	Page 1
1	COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
2	MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION
3	PUBLIC MEETING #146
4	
5	
6	CHAIRMAN
7	Stephen P. Crosby
8	
9	COMMISSIONERS
10	James F. McHugh
11	Gayle Cameron
12	Bruce W. Stebbins
13	Enrique Zuniga
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	March 5, 2015 10:31 a.m.
22	MASSMUTUAL CENTER
23	1277 Main Street, Rooms 1 and 2
24	Springfield, Massachusetts 01144

PROCEEDINGS

2

1

3

4

6

5

7

8

9

11

12

1314

15

16

1718

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right, ladies and gentlemen, if we can have your attention, call to order the 146th meeting of the Mass Gaming Commission on March 5th, today, at the MassMutual center in Springfield.

Commissioner McHugh is a few minutes We're going to go ahead, he'll be here shortly. I think we do have some representatives of the city here, Councilor Pikula and, I believe, Councilor Hannifan, right? Nice to have you here. It's very exciting for us to be out here. I know we actually -- Commissioner Zuniga and I saw Mayor Sarno on the street on our way over here and waved. But he didn't -- he didn't recognize us, but, please, tell him on our behalf that we are really excited about what's happening out here. I know the governor has been out here and has ex -- spoken enthusiastically about this project. You've heard us all, many times, talk about what an incredible opportunity we think this is, what

a -- the collaboration between MGM and the city to put this together has been extraordinary. I know that Kevin Kennedy and Mayor Sarno will keep everybody's pedal to the medal, which is great, as will Mr. Mathis. So we're just -- we're excited about this, and please give our regards and appreciation to the mayor and his team for -- for moving this project along.

Let's start with Item No. 2 on the agenda, which is the approval of minutes. In the absence of Mr. McHugh, I will ask Treasurer Zuniga to lead us.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you,
Mr. Chair. The minutes for February 15 are in
the packet, and I would move that they be
approved, subject to typographical
corrections. There's no comments.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This was the meeting that I did not attend so I will abstain from approving. Do you have a second?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any discussion?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: You talking

2.1

Page 4 about a February 5th, Commissioner? 2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. 3 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay. Yes. 4 Second. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor? 5 6 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 7 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes have it 10 three zero. 11 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Furthermore, 12 there's -- in the packet there's also the 13 minutes from February 19. I would move that -- that we approve these minutes subject 14 15 to typographical corrections. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second. 16 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any other 18 discussion? All in favor? 19 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 20 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Aye. Opposed? 23 The ayes have it unanimously four zero. 24 You know, I was just thinking, I was

commenting about the work that's going on out here, in particular we're watching it, as we're also trying to help, but watching as you all really roll up your sleeves and try to deal with issues like the treatment center and the Sheriff's office that I know everybody's working hard to relocate and that will get The parking issues, I know everybody's fixed. been working on that has been flexible. Viaduct issues would continue, but -- but we watch with interest as you all just really wrestle these issues to the ground. know they're complicated but we -- you know, we're available to do everything we possibly can do. And, again, appreciate what MGM and the mayor are doing to try to resolve these tough ones, historical commission all of them. We are on to Item No. 3, Okay. Administration. Executive Director Day. MR. DAY: Good morning, Chairman, members of the commission.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good morning.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good morning.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

1 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good

2 morning.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

MR. DAY: Welcome, with me, to Springfield. I would like to start with a short administrative update with a few items. First, I want to talk, briefly, about our license management system. Our goal for public-facing applications continues to look good as March 31st. Our staff has entered different types of applications to test the work flow, and so we are moving forward as planned in this case. But I want to note as well here, is that Penn's HR and Penn staff have been very helpful, and we plan to work continue to work with Penn directly in order to test and operate the system as we get into the initial months.

I want to note, also, yesterday, our workforce supplier and diversity -- workforce supplier diversity development, Jill Griffin, and Commissioner Stebbins met with our vendor advisory team in Plainville, had a great turnout. And then, of course they turned around and they also met with representatives

from the community colleges, the career centers, and, of course, Penn's HR group. An excellent turnout there again. And so, I know as I leave this short report

Commissioner Stebbins might have a comment or two, but it was a well attendance, and we were able to use Penn's new facility.

I want to give you a little update on project monitoring. We've been working with MGM and Wynn to present six-month schedule, or a preliminary schedule. We begin that process with MGM today, and then Wynn on March 19th. These are not complete schedules, but will provide an opportunity for the licensees and the commission to discuss their progress and challenges. Then, in April, Wynn and MGM will begin the process of quarterly reports. We already got Penn scheduled, but Wynn will join -- Wynn and MGM will also join that process.

Just a couple notes on racing.

Dr. Lightbown, Commissioner Cameron was there
as well. Yesterday, we had our first
workgroup meeting to discuss Lasik and our

2.1

procedures and -- as well, and blood gas testing. We have a great group, I think, assembled to take a look at that and give us their thoughts and recommendations on the procedure. And we anticipate being to able to do that and make any changes we need before racing begins on April 1. We've also made offers on all our positions this year for racing, and their backgrounds are pending as we move forward.

We've also been working on our budget and operations plan for the balance of fiscal year '15, and plan quarterly budget report, request for adjustments and assessment recommendations for our March 19th meeting.

We've also been working on goals development for a high-performance project, and our efforts to improve communication and efficiency. We are, at the same time, beginning to develop the fiscal -- fiscal '16 budget at the same time.

We have been successful in finding qualified candidates who will interview for our gaming lab manager position, so we're

2.1

retaining some optimism from this group. We may very well find our -- our lab manager for Massachusetts. We've also had over 200 applicants for our gaming agent positions for the slot parlor, and we began interviews of the supervisor positions here this week. And then, in addition, we've had 10 applications for our attorney position.

Today, with your -- in your packet, we are asking for final approval for the racehorse development and vendor reporting requirements. We're also asking for the formal process to begin to address operating certificate, which, essentially, preopening regulations. And then, as well, progressive slots, voucher systems, and this G2S, or the communication protocol question that also arose before the commission.

We are finishing regulation packages so you can anticipate to see these as well relative to the internal control's final approval, the alcohol beverage control, minors' protection, hearing process, exclusion lists and gaming equipment. So our agenda

2.1

here to take a look at regulations as we can put in place before Penn opens continues here the end of this month. So that brings us to Item 3D, which is about the classification policy.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Ask one question, Rick.

MR. DAY: Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It looks there's a pretty good chance there'll be racing in Suffolk Downs, at least, whatever the 50/50 chance. How -- how big a deal is that for us to do our part, our ramping up for that; are we prepared to do that, if we need to?

MR. DAY: We will need time to be able to identify candidates to fill the positions and get some -- get part-time people available to do that. But we are anticipating that so we -- we believe we have the budget to be able to handle those part-time positions as we go forward. And we're also -- HR is going forward with interviews for assistants, veterinary assistants, so that we have some positions identified in case thoroughbred

2.1

Page 11 1 racing goes ahead. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. 3 MR. DAY: So what --4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You're getting 5 briefed tomorrow, right on --6 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes. 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Do you 8 know -- if it did happen, do we know when it 9 would -- the start would be? 10 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No. At this 11 point, the legislature would have to amend 12 before any agreement can be finalized. 13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yep. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So they're --14 15 they're moving, they tell me, quickly to try 16 to do that. Hopefully, this month. But from what I understand, they're not looking to race 17 18 early in the season. 19 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. 20 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So I think we 21 would have some time, if, in fact, an 22 agreement can be put together. 23 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.

MR. DAY: And I think if I got the

whisper right from this side of table, 60 days would, of course, be a reasonable time, I think, to be able to get the staff put together.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's probably worth making sure that they -- those folks know, because they won't be mindful of our needs, you know. And it's predictable that we'll end up having to move faster than they want, so giving them our perspective and being teed up as best you can, I think is probably well-advised.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But they'll have to make a decision before March 31st, right, the legislature?

MS. BLUE: The simulcasting legislation runs out on March 31st.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right.

MS. BLUE: To extend that, they will need to make a decision.

MS. BLUE: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- we -- we hopefully will find out -- you know, we'll 2 3 have a big data point before March 31st. 4 MS. BLUE: We should, yes. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 5 Probably. Right. 6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But, you know, 7 notwithstanding all the comments. 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Great. 9 MR. DAY: So that brings us to 10 Item 3, unless there are any other questions. 11 Bruce, I don't know if you had a comment 12 either, about the -- yesterday's meeting. 13 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: No. 14 real quickly, our vendor advisory group met 15 with the new purchasing people that Penn has 16 brought on board, and the folks at Penn probably took my instructions much too 17 18 literally when I said, you know, it would be 19 great to have a detailed listing of what 20 you're looking to shop for, because they even 21 had a item about 100,000 lobster-shaped key 22 chains, for some reason, but glad it was on 23 the list, so we're moving with that.

And we, also, in the afternoon, as

you mentioned, we had a meeting with respect to workforce. They have gotten about 300 --3,888 applications for 500 jobs. One of the interesting and maybe scariest statistics that stick out -- stuck out was they planned to hire 300 people in a 45-day window. So that should be of note to us for licensing purposes, and registration purposes --CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Wow. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: -- but that's their time frame. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And when is that 45 days? COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: They haven't set an official date from opening, but it's

kind of working back from that.

Preopening, 45 --CHAIRMAN CROSBY:

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: -- days

preopening? Oh, okay. So --

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: So a 45-day

window, 300 people.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: More or less,

24 middle of May?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well, I would think they'd need time to train employees, so I suspect it would be earlier than that,
Mr. Chair.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: And it's going to be various levels. It's going to be chefs down to, you know, the hospitality and culinary help, and wait service, et cetera.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. Great.

Well, that's what this is all about, right?

Jobs. So that's where -- that's what this is all about.

know some of these updates are very, really, up-to-the-minute, some of what you were talking about is -- really took place yesterday. But I would really benefit from a written report as part of the packet, or ever in anticipation to -- you know, to these meetings. So I would ask that you send me some of that in the future.

MR. DAY: I will do that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.

MR. DAY: Any other questions? That

2.1

brings us to Item 3D, the classification 2 policy. Just as we move forward this -- this 3 is actually -- we made it look like an 4 administrative item itself, but it's of great 5 interest and importance to our policy 6 structure with the commission, because it will help set a solid line for our hiring and for 7 8 our career people. As people join the 9 commission and people -- gives a future look 10 for everybody that goes to work for the 11 commission. So we -- Trupti's here to explain 12 it to us, and Dean as well, and we would 13 appreciate your support. Thank you. 14 MS. BANDA: Good morning. 15 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: 16 Good 17 morning. 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good morning. 19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good morning. 20 MS. BANDA: Good morning, 2.1 Commissioners and Chair. So I'm here with 22 And Dean, myself, a few members of the 23 senior team work with the high-performance 24 team on developing this classification and

compensation project.

The purpose of the salary structure that we developed is to have a -- you know, competitive and equitable salary structure for staff so that we can actually provide a cap on the range paid for a particular job. So we actually have some parameters and boundaries to work with in looking at these jobs, looking at the salary ranges and the skill set.

The definition of the salary range and salary structure establishes a minimum and a maximum, and we are willing to pay for the jobs for a specific job, and spans between various different groups that we've developed. And I believe that there's a packet has the salary structures and, actually, a brief descriptor on what that specific salary structure entails, or the skill set entails for that salary structure. And we used a variety of reference -- references in general to compile the compensation. So we looked at city ratings Massachusetts wide, city of Boston, pay scales, other proprietary data, commonwealth Open Checkbook, Pennsylvania

Gaming Commission, Foxwood and Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics to compile these salary ranges and data based on skill set, background, years of experience and such.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Trupti, can
I ask you --

MS. BANDA: Sure.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: -- why you included Foxwoods?

MS. BANDA: Well, it's just one of the data points that we're looking at, because it -- it is a casino. We wanted to be broad with our search -- broad with our data points, you know, so we will look at, private, public and different industries as well so --

In addition, each job was evaluated to determine appropriate FLSA, Fair -- Fair Labor Standard Act classification of exempt and nonexempt positions. So those salaries are eligible for overtime, or salaries which are not eligible for overtime, based on the testing that we have to do, based on the skill set of the role.

All elements of the plan will be

reviewed on an annual basis. It's important to revisit the salary structure at least once a year to -- and take a look at what the market is doing, reviewing current job descriptions to ensure they are up to date, conduct job evaluations on all new positions, and adjust a salary structure based on changes in the market and taking a look at that.

So with that, that brings us to the salary structure that we developed -- or that was developed, and I believe that's in your packet with the minimum and the maximum.

And --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I had a question before we get -- we got to that, Trupti.

MS. BANDA: Sure.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The prior slide says conduct job evaluations on all new procedures. And, you know, that -- that's great, but we're also doing our year evaluation, and we're not meaning here to exclude, you know, the evaluation of every position.

MS. BANDA: Exactly. So we would be looking -- on an annual basis, we would look at, as part of our performance management process, taking a look at each employee's job and how it has changed, because as an agency the roles and responsibility will change. So taking a look at that and making appropriate market adjustments when required, and also taking a look at new jobs and -- using the tools that have been identified as the methodology that will be used to develop a salary range for that particular job.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right.

MS. BANDA: Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah, I had a question. I guess I was surprised, in looking at this chart, at the range itself for a particular job classification. I just -- I guess I'm not -- I was surprised to see the very large difference in range with the same classification. Is that common? I know -- I think it's a little bit uncommon in state government. But it -- I know I saw all the other -- all of the other data points that you

used to -- to put together in this -- this chart. Could you just -- just struck me as a large difference.

MS. BANDA: So some of them are similar, and it does give us a lower midpoint and a higher -- a lower minimum salary, and it gives us the bandwidth to go to a higher, upper end of the salary, so that's one of them. But I will turn this part -- piece of the question over to Dean, as he's certified in the comp component and can articulate that a little.

MR. VENTOLA: It just gives you a little bit more flexibility in terms of establishing your salaries. So the -- the low point is the minimum that we would be willing to pay for a particular position, and then the maximum would be the most that we -- we would be willing to pay for that position. And where somebody falls within that range depends upon their performance, their years of experience, whether they're new to the job, been on the job five years and -- and it also provides a guideline for a way to cap that

2.1

Page 22 1 job. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But the purpose of 3 this is not to give us flexibility. I mean, 4 that, maybe, is one of them. But the whole 5 points is do, sort of, a best practice. 6 What's the market bare? So Commissioner 7 Cameron's question was, is this unusual to do 8 this kind of a range? 9 In my experience, no. MR. VENTOLA: CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's not? 10 11 MR. VENTOLA: No. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. 13 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: In the 14 private sector, it's not. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. 16 MR. VENTOLA: Unh-unh. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: How do these 18 compare with the -- what the state's --19 MS. BANDA: That was one of the --CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I know that's one 20 21 of your data points, but specific that's -- if 22 we're going to be compared to anybody, that's 23 who we're going to get compared to. Where are

they? Where are we in relationship to that

1 today?

MS. BANDA: Again, that is one of the data points. And, you know, we also are unique in the type of skill set we would be looking for with the casino experience. And so, we had to be flexible and competitive.

So, in some cases we -- we do have to go outside of the state ranges for certain positions. So that's exactly the reason why we actually did this project, so that we can have it aligned with what the agency's needs are, but also keeping in mind, some of the state guidelines, and really developing our own.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I was updated to -- on these, and I've been part of that subgroup that looked at this, and they -- they are, indeed, comparable to a lot of the state positions.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So it's not -- if somebody's looking at this and comparing, does the state have a similar list?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well there's everybody in the Open Checkbook, and we can

1 look by agency and we can by position. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: No. But, I mean, 3 is there a classification structure that is 4 similar to this? 5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yep. 6 MR. DAY: Yes, there is. 7 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So if somebody's 9 comparing them, we don't look wildly different? 10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 11 No. No. No. 12 MS. BANDA: We're not enormous 13 outliers in this. We're right there. Right. If we were 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 15 and we had to be, that would be fine. 16 just -- in anticipation of --COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 17 The big 18 conclusion, as far -- as I take it, is that 19 we're very much in line with our current 20 salaries and the current ranges, and the 21 comparisons to other -- other agencies, 22 including some in the public -- in the private 23 sector. But, certainly, in the public sector. 24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Great.

1 MS. BANDA: Okay.

2.1

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

MS. BANDA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The only -- the only other question I had -- I don't know that I've ever really seen one of these before, and I was sort of surprised that in the descriptions it didn't say anything about, like, management responsibility, or clerical, or, you know, no person responsible for budgets. Is -- is that kind of -- is that kind of substantive content, numbers a person's managed, you know, that kind of thing, is that not typically part of these descriptions?

MS. BANDA: When you start getting into the granular details, you would consider those factors.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MS. BANDA: But with this, this is a fraud-based, high-level, you know, in an executive or senior level manager, developing strategy and identifying the direction of that particular agency or department, and it could

1 go for a variety of different types of 2 positions. From finance to legal to -- so we 3 didn't want to get into the specifics of that. 4 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Although, some 5 of that is summarized here. 6 MS. BANDA: Yes. 7 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I mean, if you 8 look at 12, certainly, for example --9 MS. BANDA: Right. 10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- compared to 11 13. 12 MS. BANDA: There are some who have 13 that piece. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 14 There -- you 15 know, there's a key department, the management 16 for the key department in No. 12 would be the equivalent of our directors. 17 18 MS. BANDA: Right. You know, 19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 20 there's slightly more expertise, perhaps, a 21 senior management on -- on the step above, and that -- that could be the differentiator. 22 23 But -- but yes, a lot of the granularity gets 24 into different job descriptions. This is --

this is meant to be fitting of all directors, of all managers, all staff.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

follow-up, that was the question I had, is that, you know, for slots, you know, 12 down to about nine, and they look too much grouped in having the same definition that I don't know how clear that's going to be for a candidate in terms of where you're going to place them because, you know, a difference of, you know, 10 or \$12,000 by, you know, a small variation in the description, I know you're looking for flexibility, but some of the descriptions look too similar as I was reading the description.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Like seven and eight, how do you distinguish between seven and eight?

MS. BANDA: This particular salary is a -- actually, an agency internal tool, and then taking into consideration the candidate's background, and then taking a look at some of these data points and mapping out the actual

job details to determine, actually, the range so -- or for that particular job.

MR. VENTOLA: You wouldn't -- you wouldn't look at the -- the jobs within that specific group to determine the nuances. So there's -- although the descriptors are similar, you would look at the content of the jobs that have been approved within that range, and you could see some of the nuances from -- from one range to the next.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But one -- one thing we could easily do, because we have that information, is add some granularity to the -- that's still summary level, to some of the descriptions here. For example, the one that Commissioner Stebbins and Chair Crosby were identifying, you know, to -- to call out the differences between seven and eight, for example.

MS. BANDA: We can certainly build more detail underneath it for our descriptor.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It's

available, it's just not represented here.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. All right.

2.1

Page 29 1 Any other discussion? I believe we need a 2 votes on this. Commissioner Zuniga? Sure. 3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I would 4 move that the commission accept and adopt the 5 classification and compensation plan as 6 presented here in the packet today. 7 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second. 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Subject to 9 whatever additional --10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah, subject to additional I mean -- yeah, subject to 11 12 reflecting of additional information that's 13 available as -- in order to make it more user friendly. 14 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any other discussion? All in favor? 16 Aye. 17 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 18 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 19 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 21 have it unanimously. Thank you. 22 MS. BANDA: Thank you. 23 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you. 24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Item No. 4,

Page 30 1 Research and Problem Gambling, 2 Director Vander Linden. 3 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Good morning, 4 Commissioners. 5 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning. 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good morning. 7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good morning. 8 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good 9 morning. 10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good morning. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Speak into the 12 mic. 13 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes. Okay. March is National Problem Gambling Awareness 14 15 Month. Really, it's a month to highlight a 16 couple things, really. One, highlighting what are -- what are the true impacts of -- of a 17 18 gambling disorder? What are the devastating 19 effects to gambling disorder? Not only to the 20 individual, but the ripple effects happen to 2.1 the -- to the family and to the community. 22 think it provides a good, sobering insight 23 into what those impacts are. 24 It also, and kind of the other side

of this, it provides an opportunity to highlight some of the really innovative, amazing work, amazing people that are doing this work. I think that we've seen some of that already this month.

Earlier this week Chairman Crosby,

Commissioner Zuniga and I went to -- were here
in Springfield to -- for a meeting and then a
press conference at the Massachusetts Counsel
on Compulsive Gambling in the New England

Consortium on Problem Gambling, where we took
a look at and convened -- or they did, I
should say, regulators, advocates, the
industry, bringing them together to say this
is a common -- a common issue of common
concern.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All the stakeholders. You know, Attorney general was represented, Department of Public Health, mental health from Connecticut. It was an attempt to pull together all the stakeholders, and got pretty good turnout. It was good.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ VANDER LINDEN: So the -- the theme of that -- of that effort was that

2.1

1 gambling disorders has no borders. I think 2 borders, when they're speaking of it, includes 3 differences between all of the different 4 interested parties in this, but it also is 5 geographic borders. It included -- I think 6 the New England Consortium includes members 7 from several New England states. 8 going to be to remember them all right now. But I -- I think that it, overall, was 9 10 highlighting the need, and it was call for 11 action to say, we really do need to take a 12 look at this issue. It's something that 13 affects the entire -- the entire region, and 14 what can we do about it? Mark, just give me 15 one minute. 16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Trupti. Trupti, 17 are you getting ready to leave? 18 MS. BANDA: Yeah. 19 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Would you just 20 wait one second, because I may want to ask you 2.1 something about this next topic? 22 MS. BANDA: Sure. 23 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thanks. Sorry. 24 MR. VANDER LINDEN: It's okay. One

of the things we've been focusing on here in 2 our relationship with the department of public 3 health is, really, what are the -- the 4 barriers for people to access help? Reducing 5 as many barriers as we possibly can. 6 somebody is interested -- somebody with a 7 gambling disorder is interested in getting 8 help, making sure that they don't -- they don't have to go -- go exactly to the right 9 10 person or exactly the right place in order to 11 get that help. And I think that that 12 translates well to the work that's being done 13 by Dr. Sarah Nelson, the Cambridge Health Alliance division on addiction, with their 14 15 National Screening Day. I'm going to let 16 her -- turn it over to Dr. Nelson, and let her tell you a little more about the National 17 18 Screening Day and the work that they're doing 19 to reduce barriers for people to get help. 20 Thank you, Mark. DR. NELSON: Thank 2.1 you, commissioners and chair. 22 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good morning. 23 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good 24 morning.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good morning.

