		Page 1
1	THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS	
2	MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION	
3	PUBLIC MEETING #152	
4		
5		
6	CHAIRMAN	
7	Stephen P. Crosby	
8		
9	COMMISSIONERS	
LO	Gayle Cameron	
L1	Bruce W. Stebbins	
L2	Enrique Zuniga	
L3		
L 4		
L5		
L 6		
L7		
18		
L 9	May 14, 2015 10:30 a.m 2:11 p.m.	
20	HYNES CONVENTION CENTER	
21	900 Boylston Street, Room 210	
22	Boston, Massachusetts	
23		
24		

PROCEEDINGS: CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are good to go.

6 Hynes Auditorium on May 14 at about 10:30. We

the Massachusetts Gaming Commission at the

We are convening the 152nd public meeting of

7 will start, as always, with the approval of

8 | minutes. In the absence of, I guess he's

9 Secretary, we'll ask our Treasurer to do the

10 honors.

4

5

11 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Sure. Mr.

12 Chairman the minutes for the meeting April 30

13 have been submitted are in the packet. I will

14 make a motion to approve them as presented

subject to the usual typographical and

16 mechanical corrections and additional comments.

17 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any discussion?

19 They look fine to me. All in favor, aye.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

22 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes

24 have it unanimously. Next up is Director

20

1 | Wells, Investigations and Enforcement Bureau.

MS. WELLS: Good morning, Mr.

Chairman and Commissioners. The first item on the agenda is just the reporting out of the temporary licenses that have been granted by the IEB.

I have a memo in your packet before you. Over the last two weeks, we have granted two key gaming employee licenses, one for Gary Pecorello who is a Player Services Director at the Penn facility in Plainville, and also Valerie Bisset the Slot Operations Manager at the Plainville Gaming and Redevelopment facility in Plainville.

Additionally, we gave a temporary license to Interblock USA, which is a primary gaming vendor that manufactures gaming equipment. As noted in the memo, the applications were deemed complete by the Division of Licensing. The petitioner, Penn National certified and the IEB has found after reviewing the proposed operational plan that the temporary licenses are necessary for the operation of the gaming establishment given

2.1

1 | their proposed opening date of June 24.

This was not designed to circumvent normal licensing procedures. The IEB also found the licenses are reasonably likely to issue upon completion of the investigations. That was just a report out to the Commission.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Karen, are any of these other employees licensed in other jurisdictions?

MS. WELLS: Yes. I don't have -Actually, I'll have to get back to you. I
think they may be, but I'll have to doublecheck with the State Police on that.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.

MS. WELLS: The next item on the agenda before the Commission is just an update on Region C. As you know, we did have the suitability determination for Mass Gaming and Entertainment.

I do have one small update. I was contacted by the attorney for the Rush Street Properties, Mr. Donnelly who was before you at the last meeting. In the spirit of ongoing suitability, I just wanted to report out that

he had noted to us and self-reported to the IEB regarding an issue with the vendor in their facility in Illinois. So, we'll follow up with that issue and report out as appropriate.

Notably and interesting in Illinois, unlike Massachusetts, the gaming board does not vet vendors to the casinos. They rely on the casinos to do that vetting.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: They don't do any vetting at all of any vendors.

MS. WELLS: At least the secondary vendors. I'd have a check on the primaries. They leave that to the casinos. The Rush Street Property that vetting process is farmed out to a third-party vendor by the casino. So, they have a third-party vendor that does that vetting.

So, we'll follow up on that process. That may make them be newsworthy in that jurisdiction. I just wanted the Commission to be aware that was self-reported and we'll follow up on that issue.

The other update that I have for the Commission, which the letter is also in your

packet is that the Crossroads Massachusetts,

LLC, their request for a gaming license in

Region C has been withdrawn. So, they have

submitted that request to the Commission. So,

they are withdrawing from the process. The

letter is in your packet and part of the

Commission record and they have certified that

the IEB.

The next issue for the Commission with respect to Region C is regarding the KG Urban, New Bedford application. Just to give the Commission an update, we did have the due date to have the three pieces into the Commission identifying their equity and their operator and their organizational structure.

And they have reported to the IEB that the structure is going to be -- they will use the Foxwoods, LLC entity that was already deemed suitable by the Commission as their operator.

There have been some changes in that. I'll be having a conference call with them later today about their structure. And I will report out as appropriate. As to their

2.1

equity, they're planning on partnering with GLPI. which is the REIT that spun off from the Penn National group.

And they've identified that that is their partner and they're going to have a REIT leaseback arrangements with the property.

Although they've given us the general terms of that, their term sheet has not been finalized.

So as far as identifying qualifiers, although I have a general idea of what I would expect that I would deem necessary for submission of applications, given that the term sheet hasn't been finalized, I'm hesitant to finalize the recommendation for the determination of those qualifiers.

So, right now I'm somewhat in a holding pattern until I can get the term sheet on the agreement between the parties. That still has not been finalized.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Do you have a sense as to when these terms might be finalized or executed?

MS. WELLS: I'm not sure. I know that Mr. Conroy is here. He may be able to

l address that to the Commission.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I had another question. Maybe we can ask that in a little

5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Let's ask him.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes.

Actually, I'd be interested in asking whether they have a sense in terms of timing when that term sheet or those terms would be final.

MR. BUTERA: Thank you. It's great to be back here in Boston.

MR. STERN: Good morning, Mr.

13 Chairman, Commissioner Cameron, Commissioner

14 Zuniga, Commissioner Stebbins. My name is

15 Andrew Stern and I'm the operating partner of

intent with Foxwoods so we would have an

16 KG Urban.

bit.

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

By the way, I do quickly want to say thank you to the Commissioners, to all of you, Mr. Chairman and the rest of the Commissioners and I hope someone will pass this on to Commissioner McHugh as well, for first the January extension, which we told the Commission would allow us to actually sign a letter of

operator.

That would then allow us, we hoped at the time, to get a then recalcitrant mayor to the table and get an HCA done. As you know, we came back with both of those at the very 12th hour on March 19.

I want to thank you as well for the additional extension we were granted on March 19, which we then told the Commission now that we had the operating agreement and the host community agreement, not just having a host community agreement, but also having terms to show prospective equity investors, who obviously wanted to know the answer to two questions, what can you build? And what will your local payments to the municipality be? The equivalent of what are your real estate taxes and what is your density going to be able be.

What we did begin to find with that 45-day extension was that we really needed to be both lucky and good. In order to do that we were going to need somebody on our team who not only had experience of the banking sector and

as a gaming CEO but also was from Massachusetts.

And we began talking to Scott

Butera, who is sitting next to me who is

originally from the Boston area. And from

running Foxwoods for many years, he's quite

familiar with the Massachusetts market.

And it was Scott who really began to help us make our case to the various potential development partners and equity providers. And it is not a coincidence that in showing up with GLPI, we have a company whose executives already knew the Massachusetts market, which meant that we didn't have to start from scratch, either with Scott or with he and us with GLPI.

So, to discuss the situation with GLPI, we are probably talking about at this point, it's really about numbers. The structure is the structure that they do with their deals because they're a gaming REIT. And we're essentially down to brass tacks on the numbers and the term sheet.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The answer to

Commissioner Zuniga's question is what? 2 MR. STERN: Scott, what would you --3 MR. BUTERA: Thanks, Andrew. 4 Andrew said, a couple of things. One, I've 5 worked with GLPI quite a bit over the years. 6 In fact, they were you may recall our financier in Milford in that initiative if that ever went 8 forward. 9 So, the structure of the deal is 10 very well defined. We are down to negotiating 11 the final economics, which essentially would be 12 what our rate is going to be and what our fees 13 are going to be. 14 So, I would say that that's 15 something that can be done imminently. Like I 16 said, the actual structure has been defined. 17 We have the term sheet that's detailed with the 18 exception of the two economic measures. 19 it's in negotiation but I wouldn't expect it'd 20 be something that would take a great deal of 2.1 time. 22 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Because 23 certainly, we gave you an extension but that's

not unlimited. And we're unable to have a

scope of licensing meeting I understand, which means IEB cannot continue with their suitability investigation.

All of your qualifiers have to be identified. And until they see a term sheet, it is my understanding that that can't be done. So, we have a process here. And it's really important to us that you take that seriously and understand that we are really waiting on you in order to finish the work we need to do in order to move the process forward.

MR. BUTERA: I absolutely understand it. I'm a little bit new to this effort.

Obviously, these folks have been working on this for years. And I've recently joined.

We have been working a great deal on this. Obviously, I came in on a number of fronts. One was to provide a little bit of expertise on the operating side of the development as well as the development itself as well as the financing. So, we brought a lot of that together very quickly.

And we really are down to just finalizing the final economic terms. I

2.1

absolutely appreciate the need to move quickly and we will.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: The second piece of that would be once that scope of licensing meeting occurs and all of the qualifiers are finalized, they would need to get that paperwork in quickly. So, we just urge you to assist with that as well.

MR. BUTERA: And we are all very aware of that. Most of the people have been through this process. The good news is we've all been through it. GLPI, their principles have been through it although they haven't been as many, but they are fully prepared to move expeditiously to get that paperwork in.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Great, thank you.

MR. STERN: Commissioner Cameron,
I'd just also add to that on the heels of
submitting the letter on the May 4 deadline, we
delivered that draft term sheet to Attorney
Wells, I think, within 36 hours of that
although it's not complete, so she would have
the structure. Then we got GLPI's executive

2.1

and General Counsel once we signed the letters,
Steve Snyder and their General Counsel onto a
scoping meeting call with Karen Wells and our
attorneys on Thursday. So, we've been pushing
very hard and are very mindful of this
Commission's processes.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

sheet, it occurs to me is perhaps a lot more similar to actual financing that takes place on the deal ultimately. From my perspective, we've always been very interested upfront in the amount of equity that will be placed, ultimately placed as part of the deal.

You mentioned in your remarks, Mr.

Butera that the fees were being finalized.

What about percent ownership and equity
sources? In addition to the term sheet, I
understand you sent us a letter from the KG
Urban principals that they were prepared to do contributions.

But that piece is the one that I find to be the most relevant at this point, not necessarily the final financing but those

2.1

equity terms. Understanding who is going to be paid last and who bears the ultimate risk of these operations and what percent contribution they bring. So, that then Director Wells and her team can start making those determinations of the qualifier entities and qualifier individuals.

MR. BUTERA: In order to understand the GLPI sale and leaseback structure, it's a little bit different than your traditional financing. In traditional financing obviously you have a fixed income or debt component and then you have an equity component and kind of stacks up.

The way a REIT works is they actually purchase all of the real estate assets. So, you almost kind of divide up the assets of the enterprise. And you take all of the real estate and agree on that. And then you take everything that's non-real estate like the license or the furniture and fixtures, the equipment and then that's separately owned. So, GLPI will actually be purchasing all of the real estate assets 100 percent.

2.1

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: A clarification, 2 by the real estate assets, so they will build 3 the building? They will build and own the building? That will be part of their financing? 5 6 MR. BUTERA: That's correct. It's 7 anything that qualifies as a real estate asset 8 under the REIT rules. They'll actually pay for 9 the development of and then ultimately own it and then lease it back to us. 10 11 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: What percent 12 of the overall is that? Have you calculated 13 that? 14 MR. BUTERA: I don't have the exact 15 percentage but it's a substantial majority. 16 would be everything with the exception of the 17 actual license and what in the amenity package 18 wouldn't qualify as real estate. So, slot 19 machines are clearly not real estate. Furniture and fixtures, if it's attached it is. 20 21 The REIT rules are pretty specifically defined. 22 Anything that would qualify as real estate, 23 they will pay for on market terms, including 24 the land.

1 So, the principals of KG Urban and will fund whatever GLPI wouldn't be able to 2 3 fund under that structure. 4 MR. STERN: Including the license 5 obviously. 6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Understood, 7 understood. It's that percentage. It's that 8 figure that I believe we are interested in. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is sort of drifting into the RFA-2 piece of it. 10 It's a 11 fine line, but given the uncertainty of what we 12 are dealing with and our need to make a 13 decision about is this substantially complete 14 or not, there's a lot of gray area out here. 15 That's why we are probing on issues which maybe 16 ordinarily maybe we wouldn't be getting to 17 until later down the road. 18 Did you want to finish? COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No. that's 19 20 okay. 2.1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I just want to reinforce the flavor of what both Commissioner 22 23 Cameron and Commissioner Zuniga have said. 24 have established a principle here in our

operations going way back that promoting competition is a very, very high priority. And it's in the best interest of the Commonwealth to have as much competition for these licenses as possible.

Given that as a priority, we try to be as flexible as we can within our rules and within an overall fairness to give as many competitors a chance to get to the table as possible. Ergo our extensions and so forth when in good-faith, it looks like people probably would make it.

However, our patience is not unlimited and our predisposition to competition is not infinite. And it is time to get this going and to meet deadlines rather than miss them.

And you know you need to take this into -- You're giving a message to the world, to us as well each time deadlines are met, each time parties can't get to the table and so forth. Just as a word to the wise, this has got to get moving pretty quickly.

MR. STERN: Mr. Chairman, there's

1 been a discussion of a "roll up our sleeves" 2 meeting to try to get this thing done as early 3 as next week. 4 The answer to your original question 5 that was asked here, that's what we're really 6 pushing for. We want to get this done and move along with our new partners, I don't want to 8 say as badly as the Commission does, but as 9 badly as the Commission does and as quickly as the Commission wants to finish. 10 11 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. 12 That's helpful. 13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Are you finished? 14 Thank you. Director Wells, welcome back. 15 MS. WELLS: That was the last item 16 on the agenda. I don't know if any of the 17 Commissioners have any questions for me. 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, we need to 19 make -- You're telling us objectively here are 20 the pieces. 2.1 MS. WELLS: Correct. 22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The three pieces, 23 the organization chart, the operator and the 24 financing are there in some form or other.

