care of prior to his unfortunate passing. And I believe that that release was sent to Mr. Nunes' widow either on or after an e-mail about the same date that the letter was. So my guess is that the affairs are being put in order, and there's a lot of questions as to what -- what is in his estate. So we did provide her with a copy of the release that was -- that was negotiated and worked out, signed by all the parties.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

1	COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.
2	Thank you for that. Assuming that is so, who
3	is Crossroads?
4	MR. ALLEN: Continues to be
5	Robert Potamkin, Bruce Etkin and Tim Presutti.
6	COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. Who
7	were three of the qualifiers on the last
8	go-around?
9	MR. ALLEN: That's correct. I
10	believe Mr. Presutti's interest was below the
11	level yeah.
12	MS. WELLS: I don't recall off the
13	top of my head.
14	COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.
15	All right. But but those are three
16	names
17	MS. WELLS: Correct.
18	MR. ALLEN: All qualified.
19	COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.
20	Okay. I got it. I'm sorry, there's one other
21	thing. You you have paid the 400,000?
22	MR. ALLEN: Yes.
23	COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay.
24	MS. WELLS: Yeah, the situation with

1 Crossroads, while they paid --2 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Oh, I'm sorry, 3 Crossroads --4 MR. ALLEN: Crossroads, yeah. 5 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: -- paid the 6 400,000. That's right. 7 MS. WELLS: Crossroads has paid, 8 Somerset has not. 9 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. 10 MS. WELLS: Somerset went through 11 the Region C scoping process, Crossroads did 12 not, and now they're coming together. 13 that's the unusual circumstances we have with this team. 14 15 MR. ALLEN: Partnerships are formed 16 in mysterious ways. 17 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Go ahead. 18 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Mr. Hanlon, 19 you were talking briefly about the equity 20 piece? 21 MR. ALLEN: Yes. 22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And at the 23 same time, Mr. Hanlon also referenced, sort 24 of, certain preliminary discussions.

Crossroads, at the time they were in Milford, had and were found suitable, did not have a complete financing plan, given, you know, that was -- that was acceptable at that time, preliminary to be done. And then the referendum came and, you know, it failed. So we never got to see, as I understand it, a big picture, or a clear, sorry, picture of the financing or the equity financing. What can you tell us as that may stand now?

MR. ALLEN: Well I -- we, as a little background, and I think because the referendum happened shortly after it fell off the table, we did provide this commission and Ms. Wells with a -- identifying our equity piece. I believe we -- we might have walked in or provided it to her the day before we came here for -- for our suitability hearing.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: With GLPI?

MR. ALLEN: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Is that

still --

MR. ALLEN: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Still under

1 negotiation or in spirit? 2 We've -- yes. MR. ALLEN: Yes. Naturally, he wants to understand the site and 3 4 understand the building. It's a little bit 5 different than the Region A piece so it's not 6 as significant. But, yes, the conversations 7 have already begun. And, again, we've been --8 we've been involved in this in fairly short a 9 period of time, although, we feel like we've 10 been involved for a very long time with this 11 process. 12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And the 60-day extension that you're requesting would then --13 14 help me understand what that may be. 15 substantially-complete piece or --16 MR. ALLEN: Yes. It would be -there would be a change in our table of 17 18 organization we anticipate, so that would be 19 going to the substantial completion. 20 MS. WELLS: Well, I guess, then, my 2.1 question would be, who is the applicant? 22 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yeah. 23 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes.

MS. WELLS:

24

If you are -- if you are

1 partnering, who is the applicant? 2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I quess I was 3 going to that, yeah. 4 MS. WELLS: Because if Crossroads is 5 the applicant, they paid the fee, but yet, 6 they didn't meet the deadlines for going 7 through the scoping process. So I'd leave it 8 to the commission's judgment on what to do 9 about that. But if Somerset is the applicant, 10 does then not Somerset have to pay the 11 application fee? So that's one of the 12 questions for the commission's consideration. 13 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yeah. I think that's -- we're all asking the same question. 14 15 So -- go ahead. 16 MR. ALLEN: And I -- and I think we 17 would be fine if -- either way the commission 18 decided to vote on that. But we --19 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Wait a minute. 20 You're the applicant. 2.1 MR. ALLEN: Yes. 22 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So it's not us 23 to put the deal together. 24 Right. Well, Crossroads MR. ALLEN:

believes that -- that we paid. We -- we haven't done the scope agreement. We believe we could turn that around pretty quickly.

We're talking daily with -- with the folks in Somerset so --

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. I hear you.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So if
Crossroads were the applicant, then you would
be seeking an extension of the
substantially-complete requirement, correct?