DR. NELSON: It's my pleasure to share with you the efforts we're making at the division on addiction at Cambridge Health Alliance to prepare for gambling expansion in Massachusetts and promote awareness of problem gambling and gambling disorder.

At the division, our work around gambling includes conducting basic research, working to disseminate the most up-to-date gambling research in ways that are accessible to everyone, and engaging in educational and outreach activities that inform the public and behavioral health providers about gambling, gambling problems, and gambling disorder.

As part of these efforts, we've provided training to providers within the Cambridge Health Alliance about gambling assessment and treatment for gambling disorders. We also, last year, incorporated a gambling theme into our continuing medical education conference, Addiction Medicine.

We've also worked collaboratively with the Massachusetts council on compulsive

2.1

1

gambling to provide research luncheons to inform the public about our gambling work.

3

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

And, finally, we've published for many, many years a free weekly research review called The Wager, which is the weekly addiction and gambling education review, that takes a recent academic article about gambling and summarizes it for a nonacademic audience.

Overall, we're calling our program of research, education and outreach activities as they relate to Massachusetts gambling expansion CHARGE, for the Cambridge Health Alliance Readiness for Gambling Expansion initiative.

So as Mark said, and you know, March is National Problem Gambling Awareness Month. And during this month, the division, and many other interested key stakeholders around the country, are promoting awareness and education programs to help people understand and identify gambling related problems.

One of primary events that we're promoting is our second annual gambling disorder screening day, on March 10th this

year. We decided to promote brief screening specifically because it's an extremely valuable public health tool that can make a positive public health impact through identifying people who might be struggling with gambling-related problems, and can also create awareness among providers who might have limited experience with the issue.

Gambling disorders are a low base rate disorder in the general population, but at the same, we know that meaningful numbers of treatment seekers of all kinds struggle with this problem. Gambling disorder rates are higher in treatment populations than in the general population, and, most importantly, we know that very few people with gambling problems seek treatment specifically for those gambling problems. So people with gambling problems are most likely to show up in treatment for something else, often substance use problems, mental health issues or physical ailments. That makes screening for gambling disorder particularly important among these treatment providers.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

1

2

4

5

6

8

7

9

10

11

1213

14

15

1617

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Gambling disorder screening day is an opportunity to change the situation. To promote this screening day, we've created a gambling disorder screening toolkit, and for the past two years we've launched a grassroots campaign to recruit supporters and participating organizations to participate in screening day.

Last year, the screening day on March 11, 2014 was successful in raising awareness about gambling disorder and promoting screening and other activities across the nation. The proactive support for promoting this day was greater than we anticipated. Many organizations provided meaningful promotional support, and the division was able to recruit many organizations to screen for gambling disorder on screening day and beyond. Partners who hadn't previously screened for gambling disorder identified more than 10 percent of patients as being at risk for gambling disorder in some of their practices, and were able to refer those folks for further

1 assessment.

2.1

Supporting organizations promoted gambling disorder screening day in a variety of ways, including e-mailing their distribution lists, press releases, news-letter announcements, editorials, distribution of screening resources, public calendar posts, social media announcements, Web page postings, screening magnets and invitations to promote the day at public forums.

We've, again, been extremely pleased this year with the way that people have received the idea of a gambling disorder screening day, and several organizations across the country and beyond have worked again to promote March 10th this year as gambling disorder screening day.

The organizations so far include the Massachusetts Council on Compulsive gambling, which has organized local providers to screen, and has provided supporting materials. The Bureau of Substance Abuse Services,

Massachusetts Department of Public Health, The

National Center for Responsible Gaming, The
University of Nevada Las Vegas International
Gaming Institute, The Association of Problem
Gambling Service Administrators, UCLA Gambling
Studies Program, New Hampshire Council on
Problem Gambling, and the social and economic
impacts of gambling in Massachusetts research
team at UMASS Amherst.

At the division, we've been working directly with several treatment provider groups to help them host their own screening events this year. These groups include, among others, Cambridge Health Alliance outpatient addiction services and psychiatry services, joining us for a second year, the North Charles Institute and the Advocates, Incorporated, also back for a second year, Boston ASAP, the Gandara Center, Mount Auburn Hospital Prevention and Recovery Center, Stepping Stone, and the Behavioral Health Network here in Springfield.

Our screening toolkit materials are freely available on our Web site, divisiononaddiction.org, and what we have

2.1

available are really four tools. The first is an easy-to-read description about what is gambling disorder. It defines gambling, the DSM-IV and five criteria for gambling disorder, and common consequences of gambling disorder.

Second, we have a document called,
Why Screen for Gambling Disorder? It really
provides information about the need for more
screening, key stakeholders who might consider
adding screening to their practice, and
details about what to expect from a mental
health screening, and what to do with those
results.

Third, we have the actual screen, which is the brief biosocial screen. It's only three questions long. And the document we have provides the screen itself and its psychometric properties.

And, finally, we have a list that we've prepared of local and national resources that provides resources available from the division, as well as agencies in Massachusetts and nationally.

So, really, we just hope that the word will continue to get out and more people in groups will join in on screening on March 10th and beyond. And, again, we picked that date because March is National Problem

Gambling Awareness Month, and brief screening for gambling disorder is an essential part of increasing awareness and helping people who have gambling problems. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Questions?

Interest? I couldn't tell, where -- where are the screenings meant to take place? Where -- where are you targeting for the screenings to take place? This is what I wanted to have Trupti here for.

DR. NELSON: Sure. Really, a variety of places. So stakeholders can include behavioral health providers, primary care providers. Last year, I believe they did a full screening in Plainville as well. The agencies we're working with most directly are substance-use agencies, so they'll be screening all of their patients who show up to

2.1

that practice on that day. There are other providers who have agreed to incorporate screening more regularly into their practice as well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But is it meant to be done by people already in the health business, at the point of health -- in some other health intervention, or are you asking companies to screen their employees and organizations to screen their employees? Is that even plausible? Is that -- is there a privacy issue? I don't know how would that work, but I wasn't quite sure, still, who all you're asking to do this --

DR. NELSON: Sure.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: -- or who you'd like to have do this.

DR. NELSON: In general, we have focused on treatment providers, but I could see with appropriate training -- again, it's just a three-item screening device. That's simple enough. The training is -- is what to do once you have those results, because it's easy to ask those three questions, and you

2.1

need to be prepared for what to do once you have a positive screen. But with the resources we've provided, I think anybody can screen and provide those referral resources, including, you know, industry as well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is that something an organization can do, or would you have to offer your employees the opportunity to be screened, if they want to, or could you require them or -- how would --

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No. I think organizations can do it. In fact, I know in my former career with the New Jersey State Police, we did it in-service, an all-day in-service that was -- a big portion of it was dedicated to health and wellness, and we had both a -- an alcohol and a gambling screen as part of that in-service.

You know, many, many casinos in New Jersey, and we had -- had an issue where some of our troopers developed an -- a problem, and we included that in a -- in an in-service.

And it was a very short, couple of questions, confidential, they didn't have to turn it in,

2.1

but just self-awareness. So, yes, organizations can, in fact, decide this is an important thing for them to offer.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So you're not -you're not shaking your head like you think
this would be something -- if this is
important, and we're saying it is, then it
seems like we ought to be thinking about how
can we use it ourselves? How can we encourage
others? You know, can we encourage people in
state government? Should see we require our
operators to screen their employees? There's
a whole range of things we can do to push
this, if we want to, and if it's appropriate
to do that.

MS. BANDA: Again, you know, this would be something I'd have to look into a little bit more, in terms of how that is delivered. As part of a health fair as one of the additional screening that an employee can do voluntarily, sure. Mandate, I'm not -- I'm not sure that, you know, I'm completely up to date on whether we can do that or not, so I'd have to look at that. But as part of a health

2.1

screening or a training, and then offering the screening, if an employee would like to take that, that -- that is something we can definitely do.

Well, it seems to CHAIRMAN CROSBY: me we ought to look into -- and this could be a maybe -- it's a little bit different for a law enforcement agency, but we are partially a law enforcement agency, you see where there would be a premium for state troopers. maybe this is something we ought to look into, Catherine, with your help, you know, to figure out is this -- you know, where are the rights and wrongs on this, and where the appropriate levels, and then decide whether we want to really be much more aggressive. We can talk to, you know, the state government about making this somehow a practice in state government. Maybe it should be combined with other things. I don't exactly know but -- but there's a tremendous potential for -- for us to move on this if -- if we decide that it's the right thing to do.

MS. BLUE: I think it certainly is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

something that we could talk to our EAP program about --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Yeah.

MS. BLUE: And have available through that. And I think they may already do that. I know Trupti can look into that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think EAP programs are mentioned in your materials.

MS. BLUE: Yeah. And I think on a statewide basis we could certainly suggest it to other commonwealth agencies that they -- whatever EAP they use, they might want to have this program be available too.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: A couple years ago, the National Center for Responsible

Gaming also developed what I think is a pretty good, thorough, comprehensive guide specifically targeted towards human resource personnel to be able to implement -- to roll out information and programs about problem gambling, and I think it's another -- another go-to point or document.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: On a practical level, is there a disincentive to having

2.1

somebody do this in writing, as opposed to the treatment provider asking the questions verbally?

Commissioner Cameron just said that, as part of their in-service day, that troopers were given the form and asked to fill it out, but not required to turn it in. That's another way of dealing -- dealing with the confidentiality piece. So are any studies to show whether you get better results if you ask it, or do what Commissioner Cameron said, as opposed to having name and date and turning the questionnaire in?

DR. NELSON: There aren't any studies specific to gambling. What I can tell you is that I believe we've done it both ways, in terms of filling it out versus having someone just ask you the questions. And they're -- you know, it's an empirical question in some ways. They're having somebody actually ask you the questions is more interactive, and they might be able to work more proactively to help hook you up with resources, if you need them. But doing it on

2.1

your own is a way to raise awareness without having this added burden of disclosing to somebody and being worried about what they might think. So I think both ways would be acceptable in terms of raising awareness.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I hear that,
but is this question -- well, maybe I'm
missing something there. Is this
questionnaire -- it has name and date on it.
Is this questionnaire designed for the person
being screened to turn it into somebody else?

DR. NELSON: For last year, for the treatments providers, they did turn it in.

So -- so for those treatment providers, they gave it to all their patients who showed up on that day and turned -- the folks turned it in, and they recorded, kind of, an aggregate what their results were in terms of how many people screened positive.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. So -so my question is, then, is there any
comparative study between that kind of a
modality, a written thing you turn in to your
treatment provider, as opposed to asking the

2.1

questions verbally and/or giving the people something that they can fill out and keep to themselves?

Confidentiality piece, it seems to me, is what I'm getting at or wondering about. Because this, particularly in a -- in an HR context, it seems to me there's a huge -- may well be a huge disincentive, I don't know, but -- to filling something out and answering these questions yes, and turning them into your employer.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: To your boss. Right.

DR. NELSON: Right.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And -- and even turning them into your health care providers, it seems to me, may be something that --

DR. NELSON: When you ask about a research study, I would suggest that the question has to be, what's the outcome that you want? Because, in terms of just raising awareness and raising personal awareness for people who might be beginning to experience

2.1

problems and not realize it, filling something out and just keeping it to themselves may be a first step in recognizing those problems.

In terms of really proactively hooking people up with treatment, then, within a treatment provider modality, if they're there for substance use treatment, then working directly with their counselor and handing it in, they may be able to be more directly pointed to the correct resources to follow-up. But I see no problem with a confidential screen, if there are worries about people disclosing and not wanting to disclose to somebody like a human resources official.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yeah. I hadn't really gotten to outcomes. I had gotten simply to incentives.

DR. NELSON: Right.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Or

disincentives.

DR. NELSON: Right. And I can see that that could potentially be a disincentive, if you're handing it into somebody where you

2.1

Thanks.

think there might be consequences, for sure. I don't of a specific study.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Mike, do your -does your organization and the industry, typically, do you have some kind -- I know you watch out for your employees and keep an eye out, but is there any kind of formal screening routinely done by -- by you with your employees?

MR. MATHIS: Yeah. You know, I don't know the exact answer to that, and there are others that I will follow-up. I was just listening to the dialogue and curious about the same thing. But I think -- I think the comments of Commissioner McHugh are right. think we don't do that on site because of how sensitive that issue might be on the workplace. But we're -- we're about providing the resources, third-party resources throughout -- throughout the region. So my understanding is it would be through a referral. And that's -- that's -- the additional protection in our cases, we have

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

strong prohibitions on our customers gaming on our properties so --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Your employees.

MR. MATHIS: I'm sorry. Yeah. We

-- we --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Customers?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's an

interesting revelation right there.

MR. MATHIS: That's how responsible

10 we are.

here.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm sorry to tell
Mr. Murren, there's a weird Freudian slip

MR. MATHIS: That's right. We're fairly progressive that way. No, but -- no. So we prohibit employees from -- from gambling on our properties. So to that extent, I think -- but, still, the reality exists within the -- in these markets that there are opportunities. So I'll get you some information. Maybe we can kind of help --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah, that would be interesting.

help with that dialogue.

DR. NELSON: One thing we can also offer related to that is -- is one of the resources we have is a self-help toolkit available on our Web site, and I know there are other groups that have this. It's completely anonymous, and that is a way for somebody to, very confidentially and anonymously, work through these issues and think about whether they have a problem or not. So that could be a resource that -- that people are referred to.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. I mean, and that's -- that's something we could -- we could do and encourage. You know, if it's that kind of a tool, if it's a private, confident -- you know, consciousness-raising, and then offer, as Mike says, third-party support, if necessary -- if you wish, we could -- we could push that really hard. So, you know, I think, you know, between the two or three of you, maybe, let's figure -- we don't got to move between now and March 10th, but for next year, as our ongoing program, I think being a much more active player in

promoting this particular step ought to be a part of our whole, you know, responsible gaming strategy. And, you know, we might as well start at home, figure out what we can do that makes sense for us and then we'll market that.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I had a related question, and I know this is the way, you know, it's being done with the monthly -- March being the month of raising awareness, but has there been discussion about, you know, conducting these screens more than -- more often, just as I'm -- you know as --

DR. NELSON: Yes. Within the behavioral treatment providers that we work with, we have talked with them about doing the screening on a more regular basis with everyone who comes through. I don't know, at this point, who has agreed to that, or who will be continuing to do that. But we always talk about this being a first step to raise awareness, but, really, that screening needs to become a more part of the regular practice.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:

Electronically signed by Brenda Ginisi (401-014-954-6554)

Right, because

1 I would imagine other substance abuse screens 2 get, you know, applied all the time. 3 DR. NELSON: Yes. And there --4 there are certainly some substance use 5 treatment facilities and agencies that do have 6 gambling and gambling problem questions as 7 part of -- of their intake. I believe even 8 the BSAS, basic intake for substance use 9 services, has questions about gambling and 10 whether you -- you think gambling's a problem. 11 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. Other 13 thoughts, questions? COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 14 That's great. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you. Really 16 interesting. Thank you, 17 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 18 Doctor. 19 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you for 20 hanging around. 21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you for 22 being here. 23 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. Just got 24 another job, Mark. All right. We are on to

1 Item No. 5, the ombudsman.

MR. ZIEMBA: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. Can I ask MGM president,
Mike Mathis, Springfield president Mike Mathis
and his team to join us up front? And our
representatives from Pinck, and I'll turn this
over to Executive Director Day.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Mr. Ziemba. As we start out, I just wanted to -- to just sort of a little editorial comment. In particular, I want to thank MGM for their work in this process we were -- as we were talking about scheduling and a way to begin that and what might be most productive. We have had a lot of discussion about it, and I think the product that came out, and the time and effort that MGM put into this is well worth the presentation that we'll have today. So thank you, Mike, and your team.

MR. MATHIS: And, just for the record, I think I finally complied for the first time with getting our materials into him by Monday afternoon. 5:00 p.m. on the dot, if I remember right. So, hopefully, the first of

1 a -- of a continuing compliance with that --2 that request. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Don't let him kid 4 Don't let him kid you. You're not on 5 your own in that ballpark. 6 MR. MATHIS: Right. 7 MR. DAY: With that, I know 8 Mike Fitzgerald has been the point for us on 9 this, so I'd like to turn that -- turn it over to Mike, if I could. 10 11 MR. FITZGERALD: Good morning, 12 Commissioners. 13 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning. 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good morning. 15 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good 16 morning. 17 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good morning. 18 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good morning. 19 MR. FITZGERALD: I'm Mike Fitzgerald 20 from Pinck & Company, the oversight project 21 manager for the Springfield casino project. 22 THE COURT REPORTER: Can he pull the 23 mic closer? 24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The mic closer.

1

3

2

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

MR. FITZGERALD: All right. I'11 start again. Mike Fitzgerald from Pinck & Company, the oversight project manager for the Springfield casino project. We're here today have MGM give an update of their activities since they accepted their gaming license in November, and also to give a six-month preliminary look-ahead schedule.

While the schedule isn't detailed enough for us to make full comments on it, Bill Perry and our scheduling consultant, we've looked at their preliminary -- each activity schedules, and they're on the right track for moving forward. And over the next few weeks we'll be working with MGM looking at their full schedule and we'll be bringing that to you in late spring for review and approval. So I'll turn it over to Mike Mathis to give you an update and introduce a new member of his Springfield team.

Thank you, Mike. MR. MATHIS: And thank you, Commissioners. Welcome back to Springfield. I'm -- I'm going to introduce a new member of our team shortly, but I -- we

wanted to provide a status update. It's been 118 days since the November --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But who's

counting?

2.1

MR. MATHIS: That's right, but who's counting? 118 days since the November 7th licensing. I checked, this morning, to see if that masters your snowfall in terms of inches. Not quite there yet, but the winter's not over yet as I -- as I've -- as I'm seeing.

We've been very active, and this is really an exciting -- for us, a very exciting part of the development process. This is where we go from the campaign and promises made to promises kept, and executing on the project.

In terms of the activity since our licensure, just to give you a sense of the agenda -- go ahead, Marikate. Just give us a moment while we get the deck back up. I promise you, it's longer than that. I wouldn't have been bragging about complying with the deadline. There we go. Yeah, this is just a sense of some of the things that

you'll -- you'll hear today. I will -- I will start off with some of the activity, leading up too the early construction, and then hand it off to my colleague, who I'll introduce in a moment.

We are going to show you some sequencing on our construction, in addition to the update, talk about the construction schedule, and then some of the different early phases of the work. Starting with Enabling Works, and then some of our outreach activities. And then, philosophically, an approach that we're taking on development of this project, which I think will help us deliver on our -- out commitment to really spread the -- spread the wealth in terms of opportunities to different contractors. And that is the construction manager versus GC way to build this project.

And then, lastly, Chuck, who you've seen before in this setting, will give you an update on historic commission. And very happy to say we continue to make strides with both the local and state historic commissions, and

2.1

I think there's a reflection of the effort and the dialogue that we've had, which has been very collaborative, and very happy to give you that update as well. Next slide.

A big part of the 118 days, as my CFO's has been telling me, has been shelling out a bunch of -- a bunch of dollars. We paid our \$85 million licensing fee shortly after our November 7th licensing, we've issued our \$52 million construction bond, as required by the gaming act. Over the holidays, we closed on \$50 million of project land, as put forth in our application. This is over, really, the month of December, and it compressed through the holiday season, so we were running two or three closings in a single day. I mean, the logistics of -- os some of what we had to do is a real tribute to the local team and to the owners on the site so --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: How many properties is that?

MR. MATHIS: You know, that's always a complicated question because there is subparcels within them. But, you know, I

2.1

think upwards of 30 or so different parcels, and maybe a dozen to 15 different owners.

Remember, we've -- we've closed on a number of other parcels a long the way as well, so that's just the activity since the licensing.

In addition, under our surrounding community agreements, we have made our initial payments. So we've made 1.75 million in surrounding-community, upfront payments over that period as well.

Additionally, we've -- we've been in front of you, as you know, with a comprehensive diversity plan, which you've reviewed, and I believe at this point have -- have signed off on. And really, for me, one of the -- on of the most important parts of early stages of this project is bringing on our initial team.

As you mentioned earlier, this is about employment, and I'm happy to say that we have our first five employees of MGM Springfield on the ground. And they're faces that will be familiar to you, and they come from our -- our local office because they were

2.1

1 very integral during the campaign as well.

