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CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I would like to call order the 182 nd meeting of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission today at our offices on Federal Street.

Before I start the rest of the meeting, I want to take a minute to talk about a horrible tragedy that took place yesterday. One of the extraordinary experiences that I've had as a Commissioner, and I know it's true of others of us on a number of our staff has been to get to know members of the Massachusetts State Police. All I knew about the State Police is what most people know about them, seeing them out on the roads and had no other idea anything about them.

What I have come to understand is that this is an extraordinarily distinguished law-enforcement body made up of men and women who are incredibly intelligent, committed, thoughtful, decent, very hard-working, honorable folks who serve us most of the time almost unbeknownst to us. And much of the time
we ask them to do some of the grungiest work that has to be done to make the Commonwealth the kind of place we want.

It's been an amazing experience to meet these men and women and to be able to serve with them. One of their compatriots, Thomas Clardy, was killed in a wildly senseless accident yesterday standing on the side of the road having stopped an SUV, completely innocent of any activity. And somebody crashed across multiple roads, multiple lanes crashed into him and killed him. He has six kids and apparently was a distinguished man.

It's a horrible senseless loss. I'm sure it's felt incredibly personally by the men and women on our troop as well as all of the troopers in Massachusetts. I want to give my personal regards, which $I$ hope you guys will carry forward for me, and on behalf of the Commission our regards to Trooper Clardy and his family. And by the way, our incredible respect for you all and for the work that you do. Maybe a moment of silence for Thomas Clardy.
(A moment of silence)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you folks. We really appreciate your service. I know the IEB must feel this in a personal way. So, take care of yourselves. Thank you.

With that note, and when my goosebumps go away, I will ask Executive Director Bedrosian to pick it up.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Mr. Chairman, did you want me to do my administrative update before the approval of the minutes?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: No, I'm sorry. I lost my mind there for a minute. Let's do the approval of the minutes. Customarily, we go to Judge Macdonald.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Unless any members of the Commission have any issues with the accuracy of the minutes, I would move that the minutes of the meeting of the Commission of March 3, 2016 be approved subject to any corrections, typographical errors or other nonmaterial matters.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Discussion? All in favor, aye.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? I will note by the way, Executive Director Bedrosian will speak to this, but usually to my left is Commissioner Enrique Zuniga who is out with a pretty serious case of the flu. Now administration, Executive Director Bedrosian.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Thank you. As you did point out, we found out this morning that Commissioner Zuniga is indeed ill. As a result of that Commission members, we will not be having the update on $3(c)$ which is the Plainridge Park reconciliation issues. And Commissioner Zuniga just wanted to be clear, the term reconciliation might have some negative connotations, but when he presents this I think it will be a positive update. So, that will have to be put off.

And also item 6(a), which is the
Wynn 61 presentations, in an abundance of
caution, we're going to also put that off.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Explain why that is Ed.

MR. BEDROSIAN: So, because this is associated with a Region A issue, and at this point it's Commissioner Cameron and Commissioner Stebbins who are the deliberating Commissioners, and without Commissioner Zuniga there is a strong argument we lack the proper quorum.

In an abundance of caution, we are going to put that off until all three Commissioners can be present in-person to listen and then ask questions of the presenters.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Because
Commissioner Macdonald was not here Region C (SIC) was decided, and I recused myself voluntarily from those deliberations, we decided it would be appropriate for me to stick with that as we go back and retrod that ground.

MR. BEDROSIAN: That is correct. So, we anticipate a meeting next week. So, this will be a short delay. We actually may
try and get our staff's Section 61 draft up on the website as soon as possible so people interested can have that time also to comment on our staff proposal, which will be presented to the Commission we anticipate probably next week.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Apologies to the Wynn folks for another week, but we are being careful to dot every (I) and cross every (T) on this one.

MR. BEDROSIAN: I do have two
additional updates, Mr. Chairman and
Commissioners. The first is an update that we have offered a position of an in-house construction manager to a gentleman by the name of Joseph Delaney.

Mr. Delaney currently works at the Department of Environmental Protection and had a long career also at the town of Redding. And he has accepted. We are excited about that.

And a word about why our thought process behind them. As the Commission in the past years went through its deliberation on different regions, and what would happen in
those regions, there were a lot of environmental concerns there were a lot of traffic concerns. There are a lot of concerns that required us to engage outside experts. Staff just had the concern. And we've been truly fortunate to have the outside consultants Pinck and Company and PMA who have served us incredibly well in those roles and brought a level of expertise that we never could have inhouse established.

Now that we are moving towards what might be considered a more traditional construction phase after all of the environmental permits are done and the traffic approvals are given, we have made a decision to bring that expertise in-house. And one person who can work for us with Ombudsman Ziemba and with myself to keep the Commission up-to-date on what will be happening on these major construction projects.

Pinck and PMA have been wonderful, wonderful partners in this role. We anticipate there will be a transition period of at least a few months. Depending upon what Mr. Delaney
decides, we may have some ongoing role for them. We just don't know that yet. We made a decision to bring this expertise in-house and think Mr. Delaney who was picked among a great pool of distinguished candidates, will be a great addition to our staff.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I just want to add one comment to that. I knew the PMA folks less well because by the time they came onboard, we had a lot more staff and I was further removed from it. But I did get to know the Pinck people or Jennifer Pinck in particular.

And at an early stage in our development when we had very little staff, very little expertise, Jennifer and her staff were a critical part of our team, particularly in the assessment and the evaluation phases. So, I just want to throw in my two-cents worth too to thank them very much for their work.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Thank you. And I
anticipate Mr. Delaney, he's through the background check. We hope he will join us the first week of April.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.

MR. BEDROSIAN: The last update I have is a Region C update, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. As you know, we were down in Mashpee on the 15th, just a couple of days ago --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Really? I'd forgotten that.

MR. BEDROSIAN: -- for a presentation from the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe. What we anticipate is as we continue the Section 61 next week we'll also have a meeting next week, it will be the applicant MG\&E's opportunity to respond if they choose to, and I believe they will, to the Tribe's presentation.

We will then close the host
community hearing. We had made a commitment to the folks in Brockton that we would not close it back on March 1. We would come back down after the announcement we were going to hear from the Tribe.

We believe that will be March 28 back down in Brockton. I think it's at the Shaw's Center not where we were before. But we will firm that up and give people notice of
that soon. That then would trigger that timetable in the statute of not less than 30 nor more than 90 days. We would anticipate deliberations the last week of April on the Region C license award.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.
MR. BEDROSIAN: Having said that, as I said, we are taking item 3(c) off the agenda. So, if it's okay with the Chairman, I would give this over to Director Griffin.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Director Griffin.
MS. GRIFFIN: Good morning,
Commissioners. I have some guests who have joined me today. I'll introduce them and then I have some introductory remarks to set some context.

I am joined by Chelan Brown, Diversity Specialist for Construction and Operations from MGM Springfield. Seated to her right is Jason Rosewell, Executive Director of Design and Construction for MGM, and Seth Stratton Vice President and General Counsel for MGM. Seated to his right the Jason Garand, Business Manager for Carpenters Local 108.

Just to set some context, they're going to update us on their diversity work and we will focus also -- This is an update that we received at the last access and opportunity committee.

So, to set some context, we frequently hear news reports about the frustrating lack of diversity in areas like corporate boards and company workforce hiring practices that don't reflect the diversity of the community. And these practices perpetuate exclusionary practices, income inequality, excluding people of color and women from opportunities from advancement.

The arrival of expanded gaming in the Commonwealth brings with it opportunities for new models of diversity engagement and advancement. Mass. Gaming has made diversity and inclusion a top priority and has implemented practices and systems to encourage it. The Commission approved diversity strategy plans for construction and goods and services from our licensees.

Additional goals and strategies were
required for workforce as well as the diverse business vendors and for the hiring of the unemployed. The Commission voted unanimously to implement a best practice, the establishment of the access and opportunity committee where regular reporting of progress towards the diversity goals takes place. This focused attention on workforce and supplier diversity seems to be working.

We are encouraged by the preliminary results as reported to the access and opportunity committee meeting on March 8 in Springfield. And these early reports we believe also show a clear commitment of our licensees to meet and exceed their diversity goals.

So, we've invited MGM and the
Carpenters Local 108 to share their progress. So, I'm going to turn it over to Chelan Brown from MGM.

MS. BROWN: Good morning. Thank you guys for inviting us down to share our diversity program.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Welcome to Boston.

MS. BROWN: Thank you. And also thank you guys for the establishment of the access and opportunity committee. It's been very exciting attending those meetings and meeting with community partners, union folks, different people in the trades programs. And it allows us to have a deliberate monthly opportunity to get together to work on this issue. So, we are excited about being a participant in the access and opportunity committee and excited about sharing our work here today.

Normally, when we do our reporting for access and opportunity, we go over our outreach work. And then we'll talk about our construction workforce, our goals and commitments and where we are and then the design commitments and construction commitments report to where we are with those numbers.

For outreach, we mainly have six areas of focus in our outreach program. We consistently identify and outreach to minority-, woman- and veteran-owned businesses. That's an important part of our outreach
program to identify what's out there, not only in Springfield and Western Mass. but the state of Massachusetts in general around our diversity work with minority-owned companies.

Outreach to local community groups, our community partners are a very important component to our outreach program. Without our community partners in the area, we would not be able to even talk about how to tackle diversity on construction side.

From the Community Partners that we have, we've developed a Community Partners network. Right now, it's a network of folks that comes together on a monthly basis to meet about this issue. From that network, the diversity task force developed. It's made of representatives of the Community Partners network and of the local trades unions.

We have a strong partnership, an outreach program with of course all of the local trades unions in our area. And we've done some partnership activities with them including veterans interested in construction and union open houses. We've held one-on-one
meetings with unions and union apprenticeship programs and we continue to do that as we speak.

And outreach activities with unions include different community fairs, career festivals, programs that our Community Partners have and we have a union apprenticeship program referral process that we do for folks interested in joining a local trade union.

The next slide talks about our outreach to the minority-, woman- and veteranowned companies that we did in the month of February only. Altogether we've outreached to over 100 diverse companies through our outreach efforts and met with over 100 diverse companies. Here we see six minority-owned companies, one veteran-owned company and two woman-owned companies that were outreached to in the month of February.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Can you explain a little bit when you talk about outreach? Is it going to meet them, them coming to meet you, talking about the project, talking about the opportunities? Kind of get
into the nitty-gritty of what the outreach actually entails.

MS. BROWN: They're mostly one-on-
one meetings. We either go to them or they come to meet with us. We explain MGM's diversity outreach program, our goals, our commitment as far as dollars for diverse companies, make sure that they have the proper certifications that they meet all the other requirements to be considered a minority-owned company. See if there are ways that we can partner with them.

And our goal is ultimately to get them on a bid-ready list where if their scope of services comes up, we have a network that we can outreach to.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. BROWN: These are community group meetings that we've had in February. A lot of the community group agencies that you see here deal with low-income, disadvantaged populations, diverse populations around employment, training, helping with soft skills,
employment training skills. And these are the community partners that we met with last month. On a consistent basis we meet with them as well. And they are part of our Community Partners network.

When we started the Community
Partners network, I think we started with six agencies. And we're up to 20 right now. Again, we have to YWCA/Youth Build program, Westover Job Corps. We're reaching out, doing a lot of work with our veteran service organizations -- You'll see a lot of that in those slides. -- as well as young adult programs that are doing pre-apprenticeship work around construction.

This is some of the work that the Community Partners have done to date. They held their most recent meeting at this time was in February. The network meets actually twice a month now. The meetings are facilitated by a paid facilitator to help them organize their structure and the work of the network.

They've identified two main areas of focus. One is working together to recruit
diverse populations who meet union requirements and who are ready to join an apprentice program or a union. And then also working to recruit diverse populations that are interested in careers in construction and local unions and who may not meet the union requirements.

So, some of those requirements include having a high school diploma or a GED, a driver's license, a reliable vehicle. They've identified people in that population that are really interested in joining a construction careers program but they need a little bit more training and support services. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Those are really critical goals. That's the name of the game right there, those two bullet points. That's it. Is that happening now? Are there people who you identified that through these community groups that are in either or both of those two categories now? Or is it just beginning to get organized?

MS. BROWN: Yes. Most of the folks that we're working with now through our referral system are in one of those two
categories.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, there are actual bodies that have come through that pipeline?