1 MS. WELLS: Correct. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And now we have to 3 decide is this substantially complete or not, right? MS. WELLS: 5 Correct. 6 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I have one 7 question, Director. Did we miss anything that 8 you need in order to move this process along in 9 a timely manner and be fair to everyone? MS. WELLS: No, I don't I think so. 10 11 I think that at this point the objective of 12 setting the deadline and sort of locking in the 13 deal so that the IEB knows what we are dealing 14 with that objective has been met. 15 My concern is scheduling, because 16 every week or two or three or four that goes by 17 that there's a delay is going to delay things 18 as far as completion on the backend. 19 just want the Commission to be aware of that as 20

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: When you say scheduling, you're talking about the ability to have all of the information you need to deem it substantially -- no, all of the information you

far as timeframe for the RFA-2 process.

2.1

22

23

need in order to move ahead with the background investigations, correct?

MS. WELLS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So, you are concerned about weeks slipping. So, you need a definitive answer on qualifiers and then that paperwork submitted in a timely fashion.

MS. WELLS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Because the scheduling implications are that the referendum is scheduled in June now. And we ordinarily like to have the suitability determination completed before that. That's already probably off the table.

MS. WELLS: That is not going to happen.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. And we can't receive the final RFA-2s until the suitability determinations are made. So, the scheduling implications of slippage are substantial and affect a multitude of parties and processes.

MS. WELLS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I step

back a little bit? We've always had this 2 notion of a scope of licensing meeting with the 3 IEB --4 MS. WELLS: Right. 5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- prior to 6 the deadline as a recommendation. 7 ultimately soon after the deadline for a real 8 determination of who will be qualified or not 9 or who will be a qualifier, what entity has to 10 qualify, what principles of what entity, etc. 11 Is it fair to say that you don't 12 have the ability to do that scope of licensing 13 meeting currently? 14 MS. WELLS: We have met. So, it's 15 not as if the applicant hasn't come in and 16 we've had conversations about the scope of 17 licensing. 18 I think I am 95 to 99 percent sure 19 what I would do based on what I know now. 20 the term sheet, I don't think it would be 21 appropriate for me to make a final 22 determination without looking at the term sheet 23 because that could change. I have an idea of

what I expect the term sheet to read as far as

the numbers because there are no numbers in the term sheet. It's just sort of the parameters.

So, I would like to look at that.

That may inform the decision. As far as doing a thorough and comprehensive job that term sheet, I think, is appropriate before making a final determination, although I'm fairly confident what the outcome is going to be as far as the scope of licensing decisions.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So, is it fair to say that the litmus test, if you will, is that executed term sheet which the applicant tells us is imminent as early as a week from now.

MS. WELLS: Correct. Then it's a matter of the parties submitting the BED's, the PHDF's for applicants that have already been found suitable. What we did with the Mass Gaming and Entertainment, we had a protocol for updating the information. As you know, the information on those qualifiers is now quite old. So, we have to update the information. So, there's information they'd have to submit even if they've been deemed suitable before.

And as we did with Mass Gaming and Entertainment, the operating company we'd have to look for any kind of regulatory violations, we look at their structure. There's been a change in their structure with the LLC. I would like to take a look at that. There is work to be done on that end as well.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Back on the point about the 99, 95 percent. For you to be 100 percent, if there is such a thing, sure that they are substantially complete and I know there's leeway in substantial, do you need that term sheet?

MS. WELLS: That's a different analysis. We're talking about determination of qualifiers. When the Commission was talking about substantially complete, they were talking about those three prongs of the deal put together. The Commission never actually said that all qualifiers had to have their BED's in by a certain date. So, I want the applicant understand what we had said.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Those three things included the equity portion, which you

cannot currently determine.

1

2 MS. WELLS: Right. So, the issue is 3 is an equity contributor necessarily a 4 qualifier or not? And there is a potential 5 argument for example that GLPI is not a 6 qualifier, potentially. I am leaning towards that GLPI is a qualifier. Their principals 8 would be a qualifier, but I'd like to take it 9 back to look at the term sheet and hear the 10 company out before making a final 11 determination. So, that's the issue. I have 12 the piece, is the piece a qualifier or not is 13 the decision that needs to be made and then go forward from there. 14 15 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So, it's 16 impossible for you right now to talk about a 17 timeline for completion until you have the

MS. WELLS: Right. For example, if the applicant didn't get a term sheet in for six weeks and then took another four weeks after that to get the materials in, that would affect the timeline.

entire picture. Would that be accurate?

However, if they got the materials

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

in -- got the term sheet in a week and submitted the materials at the same time that's a very different story. I am relaying to you that I'm relying on them in order to give you a more accurate timeline.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I stay on the GLPI for a little bit? Maybe those principals were already found suitable in a prior iteration of this and know how to fill out those BED's. Could they submit them to you even if you have not --

MS. WELLS: We discussed that. I've thrown that out as an option to the applicant that that potentially could defray the impact or the delay in the term sheet if they submitted the materials ahead of time. That's up to them.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That would be an easy step for the applicant to facilitate this process. You probably have a pretty good idea of who the qualifiers are going to be.

You know who the qualifiers are.

You know who you are negotiating with. You could give us the background forms on people

1 And if you happen to give us one too 2 many or one too few that's not a big deal, but 3 it gets our process rolling. And it gives you 4 a little more room on your term sheet. 5 would be a healthy piece of advice. 6 MS. WELLS: Yes. And we've had that 7 discussion. 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You have? 9 MS. WELLS: Yes. 10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay, good. So, 11 we have two things on the table. One is 12 specifically is the issue -- Crossroads has 13 withdrawn. So, that's the end of it. So, now 14 there is the Mass Gaming proposal, which we've 15 already deemed substantially complete. And now 16 there is KG Urban that purports to be 17 substantially complete and we would permit them 18 to go forward in closing up on the suitability 19 and the RFA-2 process. 20 And then generally, we've got to 21 talk a little bit more about the schedule. But 22 on the substantially complete, do we let KG 23 Urban go forward? Where are you all coming 24 down?

after listening to them today and listening to Director Wells to value the competition in this process. I think they have made a good-faith effort to put the pieces together. And they make assurances today that they understand the importance of completing the deal and getting the paperwork in so that we can move our process along.

So, I am comfortable at this point voting for this applicant to move ahead in the process.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'm perhaps on the other side of that. I've seen a lot of terms in draft that until they are executed they aren't real, not necessarily in this experience but in my prior experience. There's nothing like having to ink a deal, whatever those terms may be in terms of ownership and participation. I'm not talking about full financing. We've never let the Phase 1 be one in which the applicant had to bring their full financing package. There's an understanding that that has to be done for much later.

2.1

And I understand the differences 1 2 between going to the bank and borrow, put a 3 mortgage on something and structure something with a REIT. But every other applicant came to 5 Director Wells with an entity that was owned by 6 parties. And those parties knew how much they owned, what percentage --8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: When you're saying 9 entity, you mean --10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Every other 11 applicant. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: In this case for 13 Region C. 14 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right, for 15 Region C wholly-owned by another subsidiary or 16 partly owned someone else. And that's the 17 piece that I think is missing here, which is I 18 believe is critical. Having said that, if they are really 19 20 a week away from that I would hate close the 21 door on something if there really is because 22 there is a lot of gray in here. There's recent 23 terms, there's draft terms, etc. 24 But I really want to get us away

from this is yet another time in which we just
need a little bit more time. And then we are
here two weeks later or a month later or six
weeks later and the terms have been hashed out
but they have not been signed.

So, if I could get us to agree that

if this is imminent as in next week will the

IEB get a percentage certain that the

contribution from this applicant has been

inked, signed on. That's what I would be

comfortable with moving ahead at this time.

Otherwise, it's still just an agreement, a

verbal agreement, an agreement in spirit as far

as I can see.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Commissioner Stebbins, do you have thoughts?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: My only point was I think we have always relied on ongoing suitability. And there are many points in the process where we will expect deliverables. And at this point, what we are saying is they're moving forward but we expect those deliverables. And they did respond to that today in a way that I thought presented a good-

faith effort in moving forward.

2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'm just

3 saying that I may be disagreeing with that.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I would echo Commissioner Cameron. I appreciate the comments today and so much of the progress that they've made. I may need to have a further conversation with you about defining GLPI as a qualifier, the REIT as a qualifier.

But for the purposes of competition,
I want to hear back from you how the scoping
meeting goes, continual updates. Any signs of
slippage is not a good mark in the process and
something we revisit maybe two weeks from
today. But I am pleased with the progress
that's being made. Hopefully, we can keep
moving this along in the spirit of competition.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What I think at this stage of the game what we need to know at this stage of the game is there a plausible package here. And there is a plausible package. As best as we can tell at a cursory look, the players who are at the table and the approximate structure that they're talking

about is a plausible structure. We've had other ones that were not plausible structures.

And one them backed out and we've kicked others out that were not plausible.

Whether this deal sticks, God knows. It could die tomorrow. Even if there were a signed term sheet, the deal may still fall apart. But the barrier, the hang-up for us the compromise is a whole lot of people is not the exact financial structure. We'll get to that.

RFA-2 we will determine whether or not there's enough equity there to make us feel comfortable that this is a solid deal. And that the terms are reasonable and the rate that they're paying on their debt is something they can genuinely finance and so forth and so on. We'll get to that.

But as long as it's plausible now and they're working hard to get it done, which they are which doesn't mean it'll be next week, but they are as interested as we are in getting this done. The barrier to us is the qualifiers.

The barrier to us is not the

specific deals. As long as it's fundamentally plausible, the specific terms of the term sheet are not the barrier to us. The barrier are the qualifiers. So, we can do the background checks and get this process going down the road.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But in order to determine those qualifiers, Director Wells needs those terms.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All I'm saying is precisely yes. Exactly every single one of them, is it going to be 12 or 11 or 21 or 19, we don't know for sure. But if we had 19 of the 21 in hand now, because you know one way or the other they're going to be there, then we can get moving. And if another one comes in later on, we can deal with that.

But if everything gets held up until the term sheet is done and the term sheet delays, then the term she becomes a serious barrier to our operations. But I think you've laid out an alternative here, which is give us the qualifiers and give them to us quickly and get the term sheet done as quickly as you can.

That lets us move this process

forward. It doesn't unfairly compromise the interest of the other bidder who is doing the job. It doesn't screw up the whole process. It doesn't further compromise all of Southeastern Mass. and our ability to make a decision if IEB can be doing their job.

So, I would take sort of both

so, I would take sort of both points. I do agree, I think you do too really as you usually are, you're more rigorous from a financial standpoint than the rest of us. But I think you are still saying okay, don't keep pushing us too hard. But if you really are moving down the road, we are okay -- I'm okay with substantially complete.

I would say I'm with the sense of this that yes, for the purposes that we have used to identify substantially complete, for the principles that we've established in other loosey-goosey proposals that we've considered substantially complete that were not really very well fine-tuned, in the interest of competition that we should say all right, let's go. This is substantially complete but there

is a very high premium on getting those 2 qualifiers in, whether the term sheet is done 3 or not so that the whole compromise is not -the whole process is not compromised by their 5 inability to get a deal done. 6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I will go 7 along with that. I get that point. And I 8 think that's a good characterization. I would 9 still like to stress to the applicant that whether it's the term sheet or those 10 11 qualifiers, ideally both, imminently at the 12 discretion of Director Wells to report back to 13 us as early as next Commission meeting in two 14 weeks where they are would be a very high 15 priority of this Commission. 16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. I think we 17 do need to vote on this, right? Does someone 18 care to -- maybe you spoke first Commissioner 19 Cameron. 20 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes. Mr. 21 Chair, I would move that we consider this 22 applicant KG Urban substantially complete at 23 this point to move forward in the process. 24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Would you 2 accept a modifier to that? 3 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Of course. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Of course without 5 even knowing what it is. 6 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well, he's 7 allowed to make it, whether or not we agree is 8 a different point. 9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: With the 10 condition to come back in two weeks and report 11 to Director Wells or have Director Wells report 12 back to this Commission whether they have made 13 incremental progress in either or both the term sheet or the submission of additional 14 15 qualifiers as discussed here. 16 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes, I would 17 agree. 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do you second with 19 that? 20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I second that. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any further discussion? All in favor, aye. 22 23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 24 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously. Don't go away because I think there are two other topics that relate to this that I think just for purposes of everybody's knowledge we need to talk a little bit about.

One is the schedule in general. And since we don't know when we're going to our qualifiers or how many there are going to be, we can't speak with any degree of certainty. It will not be prior to the June 23 election. That you can count on.

I think if we take the applicant at face value and they are moving very quickly.

And in a week or two we start getting this done, then I don't want to put anybody on the spot. To try to create a sense of expectations, is it a reasonable assumption that come September we ought to be able to — that if in the next 10 to 15 days you get most of what you need, is it a reasonable assumption, a reasonable aspiration for us that by September you could have the suitability

determination made?

MS. WELLS: That's possible. Part of it depends on what we find. If there's an adjudicatory hearing, then that would extend the process.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I understand that.

I'm only trying to set general expectations.

And your ability to deliver on a deadline is primarily a function of other people. And I fully appreciate that.

So, this just to sort of try to get a sense here. If things go along reasonably well, there's a pretty good shot that we can have the suitability determination done by September. That is one of the many gating mechanisms for when the RFA-2s can be submitted.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Mr. Chair, can I make a point here? In thinking about the schedule that is our own regulation that we decided early on to separate completely the process (A) from (B).

I think that it may be worth a discussion to talk about say for example

```
sometime in August we can get the RFA-2s
2
     completed and move this process along. It's
3
     just a thought. That was our own doing.
 4
     don't think there's another jurisdiction that
5
     separates it out.
 6
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You're saying it's
7
     not cast in stone that we couldn't receive
8
     completed RFA-2s prior to the suitability
9
     determination.
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Correct.
10
11
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The real gating
12
     item would be you have to make a suitability
13
     determination before you made the decision on
14
     the award.
15
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Of course.
16
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's a good
17
    point.
18
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
                                       Well, in
19
     advance.
20
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, I take that
21
    point. That's a good point. This is a
22
     deadline of our own making and one that we can
23
     certainly talk about and get other people's
24
     comments on it.
```

1 For the moment leaving that one in 2 place, the question is when do we get the RFA-3 2s out there. We've been talking about this. I don't know what you've been discussing, if 5 anything, with the other bidders, RFA-2s? 6 MS. WELLS: I have not had 7 discussions about the RFA-2s. 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: At least the 9 Brockton bidder is presumably ready to go to work on the RFA-2, which is the second phase 10 11 application for people watching, the site-12 specific application. And presumably the other 13 bidder is awfully close to moving on that. 14 We have said that we are revising 15 the RFA-2 application to make it a more 16 rational and well-articulated and less 17 duplicative mechanism. We have said -- We've 18 referred to it as tweaking, I think. We're not 19 making any substantive, serious content changes 20 to what will be required to be submitted to us. 2.1 We are simply changing the format of 22 that based on the experience that we now have

using it in a couple of earlier situations.