And then, general site activity. Go ahead, Marikate. Starting with our hires, Seth Stratton, who I was really pleased to bring on as our vice president and general counsel of MGM Springfield. Again, you've seen him in front of you before. And he is a -- he's -- he's a local. He's a western Mass native, and has deep routes here in the community. So you will see him more and more. I know he's been working closely with your staff. So very pleased to have him on board.

Seth and I are joined by four really talented women. Again, all local and regional. Ms. Murren is -- is handling our workforce development activities, and she's joined by Anita Bird, who is working as our HR specialist. Very heavy focus early on on workforce development. So I think that the hires that we've made and the areas that they're focused on are indicative to our commitment to this area. And -- and we believe that's really the key to this project, is making sure that we have local talent and

2.1

we can bridge any of the skill gaps that exist in this market. Amanda Gagnon, as well as Shalon Brown are -- are part of the team as well in administrative capacity. And we'll continue to update you as we bring on new people as well.

The gentleman to my right, Brian Packer, who will be waking you through the construction, 13-year veteran of company, and that makes him a newbie in our company. Many of our people, as you know, have -- have been with us very long time, 20, 25 years I'm really pleased to have Brian out He's coming off the City Center project, which is a \$7 billion project. Ι told him we don't quite have that budget for Springfield, but -- but he has -- as you can see from his resumé, he has developed some of our -- our best and biggest projects in our portfolio and in some really challenging environments. So we're -- we're really fortunate to have him on board.

He's currently working out of our corporate development group. And he will

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

1 be -- shortly becoming a dedicated MGM 2 Springfield employee. He's going through the employee registration process as we speak. 3 4 But we intend for him to our vice president of 5 development and construction. And he'll be --6 he'll be walking you through some of the early 7 activities he's had on the site here. 8 free to interrupt. I'm just going to keep

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mike, on that note, then, let me go back and ask you a quick question.

going until I am interrupted. Site prep --

MR. MATHIS: Yep.

any -- you talked about the \$1.75 million in surrounding community payments. Any host community payments that you've made yet, or have the timeline for?

MR. MATHIS: Yeah. There are.

Solicitor Pikula's behind me and he can attest to some of the discussions we've had around this. Shortly after our licensing, we -- we made our \$1 million community grant payment, which was called out for in the host community

agreement. And then, we are in the process -I think we also funded \$150,000 towards the
Franconia Golf Course Pavilion. That work, I
think, starts this spring, and as part of our
commitment to the community to provide some -some kind of convention and meeting group
space so that we can -- they can leverage
the -- the local golf course.

Soon, I think there is a -- there is a process for a series of prepayments, as you may recall, of our initial 121A obligations. Those obligations start when we open, but what we agreed to do is to make some of those payments in advance to fund, for example, some of the public safety, some of the police academies and buy fire -- fire equipment. Those payments were to begin -- there's -there's a total of 10 million of those payments over the three years of development, and I think the installments were 4 million, 3 million, and 3 million over the first three years. This is a great example of our collaboration between ourselves and the city.

What we've discussed with the city,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

is because of their budgeting -- budgeting constraints, that the first payment, which was due, I think two or three weeks ago, the first \$4 million payment, they asked us, potentially, to push that payments and to accelerate the other two payments, the three -- the other \$3 million payments. So we're working collaboratively to -- to put up a new schedule of payments, where we'll make that first payment later in the fall, and then we'll accelerate the other two to occur earlier. And -- and, you know, again it speaks to our ability to -- to address different issues that may come up, notwithstanding what the agreement says.

Site preparation. We are -- we've had extensive tenant coordination meetings.

Again, I think one -- as we made the \$50 million closing payments on the land, there was -- there was significant implications with different tenants on the site. And we've been really transparent over the last two years, really, about some of the processes around that. And part of the

2.1

process includes, not only coordination and information, but one of the implications of the extended campaign and referendum was that it -- it put -- you know, it put some -- some challenges into certainty and planning. So we've been really accommodating, I think, from our perspective. We closed on most of these parcels right around the new year, but we've provided for 60 to 90 days to transition out. And along with that, we've made a series of tenant relocation and lease termination payments to help facility those relocations.

So Commissioner Stebbins, you might recall in our -- in our HCA one of the things we did is, we incented folks to stay within the downtown Springfield area. What we didn't want to do is displace them and -- and lose some of the -- some of that activity in the downtown. So we provided incentives that, if they stayed and found locations within Springfield first, and then, more importantly, within the downtown area, we would provide a payment towards -- towards relocation and moving. So we've been making a series of

2.1

those payments based on people staying in the area. We've lost some to other communities, which I guess on balance means that we're also spreading the wealth to our surrounding communities, so that's a win-win as well. We can proceed. And then, with that, let me hand it over to -- to Brian Packer to talk about some of his activity, and I'll stay here for any Q and A.

MR. PACKER: Thanks, Mike. Thanks, Mike. Thanks, Mike. Thanks for the opportunity

Commissioners and Chair, to be here today and meet you guys, and look forward to dedicating here in the next two, 2-1/2 years of my life in Springfield. I'll be boots on the ground here working under Hunter Clayton and Ken Rosevear. Hunter apologizes he can't be here today, he was -- he's over in Macau.

And so, I come here, you know, as Mike alluded to, last project was City Center, \$7 billion, and I think one key thing about that, it was a LEED-certified project. And we're going to be bringing that same LEED certification here to Springfield.

2.1

I'm extremely excited to be here on this project. There's some really special things going on in Springfield that we don't see all the time in projects that we -- we do build, and one is the -- the historic preservation that we have here, and the fabric you have downtown, and integrating our project with your existing infrastructure. Excited to be here in the community and actually living here, and as well as bringing the jobs that we're going to bring.

This is a very complex site.

There's a lot going on, as you'll see today, and an extremely aggressive schedule, so we're here today to talk about that schedule. And as Mike alluded to earlier, we've submitted a six-month look-ahead schedule. Today, I will try to boil up some of those details into higher-level summary items.

We currently have about 1600 activities in the schedule, of which generated 300 line items, that's in the details schedule that we submitted. You may be asking when are we going to see your full schedule, and when

are you going to give us a look-ahead that captures the entire project?

We're looking to -- if we get past a few of these historical issues in the next few weeks, we're hoping to start preliminary discussions with Pinck on -- on that issue mid-March, to hopefully get you a schedule in late spring that we -- both parties here vetted together.

So here in this slide, I kind of look at the project as four macro-level projects. And the first thing is, we have Enabling Works. And Enabling, to me, is really all about clearing the site, getting the site ready for what we want to do.

Immediately, we'll move into the garage. The garage is very important on multiple levels that I'll get into in a little bit. And then, the hotel podium with a projected opening right now, preliminarily, in spring of 2017.

So that is our current target.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What does the podium refer to exactly? Is that --

MR. PACKER: Podium would be the low

2.1

rise, or the area where the casino would actually be, food and beverage. Everything outside of the tower, essentially.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MR. PACKER: September of '17.

Thank you. So the previous slide had a bar for Enabling. And since that's our immediate concentration right now, and in the six-month look-ahead we gave you, I tried to take what are some of the key points we laid out in that schedule, and put them here at summary level for you. And in the Enabling phase, we're looking at about six different key items.

The first is of which we need design help, obviously, especially in some of these structures that will be preserved or portions saved, to make sure that when we're taking down the other portions around them we're doing it in a way that's structurally sound and safe. We need to procure the work. We will get into some details of how we're outreaching to the community on doing that in a little bit. We have tenants Mike spoke to that we're relocating. And then we get to

2.1

abatement demo, and actually getting the buildings lowered and disposed of, or salvaged, or preserved, depending on the building.

I'm sure you're going to be asking me about entitlements. We're working on those not only on a building-by-building basis as we're working through demolition, but we're working on a global basis for the whole project.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: What do you mean by entitlements?

MR. PACKER: Government approvals, the ability for us to move forward with the work. All -- all agencies that we need to coordinate with. And they'll be a detailed slide of some of the more important entitlements here -- here in a little while.

MR. MATHIS: And just to be clear, we're not looking for any tax breaks, I know that. If you want to offer them, we'd be happy to take them.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Signing up for Medicare.

2.1

MR. MATHIS: That's right.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So as a practical matter, it means permitting?

MR. MATHIS: That's right.

MR. PACKER: Essentially, yes. Just as all the levels, state, local, I believe we have a few federal. So that gets to project delivery method. How are we buying out the work for Enabling, and how do we envision moving forward through the project on how we're actually going to contract this work out.

There's been a lot of questions related to when are you going to get a full-time general contractor on site? And, currently, our delivery approach is we're actually using a construction management approach for Enabling Works. Tishman Construction has been retained as our construction manager. Other delivery methods for the remainder of project, we have not yet awarded those. But, right now, the construction management approach allows flexibility, as we're looking at,

2.1

approximately, 19 structures and how to deal with them. And so, it allows us to target, procure the demolition of a couple buildings together, one building at a time. It allows us to -- to react real time to what's going on out at the site. And so, that targeted approach also give more opportunities here to the local community to bid. So we're not going out with one humongous project, we're going out with targeted, smaller projects to get this site moving. And that would, obviously, then help us with our diversity and local participation. It also helps with the phase construction of the work that we're going to end up having, from Enabling, to the garage, to eventually the hotel casino.

I think it's important to mention that there will likely be portions here where we will hire a general contractor. For instance, the parking garage lends itself to that, to go out on the street, get a design-build general contractor who does -- performs garage-type work all the time. So you're going to see, over time here, we will

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

have a blend of construction management approach and then targeted general contractors.

let me ask you a question. I think, when we were going through the licensing process, and this is the condition of the license, and I'm encouraged by the method and the approach that you take, but one of the license conditions was making sure that, again, the old variation of a GC overseeing the whole project, making sure that we sat down with them, making sure you were part of discussion at the table to reinforce, you know, the diversity goals and everything else to the process. So this changes up that license condition.

And, Catherine, maybe -- how do

we -- how do we fit their model, which I'm

encouraged by, into the conditions of the

license criteria and making sure we're still

all on the same page?

MS. BLUE: I'll have to take a look at it to see. I mean, I need to understand what they're doing and then compare it to our

2.1

licensing conditions. But we can certainly think about that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's a really good point, Commissioner Stebbins. And, certainly, in Plainville, Turner Construction, which is the GC, has really been an aggressive leader in the diversity in local hiring and not having that -- unless Tishman can assume that role --

MR. PACKER: Yes. I --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: -- then it's a step removed so it's -- that's a really important link not to lose.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, Tishman is not going to hold any contracts, right; you're going to hold the contracts for all the other employer packages?

MR. PACKER: It will be our -- CM agency, correct, so they will be joining the signing.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It's a CM agent or adviser. So they'll -- they'll be holding those contracts, so we -- you know we'll be looking to -- to them for all of

2.1

those diversity numbers directly, as opposed to Turner, which is indirectly in the case of Penn. So I would actually argue that, you know, the MGM team, under this project delivery method, in terms of diversity, is held accountable, you know, firsthand, directly.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MR. PACKER: And we discussed, last week with Pinck, that I think that we can -- with the -- the requirements of a general contractor to track these things, we will be doing the same exact thing with ourselves and Tishman. And so, I would suggest we still have that meeting, still have that requirement just like it was a general contractor, and I think we can fulfill the same goals.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right.

commissioner stebbins: But I -- I'm encouraged by this approach, because I think as -- as you divide up in the project into these smaller chunks, some of the bigger firms out here in western Mass. that a year ago were thinking, what piece of the work could I

2.1

compete for, now could essentially be assigned a project and be bonded to a capacity to be able to complete that project without having a big GM or construction manager to come in over that so --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: GC.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: -- I'm encouraged by the approach.

MR. PACKER: Thank you. And really, you know, at a summary level, this just gives us more control, we believe the best product, and increased community participation, so it's working for everybody involved. Can we go back just one slide? Thanks.

So as -- as we look at the site today, I wanted to give you a few images of kind of how I see the site and how we look at how we're going to attack getting things moving. So here, early in the Enabling Works, there's two colors with the buildings that we're generally going to look at dealing with early here. And yellow is the first building we would -- we would like to take down, and that's the Howard Street school. The yellow

fencing represents Phase 1 fencing, and the red structures are what we're currently phasing in for the demo patch -- packages coming forward.

So as we look at the site today, this kind of gives you an idea of, hey, here's all the boxes we needed to start addressing now and thinking about the next six months.

MR. MATHIS: Hey, Brian, I was just going to remind the commission, the Zanetti school is one of the buildings that was heavily damaged by the June '11 tornado, so it has not been inhabited since that tornado, and I think it's close to being condemned on its own. My understanding, there's been some FEMA money attached to -- to relocating some -- some of the services that were previously in that building, so that's a -- that's a very natural one to start with, and it's part of reason we located the garage footprint over that location.

MR. PACKER: And so, we go over to the next slide, you'll see, once we get the site cleared, where the garage fits in, and

2.1

it's right there at Zanetti, like Mike said. 2 And so moving -- so that the Enabling Works 3 are really what the six-month look-ahead's 4 about. It's about starting the garage and 5 being able to do that. And then, the detail 6 that we're going to lay in here in -- in the 7 spring will show you the schedule to get us to 8 our casino, hotel development so --9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Brian, you talked 10 about four big buckets, and ending in hotel 11 and podium. 12 MR. PACKER: Yes. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What about all the 13 other stuff, when is that --14 15 MR. PACKER: At a macro level, it's 16 four big buckets to us, but all the other 17 stuff, retail, residential, that will all fill 18 -- fill in at the podium schedule. 19 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. 20 MR. PACKER: And then, we obviously 21 have some off-site buildings that we're also 22 doing, but we -- we will fill that detail in 23 in the overall schedule.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY:

24

Okay. All right.

1 But podium includes -- is everything but the 2 hotel, it sounds like? The tower. 3 MR. PACKER: Yes. We kind of look 4 at it, you know, in terms of the -- the super structure tower. That will come out of the 5 6 ground, and then we will in-fill with a 7 podium. 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Because the plan 9 is to open everything at the same time; you're 10 not phasing the openings? 11 MR. PACKER: That's correct. 12 MR. MATHIS: Yeah, important 13 distinction, Mr. Chairman, the phasing of 14 construction is different than the single 15 opening of all the components. 16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. 17 MR. MATHIS: Which recommended to 18 do. 19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, no, you 20 will open the garage first. You know, to be 2.1 fair. 22 MR. MATHIS: Yeah, that's right. 23 Very -- very, very correct.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:

Which is

important to everybody, including us.

MR. MATHIS: Exactly. Yeah,
we've -- we've since closed down the surface
lots. That was part of the site preparation.
I'm going to take this opportunity to beat up
on Rob Rizzuto down the -- down the way,
because he said it was going to be a chaotic
scene downtown, and I think we handled it
quite well. So -- but that is correct, part
of the commitment is to turn it back over to
the public when we can following completion.
That's subject to construction workers parking
there, and some of the safety considerations
as well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MR. PACKER: So on the schedule, we've provided a six-month look-ahead that has plenty of detail on the Enabling Works.

Earlier in the presentation, I showed you a roll-up slide that had these activities in it.

What I try to do is, we will scroll through here and -- and not cover every line item, but I have three slides that boils up a lot of the detail that's in here to what I think you'll

2.1

1 be interested in.

So I will say that this is organized in some major categories, and it's about getting project management in place. It's about, in the next six months we're obviously looking at Enabling. And we spoke about design procurement, tenant relocations, abatement demo. We do have some line items in here, the parking garage, the hotel tower, the podium residential, and some of the off-site activities, just to understand long-lead items right now.

For instance, elevators, what do we want to be looking at that we procure them far out in advance that we'll make sure there here when we need them? And so, those major categories tie in to what you see in the detail here. But in a flew slides, you'll see my roll-up of specific demo activities and some of the outreach items we're doing. So we'll -- we'll scan through this here, on these 10 pages, and I'll show you a few slides of the detail.

MR. MATHIS: Yeah. I think this is

not meant to be legible, or a working document for this group. It's just meant to indicate the type of dialogue and the documentation we're providing to your staff and -- and to the Pinck consultants. And that -- that we will continue to provide.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Brian and Michael, who is Schedule Solutions working for, Tishman or you?

MR. PACKER: Tishman.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Tishman.

MR. PACKER: Yes. So one of the first things, obviously, to deal with on the schedule is we have to hire some subcontractors, and community outreach is very important.

So the way we've been approaching it in Enabling Works is, we have specific scopes of works. So, for instance, we have to put up a site fence we're going to be looking at abatement or demolition of the buildings, and so we've been scheduling community meetings, one-on-ones with the contractors.

We put a -- a blast notification out

2.1

through the press and through our contacts at the unions and the chamber of commerce, and we let our network know, hey, if your interested in performing, for instance, site-work or site-fence activities, we'll schedule you for a half hour when you come down, you'll meet us one on one, Tishman and the subcontractors.

We'll get your information, and we'll also walk you through the prequalification process.

And within about five to seven days, the prequalifications forms come back, we review those, and when we have a qualified list of bidders, we will be going out to bid. This has worked very well for us in the first two meetings. The demo and abatement meetings have resulted in 20-plus qualified contractors and subcontractors for this work. And I'll speak a little bit about, hey, how do you --you know, for the Zanetti school we're not able to just go out and take 25 bids, per se, but how do you involve all 25 qualified bidders? And that's where we get into the sequencing of this work, and we look to have approximately, eight demo packages, if not 10,

2.1

1 and each one of those bidders will get a 2 chance, you know, for two or three packages to 3 be involved in this project. So we're --4 we're really trying to consciously spread the 5 wealth or give everybody an opportunity here 6 for those vendors that are qualified. 7 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Is that 8 eight --9 I'm sorry. No, go CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 10 ahead. 11 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Is that eight 12 for the Zanetti, or for everything? 13 MR. PACKER: That's -- if I look 14 at -- I have, approximately, 19 structures to 15 bring down --16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yep. MR. PACKER: -- it's -- those 19 are 17 18 packaged up into eight --19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. 20 MR. PACKER: -- packages. And we're 21 still working out, you know, if it's going to 22 be eight or nine or -- t it's -- it's meant to 23 make the implementation of this a little -- a 24 little more targeted, as well as give

1 opportunity.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And spread the wealth.

MR. PACKER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I agree with
everybody. I think it's great to be doing
this, and I know I'm serving you up a softball
here, but is there an appreciable diseconomy
of scale or -- to do it in smaller piece? I
mean, there can be a huge diseconomy of scale,
you wouldn't be doing it. But -- or is there
actually, because you got so many competitive
bidding steps, is there -- is there an economy
of scale? I don't -- which way does it work?

MR. PACKER: You know, I look at it
as, if you look at how the process has to map

MR. PACKER: You know, I look at it as, if you look at how the process has to map out from the amount of environmental surveys that have to take place, some of these structures still have occupants in them, it works out, logically, from just the schedule standpoint. And we have to get the work moving, and we have a lot of work to do. And so, the minute it's there in front of me I want to go burn it off. And that's what we're

trying to do here.

2.1

It does allow you to, when you're meeting with bidders and talking about the scopes, it allows you to drill down into the detail. So, if I'm only talking about one building with three or four bidders, we gain a lot of knowledge just on that building. If I was going out and just talking about 10 buildings, we may not get into the complete detail very good. So the buy is a little more specific, and, hopefully, is less change orders at the end of the day.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Interesting.

MR. MATHIS: So you can tell that
Brian's new to the team and I haven't coached
prior, because he didn't do merely enough with
that softball. But I think -- I think if you
look at -- if you look at our project and the
different components of it, there are aspects
of it that lend itself to this approach. And
I think the demo of the individual buildings
are -- are one of those because we can tackle
them on a parallel track. But this overall
approach, and to answer your question, I think

there are, as Brian mentioned, the garage, for example, is going to be a general contractor because it's a single, continuous project.

But I think this approach, generally, we're going to take throughout the site.

And one is, I think, the capacity of western Mass and the -- the need to pool resources and not tax any single, large contractor with -- with a project of this size, but it is also part of our commitment to the project. And there may be, in certain cases, some -- some diseconomies of scale but -- I look at it more as -- on the administrative side, and Brian will speak to this, but this approach is very labor intensive from our side.

You know, the CM approach where
we're also -- part of the contract
administration means that Brian and our
in-house staff are, in this case, meeting with
a series of subcontractors over very -relatively small scopes of work, because we
want to make sure that there's not a single
large contractor that brings his -- his usual

2.1

team to a bid and exclude some of the others that normally wouldn't be available to -- to bid on a project like this.

So, you know, we'll report on that as we -- as we go forward, but it does represent a different way to do it, and a pretty substantial commitment on our part.

MR. PACKER: And so, the outreach meetings we have scheduled in March, we have mass excavation coming up, underground MAPs and site utilities, foundations and waterproofing. So these are the type of trades we're going to be talking to here, over the next month, about the scope that'll come up after we get these buildings demolished.

This is something that Commissioner Stebbins has really worked on a lot, and it just -- to say it again, we've learned, you probably know this, that the time to make sure you get diversity commitments is in advance of contracting with your subs, you know.

MR. PACKER: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If teams come in,

they've got their standard crews, you're going to hit resistances six ways from Sunday. But getting -- getting the process starting really early on, you know, including the meetings where you're sitting now down with your bidders, making sure that the -- your -- your employment objectives are -- I'm sure they are, but I'm just -- on the table.

