

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. We are ready to call to order public meeting No. 217 today, May 25th at the MassMutual Center at 11 o'clock. First item on the agenda is the approval of minutes. Commissioner, Macdonald. COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move that we approve the minutes of the May 10, 2017 public meeting subject, as usual, to the -- to corrections for typographical errors and for other nonmaterial matters.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think I will
abstain. I was only there for part of -- only on the phone for part of the meeting. Any further discussion?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yep. I will abstain as well. I was not there for any of the meeting.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. All in
favor, signify by saying aye.

MR. MACDONALD: Aye. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it three to zero. Next up is the ombudsman report. It looks like we are going directly to Mr. Ziemba.

MR. ZIEMBA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners. Today, MGM Springfield is here to present its quarterly report for the first quarter of this year. We are joined by Seth Stratton, MGM Springfield Vice President General Counsel; Brian Packer, vice president for construction and development; and Courtney Wenleder, MGM Springfield's vice president and CFO.

In addition to the report on the quarterly activities, we have asked them to provide the Commission with an update regarding the residential units that are part of the MGM Springfield project commitments. As you are aware, at the last quarterly meeting, the Chairman and the Commission asked
about the status of such residential units. They have also been part of ongoing discussions between MGM Springfield and Gaming Commission staff.

In addition to the quarterly report, we have also attached in your packet correspondence that we have recently received from MGM Springfield as part of the MGM Springfield site plan review by the City of Springfield. MGM Springfield was required to conduct a traffic study relative to its planned electronic signage. MGM Springfield has forward a study to Springfield and to us, as we share an interest in the safety of the MGM Springfield project and its electronic signage. I am pleased to report that Springfield is in the process of its review and will, undoubtedly, approach this in the same professional manner that they always conduct all of their reviews.

And with that as a context, I turn it over to Seth Stratton.

MR. STRATTON: Good morning,
Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good morning. COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Good morning.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good morning. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good morning.

MR. STRATTON: Welcome to Springfield. Thanks for coming out here on this dreary day. As you'll note, we're doing a little bit of a divide and conquer today. There's a pretty full agenda for MGM Springfield items. You're going to hear from our team in front of you here today, as well as our human resources team on workforce development shortly after that. And then, Mike and others from our team with respect to the criminal history disqualifier issue that we've been in conversations with the Commission on.

So we're here to talk about the quarterly update. As you saw a few minutes ago, on site we're making tremendous progress.

A lot of excitement here because of the energy of seeing the project go up. And you're able to witness a little bit of that today. And I'm going to turn it over to Brian to walk through exactly what progress we've made and what we see coming in the next several months, as we normally do.

And then, Courtney, who you met at our last meeting, who we're all very excited to have as our CFO here in Springfield, Courtney will walk through the budget update that she's relieved me of duty from having to do, which I'm very happy with, and then I'll close it out with an update on what we can update you on, on the residential piece. So without further adieu, I'll turn it over to Brian.

MR. PACKER: Good morning.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good morning.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Good morning.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good morning. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good
morning.
MR. PACKER: So when we look back at the first quarter, $I$ think it was really about finishing steel and starting to get in a position where we can start enclosure over the summertime. So I think we've hit our goals on that up to a nice, final topping-off ceremony end of quarter, so we'll walk you through some of that progress.

From the aerial photos, you can see the end of December to mid March here, where a lot of that steel framing is now filled in and metal decks beginning to go on in mid March. And it was -- you know, it was always our goal to kind of have concrete in place by the end of last summer, start steel in October so we can hang all winter. And that's, essentially, what happened.

Here, this slide seems awful cold compared to today. But, you know, we had maybe -- it was a light winter, generally. We had maybe, approximately, eight events that maybe affected construction and we had to dig out at certain levels. But we were still --
since we were kind of sequenced with steel, able to make a bunch of progress. And you see here the progress from that December slide now through March.

This is looking down on the banquet space area and the outdoor deck that will be available to patrons to walk out on that overlooks on the plaza that's in your foreground. Off to the right is the hotel, and off to the left is the entertainment block. The crane you see off to the right, really, is -- was the last piece of steel that where that crane occupied we ended up working our way out of the podium and finishing up that steel as kind of the last steel sequence.

And here, kind of diagrammatically, this -- this shows you the areas of where all the concrete's poured, in teal, and then the few areas that are left to pour that are ready for pouring. One is that -- that lane I described where the crane was. And we walk it out there in the podium towards Howard Street, down by the marketplace, obviously, coordinating five or six different vendors in
the marketplace. That's one of the last areas to pour because of the high sensitivity around there's food and beverage penetrations. And then, in the garage, the bottom floor or base level of the garage is the last to get poured because it's -- it's at grade.

And so, some of the items we were working on here in the first quarter, in the podium, was at 73 State you can see the support stuff for the facade, and we're bringing steel in behind 73 to eventually connect and then relieve the supports in the front. So it's all about steel connection and making that structural connection to be able to start enclosure the following quarter.

You see metal stairs come in the podium, and you see a bunch of scaffolding go up on the right-hand side of the slide with a wrap that allowed us to begin certain temperature-controlled sequences, like sprayed fireproofing, concrete metal deck pouring that are temperature sensitive. So the wrap around the project that you see helped us perform those tasks.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So the wrap
protects the material not the people?
MR. PACKER: The wrap on Main Street does -- it kind of has two functions, right. Keeping the people that are driving along Main, any material or debris that may want to escape the site inside the site. But also, really for us, it's more about temperature control.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah.
Interesting.
MR. PACKER: In the winter, anyway.
You here -- see some photos here of just some of the snow events. The more metal deck and, obviously, concrete we have poured, the more area that we have to clear off.

The convention banquet area, in the bottom right-hand corner, if you were out there, or if you see the pictures really made a statement with the size trusses that were there, the clear spans. And, you know, once we were able to get those last pieces erected, you really saw the whole banquet space come together.

This is looking along Main Street and the hotel facade, and the scaffolding that's up to allow us to begin metal framing and sheathing on the outside of the steel structure that's up currently.

Union Chandler, you can't quite make it out, but it's in the center of that scaffolding in the picture on the left. And on the right-hand side, these are just a couple of shots behind 73 State of that connection area that I spoke about earlier.

So here are kind of some period shots throughout the quarter of that -- you know, that -- kind of that corner money shot that you've seen in a lot of our previous perspectives and renderings, and really seen the hotel tower come to life here. And then, towards the end of March with the topping-off ceremony. So that last picture is right after it was topped off.

Garage made significant progress in this quarter. The slip ramp out to Union Street was completed. The precast sequences, I believe at the end of this quarter we maybe
had six sequences remaining. And parts of the -- the dog leg right around the Colvest property took place, and that enabled us to now have a straight, kind of, remaining sequence all the way to MGM Way. So we kind of turned the corner with the garage here, in this quarter.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Brian, is that
some snow melting, or can you explain that?
MR. PACKER: That is. That's a snow melt that's -- system that's, you know, underlaid underneath the concrete that's on that ramp. So when we activate that in the cold weather, anybody exiting the garage, that'll be turned on and melt that snow. So that'll be extremely functional by the time we open. And we looked at all the areas of where we would want to put this, and this obviously stuck out -- stuck out as one of the areas you definitely would want to do it. Right?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It's great.
MR. PACKER: A few more just
progress shots and then -- of hoisting precast plank for the garage, precast tees. And then
at the end of quarter, March $29 t h$, we had a topping-off ceremony for the project. And it was -- it was a great ceremony.

Very interesting to kind of see -typically, these projects you see just a regular steel beam, right. Here, because of the architecture, it was this oval-shaped beam and everyone signed around the beam and really made for a nice placement and topping off. And it was a great day there. Some of you joined us, and we fed the workers as well so it was really just a nice morning. And now, in the day and age of cellphones and technology and video, I think everybody had their cameras out and a bunch of it hit You-Tube shortly thereafter.

So I'll move on to the design update for the quarter. We had a 50 percent design review workshop with the City of Springfield and their consultants and free mudder group in Las Vegas. That was really to walk through any questions, comments they may have had about the 50-percent set. And also, review the mockups for the exterior facade.

So as part of our site plan review, we talked with them about, hey, we'll build certain sections of the facade to get you comfortable with the quality of materials that we're going to eventually have.

So we built those mockups in Las Vegas. The City flew out and we spent a Friday out there reviewing everything. So that was a successful meeting and really good work sessions between all groups involved.

The design work early in January kicked off on the childcare center. And just recently, we've submitted documents related to the childcare center to the City for review.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Brian,
remind me where the -- is still planned for across -- kitty corner across the street?

MR. PACKER: Yeah. So if you're at the corner of Union and Main, right where Dave's Retail used to be --

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Right.
MR. PACKER: It's kitty corner to that -- to that intersection. Garage, we've had eight addendums submitted to the building
department through this quarter. The last pieces are, you know, related really to low voltage and some signage coordination.

95 State Street, where the executive offices will be, Delta wanted the permits set for that building. It was also issued to the city, and then we had a hundred percent submission for the ITS system. And roadway enhancements that's part of our offsite traffic requirement with MassDOT and the City.

On schedule, we've submitted our required monthly updates to the Commission. Nothing really substantial to note in here. The opening date of September of '18 has stayed consistent in all three of these updates. With that, I'll turn it over to Courtney for the budget update.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What keeps you up at night on the project these days?

MR. PACKER: Well, that's a long list. Right now, I'd say the primary concern is having the awards to place to complete enclosure sometime this fall. So we've awarded the major trades, curtain wall,
windows, roofing. But the goal right now is get watertight this year.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
MR. PACKER: And then you -- you
know, whatever you have to deal with weatherwise you're able to because you're enclosed. So that's one of the primary things that we're focusing on right now.

The other part of the enclosure piece is because we have so many existing buildings and, you know, the project moves at a fast pace, what in those buyouts could be missing? So is there a detail between, you know, some of those -- some of the interfaces of 95 State, where the podium abuts to 95 State, what do those details look like? You know, how does it get waterproofed? And sometimes, those details can't be drawn accurately on a set of plans. You really have to have meetings in the field and figure out how these buildings jog and accept one another, what does that look like. So we have teams starting to focus on that as framing's going up. What are the interfaces we really
need to address.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. That's interesting.

MR. PACKER: The next piece would be just the availability of -- right now, the market is extremely busy so we have seen an increase in bidders who are interested than during the bid process they may not be interested because they've just received an award at another project.

So it's, you know, making sure we obviously have a good bidders list of qualified bidders that can meet our schedule requirements, quality requirements, PLA requirements, diversity requirements. And right now, the market is -- you know, is looking for all the same things I am. Right?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
MR. PACKER: So you're competing in a robust market. Boston, obviously, has an impact out here and, you know, getting watertight this fall. And that's kind of the -- the two items that are on our plate every day.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: How's the labor market?

MR. PACKER: So labor -- the unions have done a great job of, you know, having a constant dialogue with us. We meet every month. This region, from a union standpoint, by nature over the years has had to adapt and be somewhat noematic anyway.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Be somewhat what?
MR. PACKER: Noematic.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh.
MR. PACKER: So, you know, it's not
odd from someone from here to go to another city and travel, or from folks from other cities in, you know, Connecticut or Maine or New York to travel here. So if needed, the unions have partners in the region they can call on and bring additional manpower in. Obviously, that costs additional money because you have certain types of -- additional requirements such as housing and what have you.

But in terms of the local unions being able to staff the project for us, some
folks have had concerns about it. I haven't seen any of it really come to fruition. The unions have -- they've been great in terms of response.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. Anything else?

MR. PACKER: All right. So I'll turn it to Courtney.

MS. WENLEDER: Good morning.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good morning.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Good morning.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good morning.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good morning.

MS. WENLEDER: I'm going to briefly cover the numbers. As you saw this morning, and from Brian's comments, we've made significant progress on the construction side. From a cost standpoint, we've incurred an incremental $\$ 35$ million in capital costs, which brings us up to 30 percent of our budget. On the noncapital expenditures, we've
incurred an incremental $\$ 8$ million, which is split pretty evenly between cap interest and preopening expenses. We've added several new team members over the quarter to date, who are all very focused on our opening at the end of 2018. Total project of 395 million, we're about 40 percent of our total spend. And incrementally, we've spent $\$ 43.5$ million this quarter.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And you haven't dipped into your contingency yet?

MS. WENLEDER: Not as of yet. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good. MR. PACKER: There were -- yeah. There were two earlier transfers. I think contingency was around $50-\mathrm{plus}$ million. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, it was. Okay. MR. PACKER: But since Courtney's been here, the numbers held steady at that 40-some-odd million number.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: You still have a sizeable remaining amount in preopening expenses and host community costs. How does
that kind of break out between preopening costs and the host community commitments?

MS. WENLEDER: Our host community agreements and gaming assessments, about $\$ 43$ million of the total.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.
MS. WENLEDER: A lot of the preopening will be payroll which will be -which we'll incur as we get closer to opening. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else for Courtney?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you.
MR. PACKER: Okay. So we'll move on to diversity update. The overall combined numbers for the project design and construction commitments, we've surpassed that 100-company vendor milestone in this quarter.

From a goal standpoint, target standpoint, on WBEs 10 percent. Current commitments through the quarter are 16.6. MBE
project goal of 5 percent, current commitment 7.7 percent. And on VBE 2 percent target, current commitments are 5.3 percent. And then when --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Brian --
MR. PACKER: Yep.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I go back
a little bit?
MR. PACKER: Sure.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Brian, can I
got back a little bit, just actually to
Courtney. When you report remaining dollars, is that include commitments, or is that exclude them?

MS. WENLEDER: I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: When you report remaining dollars -- or actually incurred, I should go with incurred, does that include your commitments, or is that purely cash --

MS. WENLEDER: Cash.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- out the door. Okay.

MR. PACKER: So then, if we take those numbers and we always kind of like to look at it then in the side of design and consulting versus construction. On the design side, from a WBE standpoint, 10 percent, current commitment's 15.3. MBE 5 percent, current commitment's 12.7. And on VBE, project goal of 2 percent, current commitment's are 7.1 percent.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Are those pretty set, knowing where you are with design?

MR. PACKER: Within reason, yes, yes. There's still some potential moving parts, in terms of interior design. Maybe some historic signage to buyout. But in general, yeah, you wouldn't see -- you wouldn't expect to see these move any significant amount, probably, through project end.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Brian, that's very impressive, I think.

MR. PACKER: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah.

MR. PACKER: And then, this kind of gives you an idea of those commitments. Who has been on the project thus far and received payment? And so, in green, represents team members we can trace payment to through this quarter. So -- and this would make sense, that on the design side we still have a few team members that are just on-boarding, but the majority have received payments already. And to the extent those payments were made and received, they would be then in Courtney's report.

On construction, WBE companies goal at 10 percent, commitment's at 16.8. MBE 5 percent, commitment's 7 percent. VBE 2 percent target, 5.1 percent commitments to date.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: That's impressive as well.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah, I would agree. That's really -- those numbers are really high. Has that been a challenge to keep those numbers strong?

MR. PACKER: Every day.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Every day?
MR. PACKER: Every day.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: It's a
challenge.
MR. PACKER: Especially, if team numbers see these percentages -- you know, to keep future awards diverse can be a challenge because folks like to get comfortable, right. So you have to stay on it. Every award going forward, you can't take any of these numbers for granted. You know, things happen that are unexpected.