I think -- and MS. WELLS: Right. then I think it would be two-fold. If that's the case, they'd -- the substantial -substantially-complete application, but they'd be in, for example, a different position than KG Urban. KG Urban met the -- you know, the They did produce materials on the deadlines. -- on the 9th, and did have a scoping meeting by the 16th. So they're in -- in -- you know, for interest of equity of fairness they -they're in slightly different position. So I think Crossroads is also asking for an extension of an opportunity to do the scoping

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 process as well. 2 MR. ALLEN: I think that's right. 3 MS. WELLS: I think we need to redo 4 it for KG Urban once they get their partners 5 anyway, because we couldn't complete the 6 scoping process, if that's helpful. 7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: 8 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So -- and 9 Mr. Hanlon you would be -- you or a team would 10 be considered the operator? 11 MR. HANLON: Yes, that's correct. 12 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. 13 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. 14 Further questions? Okay. Thanks very much. 15 MS. WELLS: And then we also have Ms. Wheaton from Sun Moon. 16 17 MS. WHEATON: Good afternoon, 18 Commissioners. 19 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. 20 Good afternoon, Ms. Wheaton. 21 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good 22 afternoon. 23 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good 24 afternoon.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good afternoon.

MS. WHEATON: The Seafan Trust, doing business as Sun Moon Resort, is approaching this in a different manner. It is establishing itself as a casino and resort entity independent of an existing casino company here in Massachusetts. In which case, the Seafan Trust is the applicant, and I as the trustee have the ultimate decision-making, so I'm the primary person responsible with respect to any decisions and authority, not our funder, if you will, who is an institutional investor, which would probably warrant the qualifications exemption. But let us speak to the matter of the --

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I'm not sure I -- well, go ahead. That's fine.

MS. WHEATON: Yeah. I really didn't want to go into the entire scope at this time.

I just wanted to firstly answer the questions.

On or about January 23rd, to beat the snow that we had on the 24th, I went out of state intending to return on the 27th. Not

2.1

only to finalize the written application, but to pay the fee. I was one of the many 10,000s of individuals who got caught out of state, exiled behind the snow curtain, if you will, and could not return. And there were a number of people who were bumped, who had priority for scheduled flights to return to the northeast. I got a guaranteed flight Friday morning, January 23rd, and made it back here in time to file the application on time.

I also faced 3 feet of snow that had not been taken care of, which I took care of on Saturday. Intending, of course, to then get out on Monday, we all were snowed in again. So this past Tuesday, in fact, is the first chance I've had to get out and process the fee. I had been informed as well, while I brought all of my materials with me, with respect to the written application out of state, I had been informed that a branch of my bank was there, only to find out it was for the employees only, so I couldn't do anything with respect to the fee while out of state.

So this past Tuesday, which would

have effectively been the 3rd, is my first day of getting out to process that. So I'm happy to announce that the bankers are, as we speak, in the vault counting in order to send it -- you the fee, Commissioners. And as fast as they do that, and if they don't take too long staring at the funds like they like to do before they part with them, then we're talking a matter of a couple of days for that. And Monday's weather -- but I don't know what more I may have to do, so if I do with respect to the bank, it'll probably be getting over there by Tuesday. That's one on the matter of the funds.

On the matter of the funding for the project, this being a \$4 billion project, I am also happy to announce that -- or to further inform you that the Seafan Trust already has its funding. The expectation, as reflected in the cover letter and information to you, of the minimum of \$600 million, actually, has been changed where the funders want to provide more at this time. So we're only in an influx of a couple of days going as fast as we can

2.1

for them to submit that. And I will provide that information, as I've already promised, next week when that is done.

As far as my point of view,
agreements, conversations mean nothing. I
want it in the trust account. And that's when
you would be informed of exactly who it is,
and any of the other information that you
require. And that's pretty much it with
respect to the funding.

With those funds, then Seafan is going to be in a position to hire, as independent contractors, the variety of individuals that are out there who are not now associated or under agreement with an existing casino operation, but have had decades of experience in the planning operations and management of such. And the trust is going to hire them as independent contractors. Pardon me for saying, they will work for us. They will do it our way, and there won't be a tug of war with respect to how the funds are spent on our project, which is 95 percent resort on 500 acres, more, if I can.

2.1

And the existing plans, which you've seen that have been illustrated in part, and shall be furthered, that is 95 percent resort for us all to enjoy nongaming, and the maximum and ideal plans, and the amount of money that it's going to take to provide such a resort is one which I absolutely refuse to have any funder, investor, casino operator, if you will, try to minimize with respect to the quality and the funding that goes into it.

it. And the casino experts I call them, as well as their resort experts, will be hired and work for us as independent contractors.

And this then becomes a project that we the people of Massachusetts will be putting together to do it our way for the

United States to enjoy it in the manner that the people of Massachusetts see how we can provide it as a resort and a casino. Any questions?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. Thank you very much.

MS. WHEATON: I'm trying to go

2.1

1 quickly.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Questions?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You seem to suggest that it was the snow that prevented you from transferring the funds to us?

MS. WHEATON: I couldn't physically get back here. You have to be physically in the bank.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. But you can do banking remotely.

MS. WHEATON: I don't do banking remotely, sir.

 $\label{eq:commissioner_ZUNIGA:} \mbox{Well, the bank} \\ \mbox{does that all the time.}$

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. Okay.

MS. WHEATON: I only started

Tuesday. You're going to get it in a couple of days, that's all. Physically, I was only able to be here to walk into the bank to start the process. I even attempted, before I left, to provide the preauthorization before I left at my bank. The bank doesn't allow that. You have to physically do it on the day in which it's going to be done. However the -- the

bank is doing it now so it's just a matter of a couple of days.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I think we get the point.

MS. WHEATON: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.

Thank you very much. Okay. Director Wells?