And we've learned a lot of in this process that maybe you already were aware of, of where the critical juncture points are, and the critical leverage points are, and it's in the sembling of the -- of the subs, and getting the commitments from the subs, where there can be either real resistance or real action. So, hopefully, that's incorporated into your thinking as you're putting these teams together.

MR. PACKER: Yes. The greatest point we have leverage is before we sign these guys up. And before we sign them up, they need to understand all of these requirements and know that they have to comply. And we've seen this before, and in certain communities.

2.1

When I went down to Beau Rivage, in

Mississippi after the Hurricane Katrina, they

were averaging about 6-percent minority,

women-owned business participation. And we

were able to get that over 20 percent, but it

was a cultural shift and you have to get in

early.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MR. PACKER: Because, once they're signed up, if they weren't planning on doing it, it's very hard to get them to do it. So we're having those conversations now with them --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.

MR. PACKER: -- before they get actually contracted.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.

MR. MATHIS: And if I can just add on to that, because this is an important point, we plan to get compliance both -- both philosophically, but also contractually. So we're going to flow down our requirements through the diversity plan that you approved.

Great.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY:

MR. MATHIS: I think we're not quite there in terms of a template. These early works are, you know, low -- low labor intensive so to speak. But we're getting close to finalizing our project labor agreement, which will speak to our union obligations.

I think, coupled with -- with our own internal diversity plan obligations, we will make those exhibits to our -- our template contract. We're not quite there yet, but as you can see from some of the earlier contractors that we're talking to, they're both local MBE. So even on these earlier works, where we don't have a formal system, we're very conscious of some of the overall goals.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.

MR. MATHIS: And -- and overall, we have a requirement to hit -- to hit the best efforts towards the targets that we talked about for the overall project, so we're very mindful of that.

MR. PACKER: Okay. So on the next

2.1

slide, getting into entitlements, we're going to talk about permits and some entitlements here. And this really goes to what I spoke about earlier, when I see that 10-page, six-month look-ahead, what -- what's really important to me as I sit here today, and trying to get across to my team what's coming up and what do we have to be pushing on.

And in this slide you can clearly see targets for demolition permits. We're going to be very busy here right up through July trying to get this site moving. And there's a ton of work to be done. These are our targets. This is what we're working towards right now. And this just kind of gives you an idea of what -- of what we're shooting for and how much we actually have to do here.

At a macro level, some of the entitlements we are tracking, and this is going to be a good segue to Chuck, a lot of folks say, hey, when we going to see your -- the final plan for approval or -- right -- planning board, I'm sure is interested. Right

2.1

now, we are -- we have a couple of historic issues we're trying to work past. Once we get that information, then we can finish setting certain footprints, depending on what happens with certain buildings, and then we are going to be moving on this list very quickly. There are some more of these in the schedule, but just trying to roll up, just our thought process. Let's gets it on, let's start tracking it, and we have individuals assigned to tracking these down.

So with that, Chuck will -actually, you know, I have one more slide, I'm
sorry. I'd like to talk about it. You know,
kind of -- we took you in this presentation
here, from the highest level of, you know,
Enabling Works, garage, casino, hotel and
podium, and then we talked about the Enabling
phase, and then the six-month look-ahead,
which is even more detail underneath the
Enabling phase.

We drill down, then, into the demo of the structures, and the target dates I have for those. And then, this last slide is the

2.1

first structure I'd like to take down. so, we then go and track each one of these before this given structure, make sure that when we're talking it down all the check marks -- all the boxes are checked. And here we -- we have our DP -- DEP notification plea. The utility releases, we expect to get those here, all of them 'em in March. We have some of them already. And then, the last kind of entitlement piece we're looking to cross is the Massachusetts Historical Commission approval for taking Zanetti down. And so that's kind of -- I believe that'll be our last hurdle here. And, with that, I'll -- I'll turn it over to Chuck, because he's going to update us

here on the historic commission.

MR. IRVING: Good morning.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good morning.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good morning.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:

morning.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good morning.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

1

MR. IRVING: Chuck Irving,

2 3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

president, Davenport Properties. Why don't we just start with the lead. If you go back to Brian's schedule, you can see that we're anticipating getting approvals on historic state and local by the end of April, and demoing buildings in early summer. Based on what our counsel has said, as well as yours, the entitlement process could actually go longer than six months from today to achieve that, which would disrupt our schedule.

So, Chairman Crosby, you said at the beginning, you might be willing to help us on some things. And I think that will be an issue that we'll be looking for help on. don't anticipate any problems right now, but if we do hit a roadblock, as you know we're trying to achieve this balance between historic preservation economic development. And, at some point, you know, we're going to have to make a decision on which way to go on some matters.

Our relationship with the Springfield Historic Commission has been fantastic. I looked back at e-mails last night, and I realized that we began with them in 2012, so we have had a lot of discussions with that group. The buildings under consideration back then ranged from 16 to 18. We're down to four our five issues right now, and I think that's amazing progress.

Tonight, Brian and I go in front of the historic commission, and what we've done with the historic commission since our last meeting with you is get into the gritty detail. We've gone into the buildings, and we've looked at the structures themselves, and we brought it all the way down to window moldings that we might be saving.

The historic commission aggregated their comments in our previous meeting, we've listened to them. Our design team in Vegas has responded, and tonight we're going to present our response to that. And what we're hopeful, is that we reach agreement with them on every issue so that we then can go to Mass. Historic and say, it's time to put our agreement together.

2.1

There are four bodies that

participate in this. It's the Springfield

Preservation Trust, which is an advisory,

Springfield Historic Commission, the Mass.

Historic Commission, and the gaming

commission. Based on our interpretation, you

do have a very large role, and a large say in

this process, and so I think our final

presentation will be to you saying this is

where we are, and this is where we feel this

project should go.

2.1

I think MGM's commitment to historic preservation here is phenomenal. As a non-MGM employee, I can absolutely say that. I was in the Zanetti school the other day with the Tishman folks putting pieces of tape on the pieces of wood we are going to save. And that is not something that's required, that's not what Jim Murren told us to do. And we're excited about doing that, and we're going to do that on every building. And we just hope we stay on schedule while we do that.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I do want to compliment you. I know the story got passed

around to all of us about your effort and the effort of the local historic commission to kind of get out of the conference room and go around and actually see these buildings firsthand, and see the condition they were in, and talk through a number of the issues. So I applaud both you and the historic commission for taking the walking tours.

MR. PACKER: I applaud them because they went on several floors that I would not go on. So they're a very dedicated group of folks, and the fact that they would hold a quorum in the middle of a workday and walk away from their jobs and do that is just amazing, and they've been a pleasure to work with.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Is the -the resolution of the final location of the
church been -- the one you're going to move
somewhere, been resolved?

MR. IRVING: We have resolved it.

And in deference to the historic commission,

I'd love to present it first to them tonight.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Sure.

2.1

MR. IRVING: But we have resolved it. And I think Brian and I will be revealing a lot of things tonight. And given the way this process works, I'd love to tell them first and then have it filter up to you. I know Mike will be there with us, so he will --he will share everything that happens this evening.

MR. MATHIS: You know, one of the things I was going to comment -- comment on is -- and it speaks to the slide that's up on the screen. You know, Chuck has been really fantastic. He's been our -- our man on the ground working with the local historic commission.

But what the slide speaks to is, there was a considerable -- considerable amount of energy spent around the Union House issue, because there was a night, reportedly, that President Polk spent there in 1847. It is now the Glory -- Glory shoe store that you see up on the screen. But what we learned, and what Chuck was great about doing, and along with the historic folks is, a number of

2.1

people that were fighting to preserve that building had not been in the building, so we got them out on the -- on the ground, you see that tour that -- that took place. And, really, once you get into these buildings, many of them are not salvageable, and certainly have no tie back to the historic moment that -- that people play some emotion around.

So we've -- we've made considerable strides. And I really wand to thank the local historic commission for abandoning their call to -- to preserve Union House, after having done the tour.

What spoke -- what Chuck spoke to in terms of potentially needing your assistance, and maybe it's a little bit premature is, while we feel that we've made great strides with the -- with the local historic commission, I think our sense is that the Massachusetts Historic Commission would be rather deferential to -- to the efforts that we've had with the -- with the local historical commission. And we want to make

2.1

sure, to the extent that that's not the case, that we -- that we can collaborate the same that we have done with the locals, to make sure that we're able to maintain our schedule and -- and execute on many of the compromises that we've made out on the site. So we're confident that we can get there. I think, Chuck and -- we just need to extend our dialogue. We've been so focused with the local historic commission, I think we need to focus our job a lot now with the state, and partnership with -- with Springfield.

I think, with that, we're -- we are complete with the update. Happy to answer any we questions you have, and we'll continue to provide these updates. But we're very excited. I'm certainly excited to have Brian here, because this is when the activity really starts on the site, and people can -- can start to realize what it is that we're going to do in terms of construction, employment and -- and vendor opportunities.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's great. Any other question or thoughts or --

2.1

that. I think this is very exciting. I think the progress that you're making, the detail that you're using, the approaches that you're using to fulfill the conditions, the license conditions and keep this moving are -- are really terrific. This is a very exciting project, and this project looks very good. I mean, this progress looks very good so it's a good report. You're still going to preserve the doors for the school, right?

MR. MATHIS: I'll defer to Chuck on that. But I think we're talking about using the doors of our apartments?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yeah.

MR. MATHIS: I know you liked that idea since we sold it to you, better -- better deliver on that. Are we still able to do that, Chuck?

MR. IRVING: We are going to preserve the doors. And we discovered this week, that about half of them are a golden pine that is not available anymore. And so, they're very valuable doors, and we're

2.1

absolutely going to preserve all of them.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's great.

I know there's two sides to every story, and there's still issues and so on and so forth, and we are not on the last stop on the way, the historical commission is their own independent agency. But having said that, we've all said this before, as an objective observer just looking at it, I just think you've been sensitive to historic preservation to a degree that, in my experience, is unprecedented.

So, hopefully, this -- you know, you'll get your fair due for it. And, as I said, I understand there are issues and so on and so forth, but I -- I think it's amazing that you've been as sensitive as you have to an area which is desperate, you know. So I -- I really credit you for that.

MR. MATHIS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. Thank

2.1

1 you very much.

2 MR. PACKER: Than you.

MR. IRVING: Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Thank you very

much.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah, let's get -I know we're close to lunch, but let's take a
little break anyway. We'll be back as close
to five minutes as we can.

10

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

(A recess was taken)

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

11

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. We are reconvened at about quarter past 12.

MR. ZIEMBA: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, there was just one further item that I think that the MGM team wanted to bring up or emphasize. We've been working in tandem with the MGM team regarding the Viaduct schedule. And they just wanted to provide just a little bit of additional detail regarding some recent

23 developments.

MR. IRVING: So in previous meetings

we've discussed that the Viaduct schedule was aligned with MGM. Both schedules were targeted for completion on September 2017. As you may remember, the Viaduct is, basically, the repair of the highway that goes along the major business area of the city. DOT informed the other day, that their schedule is now 2018, July. This is something that we all need to take -- pay a lot of attention to because it affects the exit ramps that abut the site. And the idea of opening the casino without exit ramps is a concern. John and I attended a meeting with DOT last week, and they assured us that that will not happen, which was good.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That what will not happen?

MR. IRVING: That -- that there will be exit ramps open in 2017. Bruce, I know you'll know this, what they're telling us is there will be a temporary ramp as you're going southbound that gets you onto Route 20. And then, for people coming off of 291, you can take the Dwight Street exit. And then, if

2.1

you're going northbound, you can take some of the earliest -- earlier Columbus Ave. exits.

That may work, but there's no reason to guess about it, so John and I have decided to put together a model using the state's consultant, as well as ours. And once we all agree on the assumptions that go into that model, such as, will there only be one lane open on 91 at that time? We'll see if it works. As you know, MGM's visitors will spike the first month that we open. And so, the last thing we want to do is have a bad headline that goes with this opening.

I can tell you that DOT is working hard with us on this. They fully acknowledge this issue, and they've been good to work with. But I think the results of that model that we put together, that we'll probably report to you within four to six weeks, will tell us whether we can open on that 2017 date or not.

MR. ZIEMBA: Mr. Chairman, one thing
I wanted to add is that the exact -- the
specifics of schedule and -- and how the

2.1

project is going to proceed, that will -that'll come after the bids are -- the bids
are awarded, excuse me, and they'll work
directly with the contractor that's involved.

And, as Chuck mentioned, DOT has been focusing on this issue. They're very well aware of our schedule. And in my communications with them they've said, hey, look, we are taking a look at this at the absolute top levels of management. So we have -- we have every confidence that we're going to be able to work with them going forward on all of these concerns.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, do you have any idea -- I think I asked John this, but where -- where did this come from, all of a sudden out of the clear blue sky? It's not like 60 days, or 90 days, or 15 days. It was 10 to 12 months.

MR. IRVING: You know what, I'd rather let DOT speak on that, but I'm hearing it came more from the trades than from government, and that they just needed more time to prepare their bids. And, obviously,

DOT wants to orchestrate the most competitive bid process possible. But I don't know where it came from, and I think it's water under the bridge because it was supposed to be awarded last year. It wasn't. We're expecting the award to occur in April.

And one of the things that makes it difficult, especially for Brian, is telling you what our schedule is going to be until we see what they're doing, because I can't tell you when we can bring precast concrete underneath the highway to get to our parking garage, until I see how they're working out their demo schedule, or I can't tell you when we can close Union Street to redo the utilities, until we know that we can close it off without impacting their construction. And they're telling us that they can't respond to that until they actually hire a contractor and work out those details with the contractor.

So Brian's ability to report to you on schedule is deeply impacted by their selection of a contractor. And our timeline on reporting to you on a lot of those issues

2.1

1 will be delayed by that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, I mean, isn't is it possible to work both ways on this? It seems to me that all this is highly plastic at -- at the moment. And isn't it possible to, for example, and I say this knowing nothing, about -- but that's never stopped me, isn't it possible to come up with what an ideal, a good schedule for you would be, and show that to them so that as they are working to with their contractors they can take that into account? And then, if you have to make adjustments, yes, you make adjustments, but then you know where you're coming from as they're making their detailed arrangements with their contractors.

MR. IRVING: No. I like the word you used, "plastic." Because we're so early in this process that we're all -- we all have the luxury of sitting down and saying, what's the best way of doing this?

District 2 is running this.

Al Stegman from District 2 is the guy in charge. And Al has been very gracious about

making his whole team available to work on that.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right.

MR. IRVING: So -- and MGM is also funding the model that we're going to put in place. I can tell you, it's a top priority for us. You know, if you ask me what are my major concerns I lose sleep at night, this has now become one of them.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: No kidding.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And that's a question that also we -- you alluded to this, John, that everybody has of DOT. You know, if -- do you know if they're bidding without alternates to do at this point, to look at sequencing or different alternatives?

MR. ZIEMBA: Well, they have some -they have some tools that they can use to
expedite the progress of this project.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yep.

MR. ZIEMBA: That's the way it's being bid. But part of the negotiations of their final contract will involve sequencing

2.1

1 and other types of issues that will 2 necessarily --3 Shifts and --COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Yeah. 5 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. 6 MR. ZIEMBA: -- necessarily come 7 after the award -- or opening of the bids, 8 excuse me. 9 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So it's 10 important to know that this is out there as an 11 issue, but it's too early to make any 12 definitive plans or -- or even particularized 13 alarms. 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But -- but I think 15 we're -- I think everybody's thinking about 16 this, but we're -- we're lucky to have this 17 much time, and we don't want to lose --18 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. 19 no, no. That's right. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: -- or pretty soon 21 the window won't be there, but the plasticity 22 helps. 23 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. 24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And I think, if a

there's -- if a workaround can be designed, that's better than not, but that is not what we were thinking about. You know, that was not what we were anticipating, and that's not going to be as good for anybody. It's not going to be as good for MGM. It's not going to be as good for the city. It's not going to be as good for the people who are trying to get to the facility. It's not be as going to be as good for the neighborhoods.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: For the state.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: For anybody. You know so -- for the state who's trying to maximize revenue. So, you know, again, I'm sort of like Commissioner McHugh, I don't know anything about this, but I don't think she should accept anything as a given yet. I think we ought to take all these things as open issues and look at it -- look for workarounds, look at it from the bottom up, look from the top down. Think of every possible way we can to ameliorate this problem.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. Right.

2.1

But the next -- if bids are due in April for DOT, you know, at that point the contractor will be on the hook for something. And -- and a lot of -- whatever work can be done with DOT between now and then, I would really encourage you to explore. And I know you are already having those conversations but --

MR. IRVING: And the only thing I want to add is, the model we're going to create will be designed for sensitivity, because The Big E is also on September. And so, we need to input in those numbers in as well and say, what does this look like? And the last thing MGM wants to do is create a backup on the highway.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah.

MR. IRVING: I don't think DOT does either. So we're all -- we're all working towards same goal here.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right, right.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you for

that, Chuck.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes, sir.

MR. ZIEMBA: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, included in your packet is an update regarding the applications the commission received for the community -- of the 2015 Community Mitigation Fund for the establishment of Community Mitigation Fund reserves of \$100,000 per community. We received a total of 24 applications for the reserve fund, including three from communities that were not eligible for the reserve.

As a reminder, when the commission established the 2015 guidelines, we decided --decided to establish \$100,000 reserve for all surrounding communities, nearby agreement communities, and communities that petitioned to be a surrounding community. And those three that I mentioned did not fall within those three buckets.

So excluding those three communities, we have 21 reserve fund applications. One of the 21 reserve fund

2.1

applications was not timely filed. It was received approximately -- it was received two days after the deadline by e-mail, and then we received the -- the written copy shortly thereafter.

As -- as I see it, there are at least two options that the commission could consider regarding this late-filed application. Consistent with our guidelines, we could determine that the application is ineligible for the 2015 reserve, or, potentially, we could specify that the reserve will not be established for the communities' use in 2015, but we could specify the commission's intention to allow the use of the reserve in 2016, assuming that the community timely files its application for the reserve in 2016. I note --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And there are other communities which could also have another bite at the apple too.

MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This wouldn't be

24 just --

2.1

MR. ZIEMBA: That's right. So I do note that, if the commission goes ahead with this second option, there were three communities that chose not to ask for the reserve this year, for various reasons. So if -- if we went forward with the determination that we would keep the reserve in place, or have the intention to keep our reserve in place for the one late community, potentially, those other communities could be in the same -- the same mix.

After consideration of these options, I ask that the commission authorize me and Executive Director Day to establish the reserves. We'll notify the communities by letter regarding the establishment of the reserves and how they can proceed to actually utilize such funding. As you remember from the guidelines, all applications under the reserve, they come back to the commission for final approval.

So as communities identify either specific impacts or planning purpose that they want to use the funds for, they work with the

Electronically signed by Brenda Ginisi (401-014-954-6554)

ombudsman's office to put together the materials, we review them, and then we forward them to the commission. And if the commission deems -- deems it advisable to move forward with that application we would then release funds to the community.

In the letter, I recommend that the commission specify that we will annually reauthorize all of those -- all of those reserves, but that no further application is necessary to preserve the reserve.

So each year the commission will take a look at its applications for the year, but it will take into account that we have these reserves established, and it would then choose to reauthorize those previously-authorized reserves for the upcoming year. And the purpose of that is that, you can foresee a situation that a community may not use a reserve for, perhaps, 10 years. And there's some -- there's some big needs for mitigation at that time, the commission, at that time, could go back and -- and say, well, maybe we should take a look at

2.1

1 those reserves that were -- were not utilized.

While I recommend that we include
that language in that letter, I also recommend
that the commission, in its discussions today,
make it known that it is our intention that
the communities will utilize that reserve for
the foreseeable future. Notably, communities
will not be able to determine the range of
impacts until these facilities are
operational. And so, it is highly likely that
those reserves would be available for many
years into -- into the future of the project.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, just to make sure I understand. We're talking about the \$100,000, right?

MR. ZIEMBA: That's right.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. So if somebody -- a town applied for the \$100,000, we say, yes, you qualify, you have the \$100,000 reserve --

MR. ZIEMBA: That's right.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Now you can draw on it anytime over the next 10 years until it's exhausted, could be the impact of

2.1

1 what you're talking about? 2 MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah. I'm not 3 specifying a specific time period. 4 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: No, I understand that. 5 6 MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah. 7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: But anytime --8 you don't have to use all the money right now. 9 MR. ZIEMBA: That's exactly right. That \$100,000 10 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: 11 is in your -- is a line of credit that you 12 have, and we'll approve it withdrawals from 13 it? MR. ZIEMBA: That's right. When we 14 15 approved the guidelines, we said that the funds can be utilized in 2015 or thereafter. 16 17 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right, right. MR. ZIEMBA: We didn't more 18 19 specificity than that. 20 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right, right. 21 And with respect to the late one and the three 22 that didn't apply, the notification would say, 23 you may apply next year or the year after, at 24 the \$100,000 reserve fund approach twill be

available to you, so long as you apply in a timely fashion in some year down the road?

MR. ZIEMBA: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is there -- the reason we did this was because this was -- it was anticipated that the -- there wouldn't be any impacts by the deadline, and we wanted to create an opportunity for people to get access to some money for things that might happen, or for some planning that we talked about. By next February, people will have time -- is there a need to keep it open, or couldn't they apply then, under the normal apply process?

MR. ZIEMBA: I think the big need is that we don't want communities to rush to find an impact before the deadline. And so, if they have the time, and they know that there's not a clock that's immediately ticking, that they can use these funds at the most wisely. Take a look at what planning purpose.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Sort of, the medium is the message, a little bit?