You know, we had a design consultant
who -- it was a WBE firm earlier in the project, they were going to do a fair amount of work for us, the partner got sick and passed away. So the reality is, it's no longer a WBE company. We can no longer count on that commitment.

And so, you want to -- you need to always have contingencies in place and not take for granted where you are today. And there's a whole lot of work between now and September of '18 to be done and put in place
so -- so we're always trying to stay on top to that and keep that in mind.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Great work.
MR. PACKER: And then, here's a
listing of all the -- the construction
companies to date that have commitments. And then, in green, the ones that have received payment to date.

And we try to stay on top of -- at least once a month these names and -- you know, we make awards to subcontractors that may have these subs named as tiered subcontractors. And, you know, how do we verify that, hey, there's a commitment here? But you don't get to the end of the job and somebody says, hey, I know I gave you that commitment but I -- I didn't use that tiered sub.

So we have a verification form we get each month that the -- all diverse subs have to sign that says, hey, we've been committed X amount to date, we've been paid X amount to date, we have change orders of X to date. So by seeing that once a month, even if
there's a glitch or dollars -- additional dollars come in, or additional dollars fall out, you can at least see the trend and try to be aware of it so you can adjust it, if needed.

On workforce, so outside of
commitments, this is actually workforce percentages based on hours worked on the project. For women, 6.9 percent goal. Project to date is at 10.3 percent. Minority, 15.3 percent. Project to date is 24.1 percent. And on veteran, 8 percent project goal, and project to date 10.4 percent.

So here it's -- it's also that kind of daily recognition. We have a badging system that we use to get a daily report on percentages every day. So if one of these groups is trending negative, we can talk to the superintendents and try to adjust quickly so that it doesn't hurt the overall picture.

So on top of that, the badging system, while it's good to kind of check folks and bodies every day, it's not very reliable
in terms of hours, which is this is this calculation. So you really need to get the certified payroll or a certification from the CFO of the company of here were the individuals and here were the hours worked. Because if you can picture, a worker comes on with a badge, they might go to lunch, they might not come back. They might run to Home Depot. It's not really -- can be representative. So we get that certified payroll.

And we were running it once a month for the AOC, obviously. But also now, we run that in the middle of the month as well. So that, even if the dailies look good, are we seeing anything, you know, mid month that would raise a flag for folks that either -you know, may not be using the badging system properly, or just to try to get a doublecheck here on trends.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Brian, the numbers, obviously, are strong. Can you reflect a little bit on what the value of the community partners network that MGM has set up
is helping you with these numbers, to the degree that they are?

MR. PACKER: Yeah. I think, you know, the Community Partner's Network, you know, was a very interesting concept when Chelon brought it to me, you know, I don't know how long ago, but, you know, maybe at least a year ago. And, you know, the idea of being Springfield very active community, a lot of different community groups, a lot of different voices to be heard.

And so, how do you -- if you're in our position, how do you work together with a bunch of those groups without, you know, having 20 separate meetings a month with, you know, also developing some common goals and really, you know, for all of those groups how do you collectively work towards something. Right.

And so, Chelon's done a great job of -- with many of the community partners to come together, form an organization that says, hey, we're going to get together every so often, and we're going to find out, you know,
what are the top five things we want to work on. And then, all of these community groups are now working together through this one group to help us with things like, hey, if I want to join a union and -- I just -- you know, I'm going to be in a position that if I work in a union in Western Massachusetts I may have to travel after I work at MGM Springfield and I may not be able to take the bus to work so I need to get my driver's license. And so, there might be a group that helps folks get their driver's license. You might need a GED to get into a certain union. There is a group that can help you do that.

They're also helping us process requests to join the union. We're helping screen to, okay, do you meet the requirements? If not, how do we get you? So there's all kinds of things going on just through the efforts of this group that has been -- really helped keep these numbers where they're at, if not increase them.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: That's
great. At our last AOC meeting, this probably
was shared with you, we had some folks from the building trades who just kind of raised the caution flag with us again that on projects where there is tremendous amount of diversity, there is some history of as a project starts to wind down that some of the women that are part of that construction crew kind of get let go first. So just -- they brought that to our attention to make sure that you're mindful of it to help keep your diversity numbers where they are.

MR. PACKER: Sure. Yeah. You know, the interesting thing about, you know, the dynamic of having a project labor agreement, especially in this market, you have a lot of subcontractors that have, you know, what we'll refer to as a core crew.

That crew may work for this contractor for 20 years. And so, when they come to a job like ours they have the core crew but then they man up through the unions. And then, as work winds down they will man down and then that core crew will move to another project.

So part of the layoff process is just part of, hey, the work is slowing down and drywall stops at some point and picks up. You know, it was interesting, just on a walk today, Maria -- Randy pointed out to me, he said, hey, there's Maria. She's now with Central Ceilings, when a couple weeks ago she was with a different company. And so Randy had told her, hey, when you get laid off, because that trade was ramping down, he said, come to me, I'll try to, you know, introduce you to the next subs coming on board.

So we're trying to do some of that so that, you know, we can keep the folks around that have been on the project that we've invested in. Because it would be very easy for Maria to leave that sub and maybe go up to UMass, or other places that need the same, you know, diversity levels we're trying to achieve. So that, really, you know, the best place it can happen is at the superintendent level because they're the guys who drive who the crews are.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Do those
layoffs usually happen by seniority; is that, basically, the way that works?

MR. PACKER: I think it could vary by sub. Probably, due to the decision of the -- the general foreman or superintendent out there. But that core crew, obviously, they're the most senior. They actually are employed day-to-day by that company. They're going to be the last. And typically, they won't even be the last to go. They'll be the last just to move to another project.

And then, just kind of keeping with some of our past presentations here, just an update of a couple current shots and what you can look forward to next quarter. A lot of you seen it this morning. The sun was out on this day, but you can really see the progress we're making with the scaffolding, and then some of the framing on the exterior of the building along Main Street. Focus on roofing, upper parapet kind of construction with the green board, and really working from the roof down to get watertight. The pool deck, a basin you can see on the bottom right. And
then we recently just topped off the parking garage as well. So as part of that we had a barbecue for the workers and that was very popular. They gave out over 400 t-shirts and ran out of shirts so -- so that was a nice day. With that, I'll hand it back to Seth. MR. STRATTON: Great. Thanks, Brian. I'll just close out with a brief update. I know the Commission is very interested in the residential component and where that stands and -- as are we. Very interested in determining where that's going to go.

As you know, our vision has always been to bring enhanced housing opportunities to downtown Springfield that both compliment our property and capitalize on the urban housing trend. When we decided to change our project design and move the hotel up to Main Street, as you're aware, we amended the Host Community Agreement to allow for the development of market rate residential housing in downtown Springfield within half-a-mile of our project. And almost immediately
thereafter, after changing that commitment, we went out, and you'll remember we purchased 195 State Street in Springfield as one of the properties where we could develop a portion of that commitment and then engaged in discussions with other property owners around other opportunities that would fulfill that commitment.

As we were exploring that and investing in those developments, the City approached us and asked us to, essentially, hold off because it was an exciting transformative development for the city, which you've heard about, right across the street here at 31 Elm in Court Square, and asked us to slow down a bit because they thought that there would be an opportunity for us to use the investment that we would otherwise invest in separate residential developments to help make that last piece of what the urban redevelopment plans for the city have always been to come to fruition.

And so, those discussions have been
ongoing. They've taken longer than we would
have liked. I think longer than the
Commission would have liked, and longer than the City would have liked. One of the issues is that, that -- that project is we would not be the developer, there's a preferred developer. And so, we're basically waiting on the City to finalize discussions with a preferred developer and come back to us and say, here's exactly what we think your commitment and participation would look like. We've had some conversations, but it's really -- it's really out of our hands. But we all think that it's worth letting the process move forward because it really could be transformative to Springfield.

So we've heard very recently that the discussions, as we've continued to hear, have made very recent progress and it's a matter of weeks from what the City tells us to be in a position where we can really formalize this. So I don't have a lot of details, and we haven't hammered out the exact details around what our participation would look like. Because of that, you know, I as --
you've heard Kevin Kennedy give an update before, and he mentioned that -- you know, the host community -- second amendment to the Host Community Agreement there are timelines around our residential commitment. Eighteen months from the execution of the second amendment to the Host Community Agreement was the first tranche of units. That amendment was back in March of 2016, so the clock is ticking on that. And that would really be -- September of this summer would be the deadline for that.

That's effectively come and gone.
And you've heard Kevin Kennedy mention that, you know, from the City's standpoint it's okay because they've asked us to hold off. In my position, that's always makes me nervous because we have a Host Community Agreement with -- you know, that says -- has a deadline in it. I've been very recently working -- and that makes Eddie Pikula, the city solicitor, nervous as well. We've been working together very recently on coming up with an amendment to the Host Community Agreement that would give us the optionality to move forward
with -- continue the discussions on this project, but also address this timeline so that there's no issue around concerns about this deadline not being met.

So we anticipate that before that deadline hits we will either have an amendment to the Host Community Agreement that gives the optionality to continue to pursue this development and extends a timeline. Or possibly, if the discussions move very quickly, be in a position to present to the city council, to the Gaming Commission, the proposal around this development, and even formalize that in an amendment to the Host Community Agreement prior to -- prior to that deadline.

So that's where it stands on our end. We look forward to further details from the City based on what we understand to be some very recent discussions between the developer and the city finalizing what were a few outstanding items on their end.

And so, that's -- that's the update that I have at this time. I'm happy to answer
any questions, to the extent $I$ can, from the Commission.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody?
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Are you
worried about it?
MR. STRATTON: Because I'm the lawyer, yes. But no, I think -- I'm not worried about it because everyone you talk to, even the -- we had a -- we had a meeting with the city council, the Casino Oversight Committee. You know, the city council is very in tune with this and, you know, concerned about ensuring that this commitment satisfied.

And, you know, John and Joe were at that meeting. And we were pleasantly surprised at how excited the members of the council at that meeting were about this opportunity. Because it's such a -- such a potentially transformative development for the city, we're not concerned that everyone involved isn't going to make the best efforts to try to make this happen. So I think the momentum of the desirability of that development is really going to push over the
finish line. It's just a lot of moving pieces.

So I'm worried about making sure that the documentation is right and we're not missing any obligations. But I'm not worried that this makes sense for the city and that everyone's not going to work together to do their best to make sure it happens.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Seth, on that note about the documentation, so it sounds like, from your standpoint, and from the City's standpoint, you really are working towards amending the Host Community Agreement. And specifically, the notion of that deadline that you spoke about, which was start-by date; is that correct, not a complete-by date?

MR. STRATTON: No. It's a complete-by date.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It's a complete-by.

MR. STRATTON: Yeah. So 18 months after the second amendment, which was March of 2016, we were to complete our first half.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right.

MR. STRATTON: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So what is the situation, currently, for this? Are you thinking towards a complete-by modification or a start-by date, given all the moving pieces, to the extent that you can talk about that?

MR. STRATTON: Sure. Yeah, I think it would be -- I think we would still do a complete-by. But if we move toward this participation in this development of Court Square, it would -- as far as I'm understanding, we would not be the developer so we can't control the project. You need to change the Host Community Agreement to reflect that -- that this is not something that we are actually developing. We are helping to -essentially, to fund.

And I think some of the open issues that I'm -- know the Commission would want to ensure are covered, as well as the City, is if -- if it is a financial commitment and we don't have control, well, what if for some reason it doesn't happen? How do we ensure that the commitment to residential development
is covered? And that's some of the -- kind of the guarantee pieces that we need to work through. And I think there would have to be some form of language that, if it didn't happen, then we'd have -- we'd have to go, kind of, back to the drawing board and have to recognize that it would be extended out because we need time to have the 31 Elm project started and hopefully completed. But if for some reason we're not, then, we recognize that everyone's invested in seeing that sort of development, then we'd have to kind of go back to the drawing board, but -- and that would need additional time. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. And actually, you were building towards exactly where I wanted to kind of get some of the question. Is there such thing -- again, to the extent that you can at this point, is there such time as we need to go back to the drawing board?

From your standpoint, is there a time frame where you go, well, this doesn't look like it's getting done in the time frame
or for the amount of resources that we're willing to do it, to do it? When, to the extent that you can predict, could there be that time?

MR. STRATTON: Yeah. So -COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: A Plan B time. MR. STRATTON: So the short answer is yes, there needs to be a time period. That needs to be negotiated and determined. I don't have an answer for you, in terms of what that time would look like. Because we're not the developer we need to say, all right, here -- what's your planned construction time? What's the outside -- what's the cushion? And where -- you know, where's that trigger where we need to know, you know, for one reason or another it's not happening and we need to then revert would be, $I$ think, the discussions.

That's where we're -- we're waiting
for the City to finalize pieces from their standpoint, and then we kind of get reinjected into the picture and say here's the conditions around our participation and what the City's going to require what the Gaming Commission
feels is needed to ensure that -- that this commitment satisfies all of our obligations. But I don't have -- I don't know what that period would be, as we sit here today.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So it sounds like you have this huge financial commitment, but you don't have a seat at the table for these negotiations, right?

MR. STRATTON: Well, we don't have a commitment yet. But $I$ understand -- we have a commitment to develop residential units in Springfield and we could always go back to -you know, we still own 195 State. We've kind of put the discussions on hold. We're comfortable that if this falls apart we can do our original plan. We just need -- because of the time it's taken, we need a little bit additional time.

To your point, Commissioner, yes, we are not -- we don't have a seat at the table, in terms of what the project looks like, what it's going to cost, the time it's going to take. Where we do have a seat at the table, or we anticipate having a seat at the table,
is we're being asked to, we need your participation to make it happen financially. And so, that's where our leverage will come. And we can condition that participation on certain guarantees that we need around our commitments under the Host Community Agreement and so forth.

And so, we have certain commitments that we've already, you know, been in some discussions with the City around. But we're going to need to ensure that all parties who have a stake are satisfied that, in order for this to basically substitute for our doing units on our own, that everyone's comfortable that those commitments are -- are satisfied.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah, if I may, to that, I think it's not about sitting at the table. You may no longer be driving the bus but you're still in -- you know, inside the bus. The question that I was asking is, you know, when do you get off the bus? When do you say, driver, you need to stop because we're turning around? And, of course, you'll recognize that, you know, at
some point, and that's something we'd be very interested in.

MR. STRATTON: Yeah. And we -- and
we have -- frankly, we appreciate the
patient -- we've tried to be patient. We appreciate the patience of the Commission because we know everyone's really interested in seeing -- seeing this piece of our project come to life and help with the transformation.

So we're -- trust me, we're pushing every day to get it moving. We appreciate the patience of -- the Commission's had, and understand that at some point folks are going to run out of patience and we're going to -and so, we -- we understand the urgency to come to some -- get some decision from the City and then kind of line up our obligations as soon as -- as soon as possible because the clock is ticking.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Seth, I --
you know, $I$ think it's important for everybody to be aware of, you know, I like your description of, you know, 31 Elm and that project and its potential is transformative.

It certainly has sat idle for a long time. It's sat boarded up for a long time. It's sat with holes in the roof for a long time.

Even when $I$ was working for the City and on the city council, we went through a number of preferred developer processes and folks came and went so I can appreciate that this is not an easy process because the history would dictate that to us.