MS. WELLS: So that -- that gives
the -- the universe of what we have for
Region C and the status of the applicants or
potential applicants, however the commission
deems their -- the status of their submissions

before the commission.

I think, at this point, the commission has the -- you know, the decision-making on what to do about these requests for extension. We have had some discussion internally, I think from the -- you know, the investigators' standpoint. What I would like to avoid is working on an investigation and then ending up having the -- the applicant not complete the deal and we've wasted time and resources on that application.

2.1

A suggestion I have for the commission, given that Mass Gaming and Entertainment has completed that, the IEB could start the process on that investigation. We still have to update the information on Mass Gaming and Carney, and we have all of Clairvest to do. So there's a substantial amount of work on that piece. And then, potentially, you know, defer to the commission on scheduling, but if another applicant completes the application, at that point the commission -- the IEB could start that investigation so as not to waste time. But that would potentially impact that May 31 RFA2 deadline.

2.1

So we -- we stand ready to do as the commission wishes, but I'm just concerned, given the amount of work we have with the -- the opening of Penn National -- the Penn National's casino at Plainridge, that we do need to focus on those investigations we're doing for the vendors and the employees. So I'll defer. We will -- we will do as the commission desires.

amplify on that, there's the work that needs to be done to get the Penn National floor ready when that -- when that time comes. But there's also the various licensing background investigations that have to be completed before that. So that's a given, and that's part of the environment in which everybody is working. But that's a point well taken, and we -- we need to take that into account. Okay.

So there we have it. We've got some requests for extensions, we've got some -- one opposition to the request. Let's talk. Who wants to -- who wants to say something, take a crack at where we are, where we should go?

2.1

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well, I think we need to start with the very basic, which is the \$400,000 fee. I think when we started here today we thought we had -- from -- from five potential applicants we had fees for three, and now we learn that two of those potential five have joined so now we're down to four? Am I -- is that accurate, we're

looking at four potential applicants, and one of them has not submitted the fee, if we look at it that way, correct?

MS. WELLS: That's correct. But you would have -- just you have to be comfortable that since Crossroads is joining that --

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I understand.

MS. WELLS: -- that scope of process you sort of have to waive that, which is -- the commission has the authority to do.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Mm-hmm. So my first thought is -- is that that is the very basic piece to starting the process, is the application fee here. And -- and I think that's probably our first decision moving forward here. Before we entertain an extension of any kind is -- I don't think we can use any resources without fees in place.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, the regulations contemplate an extension if the fee is paid.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Correct.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And if -- if

an initial application is -- is filed. The regulations deal with the minimal content of an application, and then provide for the IEB to ask for additional information. They contemplate that so -- but the payment of the fee is -- is -- and filing some -- some components of the application described in the application itself are the -- are the starting points, so point well taken. So what is your thoughts with respect to that, Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well --

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I mean, we could either -- I guess, let me be less opaque. We could either say that the deadline for the fee was the fee, or we could say there was a deadline but there was snow so tomorrow at five o'clock is the deadline. We'll extend it, or we could do other things. But, I mean, what -- what is your -- what are your thoughts as to what we should do with respect to that?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well, I suppose since we are -- if we are looking to allow one of the applicants to join forces with another after the deadline, then I would

2.1

not be opposed, in the interest of fairness, to one more business day to have that fee in, would -- would be fine from my standpoint.

Just in the interest of everyone understanding where we're coming from and -- but that would be a hard deadline. Just --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'm disinclined to any extensions, but I will -- I will try to take them one at a time. The 400,000 application fee is nothing new.

MS. WHEATON: Correct.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And did not come about just last Monday when we -- when we got all this snow, and it's not hampered by any weather. Whatever -- however the banking -- however the preference for banking is, this is something that could have been easily done regardless of the -- of the weather. So I'm disinclined to -- to extend that. And, by the way, I would remind ourselves we've seen Ms. Wheaton before.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Seen what?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: We've seen

Ms. Wheaton before she's had for -- an

2.1

extension request to us before on the Region A with a different set of circumstances, but without the application fee as well.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, but we're dealing with Region C now, and I think we really need to focus on Region C. This is a new -- we're writing on a blank slate. It's a -- we're writing on the record that we've created for Region C, for Region C. So with all due respect, I'd like to keep us focused on that. I hear what you're saying.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, I am disinclined to extend the deadline for the submission of the 400,000. If -- if you were -- if the majority wants to extend it, I would be agreeing that it's a very short time frame.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: We've provided everybody our wiring instructions. And it's the minimum that is a statutory, not just regulatory, requirement for us to move -- to do anything with it.

2.1

1 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right, right. Commissioner Stebbins, what do you think? 2 3 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: You know, 4 the initial fee is also -- I think I echo 5 Commissioner Cameron in that, you know, it's a 6 critical linchpin. As I recall, our RFA1 7 process for the slots in Region A and Region 8 B, we had people arriving to us at the last 9 minute, just under the five o'clock wire to 10 make sure that the \$400,000 was paid up. 11 Everybody with the understanding that that's 12 not refundable, regardless of, you know, some 13 issues well -- you know, relative to having all the pieces of the partnership puzzle in 14 15 place. So I'm -- I'm also weighing the 16 suggestion of trying to be flexible on \$400,000 for an additional day, but knowing 17 18 that's not really how we've conducted 19 ourselves in the first RFA1 application 20 process. 21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But we've 22 extended this deadline now twice before. 23 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yeah. 24 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: This is not --

you know the -- just to keep on the 400,000, I'll get to the other extensions later, this is not something new. This should not have kept anybody -- this should not catch anybody by surprise. You know, I know there's a desire to generate competition, and there's an argument towards that, but this -- this is not something new. I think the market is telling us something else.