MR. ZIEMBA: Yes.

Electronically signed by Brenda Ginisi (401-014-954-6554)

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Am I right, that we sort of added the planning dimension, that's not really anticipated in the use of the -- that was not originally anticipated in the use of fund, right?

MR. ZIEMBA: No. That's exactly right.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So that is something that is distinctive about this mechanism of holding that 100,000.

MR. ZIEMBA: That's exactly right. So we obviously don't know what the 2016 guidelines will look like. Part of what we're doing right now is, we are establishing the advisory committees that were established in The Expanded Gaming Act to get advice about what the program should look like in the future. But this — this planning component would be a recommendation from those groups, but I think we thought it was a good idea for — for this year that should continue, at least for that initial \$100,000 into future years, if people haven't determined their initial planning immediately.

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Okay.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, right before Chairman Crosby made his second point, you mentioned, I think, which is the principal, we don't want anybody to rush, necessarily, because there is just this -this deadline. And under that principle, you know, I think it only makes sense to, you know, roll that -- that reserve for whoever didn't make it, you know, knowing that there's opportunities there for anybody and everybody that qualifies in the future, right, because, you know, we don't know what those future impacts may be so it has to be -- you know, there's an element of we have to roll it over and see what happens in the future.

But I -- I'm also wondering, as you get some of these actual requests, how to incentivize and look at -- make sure that, because it's our planning grants, how to make sure that we're not duplicating efforts.

We're getting -- you know, because one community's doing one thing and they maybe very similar and have a lot of overlap into

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

what the community nextdoor is also thinking about and planning. So I know it's -- it's much easier said than -- than done, and that's the way we're configured, you know, by city and town. But to the extent that we can -- you know, and we have to see what those requests are ultimately going to be first. But to the extent that we can utilize, leverage regional approach, regional views, I would really be, you know, encouraging everybody to think about it in those terms.

MR. ZIEMBA: Well, we've taken that point and we're running with that. In our meetings over the past week we've met with a couple of the regional planning agencies, we've talked to them about potentially hosting some sort of method for communities to understand that they can look at these dollars regionally, but regional approaches are not only limited to regional planning agencies, so in our direct dialogue with -- with communities we can say that they can link together.

And I think the point that you make

2.1

regarding regional approaches sort of emphasizes the need for having more time, because if a community wants to work with another community, it, obviously, will take a little bit more time to put together that type of approach. So it's another benefit of being able to roll the reserve.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. Good seque.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You know, I'm fine with it. I think it's important. I'm sort of, two minds about whether to just waive the deadline for this late -- in general, we try to be as flexible as we can to implement the spirit of our regs, as well as the detail of the regs in the law. But I have a feeling this mitigation fund, there are going to be a lot of people not quite playing by the rules. You know, late deadline -- late applications, you know, stretches for what it goes for. to set very much of a precedent of waivers -you know, so I like your solution of, you know, let's -- we will offer this again, to those communities which did not apply for it,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

in 2016, and that solves the problem without a waiver.

MR. ZIEMBA: And, thankfully, we have the benefit of time because these facilities being constructed over the next couple years.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Do we need a motion, John?

MR. ZIEMBA: Sure.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Somebody?

attempt it. So I would move that we accept the recommendation to hold the line on the deadline for the Community Mitigation Fund reserve applications, and encourage anybody who -- who missed that deadline, any community who qualifies but did not meet that deadline, to encourage -- I'm sorry, to apply for next year round of community mitigation funding.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Also, the -- the extended --

MR. ZIEMBA: Just the authorization to establish the reserves, is what executive

1 director is --2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Oh, yes. And authorize Ombudsman Ziemba and Executive 3 4 Director Day to -- to effectuate those 5 reserves of those communities that did meet 6 those deadlines. 7 8 9

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any other

discussion? All in favor? Aye.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye.

Aye. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously. All right. I think we are at our lunch break. It's 12:30, right on time. 12:15. What do we want? I think some of us are going down the street to a restaurant. We might as well -- I mean, we're not holding anybody up, might as well take an hour; is that all right? Okay. So we will come back at 1:30 for the rest of the meeting. And we can leave stuff?

> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Troopers, we can leave stuff here, they'll be somebody here?

All right. Thank you.

(A recess was taken)

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.

It's 1:30, and I'm just making the announcement that, for a variety of reasons, we've decided to reconvene at two o'clock.

This is the primarily for the benefit of those who are watching us via the live stream. So we'll be back and the commission will reconvene and conduct, and carry out the rest of our business beginning at two o'clock.

(A recess was taken)

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. We are reconvening the 146th meeting of the Mass Gaming Commission at about two o'clock. Item No. 7 on the agenda is General Counsel Blue.

MS. BLUE: Good afternoon,

Commissioners.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good afternoon. 2 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good 3 afternoon. 4 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good 5 afternoon. 6 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good 7 afternoon. 8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 9 afternoon. MS. BLUE: At our last commission 10 meeting we heard from a number of our racing 11 12 stakeholders, and after receiving comments, the commission asked us to go back and look at 13 a number of issues. So you have in your 14 15 package today, three memos that address some of the issues that were raised in our last 16 meeting. 17 The first memo is a memo on the 18 19 Economic Assistance Fund. As you may recall, 20 we had a request from the -- New England's 21 Horsemen and Benevolent Protection Association 22 for the -- basically, the balance of the fund 23 from 2014, or for the entire fund, depending

on how you rate the request. We've gone back

and looked at the fund. It's a \$20,000 fund that's allocated each calendar year. The purpose of the fund is for people employed at the track in Suffolk County when they suffer catastrophic issues or illnesses, and we have consistently, over time, awarded almost the entire 20,000 each year.

So if you look at the memo in your packet, what you'll see is that in 2014 we awarded about \$19,200. There's roughly \$800 left in the fund from 2014. And we do have claims coming in now. We've had at least one already in 2015. So it is the legal department's recommendation that you not use that fund for anything, other than individuals who come forward from the track, and who make claims for illnesses or other economic hardship, as we have used it in the past.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Comments?

Questions?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah. I would agree with the recommendation. I've seen, consistently, how we've used that money. It's been an enormous help to people who are

2.1

really in a -- who've had a serious issue, and we have used that money consistently so I -- I would agree with that recommendation.

also. Do we need a vote or we just --

MS. BLUE: I think you just need to instruct the legal department to respond to the horsemen's request for that fund, and we will just send a letter to that effect.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah. I think the horsemen were not aware that we had used just about the entire balance of this money, so I think that they were --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: In prior years, you mean?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Last year, in particular.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah, right.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: They thought that that would be money that would be available, and they were surprised to learn that just about all of it had been -- had been used for legitimate claims.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I agree.

1

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah.

2

sounds like a consensus, you know, and we're

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1 22

23

24

all coalescing around your recommendation.

MS. BLUE: Okay. Thank you. second memo regards the health and welfare benefits. So if you think back to our statute and our regulation, of the Racehorse Development Fund, 4 percent is dedicated to its health and welfare benefits as the fund is split between thoroughbred and standardbred. And the question that --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 4 percent of each side's total, right?

MS. BLUE: Yes. Of each side's total, yes. So we discussed this at the last meeting, and the question was whether the commission can and should pay those funds out. The legal department went back and reviewed that. We believe it is appropriate to pay those funds with a slight caveat, which is that the language requires that the commission determine how much of those funds should be paid to jockeys and drivers.

So if you -- if you think about the

overall fund, the fund is designed to cover jockeys, drivers, horsemen owners. It covers a broad group of people. And it also says that the commission shall approve what piece of that fund gets paid to jockeys on the thoroughbred side, and drivers on the standardbred side.

The thoroughbred horsemen suggested that we go back to the racing committee and ask them to make that decision. It didn't seem to be within, sort of, the -- the expertise of the racing committee. We think that one of -- we should do one of two things.

We can ask the individual stakeholders what they plan to pay, or we can go out and get additional comment. And you'll see comments in your packet from the Jockeys' Guild, who suggested that the payments should be, at least, what Suffolk Downs would have paid, if Suffolk Downs had live racing.

So, right now, under our statute 128A, \$65,000 each year is allocated towards jockey health and welfare benefits, and that

2.1

goes to the Jockeys' Guild. In years past, 2 Suffolk Downs has paid anywhere between 20 and 3 \$30,000 on top of that, so they get, 4 approximately, \$100,000, and the 5 Jockeys' Guild has suggested that what the 6 horsemen should contribute should be equal to 7 what Suffolk Downs would have contributed. But we can also solicit additional comments or 8 9 additional input on that. 10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So the horsemen 11 would contribute 20 to 30,000 on top of the 12 65, which routinely comes from us? 13 MS. BLUE: Yes, that's right. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: By our direction, 14 15 But that's not -- is that within our yeah. 16 authority? Because I guess it is within our authority to direct that, if we wanted to? 17 MS. BLUE: The commission needs to 18 19 approve what is paid by each of the -- the 20 horsemen's group towards the jockeys or the 2.1 drivers. 22 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The statute 23 says that, right? 24 Mm-hmm. MS. BLUE: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: But suppose --2 suppose the racing starts again, then 128A 3 kicks in, right? 4 MS. BLUE: It would. On the 5 thoroughbred side it certainly would, and then 6 I would -- Suffolk would be making some 7 payment, or whoever the licensee was, would be 8 making some payment to that fund as well. 9 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And so, 10 would -- would we still have the obligation of 11 ordering some portion of the 4 percent pay? 12 MS. BLUE: Yes. I believe so. 13 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So there would 14 be three sources at that point --15 MS. BLUE: Yes. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: -- for that 16 17 fund? 18 MS. BLUE: There would be, yes. 19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Because it's 20 gaming license --21 MS. BLUE: Yep. 22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- plus 128A. 23 MS. BLUE: Yep. Plus what comes out 24 of the wagers and the premiums from the track.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What is the Section 60? 2 3 MS. BLUE: It's the Racehorse 4 Development Fund. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But what does it 5 6 say? 7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: It sets up the 8 splits. 9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The Racehorse 10 Development Fund. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, it's these 12 splits? Okay. So what's the third -- so the 13 third -- in the past there's been two 14 payments. One directed by us, which was 15 65,000, and another, which we had to approve, 16 which was Suffolk Downs, paying 20? 17 MS. BLUE: No. We didn't approve 18 Suffolk Downs. 19 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh. I thought you 20 said we did. 21 MS. BLUE: They made it. So we --22 Section 60 now introduces what appears to be 23 is a third revenue stream, which is a piece of 24 this 4 percent, that is approved by the

1 commission to be paid for jockeys and drivers. 2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And I quess 3 what the jockeys are saying, start with the --4 level fund us like we were under 128A. 5 MS. BLUE: Yes. 6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: As the first, 7 you know, first available monies to restore 8 that funding level, regardless of what happens 9 later. 10 MS. BLUE: That's right. I think 11 they're proceeding on the assumption that if 12 there is no racing, they would like to have a 13 level -- a fairly level payment for this year. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 14 Yep. 15 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, how -how can -- don't we have to wait to see what 16 17 happens on the racing front before we can make 18 that judgment, then? 19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, this is 20 the revenue. 21 MS. BLUE: We could. I mean, one of 22 the interesting things, if you look at the

comments from the Jockeys' Guild, is they --

they list what other tracks pay in total for

23

this. And they have higher -- or -- mostly, higher numbers based on how they've divided up tracks. So it may be that, you know, a little extra money wouldn't be a bad idea in a situation like this. I mean, Suffolk, in -- in the tier that that track was in, had some of the lower payments. There are other -- other jurisdictions that put a great deal more money into this than Massachusetts does.

So we could certainly wait until we found out, because we should know that, hopefully, soon. But we would need to instruct the -- the various parties to let -- you know, to let them know that we would expecting some portion of that money to be paid towards this. We just don't have an approved a number at this point.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Where did last year's 65,000 come from?

MS. BLUE: It's in the statute, 128A.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 128A.

MS. BLUE: And it's been level for a

24 long time.

2.1

Page 141 1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So that says 2 65,000. 3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. Thev --4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So is -- I'm 5 sorry, I thought I understood this, but I 6 guess I don't. So the jockeys are saying that 7 they would like that 65,000, which is still 8 required? 9 MS. BLUE: Which is still there, 10 yes. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. So that's 11 12 got to happen. 13 MS. BLUE: Yep. 14 And then, there is CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 15 an addition we have authority to direct some 16 portion of the 4 percent, that's an issue? MS. BLUE: 17 That's correct. Yes. 18 The 65,000 doesn't CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 19 come out of the 4 percent. 20 MS. BLUE: That's right. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. 22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Oh, I thought 23 -- I was also misunderstanding, then. 24 thought the request was to take The Gaming

Act, the 4 percent, and do that 65 or a hundred?

MS. BLUE: The 65 is in the 128A racing statute. It has been leveled for years and years. So there -- there are a couple of appropriations in there. The economic assistance fund is one, where they're just -- there every year that money comes out.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And it's paid by the track out of the takeout?

MS. BLUE: Out of the takeout, yeah.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. I mean,

there's no racing this year, we'll field that next year, because this lacks -- the money's here are already -- monies are available already for us.

MS. BLUE: Yes. That's what the Jockeys' Guild is -- is basing their request on. They're not asking for a higher amount in total. They're going on the assumption that, if there is no racing they would be about \$30,000 short of what they normally get. And so, they would like the horsemen to contribute

at least that much, and the commission to approve a contribution of at least that much into that fund.

with your recommendation that this is a commission decision, not a committee decision. I think that if we could put this out for comment, which will serve two purposes, we'd get more feedback from stakeholders, and, secondly, it gives us the additional time to hopefully understand the thoroughbred racing environment, because it's my understanding that that has to happen this month, a decision before the simulcast runs out. So we're really just a couple of weeks away from knowing the landscape?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Maybe.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well, and that -- you know, again, comments -- rather, additional input I think would be helpful, as well as the time to understand the landscape and make a good decision.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Whether we can do that -- we can go ahead and authorize the

2.1

Page 144 1 65,000 so they get -- they get something now 2 and then wait on --3 MS. BLUE: You don't need to 4 authorize the 65,000. 5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, that's just 6 going to happen? 7 MS. BLUE: Yeah. That happens 8 anyways. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So the jockey's 10 letter was irrelevant; they didn't need to send us this letter? 11 12 They were trying --MS. BLUE: No. 13 what they were trying to show is what the 14 short -- what the total payment has been in 15 Massachusetts to jockeys over time. 16 So, you know, the shortfall that they would have this year, if there were no 17 18 racing at Suffolk Downs, would be \$30,000. 19 And they're just using that as an example as 20 to what you may or may not choose to approve. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. But their 22 last paragraph says, "We would respectfully 23 request that the amount of money the

commission does be held at the 65,000, as if

we have to make that decision, which we don't?

MS. BLUE: Yeah. That one we don't
have to.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I don't think that's what they're saying. I had a lot of trouble with that last paragraph yesterday myself. I think that what that last paragraph says is that, with the 65 and what you authorize we want to add up to -- we want the 65 and what you authorize to add up to what we're paid, which is roughly 100,000.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well I'm -- I'm seeing -- I'm sorry, you're right. You're right. You're absolutely right.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yeah. I had to read it seven times.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Yeah, you're right. Okay. So they know they're getting 65, they're asking us for the delta. You're exactly right.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right.

MS. BLUE: Yes, that's right.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So I -- I like

2.1

Commissioner Cameron's suggestion. Let's get some more comment on it. Let's wait. The package that they're looking for is around 100,000, but maybe more if -- if we choose to up the total amount that they're getting to be commensurate with other tracks, and that's the decision that we would have to make. So let's get some more comment. Let's get a little bit more time. It's not going to make any difference. And then, let's revisit this when we have a firmer idea, perhaps, as to what racing's going to look like on the thoroughbred side.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: When does -- when the 65 get paid, or is it -- has it been paid?

MS. BLUE: That I'd have to check.

I don't know. We pay it once -- I think once a year, but I'm not sure. We'll have to ask

Derek.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. I do

know -- there is some time sensitivity in the

sense that a lot of these accounts are

actually running dry, and there are people

that don't know whether they're going to have

2.1

certain kinds of benefits. You know, they've -- the horsemen have talked to me about this, us about this. But I think if we could make -- make sure the 65 goes out as soon as it can, immediately, if there's no reason not to, and then hold our fire on the 4 percent and get some other comment, because I agree we don't have much feedback on this from other stakeholders. Okay.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Is there a separate issue to be tended here with respect to the harness association?

MS. BLUE: So the harness needs to come back too. This is a first for the -- the harness drivers, because they didn't have this requirement that they have to tell you what they're going to provide to the -- to the drivers, so they have the same issue. They need to come back and provide us with some kind of information as to what they plan to provide to the drivers, and then you would have to approve that as well. This is new because of the Racehorse Development Fund, so it's -- it's a first time for both sides.

2.1

2 ame

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Could I -- could I amend my thought here? This is -- I have a hard time keeping these different accounts separate. But the health and pension benefits, as I understood it from Mr. Spadea, they have an account that they may well not be able to pay to keep certain benefits flowing to people. And he said he's getting calls all the time from people saying, help. I don't know what I'm doing. What's happening here? And they were anxious to get the money as quickly as we could.

Could we, say, send out 200,000 of the 262, which would -- is the 4 percent for the thoroughbreds, and hold back the 62? And I just picked that number, but it's for the sake of discussion, hold back 62 to determine whether we want to mandate that some of it go to the jockeys to make up their request or not? That gets them some real money quickly that goes to their health and pension benefits, which really are, I believe, at risk, but still retains the option for us to do what the jockeys have asked for? Does that

1 seem like a reasonable approach? 2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Would be --3 the question would be what amount? 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: To hold back? 5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, I'm just 7 saying, if the high end is 35,000, let's just 8 make -- pick a round number and hold back --9 hold back 62 just so we get 'em. But I think 10 they would -- I think they would be most 11 appreciative. And I think -- frankly, think 12 we have a duty to get them the money as fast 13 as we can. It's sitting there and it's meant to be servicing these folks. So unless 14 15 there's some reason not to do that, you know, 16 that would be my suggestion on how we handle 17 that. We would need to have a 18 MS. BLUE: 19 similar situation, I think, for the drivers on 20 the standardbred side. 2.1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. 22 MS. BLUE: So, you know, whatever --23 and I don't recall off the top of my head,

what the 4 percent is of their piece.

1 much smaller --2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 87750. 3 MS. BLUE: So as long as we 4 allocated a certain portion for each fund to 5 hold back and then paid the rest of it, I 6 think the commission could do that. 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The jockeys --8 jockeys' letters only talks about jockeys, 9 right? 10 MS. BLUE: Yes. That's correct. 11 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah, because 12 they don't represent. 13 MS. BLUE: They don't represent --14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: No, no, the 15 drivers, but does the same -- the same model 16 hold in place --17 MS. BLUE: Yes. 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: -- on the other side? 19 20 MS. BLUE: Well, we need some more 21 input into it. I believe it does. 22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. 23 MS. BLUE: They don't -- the 24 standardbred folks don't have allocation by

statute, is my understanding. So I would like 2 to get more information from the standardbred 3 folks on how they do it and how it gets paid. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. So if we 5 did -- you know, basically paid out 80 percent 6 of the 262, which is around 200,000, and paid 7 out 80 percent of the 88,000, which would be 8 70,000, and held back the similar amounts for 9 both, then we can resolve this in the next 10 couple weeks. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Mr. O'Toole, 11 12 do you have any thoughts on the harness side? 13 MR. O'TOOLE: Good afternoon, Commissioners. 14 15 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good 16 afternoon. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good afternoon. 17 18 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good 19 afternoon. 20 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good 21 afternoon. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 22 Good 23 afternoon. 24 MR. O'TOOLE: Steve O'Toole,

Plainridge Racecourse general manager. Thanks for getting me out of the snow today. When I left, we're getting another couple inches.

For the standardbred side, this will be a new adventure for them. They have a parent association called Harness Horsemen International. And they have -- similar to the Jockeys' Guild, they have coverage, which they do participate in now as far as liability, but they haven't participated for a number of years in the insurance coverages for health and benefits to that nature. So they'll be able to go back and start that again.

So the initial funding would be, you know, a good start for them to get -- to get rolling on that, so I think they'd appreciate the payment. As far as separating anything out for drivers and all that, that would be something they'd have to determine, but this is all new to them.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Because that hasn't happened, there or hasn't been a parallel structure in the past; is that what

2.1

you said?

2.1

MR. O'TOOLE: They did participate

-- they did participate until the funding got
so low they couldn't afford it any longer. So
they -- they do still participate in the HHI
liability coverage so that liability
occurrences are covered. I think it's a
million-dollar policy that HHA buys through
HHI to cover all their members in that
respect. But as far as health and welfare
benefits, they -- they're not participating in
that program right now.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MR. O'TOOLE: But there is -- there is a program similar to the Jockeys' Guild that's out there for them, they just haven't participated in, probably, the last half-a-dozen years or so.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And when they were participating, that reserve between the drivers and everyone else, how was it handled for the standardbred?

MR. O'TOOLE: So it was equal.

There was no carve-out for the drivers, versus

the trainer, versus the grooms. It was -- it was universal coverage with pretty much all the same --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: For everybody?

MR. O'TOOLE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Everybody the

same?