I did have a quick question or a quick concern. A few weeks back, in the media the question was raised about the number of units. And the reply, it might have come from Mike, was, you know, we'll be close to the number, but hopefully keep the spirit of the Host Community Agreement. Can you shed any light on that comment, or where do you feel the answer was being directed? MR. STRATTON: Yeah. I mean, there's -- again, it's the we're on the bus but not driving the bus. But -- so like, I can't speak to the exact number of units. But what we understand is that the development here would be a mixed-use, residential retail
commercial development, and that there would be 60 units, which exceeds the number of units 54. However, our understanding is that there's -- that developers will be seeking -let me back up for a second.

One of the reasons this has never happened, as I'm sure you're aware, is the economics, the investment that -- that it'll take to bring that building back to life are not supported by the current economics here in Springfield. That's where MGM comes in because they're still not supported. Absent significant, you know, historic tax credits, other, you know, publically-available financing that the developer will seek, and then, essentially, financial participation by MGM.

Our understanding is that one of the pieces of financing that's necessary to make this project happening would involve a mix of, you know, some affordable housing at the 20-percent level. And so, if you look at 60 units, 20 percent, you'd have 48 market rate, 12 affordable. So I think that's -- I'm
not -- if that was Mike's comment, I think that's -- you know, you compare a total number of 60 to, you know, a 54, but you also look at our 54 was market rate, now we're talking about 48 market rate, 12 affordable. And again, I can't -- that's my understanding what the numbers are. I can't speak for the developer.

So I think that's -- that's the best information that I have and why we're talking about the number. In our view, if it were 60 units, largely market rate with some component of affordable, that, frankly, probably some of our employees who could walk to work could utilize we think it's a -- we think it's a win-win and fulfills the spirit of what we're trying to do so...

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: For what it's
worth, I see that as -- you know, additional units from your commitment. The notion of market, you know, in this case, you know, is secondary to the notion of total units, but that's just me.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else? Do I -- is the housing commitment, John and Seth, a -- just in the HCA and therefore one of our commitments because we've adopted the HCAs, or an independent condition of our -- of our license?

MR. ZIEMBA: It was included in the HCAs, and therefore it becomes part of our license provisions.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
MR. ZIEMBA: And it's also part of the RFA2 process. And so, everything that was promised as part of the RFA2 process also becomes part of our license conditions.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But there's
nothing -- if they change the HCA, it changes the commitment they're making to us also.

MR. ZIEMBA: No. So we would still have to review that. One thing that we specified during the site plan review, our design review, is that what was happening with the residential units was not happening, it was not known at the time, and so we reserved that for our approval.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And is there a -are there any dates, critical, variable dates in our independent agreement?

MR. ZIEMBA: Well, the date --
you're correct, Mr. Chairman. The date reverts back to what was included in the Host Community --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- Agreement.
But the anticipation -- the opening date is sort of what everything is tied to in our licensing procedure. So to that degree, we'd have to take a look at everything.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Because as a practical matter, we're pretty much past that already, right. So there's -- housing isn't going to be open at the time that the project opens, which is already a bit of a disappointment.

What I hear you saying again, Seth, and Kevin said this when he was here before, he spoke on behalf of the City and said, look, really, in effect, it's our fault. We're asking MGM to slow down on this because we
have this bigger picture. And I'm -- you
know, as long as it's MGM and the City asking our forbearance on this, I'm inclined to say we trust you, let's go with it.

But if we trust you and all of a sudden somebody turns around and says, geez, the market -- geez, something happened, it can't happen, there's a big problem out there, there would be seriously unhappy campers. And if it -- I mean, at some point -- so how long are we going to wait before we finally say, look, you've got to do something else? You know, forget -- we all think 31 Elm would be fabulous. But there's plenty of places for the kind of money you're talking about that are within stone's throw of this project where you can put up 54 units of market-rate housing for the money you're talking about.

So at some point, somebody has to put a stake in the ground and say we can't just keep sliding and sliding. And I know that's not your intention, and I say my dominant message is, because it's the two of you together saying we're in this together,
the City's committed to this as well, please stick with us, I'm inclined to say yes.

But I just -- I don't want there to be any misunderstanding, if something goes wrong we will not be happy, because we are -this is a critical element. I know you're committed to it. It was something that $I$ and others had talked about all the time as one of the distinguishing features of this, and it ain't going away without dire consequences.

So I just want to make sure that, while saying in good faith we trust you, and we do, we also are going to be very watchful that this really does happen. And at some point, we have to -- we have to set a date.

MR. STRATTON: We understand.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Anything else, Seth?

MR. STRATTON: No. I think it's it. Unless there are further questions, that completes our update.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.
MR. STRATTON: Thank you very much.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you very
much.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.
MR. ZIEMBA: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just move on to a matter involving the City of Medford and a 2016 Community Mitigation Fund amendment. What I'm asking for is authority to change the purposes of the grant slightly.

When the Commission authorized this grant, it was for the hiring of a planner, a transportation planner, which, at the time it was intended that that planner would be a municipal employee. At the time that we awarded that grant, it was for the fiscal year '17 expenses of that planner. And due to some of the conditions that we placed on the grant, the City is not able to move forward with that grant as of yet.

And so, what I'm asking for, for authority, is to enable -- to enable the City of Medford to utilize those same funds for a contract employee, instead of a municipal employee. And to enable the City of Medford to utilize its funding through fiscal year
'18, instead of fiscal year '17 because it is so late in the fiscal year.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: John, I
think it makes sense. You need a motion from us?

MR. ZIEMBA: I'm sorry,
Commissioner.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I said, I think it makes sense. Do you need a motion from us?

MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah. This does require a vote.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.
Mr. Chair, I'd move that the Commission approve the authorization of the designated Medford planning grant and extend it into fiscal year 2018, to allow the City of the Medford to use the funds for a contract employee or a consultant for traffic. It's mostly for traffic engineering or traffic funding?

MR. ZIEMBA: Correct. Yes. Through fiscal year '18.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Second.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I was about
to second, but we had the second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. Any
further discussion? We started out kind of insisting that this be an employee, right?

MR. ZIEMBA: No. What we insisted is that they had to document that a hundred percent of their costs are gaming related.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. That was the -- that was the issue. Right.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And it's hard for them to do that with a municipal employee who, on an average day, might answer one question about noncasino-related matters.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. This is totally a detail but I'm just kind of curious, if the 67,000, if it were for a person it would include big benefits. The number of hours that you got would probably be substantially fewer than if you hire a consultant, right; I mean, so this is a way to make the money go farther, among other things, probably?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'd say, not
necessarily.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Really?
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Because, you know, any consultant could have, you know, French -- or, you know, overhead. It could, but not necessarily.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But I don't think that's a material observation so -- okay. Any other irrelevant conversation? All in favor of the motion as made? Aye.

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

MR. ZIEMBA: Thank you, Commissioners. For my third matter, I'm joined by director of racing, Alex Lightbown. We're here to give an update, a legislative update related to the Racehorse Development Fund. We have included in your packets the language from two legislative proposals that may potentially impact the Racehorse

Development Fund.
The first is an outside section that is included in the Senate Ways and Means' version of the budget. It requires the transfer of $\$ 15$ million from the Racehorse Development Fund to the general fund no later than June 30, 2018, for the programs and operations of the Department of Agricultural Resources and the Department of Conservation and Recreation.

And then, the second item in your packet is an amendment that is still pending as of this morning. We just checked before this meeting and it was still on hold. The senate still has, approximately, 350 or so amendments that -- that they are looking at today, hopefully, before they conclude debate on the budget, either today or tomorrow.

This amendment would establish a human trafficking prevention trust fund that would be funded, in part, from the Gaming Revenue Fund. The amendment reduces the amounts that are allocated under The Expanded Gaming Act to the Racehorse Development Fund
by reducing the 9 percent allocation from Category 2 slots to 4.5 percent. And the 2.5 percent allocation from Category 1 revenues to 1.25 .

No comparable sections were included in the House version of the budget, so after the Senate concludes its debate, either today or tomorrow, they will work expeditiously to establish a conference committee. And then that conference committee will iron out the differences between the two versions of the budget. When they do so, potentially before June 30 th of this year, and then they will send that proposal off to the governor. And with that, I'll turn to Dr. Lightbown to see if she had any further comments.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I just clarify one thing before? So, at that point, the amendments, we don't know yet if they will carry on the Senate, right; they're discussing that in the next few days?

MR. ZIEMBA: Well, yes. So there was no -- so the Senate Ways and Means' \$15 million transfer, that is included in the

Senate's budget because there's no amendment to strike that from the Senate Ways and Means' version. So that will go forward to the conference committee, the second amendment that $I$ just detailed. It was on hold. They've gone through all of the amendments sort of in sequential order and put that one on hold, I would imagine for further discussion as they wind down matters of significant interest before they conclude their budget debate.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Dr. Lightbown.
MS. LIGHTBOWN: So both of these would, obviously, adversely affect the money going into that Racehorse Development Fund and being used for racing in Massachusetts.

Particularly, the second one, it would affect all the areas where that money goes to. It gets split between the harness side and the thoroughbred side. And then, that again gets split down between what goes to purses, what goes to the breeders, and what goes to the horsemen for benefits. So in that case, everything would be -- get less money.

Particularly, on the breeding side, these people are trying to plan maybe three years ahead of time, because that's how long it takes between when you breed your horse, when you get the foal, when they get ready for the races. We have people that, in good faith, have bred horses the last couple of years with the idea that this fund money is there and they'll be able to go for these purses down the road when their horses are ready.

Currently, in the fund there's
13 million. The money -- all the money goes out on a regular basis, except for the purse money at Suffolk, because -- on the thoroughbred side because that's not all going to be used in a year.

So the money that's in the fund right now, about 7 million of it, is from the 9 percent gross gaming that gets further divided, the 80 percent, to the -- down -- and on down from there. About 5 million of it is from the licensing fees, originally. So there's not 15 million in the fund right now.

That does -- obviously, money comes in and goes out, so we can anticipate that over the next year there'll be another, maybe, 15 or 16 million that'll go in and go out. So with the thoroughbreds not using all that purse money, if they don't, there will be some accumulation.

Suffolk has put in a request for their purse money for this year. It's going to be similar to what they asked for last year, the 2.4 million. The horsemen are also asking for close to 600,000 on their half. And that would come before the Commission either at our next meeting in June or the meeting after that, so that's something the Commission would be voting on.

So again, if you figure the 3 million, that -- over a year's timespan, if about 6 million is coming into the thoroughbred purse money portion of this, that doesn't leave much money over. If some other racetrack wanted to race, the Commission would be limited as to what was available. Also, we have the bill that's out there that would give
the Commission leeway over that fund to maybe spend it in other ways that might spur the development of thoroughbred racing in Massachusetts.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And then
there's -- there's also the split, the 65 -there's that whole process on that horseracing committee that also comes into play here --

MS. LIGHTBOWN: Yes.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- if this
amendment passes.
MS. LIGHTBOWN: The committee's meeting again in August. And the standardbreds, the split went, you know, to 55/45 to them from what was a 75/25 split. And the standardbreds really benefited from having that extra money. I know, on their behalf, that they would not wish to get less money total than what they're getting now. That's really been a boon to their program. And that's something that I should point out.

On that side of the racing industry, we've seen the program work as it was intended. There's more interest in it.

There's -- we've seen an increase in licenses. The Live handle's gone up. There's more interest in breeding. There's -- just anecdotally, I, you know, the other day was talking to somebody who was saying they were having a hard time finding a farm in Massachusetts to put horses on because they're filling up, which is great. But again, if that -- that split in August could potentially change again, and then the -- that would change all the percentages, and the amount of money going into the fund for thoroughbred purses would be less.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And the remainder could be less, right; the balance at the end of the year could even be less?

MS. LIGHTBOWN: Exactly. That would, you know, lower it.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. Even further.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Pro rata, yeah. MR. BEDROSIAN: So, Commissioners, I think one of the reasons we put this on today is also a process of decision, because we're
talking about a lot of hypothetical scenarios and we're hoping that maybe the Commission can think about designating one of you, because in real time we may have to respond. The legislature may ask what the position of the Commission is, given more concrete scenarios, whether it is the current Senate Ways and Means' suggestion or another amendment.

And certainly, staff, Dr. Lightbown, Mr. Ziemba or myself could explain the collateral consequences of whatever scenario happens. We can't represent the Commission. And given the Open Meeting Law constraints, in the time in which this will move, it would be great to have the ability to respond both staff with process information, than Commission with potential position information in real time.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I wanted to
speak to that. That's a very good point. I think there are a lot of horsemen out there who, because they haven't heard from us think that we not supporting them. And I know one
of our obligations is under -- under the statute is to support, protect the industry.

So, you know, I'm going to speak for me that, you know, I would love -- in particular, I would love the standardbreds to have the opportunity to continue with the tremendous work they're doing. There are more jobs, there are more income. As Dr. Lightbown pointed out, the farms are beefing up, the breeding programs. There's so much more energy around everything going on at the racetrack. And I would love to see the thoroughbred folks have an opportunity, if they can, to have a place to race and be able to utilize what that money was intended for also.

So, you know, I just -- I do support that. I hope that's possible. And -- but the point was we couldn't speak without an open public meeting. So, you know, you can tell people that, but it's hard for them when they don't hear anything from us. And they're very anxious, and this is a really -- a time when -- passionate folks that care about their
industry. So this is the time when we can speak.

And I agree that it may require a quick response from the Commission. And I would recommend that we designate our chairman to work with staff to be able to respond in a timely manner, if we get a call about, what do we think about this legislation? What do we think of this? I think our staff is fully briefed and could assist. And Chairman, you could, you know, be able to respond for all of us with regard to this matter.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You know, the -in typically, when there are discussion of changing the law in the legislature, we typically take the position, and we have so far on this one, that we don't have any comment. Our job is to implement the law not write it. And if the law changes, you know, that's for example what we've said about the change in the drinking hours. You know, we've not taken any position on that.

This is different in the sense, first of all, we do have this, sort of,
semi-fiduciary role, but it's also different because at the request of the legislature we put in legislation that we think would give us the tools, and give the industry the tools to come up with a strategic plan where the Racehorse Development Fund might be able to be put to use for a strategy that could sustain the thoroughbred industry. We don't know for sure. But at least we think, with that reform legislation we would have a chance.

So by our own statements so far, by our own actions, it's sort of nonsensical to eliminate the Racehorse Development Fund until you pass the reform legislation, which our statute calls for, and see how the industry is playing, and see whether a holistic approach, holistic strategy that has the Racehorse Development Fund as part of a reregulated industry works.

So we could take a proactive
position. We could write a letter to that effect, as well as be willing to speak. But I was wrestling with the same problem you're describing, which I couldn't -- I can't
represent us unless we've decided to take that.

So the question, I guess, is even a little bit more specifically than the way Commissioner Cameron formed it. Should we take a proactive position and state our, sort of, implicit judgment that to eviscerate or radically alter the Racehorse Development Fund prior to passing the reform regulation legislation does not make sense.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. Very well-put. I agree with that. And I think we should educate where we can and be vocal about how we responded. There's two drafts, actually, of proposed 128D. An original one and a modified one, if I remember correctly.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And explain
that, you know, it is, after all, their -- at the legislature's prerogative, really, to do what they will with -- with the Racehorse Development Fund. There are many other areas, of course. But I think it's very important for us to explain it in the sense that -- you
know, the way that you just spoke. If you wanted to make this work, you are to consider these other tools that we already alerted you to, as intended. And if they don't, well, that's also their prerogative. But I think we should -- we should make that very -- very clear.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Commissioner Macdonald and Stebbins, are you okay with that?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I'm in a hundred percent agreement. I think

Commissioner Cameron stated it well, and, Mr. Chairman, I think you stated it well. You know, giving us a chance, you know, to -- you know, we've seen the success, as

Commissioner Cameron pointed out, of how -you know, what this reenergized fund has meant to the standardbred industry and harness racing in Massachusetts.