I recognize that these deals are very hard to put together and there's a lot of moving pieces, and things do happen like the passing of a principal in one of the applicants, you know, which could be resulting to other kinds of partnerships, et cetera.

But -- but at a minimum, the nonrefundable statutory application fee is something that has been, you know, in place for this region, Region C, for a long time.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well we -we -- my initial thought was we ought to be
flexible on the -- on the fee, but I think
you've persuaded me. That is -- that's been
there for a long time. That's very easy to

2.1

comply with. Our focus was on the -- our focus was on the deadline that we set. We were -- we've been at this for some considerable period of time and we have to move forward. And so, I -- I hear you with respect to the fee. But we also required more than the fee. We required at least -- we required an application by the 30th.

Now, the regulations talk about what an application -- in Section 104 of the regs, I think, talk about what an application is. And it's a business entity disclosure form, a personal history disclosure form, and the Massachusetts supplement. Doesn't say how many of those have to be done, but it does say that that has to be in a completed application. And we've gotten that from -- if you -- we've gotten that from several. that plus the fee is a minimum to go forward, and that's what we -- that's what we wanted by the deadline. So I'm -- I'm inclined to say that the fee by the deadline was the fee by the deadline. And that the application by the deadline was the application by the deadline.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

Now, what happens thereafter is something we need to talk about for a minute, because our regulations contemplated that as well. And, I think, provide a mechanism for going forward that's both fair and equitable, and consistent with the regulations and the deadline that we set. So let's, though, just talk one -- one minute and see if we can get the fee piece ironed out and then move to the next stage. I would be inclined to join Commissioner Zuniga in saying the fee deadline was the fee deadline and that's it.

not, in any way, suggesting that we should give an extension to that just for the sake of giving an extension. My thought was, if we were allowing another applicant, and we haven't made that decision, to team up and use the fee from one, but yet the application from another, that was my only rationale for thinking one more day, because we would be in one — in one sense for another applicant, if we agree that that would — that was appropriate. So it wasn't about just

extending that deadline. It was about a fairness issue.

those two things separate. I think the forming of partnerships in other regions, and I'm sorry that I'm bringing up other examples, but, you know, we've done this in the past. There were partnerships that — that were formed after deadlines, you know, where somebody became — you know, failed in a — in a referendum, formed a partnership with another applicant, and that was all fine because at least one, in some cases two, had already filed the 400,000 nonrefundable fee and had been found suitable in some form or another.

So the forming of a partnership of a -- like yesterday or however recent, you know, is -- is all within the confines of the solicitation that we've made, which includes the basic personal forms, disclosure forms and the nonreimbursable application fee, which is why, you know, who is the applicant is an important question. But that is not a deal

breaker in my mind when it comes to the other four applicants, or the other three that -- the other four that are now three, potentially.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay.

Anything further, Commissioner Stebbins, that you'd like to offer on this particular part of the --

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: No.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Let me step back before we take the next step and look at the big picture, because we set that deadline of January 30th, after multiple extensions of previous deadlines out of a recognition that goes all the way back to where we started.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Mm-hmm.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And that is that -- that we needed to deal with Region C last for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is the pendency of the tribal gaming petition, and trying to figure out when the feds were going to let us know one way or the other about that. But, at the same time, not letting Region C get too far behind in the

2.1

process because of the economic development interest that we have in the economic development, and the legislature had in the economic development of all regions of the commonwealth. And that's why we set the initial deadline. We didn't get any response from the feds about where the petition was going, where the tribal thing was going, so we extended it hoping we'd get some information. We extended it twice. And then we finally said we have to move forward and begin to contemplate what we're going to do in Region C because it is beginning to fall behind. And that's why -- that's how we got to the January 30th deadline.

And it seems to me that that is an important goal to keep in mind here as -- as we move forward. We got to plan. We don't know what the feds are going to do, but we've got to begin the planning so that -- so we move forward and -- and figure out where we are when we get to the end.

With that is the desirability of competition. And with that is the

2.1

desirability of getting and attracting facilities that will meet the somewhat reduced \$500 million capital requirements that we've instituted for Region C. So it seems to me that's the big picture in the context within which we are operating here.

Correct me if I'm wrong,

Director Wells, but the reg -- or General

Counsel Blue, but the regulations contemplate
that after the application -- the RFA1

application is filed, that there is a review
of what's been filed for completeness. We've
defined what completeness is, and then a

notification by the director of the IEB as to
what pieces are missing, if pieces are
missing, and what's necessary so that the IEB
can complete its RFA1 investigation. Do I
read that correctly --

MS. WELLS: Under --

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: -- putting 104

and 115 together?

MS. WELLS: Yeah, under 111.