MS. BROWN: Yes, that we are working with.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Are you keeping any numbers of this, the numbers of people for example that are in either of those two bullet points?

MS. BROWN: Yes. We just started tracking and documenting everything that we do as far as the referrals in those two populations so we can look more closely at them. But we are keeping the numbers on them.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It would be great if you can, because for one thing we've talked about this a lot. We've talked about this with the folks in the Eastern Mass. project as well. It takes a lot of hand holding lots of times to get people from having been identified for one of those groups and stick with the process.

A lot of times they are intimidated. Not all the unions are as welcoming as the

Carpenters are. There's a lot of other issues. Sometimes there's CORI and credit and work habits. So, it takes a lot of handholding. If you are actually tracking, if you've got the names and numbers, (A) it'll make it easier and make it real to really make it happen, but (B) we'd like to know what those numbers are too as the months go by.

MS. BROWN: Yes. The next slide talks about our diversity task force. The diversity task force is made up of four representatives from the Community Partners network. They held an election a couple of months ago and decided who their representatives were going to be.

It's made of three or four local union representatives and MGM Springfield and Tishman, our construction partner on this job. We were able to meet with them for the first time last week. It was a really exciting meeting I think.

It brought all the parties together. People were able to make introductions. There were a lot of people who had heard the names of
people before, heard the names of different union heads but had never had a chance to actually meet them. It allows us to begin to build the relationship.

And for MGM's role, we act as a convener of the parties. We don't set the agenda. We're asking that the diversity task force basically come together to set the agendas because this is a mutual issue that they wanted to work on together.

So, their overall goal is increasing access and opportunities for diverse people in construction and the local trades unions. But then under that goal, there's a lot of the layers that have to happen and be peeled back before that can be accomplished.

So, I think it did a good job of bringing people in the room. We're excited. We're looking for the second meeting. We'll be contacting our Community Partners and the union representatives to help us craft the agenda for the next diversity task force meeting.

I think some of it is going to evolve around data. Really we were able to
dispel some myths about the union halls not having diversity in it, for example. And the Community Partners were able to hear from the union halls that we actually do have diversity. We ramped up when we knew these projects were coming.

But there are some unions that we need to look at that need help that we need to partner on, and make sure we can get women and minorities and veterans on the job. So, there was a commitment that came out of the room that day to keep this effort going.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: How many unions came to this meeting?

MS. BROWN: There were three at the first meeting.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's the issue you're talking about because again not everybody has the same attitudes as --

MR. GARAND: The task forces that only have representatives from all the unions.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay, thank you. I misunderstood.

MS. BROWN: Yes. What we are
hearing from Daniel D'Alma President of the Building Trades is that he has a lot of business managers asking to come. They want to be part of the task force itself.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.
MS. BROWN: And they talked about
how they do that. They may switch out from month to month to get all the other union heads that are interested there.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.
MS. BROWN: For February, we really
focused on our work around veterans outreach. We partnered with the Carpenters Union and Ironworkers to host veteran open houses. They were held at the Carpenters Union in Springfield. There were two days of open houses. It was attended by 18 local veterans. We are working with the appropriate union hall to make sure that those veterans that are interested in joining a union actually go through the process and follow them and see where they are now. This week we're actually getting reports back from some of these veterans that have attended the information
sessions, got all of their applications in and are now waiting for an interview from the union hall. So, we'll be able to track what happened with these folks that are interested. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.

MS. BROWN: At the time, we had met with eight trade unions one-on-one. We've since met with a few more that we'll be putting in our next report. But from the Bricklayers and Allied Craftsman's Union all of the way down to the Sheet-metal Workers Union, Laborers union of course.

We met with Jeff Nash over at the union Elevator Constructors local office. And that was a good conversation as well. In our one-on-one meetings with the unions, what we talk about is construction timelines of the MGM Springfield project. We go over the whole diversity program that so that folks know what the components are, what we are doing over at MGM, what our commitments are.

And we talk about the unions' ability to meet the diversity goals of our project. That's a very important discussion.

We found in our one-on-one meetings with the unions that they've been very open and honest about how we're going to work together to meet the diversity goals of the project.

We also talk about potential partnerships between MGM and the local union. How can we help them accomplish their diversity goals, reach out to more community members. And how can they help us make sure that we accomplish our goals.

Then we talk about the Springfield -- MGM Springfield union referral system. So, on our website we have a construction workforce form that individuals who are interested in construction can go online and fill out and choose their union that they're most interested in.

And we will make a referral at our office after we've talked to the person, made sure that they have met all of the qualifications. We'll make a referral to the union. We talk about that in our one-on-one meetings with the union so that we can see how it's going, how many referrals are you getting.

What happened with them, and we go over that process in our one-on-one meetings with them.

Right now we are following up with over 100 individuals who are interested in joining the union through the following again our construction workforce form. We're getting referrals and lists from our Community Partners of people that are interested.

Attendance at outreach events and again we are tracking the progress of each referral and documenting all union referral work. So, Commissioner Crosby talk about that second population, we're even tracking if a person needs a GED and we're not able to send them to a union, we'll track what community partner we sent them to get their GED or their driver's license assistance as well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. You anticipated everything I was asking for there it looks like.

MS. BROWN: These are a list of our upcoming outreach events. Last month, we were able to tour, Jason and I went to Westover Job Corps. facility and toured that facility.

It's amazing what they do out there with the participants there are. Everyone graduates with a license. Everyone graduates -- or a photo ID. Everyone graduates with a high school diploma or a GED. And they all graduate with some kind of trade or career goal in mind.

So, we were able to tour all the trade programs out there and talk about how we can do better in making sure those folks out there have opportunities to not only get on the MGM Springfield job but to join the construction workforce in our area as well.

We held a tour of our site with
Roger L. Putnam High School graduating seniors. That was a very exciting tour. We were able to go around to every part of our site. And the young people were able to -- the students were able to ask questions about the process. They were able to see a construction site up close and personal, and not just the see the fencing but what actually goes on behind the fencing they were able to look at.

We brought them back. We had an
information session with them. And we had local trade union representatives there that talked about what it's like to be in a union, the life of a union worker, the benefits of a union worker. They were able to ask a lot of questions. I think we are going to continue that partnership with them through our construction partner Tishman in that effort as we move forward.

Again, in March we held the first diversity task force meeting. And we'll be looking to meet with them again next month.

Looking ahead, we have open houses scheduled that we're looking to schedule for women and minorities interested in construction open houses. And we'll be partnering with one of our community partners, the Urban League of Springfield and the YWCA to host those open house sessions as we move forward in the next couple of months.

And we are just now starting to attend the local radio stations to spread the world. Different communities in Springfield the north end, south end Hispanic population,

African-American population have different community programs and radio stations. And they have asked us to just get on a program and explain how somebody can join the union, the workforce or if they are a diverse company, how they can be qualified to be ready to bid on our jobs.

That's it for our outreach presentation.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: If I can just make a comment. Impressive all of the work fairs are what most people do, but you've that done extra work that drill down where are the barriers. So, I just found your level of detail impressive and the partnerships. So, if someone doesn't have the skills or the driver's license whatever that barrier may be, you're attentive to that now. So, congratulations for that.

MS. BROWN: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Chelan, are you finding as you're going around, obviously, a lot of the outreach is targeted on the construction job opportunities, what do you
hear from people in the networks that you're creating asking you about the operational jobs? When does that happen and what kind of preinformation can you share with them at this point?

MS. BROWN: At almost every outreach event we get asked about the operations jobs. What we're telling people is that we're working closely with the operations team, under Marikate Murren who is our Director of Workforce Development and Training to make sure that the same kind of work that we're kind of doing on the construction side with outreaching to people and providing information is happening on the operations side as well.

We'll get their information. We'll turn it over to operations. And as we move closer in that stage, we'll be working together more closely.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: That's great. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I have a follow-up question as well and it relates, I think, to some of what Commissioner Stebbins
just asked. At our last meeting on March 3, there was a very impressive, in my mind, presentation on workforce development in the western part of the state, in Springfield as well as in the east with Bunker Hill and Bristol Community College. But with regard to Springfield, $I$ was especially impressed out there with the report of the work of the Casino Careers Training Institute and the work that's being done at Springfield Technical Community College.

Could you address the question of how you are interfacing with them and perhaps coordinating with them programmatically, if in fact you are?

MR. STRATTON: I'll address that question, Commissioner, because Chelan and Jason have been primarily focused on the construction aspect of our outreach. Marikate Murren as was mentioned is our Workforce Development Director, and she works very closely with those organization. I know she is in regular contact, participates on a routine basis in meetings and planning.

We're a little bit early on that stage. We're starting to lay the groundwork. I think what Chelan just spoke to was the construction team is doing a great job of laying out some frameworks and some models that the operations team is really excited about tapping into and adopting. But I think some of those will coordinate with MCCTI and use some of the models that we've already laid out in construction to carry forward some of that work.

We are still in -- We are watching closely what we are doing on the construction side looking to model it and collaborating with those organizations to make sure we can follow form.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Thank you.
MR. ROSEWELL: Good morning. I'm going to talk to you today about workforce diversity statistics. Our project goals for women is 6.9 percent. Currently, we are at 10.53 percent. That is up from 10.38 percent the month prior. Minority, we have 15.3 percent as our project goal. We're at 28.32
percent, up from 27.81 percent the prior month. Veterans, our project goals are 8 percent. We are currently at 8.5 percent, up from 7.9 percent prior month.

What you're going to see in these numbers eventually is the normalization as things start to level out.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What does that mean?

MR. ROSEWELL: We came out of the gate really strong, making sure that we were being very focused on the diversity piece. So, as we go through and we get into the job deeper, there will be some leveling out as some of the trades that come onto the job may not have some of the high diversity levels that some of the earlier trades that we're working with.

MR. STRATTON: If I could just add to that. I said to Jason this morning on the way out and we talked about it is really managing expectations.

> We are really proud of the team, of the results and of the work we've done so far
exceeding all of our goals. MGM fully intends to make its goals. But consistently beating these goals sustainability, we just want to manage expectations that there will be fluctuations and it will probably normalize and come closer to our underlying goals as we move forward.

We are going to try to get as high as we can, but we just want again manage expectations as we move forward. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I understand that. But the reason we asked you to come in this week is because you've done such a good job. Obviously, I understand. But those goals that are the published goals, as you know, are the minimum goals. Falling below that would be totally unacceptable.

We expect people, including
ourselves we have the same discussion ourselves, to exceed those goals. It's a function --- You said you came of the gate really hard. Well keep going hard. It's a function of hard work. And we know it's hard work. The very fact that you've got those two
bullet points talking about identifying people that don't yet have the skills even to get into the pipeline suggests that you know it's hard. And you're dealing with it.

MR. ROSEWELL: Absolutely.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If you don't keep a 25 percent minority okay we'll live with that but I don't you want to set yourselves up to fail.

MR. ROSEWELL: We definitely understand that the goals are the floor and not the ceiling.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
MR. ROSEWELL: Next slide we are
looking at is design and construction commitments through February 29, 2016. Our WBE project goals are 10 percent, currently we have 11.6 percent as our commitments, roughly about $\$ 6.4$ million of spend, up from $\$ 4.13$ million for the month of February. Minority project goals are five percent, commitments are currently at 11.3 percent. That's an increase or 6.3 percent over the goal. $\$ 6.2$ million in spend up from $\$ 4.88$ million from the prior
month.
Veteran project goals are two percent, currently at 2.9 percent, \$1.59 million in spend up from $\$ .9$ million the prior month.

Design commitments, this is based on approximately $\$ 24.1$ million of spend. WBE project goals are 10 percent. We're at 11.1 percent, eight companies currently on, \$2.68 million from $\$ .043$ million of the prior month.

MBE project goals are five percent, commitments are currently at 6.5 percent, six companies, current value of $\$ 1.57$ million up from $\$ .26$ million the prior month. VBE two percent, commitments are currently at 2.9 percent, $\$ .69$ million up from zero prior.

The big jump here was basically we were able to get our design team on board and we let all of those contracts. This is again another one where the spend will not go very much over the $\$ 24.1$ million. So, this one has leveled out. Thank you.