And hopefully, we can find a place for thoroughbreds to run in Massachusetts and, you know, realize that same benefit. You know, having a window, or having an
opportunity with the -- with the reform bill that's in front of lawmakers as well, to give us that chance to use the fund with a great deal of discretion, you know, to see what's out there and see how we can bring thoroughbred racing back and hopefully have it achieve the same level of success that harness racing has.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.
Mr. Macdonald?
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Yeah. I agree with the sentiments that have been expressed by others. I think it would be an enormous shame and would comprise an institutional failure, if our legislative mandate with regard to the -- to the support and creative shepherding of the thoroughbred and standardbred industries became imperiled by these stop gap -- what appear to be stopgap legislative initiative.

So I'm completely supportive of the notion of our -- of our -- designating our chairman to be the point person to express, in the strongest terms, the views that have been
expressed today.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: And I
would -- I would add to that, and maybe
Chairman you didn't hear it back from us, but encourage you to the degree that you can work with staff to be, maybe, in a more proactive mode on this one.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think I would -with your approval, I would draft a letter, I think, and send it to the legislature, as well as be available to speak to the issue, if anybody asks.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: There's a full consensus.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Do we need a -- we don't need a vote for that, just a consensus? Okay. All right. Great. Thank you. That was a helpful conversation.

MR. BEDROSIAN: So Mr. Chairman, I think the discretion is now with the Commission. We could go on to Item 4A, the 2017 MGM operations workforce development plan. In our minds, I think we had planned to take lunch around 12:45, so that still gives
us about a half-hour, if we want to continue?
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Jill --
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Were they
prepared to -- I heard that --
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Lunch is here.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Michael Mathis was going to come in the afternoon. Was he -were they prepared --

MR. BEDROSIAN: Yeah. This is not on this.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: This is not on --

MR. BEDROSIAN: Not on this, no. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: No, no. This would be 4A.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: This is for
Marikate.
MR. BEDROSIAN: Yeah, 4A. I think
-- I think they are prepared.
MS. GRIFFIN: MGM is ready to go.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is that -- can we
do that in a half-hour or so, do you think?
MS. GRIFFIN: I think so.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Marikate is saying
yes.
MS. MURREN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Then, let's go on to Item No. 4A and we'll have lunch after that.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Okay. Great.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good afternoon.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Good
afternoon.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good
afternoon.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good afternoon.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good afternoon.

MS. MURREN: Good afternoon. Is it? Or is it morning?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: It is. It's afternoon.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's afternoon.
MS. MURREN: Welcome to Springfield. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Happy to be here.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Thank you.
MS. GRIFFIN: So I'm going to just provide some introductory comments and turn it over to Marikate Murren, who's -- you know well as the vice president of workforce development for MGM.

So today you're scheduled to vote on the MGM Workforce Development Plan, which MGM originally presented on March 2nd at our public meeting here in Springfield, I believe. And so, in your packet you have the original plan. You also have the public comments that were received. We put this -- the plan up for public comment for well over a month, and we received two public comments. The MCCTI, representatives from the Springfield Community College and Holyoke Community College commented. And, also, Bob LePage, assistant secretary for the Department of Higher Ed. provided remarks as well.

There was a more recent
correspondent -- correspondence from MCCTI, which described their joint efforts with MGM to address the workforce demands and training
requirements. And, additionally, I included correspondence from The Executive Office of Labor and Workforce Development undersecretary, Jennifer James, that noted that MGM seems to have satisfied the condition 15 of their license agreement, to create a plan in consultation with the Department of Labor to market and offer opportunities to unemployed residents. So I'm going to turn it over for Marikate for some brief remarks and then...

MS. MURREN: Great. Thank you, Jill. And welcome, Commissioners, to Springfield, again. It's a pleasure to be with you to answer any questions on the Workforce Development Plan for MGM Springfield.

Bus just to give you very brief overview, with Alex Dixon coming on as our general manager, we -- he and I have really been spearheading the MCCTI relationship with Holyoke Community College and STCC. As you know, they have partnered to form TWO, which is training and workforce options. That is a
major, major success for us, as we work with Jeff Hayden, vice president at Holyoke Community College, to establish the training school and that program. I will not steal his thunder. He will be here with the president so I'll defer questions, if that's all right with you. I'll answer high, but $I$ just don't want to steal his thunder on the presentation that he will be delivering.

But it is our intent, as delivered in the Workforce Development Planning presentation that we gave you and the Commissioners, to open that school in that January time frame, as we ramp up and bring the on-boarding of our vice presidents of table games, vice presidents of slots and their underlings to help us implement the gaming school, more detailed plans and timelines to address some of the comments brought to either the public or by -- from Bob LePage will be addressed.

I really want those owners and those leaders as part of the executive committee to really take over that gaming school. And a
lot of those answers, also, will be brought to
you during the submission of the application from the MCCTI here for Springfield. And I know Jeff Hayden will go into detailed length of that.

So I would welcome any comments, concerns or questions you might have of the Workforce Development Plan. And Wanda Gispert sends her regards and is unfortunately not here. But we did speak, so I'm happy to answer on her behalf also, as our lead for workforce development.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So you were not going to go through the presentation, I suppose?

MS. MURREN: That wasn't my intent. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay.

MS. MURREN: I think we -- I think we ran, maybe, even a little long at last time, because we could talk workforce for hours. I really would defer to all of you with any questions you might have.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I did have one, or a couple of questions towards -- in
terms of timing.
MS. MURREN: Yes.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And if it's possible to go to the schematic that lays out the time frame.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: What page is it?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Oh, sorry. It's towards the end.

MS. MURREN: Is that the master time frame, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. A timeline that looks like a critical --

MS. MURREN: Like a Gantt?
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, you
know, like a schedule, yeah. So roughly, somewhere -- elsewhere, maybe in the next slide, you talk about a target date, a milestone, for the MCCTI school opening. Maybe in the winter of 2017. Is that --

MS. MURREN: Actually, we're
looking -- the intent is for January of 2018 of the opening of the gaming school.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. And
then, there's also a -- another key milestone that I see here, the Holyoke Community College Center for Hospitality and Culinary Arts, right, maybe targeted for...

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Summer.
MS. MURREN: That's this summer. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: This summer?

MS. MURREN: Yes.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And if I take, I guess, those two milestones and we also allow for, in general, time towards obtaining a GED, which is -- seems to be, in some cases at least, a bit of a prerequisite to joining those, what can we say, in terms of time frame? Are there enough people in the pipeline obtaining GED, let's say, so that they'll be ready for those -- for those positions, or are some of those efforts going to happen in parallel?

MS. MURREN: I believe there are enough in the pipeline. I think Jeff Hayden and the letter submitted to you by TWO really goes into a detailed analysis and description of their high-set, which is the GED for

Massachusetts, adult basic education and ESOL, those pipelines continue to be filled.

And I think the most critical thing I'd want to stress to the Commissioners and everyone listening, is the urgency for those who are interested in being a candidate. This is a very different project for MGM. This is truly workforce development. It is not a hiring exercise, something that we would do in Vegas.

So I would stress that, if there is an individual that does need a high-set, does need ABE, ESOL, is to visit our education partners. Go to Holyoke. Go to STCC. We need to assist with building that capacity. But there are, from what Jeff -- and I can have -- defer to him a little bit later, is there are spaces, but that also will run in parallel.

The good news is, I think if you recall, we will have a very small handful of job descriptions and opportunities within MGM Springfield that does not require a high-set. And then, once they do become a team member
and part of the family, we do have a commitment to ensure that we provide that as a team member and a family member of MGM Springfield.

So we'll have a pipeline and be able to open that up a little bit more. Have candidates come in, become employees, and then we would provide that high-set as part of an employment assistance program that we currently provide.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And by
"high-set" you mean, ESOL and adult --
MS. MURREN: High-set is the GED for the Commonwealth. It's just their new name for the GED.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, really.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So is there
a -- I was flipping through the pages as well and I found this graph very helpful, the one where you have the labor force participation on the different cities.

MS. MURREN: Yes.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Notably,

Springfield. And maybe this is a question for someone else, like Jeff or others, but do you have a sense as to that -- that figure of unemployed Springfield residents, where might they be in terms of high-set skills or --

MS. MURREN: You know, I do want to bring a little bit of an update from SkillSmart. As you know, that's our application where we're communicating to individuals to go in, register, and to build a profile. We're using that system, really as our communications through e-notifications.

When someone does build a profile, Commissioner, we are asking where their highest education level right now. And we actually are really pleasantly surprised, encouraged that most people currently in the system have a high-set or a GED.

Now, to be clear and transparent, we have about 3,500 people. And those numbers will be driven and will increase as we have additional outreach and have events. But currently, we are very encouraged by the current level of education. But no, that we
haven't really hit everyone in the population. And to your point about the timeline, that marketing outreach and that urgency will begin in this July and August time frame, to really get out to people. To create the urgency, and to encourage people to go to training and education programs. Because we -- next week we're going to be about 14 months out. So I can't stress enough of creating urgency, getting people to Holyoke and to STCC, getting into culinary programs, credit or noncredit. And also, we'll start to do some advertising for the gaming school three months prior to opening to create awareness and excitement for those positions, and then we'll do some targeted for our residents of Springfield and our surrounding communities.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.
And you, I'm sure, are aware of the -- Jill's memo and recommendation to approve the Workforce Development Plan with a condition to come back with some more specifics on the 35 percent --

MS. MURREN: Yes, sir.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- threshold? Without revealing any trade secrets, is there anything that you can speak to at this point, or can you come back within that time frame?

MS. MURREN: Oh, I will definitely be ready within that time frame. I think that, as Wanda and Renata, the two leads on the workforce development, we are going to be doing targeted events for city of Springfield, whether they are residents or veterans, and those who are unemployed and underemployed. As you recall, that's part of our diversity program that you approved in, I think it was January of 2015.

So there'll be targeted events. And I would like to bring back, in that 90 days, those time frames with you, because I also need to engage Jennifer James from labor and workforce, to make sure we're on the same page and also include participation across. Because this really is a collaborative impact that we're doing. Not only for us as the businesses but for others. Because, as you
recall, we have made commitments to assist some of our small businesses with backfilling. As people will organically move from position to position, we need to make sure that we are leading that backfilling in the education and training for all of Springfield.

So I wouldn't want to tell
everything right now. But within that 90 days or sooner, we'll have a plan for you, sir.

MS. GRIFFIN: I would add that the gaming school is a big part of that puzzle. And I understand, we'll hear later, that they've made significant progress and have had, I guess, promising conversations so I'm encouraged.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I had a question about the gaming school. It's opening -- it seemed to me, when I read this, that it's opening late. Meaning, January and you're opening casino the same year. I suppose all that will give these folks an opportunity to do is get some kind of a certificate, not an actual associate's degree
or -- so I just -- are there plans to expand this program to include higher education, for example, an associate's degree? I'm thinking of the Bristol program and what they're offering.

MS. MURREN: So if I may just jump
in. We do not believe it is late, based on best lessons learned from National Harbor. It's a little bit of a different environment here. Different than DC, where we've had many, many experienced table game dealer where we stole, with pride, some of the best people from Horseshoe and the other casinos.

What we do worry here is providing enough cohorts to get enough people through the pipeline to fill those about 500 positions on the table games side. We have about 80 on the poker side. So we would really like to audition and interview at least a three-to-one. So now, as we go up that pipeline we're at that 1,500. And I am stealing, sorry, Jeff, a little bit of your thunder. But then, how do we get more people into the gaming school?

We do worry about decay of knowledge and skill set. And so, what our game plan is to offer practicums over the weekends and off hours, and actually run cohorts during a 24/7-hour period so people can get used to working second and third shift. Because if they can't come to a training program during those time frames, we might have some challenges getting people to work.

We do not believe it's late. But remember, we will shut down the gaming school to get the resort open. And then, there are plans for then to reopen, because that workforce development will never stop. It never does. We will have some attrition and people moving. So we're encouraged. That gives us nine months.

And I think Jeff Hayden will go through a little bit more of what those cohorts look like. How many people we have to put through the school by game. And I think our timeline does meet the needs of the resort. And also, will meet the needs of the city residents who are looking for
opportunities.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I guess I
was thinking of advancement, which I know your company is -- it's something that's important, to groom and give those who started a lower-level position opportunities to move up. And I was impressed with -- and I know around the country there are schools that will offer, you know, tourism, hospitality, start with an associate's degree at a local community college, and I guess I just haven't seen that here.

MS. GRIFFIN: Commissioner, I think this is a different model. This is a -- more of a workforce training model where individuals could take their credits and enter into the community college. But after TWO, or 2-1/2 months, they could actually get a job after this workforce training program. So it's -- it's on the other side of the house. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So those higher-level positions that do require education, I guess that education wouldn't have to be specific because -- since it's not
offered in Western Mass.
MS. MURREN: That's true. Most of the positions that do require higher education is a degree. And there are a lot of cross-synergies and collaborations with relative work experience and the education.

I do want to bring up, is that we do have a relationship with American International College. We have partnered with them to provide an MBA in casino management. They have written that curriculum. But also in your packets, if you recall from March, we provided a couple of slides that talked about the step-up and the progression within the gaming side. Is that you would start as a dealer -- and I think it's a little bit towards the back of the book, sir. So you start within the experience. You get some type of education, formal education, whether it's through the gaming school. You spend some time as a dealer, and then you would step up into being a lead. More years, more experience, more training that we would provide as the employer, and then stepping up
into a floor supervisor, a pit boss, and then, ultimately, a vice president.

So to answer your question, not so much on the credit side. But $I$ think it's a wonderful opportunity that TWO and some of the other education partners could get into. But this, as Jill mentioned, is on the noncredit side and the workforce development.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Maybe I
misunderstood -- I didn't get some of your introductory remarks. But Bob LePage, in response to the first draft had this whole series of issues where he thought that the plan was lacking. Are they being addressed in the presentation that's coming? Is that what you were --

MS. MURREN: Yes, they are.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.
MS. MURREN: And they are also
addressed in the May 16 th letter that was submitted by Jeff Hayden and Jeremiah Riordan that the community colleges and our training partners are providing those services.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.

MS. MURREN: And Jeff will also, and the presidents will also make remarks towards that, sir.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Great.
MS. GRIFFIN: And I think they're also detailed in our request for more information regarding the Springfield plan.

MS. MURREN: For the 35 percent, correct.

MS. GRIFFIN: For the 35 percent Springfield residents, rather.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Are we all
set? Any other comments, questions? Somebody want to frame a question -- a motion?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr. Chair, I
would move that the Mass Gaming Commission approve the MGM Springfield Operational Workforce Development Plan with the provision that within 90 days further details be presented back to the Commission with respect to a specific plan for targeting the 35-percent employment target for the city of Springfield.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?