MS. BLUE: 111. And then, under 115

24 talking about --

Page 185 I'm sorry, 111 MS. BLUE: -- the determination of COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. MS. BLUE: That's correct. Right. I think for clarification, would help me. The -- in 111 six it says, "The commission may, in its discretion, extend the time for filing of a complete application and enable the applicant to cure deficiency in its application." That's what you're talking about?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH:

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH:

MS. WELLS:

MS. WELLS: So for the purposes of IEB and sort of going forward, I would suggest -- I would read that as the complete application where you have your equity, your operator and all your qualifiers. So just for clarification, under Subsection 6, is that the commission's reading as well?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, and then there's a section -- there's subsection of 115

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and 115.

completeness, yes.

that talks about notifying the applicant of what parts are necessary in order for there to be a complete application. I think it's 115.02.

MS. BLUE: Yes. 115.021.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So we have So -- so I guess where I'm that process. leading is that without doing -- if I have that right, without doing violence to the deadlines that we've said, we could say that the deadline was the deadline. We've gotten materials from certain applicants that the director of the IEB has the power to request additional materials to complete the application from those who have filed and paid the fee, and that we would anticipate, or we could even set a deadline for when those materials were necessary to have on file. keep this process moving forward under the framework that we've authorized with the RFA2 deadline still in place. And, in that fashion, move the process forward and keep it going consistent with our regulations. I -- I throw that out as --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

Page 187 1 MS. WHEATON: Commissioners --2 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I'm sorry, 3 we're now in deliberations. So I'd welcome 4 comments about that. 5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I quess you're 6 looking at this all in -- in the aggregate, 7 correct, not one -- not each one of these 8 requests separately? 9 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yes. I'm 10 looking for -- I'm looking for a framework, 11 basically, that allows us to move forward in 12 -- in an appropriate fashion. One that's 13 consistent with the regulations. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 14 So --COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: 15 And 16 everybody -- you know, some people don't -don't have to do very much of anything, some, 17 18 people might have to do quite a deal. But the 19 deadlines were in effect, the process is laid 20 out, the process is there, and we apply the 2.1 process and move forward. 22 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So the 23 process would be that we have three

applicants, who have paid the fee on time,

with different levels, one possibly completely 2 substantially complete or, you know --3 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Completely 4 substantially complete. That's right. 5 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I know. That 6 doesn't --7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: No, no, it is. 8 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well -- well 9 one -- obviously, you haven't had a chance to 10 look at it -- all of that application yet. But from --11 12 MS. WELLS: Just a cursory review. 13 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: From the 14 cursory review, it's -- appears to be 15 substantially complete? 16 MS. WELLS: I'd say they're in good 17 shape. 18 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay. 19 then we have two others who are missing 20 pieces. And if I'm following you, 21 Commissioner, we would advise that you are 22 missing certain pieces. That would be the 23 notification that would be needed, and then 24 the decision would be to give an appropriate

Page 189 1 time to remediate to -- to get those missing 2 pieces in, correct? 3 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's --4 that's what I would envision. And I would 5 further envision that we set the time now for 6 those additional pieces to be in. 7 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Are we going 8 to come back to this notion of what 9 constitutes substantially complete? COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think 10 11 we've --12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Because we've 13 -- we've had that discussion as well. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: No, we already 14 15 have. 16 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah, we've 17 made that decision. 18 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Not just --19 not just today. 20 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: No, no. 21 That's right. 22 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I thought 23 we'd made that decision. 24 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. We had

to have the three elements.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And the requirement was to have that substantially complete by -- prior to January 31st.

we've -- we've always had the situation in which you -- you know, people have filed documents and the IEB review has indicated that there are pieces missing, or that we need more information. We went through that whole process with the other two -- three pieces of this that we've done. And so, there's always -- there's always some more that you need.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, I guess,
I wonder if -- since we introduced a notion of
substantially complete we come back to
something that's difficult to achieve, if
we -- if we left the substantially complete
like we did originally on region -- Region A,
and let all the elements that are very easy to
measure, the fee, the forms, a host community
agreement, eventually, 90 days or 60 days

prior to, you know, another deadline, et cetera, all of those pieces take care of themselves without this notion of substantially complete.

I understand the position that Director Wells is put into, and it's not desirable, the prospect of having to review a lot of people all of a sudden in the middle of opening up and licensing vendors, which we now have to -- I understand that. And that's what gave way, in my opinion, to this notion of having this -- this substantially complete, because we don't want her to be chasing people around. But we -- we could simply let -- do away with the substantially complete and have her issue a report by whatever time she can issue with whomever has been identified or not, and make her do the recommendation as to suitability or not. Given -- given the parties that are involved or not.