MS. BROWN: The next two slides 21 and 22 are a list of our design companies, what
their scope is, where they are based out of and their diversity status. As Jason said, this is going to be pretty much it for design for the MGM Springfield project.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Chelan, going forward as your shift from design into construction, is there anything that we can do to be helpful in terms of information about licensing and registering the subs or contractors as they come on board? Do you get a lot of questions about that what they are required to do?

MS. BROWN: Yes, mostly from the construction companies.

MR. ROSEWELL: Construction commitments, construction commitments through February 29, 2016. Our project goals for WBE is at 10 percent, currently we are at 12 percent, that is 17 companies $\$ 3.71$ million. Minority five percent currently is the project goal. We are at 15 percent in commitments, 11 companies on the project, $\$ 4.62$ million. VBE project goal is two percent, commitments are at 2.9 percent, five companies currently on the
job for $\$ .90$ million.
MS. BROWN: These last three slides are just a list of our diverse construction companies. I think we have 33 companies that are on the job and have been on the job to date. So, you can see the company, their scope, their location and their diversity status. Some of these, a very small percent of the companies we helped through the certification process. A lot of them had national certifications that they had that weren't accepted by the Gaming Commission. So, we had to help them through the process to get certified.

But what we're finding in Springfield now is that there are -- I guess the word is getting out, Commissioner Stebbins. So, there are diverse companies that have already set out on their own to get the information through Mass SDO, through Greater New England Minority Supplier Development Council of how to get certified. So, they're coming to us with either an application pending or being certified to be bid ready on a job.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: We've always stressed that they can keep kind of going down that parallel path of getting certification. It doesn't allow you to count them until they've gotten their certification but it shouldn't hold them up from having the opportunity to do business with you.

MS. BROWN: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is really great. We really appreciate it. I think MGM really takes this seriously. And we really appreciate that.

This was part of the reason the Legislature passed this law. It's in the law that this is a priority, part of economic development objective of our law. It's a function of hard work. You guys are, like Commissioner Cameron said, you are doing the blocking and tackling and it makes a difference.

And we appreciate it. I hope our friends at MassLive and the other Western media will notice it. MassLive I hope you'll notice it. Hey MassLive, back there, wake up I'm
talking to you. I hope you noticed these numbers about the contractors and the employment and the diversity numbers where the goals have been exceeded because it's an important part of this job, an important part of our job. Thanks a lot. We really appreciate it.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: If I could just make a point, Jill. In addition to what has been said that there is something that's really important that's going on here and that is that you all are establishing a precedent, a standard which the Wynn organization in Region A is going to have to or has as a model and from our perspective will be under some pressure to live up to.

And it also creates a precedent that establishes a standard for Region C. And at our meeting the other day down at the Tribe, even though we don't have jurisdiction over the Tribe that the issue and priority, institutional priority of the Commission on workforce development and diversity was specifically addressed with them. And that
they made at least statements of a commitment to address those priorities and to respond to those priorities.

So, what you have done is
tremendously significant. And I really encourage the trajectory to be maintained because it's not just Western Massachusetts. Now it's repercussing to Region A and Region C we hope.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I will say to be fair, Region A the Wynn folks are a little behind in the process but to date I think they have been every bit as serious about this as you guys have. But we do hope that they'll try to demonstrate that they can beat your numbers.

MS. GRIFFIN: We're going to close out our presentation with brief remarks from Jason Garand from the Carpenters 108.

MR. GARAND: Thank you for allowing me to come and speak on maybe some of the things that aren't really being talked about.

I'm in the trenches with these other organizations, and I can share some really exciting things that are happening. I have to
give the credit to the Gaming Commission and the negotiation of a host agreement that sets standards and goals.

I don't like the word goals because goals can be not hit and best-faith effort language is often used. That's unfortunate because it falls short. Your comments about exceed are the right words to describe what is so important here.

The opportunity is going to be changing lives. And we are on the frontline of that battle. MGM and the Carpenters Union has been really working hard to figure out how to do that and do it correctly. The Community Partners organization that is being formed, it's still in its infancy, but it is kind of coalescing. And they are creating their organization and their structure. Has a lot of power and opportunities for people that on the second of the bullets are soft skills that need, absolutely need to happen for it to be successful.

A population that is looking for things that a normal person walking through the
door of any union, the Carpenters Union or the electricians, plumbers we don't typically see. So, we need that partnership in order to make this successful.

And many times without language like this it's not even talked about. Then what happens? The trades simply supply manpower for the contractors as they come in to do a job. And if the question isn't do you have women, minorities or veterans, then we have to just work off a list of members who are qualified to do the job.

So, you're changing the dynamic. And that is incredible to see. And thank you very much for that. Thank you to MGM for really wanting to go beyond just what is the goal.

There's a number of things happening here from the community partners coming together, from the unions coming together as a task force, sitting together with representatives, talking about issues. And things that are maybe at this point getting familiar with each other. Not knowing who each
other is and starting to figure out where are there shortcuts -- what can the CPs, Community Partners, do to bring more people in.

That is an exciting program. And I think that what MGM has done is invented something that very quickly they have no control over nor do they ever want control. That's the beauty of this.

This is a 30 -month project. There's an opportunity for people to come in and change their lives in careers of 30 years. So, the goal is that we open the door and somebody says I want to be a carpenter -- And it could be a minority, woman or veteran. -- who didn't have that opportunity.

And working with the Community Partners HiSET, a driver's license, being able to be reliable and show up on the job. Soft skills that today would force them either in a situation where we are not prepared for that and the contractor isn't going to deal with that in too much of an extra effort, would trip them up. Then they would find that this isn't working for them and they'd get laid off.

Our goal is that they are walking through this door in the kiddie pool, and when they come into our trade into the training they are ready to go. And that is the beginning, maybe that first 30 months is the beginning of a 30-year career. That's a very important thing to talk about.

And this Community Partners organization that is developing will be something where the trades become interactive in it. There won't be a task force at the end. It'll be the unions and the Community Partners come together in the city of Springfield to talk about who do you have, where are we short, what skill sets?

For example, Partners for Community, it's an organization that does a lot of great things in the city. They are doing a lot of the soft skills, the HiSET, the GEDs. And when they're coming in they're coming in ready.

Who are these people? Some of them are homeless women that are living in Holyoke and Springfield. This is an exciting story that nobody knows about yet. You are now
hearing about it for the first time. It hits my heart. It's such a beautiful thing to know that somebody who is stuck is going to get an opportunity to fundamentally change their life. I'm excited to know that we are all part of that.

So, we are working with Putnam
Vocational. We had a woman just come in, she got accepted into our program. She is ready to go to work. So, I just want to take a step back and talk about why this is so important now.

The project hasn't really started yet. You've seen the numbers. It's a $\$ 500$ million job. There's short money that has been spent but that's great. Because if the people who are trying to get into these jobs are still six months behind being ready then they miss out on something.

So, the goal is that they're talking to the unions, figuring out when their programs are ready to go, getting into their queues, getting into the informational session, filling out their paperwork. And then when those jobs
open up, they're not saying okay is it my turn, because the answer is you're not ready to have your turn. Not because you're waiting 100th in line, it's because you have soft skills that you haven't got to yet that get you through the door. So, that's the partnership that's happening.

We have a couple of women from Partners and that homeless program. We have people from Youth Build. They have a longer term. But there are two people that are now ready. They're coming into the Carpenters Union.

We have Roca. Roca is an incredible program that takes kids that yesterday could be doing a lot of bad things, selling drugs, in gangs, in tough situations, not feeling loved, not feeling wanted to say that's the gang I want, it's called the Carpenters Union and I'm going to be a brother of that. That to me is once again another life changing event.

So, we have somebody that's going to work. He's not going to work at MGM though. He's going to work at the Changchung CRRC
project. His first job is Monday morning. He's going to have an opportunity to change his life that starts there. And then he's going to be able to go over to MGM three months from now, eight months from now, a year from now when the opportunity says hey we've got something else going on. But in the meantime he's got a year of experience.

So, the opportunity is much larger, it's much more exciting. UMass is now doing an AOC. This AOC model is the right model to create this. Cities and towns, the city of Springfield should be passing something this. They have an REO. It's lukewarm at best. An AOC model makes sense, but it will only work when people like yourselves are on it and saying the things that you're saying.

And I really appreciate that. And I really appreciate you allowing me to share some of these stories. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think the stories are excellent. I am just wondering without being forced to get to the numbers, it doesn't sound like the union on their own were
-- You were saying it's just too much work or there was no initiative to do it.

MR. GARAND: No, that it was too much work. It was just that we are the wrong organization to do the things that these other organizations do so well.

When we open our doors to our apprenticeship program, we have 1300 students that are apprentices going to Millbury right now. Every month the Carpenters Union does an informational session. We could have 100 people walk through the door. That's an overwhelming number for us on a monthly basis.

So, what we don't have is the ability to say you need HiSET. You need GED. You need a car. You don't have a vehicle to get a job site because today you're working in Springfield and tomorrow you're working in Pittsfield. And those are the places we fall short, and we recognize that we fall short.

What we need are partners who can do those things and do them well. That's Partners for Community and Roca and Youth Build and A.W.A.K.E. We have two people from A.W.A.K.E.
that are going to be coming into our apprenticeship program. They're doing things to get them ready that we couldn't do. And that's simply a recognition of strengths and weaknesses.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay.
Thanks.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Jason, you
and the Carpenters have obviously been tremendous leaders in terms of diversity recruitment and understanding of potential impact and positive impact that can happen to your union membership.

But I think the message we want to take away from what you have just been talking about and what MGM has been presenting here this morning is that for some folks out there -- And Jill and I have heard this. -- well, it's too late. I missed the window to get into a program. Or I'm just not going to be ready in time to participate in a project.

And the message is clear this morning that the opportunity is still there. It's not too late. You talked about it being a

30-month project. So, hopefully that message resonates to people who have been kind of thinking, well, I missed this deadline or this date of application, I'm locked out. That's not the case.

MR. GARAND: Correct.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: And that's a good message to hear.

MR. GARAND: And I didn't even share that fact that from a contractor position, these small companies that are in the city Springfield and people are worried that they are not at the size or ability to come into the union that we are holding them back.

We have now signed one company, Jericho Construction. They are a minority-, woman-, veteran-owned business. We are talking to Jim Lessard of JSL and he is a veteran-owned small company in the city of Springfield. They're going to be signing a contract with the union.

They see the benefits of what the union brings to the table in training, in pension, health and annuity for their
employees. They see the opportunities to open and expand their markets. This is a really -This is the other side of the great story that is not being shared yet. But it is happening.

These companies will -- Talk to
them. They're going to tell you the process to come into the trade was incredibly easy. We're open. There's no firewall that says you're not going to make it if you're not with us already. In fact, as with the workforce, our doors are open. And we are excited about the expansion and the change.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great Jason.
That's great stuff to hear. Anybody else?
MR. BEDROSIAN: Mr. Chair, I'm going to give you a choice now. Staff needs about five minutes before the number five, research and responsible gaming presentation. We could either break now and give them that five minutes or General Counsel Blue could do about 20 minutes worth of items that would eliminate items 6(c) and 6(e).

I will say that when you get the responsible PlayMyWay update, you will see that
our branding is deep green. That is a coincidence that today is St. Patrick's Day and not planned.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We'll still have to take the five-minute break.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Yes. So, the choice is do you want to take the five-minute break now or in about 20 minutes?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I just assume get the legal stuff over and then take a break. Okay, great. General Counsel Blue.

MS. BLUE: Good morning,
Commissioners.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you very much. Excellent presentation.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes, really
appreciate it. Thank you, Jason.
MS. BLUE: In your packet today, you have four small business impact statements. These are the small business impact statements for the emergency amendments that you approved at your last meeting to 205 CMR 134 and 205 CMR 116.

Those were amendments to the
qualifier regulation, to the temporary license regulation, to the term of the license regulation and the new qualifier section of 134. So, if you would like we can take these altogether and approve them as one. And then we will file them and move these amendments through the formal promulgation process.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Fine with me. I think that makes sense.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So, we need a motion, Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes, why don't you go ahead.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I move that we approve the small business impact statement to 205 CMR 134, licensing and registration of employees, small business impact statement 205 CMR 116, persons required to be licensed or qualified through the promulgation process. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Second. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Discussion? All in favor, aye.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously.

MS. BLUE: Thank you. And item (e) is a request for an NDA. As you may recall, the Commission asked the legal department to bring these forward for the Commission's review before they were approved. Deputy General Counsel Grossman is here to present what the request is for your consideration.