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

MS. MURREN: Great. Thank you. I
look forward to seeing you.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. Great. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

MS. MURREN: It's been a pleasure.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Knock 'em dead.
MS. GRIFFIN: Thank you.
MR. BEDROSIAN: Mr. Chairman,
it's -- it's 12:36. This might be an
appropriate time to break for lunch. We just might want to let our viewers know when we will be resuming.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. I think we'll take a half-hour.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Sure.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And so, shortly after one o'clock.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Sounds good.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. Great. We are temporarily adjourned.
(A recess was taken)
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It is a little after 1:05. Are you ready, Director Griffin?

MS. GRIFFIN: Good afternoon.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. So
we'll start with Item No. $4 B$ on the agenda.
MS. GRIFFIN: Chairman Crosby, I know you -- you ask me often for updates on how the community colleges are doing. And we thought it would be a great time today to provide you an update on the Western Mass -Massachusetts efforts.

So here we have -- let's see, from the far left we have -- my left we have Jeffrey Hayden from Holyoke Community College. We also have Dr. John Cook from Springfield Technical Community College, and Dr. Christina Royal from Holyoke Community College.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Great.
MS. GRIFFIN: So I think Dr. Cook is going to kick it off.

MR. COOK: We're getting our act together. We're new around these parts.

MS. ROYAL: And I'm newer than him so...good afternoon.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good afternoon.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Good afternoon.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good afternoon.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good afternoon.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good afternoon.

MS. ROYAL: My name is Christina Royal. And I just started in January as president of Holyoke Community College, and most recently moved here from the Twin Cities, Minnesota so I'm getting my bearings on all level in the community, in the state, and at the institution. So I'm very excited to be here and to really get up to
speed and immersed in this wonderful project that we have with Springfield Technical Community College and MGM, and really looking forward to ways that we can really transform this economy, to be honest with you. It's much bigger than the institutions or MGM. I look at this as a huge economic development initiative. And I think we are prized to really transform Western Massachusetts, so that's very exciting.

One of the things that $I$ wanted to stress as coming in new, is I've had a chance to meet with President Cook, as well as the other Western Massachusetts presidents, and really talk about the local region, the economic development initiatives, the needs in the local community. And I'm very excited that we're able to build off of an existing partnership with Springfield Technical Community College and really come together under the umbrella of our TWO program, the training and workforce options initiative, where we have an existing partnership.

```
    I think John and I are both
```

committed to expanding that entity with our gaming initiatives and looking at how we can collaboratively look to make sure that, not only MGM's workforce needs are taken care of, but that, you know, we have vibrant job opportunities within gaming, culinary arts programs and hospitality management to be able to really help the local region, both with job opportunities and also with businesses. So with that, I'm going to turn it over to my colleague for an introduction. We're later going to have Jeff Hayden walk through some details in a presentation. But I just wanted to say that I'm grateful to be here and look forward to working with you all. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you. COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Thank you. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Welcome. MR. COOK: Good afternoon, Commissioners. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good afternoon. COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Good afternoon.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good
afternoon.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good
afternoon.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good
afternoon.
MR. COOK: Again, John Cook. I'm the very proud president of the Springfield Technical Community College. This is our 50th year so quite an anniversary for us. We are quite pleased with $H C C$ to be that most affordable choice for many families and students here in the region. I'll try not to take up too much of your time and give the time over to our presentation. But just a few details that you'll find in some of the literature we push in your direction, but also something that's maybe not as obvious.

For STCC in particular, 85 percent of our students live within 8 -miles of the college. Half of our students are graduates of Springfield Public Schools. So as you think about the local obligations and the commitment to a local workforce, please know our community colleges are very
well-positioned to really contribute to that ecosystem.

I heard earlier conversation around, sort of, the pathways and the career possibilities. This is why community colleges, I think, are so appreciative of the chance to partner, is we often will take that high-school-equivalency individual, already give them a student ID, they think of themselves as a student, and they come and hey do take that one-year certificate with us, which they parlay into that two-year associate's degree with us and then they, let's say, persist on through an entity like the Commonwealth commitment that caps their bachelor's degree at 30,000 and that's how they move on to a UMass or a Westfield State. That's our ecosystem that's really central to us, and really important to, again, those families.

Depending upon where your questions may -- may land and what you want to ask a little bit more on, $I$ think, again, between our two institutions we are well-positioned
with the array of programs. We even do have -- yes, we don't have a casino management degree, let's say, explicitly right now, but we do fast track customer service, we do business management, IT and security. So all of those things that are not just front of the house, or sort of at the table, are also, we anticipate, the types of needs for MGM here. Lastly, in terms of scale, it's not lost on myself and President Royal that we're looking at, you know, upwards of $14,15,000$ applicants to land at the workforce that we need. So just know that at any given time, between our two institutions, we have about 12,000 students. And not that we can walk them down State Street or just have them pop down 91 to the doors there, but I think we carry a reasonable amount of optimism about how that translates to this next phase, the renaissance of the city.

I would say, lastly for the good of
the order, just know President Royal and I carry a great deal of trust with one another. Before I think either one of us started we
heard about this thing called Two and knew we had to have our act together when it comes to that. So I think you'll find, even if we can't be at all the meetings, we are -- really have one mind when it comes to making sure that we do well by this. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Thank you. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. And just for the record, we're very much aware of the fact that you're both new to the game and have -- I'm most appreciative of how seriously that you've taken this and that you're taking the time to come. I'm sure you're both drinking out of fire hoses so thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr.
Chairman, one quick question. President Cook, you pointed to the fact you have 12,000 students between your two facilities. You've engaged in other conversations with your higher ed. colleagues at the other colleges, what does that population grow to, in terms of students up and down the valley in higher education, even a ballpark number if you have
it?
MR. COOK: UMass is always the big one out there, up in Amherst. I'm trying to think if I know the undergrad population off the top of my head. I mean, it might be as big as 15,000, you know, at the undergrad level. Greenfield Community College, sort of at the tip of the valley there, is another 2,000 students. And even when we look west a little bit at Berkshire Community College, I think there may be 1,800 .

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.
MR. COOK: And of course, just across the river at Westfield State, I think they have also 6,000 students.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.
MR. COOK: So, again, there are definitely some possibilities when we sort of look to education as a key point of engagement, not just community colleges.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: You think of that pool that we've always talked about from the beginning, in terms of the number of people into the funnel to get out the MGM
employees that they need. And to your point, you can't walk everybody down State Street and encourage them to sign up. But throw in your other public higher ed. colleagues, you throw in the private colleges, we're well surpassing that pool, in terms of availability, if this is the career path people want to take.

MS. ROYAL: I just like to add that to that, that I think there's also a population of folks that aren't at the colleges right now that we'll really be able to connect with. Folks that are either unemployed or under employed that haven't yet made a decision to go back to a community college for a career change, but, you know, might be bracing for something like that, some type of transition in their career. And so, I think there's a lot of potential about what we'll be able to tap into in the western part of Massachusetts, both in the existing capacity, as well as the growth capacity at both institutions.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: If I could
speak to that point. President Royal, I have
experience in Atlantic City. And lots of people, right, that did not have any kind of degrees got lower-level jobs in Atlantic City. And the partnership that the casinos had with Atlantic Community College and then later on, Stockton State College, within 30 minutes of the casinos.

I think there was so many people who never thought they were college material. They just couldn't -- you know, you get a certificate you still don't know that you're college material, if you get a certificate in something to -- gaming related. And between the casinos offering opportunities for advancement and the colleges offering programs that worked with shift work made a huge difference. They'd start -- they had jobs in the casinos. They'd start with the associate's program that was connected, do you know? And they were encouraged, a lot of people to start there. And once they -- after a semester they thought, wow, I can go to college, I just passed four classes.

And so many people then getting
their associate's degree. There were programs -- this is -- I'm talking many, many years ago, but programs -- similar programs with those in law enforcement. And the same thing, I never thought of myself as college material. And so, that's -- those are the individuals. And those partnerships, I think, really make a difference, because if you're being encouraged not only by the colleges but also by your employer, hey, they'll be opportunity for you to move up. I think you should consider this program at the community college.

So I just -- I hope to see that same kind of synergy here with individuals who would not have considered going back to school without that encouragement.

MS. ROYAL: I would echo your statements, Commissioner. In my former life, I was in Cleveland, Ohio and the community had brought Horseshoe Casino online there in downtown Cleveland, and my institution had the training contract for both the gaming side, as well as we had created, invested in downtown

Cleveland in a hospitality center for culinary arts.

So I think we saw the same thing with the gaming contract, in terms of a lot of the expected employees came from a lot different populations than we had nationally expected to begin with. So I do think that I expect that we would see the same trend here as well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's great
experience to bring to our table. I didn't know about that. That's great.

MS. ROYAL: It feels like deja-vu. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah, really.

Great. Fortunately, somebody that knows what they're doing.

MS. ROYAL: I wouldn't go that far. MR. HAYDEN: So if I might jump in, I think, you know, to get right to the bottom line. I think there's two key issues that we need to be concerned with, with the development of training for casino jobs and casino-related jobs and the gaming school. And those two things are recruitment, getting
enough people from the community to get into those jobs, and then, obviously, the whole notion of how do we scale that up and how do we fund that? Those are the two primary issues.

And so, when we look at the overall labor challenge for the gaming industry in Massachusetts, and specifically for MGM here in this region, it's a big hill to climb. It's a need for at least 20,000 people to be thinking about gaming and gaming-related jobs and the service-related jobs. And then, when you start to look at the challenge for the gaming itself, there's a large number of people that need to be recruited, a large number of people that need to go through that funnel and be ready to take those jobs.

As Dr. Cook said, at the community colleges there's 12,000 students, and there's probably another 6,000 students who are taking workforce-development-related programs. And whether that be at a very basic level, adult basic education speakers, English speakers of other languages, high-set preparation, GED
preparation, workplace skills training, culinary training, customer service training, those types of things, all the way up into industry-recognized credentials.

And so, that population that we have of somewhere around 18,000 people that come to either community college is part of what we need to tap into, and need to tap into aggressively. But also, we need to look at our workforce development in the region and figure out how we can get more people in the pipeline for education and training, especially those who might be unemployed underemployed, opted out of workforce and have them return.

I mean, we're in one of those very unique storms, right? We have -- in Western Massachusetts we have a very limited labor pool that's available because of a high level of employment in the region. Unfortunately, most of those folks who are unemployed, underemployed are in the urban core of the region, in Springfield, Holyoke, Chicopee, and other neighboring components of that core.

And so, in order to find enough people, we need to take those people who are -- those $11,000,12,000$ people and try to get them back into the workforce. So that's a huge challenge.

And the other thing is, you know, our population is flat in Western Massachusetts, our immigration into the region is flat. And so, it's really about trying to take people who have opted out of the workforce or not been able to be in the workforce to get them the skills and the resources they need.

The -- you know, and this is the model, in terms of the workforce model that we're using across the state with Massachusetts Casino Careers Training Institute. It's about making sure that other industries know about the workforce challenges. And so, we've done things in finance, we've done things in banking, we've done things in manufacturing and health care in order to try to scale-up the workforce so that, in the event that some of their
employees might be attracted by positions at MGM, here's the opportunity for them to grow and to do more on their own as individual businesses not associated with -- with casino gaming.

Obviously, want to make people aware of jobs. We want to assess their skills. We want to make sure they've got proper counseling to be ready for training. Not ready for the job. Ready for training. And then, also get them the training and place them in jobs. That's a cree -- a key component.

Along with Jeremiah Riordan from Springfield Technical Community College, we've been working on five key areas. One is the career launch that MGM has done with SkillSmart. And we've been a partner in that to try to make sure that people are aware of the occupations. And we've done, already, probably close to 40 or 50 outreach sessions in that regard. We've also created courses in related to key skills that have been identified by SkillSmart and done all those
types of things.
The four other initiatives on the screen I'll go into a little bit more detail. So one is the hospitality and culinary center that we're developing, the current programming we have, the grant activity we have. And then, more detail on the gaming school because I know that's something we want to talk more about.

So with our culinary institute, it's an investment at the corner of Appleton and Race in downtown Holyoke of between six and $\$ 7.5$ million. Construction's in process. It's going along really fast. All the internal framing is up and all that kind of fun stuff.

We're looking for November 1st opening of the center, with our workforce development programs taking place there immediately. And then, in January, our credit program with our culinary certificate, and with our various associate's degrees, our management degrees, our hospitality management, food service management degree
will be offered.
And two key components to be aware of. One is, we've created a remedial track for hospitality and culinary. And what that mean is, someone who might normally go into developmental education in math or English, we're providing a series of linked courses in math, English and culinary, so it's all going to be contextualized, is at that remedial level.

So somebody coming into the program, who might not meet the -- some of the entrance requirements will be able to take that in one semester before the program starts. So we're hoping to enroll folks this summer into that program and test it out as a pilot to begin with.

The other thing is, there'll be a new certificate program that we'll offer, and then a new two-year associate will be developed a year from now. So some of those things that Commissioner Cameron was talking about, in terms of certificates or degrees that lead to more education, these are the
types of things that will connect students to Johnson and Wales in Rhode Island, or connect them to UMass Amherst, connect them to various management-related programs at Eisenberg. Eisenberg does have an option for casino gaming as well.

So we'll really concentrate an awful
lot, in terms of those credit students, so that they see it not as an opportunity to get a job, but to have a career. So that's really our focus there.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Jeff, just on average, what do -- how long do those certificates take, the remedial and the new credit certificate that you spoke about?

MR. HAYDEN: So that'll be in the summer --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah.
MR. HAYDEN: -- done. So it'll be --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So three months remedial?

MR. HAYDEN: It'll be anywhere from a eight- to 10-week program.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right.
MR. HAYDEN: So, in other words, someone who is coming out of high school says, I want to take this program, they do the testing, they find out that they're at the remedial level. Then, they take this program and then they're ready for the classes in September, as opposed to coming in in September and having to take remedial work and then pushing back their course work further.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. And then, the regular one would take about a year? MR. HAYDEN: Yeah. So we are streamlining it to 24 credits so that it certainly can be accomplished in two semesters. And so, someone who's interested in, perhaps, taking some intersession courses and summer courses, you know, can squeeze that in even shorter period of time.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. And have you figured the capacity of that first class?

MR. HAYDEN: So in terms of the summer cohort, we have two sections being
offered, which would be 32 individuals. And again, this summer is a pilot and so we'll scale that up. But our hope is that, overall, on the credit side of the training we'll have somewhere around 300 individuals in culinaryand hospitality-related programs. And so, those -- 300 of those, probably, a third of them, at some point, will need that remedial program.

And, you know, I won't talk about the ongoing programs that we have. I will just highlight two new ones. One is the securities training certificate that Jeremiah and the team at Springfield Technical Community College have developed, as well as an interesting one. I kind of like it, The Brew Master's License Program. But both of those show the flexibility and the ability of the community colleges to adapt quickly to develop programs that meet specific needs.

And so, the security training certificate is one that, after discussions with folks at MGM, as well as other leaders in that areas, was put together in order to
address the need for -- for folks who need a little bit more detail, in terms of security-related positions.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So that's -that's targeted for casino security?

MR. HAYDEN: Yes, it is.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Like, would it include surveillance training for this --

MR. HAYDEN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It would. Great.
MR. HAYDEN: And then, obviously, the other area is the whole gaming school curriculum. And as I -- we will have an application in to the Commission, in terms of the gaming school, hopefully, within a month. And in that application we'll meet all the requirements of the application process.