This is all by the way of saying that if you

23

are an applicant for Region C who wants to get moving on RFA-2, the fact that we've not giving you the revised form yet shouldn't be a barrier.

The work, the material that you are going to need to submit in your RFA-2 is the same material for the very most part that you submitted last time. We will get the revised actual form of the RFA-2 done we hope in a couple of weeks.

All of the Commissioners are working on their share of the 160 odd whatever it is questions. But I just want to make it clear to the applicants that the fact that we can't give you the final form shouldn't be a delay in your going ahead and doing the work to fill out the form when you get it in a couple of weeks.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think we can probably say definitively that we should have it done in two weeks. I can't imagine that there are any issues that would preclude us from doing that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's mostly up to the Commissioners and our consultants. So,

if we can get our work done in the next few
days, we are presumptively for sure it's the
28th that we would get the actual form
available for people. But I didn't want the
lack of the revised form to in anyway be a
deterrent here or a slowdown.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'm done with the finance provision. They were really tweaks. My hope and read is that it will save us a go-around. We had a couple of go-arounds with the prior applicants to clarify this. We termed requests for clarification, because people saw budget line items and they interpreted it differently among themselves. And what we tried to insert here is consistency so that we could compare apples to apples a lot easier.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Same here. We are close to putting in our changes. A lot of it is just as you pointed out Mr. Chairman, eliminating the duplication. I would argue that all of the questions are rational, but just tweaking it so information -- just making sure that questions are clear, information

1 doesn't need to be kind of cut and paste and 2 dubbed into two different answers and kind of 3 realigning some of our questions. It's our goal in two weeks to have a conversation, all 5 of us agree on what the questions are and if 6 the revisions are okay. I don't see a problem in meeting that deadline. 8 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes, we are 9 very close. 10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Nancy, do you know what the story is with Jim's? 11 12 MS. STACK: I think they are 13 actually in very good shape at this point. 14 MR. ZIEMBA: I want to raise one 15 consideration that I know that's been 16 contemplated, at least in Jim's division, is 17 that previously in all of our Category 1 18 competitions, most every facility if not every 19 facility put forward a draft environmental 20 impact report as part of their RFA-2 filing. 2.1 And when our consultants reviewed those 22 filings, it was in the context of significant 23 amounts of information related to traffic and 24 otherwise when they were reviewing the

applications.

We do not know currently whether or not the applicants are planning to -- what their schedule is for filing of the RFA-2. Our regulation calls for only the ENF certificate, which can be much less significant in terms of information than the RFA-2. And by the July 10 deadline, I believe both of the applicants would certainly meet the ENF certificate.

But what would additionally be filed is sort of an unknown right now. And what level of response by our consultants would be required in the absence of the draft environmental impact report being filed. That's one consideration going into these questions for consideration next week -- next meeting.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Remind me generally, prior Category 1 -- prior applicants were in very different stages in their EIRs preparation and submission. But for the most part by the time we got to RFA-2 submission, they were mostly done with the DEIR?

MR. ZIEMBA: For the Category 1s, I

believe that all of them in some iteration had
filed their draft environmental impact reports.

For the Category 2s in the middle of the
process, I believe, we received DEIRs from at

5 least two of the applicants. One had finalized 6 it.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Based on the projects, etc. So, are you suggesting that that is really a schedule driver? If we want to have the ability to look at a lot of the details let's say of traffic and building and site design having a DEIR would be very helpful.

MR. ZIEMBA: It certainly would be very helpful. Can we act in the absence of one, we have not done so for Category 1s in the past. But that's part of the consideration that we would be thinking about in terms of these questions for the next meeting.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But we could decouple them like Commissioner Cameron said about another issue. We could decouple the submission of the RFA-2 from getting the DEIR subsequent so we could start our evaluation

with the rest of the RFA-2 awaiting the DEIR. 2 They don't have to be packaged together. MR. ZIEMBA: All of this deserves 3 4 some consideration. 5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: As I said, I'm 6 just trying to create a sense of expectations for everybody involved that's not anywhere 8 close to locked in stone. The big variable 9 here -- How many months was it typically for us in our other three licenses between the time 10 11 the RFA-2s came in and were completed and our 12 decisions were made? What's the range? 13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Ten months 14 maybe. 15 MR. DAY: Actually, it ranged from 16 about four months to eight and a half. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Region A was 18 presumably --19 MR. DAY: Region A arbitrations 20 added for Region A. 2.1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, this is the 22 point I wanted to make. The really big 23 variable once the RFA-2s are done and our 24 ability to make a license award is the

negotiations between the applicants and the surrounding communities and the ILEVs, the impacted live entertainment venues, essentially the surrounding communities. Those dates are beyond our control.

As we experience in the eight and a half months it took us to make a final decision in Region A because surrounding community issues went on and on and on, which is fine.

If it does, it does. But those are deadlines which are beyond the Commission's control.

Those are up to the applicant, fundamentally the applicant and the surrounding communities.

Left to our own devices, within four months probably from the time we get our application we can have this done. But it could extend if the applicants and the surrounding communities can't get their acts together. So, left to our own devices we ought to be able to have this done by the end of the year, give or take. Whether we make that deadline or not is really not in our hands going forward.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think there

1 are a lot of successful models out there for 2 surrounding communities, nearby community 3 agreements, and experience on both teams with doing it successfully with negotiating successfully. I think that will help. 5 6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: This is only 7 my read from seeing how some of these 8 surrounding community agreements were being 9 executed in the past. Hopefully, there's a lot 10 of lessons learned from a lot of parties, but 11 that applicants turn their attention to 12 surrounding communities only after they had 13 reached a host community agreement and had a 14 vote, which was a big, big milestone to be 15 accomplished first and foremost. Otherwise, 16 there was no real project. 17 And if that is soon to be 18 accomplished here, I would encourage all the 19 applicants to get on that surrounding community 20 bandwagon, if you will, soon. 2.1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right, that's what 22 I was getting at. Thank you. Anything else 23 that we need to talk about with Region C? 24 MR. ZIEMBA: Mr. Chairman, you

referenced that potentially we'd like some comments on our deadlines. We'll probably discuss this at the next meeting. Is that something we'd ask our applicants to weigh in more formally?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Sure.

Yes.

That's very much our style and very much appreciated. So, we'll be trying to fine-tune those aspects of the deadlines that we can control as soon as we can. At the moment, the major item is the qualifiers and term sheet.

Yes, starting two weeks from now -So, if anybody, particularly applicants have
comments or suggestions on how we handle the
interplay of these variables apropos of the
schedule, please let us know.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Perhaps this will be too aggressive to try to put something for next meeting but could we work to have our best-case, worst-case perhaps middle-of-the-road schedule subject to a number of these moving pieces and the feedback and comments we can get from applicants?

I think it would be like we've done

Page 50 in the past to at least predict the next 2 deadline of RFA-2 would be very helpful. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We could try to do 4 that. 5 MR. ZIEMBA: Yes. 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Anything 7 else on Region C or IEB? 8 MS. WELLS: All set. Thank you very 9 much. 10 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do you have any 12 opinions on deflate gate? 13 MS. WELLS: No comment. 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Next up Research 15 and Responsible Gaming, Director Vander Linden. 16 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Good morning, 17 Commissioners. I'm fortunate to be joined with 18 me this morning as we talk about the crime 19 measures by three distinguished persons. 20 Behind me we have Chief Alfred. He's the 21 police chief for the Plainville Police 22 Department. 23 We also have who you know quite 24 well, Detective Lieutenant Brian Connors.

our commanding officer of the Gaming

Enforcement Unit for the Massachusetts Gaming

Commission. To my right we have Christopher

Bruce whom I will provide a more thorough

overview of what his position and

qualifications are here in just a moment.

Massachusetts Gaming Commission has taken a very close look and intense effort in wanting to understand what are the social and economic impacts of expanded gaming in Massachusetts.

We want to know both what are the positive impacts. We also want to know what are the negative and unintended consequences and impacts that expanded gaming will bring to the state.

Crime impacts, I would say transcend both of those issues. Crime impacts are social impacts as well as economic impacts. Through my two years here as we've gone through many processes with our communities, what I can say definitively is there is a lot of interest in communities wanting to know what will the crime impacts be when the casino would come to their

2.1

community.

What I can also say definitively is that there isn't a lot of good evidence that would give us a solid idea of what those crime impacts would be. It just simply doesn't exist. We've done research looking at jurisdictions across the country and around the world to try to answer this question.

apparent, we wanted to try to approach this issue in a different way. That being led by Commissioner Cameron who said let's try to take a slightly different approach with this. Let's not -- Let's break this piece out and let's try to get a very crystal clear picture of what are the crime impacts that are a result of expanded gaming in Massachusetts.

Whereas other studies really had a difficult time trying to draw its causality if there were crime increases in specific type of crime, drawing causality to casino gambling or to gambling in general. We want to be able to do a much better job than that.

The person who rose to the surface

as the person who would be most qualified to do 2 that is Christopher Bruce. I'm going to read 3 his description, his bio to you just very briefly. Then I'm going to turn it over to 5 Christopher and talk about the work that we're 6 doing here today that we're doing in Massachusetts. 8 Christopher Bruce has been a crime 9 analyst in Danvers. He's been a crime analyst 10 in Cambridge, Massachusetts at their police 11 departments. Throughout his career, he's been 12 extremely active in the crime analyst 13 community. He has been president of the 14 International Association of Crime Analysts. 15 He's been vice president at the same 16 organization. 17 He was also president of the 18 Massachusetts Association of Crime Analysts from 2000 to 2004. He does numerous 19 20 presentations. He also teaches at Pippin

crime and traffic safety program. In this, he

University and Western Oregon University.

is a currently the director -- analytical

director for the data driven approach as to

21

22

23

Не

provides workshops, training and technical assistance to agencies seeking to analyze and reduce their crime and collision hotspots.

He's presented and published numerous articles on this topic. Actually, too numerous really to go into a lot of detail. I am personally thrilled that we have the opportunity to work with Christopher. I think that hopefully what you will see is that this is not us just trying to capture secondary data and process that.

We want to take a much closer look, which is to the credit of a lot of our stakeholders, it's to the credit of Chief Alfred behind me, to the other police departments that we've had the opportunity to work with. It seems to me that we have a large buy-in with the approach that we are taking on this issue.

So, with that I will let Christopher talk about our approach.

MR. BRUCE: Thank you, Mark. I want to commend the Gaming Commission not just because they contracted me, but just in general

for the approach that you've all taken to this particular issue.

I think what we've typically seen on evaluative research for any type of change like the introduction of gaming facilities has largely been based on broad level crime statistics published through national programs like the UCR. And what you've all asked me to do is to take a much more detailed look at all of the data that's being collected by the police agencies in the affected areas and look at the different changes on all issues of public safety, not just crime but all types of other calls for service, disorder and of course traffic collisions.

That's really what my profession, crime analysis, is all about. We deal with four major areas that are up on the screen there people, places, patterns and problems. The work of a crime analyst who work in police departments are to identify things like repeat offenders and repeat victims. That would be people.

Patterns of activity, multiple

crimes committed by the same person or some sort of common causal factor. Long-term and chronic problems and hotspots places where a lot of activity occurs.

So, I'm going to be bringing the various techniques of those types of analysis to this particular project.

As I said, previous studies have -You don't need to be able to read it, but it's
just a data table from a typical study on
casinos and crime using very broad level crime
statistics. And the reason I think that most
studies have done that is because those
statistics are readily available. They're the
only thing readily available really for crime
statistics in the nation or even in the state.

When the analyses of previous casino impacts have gone into more detail, they've generally been for one city alone because it's very difficult if you've never worked with the data, you wouldn't know that it's extremely difficult to get data out of the typical police records management system and into a format that is suitable for analysis.

2.1

The researchers that have done that previously for certain areas have basically concentrated on one city like Philadelphia or one jurisdiction. Whereas this project is synthesizing data sets from multiple jurisdictions, in the case of the Plainville project six adjacent agencies and I think we'll have a similar number in Springfield and Everett.

These agencies are using different systems to manage their data. They have some common standards in crime and collisions because of state and national standards, but there aren't standards in other areas. So, analyzing this is largely a process of fusing these different data sets together into a common data set with common definitions. So, it's a bit of a project to set that up. Can you go forward please?

This project is going involve a much more, I think, detailed analysis of the impacts of gaming facilities than has been done in the past. We are going to be looking at changes not only in crimes but in non-crime incidents

such as noise complaints, youth disorder, animal calls, anything really that occurs that doesn't rise to a crime level but that police respond to.

It's of course also going to include a crime analysis and an analysis of collisions. And we're not going to be looking at the volume of changes in these areas, we're going to be looking at the changes in hotspots. We're going to be looking at the changes in patterns.

So, it may be that the volume remains consistent but we see shifts in geography or shifts in time as to police activity. These are all things that of course police agencies have to account for. I'll be able to look at specific incidents that are definitely related to the casinos through a coding mechanism that I'll talk about, but we'll also be looking at specific patterns and problems that develop. And hopefully provide the police agencies in the affected areas the detail they need to make effective decisions about how to respond.

It's not just about assessing

2.1

whether something went up or went down. It's about providing the level of detail necessary for the police departments to take the appropriate steps and identify the resources they need to counteract any increases that they see. Go forward, please.

As I said, we're getting started right there in the Plainville area. Those six agencies are involved. And these are the major project areas that we are looking at. The first part is extracting data from each police agency's computer aided dispatch and records management system.