MR. GROSSMAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. You have before you two separate requests from Plainridge Park Casino to enter into a nondisclosure agreement. This would supplement the one you had a look at a few weeks back. We have prepared a draft of what it may look like, which only contains the first two categories.

Before we get into it, I would just remind the Commission the standard we look at is whether the information would contain a trade secret or would be detrimental to the gaming licensee if it were to be made public.

So with that in mind, the legal staff and the Commission staff is recommending that the Commission approve three of the requests and deny the fourth. The three that we would recommend approval for include the monthly disciplinary reports that are compiled by Penn National Gaming that detail reports of discipline for all of their properties nationwide.

The second is for the standard operating procedure for Plainridge Park Casino. And the third is for the audio recordings, video recordings, photographs and other images that are taken from their surveillance system. For those we would recommend that you approve the request that we enter into a nondisclosure agreement.

The fourth request is for floor plans. We would recommend that we not enter into an agreement for that. The reason being that we've already disclosed and released copies of the floor plans. We've redacted all of the back of house information including money-related areas, surveillance and security
areas and the like.
And we would suggest that the public records law and exemptions adequately protect all of our interests when it comes to the floor plans. We don't see a need to enter into a nondisclosure agreement.

With that if there are any questions we can get into that. I would just add that we've consulted with our colleagues in the IEB relative to these requests. And we all share the same recommendation.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Just for clarification, the disciplinary reports, those aren't prepared by Penn internally. Those are disciplinary actions taken in other jurisdictions, correct?

MR. GORSSMAN: That's right. As I understand it, it's a compilation of all the disciplinary actions that have been taken against the licensee in other jurisdictions.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: So, aren't they already public documents in other jurisdictions?

MR. GROSSMAN: Perhaps. And I think
it's a good point to focus on here. The key is the compilation of the information. It's not necessarily that each individual matter would be on its own subject to protection.

It's the report as compiled that there is concern with. That's understandable. As they've described in their request, it is similar to litigation compilation where you could go around the country and find individual lawsuits and filings and whatnot. But to tee it up for someone with interest like this could be detrimental to the licensee. That's what they are concerned with. We found merit with that concern.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: How is it detrimental?

MR. GROSSMAN: Just anyone who is pursuing litigation or what have you would have a one-stop shopping way to find all of the instances in which they have engaged in any type of behaviors.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I don't know that
I see that as a problem. It's all out there. It's public information. It's information that
the public has a reason to have access to. It's nothing earth shattering. It's not like something is going to happen that isn't already going to happen because every jurisdiction if there is anything significant the news covers it.

I don't know why -- Just on the face it, I could see how they could consider it kind of embarrassing. It makes it easy to have a summary. But $I$ don't quite see what the big deal with that is. It says it's the compilation that makes the document sensitive and confidential. Sensitive maybe, confidential, no, it doesn't change the nature of the information. Because it's compiled, you can't compile public documents and create a confidential document by the compilation of public documents. That just doesn't make sense to me.

Sensitive I understand, but I think that's really a $P R$ issue. It's not a significant public policy issue that $I$ can see. But you disagree with that apparently?

MR. GROSSMAN: I can see both sides
of the argument. When it comes to something like this, I'd be inclined to err in favor of protecting the documents so that we can receive it. If we don't enter into these agreements, we could run into a situation where they just won't give us certain documents.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes, they will.
MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we can get into situations where they modify the documents or what have you. I think the most important thing is that we have free access to all of this information.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do other people have --

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Just to make sure that $I$ understand what is actually at issue here in terms of the reports that are subject to the request.

In answer to your response I think to Commissioner Stebbins, do I understand it that these are not reports that have to do with disciplinary incidents at Plainridge as such; is that correct?

MR. GROSSMAN: That's not my
understanding of what this would cover.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Rather it is disciplinary actions that have been taken against Penn in other jurisdictions?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: By the
jurisdictions.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: By the
jurisdictions.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
MR. GROSSMAN: Right. So, Penn
National I take it compiles a list of all the disciplinary matters that have been taken against it in all of their whatever, 20 some odd jurisdictions.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Other thoughts on this question because it's sort of an interesting question. If we have a representative here from Wynn, who I wouldn't --

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: From Penn.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, okay.
Roberta, both, if either or both of you. You probably have the same thing. I don't know at Wynn. But certainly Roberta if you want to
speak to it, you're more than welcome.
MS. GREGOIRE: This is a report prepared by Penn corporate. It contains information about regulatory action in other jurisdictions. It's provided upon request to the IEB. It's not a regulatory requirement. It is information that we do feel is sensitive and would like to have a protected.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Why is it
sensitive?
MS. GREGOIRE: Because as Todd said, it covers everything across our properties. And a lot of that is not relevant to what happens at Plainridge or here in Massachusetts.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: IEB agrees with this as well, the recommendation?

MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. I don't know that we got into this level of deliberation over it. On its face, it struck me as something that I could understand why you wouldn't want out there.

As she mentioned, they are not required to give this to us. They do. I take it it's helpful to the IEB. I guess they like
receiving this information. I kind of, on this one, took it at face value that they say it's sensitive to them.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Director
Wells, do you have any thoughts on this matter?
MS. WELLS: Good morning. I am
familiar with the document that we are talking about here today. It is something that is definitely helpful for the IEB to review as far as not only looking at what's going at Plainridge Park Casino but also we have an obligation to evaluate the continuing suitability of Penn National. So, this compilation of everything and the regulatory violations and issues in other jurisdictions is definitely helpful to us. So, it's something that we want.

I can understand from the company's perspective that having it compiled in a document in some ways can be uncomfortable if that gets out. I think that from our perspective, it is information we want. If we take possession of it and it becomes a public record then we may be compelled to disclose
that.
Another option for us would be instead of us taking the document would be just to view the document, but that makes it a little more cumbersome for us. So, it's certainly easier for us to be delivered the document, take possession of it. And then have the NDA so that parties are comfortable instead of us having to go and view a document at a different location and not take possession of it.

So, from it's from a logistical point of view which I realize is slightly different the issue you're discussing today on the substance of whether or not it should be appropriately a confidential document.

But on logistics, when we are working in that relationship with the licensee and understanding what their concerns are then we try to be flexible and reasonable with them. That's an issue for us that the logistics of having the document just delivered. I get it emailed to me. And I can view it at any time.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Is there an
issue that you can see where a trend may be identified that someone could exploit if there happens to be a number of locations where there may have been some kind of a lapse in security, surveillance, something that you would find useful but someone else could use to exploit? I'm trying to understand the nature of the risk here for the document other than uncomfortableness if there happens to be.

MS. WELLS: I haven't seen that. It may be from an investigatory standpoint, sometimes you like first crack at evaluating what's going on in these different jurisdictions before it becomes a public issue so that we have an appropriate response for the Commission in a timely manner. That's a public policy discussion which I would defer to the Commission on how you'd like to handle that. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Is this an issue in other jurisdictions? Or is this typically a document that would remain confidential?

MS. WELLS: I don't know the answer
to that question. I would have to make a
request of other jurisdictions on how they handle that.

I know from my travels and discussions with other jurisdictions, Massachusetts, the laws regarding what's public and what's confidential as far as investigations, we certainly are on the side of the spectrum towards transparency. Most other jurisdictions, the materials that the IEBs are reviewing there really is no issues of disclosure. That's something different.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So, we disclose more than others is what you are saying.

MS. WELLS: The law is whether we disclose it is different than what the parameters of the law are. Some other jurisdictions particularly for gaming and gaming investigations have specific statutory protections for the information that's obtained during investigations.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I, I think, would be comfortable with more information from Penn why they in particular they feel this is
confidential, what other jurisdictions do. If there is a risk here, that's really what I'm concerned about a risk. If there's no risk, I would tend to agree that this may not be a confidential document. Just if we could get more information, I'd be more comfortable making a decision about this.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If there were something which had some -- in the document something came up, I don't know what it might be but something came up that might have some positive help to a bad guy, to take that particular thing out in any given instance. And I'd also be happy to shelve this one for a week if somebody wants to weigh into it more heavily.

Penn doesn't have anything to hide. If there were tendencies, if all the sudden there's judicial actions or the jurisdictional actions, regulatory actions were on the ascendancy or there were a series of serious ones, we would want to know, but the public has the right to know that too. It's not a secret. It's out there.

So, it feels to me like unless there is some other consideration like Commissioner Cameron is saying that this is kind in the world we live in. And we meaning us but also meaning the operators they are sort of buying into this world of transparency.

MS. WELLS: I think I agree with that. I think the potential counter to that is if Penn doesn't -- It is a valuable tool for us. So, we don't want to have a deterrent to Penn compiling this and creating this document.

My concern would be if there's risk of disclosure, and I would defer to Penn on what their policy would be, if they would stop doing it because of a risk of disclosure for some reason.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We can require it.
MS. WELLS: I guess you could. I think they'd do it, and correct me if I'm wrong, Roberta, they do it as a general practice and it goes out to all the jurisdictions. It's not something that's done for the IEB, I would say.

> MS. GREGOIRE: It goes to our
regulators and our auditors only.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I'm happy to also kind of set this aside and take it up later. It's an internal corporate document of the compilation of kind of monthly disciplinary issues.

Is there information kind of above and beyond other than here are all of the infractions but maybe internal information as to what steps the company is taking to either settle the jurisdictional issue or disciplinary issue or to go beyond and above here is the infraction, here is the penalty, the jurisdiction, the basic facts. If there's more information in that that is part of the compilation, I could somewhat see a reason to not disclose that. But $I$ just don't know. MS. GREGOIRE: We'll get back to you.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Mr. Chair, I would suggest it sounds like the licensee will have a sense of the Commission right now. Ms. Gregoire may want to go back and consult with some folks at Penn. I'm going to suggest we
pull this.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do you have anything to add before we do this?

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I would just add that I share the concerns of the other Commissioners. That given the pertinence as Karen has said to the issue of the ongoing suitability of the licensee and the public interest in there being dissemination of this suitability pertinent information being in the public domain so that we can be held to account, I think that there are some real significant issues here that need some further thinking through before we vote on it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.
MR. BEDROSIAN: My suggestion is you not take a vote at this time and we will circle back either in a week or two.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We can do it on the other two.

> MR. BEDROSIAN: I'm sorry. I
apologize. I came in. I was just thinking about this particular item. But the other two we'd appreciate.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: On the other two, what is this standard operating procedure, Todd? What is that? I think you just described it as SOPs. And I apologize for not having read in greater detail the materials on it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: There isn't any more.

MS. GREGOIRE: They are step-by-step instructions for each department. So, they're very detailed. They cover each of the departments cage, security, surveillance, something that we would not want to be out in public.

MR. GROSSMAN: Kind of like the internal controls I think in a little more detail --

MS. GREGOIRE: Much more detail.
MR. GROSSMAN: -- is my
understanding of what they are. And we do protect the internal controls, which are much more general. So, that seemed like a reasonable request from that perspective.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is one where I can see the kind of concern that Commissioner Cameron expressed. You don't particularly want the way you handle your cash movement from point-to-point or other kinds of stuff. And I don't think there's any kind of public interest served in having it out there.

So, there is neither a public interest in having it out there and there is a risk in having it out there. So, it makes sense to me.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes, I agree.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Todd, what are your thoughts let's just circle back on the floor plans issue. Obviously, we don't want people wishing to do harm to the casino to understand kind of the back-of-house operational locations.

MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: But I sense from what you said is there is a way to redact or protect those pieces of the floor plan maybe while showing the general layout of the public areas if anybody was even interested in having
those.
MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. And we've already released the floor plans. They're out there on our website. At the moment, you could go look at them if you really wanted. And you could just stand there and draw them yourself if you really wanted to.