But one of things that we have done, we've developed a curriculum with the help of our many partners, and we have begun to run that by the state officials at the Department of Labor and Workforce Development. And so, their approval will be key to what you need to see, as this being a certified program and one
that can be offered in the state.
In terms of grant activity, you know many of the grants we have, but I would summarize it very quickly and say that we have about $\$ 300,000$ worth of grant activity ongoing right now. We're looking that we want to have about 500 to $\$ 600,000$, at least, in the fall or early spring of next year.

What that type of grant money does, it enables us to do training without any cost to individuals and -- but as you can imagine, that only goes a short distance, in terms of the cost of training. And so, we will continually seek new opportunities for funding and would seek your support in that regard.

The -- in terms of things in process, you know, obviously, one of the key areas that we can work with is the issue of hospitality and culinary workers for the region, and do specific business-focused applications in regard to training to scale-up on that end and, hopefully, that will have an impact on the MGM project as well.

And now to go into a little bit more
detail about the -- the actual gaming school planning that we've done to date. This is something actually we've been working on almost two years, in terms of all the different issues that need to be addressed. And I'll go through some key dates, some of the assumptions we used, some of the assumptions we're using in terms of the proforma and -- and then talk about funding models and suggest some next steps.

In terms of timing, the culinary arts center, which right now I think the favored name, although we're not done with the naming process, but is the MGM HCC Culinary Institute, but we'll figure that out down the road. But that will open in November, and the credit programs will open at the beginning of the spring semester.

The -- earlier Commissioner Zuniga asked about the timing of -- and opening of the gaming school, and perhaps this slide is what confused folks. So we are looking at doing some of the classroom-related training in the fall of this year, in order to make
sure that we have enough capacity to meet the need and the number of cohorts that we need to do the gaming training.

When MGM mentions that we're going to open the gaming school in January or February, what they mean is the lab that will be part of their facility will be available to us at that time period. But, obviously, this fall will be a heavy recruitment period for us, and then we'll get some folks through some of the basics.

As you recall from your regulations, there's a requirement for them to have education on the gaming law, on problem gaming, on safety and emergency training, like CPR and those types of things. So those -there's about 40 or 50 hours of those requirements, including customer service, that we would offer this fall and -- as a way to try to get cohorts started so that we can have them day one get right into the gaming training when the lab opens.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Are you seeing enough interest in those programs for this
fall?
MR. HAYDEN: I would say, no. And I think that's really a function of a couple things. One is, you know, people have to have a sense that these jobs are there and ready and all that. And I think part of the work that you all have always done, but I think even now more so, we need to trumpet the fact that there are workforce development and job opportunities for people, and now's the time for them to start thinking. As Marikate said earlier, to think about, do I need my high-set? Do I need a particular certificate, or do I need to finish my associate's degree, or my bachelor's degree? So I think the more that all of us as a team can trumpet that fact that, you know, it's -- now is the time for people to get engaged, that would be very important.

And then, obviously, the dates you know from MGM. Their career center will open sometime in the -- early 2018, and then they'll have mass hiring events in the summer, and then the grand opening in September. So
all of the gaming school activity, obviously is focused to meet those various timelines.

Some of the basic assumptions is
that for every job, that we're going to need at least six people. MGM, as Marikate mentioned earlier, would like to interview three people per occupation. So that means three people that we're going to need to train and scale-up, who might not get employment through this effort. And -- but, obviously, there are dozens of reasons why people don't complete programming, they drop out of programming, they don't meet criteria. All those type of things that familiar with.

We have submitted in the past, and will resubmit that to you when we do the gaming school application, the headcounts that we are basing all of this information on. But as Marikate said, 500 dealers plus 88 poker dealers is a significant number of folks that we need to train.

Some of the great news, and in some senses, it looks like I buried the lead here, is that the gaming school lab is proposed that
it'll be at 95 State Street within the MGM facility. And so, that's a very significant contribution by MGM to this process. And, obviously, we will have an agreement with them, in terms of using that space.

The second great news from MGM is the fact that they will provide the gaming equipment needed to do the training and the related materials. And this will obviously all be done in accordance with the regulations, but, you know, that's another significant contribution that they're making. And the model that we're starting to think about is that we would have at least three terms. So, you know, if we get started in November, the first gaming cohort would start -- in the lab would start immediately in January, or whenever it's opened. And those three terms we would schedule over the spring in order to have people ready for the workforce.

As Marikate said, one of the things that we're worried about is whether or not people's skills fall off. And so, we will
have regular hours every week. Some on Fridays, some in the evenings, and some on Saturdays for people to practice and to continue up their skills. And, frankly, we're looking at how we might require that, as opposed to making it optional.

So in other words, if you're a job seeker and you're looking for this typical -this type of dealer position, then, you know, as part of the gaming curriculum, we want to make sure that they keep those skills fresh. We're looking between 20 and 30 hours a week. And more likely, 30 hours a week. And that the will be in compliance with Section 30 requirements of the state, as well as WIOA requirements.

And then, we will be asking students to pay a nominal fee. All of that cost and fee information we'll submit in our application to you. But, you know as part of -- to give a little preview of the ask later on is really for the Gaming Commission and the state entities to work with MGM and ourselves to try to find additional workforce
training dollars because it's desperately needed. And the goal of that would be to have individuals pay less, as opposed to paying, potentially, six, seven, $\$ 800$.

So in terms of the proforma assumptions, you know, we're looking at direct training and indirect costs, the space cost. And then, in terms of revenue sources, we're looking at grants, the partners, whatever they can contribute. So MGM has already invested in term of those commitments I mentioned earlier, and then in terms of an individual student contribution.

The -- one of the key pieces of
MGM's commitments is also to fund the instruction of the training. And this is a big new piece. And it's a significant investment that will help, again, bring down the total cost.

On average, we're looking at costs -- the total cost for the first year of training about $\$ 2$ million, and we're looking at -- without any offsets, it would be, approximately, between 3,000 and $\$ 5,000$ per
student. With some the types of offsets that MGM has already put in place, with some of the offsets that we hope to obtain through grants, we're hoping to get it down to a 200 or $\$ 300$ fee so that people have a sense of investment and skin in the game, but at the same time it's not onerous. And, obviously, we would figure out scholarship mechanisms as well.

I won't go into these other details, but, obviously, we need to -- to have a yield of at least 1,700 people from the gaming school operations to fill those jobs, if we're going to meet some of those ratios that $I$ mentioned earlier.

And so, this details the funding sources a little bit more. But one of the key pieces really is, A, to have the state approve gaming training, which is a process that we're in the midst of exploring with them as eligible for WIOA vouchers, and then also have dialogues with the regional employment boards in the region to give us a sense of how they can, perhaps, dedicate some of those WIOA
vouchers specifically for gaming and gaming-related positions. That effort will need your support as well.

In terms of various grants, you know that. And this here, this ask that's mentioned, you know, 500 students, $\$ 400$ a student, that's just a rough ballpark. And as we start to finalize the numbers with the gaming school, we'll get that better to you. But if there was an infusion of between 200 to $\$ 500,000$ into training, it could get us to the point where we could offer that training at a very nominal prices to individuals.

The -- and I mentioned al the parts of MGM's commitment. I will say, on a sidenote, that the community college foundations committed to donating $\$ 25,000$ each to do student support services during this whole process, which will help us, especially on the initial intake, to offsets some of the cost in relation to that.

As you can imagine, you know, not only do you have a director of the gaming school, but you also have four or five
recruiters, who are doing all the assessments and all the -- all the placement into training, and then helping with job placement at the end of that.

Next up, the license application, finalize and implement our recruitment strategy. As I mentioned, that needs to take off in the fall. Finalize and schedule the training. As you can imagine, this is kind of a -- a unique matrix that we'll develop in order to get people into the spots. As Marikate mentioned, 24/7, in terms of our approach. And part of that is to make sure that folks are ready to do third-shift work. And so that'll be an opportunity for them to test it out.

And then, the training manuals are complete and we will add on a few more courses, but we'll have all that material to you. And then, obviously as I said funding money. I won't reiterate the needs because I've mentioned them already numerous times. But, obviously, our partnership with you, the Gaming Commission, really is going to rely on
our ability as a united effort to try to identify new financing sources in the -- you know, for the training.

And then, also, to really work on the recruitment effort. How do we make sure that the funnel is large enough to get enough people into the training process so that quality applicants can be done?

And with that, I'd say one final point, and this is more to address the point of Commissioner Cameron from earlier, is the partnership with Johnson and Wales, the partnership with AIC t,he partnership with UMass Amherst, as well as other partnerships that both institutions have, is our standard operating procedures, right.

The -- we work in partnership and collaboration across the board. And whether it's with community-based organizations that are looking to find opportunities for their clients, or whether it's colleges that we're feeding folks to for more information. So we're very comfortable with this collaboration model, and also very comfortable with the fact
that we know that what we do is not the end but just the beginning of opportunities for individuals.

And after all, I'll repeat my mantra, which you've heard many a time. We want to help them get a job, get a better job, and do their job better.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.
MR. HAYDEN: Questions?
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Comments or
questions?
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yeah. Jeff, three points. Marikate touched on this earlier, it's highlighting the urgency for people think about -- whether it's the gaming career or other careers. And you and Jeremiah were, you know, kind of partners with MGM going back to last fall and all the SkillSmart sessions that got rolled out getting people to understand, all right, if $I$ want to make a track towards a chef position, here are all the culinary classes I need to take, all the other requirements.

So again, you know, stressing the urgency, as you pointed out, of don't just expect to walk up to MGM's HR department next September and say, hey, what can I do? We hope people will be, you know, thoughtful about what those opportunities are, as well as begin to kind of stake out a career opportunity themselves.

How much does the gaming school follow the Maryland model? Is it start with required training in Blackjack and then picking up another game, once you complete the Blackjack training?

MR. HAYDEN: So the initial piece will be those required hours of training that are more classroom-based. So that's the way we'll approach it there.

Obviously, to maximize our use of the training lab, we will not have everyone just take Blackjack first. Although, obviously, it will be strongly weighted towards that. So individuals who are doing Poker, that does not require them to have a second game, and so that track will start on
its own. but the majority of folks will start with Blackjack.

But again it's -- you know, how we schedule it and how we arrange it according to the available space and the cohorts will be a key part of our application to you so...

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: And thirdly, again, looking at the model that MGM used in Maryland, I know we all went down and saw the the facility, the help for assistance for students who may need some financial support, that also had a WIOA, if I'm getting the acronym right, that WIOA component for folks that may have not have had the financial means. I'm assuming that the State of Maryland was able to be a partner in that process.

MR. HAYDEN: Right. And so, our hope is to have a dialogue with the Department of Labor and Workforce Development to talk about gaming training, being eligible for WIOA funds, we're pretty sure that they will go in that direction. But, obviously, I'm not speaking for them.

And then, having a dedicated plan for the use of WIOA vouchers in the region is really something we need to work with the Workforce Investment Board with the Regional Employment Board of Hampden County.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Jeff, I had a question. I suspect that it's, obviously, based on experience, not just from you about but from MGM. But these yields, the figures and assumptions that you go towards this funnels, I wonder if there's any worthwhile efforts in trying to decrease those -- those multiples, or is that really what experience it takes, is there needs to be enough people through the pipeline because it's not for everybody and nothing ever is, and people are going to drop off because they make some plans and what have you; but what can you say towards relative to whether it's worthwhile, you know, looking at those ratios?

MR. HAYDEN: Well, and certainly we would want to tighten those ratios where we
can. But you know from common sense and your own experience, right? So you put out a posting for a job. You know, how many responses do you get? You get 200 responses for a job on the Commission? You know. And then, when you start to interview them you say, how many are we going to interview? And so, you know yourself that those ratios are pretty big. And they're probably bigger than what we have assumed here.

For MGM their experience is that three interviews per position is appropriate. But that's based upon the fact that the people who are coming in for those three interviews have all the credentials, have been trained properly, are able to pass the various screenings that are required in these positions, and have the skills training in the particular area.

You know, I'll yield to my partner, Marikate, from MGM, in terms of how the workforce development -- I'm sorry, how the human resource professionals look at that. But, certainly, in terms of the ratios, I
think, you know, yes we want to tighten them, but we're also using common sense to say, geez, seven people per job, six people per job at the top of the funnel is probably realistic.

MS. MURREN: And I would also like to bring to the Commissioner's attention, also, the use of SkillSmart. We will do some targeting, based on the skills -- skills that current and applicants have within the system. Now, those applications and those individuals within those profiles might not pick, let's assume table games, but if we can tell that, based on their skills where they currently are, SkillSmart can basically mind that information for us in that data and tell us, there's a group of about a hundred people who might not have picked table games, and then we could really target market and e-notify them and say, hey, John Doe, you have the skills to be, right now, a table games dealer. There's a class going on, or even if you have experience, here's the information. And that's the way we're also going to use that
system. Not only to get people to get them outreach and notify them of the positions, but also use it as a recruitment tool as we start to get more people into the system to build that pipeline.

MR. COOK: We have a parallel. It's not a perfect one and its scale is smaller. But for us, our health care programs carry a fair bit of demand. And so, let me just walk you through nursing as an example, to show you that we think about these things.

STCC takes about a hundred students in a nursing cohort every fall. We have over 500 applicants for those places. And we have another thousand students in a prehealth option, who really aspire to apply to that. And it's -- for us, some of these gateway courses are things like the ability to take and pass anatomy and physiology.

I think we see some of that kind of rationale with this type of training. There's going to be key courses, key skills that people need to demonstrate and, again, lean on that -- that nice central use of technology.

SkillSmart actually really does bring all these things together. A person can go in and say, this is the job I aspire for. It'll map based on what they've entered to see, do you have those skills and competencies? And if not, HCC or STCC may have them, and they can already look to see when they can take those. So there's some real promise there.

MR. HAYDEN: If you answer the phone and you say, what do you want? Then, obviously, customer service class 101's probably --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. I'm also intrigued both of your comments relative to the training being offered on third shift, for example. We've had already experience with Plainridge where there's a fair amount of turnover, and at least some of it is -- which is also part of the gaming industry, and at least some of it is explained to the notion that people think, yes, $I$ can do the third shift, but when they actually have to do it they think otherwise, at least a portion of them.

MS. MURREN: And it gives applicants and candidates an opportunity, also, to work and get their education. Right? So this is about not, as Jeff mentioned, now, the job now, but really building that career.

We've committed from that for MGM Springfield. We do, in general, from our corporate entity. And that is ultimately the goal, is to really, as you, Commissioner, mentioned early, really progress people through the company. And we've mentioned before, it doesn't necessarily have to be an up-and-down hierarchy. It can be a lateral move into different divisions.

You know, we do have Lorilee, our senior vice president. She presented to you in October of 2014, with the company 27 years, 13 promotions into multiple divisions. So you really can have a long-term career with the company. And that's what we're looking for, really to target our city of Springfield residence first, right? That inner center of the onion, and then also our surrounding communities in the region.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Jeff, I have a question. I'm kind of curious as to -as to what the kind of sources or models of prior experience in other jurisdictions that you've based your proposals on here.