These are very complex data systems that require some level of knowledge to understand how the architecture works and how to get the data out of those. That's been sort of the first phase. And it's been difficulty even for me with the experience that I have just learning the vagaries of the different records management systems.

But I got the data out, and based on that we're going to be establishing a baseline report for the normal level of activity and the

2.1

normal types of activity that these agencies experience per season, per month, per day of the week, per hour of the day, etc. in order to then assess what happens afterwards. Once the casino opens are there any changes to that normal.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I just want to interrupt on one point. You pointed out that you will be establishing a baseline data against which we will be more matching what we're talkingabout, which is exactly comparable to what we're doing for every other social and economic impact.

Our social economic impact of gaming in Massachusetts, which we'll be talking about in the next couple of meetings is doing the same thing for all of the other variables whether it's problem gambling or business starts or unemployment and so forth.

So, this is a piece of a larger study of establishing the clear and understandable baseline against which longitudinally we can assess changes that are happening for everything not just crime.

MR. BRUCE: And I envision working very closely with SEIGMA to make sure that we are using the same research methodologies after the data is prepared.

We are working with agencies to train them to record incidents that are specifically related to the presence of the casino -- And I'll talk about what that means in a second. -- to analyze the changes, what changes after the casinos open. Again, as I say in my last bullet point, working with SEIGMA to integrate the analysis of public safety issues with other social and economic impacts that they're tasked with analyzing.

This is just a typical schematic of a police data system, part of a police data system. Everyone is a little bit different. So, I've had to do a connection to them and extract the data.

A big part of that is translating multiple codes or multiple data sets into a common library. So, for instance, no police department uses the same list of calls for service types than any other police department

uses. So, in order to be able to analyze for a region, we've got to be able to translate what they do use and do a common set of codes.

And on the slide you have -Actually, I'm sorry. This was a late addition.
On the slide here, you can see that Plainville
on the left-hand side calls a burglary a
burglary, whereas Attleboro on the right-hand
side calls it B and E NR or B and E residence
and so forth. So, it's just a matter of trying
to fuse all of these data sets into the same
thing. It takes a while, but once it's set up,
it works perfectly going forward.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So long as they don't change it.

accounting for that obviously, yes.

Occasionally, they add a new code or subtract a code too. But whatever they choose to do, we'll translate it into some common definitions.

MR. BRUCE: They might but I'll be

So, based on the calls for service data that I've already received from some of the agencies, this is an example of sort of a

2.1

1 baseline report for one particular variable.

This is just total incidents of a variety of types. It's not an exhaustive list.

But going over the past five years,

the normal deviation that they see in those

incidents. That figure at the end, the CV

coefficient, the variation is a statistic that

helps determine how much variability there is

in a particular incident from year-to-year.

And in the case of Plainville, which is what we're looking at, it's very low in all cases. That's a good thing. It means that the baseline is going to be actually quite representative of what's normal. So, it offers a good basis for comparison.

If these calls for service class were just all over the place swinging wildly from one year to the next, it would be very hard to establish whether any changes that we see in 2015 are related to the casinos or not. But their numbers are good. Keep moving forward please.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I actually had a question on that. What if you have a very

say, city with a high coefficient of variability prior to the introduction of casinos, are there externalities, let's say other factors that need to be analyzed and whittled out of the data?

MR. BRUCE: Absolutely. That's part of this process of course. To take an example, a lot of police activity is self-directed.

Drunk driving enforcement for instance or drug enforcement or liquor violation enforcement, we don't generally speaking know about those incidents unless the police are proactively doing something and therefore making arrests.

So, you might see an agency that one year they do a certain amount of drunk driving enforcement. The next year they get a grant from the state to do a bunch of more enforcement. So, their numbers go way up that year. The next year they don't have the grant and they go way down. So, it's all been driven by what the police are choosing to do.

In that case, we wouldn't be able to use drunk driving arrest statistics as a good baseline to compare future activity. We'd have

to look towards a more complex data set like the number of collisions that are caused by drunk drivers or that might be the only thing in that particular case.

The same with drugs, we can't necessarily look at drug incidents as a good baseline measure because it's all based on police enforcement. But we can look at overdoses or medical aid calls that involve drugs or traffic collisions involving somebody under the influence of drugs.

So, anytime that we have an unreliable statistic that way, we shouldn't use that to compare changes. We should look deeper for a better statistic. And fortunately we are collecting the level of detail from these systems to enable us to do that. Does that answer your question?

much. Let me just follow up a little bit. How do you account for externalities to the police activity? I'm just brainstorming a little bit here. Game day in Foxboro, it occurs to me that may have a big impact potentially on the

activity around that whole area. Whereas every other day would be a lot more close to whatever baseline, etc.

So, just help me conceptually understand whether and how, if you will, you'll be able to account for those kind of externalities.

MR. BRUCE: Sure. The point that you're making gets to the deeper point which is that just because something does increase after the introduction of the casino doesn't mean it's casino related. And we're certainly not making that assumption in any part of the analysis.

We can help control for that by the use first of all with controlled areas. Some places that are far enough away that they probably are not being impacted by the casino and yet we can look and determine what their statistics do during the same time period. And thus determine whether there's something unique about the Plainville area, which is probably in that case the casino that would cause the increase.

Your specific example about game day in Foxboro should remain consistent going forward unless they see much greater attendance at the games or something like that in which case that's a question we'd definitely have to ask. Sometimes we just can't account for it. Sometimes we just can't get to data set that would help us control for other causes of increases and decreases.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Like snow.

MR. BRUCE: Like snow. That's actually a very good example. So, although in that particular case I suppose we probably could get that data set. But looking at the overall increases and decreases after the casino is introduced is only part of the project. And we would only draw conclusions based on increases if we could specifically tie those increases in some way to the presence of the casino.

And what you're seeing on the screen here will actually help us do that little bit.

This is where we're asking the agencies to do a little investigation on each incident and

determine whether or not it is casino related.

And it could be casino related through a variety of different mechanisms that you can see here, where if they make an arrest of somebody or have a suspect that the offender was in the area to use the casino or the victim was in the area to use the casino.

The incident occurred on casino property. It involved an employee or a contractor of the casino. It involved a vehicle seeing entering or leaving the casino property. Or it occurred on the property of an ancillary business, a business that opens just to service, primarily to service the casino customers. And that will be somewhat difficult to track, but we are working on the mechanism for that.

So, this won't tell the whole story because there are going to be many cases in which we don't know whether it's casino related. Mostly because we don't know who the offender is or where the offender is coming from. The typical burglary or clearance rate or theft clearance rate hoovers between 10 and

20 percent in most agencies. So, you're talking about a large number where we don't know specifically.

But of the ones that we do know, if we can determine that a large percentage of them are casino related by the use of this flag then that will give credence to any major increase in that category that we see in the area being casino related. Does that make sense?

So, if we see a 20 percent increase in burglaries in Plainville after the casino was introduced, and when we analyze the burglary arrests we find that 50 percent of the increase involves people who were in town to use the casino, offenders were in town to use the casino, that gives credence to a large part of the increase being related to the casino.

It's not a perfect analysis. And there is no perfect analysis in this. But at least it helps us come up with a logical determination of what's happening in the data.

So, we're working on different ways that they can record this information in their

existing systems.

Some examples of things we might see, and this is not in any way set in stone, but this is what other agencies have reported to me that they've seen, other crime analysts that I've talked to across the country. Now it's important to recognize that many of these increases or possible increases that we see on the screen are largely related to simply the presence of so many additional people in an area.

It'd be the same if we were building a Walmart or a movie theater or some other major entertainment venue. There will be some crimes probably that are specifically related to gambling. But I think most of the increases that we are likely to see are just going to be related to increased traffic, increased people in these communities.

So, that might include theft from vehicles from the casino parking lot and surrounding parking lots. Thefts from vehicles are a constant problem for many Massachusetts communities. Anywhere you have a major

commercial entertainment venue, it's something to watch for.

Forged checks and fraudulent credit cards used in areas businesses increased.

There's increases in lost property calls for service. General increases in the traffic collisions just because of the number of cars. Stolen vehicles may be recovered in casino and nearby parking lots. Drug and alcohol-related medical aids at nearby hotels.

These are just some examples of things we'll be testing for. But we're not going into this with any prejudice. There's not even really any hypotheses. That's sort of the difference between research and crime analysis.

Crime analysis, we just take the full data set and we ask what's different, what's changed, what's new no matter what category we're talking about. So, we're approaching this with a very open mind.

So, among other things, we're measuring changes. So, we'll be looking at how things like traffic collisions compare to

baseline. We'll be looking at mapping. So, 2 we'll be creating hotspot maps of different 3 types of calls for service and crime. looking at how those change after the introduction of the casino. 5 6 On this particular map, although you 7 can't really see the streets all that well, but 8 most of those hotspots are on Route 1 going up towards Plainville. So, that'll be interesting 9 10 to see whether we see volume changes there. 11 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Is that 12 collisions or any kind? I'm just curious. 13 MR. BRUCE: These are just 14 collisions, yes. And then we want to do, 15 again, a very in-depth analysis of what's 16 happening. I don't want to just report to you 17 that burglaries or thefts from vehicles went up 18 20 percent in Plainville and the surrounding 19 area. 20 I want to be able to say these are 21 the specific places they're happening. These 22 are the times they're happening. This what is 23 being stolen. This is what we know about the 24 offenders. This is what we know about the

victims. That will give the police departments more information they need to make effective response decisions to the increases.

Most of the agencies in the area, in this particularly area at least, Attleboro is the one exception, don't have full-time or even part-time crime analysts on their staff. So, I think that they'll be relying a lot on our analysis to help determine what the changes are. So, obviously we'll make that as objective and useful as possible.

So, I hope that's given you a decent overview of what we're doing here with this particular project. It's a very emergent design. So, as I say, we don't go into this with preconceived notions or hypotheses but just look at what the data tells us after the changes are made.

And I'll be bringing all of the techniques I know as an analyst and whatever my colleagues who work in areas that have casinos can help me with to do this analysis.

So, we will start seeing some results in about two months I suppose. Once a

2.1

month has passed maybe after Plainridge Park opens we should be able to start doing some baseline comparisons at least for the summer months.

And Mark wanted me to emphasize that we'll have the baseline report done probably about the first week of June.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Great. Thank you, Christopher. I've just got a couple of comments. First of all, I am just very grateful to this group of chiefs who readily decided to help us with this project. What we did is rather than mandate something we went out, we had a meeting and we said we need to help.

This is what we are trying to accomplish. This has never been done well, because there was no baseline and because these records management systems do not speak the same language. So, it's very difficult to analyze.

So one of the chiefs, recommended Christopher. So, we did our due diligence, thought that Christopher would be perfect for

this project. There were additional meetings in which lots of good ideas surfaced on how to move forward, really how to get this project going.

And the other thing that I am most interested in is -- The research is terrific. It will be very valuable. But the real-time information to put good law-enforcement solutions in place, to collaborate, I think that piece is critical. And we made a commitment to keep it safe and secure if we're going to have expanded gaming in the Commonwealth. That's one of our responsibilities. And I'm really very hopeful that this is one tool in which to do that.

And couldn't be more pleased with the collaboration and the real efforts. You have to open up your police department and let Christopher in and let him look at your information and trust that it will be used wisely for the right purposes.

So, I'm very, very thankful and I really look forward to this. And we'll tweak it. We'll take it to Springfield. We'll take

it to Everett. I know Everett is already interested in this project because they want to make sure their efforts will indeed fit in with this project.

So, we've gotten some information, some ideas about how to do that moving it forward. But this piece is I see it working very well. And we see two of our folks here in uniform who have been collaborating with this project and others by the way, everything that will happen to open this facility.

So, I thank you Christopher. And I know we're on the right track with this.

MR. BRUCE: Thank you.

unnoted that we have a Commissioner who is a very distinguished senior law enforcement official who brings some credibility and knowledge and discipline to this process. It probably would have been hard -- I see Chief Alfred nodding his head. It would have been hard had Commissioner Cameron not been part of this team to spearhead the effort.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I would say a

2.1

lot not just some credibility and experience.

2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I wouldn't want to 3 get her head too big.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I think this is great. It's a great presentation. It's very easy for me to follow and sounds like you've thought a lot about the moving pieces and the stakeholders with your advice and that of others.

I'm particularly really glad to see that the research is but a tool that will feed real action and response in real-time. Because it's one thing to do research for research purposes, but if there is a way to mitigate, intervene, correct, fine-tune in real-time, that's a fantastic use of the research piece. So, I'm really glad to see that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's a really good point. This is really a model. This one set of data is a model for this entire project, as I said. And the Legislature deserves credit.

They did set out the mandate that we do this baseline study. And that we

longitudinally study impact on each of these variables both for the purposes of research and for the purposes of informing the way we deal with it.

So, if find out that there are some kind of crime increases due to the casino, we can come to strategies quickly. We've got data to reinforce those strategies. We find out that bankruptcies do increase, we find out that domestic violence rates do increase, whatever, we'll have the data to drive our actions. So, it's a very good point.

The research will be fascinating and important and interesting for decision-makers around the world probably, but it will drive our actions and this a very practical. I really can't wait for the public to understand the extent to which we will understand what is happening here whether it's crime rates or any other impact of gambling as this unfolds across the Commonwealth.

I do have one question. Did I interrupt you, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: No. I have

2.1

a couple questions.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Let me just finish. Does the reporting officer have to collect new data? Are you adding new data points to the paperwork that the officer on the street needs to report?

MR. BRUCE: Assuming the agencies agree to it, yes. That's what we are proposing. We don't want to obviously step on officer's discretion. They'll have a good sense. Obviously, if they're responding to an incident involving community members that clearly doesn't have anything to do with the casino, we're not asking them to fill out something for every report.

But especially when they have outof-town people that they're contacting whether
in a traffic collision or involving some other
police incident, we'll be asking them to ask
those people are you in the area to make use of
the casino. If so, make an annotation in their
report to that -- record that additional piece
of information.

I'm drafting a proposal for a couple

1 of mechanisms by which they can do that.

Hopefully, they don't find it too onerous to do that. It does put a little bit of burden on them to do that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is what I wanted to get at. The devil really -- Where the rubber meets the road, so to speak, in our ability to collect this data is if the officer on the street buys into this program.