There are obviously sensitive areas. Those we would not want to disclose publicly and we haven't and we wouldn't. But I think there are adequate protections in place such that we don't need to enter into a nondisclosure agreement.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I would agree since we already protect the areas that we agree are sensitive in nature and wouldn't want them to be made public. So, I would agree with your assessment.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, if no further discussion, do we have a motion on the two? Does somebody want to bring one?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr. Chairman, I would move that the Commission approve the request for nondisclosure
agreements for standard operating procedures and item 29, the video recordings, audio recordings, photographs, etc. from the casino's surveillance system.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Second. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
discussion? All in favor, aye.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Do we need
to take action on the floor plan issue to accept staff recommendation or because we approved the other two --

MS. BLUE: I think it would be helpful to take action to accept our recommendation not to keep it confidential.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr.
Chairman, I move that the Commission accept the staff recommendation on the request for nondisclosure on the floor plans, item number

30 as presented in the packet.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Discussion? All
in favor, aye.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.
MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you. We'll bring a draft agreement back before you when we come back with the information about the disciplinary reports, if that's okay. We'll hold off on signing an agreement for these other two.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else, Roberta if any other information you want to get or if anybody else wants to come speak to us or whatever, fine with us. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We're not doing Easton, right?

MR. BEDROSIAN: We are not doing

Easton now. I would suggest --
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: -- taking a break.
We'll take say a nine-minute break and be back at 11:30.
(A recess was taken)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are reconvening public meeting 182. Next up on our agenda is Director of Research and Responsible Gaming, Mark Vander Linden.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Good morning, Commissioners. As one part of the overall strategy that the Commission has adopted to provide information and education to patrons, the Commission adopted and approved the development and implementation of a pilot program at Plainridge Park Casino called play management -- a play management system. In the past few months, the Commission has -- We've changed the name of this to be called PlayMyWay.

PlayMyWay is an innovative budget setting tool that will be available in slot
machines at Plainridge Park Casino in the very near future. Patrons can voluntarily use this program. If they do choose to use the program, they receive notices at 50 percent, 75 percent, 100 percent and every 25 percent thereafter of the budget they had determined for themselves. I want to emphasize that this a budget setting that is voluntary. It doesn't cut patrons off from play once they hit 100 percent. What want to do is to increase the level of awareness for patrons so they can make an informed decision about whether they continue to gamble, whether they stop and how much they spend.

This is an innovative tool. This has not been done in the United States before. There are few jurisdictions in North America that either have just begun using it or will begin using it later in the summer or early fall.

It has been tried in other jurisdictions around the world. And we're closely monitoring those to see what we can pull from those that would be considered best
practices and adopt those in Massachusetts.
I want to point out this is a complex process. We are very interested in creating a tool that is useful for patrons, a tool that will truly help them make an informed decision about their gambling behaviors. We want to provide a tool for those that don't want to use it doesn't interfere with their gaming experience.

We want to provide a tool that's attractive and appealing to use. One that aligns or is fully integrated with their gaming experience. All of these things are important considerations as we move down this path in the development stage.

This development process has required extensive collaboration. Collaboration obviously with Penn who has been fantastic in working with us to create this product. We've worked closely with Harvard Medical School Cambridge Health Alliance Division on Addiction to develop the evaluation component.

One of the central criticisms of
this type of tool is that there is little evidence that would prove its effectiveness. We want to prove conclusively whether or not this is a useful tool, what the value of it is to patrons who choose to gamble in

Massachusetts. They are an ideal agency to work with to develop this piece of it.

We've worked closely with Bally
Technology who does the actual development piece of this. And I'll cover more of their work in just a few minutes. All of these entities are working closely together with us at the Massachusetts Gaming Commission to develop this product.

What I want to cover this morning is a little bit about our new campaign, our new brand. I want to cover some changes that we decided to make to the way that it appears on the electronic gaming machine. Then finally $I$ want to cover the timeline, when will you actually see this on a slot machine at Plainridge Park Casino.

To cover the piece about how are we positioning this, what does our marketing
campaign look like, I've been working very closely with Elaine Driscoll, Director Driscoll as well as Mike Sangalang and the advertising agency, More Advertising here in Boston. With that I want to turn it over to Elaine.

MS. DRISCOLL: Good morning,
Commissioners. So, basically what I'd like to do today is just tell you a bit about the PlayMyWay brand, how we developed it and then also what the plan will be for distribution once we are ready to launch the actual program.

You have in the Commissioner's packet basically an overall communications plan. Just by way of background, this plan was originally created to give guidance to More Advertising basically before they started their creative work. We wanted to be very specific about what we were trying to achieve and to give them a sense of what we wanted the brand to look and feels like. That was based on a significant amount of research that Mark and I did with other jurisdictions.

So, you'll actually even notice in this communications plan, I went ahead and
included some collateral from Ontario who seems to have had so far a successful program. One of the things that -- By the way, the folks in Ontario were extremely generous with sharing their experience with us. So, we were very appreciative of that.

They also were happy to share with us all of the collateral that they created. So, we thought that that was an important piece because they really stressed to us the importance of a really good marketing strategy and that they believe that that was critical to the overall success of their program thus far. So, I included that so you could get a sense of it.

I know Commissioner Cameron you often like to see what other jurisdictions are doing. So, I thought that that was an important example.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Excuse me, Elaine. When you use the word collateral, what does that mean?

MS. DRISCOLL: All of the marketing pieces, the brochures, the rack cards, the
signage.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Is that a term of art in the marketing world?

MS. DRISCOLL: I guess so. I don't know. At any rate, you will notice that. I'll take you through this memo briefly. I'm not going to hit on every single point, but $I$ just want you to get a sense of like I said our strategy and how this all came to be.

The bottom line is is that our strategy is to introduce the PlayMyWay program to Marquee Reward players via a highly targeted branding and marketing strategy.

We also need to educate the Plainridge Park Casino employees and the GameSense advisors about the availability and functionality of the play management system. And we'll be doing that through a series of communication outreach methods.

We also want to increase general awareness of PlayMyWay by developing and executing an advertising campaign. And we also want to highlight the availability of the budgeting tool and MGC's commitment to
innovative responsible gaming strategies.
When we had done our research, the way we came up with basically like I said the overall look and feel of the brand, is that we were cautioned from other jurisdictions to make sure that the marketing materials were not overly developed as responsible gaming -- as a responsible gaming initiative.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is true of all of our stuff, all of our GameSense stuff everything, right, not just the PlayMyWay?

MS. DRISCOLL: It is but $I$ would say that the difference would be GameSense materials you won't see any gaming type visuals. Whereas, actually PlayMyWay is a much more of a departure of that because to look at PlayMyWay materials, they actually look more like casino promotional materials than they do GameSense materials.

But we wanted to have a subtle but identifiable connection to GameSense. And the way that we did that was one GameSense is obviously -- the logo is obviously on the materials. But two, we chose to sort of stay
in the same color family just so there's an identifiable connection but it's subtle. That was done purposefully. That was the guidance that was given to More.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: The message, basically you don't want it to be a downer, right -- to interfere with the enjoyment, excitement, buzz of the gaming experience?

MS. DRISCOLL: So, I would say exactly. From both Ontario and also Plainridge Park Casino marketing staff, who by the way have been really helpful in collaborating with us on this, one of the things that they both stressed over and over was the importance of customer experience.

And that we need to be very mindful that in order to attract players to enroll. And the way to do that is to create branding materials that focus on the customer experience. It is something that is more -basically inciting them to participate as opposed to something that they wouldn't want to participate in.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It was really a precondition sort of of our discussions with the licensees that we do no harm. 80, 90 percent of the people who play in the casino -adults, maybe not 80 or 90 percent in the casino, but 80,90 percent of adults play in a completely healthy way. They're not at risk. There is no downside. It's just a fun kind of entertainment for most of the people who gamble. So, we don't want to disrupt their experience in the effort to try to give constructive support to the whatever it is, five, 10, 15 percent that are potentially at risk.

MS. DRISCOLL: So with that background in mind, I will now take you through quickly just the different pieces of collateral that we've created that will be all the various education pieces that will be distributed prior to implementation.

And you actually have some of the pieces in front of you. We had mock-ups done. And we'll get to those in a minute, but the first piece that I want to show you because
it's actually just a piece, a fun piece of marketing collateral that we happen to really like. - And this is interesting, because this actually wasn't created by More Advertising.

We wanted to have a digital focus on some of our marketing materials in addition to the standard trifold brochure and rack card and things like that that will be in the casino floor at Plainridge. We wanted to create an animation which is something that some of the other jurisdictions have as well.

And we actually went to another state agency called Digital Mass. They're essentially a component -- They're a division of Mass IT. Essentially, what they do is they help state agencies develop marketing materials.

Basically, they provide this added value service for other state agencies. I just want to say that they are tremendous. They are very talented. They were super easy to work with. And they created an animation for us that we really like.

So, we will be using this across
social media platforms. And we'll also be able to put it on our website and on the GameSense website. So, without further ado.
(Video played)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's great. Mike was that streamed? Oh, it was. It wasn't on our screen here.

MS. DRISCOLL: Again, I want to just give a special thanks to the Digital Mass. team for creating it. I was so impressed with how easy it was to collaborate with them. We had one in-person meeting. Gave them all the materials. They sent us a storyboard. We approved the storyboard, three days later we had this animation. I just want to publicly thank them.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: That was one of -- The voice was someone from their team and they picked the music as well?

MS. DRISCOLL: Yes, yes. They did the whole thing. As you can see it's a great example of what we are trying to do in terms of
branding this. It's very much so a departure from some of the usual responsible gaming type of pieces.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Absolutely. Is that something that when we launch you'll be able to send out, Tweet out?

MS. DRISCOLL: Absolutely.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Because I'd like
to send it around to people $I$ know too.
MS. DRISCOLL: Absolutely.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Elaine, can
I ask you a question? The role of the Marquee Reward card is that -- Taking a step back, what is the Marquee Reward card.

MS. DRISCOLL: I'll let Mark answer that.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: The Marquee Reward card is a player card. I think virtually every casino has a player card or a player reward card as an option for people to enroll in. It provides them with incentives and comps to continue to gamble with that specific company. It's really a promotional campaign for them.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: What percentage of people who game at Plainridge do you think have Marquee Reward cards?

MR. VANDER LINDEN: I've heard generally it's around 70 percent of individuals.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I see you're not really losing many. That was my concern if you had something that only a small percentage of a relatively small percentage of players have then you might be missing that part of the population that's the target.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Not only are we not missing them, we are hitting the target population. That it's the frequent gamblers that we are hoping that this type of tool will be attractive too. Those frequent customers typically have a player reward card.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You'd never be a frequent player and not have one.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Okay. It's part of your kit as a compulsive gambler to have one of these cards.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Roberta, do you
know what percent of your players are on the program or what percent of the play is on the program?

MS. GREGOIRE: I do not know.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I've heard numbers way north of 70 percent but certainly 70.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: There's real advantages to having the card.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If you're a regular player, you want the card.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Bonus points, free meals.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: So, it's important that it's connected to the player reward card. There were a couple of options early on. We could connect it to the player reward card, the Marquee Reward card. We could go with a separate card. The separate card felt like it was too detached from the overall look and feel of the gaming experience.

The Marquee Reward card is the one way in which when you put your card in it knows who you are. That's the one way that you are able to continue -- that it knows how to track
the play, knows where you are in terms of the budget you set.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Elaine, I have a question. I noticed the Canadian material had the logo of the participating casino. Penn is obviously -- Plainridge Park has been a big partner of ours in getting this done. Was there any conversation about having their logo on the material as well?

MR. VANDER LINDEN: One complicating factor of this this is that it's only being offered at Plainridge Park Casino. That's the only property in all of the Penn properties that this is at. So, it did become complicated.

We didn't want to confuse people to think that they can go to Maine and that PlayMyWay would be an option for them. So, in discussions with Penn, we decided that we wanted to keep that separate. As you can see through the collateral material, through the video that we do align it at certain points, strategic points.

MS. DRISCOLL: That was reviewed
with Plainridge marketing as well. So, they are aware of those decisions.

Lastly, I'll just quickly tell you about that right now the collateral pieces that have been created, now that the brand has been established, the beauty of it that is it's really easy to add new pieces. Say we identify different types of pieces that we'd like to have that's easy at this point.

One of the important things that we are doing as we are ready to implement is Plainridge Park Casino will be sending out a direct email blast to all their Marquee Reward cardholders. So, there will be a direct email blast. As you can see, we've already designed that. I think that will be an important announcement piece.

We also have a trifold brochure. We have a rack card. We have our retractable banner over here as you can see. We'll be to put that up in the GameSense Info. Center. It's mobile. So, we could always put it over on the racing side if we wanted to. The beauty of that is we'll be able to move that around
and highlight that in different places.
Then we'll also have some access to digital signage throughout Plainridge. And they'll be able to promote the program in various places through that as well that again, now that the key elements of the brand have been developed. So, we are happy about that.