If she can -- if she has said, I've communicated, I've asked, haven't received, therefore I do not have a recommendation of suitability because they have not identified a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

major -- major piece of funding, or their
operator or whatever, then that's -- that's
where we are.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: That would differ from what we've done in the past. And I think it would also be a drain on our resources to move forward in that — in that manner. I would be much more inclined to send a letter out. This is — these are the pieces you're missing. You have until X date to get them in. And if they're not in at that point, that applicant is no longer in the process. They have not completed the requirements which — in that manner we would not be utilizing all of the resources for IEB on an applicant that may be never able to put their entire package together.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, I guess that's what we did. That's what we tried to do last time, right? You sent a letter. You scheduled a scoping conference. You know, they came or not with some -- you know, with whatever they had at the time. And then the

2.1

deadline came, and now we have what we have.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: But I think

we're -- what we're trying to do here today is

be consistent with what we've done in the

other regions, which was time to cure some

deficiencies. And just about all the

applicants had something that wasn't -- that

needed to be cured. Very few were -- were

totally complete. I would agree that some of

these are less complete this time, that's for

sure. But, again, I think it's important that

we try to be consistent and let people clearly

know what their deficiencies are toward a

complete application, and what would be the

appropriate time to -- to cure them.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yeah. I think the last -- what we've learned from the last -- of course this is a -- a continuing learning process. But I think what we learned from the last episodes without -- that we tried to cure in what we were doing here, was the endless chase for the missing pieces. And without any hard deadline in place, we had -- we had no real way to -- to announce a

2.1

drop-dead date. And I think that it's really important to do this here, if we're planning to hold, as I hope we can hold, the RFA2 deadline to get this process moving down the line.

So if we said, for example, that
Director Wells was authorized to let the
applicants know of the pieces that were
missing, you know, letter by such and such a
time, that they were free to contact her
immediately to tell her plans and see if they
had everything lined up, and that the deadline
for the missing pieces was, say, the middle of
March, then we would have a structure that was
both consistent with the regulations, and
would avoid, to the best we can avoid, the
kinds of endless chase problems that we've had
in the last two, and have some hope of being
able to keep to the RFA2 deadline that we've
set up.

Now, as Director Wells has said, we've got a number of other things on our plate. And everybody, the public, the Region C applicants, the Region C people have to

understand that we've got a set of priorities, and we've got to meet those priorities in the order in which they are priorities. But -- so we have to do it. I mean that -- just depending on what we get in. But that way, it seems to me, is the best we can do to solve the kinds of problems that -- that cropped up before and still -- and still -- and still carry this process forward in a smart fashion.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well I -- I would be -- I would go along with what you describe, Commissioner, so long as we kept the RFA2 deadline current as we -- as we have.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yes. I would not like to change the RFA2 deadline.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I sense that that's -- that's going to be very difficult very quickly. I would -- I don't know -- I cannot do all this math in my mind. I used to be able to. But if you take away 90 or 60 days from the end of May and -- and you start to put some of this activities not in parallel, but one after another as it was described to us here, I first need a study in

order to do a host community agreement.

That'll -- you know, a catalyst first in order to -- et cetera. We are right up against a deadline very quickly.

So I -- I -- I don't want -- I don't want us to be in a position next time of talking at a future time, even before May, of extending yet another deadline, because although the efforts of either chasing or not receiving information have -- have resulted in whatever the case may be, something tells me that, you know, there's going to be, potentially, more than one party coming to the same -- same situation of saying we just need a little bit more time.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, but we have the power to say no. And, you know, the problem with saying what we've got today is what we've got today, is that it's going to turn out that we don't -- somebody, that everybody doesn't have something in. And the question is, is it a minor piece, or is it a major piece? But some -- everybody, I will warrant, doesn't have something in, or

2.1

something's going to change in the financing, or something's going to change in the makeup of the company, or something's going to change somewhere.

So that we -- we simply have to anticipate that we can't drop a steel curtain down on the filing process. What we can do is set a deadline for things that exist as of that date for the -- for the supplementation based on conditions as they exist -- as they exist of the deadline date. And after that, it, you know, if somebody, God forbid, should pass away, or there has to be some other change, that just goes with the -- with the -- with the course.

But as of now, it seems to me we ought not to contemplate moving the RFA2 deadline, and we ought to try our very best to see if this will work to allow us to keep it.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Is it -- is it feasible to think - and looking for Director Well's feedback on this - instead of putting you in the position of setting timelines of when you want to have material

2.1

for investigation, let's count on the -- let's count on the RFA2 process clock?

MS. WELLS: I think it would be helpful for me to go with the -Commissioner McHugh's recommendation of the commission setting a deadline, even today, on a number of days where those materials -- that if the IEB sends a deficiency letter to -- to the applicants that the commission set today, so there's no question, the commission's made the decision, and that's the date the materials have to be in. Because for planning of resources, that's the most helpful thing for me.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: But you've already sent deficiency letters. Would you contemplate if -- if this proposal were adopted, would you contemplate sending additional deficiency letters that were more specific or --

MS. WELLS: Correct. So I gave, sort of, a general letter to the applicants that we couldn't complete the scoping process.

24 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right.

2.1

MS. WELLS: What I would anticipate, we'll review the materials. I would meet and/or have telephone conferences with the other applicants that were not substantially complete. And then, based on that I would send out an additional specific deficiency letter on what I would need from them in order to complete the application.

Now, it's a little tricky when they don't have their deal together because normally we do a scope-of-license process and I can identify the qualifiers that need to submit. But I think that, that's something given the -- you know, the level of experience that are -- the folks we're dealing with have with the casino industry, they would understand what they need to do.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.

And so that -- would you -- I don't want to pin you down --

MS. WELLS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: -- but would you anticipate that that process, the process of looking things over and sending the -- the

2.1

What about

more specific deficiency notice could be completed next week?