Everybody's busy. And cops are busy like everybody else is busy and have a lot of paperwork to fill out anyway. Chief Alfred, you are going to have your folks doing this. Has there been any discussion with the unions or the officers on the street? How do you manage that critical piece of the dataflow? How do you make that happen? Feel free to come up Chief, if you'd like to. Come up to a mic if you'd like to.

CHIEF ALFRED: Mostly through training. And remember the officers in the community have a vested interest in also identifying what goes on in their community to the effect of Plainridge.

Even something as simple as a tab
put on our reports that says Plainridge and
they can simply click that and identify or flag
the report. We've already had that discussion.
Something as simple as that so there's nothing
too crazy. They just have to click a tab like
that and flag that report that it's related to
Plainridge.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, it's not a big deal. You're not asking about lot of data points. There's not going to be new form that they have to fill out. It's simply telling us that this particular event was Plainridge related.

CHIEF ALFRED: Correct. An example, some things don't always arise to be a crime, it could be a domestic argument where they would ask what's the argument over. And they ascertain that it involves something to do with the racino, then again it would be a domestic report, but we would be able to then flag it and say it is related.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Great.

24 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: If I can add,

the speed of the leader. These chiefs have 2 willingly bought in to participating in this. 3 And officers know when something is important to their chief. So, that's another way of 5 getting some buy-in. 6 And certainly, we'll have training 7 that will be interactive training. What do you 8 think? This is what we're thinking. How do 9 you think it'll work? That kind of training. 10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's great. 11 feedback from the folks on the street, I think, 12 will be really, really helpful to us. 13 critical. 14 And we ought to just for the record 15 try to think of something along the way here to 16 do for the officers in these communities who 17 are going to be a part of this. Maybe it's 18 just a thank you note, but somewhere along the 19 line, we ought to think of something to 20 recognize that they are a critical, critical 21 link to this process. 22 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Coffee and 23 donuts wasn't enough. I agree. 24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I didn't mean just

1 for chiefs, I mean all of them. 2 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you, 3 Chief. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you very 5 I agree it's really a terrific 6 presentation, really clear and very exciting. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I would just 8 add a comment. Christopher relative to when I 9 was reading through the presentation one of the 10 things that brought my attention was casino-11 related flags. I think the Chief was just 12 getting at, his officers are going to have a 13 good sense from what would be a normal crime 14 statistic in the community as to whether it is 15 actually casino-related. But it's good to go 16 through the presentation and see that when

you're thinking casino-related flags, there's a

18 direct correlation to the casino. It happens

on the property. It happens with a vendor. It

happens with an employee.

Throughout the host and surrounding community meetings that we had and the input that we had from the community, one of the big flags that kept getting raised was a concern

20

2.1

22

23

over a spike in DUI cases.

And from your comments this morning that's more of, and I'm not the criminal public safety expert here, Commissioner Cameron is, so I apologize if I get terminology wrong, in that it is more of a proactive enforcement piece than some of the other crime stats which are going to be much more reactive. But that's a critical element in the comments that came up from residents not only of Plainville but the surrounding communities.

How can we dive into those -- What would be your thoughts of diving into those numbers a little bit more as they become aware. We're not just waiting for a collision, obviously. We're tying it back to a regular police stop if we see erratic behavior. How can we gauge that crime statistic itself maybe in a better fashion as we proceed?

MR. BRUCE: Assume we're looking at the number of DUI stops or arrests that our police make is going to give a misleading pictures clearly. If there's increased focus on DUI as a problem and the police agencies

therefore devote more resources to it, they're going to make more stops.

In many communities in the Commonwealth, I hope this isn't a terribly shocking statement but the average police officer working on a four to midnight shift, if he really wants to make a DUI arrest that night, he can make one.

So, if there's an increased effort to find drunk drivers, then obviously we're going to see the numbers go up. So, it's not the DUI incidents or arrests that we should be focusing on to determine any level of increase, but collisions that have DUI as a related variable.

Again fortunately, the data sets for collision recording are specific enough that we can ascertain that from the data.

So, if agencies anticipate the problem and start doing additional enforcement just as the casinos open, it may be that we never see an increase because the preemptive enforcement counteracts any increase that we would expect to see. That's going to be really

2.1

difficult to ascertain. 1 2 But in all cases, we are looking at 3 outcome measures. What the police do is important for various types of analysis, but in 5 determining the impacts of the casinos on 6 public safety, we need to always look at the outcomes, not the numbers of interceptions that 8 the police made of drunk drivers but the number 9 that have gotten into accidents. That'll be 10 the true measure of public safety changes. Does that make sense? 11 12 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yes, it 13 does. Thank you. 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else? 15 Thank you very much gentlemen. It's great. 16 It's 12:00. This is a pretty good 17 breaking point. Shall we take an hour, take a 18 one-hour break. So, we will reconvene here at 19 1:00. 20 21 (A recess was taken) 22 23 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We will reconvene 24 the 152nd meeting of the Massachusetts Gaming

Commission at about 1:00. We have some changes in the order of our schedule. We'll start out with General Counsel Blue of the legal department.

MS. BLUE: Good afternoon,

Commissioners. The first item on our list from
the legal division is the exemption delegation.

And I think if you recall at our meeting last time, we discussed the delegation of authority to the IEB to grant petitions for exemptions from nongaming vendor licensing and registration requirements under the catchall provision, which is called 6(n). And that's an exemption rule that's in the public interest.

Commissioner McHugh requested that we put something in writing. And in your package is a memo requesting the delegation and explaining the purpose of the delegation. We think this will be helpful because it will free up a little bit more of the IEB's time. It will also create less of a process for bringing these in front of the full Commission for review.

We don't know how many of these that

2.1

we will see. The legal department will help the IEB in monitoring these. But we think that there should be enough of them that this will be very helpful.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Comments?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. I think having the director have the discretion to grant that waiver would be a major help for Director Wells in her ability to manage a lot of what she has on her plate in terms of workload and priorities, slippage of qualifiers and things like that. So, I am okay with this. I was last time. I know Commissioner McHugh was and now he's not here but he wanted to see it in writing. And I think the memo here explains it really well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Can you give me an example of what such a thing might be?

MS. BLUE: What has come up, for example, is an entity that wishes to put advertising in the casino as opposed to a casino buying advertising. We have, I think, it's 13 exemptions in this section, 12 of which are very specific, one of which is advertising,

but it is drafted in such a way that it assumes the casino is buying advertising.

Well, people who want to put advertising say in the racing program, it doesn't necessarily make sense to license them as a nongaming vendor. So, they could fall under this section. The IEB could approve it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Okay.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I'm sure that you say in the memo, legal will work concurrently to make sure they are sound decisions.

MS. BLUE: We will.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And if there's always any doubt, you come back right here, right? That's the whole point.

MS. BLUE: That's right. If there were a question that we were uncomfortable with, we would bring the petition to the Commission.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Do we have a defined form or requirements for what the petition needs to look like?

MS. BLUE: We don't. We'll take it

in a letter. I would imagine some of these 2 will be small type businesses and I don't want 3 them to be sort of caught up in a form. long as they can explain in a letter to us what 5 they are doing and what they need that'll be 6 fine. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, you wanted to 8 know when Plainridge returned. Steve is here. 9 Is that who you were talking about? 10 MR. DAY: No. I was talking about 11 the architects. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any other 13 thoughts, questions? 14 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I think this 15 will help expedite the process and to our 16 General Counsel's point just kind of folks who 17 are providing services that are kind of in that 18 category of businesses anyways to kind of 19 quickly move through the process and not hold 20 our licensee up. 2.1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do you want to move to that effect? 22 23 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr. Chair, I 24 move that the Commission delegate to the

Director of IEB the authority to accept and 2 grant or deny a petition for exemption under 3 205 CMR 134.04 subsection 6(n) from the nongaming vendor requirements under 205 CMR 5 134. 6 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second. 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any further 8 discussion? All in favor, aye. 9 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 11 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 13 have it unanimously. 14 MS. BLUE: Thank you. The next item 15 in your package is a policy. The policy is 16 entitled the review of executive session 17 minutes. The purpose of this policy is that --18 and all commissions and agencies that operate 19 under the open meeting law need to have a 20 policy like this. Basically, what this is is 21 this provides a process for the regular review 22 of any minutes that are taken in executive 23 session and then delegates to the General 24 Counsel the authority to review those minutes

and determine whether they should be released.

Now if you look at the statute, the first to paragraphs in the policy basically follow the statute. The open meeting law statute requires that executive session minutes can be kept confidential until such time as the need for the executive session disappears.

That's really what I will be evaluating for executive session minutes.

So, to the extent that it's investigatory, for example, and to the extent the investigation has been completed and determined then it might be the time to release those minutes.

But the open meeting law contemplates that at some point for almost all executive session minutes they will become public like other minutes.

So, this sets up the policy. The idea would be that I would review any executive session minutes quarterly. I would determine whether anything needed to be redacted. I would consult with the appropriate other parties, if there are other parties to

determine whether they still had ongoing 2 issues. And then I would prepare them to be 3 made public. And we would post them along with our other minutes. 5 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So, for 6 example, if the issue in executive session was investigative in nature, you'd check to make 8 sure there was no issue with the case still 9 pending or that that could reveal something 10 that you wouldn't want revealed before a case 11 is adjudicated. Is that what you're saying? 12 MS. BLUE: That's correct. And I 13 would also check, for example, if other law 14 enforcement agencies were involved, I would run 15 it by them as well to make sure that we weren't 16 doing anything that impacted their 17 investigation. Then I would file a report. 18 I'll come to the Commission and report on what I've released. 19 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is this just 21 prophylactic or have we had requests? 22 MS. BLUE: We have not had requests. 23 But we think this is important to have in 24 place.

```
1
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes, I agree.
2
     Other comments? Do we need to vote on this?
3
                MS. BLUE: Yes. We will put this
 4
    with the rest of our policies.
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Commissioner
5
6
     Stebbins?
                COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr. Chair, I
8
    move that the Commission adopt the policy
9
     relative to minutes of executive sessions of
10
    the Commission as prescribed in the memo in the
11
    packet.
12
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
13
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second.
14
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
15
     discussion? All in favor, aye.
16
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
17
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
                                      Aye.
18
                COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
                                        Aye.
19
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes
20
    have it unanimously.
21
                MS. BLUE: Thank you. And then
22
     finally, we have the amended small business
23
     impact statement for regulation 205 CMR 14.
24
     This is a racing regulation. It came before
```

the Commission a very long time ago
particularly because the racing regulations
have to go to Legislature and this one has gone
through.

This was part of the regulations that we did or in conjunction with the Race Horse Development Fund regulation. And this section 14 gives the Commission a little bit more flexibility in terms of licensing, in terms of dates, in terms of requiring when bonds come in and checks are paid and things like that.

We didn't put a copy of that
regulation in your packet but we did provide
one here today. It has been approved. It has
gone through the legislative process. Now by
having the amended small business impact
statement, we will file it for final
promulgation. So, that's where we are. But it
has been a very long time since you've seen it.
And there are no changes in it since you've
last seen it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Questions, comments? You need a motion on this too,

Page 96 1 right? 2 MS. BLUE: Yes. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Commissioner 4 Stebbins? 5 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Sure. 6 Chairman, I move that the Commission approve 7 the amended small business impact statement 8 relative to proposed regulations in 205 CMR 14 9 supplemental license procedures. 10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? 11 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further 13 discussion? All in favor, aye. 14 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 16 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 18 have it unanimously. 19 MS. BLUE: Thank you. 20 concludes legal's presentation. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Are you going to talk about the letter? 22 23 MS. BLUE: Yes, with Executive 24 Director Day as part of his. Thank you.

1 MR. DAY: If we could have the Penn 2 representatives come up. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are now on item 4 six. 5 MR. DAY: If you could take a look 6 at item 6(a) tab. As we're getting seated, at the Commission's last meeting we presented a 8 report comparing the RFA-2 proposal to the 9 final floor plan as was received from our 10 architect, and concluded that the attached 11 plans are generally consistent with and 12 reflecting a similar quality of the design 13 included in the RFA-2 application. 14 What we have today is we have 15 joining us Jack Rauen from Penn, Mike McGrew VP 16 for construction, Darlene Whitmore, the project 17 architect and Dane from Pinck and Company, Dane 18 What we want to do is have some Wigfall. 19 additional facts presented to the Commission to 20 share with you the areas that you're 21 specifically interested in according to our 22 regulation. 23 The areas we'll focus and take into

consideration that's on the list that's

included in CMR 205 151. And for ongoing construction and those areas that are sensitive will not be a part of the presentation.

requesting that the Commission accept Ray
Porfilio's recommendations and conclusions.
So, that's the architect the last time and his
memorandum is included in the packet. And he
has two recommendations and a conclusion at the
end of that memorandum that hopefully you will
have enough information at that point to
approve the floor plan pending final
inspection. And delegate to Commissioner
Cameron the authority to approve the remaining
areas of the floor plan based on the site final
inspection by MGC staff.

That's kind of what we're here for and what we hope to and I know I'd like to have Counsel Blue add a little comment.

MS. BLUE: Before we consider the Plainridge floor plan today, I wanted to update the Commission on a matter that arose late yesterday. Late in the day yesterday, we received a letter from the counsel for the

Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe expressing concerns
that they had about the Commission's regulation
205 CMR 143. And that is the regulation that
pertains to slot machines.

Their concern is regarding slot machines, the amount of gaming positions and the definitions of electronic table games. We are reviewing their letter. We have not reviewed it entirely. They also sent this letter to the Attorney General's office. And they asked the Attorney General's office to review the Commission's regulation on these issues.

I spoke to the Attorney General's office yesterday. And I let them know that we look forward to working collaboratively with them and to answer any questions they have about our regulation. I also explained to the Attorney General's office that the purpose of the Commission's review of the floor plan today was not about that regulation. It was in fact about the floor plan and about our preopening certification process and the compliance with that regulation.

I further assured the Attorney

General's office that the Commission's review

and possible approval of the floor plan did not

and would not prejudice any matters that the

Tribe had regarding the regulation. And that

it would not impact any of those discussions

that we would have with the Attorney General's

office.