2.1

MR. O'TOOLE: Yes, because the -well, the Jockeys' Guild is more concentrated
on the jockeys, whereas the national HBPA is
concentrated with -- with the horsemen
population. So the HBPA is the New England
HBPA. They're an arm of the national HBPA,
and I think they provide the other insurances
for the trainers and the groomers, and the hot
walkers and things like that.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Which would explain the difference in the statute, perhaps, Catherine, right, there's not that specific --

MS. BLUE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- carve-out,

if you will --

MS. BLUE: That's probably true.

Page 155 1 Yes. 2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- for the 3 statute? Thank you. 4 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So treating 5 them equally for purposes of getting some 6 monies out now, you believe would be 7 appreciated by the -- the harness horsemen? 8 MR. O'TOOLE: I think it, so they 9 could start that process with HHI step, 10 figuring out what kind of policy they could 11 purchase and get that process rolling. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. 13 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. 14 MR. O'TOOLE: Thank you. 15 So we would look CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 16 for feedback from the thoroughbred stakeholders --17 18 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 19 stakeholder, right? 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: -- and, but also 21 it's, sort of, still going to be inviting the 22 standardbred people to take a look at this and 23 see whether they want to have a similar model.

MS. BLUE:

Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Okay. 2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But we would 3 still reserve, maybe 20 percent, I guess, 4 right? CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Of both. 5 6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Of both. Even 7 though, at least with standardbred we might 8 not have to because everything goes to the 9 same pool. 10 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. 12 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Until we have 13 more comment, I think that's appropriate. 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. 15 MS. BLUE: So if you could -- if you 16 vote to approve the payment and holding back the 20 percent, we'll go get started on that. 17 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Commissioner 19 Cameron, do you want to take a crack at it? 20 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So I move 2.1 that we -- that we distribute a portion of the 22 4 percent for both harness and -- and 23 thoroughbred racing, holding back a 20-percent 24 until we understand, better, the landscape.

We also -- that's a separate -- the comment is separate so --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any discussion

further? All in favor? Aye.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes

have it unanimously.

MS. BLUE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.

MS. BLUE: The second memo in your

package deals with the payment of the

17 | 16 percent, which goes to the thoroughbred and

18 standardbred breeding programs. We went back

and reviewed that. Under Chapter 128, which

is the agriculture statute, as opposed to

21 128A, which is the racing statute, the

22 Massachusetts Thoroughbred Breeders

23 Association is recognized as the association.

24 They are recognized by statute, so the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

commission does not have to take any further action to recognize them.

The Standardbred Owners of

Massachusetts is the group that you have

recognized in the past for the standardbred

owners, and -- and they've submitted a request

for this payment so we have -- so we generally

approve them as the group for the breeders

every year in front of the commission.

So we believe that you could make the 16-percent payments to both groups. The Racehorse Development Fund says it goes into an account that they set up, each one of them sets up, and we could, with your approval, making those payments as well.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: General

Counsel Blue, we authorized -- I was reading

that in the minutes. We authorized 8 percent,

because that's what the request was, and

then -- so do we have to amend that

authorization that we --

MS. BLUE: Well, the 8 percent is a different number. The 8 percent is under the agriculture statute.

2.1

1	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Right.
2	MS. BLUE: And that's the limit that
3	they can use for their total for marketing and
4	other nonbreeding activities.
5	So I would recommend that we we
6	pay them the entire amount that's due under
7	the racehorse development, subject to the fact
8	that, when we request that they show us
9	documentation, that they have not spent more
10	than the 8 percent on their marketing.
11	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No. I agree
12	with with that. I just didn't know if we
13	had to amend our prior motion, which
14	authorized 8 percent.
15	MS. BLUE: I think we can do it
16	here.
17	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, it was eight
18	of the 16.
19	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: It was?
20	CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It was eight of
21	the 16, right.
22	MS. BLUE: Yes. But that the
23	eight
24	COMMISSIONER CAMERON: But we're now

1 going to give the whole 16, not just the 2 eight. 3 MS. BLUE: When they talked about 4 the eight, they're talking about the separate 5 part of the statute. 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. 7 MS. BLUE: I think that they can 8 probably use more than just the marketing 9 money. The 8 percent is all they can use for 10 marketing. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. 12 MS. BLUE: Our Racehorse Development 13 Fund does entitle them to the entire 16. Right. Yeah, I 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 15 totally agree. I think we should definitely 16 do that as soon as we possibly can. Any other discussion or different views? 17 18 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And this is 19 similar, right, it has the same split, the 20 75/25? 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. It's 22 1,000,050 for the thoroughbred breeders, and 23 350,000 for the standardbred. 24 Commissioner Cameron?

that we authorize the entire 16 percent distribution from the Racehorse Development Fund to -- the 16 percent to the Massachusetts Thoroughbred Breeders Association, and the 16 percent of the split of the Standardbred Owners of Massachusetts.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Standardbred breed -- breeders, right? Yeah, owners.

That's right.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Owners. It's the name of the organization.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. Second.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Now, what are we doing -- the thoroughbreds, we don't know whether there's going to be a race or not. We don't have anybody to give purse money to, and we understand there may be a change in how the purse money's used anyway, directed to be used, but the standardbred, they're racing now. Should we be giving that 16 -- it's certainly not going to go to less. It might -- it's possible we might decide it someday, or the racehorse -- the racing

2.1

committee might decide it some day, if there is no thoroughbred racing, to change the percentages. But, at the moment, it's 75/25 and, certainly, standardbred isn't going to be going down, so should we not consider authorizing -- or maybe we don't have to authorize the payment to the standardbred purse holders' purses?

MS. BLUE: Well, based upon the action by the commission today, we've now taken care of all of the breeding money, and then all of the health and welfare money leaves only the purse account money.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MS. BLUE: And because the standardbreds are racing, I would suggest to the commission that we authorize making the purse money payments to the standardbred.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MS. BLUE: It goes into an account. They will have to enter into an agreement with their horsemen, as they always do, and they can determine how to allocate that money. But I think we should make that payment at this

2.1

1 point.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Okay.

Good. Just out of curiosity, Steve, you know, if this -- there's \$2,000,187 in the Racehorse Development Fund will come to the purse account, what does that do to the -- your purses?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Builds them up.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, I know that.

I mean, how much? How significant is that?

MR. O'TOOLE: So it's very

significant because right -- going into this

year, Penn National overpaid the purses last

year about \$850,000.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Wow.

MR. O'TOOLE: So the -- you know, there's an ebb and flow to the purse accounts in good times and in bad times. So right now, that flow is in the negative for the -- for the purse accounts. So this will help replenish that. We'll be able to start off with where we were last year, if not, maybe a few dollars more. And then, as handled

Page 164 increases the purses of -- handled money comes 2 into the purse account, as well as operations 3 that begin in June, sometime in June --CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 4 I misunderstood. 5 You said Penn national, they had a subsidy of 850,000? 6 7 MR. O'TOOLE: Correct. 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. And what 9 was the total purse amount? 10 MR. O'TOOLE: That we paid last year? 11 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. MR. O'TOOLE: 2.2, \$2.3 million. 13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 2.2. So this is 14 15 almost doubling the total -- total purse amount? 16 MR. O'TOOLE: I just -- just using 17 the figures that are out there for projections 18 19 and everything, it looked like about a four to 20 \$5 million purse account. 2.1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Counting? 22 MR. O'TOOLE: For this coming year. 23 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Counting racehorse

24

development money?

1 MR. O'TOOLE: Yes. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah, okay. 3 it's 40 to 50 percent of the total. Wow. 4 MR. O'TOOLE: Yes. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'm sure it's 5 6 public. 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. Well, 8 that's great. I think we should get that out 9 there ASAP. Commissioner Cameron? 10 MR. O'TOOLE: Thank you. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thanks, Steve. 12 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No. 13 that's --14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: No I thought -- we 15 need to move to authorize the payment, right? 16 MS. BLUE: If you would. 17 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay. 18 authorize that we -- we provide the 80 percent 19 purse account to the standardbred -- to the --20 I want to say it's the same --21 MS. BLUE: It's the purse account 22 money to the standardbred licensee. 23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So it's the 24 purse account -- the 80 percent to the purse

account to the standardbred licensee. 2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any other 4 discussion? All in favor? Aye. 5 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye. 6 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 7 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 10 have it unanimously. Great. So the one -- so 11 we're still sitting on 6-1/2 million for the 12 thoroughbreds, and we will await progress for 13 what we do with that. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And we're 14 sitting on -- and we're sitting on 20 percent 15 16 of the four -- of the 4 percent. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Of the four. 17 MS. BLUE: Of the health and 18 19 welfare. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Great. 21 That's very helpful. Thank you. 22 MS. BLUE: Next in your packet, we 23 have two amended small business impact 24 statements. We've included the regs with

them, but you have already approved the regs, they're just there for your benefit. These are the amended small business impact for 205 CMR 149, which is the Racehorse Development Fund regulations. And for the amendments to 205 CMR 134, which is licensing regulations. Once you approve the amended small business impact statements, we'll file these and they'll be ready to go after they're posted. So we've been through the whole formal process.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Sure it's all right? Anybody? Any thoughts, questions, issues? Do we have a motion?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Sure. I can move that the commission approve submitting the amended small business impact statement for regulations 205 CMR 149, the Racehorse Development Fund regulations, as well as regulations 205 CMR 134, the licensing regulations, as presented here in the packet today.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any other

2.1

discussion? All in favor? Aye.

2 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously.

MS. BLUE: While we're doing the small business impact statements, if we would just skip ahead a little bit, we have two small business impact statements. They're under the IEB section, but really they're should be -- they're more legal-department focused.

These are the small business impact statements for 205 CMR 139. And 140, these are the continuing disclosure and reporting obligations, and the gaming -- gross gaming revenue and tax remittance and reporting.

This will start us through the formal process on these regulations, so if you could approve the small business impact statements, we'll get that process started.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And these

Page 169 1 regulations we also approved last time --2 MS. BLUE: Yes. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- if I 3 4 remember correctly, on the taxes --MS. BLUE: 5 Yes. 6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- the gross 7 gaming revenues have been --8 MS. BLUE: To start through. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Discussion? Motion, Commissioner? 10 11 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Sure. I would 12 move that this commission approve the 13 submission of thee small business impact statement on regulations 205 CMR 139, the 14 15 continuing disclosure and reporting 16 obligations of gaming licensees and 17 qualifiers' regulations, as well as the small 18 business impact statement for 205 CMR 140, the 19 gross gaming revenue tax remittance and 20 reporting regulations as presented here in the 2.1 packet. 22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? 23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any further

discussion? All in favor? Aye.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously.

MS. BLUE: And then, finally under legal, we have, for your consideration today, a policy. This is one more of the pieces of our ongoing records management, overall records management type policy. And this is a policy regarding the removal of the applicant materials form the commission's Web site.

We have a lot of the applicants' materials from the very first -- from RFA1s and RFA2s for both successful and unsuccessful applicants still on our Web site. And we wanted to put into a practice into place whereby we move some of those. We archive them. So we don't -- we don't get rid of them or anything, we archive them. But we leave up just those materials pertaining to the successful applicants. And that frees up some

2.1

space, and then allows people to see, you know, what's going on with the current applicants. It also acknowledges that some of the other material gets stale over time. A lot of that stuff is now two, sometimes close to three years old. So if we implement this policy, it will -- it will allow us to take some materials down, but we will still be keeping them in an archive.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And on a ongoing basis, your recommendation would be that when we make a decision, like, a Region C decision, if we make one, that upon the decision the materials would come down immediately for the losers?

MS. BLUE: I think we were going to leave them up for about a year, if they're unsuccessful --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, it was a year?

MS. BLUE: -- and then we would take
them down. It does allow folks to go back and
look at them. We do, oftentimes, get requests
for some of those materials so it just makes
it a little simpler. We'd leave them up for a

2.1

1 little period of time. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, that's not 3 what it says here. 4 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, it says, 5 "take it down upon the award of the license." 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. 7 MS. BLUE: Upon the award? 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. 9 MS. BLUE: Okay. We leave the 10 successful. 11 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Successful. 12 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. 13 Successful stays up for the life of the 14 license unsuccessful comes down with the 15 award. MS. BLUE: With the award. 16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm agnostic on 17 18 the point, if you think ought to -- it would 19 be better to leave it up for a little while, 20 Catherine. 21 MS. BLUE: I don't think so. 22 think -- it will be available. You know, as 23 long as it's readily available, if someone 24 asks for it, then, I think we're fine.

1 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Do you need a 2 motion? 3 MS. BLUE: Yes. And then we'll add 4 this to our list of policies. 5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody? 6 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So I move 7 that we approve the removal of applicant 8 materials from the commission Web site policy 9 as outlined here in this -- in this report. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: 10 Second. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is there any other 12 stuff that we have up that we need to think 13 about whether to bring down or not, that we need to follow a policy? 14 15 MS. BLUE: I'm sure there is. 16 should get with Elaine and have a conversation 17 about what's there. We could give some 18 thought to archiving certain periods of 19 time --20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. 21 MS. BLUE: -- that don't need to be 22 as readily available, but can be available if 23 needed. So it's something for us to consider. 24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Okay.

Page 174 further discussion? All in favor? Aye. 1 2 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye. 3 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 4 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 6 7 have it unanimously. 8 MS. BLUE: That's all for legal. 9 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. 10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 11 Thanks very 12 much. 13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We now get to 14 Item 7, the IEB. Director Wells. 15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Counselor 16 Blue, was there a 205 CMR 151 part of the 17 packet for a reason? 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think that's 19 what came late. 20 MS. BLUE: 205 CMR 151. 21 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: That's the 22 operations --23 MS. BLUE: I don't see that on the 24 agenda. Which one?

Page 175 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. Then --1 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It was left on our 3 places. 4 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It was left on 5 our places. 6 MS. BLUE: Oh, the operations 7 certificate, it's here; it's going to come up 8 under IEB. 9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, 7C, that's 10 11 right, yeah. 12 MS. BLUE: Yep. 13 MS. WELLS: Good afternoon, 14 Commissioners. 15 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good 16 afternoon. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good afternoon. 18 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good 19 afternoon. 20 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good 21 afternoon. 22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good 23 afternoon. 24 MS. WELLS: I believe General

Counsel Blue has just confirmed that she took care of agenda Item 7A, the approval of that SBIS, so I'll move on with the IEB section of the agenda this morning, to 7B, which is the temporary license request. So for your consideration this morning I have three requests from Penn National for temporary licenses from primary vendors.

The first request is for

Konami Gaming. Konami Gaming was incorporated in the state of Nevada in January of 1997, is a wholly-owned subsidiary of

Konami Corporation of America, a holding company, which, in turn, is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Konami Corporation, the parent company. Konami Gaming is a designer and manufacturer of slot machines and the SYNKROS casino management system for the global gaming market.

Konami Corporation was founded in March of 1969 as a jukebox rental and repair business by Kagemasa Kozuki, the current chairman in Japan, and is currently a multidimensional Japanese holding company,

2.1

which conducts business through its various subsidiaries, which are publishers of toys, trading cards, animate, slot machines, arcade cabinets and video games, as well as operators of some health and fitness clubs in Japan.

There are eight entities, which are deemed qualifiers under this application filing for Konami Gaming, as well as the investigation also extends to eight individual qualifiers.

Konami Gaming is currently licensed in at least 37 states and licensed by, approximately, eight international gaming jurisdictions. Inquiries into various jurisdictions proved licensure by Konami Gaming to be in good standing. investigation relative to the criminal civil and financial background, the applicant to date, or it's affiliated entities and individual qualifiers, has not produced any information that would preclude a finding that Konami Gaming possess the requisite qualifications for the issuance of a temporary gaming vendor primary license of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

1 So the finding by the IEB is that 2 it's reasonably likely that the -- the license 3 would be issued upon completion of the 4 investigation presented -- presentation to the commission. And that's the standard. 5 6 So I don't know if the commission 7 wants to potentially vote on these separately, 8 or I can go through each of three requests? 9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You have three 10 requests --11 MS. WELLS: Yes. 12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- for gaming 13 vendor primaries? 14 MS. WELLS: Primaries. They're all 15 primaries. Do you want me to go through all 16 three, or do you want to do the vote one at a 17 time? 18 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So you have a 19 short summary for all three just like the one 20 you just read? 2.1 Correct. Similar, yes. MS. WELLS: 22 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think 23 that's fine. 24 MS. WELLS: Okay, go through? The

second request for temporary license, also from Penn National, is from Modern Gaming East, LLC. Modern was incorporated in the state of New Jersey in January of 2005. Its office is located in Ventnor, Jersey, and is primarily a sales organization whose members have a combined 44 years experience selling gaming and nongaming equipment to the regulated U.S. gaming market.

Modern currently acts as a sales agent for gaming and nongaming products, including slot machines, slot machine peripherals and components, and will providing this type of service to Massachusetts casinos. The peripherals and components include LCD monitors, laser printer and billing acceptors.

Modern currently acts as a sales agent for Konami Gaming, which I previously spoke about, in certain states, and intends to act as Konami's sales agent in Massachusetts. All agreements with casinos are entered into between Konami and the casino. Modern acts as the sales agent only. In its entirety, the Modern Gaming application consists of one

2.1

entity qualifier and two individual qualifiers.

Modern Gaming is currently licensed in at least seven gaming jurisdictions. And inquiries into various jurisdictions proved licensure by Modern and its qualifiers to be in good standing.

So similar to the Konami application, the -- the finding by the IEB is they're reasonably likely to be licensed upon completion of the investigation and presentation to the commission.

The third petition for temporary licensure by Penn National is for Ainsworth Game Technology. The specific entity seeking a primary gaming vendor license is Ainsworth Game Technology, Inc., I'll refer to as the applicant. It was incorporated in the state of Florida in 2006, has a current principal business address in Las Vegas, Nevada. It is 100-percent owned by AGT Party, Limited, a nontrading, Australian proprietary company in -- incorporated in Newington South Wales -- in Newington New South Wales, pardon me,

2.1

February 15th of 2001. AGT Party Limited is a wholly-owned -- is wholly-owned by the parent company, Ainsworth Game Technology Limited, and serves as a holder of investments of international companies.

Ainsworth Game Technology, Limited is an Australian-based manufacturer and supplier of gaming machines, software and associated gaming-related equipment headquartered at New South Wales.

Ainsworth Game Technology is a publicly-traded company listed on the Australian Securities Exchange under AGI and registered with the Australian Securities and Investments Commission in 1995.

The applicant, a subsidiary of
Ainsworth Game Technology, Limited, provides
sales, marketing distribution and technical
support of slot machines and related equipment
to casinos in the Americas.

The applicant registered as a foreign corporation with the Massachusetts Secretary of State on April 10, 2014. Along with the applicant, two additional entities

2.1

and nine individuals have determined -- have been determined to be qualifiers.

While the applicant, which is registered, qualified or licensed by over 100 agencies and jurisdictions, including Pennsylvania, Ohio, Missouri, New Jersey and Nevada is reasonably likely to be licensed upon completion of the investigation, there are certain historical issues, which the IEB has identified, and will thoroughly review and investigate, which include information from 1981 to 1984, the criminal history of Ainsworth Game Technology, Limited CEO and current qualifier related to issues in the Oregon Tribal Gaming Commission that is approximately 30 to -- 30, yeah, now 31 years old.

So subsequent to that, in 1997 the Colorado Limited Gaming Control Commission issued a notice of denial against Aristocrat's manufacturer and distributor license, in part, because of Leonard H. Ainsworth's influence in an association with an Aristocrat.

In August of 2008, there was an

2.1

issue where the Oregon State Police found
Ainsworth Game Technology Limited not suitable
to do business in Oregon in August of 2008
based on information about one of the
principals. The company challenged the
finding, and in August of 2010 reached an
agreement with the OSP and Oregon Department
of Justice, and the OSP substantively has
withdrawn this finding of not suitable and
replaced it with a revised determination,
which clarifies the ability of each tribe to
enter into a contract with the company.

And then, in 2011 Missouri Gaming

Commission issued an order of denial for

Ainsworth Game Technology and found two

principals unsuited -- unsuitable for

licensure. After an appeal by Ainsworth, the

Missouri Gaming Commission ultimately approved

the application in 2014.

So there is some historical information there. However, based on the current status of licensure of the company in numerous jurisdictions, it's reasonably likely that they will be issued a license by the

2.1

1 commission, but I wanted to alert the 2 commission that we will be looking into these 3 issues and confirming there's nothing that the 4 commission would need to -- it would rise to 5 the level the commission would want to deny 6 the license. 7 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So, Director, 8 you're asking for temporary licenses --9 MS. WELLS: Yes. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 10 -- for these three entities? 11 12 MS. WELLS: Correct. 13 Penn National is. We're -- we're -- the finding is that they're reasonably likely to 14 15 be issued the license. 16 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And you've looked at Ainsworth enough, you feel like, to 17 18 -- to recommend them at this point, but you'll 19 be -- you'll be doing more work? 20 MS. WELLS: Correct. 2.1 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: What's 22 Ainsworth's role; are they related to 23 Aristocrat? 24 MS. WELLS: Yeah, there's a

Page 185 1 connection. I don't know. Do you know the 2 specifics on --3 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Are they a sub 4 of Aristocrat? MS. WELLS: Well, no. I think there 5 6 was a -- one of the principals had worked -- I 7 can't remember if it was Ainsworth came before 8 Aristocrat, or Aristocrat became before 9 Ainsworth and then -- and they're -- at the 10 same time, and then there was a split-off. 11 they're -- they're connected historically, but 12 now they are two separate entities. 13 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I see. I see. 14 Okay. 15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And what does -- what does Ainsworth do? What kind 16 of -- what kind of equipment -- similar to 17 18 Aristocrat? Is this --19 MS. WELLS: Yeah. So they're --20 they're both a product of the gaming 21 equipment. 22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So 23 technology -- technology for gaming equipment. 24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And the problem in

the 80s was with Mr. Ainsworth? 1 2 MS. WELLS: Correct. You know, I want to make sure I'm disclosing information 3 4 that may potentially should -- that should be 5 redacted in a public setting, but it was --6 there was a -- make sure I'm expressing this 7 correctly, a criminal history issue of an 8 individual who had the connection with Ainsworth Game Technology, but it's very old 9 10 history. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is the same --12 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. But we 13 don't know who the individual was? I mean, 14 you may know --15 MS. WELLS: Right. 16 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: -- but you're not -- you're not saying the individual. 17 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, you 19 identified, just now, somebody named 20 Ainsworth. 21 MS. WELLS: No, no, no. It's got a 22 different name. I'm just -- I don't know if I 23 should check with legal whether -- at this 24 point, I'd prefer to --

MS. BLUE: This would be -- this is a -- it sounds like a criminal history issue, which we would obviously redact a report we were going to do. I think, what is important for the commission to know is, there does seem to be some sort of issue. It is very old.