Over here you can see we had posters created for employees. So, these posters will all be hung on the back of the house at Plainridge Park so that all of the individual employees know what this program is as well. Mark, if you want to talk about the training. MR. VANDER LINDEN: One point I want to make before I talk about that as you may recall in previous discussions of this, two central concerns -- In our research that we have done with other jurisdiction of this type of technology, there were two concerns that rose to the surface. One is determining what the effectiveness is. That's our robust evaluation component to this to really try to figure out whether this is effective.

The other was that other
jurisdictions said you need to make sure you market this that you position this right. I think that working with More, working with Elaine and Mike on this, we've really taken that point and refined this to a fine tip.

Another piece to make sure that it is rolled out effectively is the training. So, while we talked about how we want to keep this kind of under the GameSense umbrella but slightly separate, our GameSense advisors are still going to be kind of on-site champions for this tool.

It fits very well within the full toolkit of what they are trying to do, whether it's explaining to patrons how games work and specifically I think that the lines on slot machines can get very confusing. They're an amazingly resource to talk about how slot machines work both inside as well the external surface of the machines. They can talk to about the odds of play.

And this is one way in which they can take that to another level. For a long time, we talked about setting a budget and
sticking to it as a key responsible gaming principle. We've taken this to a new level and we're giving people actual technology to do that.

And I think that this is a really important step. It's a valuable tool for our GameSense advisors. I think it's also has value for Penn that this as we position it as a benefit of their Marquee Reward to allow people the ability to set their limits, to set a budget and track it as they play.

We want to make sure that that message is effectively communicated across the Penn staff at Plainridge Park Casino. As I walk through the timeline, you'll see that there is a specific period just before launch that we will be doing that training up until that point. We'll be working with Penn, the Mass. Council on Compulsive Gambling, and the GameSense advisors to make sure that that training hits the mark and keeps the same tone that we are looking for both in GameSense as well as the PlayMyWay campaign.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Before we take the
next step, can we see that one more time?

MS. DRISCOLL: The animation?
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes.
MS. DRISCOLL: Sure. By the way,
we'll have a 30-second version and things like that. This one is about a minute and a few seconds. And then we'll have a 30-second version.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: I had to watch it numerous times too. I think it's a great piece.
(Video played)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Does it remind you of your evenings at the disco, Mr . Chairman?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes, John Travolta.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Next, I want to transition to talk about how PlayMyWay is displayed on the screens and what is the player experience of PlayMyWay.

If you recall back in December, you had a first glance at what we were then calling the play management system we are now calling the PlayMyWay system. You saw it on two different types of screens. You saw it on what's called the DM screen, which is the large fully electronic screen. You also saw it on the smaller what is called LVDS screen. And that is approximately two inches by about six inches in diameter.

The one thing that we realized and I think you all realized as Commissioners that the display on that LVDS screen was quite small.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The little screen.
MR. VANDER LINDEN: On the little screen was small. It fit very well on the larger screen, but when we tried to translate it and crunch all that language down onto the LVDS screen, it was just too small. We knew we needed to deal with that.

We also had this promotional
campaign that was kind of coming to fruition at the same time. It created a really nice
opportunity to make sure we took the messages that in the flow of what we already had created but then integrate the promotional campaign.

So, what $I$ want to do is just go through key screens with you where probably the largest changes have occurred. So, what you see before you is on the left is the old screen with the language that was on there. And on the right what you'll see is the reduced, the smaller version. This will fit much, much better on that small LVDS screen. These are mock-ups. And I'll talk to you in a few minutes about how this will be integrated and what the timing is for that. But this is some of the new language that we have.

The language that you see on the new screens is the language that you see in the promotional materials that we have developed. Obviously, we are carrying forward the look and the feel of PlayMyWay into that as well. I want to thank Mike Sangalang actually for helping me do some of this translation and getting this ready for the content to be brought forward through this system.

That's the first screen. This is kind of introduction screen. After that you'll see the terms and conditions. Again, it was very content heavy. Consulting with legal, consulting with Bally, we are moving forward with -- we can shift to the next screen -- a much shorter, more concise terms and conditions.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: On this one, Mark, it seems like the fonts are still really small. With all that extra space, why not make them bigger?

MR. VANDER LINDEN: You have to understand, if you look, you'll see the slot machine on the left side there that will still be there on the new screen once the content is brought forward. What this does is it basically when a player launches the PlayMyWay system it takes over half the screen.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I see.
MR. VANDER LINDEN: So, the slot machine screen is still there. It shrinks it down. So, we really only have about half of a screen. We need to be very conscious of that.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I didn't realize you had that slot machine face in the new version.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: The next is setting your budgets. Again, this did not fit well on the small LVDS screen. You can see we drastically simplified this screen. This actually aligns really closely -- We took some notes from the Ontario group, the Ontario Lottery Group and looked at how they were using this type of screen. And we adopted something very similar to them.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: When are they getting update?

MR. VANDER LINDEN: The Ontario group?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes.
MR. VANDER LINDEN: That's a good
question. I asked them when they were expecting some of their initial evaluation, they'll forward it to me. But they didn't have anything ready at this time. They piloted it at one casino. They are preparing, as I understand, to launch it across the province.

The next you'll see, this was what I felt like when $I$ first saw it was a very nice interface when you launch the GameSense button. There's a button on the bottom that just provides information about GameSense.

I felt like that screen was nice. But when we integrated the PlayMyWay word mark we also took it a step further and wanted to isolate and have a different look for voluntary self-exclusion. I think that that actually came out quite nice as well. Again, Commissioner Macdonald, if you can understand that the slot machine will still be there. We have half of this screen.

Those are the main differences. I didn't want to take us all of the way through every single one because quite honestly there were certain screens that it did end up looking very similar but there weren't issues of the size and dealing with managing the content on those screens. So, those remained unchanged. Any questions about that?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Much nicer, cleaner, easier to use. People don't want to
do all that reading. This is excellent.
MR. VANDER LINDEN: We do not want a product that seems like an add-on, hooked onto the side, responsible gaming tool. We want to provide a resource for patrons that's integrated into their gaming experience. That's been our mantra working with every single one of the stakeholders through this process. And it's a message that came through loud and clear from PPC as well.

Next I want to switch over and talk to you about the timeline. This is the updated timeline that $I$ just received. What you'll see is there are several -- I'm just going to break it down for you.

Starting next Monday there is going
to be about four weeks where we are taking all of the content and making sure that it is integrated into both the electronic gaming machines, the slot machines as well as the kiosk.

I didn't mention this, but there are two kiosks on the floor at Plainridge Park Casino. One in the GameSense Info. Center and
one will be placed on the opposite end of the floor. At both of those kiosks, you can enroll and change your limits in PlayMyWay. You can also get other GameSense information and resources as well. So, we will spend four weeks updating the content on that.

Then we go into about a month long period where we are testing and retesting. There's testing and walk-through that needs to happen for the Commission. There's testing and walk-through that needs to happen for PPC. We need all parties that are involved with this to be perfectly comfortable with how it looks, how it feels and that it's not interfering with other gaming functions.

I'd like to point out that Director Glennon has been involved in all of these conversations especially when we talk about how it interfaces with their casino management system and other systems that are at Penn.

Once that user acceptance testing, once the testing walk-through is complete, we will go into a brief period where we will do intensive training on-site. Our GameSense
advisors are up to speed to date. They know what's happening. They've received some training and updates already. But we will move into a very brief period of intensive training with them with Plainridge Park Casino staff. And then at that point we will be ready to go live.

This timeline is at the end of May. I would love to see this move along as quickly as we can. In fact, I'm working a daily basis with Bally, with other stakeholders to make sure that we are on track, we're on time.

If there are any ways in which we can reduce this timeline, we will continue to look for that. When we built this timeline, this updated timeline, $I$ understand that it's a relatively conservative timeline so we can hit our marks. But we are interested in providing this resource to patrons at Plainridge Park.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Very
impressive. I love the new look, the new feel.
I think it will make a big difference.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: John,
anything you want to add?
MR. GLENNON: No, I just think the collaboration -- I want to reiterate the collaboration on the part of the technical people Jason Gittle and his team has been exceptional. I think we're in good shape to make the date that's on this timeline.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: I want to highlight one piece where it was a hurdle and a barrier and our collaboration with Penn was key.

You'll see that there's a five dollars incentive. We were trying to figure out a way to get that incentive to patrons as quickly as possible once they enroll. What it looked like was that we would -- we couldn't figures out a solution to get it to them right way. And it looked like what we would have to do is send it through the mail. That's not a good incentive.

An incentive really to be truly effective, you need to get it to them right away. And working with Penn, working with Jason Gittle trying to figure out a way so that
we can immediately deliver this incentive to patrons.

And even a step further that we can leverage the skills and the resource that we have in our GameSense advisors to deliver that as well as additional GameSense messaging. It was just a much appreciated the work with Jason, the work with Director Glennon to accomplish that.

Right now, the incentive, the patron can enroll, walk over to the GameSense Info. Center and easily pick that up. It's a onetime incentive that patrons will be able to do that.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Mark, can I ask you one last question? It's putting my old researcher cap on. You said that you fully intend to test whether this product is effective. What do you think the measures of effectiveness will be? What are the criteria that you are going to be measuring against?

MR. VANDER LINDEN: I think there are a couple of ways that you can take a look at this. I think one way in which we'll look at is the cold hard data. We will have data
from patrons who enroll in looking at -Anonymized, you understand. -- looking at play behavior and looking at how they respond to the notifications that they would receive as they approach their limits.

We will have a comparison group where we can see -- compare play behavior looking not just at expenditures, looking at speed of play, taking a break that sort of thing.

We can also take a look at what is the value of this to the patrons? We can evaluate that through doing patron surveys, through questionnaires. We are already doing patron surveys through the GameSense Info. Center as well as through our broader SEIGMA study. We should be able to integrate questions that would ask about how do they feel about PlayMyWay? Is it a tool that brings value to their gaming experience? Is it something they find useful?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Excellent. Great. MR. BEDROSIAN: I was just going to suggest, Mr. Chair that it might be appropriate
to take a break now.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's what I was going to suggest too. Easton is coming at 1:00, right?

MR. BEDROSIAN: That's correct.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Why don't we come back at 1:15 and that will give them a few minutes to get set and we'll reconvene and do our last two or three items at 1:15.
(A recess was taken)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Now we are
reconvening meeting 182 of the Mass. Gaming Commission at about 1:15.

Before we go any further, I wanted to announce that we have just been informed Commissioner Gayle Cameron has been reappointed to the Gaming Commission by the Governor and the Attorney General and the Treasurer, all three. It was a close vote. She's appointed to a new five-year term. So, congratulations and welcome back until 2021.

We have two items left. Which order
are we going? Are we going Easton first?
MS. BLUE: Easton first, yes.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, this would go
to General Counsel Blue.
MS. BLUE: Good afternoon,
Commissioners. Before you today is a request by the town of Easton for a hearing to review and vacate the arbitrators' award selecting the applicant MG\&E's best and final offer as the surrounding community agreement between MG\&E and Easton.

Easton's letter requesting a hearing
is included in your Commission packet along with the arbitrators' award. And the arbitrators' award contains the actual surrounding agreement as well.

Easton and MG\&E were unable to finalize a surrounding community agreement. And pursuant to the Commission's regulations, the parties went to arbitration. The regulations provide that a party to arbitration may file objections to the best and final offer submitted by the other party. 205 CMR 125.01 states that if a party does not file an
objection to the best and final offer, the decision of the arbitrator becomes final and shall not be subject to further review.

Easton did not file objections to MG\&E's best and final offer. MG\&E did not file objections to Easton's best and final offer. On February 5, the arbitrators issued their decision selecting MG\&E's best and final offer.

On February 11, Easton filed a letter with the Commission requesting a hearing to review and vacate the arbitrators' award.

The Commission considered a similar request from the city of Chelsea when Chelsea and Wynn submitted to arbitration because they could not finalize a surrounding community agreement. Like the present situation, the arbitrator in Chelsea picked the applicant's best and final offer as the surrounding community agreement. Chelsea filed a petition asking the Commission to review and vacate the arbitrator's award.