I know that the letter, it will be posted so that we can have that conversation. And we also meet with the Attorney General's office promptly to discuss any concerns or questions that they have.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I just had a chance to read it this morning since we just got it yesterday afternoon. And I agree with you obviously completely.

First of all, it doesn't have reference to what we are doing here today. Two is that we will of course collaborate completely with the Attorney General in taking a look at this. But also just for the record, we've discussed this at a very robust, very public, very rigorous conversation. We had an

extended period of time for public comment. 2

This was done about a year ago.

And as with all of our regs. we go through a very careful thorough legal review and analysis within the context of the broad authority the Legislature gave us to interpret and implement that law.

Having said that as I said, we'll completely collaborate with the AG to look into But for the record, it's pretty clear that there was a long and rigorous comment period a long time ago. And as usual, we operate under a very strict and rigorous legal review of our own.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I couldn't agree more. And my recollection is that there were a series of discussions, not just one, and the normal review of the promulgation of regulations. We had a number -- And now our legal team has to go back and search those times and meetings and all that, which is commendable but there were more than a couple of lengthy discussions and analyses and documents that we considered.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If I remember 1 2 correctly, one of the significant data points 3 in that long conversation was that nobody 4 objected to it. 5 Okay. Thank you for that sidebar. 6 MR. DAY: Chairman and members of 7 the Commission, also the process of the 8 approval of the floor plan and its 9 consideration and ultimately the final 10 inspection that's all part of the operations 11 certificate approval that the Commission will 12 hopefully be able to grant as we get toward the 13 end of June. With that I turn this over to 14 Jack and his team. 15 Thank you, Rick. MR. RAUEN: 16 afternoon. Always a pleasure to come here and 17 speak with you about our project. 18 Before I turn the conversation over 19 Michael and Darlene, I wanted to make just a 20 couple of brief comments on the report of Ray 21 Porfilio, the consulting architect. 22 We take note of and certainly agree 23 with some of the more significant comments in 24 that report, specifically that the plan is

unchanged from that which we put forth in the RFA-2. That's always our goal. The program is appropriate for its intended use, we certainly agree with that. And the finishes and quality are appropriate and consistent with the RFA-2.

We were glad to see them draw those conclusions because those were three big things on our objectives. Also, we are very pleased that he's recommending to you today to approve our floor plan as consistent with the RFA-2.

Finally, this is our second opportunity to work with Ray. He is thorough, diligent, carries out his charge very well.

And we appreciate his efforts and the conclusions that he drew. With that I'll turn it over to Michael and Darlene to review the floor plan.

MR. MCGREW: Thank you,

Commissioners. I appreciate the opportunity to

present this to you again and get some

clarification to some areas on the floor plan

and give a little more detail.

The first slide that we're going to look at is the overall floor plan. This is

2.1

basically to give you orientation again to the site. I know you're very familiar with the site, but -- Rick, may I have the pointer please? Do you by chance have that?

again. Basically, this plan shows the overall first level of the facility. This is the existing racing building. This is the new portion of the casino that was constructed. And then this is the parking structure with the valet entrance here, also an entrance here and an entrance from the garage.

We'll go onto the next slide which shows more in detail. This also, starting with the entrance into the facility, basically three major hindrances. Entrance from the garage here and one thing I want to point out at each one of these entrances is the security podium which is located right at each entry for carding and entrance into the facility.

The main entry here and valet, also there is a security podium here. The racing entry on this side, which allows people to go to live racing in this direction and then also

come up to the casino. Our security point there is right as you enter the casino floor at the top of the ramp.

The other elements on this drawing and blow up to help you understand are the kiosk locations. We have the lottery kiosks throughout the facility. We try to point them out scattered throughout the facility in locations where easy access.

Another area we want to point out is the local artist display. We have met with her. We've looked at this location where 85 percent of our customers come through. Paula DeSimone, that will be the location for her display. And then we have artists of the future display, which will be on the racing side and be on the location as soon as you enter on the left on the racing facility.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's a display that will turn over from time to time?

MR. MCGREW: Yes. Annually it will

be turned over. There will be a program. The program will still be developed in the future.

24 The nice thing about that is that it's in a

2.1

1 location where the minors can get into because 2 that building you're not carded over 21 until 3 you get into the casino. So, the program can be any age level of program. 5 Does anybody have any questions? 6 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yes, I do. 7 I'm assuming all of the lottery kiosks and Keno 8 locations are consistent with Penn's agreement 9 with Mass. Lottery? MR. MCGREW: One other thing I'd 10 11 like to point out is the GameSense location. 12 Actually, if we go to the next slide --13 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm just going to 15 finish up on this one too. I just want to 16 point out for the record that there are seven 17 lottery kiosks. And that was done and worked 18 out with the lottery in answer to that 19 question. This is all apropos of the mandate 20 in the law that we do everything we can in 21 collaboration with our licensees to protect 22 lottery revenue. So, I think having seven 23 kiosks there well-positioned is a great part of

24

that.

1 MR. MCGREW: Thank you. Anymore 2 questions? 3 MR. DAY: Just for a clarification, 4 everybody nodded but on the question from 5 Commissioner Stebbins was are those lottery 6 machines and placements in compliance with your agreement with the lottery? 8 MR. MCGREW: To my knowledge, yes. 9 They've been working that out with Lance and 10 the operations on locations, which actually 11 Darlene has worked very closely with him on 12 locating and placement. MR. DAY: 13 Thank you. 14 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: The agreement 15 itself says prominent places. It's not 16 specific in the agreement itself. 17 MS. WHITMORE: We put them in the 18 entryways, prominently on the casino floor and 19 then in the food venues. 20 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: It appears 21 to be able to play Keno while you're sitting at the Flutie's bar or other areas. 22 23 MR. MCGREW: On this plan as well 24 the GameSense location is right where you come

in entering from the garage where 85 percent of our patrons will come in. We think it is a very good location.

We met with them, went over their program. And as you'll see in some later slides, a better blow-up of that and detail of that where that location is in the layout.

We can go to the next slide. This next slide basically blows up the gaming area. To define the gaming area, we put a red line around total gaming floor to show where the actual gaming floor goes all the way around the facility. It's kind of a line that just follows the path where works out of the restaurants and so forth where all of the gaming devices are.

Also wanted to show that at every major entry point, we have security at these key locations to also ensure that before anybody enters a gaming floor that they're properly identified and carded.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I was first puzzled by what these little red dots were. But I guess they're the lottery kiosks, but

1 you're missing some of them. 2 MS. WHITMORE: This slide just 3 represents the gaming area. We couldn't get 4 the other stuff to white out. So, this is just 5 the gaming area for this slide. And the 6 previous slide is the one that just shows where the monitors --8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: There's a bunch of 9 little red dots on this one too. And I 10 couldn't figure out what they were. 11 MS. WHITMORE: The red dots are the 12 lottery terminals, yes. And some of those are 13 not on the gaming floor. Some of them are in 14 the entryways. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, I see. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I realize that 16 17 this question may be for Lance or may be for 18 even later, have you determined the hours of 19 operations of the food and entertainment venues 20 at this point? 2.1 MR. MCGREW: Yes, they have. I'm 22 not privy to that. Obviously, that's 23 operations side. 24 MR. RAUEN: That's a good question

1 for Lance. 2 MR. MCGREW: Yes. That would be a 3 good question for Lance. This is the entry 4 from the garage. As you can see here, this is 5 the GameSense area. We have a floor layout 6 where we have, based on the program elements that we discussed in our meetings, they have a 8 nice inviting entry to come in, kind of open. 9 Then they also have an area in the back that if 10 they need to sit down and talk with anyone, 11 they can talk in the back area, very 12 comfortable. And it has their GameSense kiosk 13 14 located here. And there is also a GameSense 15 kiosk located over at the entry to the casino 16 by the racing area. 17 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Am I looking 18 at this, are we expecting the only access to 19 that back area, which I guess is an EMT space, 20 is through the GameSense space? 2.1 MS. WHITMORE: Yes. 22 MR. MCGREW: Yes. 23 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: So, if I

need medical attention, I'm going through the

GameSense space?

MR. MCGREW: This is where they'll house their equipment and then they'll be out on the floor. They would have to go through the GameSense space to get that access. This location was worked out with the Plainville Fire Department.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Mark has reviewed this as well. So, presumably -- I agree that's looks a little bit funny but EMT has to go through something to get there. I assume Mark must have reviewed that.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.

MR. MCGREW: The next slide goes back to the venues as we have presented before. We have Revolutions which is the bar stage area. In this area, we have the food court made up of three venues The Bean, The Slice and B Good. We have Flutie's Sports Pub and then we have the Slack's Oyster Bar and Grill which is located at the racing building. Any questions here?

Go to the next slide, this here is an overall floor plan of the upper floor level.

Basically, this is the multipurpose room. And then this is the simulcast area over here.

The next slide actually shows a better roll up of the gaming area, racing gaming area. So, we can go to the next slide which gives a better detail. This is on the first level live racing. Then this is the simulcast on the second level. The main entry for the live racing as soon as you come in that main entry, you go directly into there. The track is orientated on this side and then the simulcast is on the second level on the east side.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That north entry on the top left of that drawing is that entry if you went the other way, you went to the corridor out to the casino, right?

MR. MCGREW: Yes. When you go right, you go out to the casino. When you go left you go to live racing. Very open and inviting space. The way we had to do the walkway is we made it real wide at the entry and then narrowed it down into the casino. Very inviting and open.

1 The next slides that you'll be 2 seeing are from the interior finishes and I'll 3 let --MR. RAUEN: Commissioner Stebbins, 5 no matter how many times we look at these 6 plans, we always come up with something. And I never noticed that you have to go through 8 GameSense or there would be traffic from EMT through GameSense. I'm not sure at this late 9 10 juncture if we can do anything about it, but that's worth a look. Let us take a look and 11 12 make sure that it's not disruptive and what 13 type of activity that would be in the EMT and 14 if we have any other options. 15 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. I 16 appreciate that. Thank you, Jack. 17 MR. MCGREW: We'll go to the next 18 slide which will show you some photographs that 19 Darlene can comment on relative to our 20 finishes. 2.1 MS. WHITMORE: Good afternoon. 22 Sunday, this is as of Sunday the progress we've 23 made in construction that will show you the 24 imagery of what's happening with our concept

and design that has been actually built. 2 This view is as you're coming in 3 from the parking garage entry. Actually, I'm 4 sorry. It's a view from Flutie's towards the 5 parking garage entry. You see illuminated 6 feature columns that have this stone, the dark sparkly stone cladding them. And a zebra wood 8 finish on the stepping wood ceiling elements 9 and the water is reflected into the carpet. 10 Those are the materials we used and the concept in our RFA and built for them. 11 12 So, if you go to the next slide --13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Before you do 14 that, I'm just curious what is that element on 15 the left. There's a slot machine on the left. 16 And then there's something right next to it if 17 you continue down the corridor. Is that a 18 kiosk? CHAIRMAN CROSBY: A kiosk of some 19 20 sort. 21 MS. WHITMORE: They're in the 22 process of installing the games. So, that's 23 the slot machine. It hasn't been placed yet.

It's sitting on the floor. These are the bases

and these are the slot machines.

machines at the same time.

And the slot machine is just sitting there. There's a bunch of bases over here.

They haven't set the machine yet. So, they're in the process of building and setting the

MR. RAUEN: We can't tell what that other piece is if you go down the walkway carpet further down. I'm sure it's some kind of construction material.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Some cardboard or something. It looks like there's been so much progress.

MS. WHITMORE: Right, there has been. As you can see we have the metal chandeliers this photo also. One of them, the last was going in yesterday.

If you go to the next slide, this is Revolution 1776. It's from the bar looking towards Flutie's. You can see Flutie's is the same zebra wood elements from the ceiling. As you're coming into the facility, we used that same material at Flutie's. These are the museum style cases that I discussed at the last

meeting where Flutie's uniforms from his various career will be displayed in these cases right here.

And these are the clouds, we call them. And that's just an element in the ceiling for acoustics and we have lights up here. And this is this stage. So, that's the view from the bar. As you can see, it's a very open plan. No matter where you stand, you can look around and see pretty much the whole casino and you'll know where you're going to be.

If you go to the next slide, this is a view from the food court. You can see Revolution 1776 is here. This is the food court. You're looking toward the main entry. These are the illuminated feature columns as you're entering the facility here. And we also have the same elements coming in from the porte cochere entry.

If you go to the next slide, this is in the food court looking towards Revolution 1776. So, you can see it's a circular stage platform. These are going to be illuminated

2.1

1 light-changing elements around the bar. 2 in the cardboard is a metal railing. 3 really pretty, but you can't see it in this picture. 5 If you go to the next slide, this is 6 coming in from the parking garage entry looking towards Flutie's. So, we have the illuminated 8 columns. This is this beautiful zebra wood ceiling elements, very highly reflective and 9 the stone on the sides of the columns. And 10 11 you're looking towards Flutie's which is also 12 the same stone that's in the columns at the 13 portal where the Heisman trophy display case 14 will be at the main entry. 15 Next slide. That might be it. 16 That's it, okay. Does anybody have any 17 questions? 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any more questions 19 or comments? 20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It looks like 21 there's been a lot of progress. 22 The building has taken MR. RAUEN: 23 on life and energy. And between the interior 24 design elements and the slot machines

```
1
     themselves, it's a beautiful place.
 2
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Sure looks
 3
     like it.
 4
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Do we need
5
     to do anything? Do we need to accept this?
 6
                MR. DAY: Yes.
                                I'm hoping that the
 7
     Commission would accept the architect's
8
     recommendations and conclusions of the floor
9
    plan, and hopefully delegate to Commissioner
10
     Cameron the final approval.
11
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Commissioner
12
     Stebbins, we'll go with you today.
13
                COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr. Chair, I
14
```

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr. Chair, I ask that -- Do we want to include some type of acknowledgement or incorporation of the memo from our consultant as well?

MR. DAY: Yes. It's included in the packet as well, yes.

19 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr.