The IEB will need to look into it to determine that it has no ongoing impact. But the request, I believe, Karen, is that -- for a temporary license subject to IEB further investigation.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I know Penn made these applications. Do we know, or have we heard from Penn that they plan to do immediate business with all three of these?

MS. WELLS: Yes. So I had requested from Penn, the list of the primary vendors that they planned on doing business with, and these were included in that list.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And if we were to wait until you complete the Ainsworth investigation, that would put them at a competitive disadvantage?

MS. WELLS: Correct.

Page 188 1 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That would put 2 Ainsworth or Penn, or both? 3 MS. WELLS: Yeah. I would say, 4 both. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Did Ainsworth have 5 6 time to get their application so that they 7 could have been properly checked? Why are we 8 -- why do we not --9 MS. WELLS: Well it -- it takes a 10 long time to do the full investigation, as you 11 know, for a primary vendor as a step down from 12 license investigations, but that would 13 incorporate travel to other jurisdictions to look at information and interviews with 14 15 qualifiers so --16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: When did you get 17 the application? 18 MS. WELLS: I don't have the date of the transmittal. 19 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: More or less? 2.1 Pardon? 22 MS. WELLS: I don't have the date of 23 the transmittal. I would say --24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: More or less?

1 MS. WELLS: -- months.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Months ago?

MS. WELLS: Maybe -- I -- you know, I'd have to look.

weren't timely, because they were -- didn't

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So you're not asking for a temporary for them because they

8 get around --

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

MS. WELLS: No, no, no. All of these primary vendor investigations, the expectation is these will take many, many months. Say, six to nine months, potentially, to do, depending on the volume and what else the IEB has going on at the same time. expectation is that all of these vendors are going to be requesting temporary licenses and potentially getting them if they are -- if it's appropriate before the investigation is complete. So this is no surprise. It's not as if they're getting a temporary license because their investigation wasn't done in time or some delay either by the applicant or the commission.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well -- go ahead.

Page 190 1 Whoever --2 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yeah. 3 Gaming vendor primary. So we're expecting, 4 and hopefully Penn has shared this with you, 5 that there's going to be an ongoing business 6 relationship with these folks, proceeding out 7 past their opening date? 8 MS. WELLS: There may be -- yeah. 9 For example, maintenance of machines or they 10 may buy more machines or new machines, or trade out machines. Those kinds of things. 11 12 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: it's -- it's less of a risk, I think, at this 13 category that we do the temporary then come in 14 and do the business. 15 16 MS. WELLS: Yeah, right. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: And walk 17 18 away before we conclude the --19 MS. WELLS: Right. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, you know --2.1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I was going to 22 chime in. I, for one, am comfortable with --23 you know, with the recommendations for the

temporary license, even with this historical

topic on the last one. I don't know if my colleagues feel differently, but I'm prepared to act on the recommendation of the IEB.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well, I think we've routinely received very sound recommendations from the IEB. And the fact that they were licensed in over a hundred jurisdictions, you know, is probably part of the reason why you're making this recommendation to us. So I --

MS. WELLS: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: -- I am comfortable as well with the -- with the recommendation, and the full investigation will take place, and if something changes you'll advise us.

MS. WELLS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I agree. I would move that the commission approve temporary gaming vendor primary license for Modern Gaming, Konami and Ainsworth Game Technology, Inc. Did I get all three names right?

MS. WELLS: That's correct.

2.1

1 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? 3 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I tend to agree 5 with the commissioners. If feels like 6 story -- going through the story makes it feel 7 like there's some -- a company that's got some 8 things that are fast and loose. But I think, 9 if you recommend it, then I think it would --10 I think it's appropriate to go along with your recommendation. Any other -- any other 11 12 discussion? All in favor? Aye. 13 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye. 14 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 15 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 18 have it unanimously. 19 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I would just 20 add that I think the record ought to reflect 2.1 that -- that there's no individual names that 22 have been indicated as the -- as the 23 individuals who had some troubles in the past. 24 MS. WELLS: Right.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's yet to be determined.

MS. WELLS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: We don't -that's not anything the commission is -- it's
any part of the commission's record. And
whatever -- whatever individuals that are,
perhaps, involved in something, is yet to be
determined.

MS. WELLS: That is correct. Thank you. And if the commission will indulge me, I realize it's not on the agenda for today, but it's something that was not called to my attention 'til about 4:10 or 4:15 yesterday afternoon, I thought the commission may be want to be aware.

As to Region C, the applicants for licensure, for casino license in that area, I did -- as the commission knows, the deadline for submission for all the materials for the RFA1 application, including the BEDs and PhD apps for the qualifiers identifying the operator, the equity and the -- and the entire structure, are due on the 16th, that's what

2.1

the commission decided. I had reached out --1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'm sorry.

> Which -- what was that -- that date again? CHAIRMAN CROSBY: March 16th.

The 16th is when the --MS. WELLS: basically --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: March 16th?

MS. WELLS: -- March 16 is when the application is due. So they have to provide their structure, they have to identify their operator and identify their equity contribution to the project.

And I received -- I had sent deficiency letters to two of the potential applicants for that due date. Received -- in that letter I sent to the Crossroads application, I indicated -- we had had conversations that there's information missing, and we had spoken and scheduled a scoping meeting for tomorrow, March 6th. in the letter, I had indicated that materials identifying who -- who the -- what the structure is and identifying their qualifiers, it should be submitted to the IEB, which was

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

1 Monday.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

I got a note from -- e-mail from the lawyer from Crossroads, indicating they wanted to postpone the scoping meeting until the following week, which -- on the 10th or the 11th. I responded back to the attorney indicating they had missed the deadline for submitting materials to the IEB for us to review, that March 2nd deadline that I had set, and indicated if they had -- they would provide those materials by the end -- by, I think, four o'clock on Friday -- on Wednesday, yesterday, the 4th, that I could postpone the scoping meeting 'til the Monday -- Monday, what's the date on Monday? Monday, March 9th in the morning. I did receive an e-mail back from the attorney that reads, "Karen, my clients were not able to finalize their agreement by your four o'clock deadline. No further information.

So I just wanted to bring that to the commission's attention, if the commission wanted to weigh in or give direction on what you'd like to me to do at this point. The

procedure has been that the applicant, for all our licenses, provides information to the commission so that we can do a scope-of-licensing process and identify who the qualifiers are, write up a letter to give to the potential applicant, and then that is the basis for their submission on any particular deadline for applications.

So I'm in a -- a bit of a bind here because I don't know, you know, if the commission wants me to extend the internal deadlines that we have, or if the commission has a position on that the problem, you know, that we have is that staff needs time to review the submissions they give us, then we have to schedule the meeting, meet with the applicant, and then after that we have to draft the letter back to the applicant identifying the qualifiers, and then after that, they have to make sure that all their applications meet the requirements of the scoping letter.

So that's the process, and just wanted to bring that to commission's attention

2.1

in case there's any comment or direction you'd like to give to me.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, it seems to me that, as we look at the structure, and I don't think we've discussed this before, but the deadline for submission of materials is the deadline that the commission sets. All right. That's been true in every case.

And what the IEB has done with the scoping meetings and the like, is provide a service to the applicants, so that the applicants will have an understanding of what stuff has to be turned in by the deadline.

And it seems to me that the IEB has extended itself, and has set the internal deadlines that you just discussed so that the applicant will have the opportunity to fulfill its obligations in giving the IEB a full list of things when the deadline for submission arrives.

If the applicant chooses not to comply with the IEB's request for information and meetings, and the like, in a way that gives the IEB a reasonable chance to respond,

then, when the deadline arrives and they submit materials, the IEB may go through them and find that they're still in complete and that, in this case, is the end of the game.

you've set now a deadline, you can do what you can do, what you choose to do -- this is one approach. I'm just think out loud here. You can do what you can do. You can do what you choose to do. But if, in the end, their materials are incomplete that -- that's the end of the ballgame. And it's -- and if it's incomplete because they didn't talk with you beforehand and -- and give you an opportunity to tell you them what you need -- that's -- that's on them. That is how it --

entirely. I think your characterization of the service is key here. And that's something that you have been doing quite a bit, trying to anticipate who needs — you know, trying to anticipate questions, who would need to be submitting those BEDs, which are lengthy in nature, and thus the service, but the deadline

2.1

is the deadline, and it's still in the future.

I suggest you see what happens when that

deadline, you know, comes to fruition.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I hadn't really thought about it that way, but you -- there's no requirement that they have a scoping meeting. If they call you will up and say we don't want to do a scoping meeting. done this many times, we know who the qualifiers are, and they bring in -- and what the structure -- what you're going to need, and then they submit it and, in fact, they do there's no -- no harm, right? don't -- Jim characterized this as a service. And it -- although you have -- really want them to do it so that everything does, in fact, come in on time, if they choose not to, that's fine, right?

MS. WELLS: I think --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You could then -- you could, at the time, deem them to be incomplete, just like Commissioner McHugh -- yeah, Commissioner McHugh has suggested, as a possible scenario.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. WELLS: Yeah. I think just in a practical of what happens if they submit and there's one individual qualifier. Were they really -- you know, I look at it when the IEB, who does an evaluation, and, you know, we have this person be a qualifier, does that knock them out of the box? Or do we say, okay, we'll give you a little time because it's only one qualifier? That -- that potentially, creates some confusion, but I think that the solution that Commissioner McHugh suggested is definitely work around and that helps me. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And you do have to come back, after these deadlines and tell us

come back, after these deadlines and tell us whether they're substantially complete or not.

That is -- that is a judgment you've had to make --

MS. WELLS: Right.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: In the past.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: -- repeatedly.

Right. So you're perfectly capable of doing that.

MS. WELLS: Yep.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think what

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

you're hearing is they've had opportunities to work with you, to receive the information they would have needed to do this in a complete way. And that, we're not going to necessarily be sympathetic to a very limited submission at this point, because they've had many opportunities to put the whole package together, and to speak with you and use your services. So I think the deadline will be the deadline. And as far as I'm concerned, there won't be a lot of room for a less-than, substantially-complete submission at that point.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I agree with my colleagues. I guess the question is, do you want to take the time that they've asked for next week to sit down with them as close as they are to the deadline of the 16th and spend time with them?

MS. WELLS: Well, I would want to see their submission first. That's why I've requested that, to see if it's a good use of the resources. Obviously, we have an enormous amount of work going on right now, so I'd like

2.1

to see the submissions and then scheduled that. But, I've been readily accessible to all the applicants, so I'm never going to turn anyone away that is needing help. That's just, you know, not how we operate, but it's, obviously, frustrating.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: At this point, they're not even asking for next week. You offered next week and they said they couldn't meet the deadline, correct?

MS. WELLS: I -- they asked for the 10th or the 11th. I responded, if you can get your paperwork in by the 4th, I can meet with you on the 9th. And they said they couldn't make the deadline of the 4th, and that's how it was left.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: So the ball's in their court.

MS. WELLS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. And Commissioner McHugh said, how you choose to handle it, it's up to you.

MS. WELLS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And I agree with

1 that. 2 MS. WELLS: That's all I have. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Thank you very much. All right. We are now at Item 8? 4 MR. DAY: We're still on Item 7. 5 6 MS. WELLS: You've got letter C. 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. 7C. Okay. 8 Right. 9 MS. LILLIOS: Good afternoon, Commissioners. 10 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good afternoon. 12 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good 13 afternoon. 14 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: 15 afternoon. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good 16 17 afternoon. 18 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good 19 afternoon. 20 MS. LILLIOS: Before you is a draft 21 of a regulation, which you're seeing as a 22 group for the first time. It's 205 CMR 151 23 dealing with the operation certificate for the 24 gaming establishment. And the statutory

authority for this regulation drives primarily from Section 25A of Chapter 23K. And this draft was prepared with the collective efforts of Bruce Band and Todd Grossman.

There are five sections in the regulation. The first states that, before opening, the gaming establishment has to request and obtain an operation certificate from the commission. And the certificate issues only after the commission conducts all of its reviews, tests and inspections that are required by law, the regulations, and required by the commission.

Also included in the first section, in Subsection 3, is a nonexclusive checklist of items that the IEB will review, inspect and test, including the licensee's system of internal controls, their compliance with 23K. There's a requirement that each licensee provide a list of -- a complete list of employees, a confirmation that the gaming area and other nongaming amenities are built to a superior quality, and confirmation that the license -- all of the conditions of each of

2.1

the gaming licensee's license are met, and that there is an emergency response plan on file with the fire and police departments in the host community.

The second section requires approval of the gaming establishment floor plan of the gaming area, simulcast area and restricted areas. specifically to confirm the security features. And this is a requirement of Section 25C of 23K. And this section specifies what needs to be included on the layout of the floor plan, such as equipment positions and the location of security features, as detailed in subsections A through U.

The third section addresses the test period, during which the IEB assesses compliance, including the IEB notifying the licensee of the schedule, and the terms and conditions of the test period.

The fourth section states that the operation certificate itself, once issued, remains in effect for the duration of the license, and the licensee must operate in

2.1

accordance with the terms of the certificate. 1 2 And the fifth section addresses 3 amendments to the operation certificate and 4 outlines a process whereby the licensee may 5 partition the commission to -- for amendments. 6 So that's a summary of the 7 regulation before you. And Bruce Band and I 8 will try to answer any questions that you have. We are -- we will be asking that this 9 10 enter into the formal process at this point. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Questions? 12 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I just -- I 13 had quick comment, a quick question. 15101, this is, I think, maybe a little bit to 14 15 detailed, but the second sentence in that 16 paragraph doesn't make a lot of sense. MS. LILLIOS: Subsection 1 of the --17 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yeah. 18 19 MS. LILLIOS: The operation 20 certificate --2.1 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Shall not issue until --22 23 MS. LILLIOS: -- shall not issue 24 until the commission --

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I think it's

-- I think it's just the words that are -
MS. LILLIOS: Okay. We'll take a

look at that.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I don't want to be too detailed about it but -- and help me out under -- can you just walk through 15104, Subsection 1? Help me understand the timing of when an effective date would be established. You touched on it but --

MR. BAND: I think this would be set up and stuff during the meetings with Penn in the development stage we'll be having now between opening, and what we'd expect in a test period.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. With?

MR. BAND: With -- with live slots

it will probably be, you know, real coin being played but how we would monitor their system, table games, and the next opening will be a little more detailed.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. So -- and it's from effective date point A carried through whatever the life of the license is,

2.1

five years or 15 years.

2

3

4

5

MR. BAND: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Bruce, what

exactly does the test period consist of?

6 MR. BAND: The test period, it

7 really gives us to a chance to look at them

8 operate. Historically, at various casinos and

9 jurisdictions that we've dealt in, some --

some of the property that had trouble, like,

11 balancing their banks, they can't count their

money properly. And these are things that we

13 want to know before we issue a license. There

is one property in New Jersey, it took them

three weeks to account for \$600,000 that was

missing, that was locked in some room that

nobody knew about. It's little things like

this, that when you get close, sometimes

they're not quite ready as you like to look

at. From a regulatory standpoint, we want to

21 know they're on solid ground, has properly

22 trained all their people. The surveillance

23 people know -- know their system and --

24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But how do you do

1 that?

MR. BAND: You actually ut people in the -- in the areas to observe. It's almost like a continuous audit. The end of the night, you actually let them go through the count process, make sure they can balance all things.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So this is like a soft launch, you have customers there?

MR. BAND: Yes, you do. With a slot parlor it's a little different than a mixed one. The slot parlor, it all has to be live money because of the slot machine. If you had table games in the mix, you would actually have what we call play money so it wouldn't really count. And at least, at that point, we could test the dealers to see if they could catch people cheating or -- or anything like that. So it's to test the system, see how well-trained there are, how ready they are.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But so you -- you actually bring real people in, in this case.

MR. BAND: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: For some number of

1 hours or days, or something?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

MR. BAND: Yes. And that's what we'd set out to determine.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.

MR. BAND: In the scheme of things you -- let's say if you did it for an eight-hour period, you'd want to see all their shifts during that eight-hour period for -- you know, somebody didn't bring in their strongest team just for us to see. We want to see everybody.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right, right.

MR. BAND: Usually, for something

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: How -- how

long is that test period, typically, Bruce?

like a slot parlor, I would envision it being one or two days, unless we encountered

problems. And, at which point, they would

have an opportunity to rectify the problems and let us look at it again. I don't foresee

21 that in this case, but you just never know for

22 sure.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Many of the requirements in this first section are, you

now, pointed to you cannot operate until you get the certificate, and to get the certificate you have to have done of all these things. Many of them, or some of them way in advance of, say, even a test period, like the system of getting approval of the system of internal controls and --

MR. BAND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- all kinds of other things. I'm not suggesting, you know, any of these should be in regulations, but have you get a sense as to how soon, how early certain things have to fall into place so that that -- this test period and eventual opening can happen?

MR. BAND: From a regulatory standpoint, I'd certainly like to see those fall in place as soon as possible. But these things sometimes take a little longer than you anticipate. I think everything in this is certainly doable, and they're working towards that now so --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.

MR. DAY: Commissioners, I might --

2.1

1 I might add that I did, because we wanted to 2 make sure, at least Penn is the one that's 3 coming up for opening, so I checked this set 4 of draft regulations with their compliance 5 people too, to see if they found any 6 particular problems. They made two 7 suggestions and we corrected those. 8 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: 9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Real-time 10 comment.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Any other -- any other questions or thoughts?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: This is submission to start the formal process?

MS. LILLIOS: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. So you

17 | need a vote?

MS. LILLIOS: We need a vote.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Based on more comments, I could -- I'd be happy to make a motion to start the formal process of promulgation of regulations 205 CMR 151, the requirements for operations and conduct of gaming at a gaming establishment, as submitted

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

2.1

22

23

in the packet here today. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? 3 further discussion? All in favor? Aye. 4 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: 5 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 6 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 7 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 9 have it, surprisingly, unanimously. 10 MS. LILLIOS: Thank you. 11 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And Item 8. 13 MR. GLENNON: Good afternoon. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: 14 15 afternoon. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good afternoon. 16 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 17 Good 18 afternoon. MR. GLENNON: Good afternoon. 19 20 want to step a little bit out of turn. 21 Generally, our technology presentations and 22 stuff is dry, so I can't imagine that many 23 people are tuning in, but there is one person 24 that tunes -- that tunes in that I want to say

hi to. Hi, mom. My 93 year-old mother makes a habit of tuning in when I'm on the agenda so I wanted to acknowledge --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Great.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Welcome.

MR. GLENNON: So I'm here to update for you today on a number of things. I think the first thing is our support of the process to try to get Penn opened and not to be in the way of that, and there's some things that have to happen -- oh, we're doing regulations first, I'm sorry. Let me take a step back.

We are proposing a softening of the regulations that we promulgated related to the gaming standards. And after discussions with licensees and some of our vendors, including G-Tech, it became apparent that some of the requirements that we have put in the original set of regulations were too tight, and maybe even didn't allow for a proper competition or mix of games on the floor and -- and really weren't providing us as regulators with any substantive additional information that we're

2.1

going to need to regulate.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

So the language here proposes that we soften the requirements for -- not soften, but define them a little bit differently, we require G2S or SASS protocol, but we've taken out the date and some of the restrictive language. So I think that is the essence of the what the change is. I think it's going to be perceived favorably by all concerned, and I would recommend that we move that forward.

In addition, we did take a look at language related to progressive slots and kiosks that Bruce Band had brought forward from New Jersey. And upon review of that additional language, it's covered by the GLI standards that we adopted by reference for those particular areas. So we -- you know, we did do the review. We sat down, we looked, and there was not anything distinctively different between the language that -- that Bruce brought that we were looking at, and regulate the standards which -- of GLI put forward in those to areas. So it's on the agenda, but we chose not to make any changes

1 to our regulations relating to those two 2 things. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: 3 So where --4 where are we with these regulations, now that 5 we're amending them? 6 MR. GLENNON: So this -- the 7 language you see here is the -- the first pass 8 in the process to make the changes that I 9 just, kind of, highlighted. 10 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: These 11 regulations are not in the formal. 12 MR. GLENNON: They are regulations. 13 These are --14 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's right. 15 MR. GLENNON: These are changes to 16 regulations that are promulgated and already 17 filed so --18 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So we need to 19 put these changes through the formal process? 20 MR. GLENNON: Indeed. 21 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I have just 22 one question. It really isn't about the 23 regulations. It's about my understanding of 24 the -- of the CMS.