In the Chelsea matter, the
Commission determined that pursuant to
Commission regulations the award of the
arbitrator is final and binding and are subject to further review. However, the Commission determined that it may consider review if the award on its face or in any of its aspects was egregiously outside the pale of reason decision-making. In the Chelsea matter, the Commission did not grant Chelsea's request for a hearing.

The question before the Commission today is the same question that was before the Commission in the Chelsea matter. Namely whether the Commission should grant Easton a hearing to review the arbitrators' award. If the Commission determined that a hearing is appropriate, a hearing on the merits of Easton's request would be held at a later date. The Commission need not discuss the merits of Easton's request today.

Representatives of the town of Easton and MG\&E are here today to present their arguments to the Commission as to why the Commission should or should not grant a hearing. Each party has been advised that they have 15 minutes to present their argument to
the Commission. So, are there any questions from the Commission so far?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Just for the record, I don't think we determined that there was a right of appeal if it were way outside the pale of reasonableness. I think Judge McHugh said that he thought that must be the case. And went on to say even if that were the case, he didn't think that the Chelsea decision was so. But I don't think we ever determined that there was a right of reasonability.

MS. BLUE: I think what Commissioner McHugh was trying to set was a standard at which point the Commission could, if it chose, to determine that a review was required -- or was allowed not required. It is true that the Commission didn't express an opinion particularly on whether that was the standard.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: There may or may not be some such standard but we never agreed that there is. Jim said he thought there might be but we never established that as a principal of our transactions.

MS. BLUE: I think that is correct.

If there are no further questions, I would like Attorney Talerman representing Easton to come forward and address the Commission. And then Attorney Talerman will be followed by Attorney LeRay who will address the Commission on behalf of MG\&E. So, Attorney Talerman.

MR. TALERMAN: Thank you, good afternoon. Happy St. Patrick's Day. Thank you for having me in.

To be just careful, we didn't technically request a hearing. We requested that you issue remedial action on the arbitration award. But we are pleased that you've invited us in.

As I understand it, as Attorney Blue has stated, it's not so much hearing today as a hearing to determine if you have authority to hold a hearing given the circumstance of arbitration. And I'll try and confine my comments to that endeavor, although I believe I'm going to have to provide some level of factual background to give you some context in which our request arises.

As you've heard, we engaged in an
arbitration with MGE regarding our surrounding community agreement. The arbitration unfolded in a very tight window. As noted in the decision of the panel, the arbitrators were clearly frustrated by the process and felt quite clearly and they expressed this, their somewhat of an inability to reach a fair result.

They did ultimately decide in MGE's favorite with misgivings and it is clear by their decision that they wished they had had the authority to split the difference, a position that the town had propose but MGE rejected.

We objected to this, Commission, the arbitration decision on several grounds. We believe you do have the authority to vacate the arbitration decision under your statutes and your rules. We believe at the very least, under your authority you have the power to direct the arbitrators to correct errors that they made with respect to your regulations regarding the arbitration.

So, with respect to some context, as
you know, § 1 subsection 8 of the Gaming Act states that an applicant, it is an applicant that "bears the responsibility to identify and mitigate all adverse impacts." This is reinforced again in § 15 of the Act, subsection 7 which states "the applicant shall" --shall -"identify the infrastructure costs to surrounding communities."

The various infrastructure costs are then laid out in your regulations regarding surrounding community agreements under 125.01(2)(b) (4) and include among issues traffic, which is a major use here, but also such issues as impacts to public safety services, housing values and a whole host of others.

Placing the burden on the applicant makes a lot of sense. It is after all their application and they have to demonstrate that the project is consistent with the Gaming Act. But I believe it also recognizes that there is really an unequal set of resources here.

An applicant has a significant amount of resources, has several years to study
and prepare a project. And a surrounding community has a window of a few short months. As it applies to an arbitration, literally a few weeks to prepare their case. So, recognizing that the burden on the applicant is an important matter as it applies to our appeal.

Our arbitration memos, which I assume have been forwarded to the Commissioners themselves and they're lengthy. And I would not recommend that you read all the way through them unless you have to because there's a lot of information. We both had exhaustive memos. Mr. LeRay did an excellent memo. We both had a set of exhibits that we provided and affidavits and otherwise.

However, whereas the town addressed a variety of the impacts that the casino would cause including impacts to our public safety departments, our police and fire departments in particular, the applicant only addressed impacts to traffic convenience.

And we believe that that was
insufficient. In other words, they just
ignored their duty under the Act to study those various aspects of impacts to the town. They're certainly cognizant of the existence of those impacts. They looked at them for Brockton. They referenced during the context of the arbitration itself that they looked at those issues in the other cities and towns across the country where they had these issues.

But they feigned ignorance here before the arbitrators by saying, well, we didn't study it because we didn't think those impacts existed. Well, we're not aware of any study they did at all. And they didn't present any information on that. Again, it was their burden to do that.

We believe the arbitrators erred by not compelling them to produce something or in other words, by not crediting the town's presentation in that regard. In other words, the arbitrators rewarded the applicant for feigning ignorance to these particular issues, a position which I don't think was appropriate. In fact, the arbitrators said that the town's position on those issues were
speculative. In fact, they weren't. And we produced real-life testimony and evidence regarding a former gaming facility, a dog track, in the neighboring town to support our conclusions, again, issues that were never studied by the applicant.

And the import of that is this is that if an applicant can just come in and feign ignorance to the things that the Gaming Act requires them to do when it comes to surrounding communities, they're going to do that every time. The arbitrators, in other words, set up a template where an applicant can come in and say, well, we didn't think there was any impacts. We didn't study them. And because of that lack of evidence, then the arbitration panel would decide accordingly. In that vein and moving onto our second concern regarding breach of the duties under the regulations, that's not what unfolded with the Longmeadow arbitration. In the Longmeadow arbitration there was a robust discussion by the arbitrators in their decision as to the impacts to public safety services.

We presented evidence and testimony regarding the direct parallels in that situation with Longmeadow.

Under your regulations regarding surrounding community agreements, the consideration of other arbitrations is deemed appropriate and encouraged to submit them. We all named our various other surrounding community agreements, arbitration decisions and submitted them for consideration.

Concerning to me and my town is that the arbitrators never made any mention whatsoever of the Longmeadow arbitration in their decision. We feel that was error. There's a direct parallel. You simply cannot reconcile the two.

I've got great respect for each of the arbitrators. I've worked with one of them. He's another municipal counsel like me. I've been before Judge Baylor before in his capacity as a judge. And I've been against the other arbitrator as he works for a firm that is consistently within the towns that $I$ represent on development projects. I just think that
they missed the boat here a little bit. And it was outcome determinative.

As to your authority, you adopt the regulations under which the arbitrations occur. They are your regulations and your regulations to enforce. And I'll point to two key areas within your umbrella jurisdiction where I think you have the authority to reach back into their arbitration and at the very least require that the arbitrators look at it again because they simply misapplied the standard.

The first is under $\S 1$ subsection 10 of the Gaming Act where it says the Commission has the power and authority -- the power and the authority granted to the Commission shall be construed as broadly as necessary for the implementation, administration and enforcement of this chapter.

Under $\$ 4$ of the Act subsection 10, the Commission can require an applicant for a position which requires a license under this chapter to apply for such license and approve or disapprove any such application or other transactions, events or processes as provided
in this chapter.
We think both of those provisions give you the authority to weigh in on this. After all, it is a binding arbitration. It is not subject to the Uniform Arbitration Act in Massachusetts. We are not suggesting that you throw it out and start anew.

We would suggest that the best course here would be to send it back to this arbitration panel or hold a hearing yourself considering a proper application of the regulations as I've set forth here today.

We are cognizant in kind of
conclusion here, and I'll take whatever questions you have, that there are far more consequential decisions perhaps regarding this particular application in Brockton. As you deliberate on their certainty or uncertainty given other casinos proposed in the area, we think it's appropriate for you to take into consideration how the various surrounding community agreements unfolded in this matter. We think it's a relevant topic to consider.

Unless you have any other questions,
that's my presentation.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What was the vote?
MR. TALERMAN: It was unanimous.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Counselor.
MR. LERAY: Good afternoon, Chairman
Crosby, Commissioners. My name is Charles
LeRay. I represent Mass Gaming and
Entertainment. And I understand from the introduction that this hearing is not about the merits of Easton's petition. It's about whether or not there should be a hearing on the petition. So, I'm going to avoid discussing the merits unless you have any questions for me on that area.

The statute and the regulations simply don't provide the Commission with the authority to do what Easton asks, vacate the arbitration panel's decision. § 4, subsection 37 authorizes you to adopt, amend or repeal regulations to implement and administer and enforce the statute.

And you've done this under that authority. And the regulations are codified at 205 CMR. 205 CMR 125.01 in particular governs
surrounding communities, how you determine what a surrounding community is, the process for surrounding community agreement, and if no agreement is reached the process for arbitration.

In particular, 205 CMR
125.01(6)(c) (12) provides that in this situation "the decision of the arbitrator shall be final and binding and shall not be subject for the review." That was a careful decision this Commission made. And it's typical of arbitration proceedings that an arbitrator's decision is rarely subject to review and any review is extremely constrained.

Easton is asking you to overturn a three-member arbitration panel's unanimous decision. They selected an arbitrator. We selected an arbitrator. They jointly selected a third arbitrator. All three participated in the arbitration hearing. All three asked questions of the parties and of their witnesses.

Their decision shows that they referenced the Commission's handbook providing
arbitration for surrounding community agreements. They unanimously voted that our best and final offer was the most fair and reasonable of the two.

Mention was made to the Chelsea attempt to do something similar, which I understand is the only time anyone has ever tried to get the Commission to overturn an arbitrator's decision in this manner.

You held a hearing on that on June
26, 2014. Chelsea claimed the arbitrator violated your regulations, selected a best and final that was inconsistent with Chapter 23 K and the regulations. In that hearing, it was clear that there is no 30A administrative appeal. There's no adjudicatory hearing process in play here because of 30 A .

As Easton is doing here, Chelsea asked you to find that you have some sort of free ranging equitable power to vacate a surrounding community agreement notwithstanding the clear provisions of the regulations to the contrary. And as has been discussed,

Commissioner McHugh articulated what he thought
was the standard, the possible opening which is whatever limited equitable powers the Commission may have, it would be some inherent power to look at awards that were egregiously outside the pale of a reasoned approach to problem-solving.

There because the award did not meet that standard of being egregiously outside the pale, the Commission voted unanimously not to grant a hearing. The transcript shows that at least a couple of the Commissioners thought that Commissioner McHugh had correctly articulated a standard that one would have to satisfy to get a review in the face of a regulation that clearly says this is binding.

Here we have an arbitration panel
that issued a unanimous five-page decision. It discusses the parties' arguments, the evidence it considered, some it didn't consider, what it found persuasive or not. They were presented with about a three-inch thick stack of memoranda and exhibits combined by the parties plus most of the day of hearing.

They had a fairly short window in
which to issue decision. It's not surprising that they didn't address each and every argumentable piece of evidence put in front of them. They hit the things that they thought were important to provide a reason for their decision. And it concluded by articulating how they decided that MG\&Es best and final was the more fair and reasonable under the circumstances.

That decision is simply not egregious beyond the pale of a reasoned approach. Had the arbitrator selected the town's best and final, Easton certainly would be vigorously opposing any attempt to re-open that award. They are trying to get a second bite at the apple, a bite that the statute, the regulations and equity don't allow them.

So, we respectfully ask that you deny the request and leave in place the arbitration's panel unanimous decision selecting MG\&E's best and final as the most fair and reasonable. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you.

```
Questions first of all?
```

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I would actually ask you to address some of the merits of what Mr. Talerman had argued to us and appeared in the letter appeal.

MR. LERAY: Do you have any particular questions you'd like me to answer?

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: For example that the arbitrators did not address except in the summary in almost dismissive form the issue of the impact of the development on police and fire services.

MR. LERAY: So, the first that we knew that there was a police and fire question was the eve of the arbitration. During the entire negotiating process, the only concern that was raised by the town was traffic.

We knew from our experience with other operations that our operations typically do not cause public safety crime, other issues. So, we assumed that there wouldn't -- Well, we thought there wouldn't be any. And in discussions with the town they were free to raise anything.

The town's position is that we have
to prove the negative. We should have undertaken a study of their fire service, undertaken a study of their police service, undertaken a study of their tax basis and figured out that they were chronically underfunded and done all of this analysis with no suggestion from the town that there was a problem.