Chairman, I ask that the Commission give approval to the prescribed gaming floor of

22 Plainridge Park and the elements included in

23 the packet including the memo and

24 recommendations from Ray Porfilio and Epstein

15

16

17

18

20

Page 119 1 Joslin Architects, Inc. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? 3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any discussion? 5 All in favor, aye. 6 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 7 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 8 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously. 10 11 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: There was 12 another request for a motion in there that I'll 13 be happy to make if that's okay, Mr. Chairman 14 that the Commission delegate any, to 15 Commissioner Cameron any tweaks or changes as 16 they evolve from the implementation of this 17 plan. 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Tweaks or changes, 19 okay. Do I have a second? 20 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any further 22 discussion? All in favor, aye. 23 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 24 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

Opposed? The ayes 1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 2 have it. Commissioner Cameron I think recused 3 herself from that vote. 4 MR. DAY: Thank you very much. What's next? 5 MR. CHAIRMAN: 6 MR. DAY: I'm waiting for Mr. 7 Grossman beside me. The next item is tab (b) 8 training assistance emergency regulation. 9 While Todd's coming up, you have under that tab 10 is staff is recommending an amendment to CMR 11 134.03 by adding paragraph two that allows 12 Plainridge Park Casino to utilize employees 13 from other Penn or affiliated properties to 14 assist and train their new employees during 15 preopening and for a short period after 16 opening. 17 That's provided there are some 18 conditions, PCP must identify personnel in 19 advance, they must provide an ID that is 20 distinguishable from other employees. They 21 must attest the employees are in good standing 22 if those employees are licensed. And they must 23 be accompanied by a licensed employee anytime 24 they are in a restricted area.

The foundation for the reason that we are proposing this amendment or emergency amendment to our regulations is that our regulation approach and scheme overall did not contemplate startup operations and the need for mass hiring and training.

It is evident that if PCP -- I think that's a drug -- PPC is not able to use experienced personnel to train, it will result in a hardship to the operation. The proposal maintains the regulatory scheme and provides PCP the flexibility they need to get ready to open. I'm sure Attorney Grossman might as well have a comment or two.

MR. GROSSMAN: I could but I don't know if I have too much to add. That sums it up. Essentially, there is just this class of individuals who we need to be saying do not have to be licensed or registered because they're just there to train other people.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I understand the scope of the regulation. And I think when we've looked back on some of the earlier discussions we had about training entities, we

2.1

recognize from other jurisdictions that each
licensee to a degree likes to do some of their
own training to incorporate new employees to
the Penn way or to the MGM way or to the Wynn
way, and fully would've expected folks to come
in from out of town.

And I think this is a great solution to keep, as Director Day says, to our regulatory commitments but at the same time give our licensee the flexibility to train people. And we know there's a huge dose of training coming between now and opening day on June 24. So, it makes sense.

MR. DAY: Thank you, Commissioner Stebbins. I also add that it is time restricted. It basically is for a 60-day period. Then it would be over. And it's not renewable.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Who on our staff would be sort of tracking that? Whose job is it to make sure for example when 60 days are up?

MR. DAY: IEB. They'll also have to have a separate badge. And Penn is going to go

1 with a different color. So, it'll actually be 2 evident from just walking by. It'll be our 3 regulatory staff and our agents that are onsite. 5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. Any 6 discussion. questions? 7 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So, we need to 8 promulgate this by emergency? 9 MR. DAY: Yes, we do. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And at the 10 11 same time, regular promulgation or given the 12 temporary nature of this we'll be done with 13 that? 14 MR. DAY: At the same time regular 15 process. And as this moves forward, we'll look 16 at how it comes out in the end. We may have to 17 come back to the Commission for some tweaks to 18 prepare for future use by the casinos. 19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Fair enough. 20 I'd be happy to move, Mr. Chairman, that we 21 adopt on an emergency basis the proposed 22 regulation submitted in the packet 205 CMR 134 23 licensing and registration of employees, 24 vendors, junket and representatives and labor

```
1
     organizations as amended by subsections
2
     134.03(1) and (2) as presented here in the
 3
    packet today. And at the same time move that
 4
     this regulation started the normal promulgation
5
    process.
 6
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
 7
                COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
                                        Second.
8
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
9
     discussion? All in favor, aye.
10
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
11
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
                                      Aye.
12
                COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
13
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed?
                                            The ayes
14
    have it unanimously. Good job, Todd.
15
                MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, that gets us
16
     to tab (c) and Doug O'Donnell is here to
17
    present two requests from Suffolk Downs.
18
     is a request for capital improvement trust fund
19
    monies and the second is a request for
20
    promotional fund monies. I wasn't ignoring Dr.
21
     Lightbaum. As she comes up following Doug she
22
     will be asking the Commission to cancel and add
23
     some race days.
24
                DR. LIGHTBAUM: Doug is going to
```

talk to you about the capital improvement and promotional funds requests from Suffolk Downs.

As you guys have had some of these come before you, this one we don't have enough money to completely pay it off. Doug will get into the financial details, but one thing we were wondering was if you were comfortable with it, approving payment as the money comes in of the rest of it so we wouldn't have to come before you each time a chunk of money came in to pay it off.

I did get a chance to talk to Derek about it and he agreed that was okay. I'm not sure legally if Catherine might have any comments on that.

MR. DAY: Basically, Alex, what it would be is the same request which has been previously approved.

DR. LIGHTBAUM: Right.

MR. DAY: It's actually just an expense disbursement, rather than dispensing.

DR. LIGHTBAUM: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is one of
these funds that they give us the money and we

give it back to them, right? 2 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Right. MR. DAY: Both of them are. 3 4 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Both of them are. 5 So, I'll let Doug go ahead and describe the 6 finances. MR. O'DONNELL: Good afternoon, 8 Commissioners. As Alex just mentioned, we have two memorandums in front of you both pertaining 9 10 to Suffolk Downs with their promotional trust 11 fund and a capital improvement trust fund. 12 The first one being the capital 13 improvement trust fund. The original request 14 for consideration, which was submitted by 15 Suffolk Downs and approved by Dixon Salo, the 16 architectural firm, was \$4 million. 17 To date we have reimbursed \$3 18 million and change which will leave a balance 19 on the project of \$923,000. And the monies in 20 the capital improvement trust fund as of May 4 21 was \$325,754.35 which is what the request for reimbursement is. 22 23 So, what we essentially have been 24 doing is when that money builds up they will in

turn request reimbursement. And that's when we come to the Commission. If we were to avoid that one extra piece as Alex had mentioned, we could basically approve it, because the monies have already been paid for. This has been paid in full, the \$4 million.

So, it's a matter of building up

So, it's a matter of building up money in that capital improvement trust fund to disperse it to the tracks. We have a stack of paperwork for this particular project. It's probably a foot thick.

So, what we are doing today, we will need your approval to reimburse that money to Suffolk Downs for this capital improvement trust fund.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Remind me that the money that comes to this fund ultimately lags in time, right? It comes out of activity that has already also taken place?

MR. O'DONNELL: Correct.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: To some

22 degree.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

MR. O'DONNELL: The money that go to the cap fund are from the breaks, the simulcast

breaks and live racing. As that money builds, 2 when they paid their bills to the Commission, 3 that money is allocated for this capital 4 improvement trust fund. And as that builds up, 5 we will then disperse it when it's a sizable 6 amount. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: If there is 8 let's say very few racing days this next coming 9 year, would that affect the monies that 10 ultimately come to this fund? 11 MR. O'DONNELL: Very minimal. 12 racing does not have a huge impact on the 13 amount of money that goes into the fund. 14 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It's mostly 15 simulcasting. 16 MR. O'DONNELL: Correct. 17 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Doug, just 18 so I'm clear, I'm not sure how long it took us 19 to accumulate the \$325,000 request there, but 20 do you see two more similar requests to 21 essentially -- We approve today. We're a third 22 of the way there. Do we make two more payments 23 of roughly about the same amount of money? 24 MR. O'DONNELL: Yes. On the

1 average, you're looking at monies in this cap 2 fund on an annual basis between \$750- and 3 \$900,000, in and around there. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's when you 5 were having racing though. 6 MR. O'DONNELL: That includes 7 simulcast. It's based on the handle. So, yes. 8 Once this 325 is dispersed that will give us a balance of \$597,000 to fulfill the contract. 9 10 And once that is paid off that contract will be 11 done. 12 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. Thank 13 you. 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If we went along 15 with the suggestion to delegate out, on the one 16 sense it seems obvious, but what would be the 17 check and balance on that? You would receive 18 the, two of you, one of you would receive the 19 request. And if you thought this was 20 appropriate, you'd have to run that by Derek? 2.1 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Yes. 22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, it would be at 23 least two different parties involved in 24 authorizing a check.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. I think for our ability for the money that's the check. The other check is what Doug and Alex have already done, which is corroborate that the expenditures have taken place and indeed they have.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think we could delegate it to the Executive Director who in turn could make sure not only do the numbers work on the racing side but that our CFAO is an agreement.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's fine. It makes all the sense in the world, but those are pretty good size checks to be writing. And we want to make sure there's more than one person who is checking just for appearances if nothing else.

MR. O'DONNELL: With each project, whether it's a cap fund or a promo fund, all invoices and checks are submitted to us. So, we know the monies have been paid and the checks have cleared. So, we know that it's been paid in full prior to us disbursing any

2.1

1 money.

what needed to happen. I'm really thinking about writing checks to somebody. When we write a check to somebody for \$320,000, we want to make sure it's going to the right person.

So, I think Commissioner Cameron's idea is a good idea, to make the delegation to the Executive Director. And he can handle however he wishes.

MR. O'DONNELL: We also have here another memorandum regarding the promotional trust fund. It's basically the same situation. The original request for consideration was \$475,000. To date they've been reimbursed \$207,000 leaving a balance on the project of \$267,000. As of 5/4/15 there was approximately \$88,000 in the trust fund.

So again, it will take another two or three requests for reimbursements to fulfill this particular project and have it closed out.

22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Any more

23 questions or anything?

24 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can we

reference the project number in the votes here 2 to make sure we are talking about these 3 particular projects? 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes, both for 5 purposes of these and for the delegation. Do 6 you want to make that motion? COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Sure. T']] 8 move Mr. Chairman that the Commission approve 9 the current requests and delegate to Director 10 Day subsequent requests for disbursements from 11 the capital improvement trust fund monies for 12 project SCI 2012-2 request from Suffolk Downs 13 as presented and discussed here today. 14 And I would further move that the 15 Commission approved the current request from 16 Suffolk Downs for the promotional trust fund 17 monies project SPT 2010-1 as presented here 18 today and further delegate to Director Day 19 approval of subsequent requests for this 20 project as presented here today. 2.1 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second. 22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further 23 discussion? All in favor, aye. 24 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 2 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 4 have it unanimously. 5 MR. DAY: Thank you, Commissioners. 6 That gets us to racing days. 7 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Plainridge Park has 8 requested canceling Monday, June 22 and 9 Wednesday, June 24 due to the casino opening 10 obviously, the soft opening and then the 11 regular opening and would like to reschedule 12 those on Sunday, June 21 and Tuesday, June 23. 13 They've also asked to reschedule the 14 days, the six days that we canceled at the 15 beginning of the meet due to the severe winter 16 weather that we had and giving the horses more 17 time to get ready to race. They're proposing 18 to race those races on alternating Tuesdays 19 beginning in September. So, September 8 and 20 22nd, October 6 and 20th, and then November 3rd 21 and 17th. Steve O'Toole is here if he has 22 anything to add. 23 MR. O'TOOLE: Good afternoon 24 Commissioners. So, as Alex pointed out --

pretty much laid it all out. The only thing 2 that I would point out is in Alex's 3 recommendation that the Sunday before the controlled demonstration at Plainridge would be 5 post time 1:00. So, we would continue with 6 Sundays at one. And then moving back from the casino opening on Wednesday the 24th, we'd go 8 on the 23rd. That would be at 4:00, our usual 9 afternoon post time. 10 The cancellation request earlier, a 11 few months ago helped out the horsemen very 12 And the fields have been decent size. 13 And it looks like in the proposed dates, the 14 alternating Tuesdays gives us a three-week --15 three day a week schedule and followed by a 16 four-day schedule and then a three-day 17 schedule. So, if there is a problem with 18 filling cards, I think there'll be the ability 19 to by the week out having the extra day. 20 it has worked out pretty well. 2.1 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I see that 22 the Harness Horseman's Association has been 23 consulted and agree with these changes. 24 MR. O'TOOLE: Yes. Whenever we do

dates like that we usually take into 2 consideration. Although this particular year, 3 they were so grateful to have those early dates canceled, it was pretty much whatever you think. 5 6 As it wound out and as we worked the 7 schedule, it just seemed to be a nice time to 8 put in the extra days because there is stake 9 races scheduled I believe on those Mondays just 10 before the Tuesdays. So, that throws some extra horses in the mix. 11 12 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I note the 13 new letterhead too. It looks sharp. 14 MR. O'TOOLE: Thank you. 15 DR. LIGHTBAUM: I did confirm with 16 the horsemen that they were onboard with this 17 also. 18 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. 19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Makes a lot of 20 I'm just curious if changes to the 21 schedules have an effect on pari-mutuel customers elsewhere. 22 MR. O'TOOLE: It does have some 23

effect. The earlier we get our changes out,

Electronically signed by Laurie Jordan (201-084-588-3424)

the simulcasting community does a very good job with the group emails and everything getting the word out, the schedules altered and publicized and everything. Every track does not like to interrupt their continuity and change the schedules. We try change our schedules as little as possible.

Sometimes with mandatory dates and with the heat and weather and things like that cancellations do come up. But the added dates are always widely advertised and simulcast directors do a good job getting that word out.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Great.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further

discussion? Commissioner Cameron?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Mr. Chair, I more that we approve the request by Plainridge Park Casino to change their racing dates to accommodate the opening at Plainridge, as well as the new dates which would make up for the dates because the weather was not cooperating at the beginning of the race season so they added dates.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: As detailed in --

Page 137 1 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: -- as the 2 memo dated May 11, yes. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? 4 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second. 5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any further 6 discussion? All in favor, aye. 7 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 9 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 11 have it unanimously. 12 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. 13 MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman that's the last item I have. 14 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. We are 16 to Director Griffin. 17 MS. GRIFFIN: Commissioners, good 18 afternoon. Before we start I wanted to 19 introduce to you to the Mass. Gaming 20 Commission's first intern. This is Corrine 21 Reynolds. She's a recent grad of Michigan 22 State University. And she'll be supporting the 23 work of the access and opportunity committee. 24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Go Spartans.