MS. WELLS: Week to two weeks. Week -- 10 days.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:

March 15, which is a date that Mr -
Commissioner McHugh suggested for the -- that hard deadline of curing all their deficiencies, however deficient some of them have been?

MS. WELLS: The sooner it is, the easier it is for me to meet that May 1st deadline. You know, as you'll recall, when we did the suitability reviews for Regions A, B and the slots parlor, those took from six to nine months for the whole process, and we had a hundred consultants working for us. We're not in that same situation.

However, in this situation, some of this work's already been done and we just need to update it. So we just -- you know, I can work with you, and I can let you know where we are. I think the big question for me, which

would be helpful, and if you don't want to answer this question now I'll defer, but the question for me is, do I start working on an application before they've cured the deficiency?

So, for example, if I sent something to KG Urban and say you have to have something -- you know, X, Y and Z in by March 15th, do you want me to start on the investigation before March 15th, or do I start on March 15th once we know? So that -- that would be helpful. I don't know if you can answer that question.

commissioner zunigh: Well my -you, of course, manage your workload. But
something tells me that you start working on
if you have -- if you've billed -- you know,
if we've billed our applicants for those
investigation costs.

MS. WELLS: Yeah. It's not a matter of costs. It's more the allocation of resources. But however the commission wants me to do it, I'm -- be happy to do that.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: It seems that

2.1

1 it's a matter best left to your judgment. 2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. 3 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: It's the feel 4 for -- it's the feel for a lot of things 5 and --6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. 7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: -- I think it 8 would be best left to your judgment. 9 MS. WELLS: Okay. 10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I agree on 11 that. 12 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Commissioner Stebbins, does that answer your question, or 13 14 did you have more that you wanted to pursue 15 there? 16 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: No, it does. I was hoping to find-- get some feeling as if 17 18 to -- you know, or what I assume is our shared 19 interest in leaving the RFA2 deadline where it 20 is, when you start to back out the 60 and 90 2.1 days from that to consummate a host community 22 agreement and schedule a ballot question 23 whether -- you know, and that's going to be a 24 driver for our applicants. You know, people

in communities are pretty smart when they see things aren't complete or they don't have the complete picture. But for your purposes, wanting you to feel comfortable with the timeline for your allocation of resources is key.

MS. WELLS: I think Commissioner

McHugh's comments that we know this is

somewhat flexible, we'll have to evaluate, and

I think that he's made that pretty clear, and

I'm comfortable with that.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. So is -- are we coalescing around a plan, or coalescing around an approach?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think we are. I think the date would be the one piece in question.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The date would be the one piece in question. I'll go along with that. Did we conclude it was only you and I that agreed, Commissioner, relative to the 400,000.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The 400,000 is -- the deadline was the deadline.

2.1

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. 2 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. 3 mean, that's where I -- that's where I'd come 4 back to. 5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, that's 6 where I am. 7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. 8 Commissioner --9 MS. WHEATON: When you do --10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You're not 11 invited to speak, Ms. Wheaton. 12 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: No, wait a 13 minute. Wait a minute. MS. WHEATON: If it's not mentioned 14 15 prior to your decision, then it's impossible to mention it after the fact. There's two 16 points I wish you to take into consideration 17 18 with respect to just that time frame. 19 November 4th there was an 20 initiative, a referendum statewide in which 21 the people of Massachusetts deliberated whether or not they even want expanded gaming 22 23 here at all. That stopped the clock, stalled 24 it certainly for a lot of people making their

plans. And certainly, realistically, in the real world of private business and the fundraising and financing thereof, there's not a lot of people who want to put out an awful lot of money when a month or two from now the state may say no. That -- that puts us into November where people then look around and see the changing of the guards all around and -- and this continues.

We're then into December in which one is getting started again, but you have the holidays. You have an awful lot of private business people that are away from December 15th to January 15th. I requested in December, in reality, that this early January not be the date. It's the worst time in the year to do any kind of business here in Massachusetts and New England. Everybody is away. I got to tell you. I got to share it to -- with you, and be as frank as you are and open with us. Notwithstanding, people have gone forward.

I don't know when the others got notice that the process would, in fact, then

2.1

1 begin one week after New Year's, January 9th. 2 You've got people jumping here. Appeared at 3 the scoping meeting, got whatever information. 4 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: We -- we 5 understand. 6 MS. WHEATON: No. I'm just going to 7 finish my point, if I may, please, sir. 8 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: We really 9 have -- we really have heard -- now would you 10 get to the --11 MS. WHEATON: My point is this, I 12 have, in my case I've not asked for two 13 months --14 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. 15 MS. WHEATON: -- for anything. 16 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. 17 MS. WHEATON: I have it underway 18 right now. 19 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. 20 MS. WHEATON: And the only thing 21 that made it impossible, an act of God, from 22 doing so, was that blizzard. Otherwise, you 23 would have had it. 24 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay.