President Royal said that in earlier incarnation that she was, you know, active in Cleveland and, apparently, in a -- in an experience -- in an experience that is significantly, or at least appreciably parallel here. But what are the -- what are the institutions and the jurisdictions that have gone through this before that you have gotten the benefit of the experience of, and what risks or things to avoid or, you know, unanswered, you know, questions are out there that we should be aware of going forward? MR. HAYDEN: Sure. So thank you, Commissioner. Over the two-year period I mean, we've had a study of many different jurisdictions. We've looked at, obviously, the Atlantic City model and how that's used. We had -- initially had a Letter of Intent with Atlantic Cape Community College in terms
of curriculum. President Gentile up at North Shore Community College, you know, was from Atlantic Cape, and so her experience in that area has been useful.

We've also worked with the Maryland casinos, and we've gotten information from Prince George Community College. We've worked with Maryland Live down there as well. We've gotten information from them.

We've studied the Pennsylvania casinos and had opportunity with Mr. DaSilva at Wynn to talk about his experience at Northampton in Pennsylvania, which actually is a model very close to what we're talking about here, and so that's been useful.

We've had a treasure trove of information, obviously, from MGM itself and its international experience. We have looked at Michigan and models there. We've looked at Cleveland.

You know, pretty much a very exhaustive look at what works and what doesn't work, to the point where one of my teammates can tell you how much the gaming training
costs in most of those jurisdictions. So, you know, for the individual student.

And so, I think, you know, we've had an exhaustive approach to it, but we've also come at it with a mindset that we're always open to learn something new and to do something differently, not to be stuck in a model but to create a model that's going to work best for Western Massachusetts and the people of Springfield and the region, and best for our customer, MGM. So that's been the approach we've taken.

I would say to you, Commissioner, that I think the two issues I started with are the two issues we need to be most concerned about. Are we going to get enough people who are going to want to go into training? So -and I'll use a very simplistic example. So if training costs $\$ 3,000$, the number of people that are going to enter into training is going to be very limited. If training costs zero, we might have thousands and thousands of people want to do training.

So I think that's one worry that I
have, is are we going to have enough people?
Are we going to be at a price point, or we going to be at a quality that will -- and to show options to individual learners that will be attractive to them?

You know, I think the end goal for them to get a job with MGM is very attractive. You know, international company and all those types of things, and you've heard all the details about that company. But I do think when it comes to training it's, is it available to me? Is it on my schedule? What about things like childcare and transportation? What about costs, you know? And what's the value added? Can I take the hospitality and culinary workforce training and use that toward credits at the college?

And so, for example, if someone takes Serve Safe, which is an eight-hour program, our culinary hospitality credit program will give someone one credit for that. And so, those types of things, the value-added pieces are what they look for.
And then, secondly, is the -- you
know, how are we going to pay for all of this?
You know, when you look at training and you see the pieces that MGM is willing to support, you know, that's a huge part of it, but there's still more that needs to be done.

It is an initial enterprise of about \$2 million, and then over the next four years, probably averaging about a million dollars. And that's based on the level of turnover that MGM expects, and it's based on the -- you know, the natural turnover that occurs with populations of people who have traditionally been unemployed, underemployed or lacking educational attainment.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Just
following up briefly, are you confident that the -- that the price point that would make for a successful program is actually realistic, in terms of reasonably available funding sources?

MR. HAYDEN: Well so, you know, I think my -- my answer to that would be we still have to identify what those available sources are. And I will say that every entity
that might be engaged in that discussion has shown interest. What we haven't been able to do yet is to get us all in the same boat, all with an agreement of how we're going to do it and to define that.

And so, you know that's some hard work that needs to be done. I'm confident we can do it. And then, obviously, what we land on in terms of price point will be the best we can do. And if -- if it's the best we can do, I would think that we'll not only get enough people to take the training but we'll meet all the goals, in terms of Springfield residents and regional residents.

MR. RIORDAN: Jeff, if I could interject quickly. If you were to compare this to a lot of our existing programs, manufacturing, health care and others, the price point that Jeff and I worked up is much, much lower for the number -- I mean, you're talking about programs that could be two to 300 hours of training that they're going to be receiving. By comparison, those programs would cost a lot more than we've already
priced them at.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And at least one of the sources that you reference is your ask relative to the Community Mitigation Fund that -- some of which, you know, will be analyzed in the next few days; is that correct?

MR. HAYDEN: I wasn't so bold to make it an ask for that specific fund.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No. But you were being very modest.

MR. HAYDEN: But thank you for that recommendation.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No, no. I want to make sure that we're all, you know, understanding what we're all communicating here.

MR. HAYDEN: Thank you. I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else?
Questions? Thoughts?
MR. HAYDEN: So if I might just thank the Commission for your time and your patience. I lost the bet to Jill. We were a
lot longer than $I$ had said we would be and I apologize for that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: No problem.
MR. HAYDEN: But it's been a pleasure to work with you and see you again. And the colleges, in unison, are very grateful for this opportunity.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, we're please
to have seen it evolve since the first meeting we had way back when. So great. Thank you very much. It was very exciting.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you all. Good luck.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Commissioner Bedrosian has -- or Executive Director Bedrosian has suggesting that we make a little scheduled change. We do have quite a few people here who are to be involved in topic 5B, the gaming service employee registration review. I think we'll skip to that topic and then that'll enable people who have come to get that over with. So we'll take about a
five-minute break while you guys get set up for that topic, and we will get going shortly.
(A recess was taken)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Call to order public meeting No. 217. Folks, if you'll take your seats, please. All you glad-handers in the hallway, in the aisle take your seats, please. Before we get to this next topic, we're going to have one other side light. Executive Director Bedrosian had one administrative matter he wanted to bring up.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Sure. So thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. Before we start this important topic, 5B, I did want to recognize a couple gentlemen sitting behind me, Guy Michael and Robert Carroll, who have been with the Commission, I think since the very beginning. In fact, they were IEB. They have been a lot of things to the Commission, including very close confidants. And they, in my first year as executive director, were instrumental in
helping me through this -- through this experience.

Unfortunately, our professional
relationship, while it may end this year, I think our personal relationships with them will always exist. They have been enormously helpful. I think they are part of the reason the Commission and staff is where it is. And I just want to acknowledge them and thank them very much.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you. Yeah.
I would like to -- I'd like to add my two cents worth to that. And there may be others who would like to do the same.

You can't imagine what it is like to have a Bill that says, okay, now we're going to have casinos, and nobody in Massachusetts knows anything about casinos, including the five commissioners. At our first public meeting we were asked by --

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I know you always by --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Pretty much.
Right. So she had some. But at our first
public meeting, I think somebody in the press asked us to stand up if we'd never been in a casino or something like that, and four of the five of us stood up, or something like that. So we had to turn to outside help.

And those are situations where you can be sort of exploited, where you really don't know, you desperately need outside help. And we got luckily and found two men, whose roots are deep in the law enforcement and casino world in New Jersey, who were not only tremendously knowledgeable and helpful, but also tremendously honorable and -- and committed to our success. And have said a couple of times, we want to be paid. We expect to be paid. But we want you to be successful and we'll do anything we can to back you up. So I would like to add my two cents worth to that, Ed, and give a standing applause to our --

MR. CARROLL: We want to just say, we thank you all very much. This is unexpected and overly kind. And it has been our privilege to have been able to, in some
small way, help you guys do what you have magnificently done from scratch, as you pointed out. And it's something that we'll treasure for our entire careers so we thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Go ahead.
MR. BEDROSIAN: Yeah. So if I could also, potentially, help set the stage for this topic. Commissioners, as you remember, and I apologize, $I$ don't remember the date, but I think it was two meetings ago, we started this topic back in Boston. Obviously, it's an incredibly important topic. And by the presence of the folks here today, one that's particularly important to this region.

Since -- I just wanted to update the Commission, sort of, what's happened since the last meeting, which is, staff has worked and met with the folks from MGM on their interpretation of The Gaming Act. And while we absolutely recognize the underlying policy concerns, not only they have, but a lot of
folks in the room have as being genuine, real and very important, we didn't come to an agreement on the interpretation of the act that we thought gave the Commission the regulatory authority to do some of the things that, policywise, I think people would like you to do.

So -- but having said that, our
interactions with MGM were professional, polite. I think we both understood where each other was. We also understood that this was an important -- important topic for people to have a public voice in.

So with that, Mike Mathis and I worked on -- or Mike did at my direction, worked on getting a representative panel of folks to address the Commission today. And to be clear and remind the Commission, we put out a public comment period for people to, sort of, give public comments to the Commission. Those comments are contained in the book. The Commission always takes additional comments at MGC comments, so we're open to hearing more comments.

I will harken back. I think that, in the end, the position of staff harkens back to a memo that the gentleman behind me did in May of 2014, in which they pressed for a legislative solution to this issue but recognized, also, the extreme important policy reasons behind a legislative solution.

So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Mike Mathis and say that staff is here. We have four -- well, three great legal minds here, also, if you have any questions during or at the end of the presentation. So, Mike.

MR. MATHIS: Thank you, Executive Director Bedrosian, Chairman, Commissioners. You know, best-laid plans, I was tasked with choreographing this presentation. And because of some schedule conflicts, I'm going to ask the mayor, to take him out of order because he's got a conflict, because the afternoon's gone a little long. But I'm going to echo many -- in a moment, echo many of the comments that -- that Ed mentioned, because it's been a really collaborative process, this important
issue. The amount of time you've spent on this, you know, is a testament to that. But without further adieu, let me bring the mayor up, and then I'll come back and sort of set the stage for the rest of the presentation. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you.

MR. MATHIS: Mayor Sarno.
MR. SARNO: Thank you very much.
What was the old movie line, go west, young men, young lady? We always enjoy

Chairman Crosby and Commissioner Cameron, Commissioner Macdonald, Commissioner Zuniga, Mr. Baseball himself, Commissioner Bruce Stebbins, coming out here to Springfield. And we've had an outstanding relationship and we deeply appreciate that, as we have had with MGM. And Mr. Director, thank you very much. You're going to probably feel it's sort of unique that I'm known as a law-and-order-type mayor. And I'm going to speak to you pertaining to CORI reform, which I think is extremely important.

I am glad that my colleagues in the state legislature and friends, state
representative Carlos Gonzalez is here, who's well-versed in economic development and job creation, and my colleague, State

Representative Buddy Williams, because I think, eventually, you're going to need some type of legislative edict coming from the state. But in the meantime, we want to press the issue with the Gaming Commission.

Any urban mayor in America will tell you, in order to continue to knock down poverty, the vicious cycle of poverty and public safety issues, three things are essential. One being family, famiglia. 1A, education, which we spoke to earlier, and 1B, jobs. Put our people to work.

For me, in picking the world-renowned MGM to come to the city of the Springfield, besides the economic development and the -- being able to capture tax revenue, jobs. Whether they were white collar jobs or blue collar jobs and putting people to work is part of their identity, self-esteem, less likely to get involved in the vicious cycle of poverty and/or public safety issues.

So what we've come before you here today, and in speaking to the building trades, my friends in the building trades, they have many success stories there that people made a mistake. And again, $I$ am not talking about any type of hideous-type crime. I'm not talking about entitlement and all. I'm talking about people who have earned it and empowering people of all creed, colors and backgrounds, number one, in Springfield, and all the surrounding areas. That, in a fair and common sense approach that the Gaming Commission can look in working with MGM and my administration -- I know president of Springfield MGM, Mike Mathis, will be giving you a delineation of the facts and figures on that, that there might be some type of plausible compromise, where people, again, who have earned this opportunity, who have done well in the community, might have made a mistake some years ago, might have made something that was very minor in nature, but not to close the door completely on them.

I do respect and appreciate the
stringent rules and regulations that have to be put forth in the gaming industry, especially dealing with finances and the integrity and professionalism of that and the Board's activities in that, and MGM and the staff. So we wanted to start this conversation.

As you know, I think we penned a 2014 letter to put this on the horizon of our concerns of getting people that -- you know, have really done the right thing but have a negative mark on their application and might not be able to give the explanation why they should have a second opportunity that they earned.

So the Gaming Commission, I really
appreciate that you're taking the lead on this. But again, $I$ will send a clarion call to the state legislature that CORI reform has been on the docket a recent number of years. And I know it's a balancing act because you don't want to be -- say, geez, are you soft on crime, or you're too hard on crime?

To me, it's just common sense and
fairness for someone, he or she, no matter what creed, color or background, that has earned the opportunity to be able to take advantage of this really huge job generator that MGM -- well over 3,000 jobs when it's opened. We've already -- I think well over a thousand to 1,500 jobs in the construction trades.

And you hear those stories. I think you will hear some of those stories today, where someone, he or she, made a mistake. Not a mistake that was, you know, overpowering or hideous in nature, but did what they had to do, he or she, and have gotten back on their feet to be very productive citizens here in Springfield and Western Massachusetts.

So we would ask the opportunity, as we continue to refine and craft and review the guidelines, that there is some latitude given within reason, where there might be a fit that somebody could earn that opportunity.

> And I'll just close with this:

Again, if you give a person an opportunity to bring themselves up, nine out of 10 times they
end up bringing up their family, in turn, which ends up bringing up their community, which ends up bringing up the whole area, which is extremely important moving forward. Mike will show you the percentages that we're looking at. And again, if it can be clarified, and if the state delegation can do some type of query on what is acceptable and what is not.

So you're hearing this from a law-and-order mayor. Not about entitlement. About empowering and giving people, our people of Springfield and surrounding areas, who have paid their dues, have done the right thing, have a skill set to bring.

I think, when you hear from Richie Devine from the sheriff's department on the drug and alcohol rehab program that we partnered for many, many years, my old south end community center, you had many people that made a mistake, who are very, very talented, licensed individuals, who got back on their feet.

So if that can be looked at, that is
deeply appreciated. And to the state delegation, that a real look on that, that clarifies who has an opportunity and -- for the hideous-type crimes that are put across, they should not have an opportunity at that point in time.

I thank you very much for your time.
I thank you for taking me out of order. I have to head back for a three. And we always love having you. You are always welcome in Springfield and Western Massachusetts. Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We'll be back. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

MR. MATHIS: So as hard as I work to make sure that I'm not the guy that follows the mayor, something happens where I am always the guy that follows the mayor. Can't match his passion. Can't match his eloquence, but that's my job. So with that, I want to sort
of set the stage.
Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, thank you for the opportunity to speak to you this afternoon about the very important issue of employee licensing and registration, and the impact of criminal backgrounds on that process.

I've prepared remarks for today. As you know, that's unusual for me. I usually sling from the hip. But it was important for me that $I$ try to limit my comments to leave time for the other stakeholders on this issue, who I will introduce to you shortly. Before those introductions, $I$ will just say at the outset, that the amount of time and energy that you and your staff have spent laboring over this issue, and $I$ think we can all agree that we're laboring over this. There's really important issues on both sides of this. Is a testament to the quality of this Commission and the men and women that work for you. And you want to get that -- you want to get this issue right. You know, that is clear.

Similarly, I hope MGM's commitments
to this issue, regardless of where each of you land on the outcome, demonstrates to you that you have a licensee that cares about its host community and also wants to get it right.

Staff has asked me to help coordinate this presentation in our panel. You should know that there are many in the room today that would like to present to you, but they have entrusted me and this panel to express their concerns and to make their case. I want to thank them for their trust and for taking the time today to support us.

Specifically, I want to recognize city councilors, Tim Allen, Adam Gomez, and city council president, Orlando Ramos, and also state reps. Carlos Gonzalez and Bud Williams.