1 Welcome.

2.1

MS. GRIFFIN: You'll remember that in December of last year, the Commission voted to establish an access and opportunity committee. This is a new initiative developed to support the Commission's ongoing commitment to achieve diversity within this new expanded gaming industry.

And the committee's primary function is to monitor diversity in the construction, workforce and supplier base of these licensees, and also to make related recommendations to the Commission and the licensees around diversity.

I'm joined today by Ron Marlow, chair of the Mass Gaming access and opportunity committee. You may know that he is the new Undersecretary of the Executive Office of Labor and Workforce Development and the former Assistant Secretary for Access and Opportunity at the Executive Office Administration and Finance. He's been a longtime friend of the Commission regarding issues of diversity. And has been generous in his time advising the Commission regarding diversity.

So, we are here today to provide you an update on the activity since that December 4 meeting. I'm going to just briefly speak about the establishment of the committee and then turn the mic over to Ron to give you some meeting highlights and talk more broadly.

The Commission invited 10 individuals with expertise in labor, workforce development and supplier diversity to join the statewide committee including representatives from the Commonwealth's Office of Supplier Diversity, the Executive Office of Labor and Workforce Development, the Policy Group on Tradeswomen's Issues, the New England Regional Council of Carpenters, and the state Office of Veterans Affairs.

We've established two regional subcommittees that include each licensee for the full resort casinos, the local unions, community organizing groups like the Pioneer Valley project, One Everett and the Black Economic Justice Institute as well as community nonprofits like the Urban League, the Mass.

Minority Contractors Association and the Latino

1 | Chamber of Commerce.

The meetings alternate between

Region A and Region B. And we use technology

to ensure participation. So, on Tuesday we had

our second meeting of the committee. And it

was held at the UMass center in Springfield.

Two Commissioners, Commissioner Stebbins and

Commissioner Zuniga participated. Thank you

for that.

Now I'm going to turn the mic over to Ron and ask him to add some perspective.

MR. MARLOW: Thank you, Jill. Good afternoon, Commissioners. First of all, let me say thank you for being willing to move the agenda around so that I could get here and participate. Secondly, let me say Chairman Crosby I thought we were good friends until you uttered goes Spartans and (INAUDIBLE) but that is quite alright.

But more importantly, let me say
thank you to the Commissioners and the
Commission for establishing an access and
opportunity committee. An access and
opportunity committee is not a new idea, but it

is an idea that was resurrected in the last executive administration as a means for understanding and driving towards collective goals around diversity and inclusion.

Clearly Director Griffin in bringing that idea before the Commission and the Commission embracing it recognize that there is some value not only in helping facilitate achieving our diversity and inclusion goals, but more importantly in aiding in transparency around our efforts to get to those goals.

And even more important than that creating a space in which individuals and organizations who are typically on opposite sides or feel like they're on opposite sides of an issue in a tug and pull battle to try to get a project done but to try to do it as inclusively as possible. An AOC gives an opportunity for those folks to come together to establish relationships, to work together and to strive in common objective to reach and attain our goals.

As Director Griffin mentioned, there have two meetings already. The first one

2.1

primarily organizational but well attended gave both of the licensees, MGM Springfield and Wynn 3 Everett an opportunity to introduce their teams to the committee. It gave them an opportunity to start to sketch out, if you will, the diversity and inclusion objectives that were contained and have been embedded in their 8 application and now their license.

And more importantly or equally important, it gave Wynn and MGM an opportunity to meet those individuals and those organizations who will be their colleagues in this effort.

And by colleagues what I mean is this, will there be pushes and nudges to ensure that the licensees achieve and exceed their goals, yes. But more importantly and I think this was evident in Tuesday's meeting in which we know already that MGM has already reached out to the PGTI group to start to talk about ways in which they can work together to recruit more women into the trades so that we can achieve the goals not only on the project, but on other projects that take place in

2

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Springfield, Boston and in between.

That is part of what the AOC is all about is developing those partnerships and relationships again in common pursuit of goals and objectives.

I think we are off to a very terrific start keeping in mind that both projects are in very early stages. And there's always an anxiety around what the numbers say. Sometimes that anxiety precedes actual activity, but it is a good way of ensuring that the licensees know that not only are their efforts being watched by the Commission, not only are their efforts being watched by the Director Griffin, but their efforts are being watched by communities written in large in both the greater Boston community as expressed in Everett and the greater Springfield community and downtown Springfield. But again that this is not adversarial, it is in partnership.

Again, I would say thank you to the Commission for having both the foresight and the courage. As you know, this is a brand new experiment in Massachusetts. And any time you

2.1

introduce an element that wasn't on the table at the very beginning, there can be some nerves frayed.

But the courage that you displayed in creating an additional tool and that's what the AOC is a tool in reaching our collective objectives around diversity and inclusion.

Again, thank you to the Commission for doing that. And I say thank you for giving me the opportunity to lend time and effort in chairing the AOC. My goal is to make sure that voices are heard, objectives are achieved and the Commission is done proud by the work of the AOC. And I'll stop there.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you, Ron.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, I want to say thank you. You keep thanking us, but we should be thanking you over and over again. I saw you in action on Tuesday mediating a group of multiple perspectives and other expectations.

Some update that is not quite what they wish they had because the projects are in early stages but doing a great job at that.

One of my takeaways is even though it's early, 2 it's great that we have this. It's critical 3 that we stick to this try to avoid canceling, 4 postponing any of these meetings, because the 5 trend, the behavior or the relationship over 6 time will hopefully also go a long way in achieving all of those goals that you 8 described. 9 MR. MARLOW: Commissioner, thank 10 you. And again, I said this at the first 11 meeting. I do believe Director Griffin is a 12 Yoda disciple because she can get you to do 13 things that you would not normally do. I would 14 not normally drive to Springfield in the middle 15 of the day. Thank you, Commissioner. 16 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I would just 17 echo Commissioner Zuniga. We are thankful that 18 this administration saw the wisdom in engaging 19 Ron in his new capacity. And we are also 20 grateful for the time that he is giving us in 21 chairing the AOC. It was a good meeting. Ιt

These open meetings. So anybody even if they're not on the committees is

was active participation by everyone.

22

23

invited to attend and participate. Ron did a great job in allowing anybody who was there who was not a member of the committee to weigh in. We think that's important.

And I was impressed by some of the activities of our licensees. As it's been pointed, it's still very early on in the process, but MGM is boiling down the numbers to the firm they hired to the erect the fence to track diversity even in some of these very early contracts that they're awarding.

Then we heard stories of Wynn representatives going around to laundromats in Everett to post posters targeted to women and minority and veterans to think about a career in construction and taking advantage of these two big projects as a way to jumpstart a new career a new opportunity for them.

So great work, Ron runs a great meeting. I find that if you've been to Penn State, driven by Penn State, thought of Penn State, you are in good graces with Ron. It was good.

MR. MARLOW: Thank you,

1 Commissioner.

Marlow, I want to thank you as well for this good work. And I just had a question really off-topic. This is great work in construction and in gaming. I just wondered if there's any work being done around public safety in the Commonwealth to increase numbers and be more inclusive.

MR. MARLOW: That's a good question.

I'll go back to my colleagues and come up with
an answer and get that back to you directly.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Great. Civil service needs to be looked down and a couple of other things. I just wondered if anything was being done.

MR. MARLOW: I can tell you this broadly speaking, Governor Baker is even more laser focused than Governor Patrick was on questions of diversity and inclusion. It is something that he is holding secretaries responsible for.

So, while I don't the specifics in

the public safety realm, I am pretty confident that as we look up his goal is to increase the diversity within the executive branch so that it even better reflects the diversity in the Commonwealth. So, while I can't give you specifics take that as a general concept.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Ron, how was the attendance at this meeting? That's one of the proofs in the pudding.

MR. MARLOW: I was actually at the Urban League of Eastern Mass. yesterday. And I teased Darnell Williams to say Darnell, I'm not quite sure how you missed the Boston meeting but made it out to Springfield. So, it must be something about Springfield.

I was very surprised. I believe there were 28 or so individuals in the room. Many of them who traveled from Boston and bore the traffic of 128, because once you get to the Pike it's smooth sailing. So, it was very well attended. I think that is a testament to the work you've done, the Commission in terms of highlighting the importance of diversity

2.1

1 inclusion.

I think it's testament to the work that Jill has done in recruiting individuals who are committed to rolling up their sleeves and working in partnership. Anyone can throw stones. It takes a little bit more to do partnership. So, it was very well attended.

If it wasn't for the fact we had a slightly bigger room than we did for the first meeting, it would have been exactly like the first meeting.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You made a point just to reinforce it and you said that sometimes at the outset of these things there's a little anxiety because this is all going to be about finger-pointing. And it's important to make clear to our licensees and they will learn I hope with experience that this is a tool as you said. This is a way to help.

There was an extraordinary story when the folks at Plainridge were having a hard time meeting their objectives for women in the construction process. And rather than them being defensive about it and rather than trying

1 to explain away the numbers or the hide the 2 numbers, they reached out to our effective AOC 3 and said can you help us? How do we do this better? 5 That's what's supposed to be 6 happening here. So, if we can keep that tone that this about being honest and assume the 8 commitment of good faith and roll up our 9 sleeves and work together to make it happen. 10 This is really great. And I second everybody 11 else's endorsement of Secretary Marlow. 12 MR. MARLOW: Just do me one favor, 13 next time you say go Spartans, follow up with 14 go Nittany Lions. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm actually for the Iowa Hawkeyes, don't get me wrong. I just 16 17 like the Big Ten, anybody in the Big Ten. 18 MR. MARLOW: All right, go Big Ten. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Next time it'll be 19 20 go Hawkeyes. 2.1 MR. MARLOW: Thank you, 22 Commissioners. 23 MS. GRIFFIN: Can I just close by 24 saying that the meetings take place on the

second Tuesday of every month. And we'll be 1 2 meeting at the Carpenters Union in Dorchester 3 in June. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If you haven't 5 been in that building, it's worth just going to 6 see that building. MS. GRIFFIN: It's a beautiful 8 building. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Before you leave, I saw some emails. I see Liz sitting back 10 11 I saw some emails going back and forth 12 about some award by some woman construction 13 worker or something? What was that? Did that 14 have anything to do with us? 15 MS. GRIFFIN: This is a national 16 organization and a resource that Liz Skidmore 17 has alerted us to that highlights women in the 18 construction trades. Every Tuesday they 19 highlight a woman in the trades. It's 20 something that the local community and in 21 Massachusetts and greater Boston were talking 22 about doing something like that locally. 23 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. That's 24 good.

Page 152 1 MR. MARLOW: Thank you, 2 Commissioners. 3 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you. Is 5 that it for today? 6 MR. DAY: It is. 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And I think we've 8 covered everything. Anything else anybody? All right. Thank you all very much. Do we 9 10 have a motion to adjourn? 11 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Motion to 12 adjourn. 13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor, aye. 14 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 16 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you. 18 19 (Meeting adjourned at 2:11 p.m.) 20 21 22 23 24

ATTACHMENTS:

- 2 1. Massachusetts Gaming Commission May 3 14, 2015 Notice of Meeting and Agenda
- 4 2. Massachusetts Gaming Commission April 30, 2015 Meeting Minutes
- Massachusetts Gaming Commission May 14,
 2015 Memorandum Re: Temporary Primary
 Vendor and Key Gaming Employee Licenses
 Issued
- 10 4. May 11, 2015 Letter from Law Office of
 11 Robert L. Allen Re: Crossroads
 12 Massachusetts, LLC
- 13 5. Massachusetts Gaming Commission Region C -14 List of Request for Extensions
- 15 6. May 4, 2015 Letter from New Bedford Mayor

 16 Jonathan F. Mitchell
- 7. Presentation: Analyzing the Effects of
 Casinos on Public Safety (Christopher
 Bruce)
- 20 8. Plainridge Park Casino Floor Plan
- 9. March 31, 2015 Revised April 10, 2015
 Memorandum of Epstein Joslin Architects,
 Inc. (Ray Porfilio)

1 10. 205 CMR 134 Licensing and Registration of
Employees, Vendors, Junket Enterprises and
Representatives, and Labor Organizations

- 11. May 14, 2015 Massachusetts Gaming

 Commission Memorandum Re: Suffolk Downs

 Request for Capital Improvement Trust Fund

 Monies with attachment
- 12. May 14, 2015 Massachusetts Gaming

 Commission Memorandum Re: Suffolk Downs

 Request for Promotional Trust Fund Monies

 with attachment
- 13. Massachusetts Gaming Commission May 12, 2015 Memorandum Re: Plainridge Park Casino, Rescheduling Live Racing Days with attachments
- 14. Massachusetts Gaming Commission May 14,
 2015 Memorandum Re: Delegation of
 Authority to the Director of the IEB
 Investigations and Enforcement Bureau

15. Executive Session Minutes Policy

Page 155 1 **GUEST SPEAKERS:** 2 Scott Butera, Consultant to New Bedford Project Andrew Stern, KG Urban 3 Chief Alfred, Plainville Police Department 5 Christopher Bruce, Consultant in Crime Analysis 6 Michael McGrew, Penn National Jack Rauen, Penn National 8 Darlene Whitmore, JCJ Architecture 9 Ron Marlow, Office of Labor and Workforce 10 Development 11 Steve O'Toole, Plainridge Park Casino 12 13 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION STAFF: 14 15 Catherine Blue, General Counsel 16 Richard Day, Executive Director 17 Jill Griffin, Director Workforce Supplier and 18 Diversity Development 19 Todd Grossman, Deputy General Counsel 20 Dr. Alex Lightbaum, Interim Director Racing 21 Doug O'Donnell, Financial Analyst John Ziemba, Ombudsman 22 23 Karen Wells, Director IEB

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

Notary Public May 11, 2018