Page 207 1 MS. WHEATON: And -- and that's the 2 only --3 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okav. 4 MS. WHEATON: -- point in my case 5 so --6 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: We -- we 7 understand that. 8 MS. WHEATON: The application is 9 there, the fee is there. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Great. 10 11 MS. WHEATON: It's a matter of a 12 couple of days --13 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. 14 you. 15 MS. WHEATON: -- and that's it. 16 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Thank you very 17 Thank you. All right. Now, have we -much. 18 have we coalesced now -- did we finish the discussion about the date? 19 20 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: We need to 21 finish that discussion. 22 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. So 23 let's finish it. I'm -- I'm inclined to say 24 that the date -- the January 30th date was the

January 30th date, for the application and the fee. And our regulations contemplate extensions only after both of those things are done, so I'm inclined to do that.

 $\label{eq:commissioner} \mbox{COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'll go along} \\ \mbox{with that.}$

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Commissioner Stebbins?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I would agree with that.

11 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.

12 | Commissioner Cameron?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I'm going to make it four.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. So I would anticipate then -- and I think we've been at this long enough so I think we ought to try to put -- or we can take it however long we want. But I think we ought to try put square corners on -- I think the plan around which we've coalesced is, that whoever paid the fee and filed an application by January 30th is in.

That Director Wells will promptly

1 send out another more particularized deficiency notice as to the elements that are 2 3 missing, and that she needs to have in order do a completed suitability examination, that the deadline for responding to her and 6 providing those materials will be -- I said the 15th. I just looked at the 15th. Sunday. Will be the 16th. That'll give that additional weekend to do it, and that we will not move the RFA2 date now. Is that -- have I stated what -- the plan around which we've 12 coalesced is? 13 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Five weeks,

is that what we're talking?

MS. WELLS: Just for my purposes -my clarification, the combination of Somerset and Crossroads, that they meet those requirements?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, we've closed the -- we've closed the application fee piece, and somehow they've got to figure out what they're going to do. It is what it is.

> MS. WELLS: Okay.

They've got to COMMISSIONER MCHUGH:

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

Page 210 figure it out, and we're not going to dictate 2 how they do figure it out. 3 MS. WELLS: Okay. 4 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Just -- just 5 to be clear, we're holding fast to the RFA2 6 deadline? 7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. 8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That's 9 correct. 10 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: As of -- as of now. 11 12 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. 13 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: If something changes because of resources --14 15 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. 16 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: -- we have the ability. But for now --17 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: 18 Right. 19 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: -- we do 20 not -- we are not inclined to change that. 21 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. 22 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: As long as 23 the only discussion around potentially moving 24 that is subject to our available resources and

1 nothing else, if that's your intent? 2 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. 3 Let's -- somebody want to make a motion to 4 that effect? 5 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I'd defer to 6 you, after my efforts this morning. I think 7 you can put it together. 8 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well --9 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I can do 10 that. 11 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Pardon me? 12 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I can do 13 that. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: 14 15 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So I move that we hold fast to the deadline for the 16 application fee and the application itself, 17 and we are now authorizing Director Wells to 18 19 send out deficiency letters for those pieces 20 of the application, which are incomplete at 21 this time, and that the deadline to have a 22 full submission is March 16, 2015. 23 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'll second 24 that.

Page 212 1 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. 2 Any further discussion? All right. All in 3 favor? 4 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 6 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye. The ayes 8 have it unanimously, and that's how we will 9 handle Region C. All right. That brings us 10 to the end of our agenda, I believe. Is there 11 any further business that we need to discuss, 12 take up? All right. I'd hear a motion, then, 13 to adjourn. 14 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So moved. 15 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Second? COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 16 Second. 17 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All in favor? 18 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 19 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 21 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: We're 22 adjourned. 23 24 (Proceeding concluded at 2:51 p.m.)

Page 213 1 **GUEST SPEAKERS:** 2 Sheriff Michael Ashe, Western Massachusetts 3 Correctional Alcohol Center 4 William Christofori, Western Massachusetts 5 Correctional Alcohol Center 6 Robert DeSalvio, Wynn Mass, LLC Ulrico Izzaquire, Wynn Mass, LLC 8 John Donnelly, Esq., Mass Gaming and Entertainment 9 David Stern, DJS Global Advisors 10 Kevin Conroy, Esq., Foley Hoag LLP 11 David Hanlon, Somerset on the Move 12 Robert Allen Esq., Law Office of Robert Allen, Jr. 13 Kathryn Wheaton, Sun Moon Casino 14 15 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION STAFF: 16 Richard Day, Executive Director John Ziemba, Ombudsman 17 18 Jill Griffin, Director Workforce Supplier & 19 Diversity Development 20 Catherine Blue, General Counsel 21 Todd Grossman, Deputy General Counsel 22 Loretta Lillios, Deputy General Counsel 23 Karen Wells, Director, IEB 24 Derek Lennon, CFO

CERTIFICATE

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1

I, Brenda M. Ginisi, Court Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript from the record of the proceedings.

I, Brenda M. Ginisi, further certify that the foregoing is in compliance with the Administrative Office of the Trial Court Directive of Transcript Format.

I, Brenda M. Ginisi, further certify that I neither am counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this hearing was taken and further that I am not financially nor otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

Proceedings recorded by verbatim means, and transcript produced from computer.

19

20

WITNESS MY HAND THIS 8th of February

21 2015.

22

23 BRENDA M. GINISI

24 Notary Public

My Commission expire

June 18, 2021