1 MR. GLENNON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The first sentence of four says "near real-time stream of data." There is a lag there.

MR. GLENNON: So --

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: This is a technology question, not a regulatory --

MR. GLENNON: Yeah, so, I think near real-time, when we first put our regulations together, I think some of the conversations we've had with -- with GLI when the words real time were in, I was convinced that near real time was the appropriate way to put it because there is some latency, and information is passed to multiple levels. Information is stored with the game. If the game loses connectivity with the site controllers, which collect local data, then -- you know, until that connection's restored, the data's stored at the game.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right.

MR. GLENNON: And then, subsequently from that, at the local level, if the site controller, which is collecting the data from

the machine, loses connectivity with the central management system, that data is stored and forward when connectivity is replaced. So that's the reason for making the nuance distinction.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And the way this language is written, you've let it --

10 it's broad enough, but as long as it's

compliant, the communication protocol is

12 compliant with the central monitoring system,

then we'd -- we'd be okay, is the way my

read -- am I reading this properly here?

MR. GLENNON: I think industry

standards is what we're saying. There are two

industry standards. We will accept either --

18 either one of them.

19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But if we

20 don't have, or if we sunset the central

21 monitoring system would this be mute?

22 MR. GLENNON: I don't think it -- I

don't think it would have an impact.

24 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Page 219 1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else? 2 we need a motion to start these in the 3 process? 4 MS. BLUE: (Nodding her head up and 5 down) 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Commissioner 7 McHugh? 8 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I move that 9 the amendments to 205 CMR 143.01 and 143.16 as 10 they -- those amendments are contained in the 11 packet for today's meeting, be approved by the 12 commission for commencement of the formal 13 adoption process. 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? 15 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second. 16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any further 17 discussion? All in favor? Aye. 18 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye. 19 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 20 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 23 have it unanimously. 24 MR. GLENNON: Thank you very much.

So on the second item, we're going to talk a little bit about the Gaming Technology Laboratory, an update on that.

You know, we just talked about the regulations. And what we have to do with the Gaming Technology Laboratory is stand-up business processes that enact the regulations, operationalize them, and allow us to work with our licensees, the manufacturers and the labs.

And so, in February we put out a draft of those business policies and practices for comment. And what you have in your package is that initial draft, along with feedback and our response, similar to the way we did it with the regulations. But as we did this process, one thing became apparent. Getting that full document vetted and in shape, we weren't going to have time to do that before we needed to certify laboratories. So we pulled out the laboratory certification piece of that, finalized it, and so -- and earlier this week we posted the requirements for an independent laboratory to become certified by the commonwealth, along with

2.1

applications on our Web site. And we expect that the qualified labs that do this type of work will apply in short order. Actually, I've asked for those applications by mid next week.

There is a new form associated with those. The MGC vendor background investigation form that was created by Loretta and the IEB team, and that the will be the information which we use to do the background check. And I expect, and I hope, be able to get enough information to bring qualified laboratories back before you on the 19th, in two weeks, to certify them contingent upon the outcome of the background -- more detailed background investigations.

The laboratories that do this work are certified in, literally, hundreds of jurisdictions around the world, and I -- I really find, you know, just based on my dealings with them, I don't think we're going to find something in their background, or in our investigations that's going to cause us any -- any real concerns. But having said

that, we have a process, we're adhering to it, they'll be an application along with a fee, and I hope to bring those -- that back.

The reason for doing this in such an expedited way is that we need the services of these laboratories to support Penn in the opening of the Plainridge Park Casino. We need to engage them to help us get through the process and with -- with some workarounds, because the full business processes that we're looking to stand up, we're not there yet. So that's the reason for doing the certification.

One of the issues, one of the challenges with supporting Penn's opening, is getting product, the electronic gaming machines into the commonwealth prior to our permitting process, our certification and permitting process. So we've answered a lot of questions of vendors, who are selling to Penn, about how we're going to do that. I've asked Bruce to sit at the table here and talk with the -- you know, answer any questions. But we will stand up on the Web site next week, the workaround process to allow devices

2.1

1 to be brought in.

2.1

So I think -- and, Bruce, correct me if I'm wrong, if a manufacturer has been licensed by the commission, as you did Konami and others today, Bruce and IEB will work to bring machines that are -- have not yet been certified and permitted into a secure warehouse here in the commonwealth to allow the timing and logistics of building the gaming floor to happen, and then subsequent to that we will work on the permitting, the certification and the permitting these platforms so that that gets done before opening. And that's where we'll work with the labs.

So I hope I haven't confused you with, kind of, a roundabout explanation of -of why we're moving quickly to certify the
labs and how we're supporting Penn's opening.
So let me stop there and -- and entertain any questions about that.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: If you bring -- if these machines come into the commonwealth in the fashion you've just

described, what's tested is a specimen of that machine, not every one of these machines, right?

MR. GLENNON: Correct.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And so the testing can go on at the -- certified testing -- independent testing lab of the -- of the specimen machine, the programs, the coin changers, all aspects of it, and then the certification comes and all machines that meet the specs that were tested, then are approved and can be deployed; is that -- is that how this works?

MR. GLENNON: Yeah. So in -- in a lot of cases these -- because we adopt GLI standards almost in their entirety as they're written, the machines -- our standard, they're similar to the standards of other jurisdictions. So, in some cases, it will be a transfer of certificate. The testing has been done for that particular platform version of software. It won't -- you know, GLI or BMM won't have to do it again. They'll issue a certificate that says this machine has been

2.1

tested to meet.

2.1

But the way our process works, we will take a certification from the lab, that the platform meets our standards. We will then permit that particular instance or configuration, and then vendors can sell, and then individual instances of the asset will be registered to us. That's the way -- those are the terminologies that have got to be confusing. Certification says it meets the standard.

There is one additional test, which we need to decide where that testing takes place. It's the interoperability test that says that that machine, that particular configuration plays nice with CMS or, you know, plugs into our system as well as the house system. I think we're going to figure out where we do that. One of the reasons for having a gaming lab at our headquarters is to do some interoperability testing. I'm not sure that we want to do it all. I think that's a conversation we're going to have with G-Tech and the labs that do the standards

testing, to see if we can find some -- you know, some efficiencies there.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Do the labs do that kind of interoperability testing?

MR. GLENNON: I believe in some jurisdictions they do. In the places that we went to look - and Derek made this point to me when we were talking about this - in most of the jurisdiction -- in all of the jurisdictions, actually, that we went to visit that had central systems, there was a lab doing, you know, secondary interoperability testing for the central management system, you know, at the commission or the -- the lottery headquarters. I'm not sure that that's the most efficient model. We're looking to, I think, not minimize the work, but I think we're looking to have the burden of the testing be on our -- on the labs, they're doing it on our behalf.

So I think it's something that's to be determined. I think we'll have a lab, and I think I'm going to look to G-Tech to say what is going to make them comfortable. That

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

they can do complete testing to make sure that, you know, the devices that are coming into the jurisdictions don't cause any problems and work well with the CMS.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: But then -
then that test -- that test also has to be a

test of the deployed machines in the

configuration that they're deployed, then,

that configuration interfacing with the CMS,

that's probably the last piece of that, right?

MR. GLENNON: Yep. So that's -- I mean, that's what we're doing, you know, with the labs, and I think it will -- all things considered, I think will not end up being any kind of encumbrance to, you know, the critical path to opening Plainridge. We're going to have to do some workaround. Bruce will have to work with the manufacturers to bring inventory into that secure warehouse prior to testing. But I think that there was a lot of angst around these procedures that went out because people thought we were going to have to, you know, nail them before we could -- they could ship product in. So we're working

2.1

with them. I think it's an important message to get out.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Just in terms

-- in terms of process, the ITLs would respond
to get certified, you'll do your thing and,
you know, certify them, then who chooses
what -- what test -- what lab to
go?

MR. GLENNON: So the business relationship in the case of the manufacturer is, it's the manufacturer's choice who to do business with based on the cost. The remuneration is from the manufacturer to the lab to get the certificate that it meets our standards.

That having been said, it is the commission's plan to engage in an open procurement, one of the labs that we certify, to assist us on a professional consulting basis. We need to certify the game floor as part of the opening procedures, and I don't know -- Frank may be -- Frank Neborsky is also here from Power Strategies, and I have to credit Frank with helping me with the

2.1

process of -- not only -- and Stephanie Maddox as well, another principal, with building the processes, what would you say is -- in terms of opening the gaming floor, what support will we need from an ITL -- CITL?

MR. NEBORSKY: Generally -- good afternoon, counsel.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good afternoon.

MR. NEBORSKY: Generally, they come in --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Identify your -- identify yourself, please.

MR. NEBORSKY: I'm sorry. I'm

Frank Neborsky, Power Strategies. Generally,
the certified independent test last will come
in and provide certification for the games, do
the testing in accordance with the standards
of the commonwealth, perform any on-floor test
that may be necessary to ensure that the game
communicates with the system from an
accounting standpoint. And then, likewise,
the systems are communicating back with the
CMS system to make sure that that information

2.1

is being properly reported as well.

They verify that the certification that they did in their lab, wherever that site may be, that the product, the programs, software, firmware, and associated equipment that's included in the cabinet that was delivered and then subsequently installed on the floor, meets the standard, and meets the criteria that they use to test, and everything is regulated and -- and properly affirm that it is what they tested and what's being installed on the floor.

MR. GLENNON: So long answer, you know, we'll be engaging labs to support us in some validation for opening. But an ongoing basis, the relationship is between the manufacturers and the labs.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So they've been alerted of this time frame, which is a tight time frame, the ITLs?

MR. GLENNON: Yes. I've kept them up -- I mean, I think they were very anxiously waiting having the applications to be able to fill out because they realized that the time

2.1

is short as well. So, yes, they were prepared.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Great.

MR. GLENNON: So, I mean, I really, I think, was looking to share, in a general sense, the overall business processes, the fact that we received a lot of feedback and we've responded in the documents. And I think what we need to do now is take that first draft, incorporate our responses into those, you know, into the business processes, change them where necessary, and then come back out with another iteration. But it's a conversation. I'm really grateful to all the people that have participated. You know, both -- two of the premier labs in the country, along with a number of manufacturers, you know, and have willingly helped us. again, these are not regulations, these are our business processes. But it makes sense to, kind of, have everybody be on the same page, to use best practices as we do this.

The other thing that will come out of the eventual document is, we will be able

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

to understand where can we automate some of the hand-off of this information? certainly use the portal that was created for the licensing management system to allow manager -- manufacturers to apply for their permits. I think the data that comes from independent test labs, its result -- that are our results and related to configuration of the machines, I see the need to populate that into the central management system. These are things we can -- we need to figure out. don't think there is software that does this type of hand-off. But whatever we can automate in our business processes with our partners is going to make doing business easier.

And so, I think, underlying what we have here what -- what we get out is going to be, really, an articulation of how we doing -- how we're going to be doing business in what is a pretty complex relationship between us, the licensees, the manufacturers and the testing labs. So that's the update. And can I entertain any questions on any of the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

1 material.

2.1

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, I looked through this and read as much as -- as I could. I got it yesterday. I have a couple comments that I -- very small comments that I want to take up with you offline.

MR. GLENNON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: But overall, I think this is really a thoughtful and thorough, and highly-detailed plan, and a very thoughtful treatment of all the -- the issues that were raised by the people who commented on them.

MR. GLENNON: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And it's also, frankly, presented in a format that's easy to access and understand, so I think this is -- a first-rate -- a first-rate job.

I had a question, and I don't know whether we've resolved it, and we need not even take it up today. But I do think at some point we have -- that we need to take it up, if we haven't. Maybe I was -- I just forgot. And that is, what on a going-forward basis is

going to -- do we envision will be done by our lab and by independent outsiders? I don't know that we've ever really sketched that out in -- in a broad form. Maybe we haven't. And if we haven't, we certainly don't need to take that up today out of the blue, but I think we do need to think about that. I'd like to know about that.

MR. GLENNON: Okay. I mean I -- yeah, I'd be more than happy to talk to that sure.

well, I think we have talked about this back when we made the decision, but it was a long time ago, and I certainly don't remember very much about it. And I don't really know what's happened. Other than this update, I've sort of lost track of whatever happened in the lab. So I think it might be -- so I have some of the same thoughts. I think it might be a good idea to put us -- put you on the agenda next session, if we can, to just get an update, or you and Rick, you know, to talk about what -- why we doing the lab? What is the interface?

What is the status, et cetera?

2.1

MR. GLENNON: I'd be more than happy to give you that update.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I think that would be really helpful. Particularly, now since we're beginning staff it up.

MR. GLENNON: Well, I mean, I think it's a conversation -- I did have a brief with Commissioner Cameron and Stebbins on, you know, what we see using the space and the headquarters for, and why we're allocating space and what we're going to do. So, I think, let me prepare something that kind of articulates that in a -- in a way that everybody can understand, maybe some crayon drawings or something, and I'll bring that back.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. Okay. The second thing, and I do want to talk about this for a second, because I do want to make sure we're on the same page, is on page three of the application, which is page 125 of the packet. I don't know if we can bring that up, but it's -- it's a section that deals with the

public records law. And the sentence that caught my eye there is, "Please note the commission will use its best efforts to protect any information it deems subject to an exemption." I'm concerned that that is inconsistent with our policy with respect to redactions.

The policy, with respect to redactions that we -- or may be inconsistent with it so that's why I wanted to have this discussion. The policy with respect to redactions that we adopted not too long ago says that we will redact the things that the public records law requires us to redact. It does not say that we will redact and keep from public disclosure everything we are able under the Public Records Act, to keep from public disclosure.

And this is an issue that arose when we were dealing with the RFA2 applications and some of the RFA1 applications. And it seems to me that this is inconsistent with that policy, if we are saying that we will not release information that we are entitled to

withhold under the public records law, and the applicants rely on that when, in fact, we've said something different in the policy.

MS. BLUE: So we do have our redaction policy. The reality is, however, that we have very few exemptions to use anyways. So a lot of the information, I think what we'll have to do, John, is make clear to people involved that, while there are exceptions under the public records law, they don't apply to the vast majority of the information that we take in. So we really only will end up redacting the things that we are obligated to redact, which is generally personal information.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right.

MS. BLUE: And we just need to make that clear. I mean, many of our -- we had an exemption for applicants when we took in the RFA1 and RFA2, but that exemption only applies to applicants, and these folks don't fall into that so --

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right.

MS. BLUE: We just need to let them

2.1

1 know what they're -- what they're looking at 2 so that they can plan accordingly. 3 MR. GLENNON: So is it saying that 4 you, you know, don't include any proprietary 5 or IP that you don't want, potentially, 6 publicly available, yes? 7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: However you 8 choose to phrase this. I'm just --9 MR. GLENNON: Okay. All right. 10 Yeah. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: -- you need 11 12 consult over that. 13 MR. GLENNON: Yeah. I just don't 14 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: 15 want to appear to over promise here. 16 MR. GLENNON: Okay. 17 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And that --18 that can be a big deal. 19 MR. GLENNON: Okay. Well, let me 20 circle with Loretta and make sure I get the 21 both language right because I really just took 22 the form from IEB and put it in the package 23 so -- and I don't want to have something 24 submitted that we then have to go back and

say, you need to pull some of this out because
it looks like it's something you don't want
anybody to see so --

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yeah. They may not be able to pull it out.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: John, I had a quick question. It's under the document, Qualifications and Conditions Certification.

MR. GLENNON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: And it's just down at the top of the page, page -- which is page 117 of the packet.

MR. GLENNON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Number 11, you know, "shall allow up to three MGC employees to visit annually to inspect," and it talks about the laboratory covering our costs, I'm a little uneasy with that.

MR. GLENNON: Okay. Well so -first of all, I took, liberally, from Iowa's
qualifications, so that's kind of the genesis
of this, we made some changes to be specific
to us. One of the things that we talked about
with labs was we were going to certify them

2.1

one time, and then they need to reapply every year with any changes, and then they would give us up to \$2,000 for remuneration for us to audit them. And I think what this is calling out is the ability to annually go and make sure that they are employing best practices in their record-keeping, in their testing methodologies in the work that they're doing on our behalf. Is it the facts that we're asking them to pay?

no problems. You know, I would view it as -you know, if they're vendors of ours, I
question whether there should be some
restrictions on how many times we can visit,
how many of our team can actually go out and
visit. I just wasn't sure in the remuneration
of, or reimbursement of, you know, our travel
or out-of state car -- you know, just doesn't
seem to blend with how we assess and have an
operational budget.

MR. GLENNON: And, you know what, I
-- I certainly would make -- be willing to
make changes to that. Like covering a trip

2.1

for one person for an audit. I don't see a team of three people going, frankly. I think the gaming lab manager would want to make a point to visit. Frankly, these labs conduct multiple sessions for regulators a year and invite us to participate. You know, get together with your fellow regulators, let's talk about, you know, what best practices are. So I think there'll be opportunities for us to do those audits in New Jersey and Las Vegas, and not make it a burden. But I'm -- you know, I'll rework --

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Let's just relook at that.

MR. GLENNON: Yeah, no. I'll definitely rework the language.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I agree.

Touching base, you know, visiting their labs,
is -- we've had an opportunity to do, I think
all five of us as commissioners, it's a good
sound business practice but --

MR. GLENNON: Kind of wanted to institutionalize our right to do it once a year, if we wanted to so -- regardless of who

2.1

1 pays for the travel expenses.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: John, you got a request from Derek Smith from Scientific Games to follow-up with a conference call. Did you do guys have that?

MR. GLENNON: No. There wasn't enough time. He, basically, asked early this week. I've only talked with Global Cash, but I told Derek that -- I let him know that our responses would be in the packet, and that we would talk subsequent to this meeting about our responses. So I will follow-up with Derek. He's been -- he's one of the people in the industry that I think has responded whenever we've asked, whether it's responsible gaming or for comments, and Derek is from Valley, which is now part of another company, Sci Games.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: John, you have -- this was a lot of work, first of all, all of these comments and responding to them. Did our consultant assist you with that?

MR. GLENNON: In a great way.

Absolutely. Yes.

2.1

1

2

3

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And they will continue to assist you because you have a lot of to be reviewed.

It's a

4 MR. GLENNON: Right. work-in-progress, and I think we need to get 5 6 through it all. We need to have the back-end 7 conversations with the people that gave us the

8 In some cases, I think original comments.

we're just going to make a decision that we're

10 going to do it in one way.

> One particular cause of angst was the fact that we're requiring individual configurations, meaning a gaming machine, the software, the bill acceptor, the printer, to be treated as a single configuration. One of the questions was, you know, can't we certify a bill acceptor and then just plug it in with a combination of whatever we want? And the answer is no, because I think in my -- and I'm open to interpretation here, a configuration is the combination of all the components that make up the gaming system. So to say that a bill acceptor is certified but without plugging it into the machine that it's with

and calling that the system, I think it's a mistake. It makes it more complex, and we may have to look at our permitting cost, because we charge \$500 for a configuration, and that may be a little bit onerous when you look at the fact that we're going to be permitting individual combinations of the different devices.

Most vendors -- I mean, most licensees will choose one type of bill acceptor and one type of printer, so it's not that problematic. But that was one of the more, I think, substantive comments that bears additional --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Did that come from multiple -- from different people?

MR. GLENNON: No, just one.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Just one?

MR. NEBORSKY: Aristocrat and IGT both mentioned it, I believe.

MR. GLENNON: So that bears further discussion.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, I too

1 see that there's been a lot of work that has 2 been done, you know, on this round, and I 3 think you're showing a lot of great progress. 4 MR. GLENNON: Thank you. 5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you. 6 MR. GLENNON: Item last is we have 7 another round of candidates for the gaming lab 8 manager positions, some Skype interviews, and 9 I'm hopeful there on that. Thank you very 10 much. 11 Okay. All right. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 12 Thank you. Director Day, I think we're at the 13 end of the list? MR. DAY: I have nothing else. 14 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else? All 16 right. Do we have a motion to adjourn? 17 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So moved. 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor? 19 Aye. 20 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: 21 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 22 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 23 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right.

```
Page 246
 1
                    COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay.
                    CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are adjourned.
 2
 3
                     (Proceeding concluded 3:43 p.m.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

Page 247 1 **GUEST SPEAKERS:** 2 Sarah Nelson, Ph.D, Cambridge Health Alliance 3 Michael Mathis, President, MGM Springfield 4 Michael Fitzgerald, Pinck & Company Brian Packer, MGM Springfield 5 6 Chuck Irving, Davenport Properties 7 Stephen O'Toole, General Manager, Plainridge 8 Racecourse 9 Frank Neborksy, Power Strategies 10 11 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION STAFF: 12 Rick Day, Executive Director 13 Trupti Banda, HR Director 14 Dean Ventola, HR Business Partner 15 Mark Vander Linden, Director of Research and 16 Responsible Gaming 17 John Ziemba, Ombudsman 18 Catherine Blue, Deputy General Counsel 19 Karen Wells, Director, IEB Loretta Lillios, Deputy General Counsel 20 21 Bruce Band, Deputy Director, IEB 22 John Glennon, Chief Information Officer 23 24

CERTIFICATE

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1

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

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

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

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

19

20

2.1

WITNESS MY HAND THIS 8th of March

2015.

22

23 | BRENDA M. GINISI

24 Notary Public

My Commission expires:

June 18, 2021