I don't think that's what the regulations require. It's absurd to say we have to prove the negative across-the-board. Had they raised that issue earlier, we would have had something in the record earlier.

In the course of the hearing, we contested whether the police and fire chief's last-minute affidavits were adequate. I will tell you that $I$ have a history as a police officer. So, I was able to ask some questions and point out some issues in his affidavit. As the arbitrator said in their decision, they ultimately found that what the town presented was unpersuasive.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: What about the Longmeadow -- failure to take into account
the Longmeadow arbitration?
MR. LERAY: So, the argument about Longmeadow at its core is the number -- the percentage of vehicle trips at issue in Longmeadow is similar to the percentage at issue here and therefore Longmeadow is a template. That's like me saying there are four Commissioners. There are four people in a barbershop quartet. Therefore you must be able to harmonize. It's not a rational argument.

The actual basis are very different. Longmeadow has Route 91 going through it, which has a chronic history of traffic problems in one area. It has one alternative route, Route 5. So, if anything goes wrong on 91 , everybody has to go through Longmeadow as their detour.

Here we have 24 going north and south through Brockton bringing the bulk of the traffic to and from the facility. 24 has a lower crash history than the average of all Massachusetts highways. If 24 is closed down, you have parallel to it to the east 27 and two roadways in West Bridgewater.

And in Easton, you have 123 which
would nick a corner of Easton and get you farther up onto 24. Easton's traffic consultants' entire premise was let's look at the traffic coming to and from the south. Let's assume that 50 percent of that traffic decides not to be on Route 24 every day but decides to go through the parallel towns. And then let's distribute it through Easton not as though it was coming from the south or the west, but let's pretend it organically grew up in Easton, the same way traffic grows up in Easton every day from residents and business there.

So, they had traffic from the north part of Easton heading south to go through five bad intersections rather than taking the direct route to the casino. It's simply a different situation.

MR. TALERMAN: If I may,
Commissioner Macdonald. I apologize if I call
you Your Honor. I don't know what's appropriate.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD:
Commissioner, I'm proud of that and it's also
current.
MR. TALERMAN: Old habits, I
suppose. This may be why we need a hearing. Those statements are 75 percent false. They never engaged us in any kind of discussion regarding impacts.

And again what he is suggesting is a flipping of the burden that we have to come up with potential impacts. During our -- It was ultimately resolved short of an arbitration, during our negotiation with Raynham, all of those issues were discussed robustly between the applicant parks at the time and the town. They studied those issues in other towns. Again, the statute requires them to look at those things.

They never looked at it once. And to feign surprise on the eve of a hearing that we exercised our right to raise issues that the regulations explicitly state that they should have studied to begin with is indeed the core problem here.

As to Longmeadow, I think he gives it short script. We provided extensive
evidence regarding direct parallels. As to the one roadway, their own traffic analyst said 75 percent of all vehicle trips are heading directly to and directly from a roadway that serves as a major artery for the town of Easton.

I don't want to get too deep into the weeds here on the facts but if we're going to have a hearing on that let's have a hearing on it because that was giving a short scripts to everything.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Other questions?
Do we have reflections on the issues here, anybody?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think the issue is not the facts. The issue is if in fact this process was egregiously outside the pale and I am not persuaded that it was.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else?
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: That is my conclusion as well. As with most things that Judge Commissioner McHugh did, I find myself following way behind him but in his footsteps and impressed by how he resolved the issues.

And under circumstances like this where the regulations did not provide an avenue of appeal and where the regime appears to be one without question that anticipates that there is no appeal from an arbitration, in the interest of the overall efficiency of the licensing process, as standard as demanding as Judge McHugh articulated.

Again, whether the award is egregiously outside the pale of a reasoned approach to problem-solving, I was struck most by the decision itself, by the arbitration panel. It was well articulated. It identified the weaknesses in MG\&E's presentation as well as the strengths of MG\&E's presentation. And most significantly, in my review of it, it identified the traffic issues as ones that were most front and center as likely partner to the adverse impacts of the casino on Easton.

And the arbitrators' decision essentially was one that they found the MG\&E traffic analysis to be more persuasive and giving substantial deference to the basis of those conclusions as being ones that fall
within the expertise of State Department of Transportation.

Clearly, the panel was pained that they felt that there were some weaknesses to the MG\&E presentation. But the regime is one that they had to choose one or the other. And they made a hard decision and chose it. And the fact that the decision was one in which it basically held Easton to the same terms of surrounding community agreements as earlier negotiated with all the other surrounding communities that to me strongly suggests that there's an inherent equitableness to the outcome of the Easton proceedings.

So, I don't see that there's a basis for making such a significant exception to the statutory and regulatory structure that has been created here for resolving these disputes. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I would agree with Commissioner Macdonald's assessment. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I tend to as well with one other important caveat I think that raises the standard for us intervening is the fact that the law gives the cities and towns,
the surrounding communities another bite at this apple.

If it turns out that there is in fact a mistake or if it turns out that the town is right that there really is a public safety demand or any of the other significant issues, they have the opportunity to come back to the community mitigation fund based on real experience.

That does not apply to the licensee. If the licensee turns out to have been overly generous, they don't get to take it back.

So, I think to me that makes the standard even higher to justify our intervening. So, I would come to the same conclusion the others have expressed. I guess we could vote.

MS. BLUE: So, if you would vote -If it is the consensus of the Commission to vote to deny a hearing, then that would be the motion and the vote.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: So moved.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any further
discussion? All in favor, aye.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously. Thank you. We have one more item. And that would be Director Wells for Investigations and Enforcement Bureau, two more items.

MS. WELLS: Good afternoon,
Commissioners. Two matters on the agenda for you this afternoon. The first is for your consideration the suitability of a qualifier for Penn National. It's Jane Scaccetti. In April 2015, Ms. Scaccetti was appointed a member of the Board of Directors and the chair of the audit committee for Penn National, thereby was deemed a qualifier by the Massachusetts Gaming Commission.

She has submitted all of the required forms and supplemental document requests to the IEB. And investigators conducted the rigorous background check that is a protocol for qualifiers for our casinos.

She was interviewed in person by the IEB State Police and financial investigators as part of that protocol. And investigators also conducted a financial responsibility evaluation with positive results.

Ms. Scaccetti attended Temple University where she was awarded a BA in business administration. She also obtained a master's degree in taxation from Villanova University. She has been employed by Drucker and Scaccetti since 1990 and currently holds the title of shareholder and Chief Executive Officer. Drucker and Scaccetti provides tax and financial consulting services to businesses, organizations and high net worth individuals.

She disclosed in her application materials she's been licensed or registered to participate in some form of gaming in 16 jurisdictions in the United States. We did confirm the key gaming license in West Virginia, by the Ohio Casino Control

Commission, the Ontario Alcohol and Gaming Commission, the Indiana Gaming Commission, the

Nevada Gaming Commission. She also has a racing license as a key person from the Maine Gambling Control Board. She's an official with the Pennsylvania Racing Commission.

All of Ms. Scaccetti's licenses were in good standing. And all jurisdictions contacted reported no derogatory information relating to her licensure.

She holds a certified public accounting license. This license was initially issued in 1978 and was last renewed December 22, 2015. There is no record of any disciplinary actions taken against Ms. Scaccetti. She has held various directorships in the course of her career. Aside from the Penn National Gaming Board, she's been on the Board of Directors of the Pep Boys, a trustee at Temple University Hospital, a trustee at Temple University Health System, a trustee of Temple University, on the Board of Directors of Mathematica Policy research, a trustee of Salas University among others.

During the course of the investigation, no significant issues were
uncovered related to her application for licensure. The IEB has no concerns regarding her suitability. She demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence she is suitable for approval as a casino qualifier.

I'd like to thank Trooper Dean
Cerullo and financial investigator Monica Chang for conducting the investigation. And the IEB is recommending that the Commission make a finding of suitability for Ms. Scaccetti. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you, questions comments, anybody?

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: She seems like a very impressive person.

MS. WELLS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do we have a
motion? We need a motion, right?
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes, we do. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr.

Chairman, I would move that the Commission approve Jane Scaccetti as a casino qualifier. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any discussion?

All in favor, aye.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously.

MS. WELLS: The next item on the agenda, I'd like to bring up Trooper Brian Talbot who was the primary investigator along with Monica Chang and Marlin Polite is here as well for the financial side. I'd also like to thank Ed Jay and Ferdinand Pellegrino who were the financial investigators on the individuals in this matter.

Before you today is the suitability determination for a gaming vendor primary license for Modern Gaming East, a gaming primary entity. The president of Modern Gaming East, Mr. deGrandmaison has asked me to communicate to the Commission he would have liked to be here today for the consideration of his license application, but he had a family commitment involving a teacher conference with his sons.

So, he was not available to be here today. He wanted to communicate to the Commission that he realizes that his license is a privilege. He thanks the IEB and the Commission for their work on the application. So, in summary, Modern Gaming East is the applicant before you today. There is one entity and two individual qualifiers who were subject to the suitability investigation. The investigators conducted that investigation based on the standards set forth in Massachusetts General Laws 23K sections 12,16 and 31 as well as 205 CMR 134.10.

Modern Gaming East is a New Jersey based corporation -- pardon me, company that acts as a sales agent and a representative of Konami Gaming which was before you previously and recently awarded gaming primary license for Massachusetts.

To date, Modern Gaming has acted as a sales agent for Konami with respect to Konami equipment purchased for use at the Plainridge Park Casino, our Category 2 licensee. It also occasionally purchases used gaming equipment
typically from casinos for resale.
Mr. deGrandmaison who I previously referenced is the president and 50 percent owner. And Mr. Tessmer is the vice president and 50 percent owner. And those are the two individual qualifiers for the Modern Gaming. To date, they've conducted business in Massachusetts pursuant to a temporary license which was initially issued in March 2015 pursuant to 205 CMR 134.12.

As part of the investigation, the IEB among other things reviewed the materials submitted as part of the application, supplemental documentation, a variety of other record checks and interviews. The applicant was fully cooperative and forthcoming in all respects with respect to this investigation.

The entity is currently licensed by
the New Jersey Division of Gaming Enforcement and the New York Racing and Wagering Board.

And its licenses are in good standing.
There was a settlement with the New Jersey Control Commission in 2008. The investigation revealed it did not reflect
systemic deficiencies in the applicant's operations. And therefore we are not recommending that that impede licensure.

Modern Gaming has no criminal record. The investigation discovered no civil litigation naming the entity as a defendant. Research available online and print media surfaced minimal media coverage and no derogatory or negative information was identified.

The IEB also evaluated Modern Gaming for financial stability, integrity and background by performing financial analysis and verification of their financial information, and did not undercover any derogatory information that indicates that the applicant did not possess the requisite financial stability, integrity and background to be licensed as a gaming vendor primary.

The IEB also performed the requisite background suitability investigations of Mr. deGrandmaison and Mr. Tessmer, both qualifiers for Modern Gaming by virtue of their 50 percent ownership in the company and their positions as
president and vice president respectively.
After performing all of the requisite inquiries and database checks, no facts were discovered that would disqualify either of those individuals from licensure by the Commission.

In conclusion taking into
consideration the entirety of the investigation, the IEB recommends the Commission approve the application of Modern Gaming East, LLC for licensure as a gaming vendor primary. Investigators are here if you have any questions.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: When was the company incorporated?

MR. TALBOT: It was in 2004.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any questions?
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No, just a comment that it's a well-prepared report, wellwritten, congratulations. I commend Investigator Chang and Trooper Talbot. I know this is a very different style of investigation. Very well done, clean report.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else?

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I gather there have been no issues during the period of time that they've been operating under a temporary license?

MS. WELLS: There have been on. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr.
Chairman, I would move that the Commission approve the license for gaming vendor primary for Modern Gaming East, LLC a.k.a. MGE.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
discussion?
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Just maybe add to that also -- unless that needs to be a separate vote with regard to the two qualifiers Mr. deGrandmaison and Mr. Tessmer.

MS. BLUE: I think you can add that to the motion and do it altogether.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Then we so do.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: With that
addition, amendment, any further discussion? All in favor, aye.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All opposed? The
ayes have it unanimously. Anything else? Do we have a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So moved.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor, aye.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Unanimous.
(Meeting adjourned at 1:56 p.m.)
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