Today, you will hear from my colleague from Las Vegas, Hilary Muckleroy, to my right, MGM's vice president and legal counsel, who specializes in employment and labor law. Hilary will discuss MGM's existing policies around criminal background checks and our hiring process. You will -- you've
already heard from the mayor.
You will also hear from two
individuals. Rich Devine from the Hampden County Sheriff's office, and Chris Judd from ROCA, who work in the community to help those released from incarceration to rehabilitate themselves and find employment opportunities.

Lastly, and I think most
importantly, you will hear from two Jafet and Danny, that come from the criminal justice system based on mistakes that they've made in their youth, and who are asking that they not be automatically excluded from the employment opportunities that this once-in-a-life-time development in Springfield will offer.

Special thanks to both of them, in advance for sharing with us what is obviously a very personal issue. And to Jafet, in particular. I met with Jafet and our stakeholders the other day to prepare for today's presentation. And at one point he politely raised his hand and asked if I could stop referring to him and the folks we're talking about as ex-felons, which I had fallen
into the trap of doing just because we were -we were in the middle of a dialogue.

His comment to me was that he didn't define himself by the one mistake or bad part of his life and that he didn't want to us to either. And I think that's part of the discussion that $I$ personally lose sight of from time to time, that at the end of the day we are talking about people here.

Before I turn it over to Hillary, let me just try to succinctly frame our ask because, at some point, $I$ think it's really important to understand what is the request before you.

We being MGM, along with the City of Springfield and the stakeholders up here, are asking that the Commission do two things. One is, that the Commission change its existing practice of imposing The Gaming Act's Section 16B automatic criminal disqualification provisions, that they stop applying that to nongaming employees. We believe that, by its language, Section 16B applies to applicants for a license and not to registrants.

Second, we'd ask that the Commission recognize that the statute already provides that gaming service employees, as the defined term, which are essentially nongaming employees, are the class that should be registered, and that the Commission has brought authority under the act to create a registration process, including within that process, deferring to its licensees, meaning us, to vet those candidates based upon such factors as the seriousness of the crime, its relatedness to the job being sought, and rehabilitation since the date of the crime. All of which MGM currently does. And as Hillary will tell you, the law will require we continue to do, regardless of your decision today.

That is to say, that if the Commission continues to its current practice, come the summer of next year, we will likely end up in the unimaginable predicament of being forced, that is MGM, being forced to interview and give conditional offers of employment to applicants, who we know will be
rejected by your staff.
Just one last comment. We recognize that for most of you, perhaps all of you, that this is not a matter of why but the how. In other words, you understand the compelling public policy behind giving us, the employer, the right to individually evaluate a person for a job. And not to assume the commission of a certain crime 10 years ago means that they can't be a good employee for MGM or for this industry.

For most of you, I suspect it's more about the how. How does the Commission grant our ask and stay faithful to The Gaming Act. On that issue, your staff and our team have submitted our respective legal analysis, which, in some cases, is a dueling analysis. And I'll just say, to use a courtroom phrase, MGM will rest on our papers with respect to the legal analysis, and hope that you agree with us that there's more in the statute that points to imposing different standards for different classes of employees than there is to support a one-size-fits-all, which, again I
believe is the current practice we're asking you to change.

To loosely paraphrase
Chairman Crosby from the last hearing, why would the legislature hold the CEOs of MGM and Wynn to the same licensing standard as an entry-level dishwasher? The answer, we believe, is that the legislature wouldn't do that and they didn't do that. And we think there's compelling provisions in The Gaming Act to support that view.

So the reason we think it is important to use this panel to continue to talk about the why, is that there is no perfect direction given by The Gaming Act. I think both sides will acknowledge that.

If the reader believes in one outcome, they will naturally jump through grammatical hoops, insert a word where it does not exist, and ignore or explain away the provisions that undermine their argument. And we, as the proponents of this request, are guilty of the same, in some cases.

If we all agree that -- that what
is -- that is -- if we all agree that this legal analysis can devolve into that exercise, at least in this case, we hope that after hearing more of the why you'll agree with us that it's just a matter of having the will to figure out the how.

My final comment, and this likely -this really struck home for me, in the last few weeks I've met young people who have -who will be excluded from employment based on this issue. They knocked on doors back in a sweltering summer of 2013. They made phone calls for us. They hosted information sessions in their homes. All to help us win the license in this community. Recall that they had to do that twice for us, unexpectedly.

None of us would be sitting here today, and I mean none of us, if it weren't for the efforts of those young people. I don't know if they'll be qualified for a job when we start interviewing next year, or how strong the other applicants will be for those jobs. But $I$ know we at MGM have to work as
hard to give them the chance to prove themselves as they gave us to prove ourselves. And with that, I will turn it over to Hillary. MS. MCELROY: Good afternoon, Commissioners. I know I've had an opportunity to meet several of you on my previous visit, or at the site visit this morning, but I wanted to thank you for the opportunity to speak today, very briefly for the sake of time.

As Mike said in his introduction, I am one of the corporate legal labor and employment attorneys based out of Las Vegas for MGM Resorts International, and I support MGM Springfield in the opening of the property and the hiring events, and hiring processes associated with that. I also have the privilege of assisting MGM National Harbor in its hiring processes when it opened late last year.

I wanted to take the opportunity to preface my remarks with an observation. That as a former litigator, I'm always grateful for the opportunity to have a problem where all of
the parties agree on the outcome. And I think we can all agree on the outcome here. We want to ensure that we are maintaining the integrity of gaming in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and that we are providing a safe and secure environment for both patrons and employees of MGM Springfield. So it's a good problem to have when we agree on the ultimate outcome. It's just a matter of how we get there.

As Mike indicated in his opening remarks, we as an employer have certain legal obligations that we are bound by, both under federal law and Massachusetts state law. And as you may or may not be aware, the EEOC has issued guidance -- guidance for employers and the employer's use of criminal history in rendering employment decisions. And there are certain prohibitions that we as employers have on using criminal history. And the first and foremost of those is that you cannot have a blanket rule. It is unlawful under federal law to have a blanket rule, for example, that we don't hire felons. The EEOC guidance
mandates that we participate in an individualized assessment. And I'll get into what that consists of in just a few moments. We cannot consider, for example, arrest records that do not result in a conviction. Massachusetts law is similar. The CORI Reform Act sets forth similar obligations, including a limitation on the point in time at which an employer can inquire about criminal history. The so-called Band the Box laws that Massachusetts and several other jurisdictions in the United States have adopted, which means we don't even inquire about criminal history until a conditional offer of employment has been made. It's not information that we collect up front in the hiring process.

Massachusetts law also prohibits an employer inquiring as -- into arrests that do not result in a conviction, and also prohibits an employer from inquiring about misdemeanor convictions that have occurred more than five years ago, unless there has been some intervening conviction as well.

And when you look at the obligations of the employer under both federal and state law and you compare that to the automatic disqualifiers in 16B, you really start to see the tension there, because, for example, in 16B there is an automatic disqualifier for a felony or other crime related to theft, embezzlement and things like that.

Arguably, that could be a misdemeanor conviction, a misdemeanor theft conviction that occurred less than five years ago, which, we as an employer would be prohibited from inquiring about under the CORI Reform Act. So you start to see this tension, when you balance the employer obligations with these automatic disqualifiers under 16B.

And to Mike's point, the practical impact of that is that we as the employer invest a lot of time and resources in the hiring process in recruiting, interviewing, screening, conducting a background check for a potential candidate, who we then pass because they may have criminal history that we are not permitted to inquire about but that
automatically disqualifies them when they get to the gaming licensing process. So it is a lot of wasted time and resource for someone who has no chance of obtaining a gaming license.

I wanted to give you a little information about what the company's internal background check process is, to perhaps give you some assurance that this is not going to be a wild, wild west situation where the company intends to go out and, you know, hire folks with criminal history that creates a risk of having them in the workplace. Either a risk to their coworkers, to the integrity of the gaming process, or to patrons of MGM Springfield.

So as I said before, we comply with
federal and state law. We will continue to do that, regardless of what the outcome of this discussion is, which means we do not impose blanket rules. No blanket prohibition, for example, on the employment of felons within our organization. Instead, we conduct that individualized assessment that is required
under the EEOC's guidance. And that requires us to collect criminal history information and examine that, really in connection with the positions sought.

So the individualized assessment examines a number of factors, but the primary focus is job relatedness. So if we have a candidate who is applying to be a kitchen worker, for example, but has a felony DUI conviction, or a felony assault conviction from seven years ago, perhaps we don't care as much about that because there is no nexus, really, to the crime -- the underlying crime and the work being performed and the job being sought. So we first and foremost look at job relatedness and business necessity, and whether there truly is a risk based on their prior criminal activity compared to the position that they are seeking.

We also look at a number of other factors, including the level of offense, whether it's a felony or a misdemeanor, the number of criminal offenses. So is this a one-off incident, or does this appear to be a
pattern of conduct. We look at the age of the time of the criminal offense. Was this someone who was $18,19,20$ years old and perhaps is older and wiser and has learned his or her lesson?

We look at intervening work history, or work history, frankly, both prior to the conviction and subsequent to the conviction. Was this a criminal conviction from seven years ago but since they are released they have been gainfully employed and have demonstrated, you know, a commitment to reentering the workforce and becoming a productive member of society?

And then, lastly, we look at rehabilitative efforts. And that can be anything from intervening educational acquisition, you know, they went back and got their college degree, other workforce training programs that they may have participated in, as well as substance abuse programs that they may have participated and successfully completed.

And I'd like to close, really more
on a personal note, because I could get up here and talk -- as much as Marikate likes to talk about workforce development, I can about background checks day in and day out. But when you look at the data, and there is a number of scholarly articles, sociological studies, academic studies, data analytical models, predictive analytical models, there's a whole host of research on this topic, an examination of criminal history alone in a vacuum is really not at all predictive of recidivism rates. It is not at all predictive of a candidate's likelihood to commit future criminal offenses.

And, in fact, the inverse is true. When you look at postconviction or postrelease employment, that is one of the key driving factors in reducing recidivism rates. So if you want to ensure that folks really have the opportunity to reenter the workforce following an incarceration or a criminal conviction but you want to make sure you're preventing them or discouraging them from engaging in that type of conduct moving forward, the best thing
you can do is put them back to work.
And I think that's the goal that we all have. And I think the mayor echoed those comments. Mike and the company certainly feels strongly, again, not about guaranteeing that these folks have employment, but at least, at a minimum, providing them the opportunity to compete for jobs that they would otherwise be qualified for. And with that, I will open it to the panel for any questions.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any questions?
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: How are we
going to go through this? I mean, are we going to go through the presentation and then get to our questions and points, or are we going to --

MR. MATHIS: I'd recommend that we'd do that, get all the way through.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, I think, in this case, this is so specialized --

MS. MUCKLEROY: And I do have to catch a flight so I may have to leave before the panel --

MR. MATHIS: I've loss all control of the -- of the presentation.

MS. MUCKLEROY: So if you have any questions specific for me, I'm happy to answer them now.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody?
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well, I
think, you know, listening to your comments about policy, about recidivism rates, all of that is important information, important to all of us, certainly important to you, important to our staff, frankly. But I think that's not the point here today. We're talking about a law. And for me, it's -we're -- it's a separate issue altogether. One that we can certainly -- I can certainly sympathize with, but that's very different than about talking about our authority as a commission versus what the law says.

So that's my only point to you, is I do appreciate your -- your knowledge, but I just don't know that it -- that applies directly to what we're talking about here.

MS. MUCKLEROY: And that's
completely understandable. I'm not the administrative attorney, and I know that Mike and the rest of the team have submitted, you know, arguments and papers on that issue, and I do appreciate your perspective.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I was going to say
the exact same thing. I don't think there's anybody at the gaming commission, staff or commissioners, who disagree with the points and the principals, and the policy direction that you are articulating. The problem, as

Commissioner Cameron said is, what is our authority within this law? But thank you for your background data.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And it is a tribute to your company, that you do take these matters seriously, and I really do think that's an admirable, you know, way to look at this.

MS. MUCKLEROY: We would agree.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else, before we lose our Vegas representative? Thank you very much. Thanks for coming back. MR. MATHIS: I just want to thank

Hilary. One of the pleasures of being part of an MGM Resorts is, I don't know that we have 70,000 Hilarys, but we've got a bunch of them. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.

MR. MATHIS: And it's great to be supported by a team like that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. Thank you Hillary.

MR. MATHIS: So -- safe travels.
MS. MUCKLEROY: Thank you.
MR. MATHIS: Rich Devine, if I can, I'll pass it to him for the next presentation. MR. DEVINE: Thank you, Mike. Good afternoon, Commissioners. I just want to say that we certainly appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today.

I began as a correctional officer at the old York Street jail. And in 1989 Sheriff Ashe came to me and said I'd like you to get -- and try to help people get jobs. So for the last 28 years I've been working with people -- our returning citizens coming back to -- coming to our neighborhoods and communities.

And I know, if you think of what Sheriff Ashe was trying to accomplish there, by taking somebody out of uniform, I believe it was because of public safety. We know and it's proven, that if someone has a living-wage job, then they're less apt to go back to jail. So that's -- that was the intent of Sheriff Ashe, when he asked me that so many years ago. And I think it's important to realize that the MGM positions are living-wage jobs. And even beyond that, it's an opportunity to climb a career ladder.

Over the last 15 years, we've placed about 400 people into jobs. And, you know, it sounds pretty good, you know, we're over 10,000 people we've placed. But these -- a lot of these are entry-level jobs. And what MGM provides is the opportunity to climb the career ladder. There's an opportunity to grow with the company. And that's why we're excited about this.

We work with hundreds of employers over the years. One, Mel O'Leary, who's right behind me here, from Meredith of Springfield,
the president, and he's worked with us for 20 years. And, you know, I think it's important to also realize the employer's perspective of hiring the ex-offender, and why did Mel stay with us for all this time.

Chris will speak about a lot of the job readiness and the skills and skill-buildings and stuff, but we realize that with certificates and skill-building, that is what opens the door from jobs. And, you know, you just heard from Jeff Hayden and John Cook and everyone from the colleges. We have a great relationship with them. We have our own restaurant in the community, but we have a partnership with HCC, where they earn a culinary certificate and the opportunity to continue with school. And we've had four cohorts of that. And after that they -- we helped them secure employment. And culinary is a very strong area for our folks to be hired.

I think the strengths of what we do is we prescreen and match the employer's needs. What we do, we always get a
description of the job for the company. And we really want to make that job match the best that we possibly can because we don't want the person to fail. Some do, of course. That's part of life. That's going to occur. But we do our best and our utmost, and I think it's why Mel has worked with us for so many years, is because it's better than a straight hire off the street. The employer knows and has an idea about who they're hiring.

What we have seen is that the -- our population is motivated, enthusiastic. And what the military has found, that people with criminal records that do go into the military become Sergeants faster than a regular enlisted person. So -- because they're hungry. They're ready to go to work. They appreciate that second chance.

The program that we have is nationally recognized. The Associated Industries of Massachusetts just awarded the 21st century award. Sheriff Ashe was called down to The White House. President Obama recognized him there. But the thing that
we're really excited about is our partnership with the career centers, Future Works and Career Point. And Governor Baker has put a line item in for a million dollars for us to take our programs and model them across the state. Of course, the way the budget is right now, it's getting hammered, but we're very happy to be a line item, as you can probably realize.

A lot of what $I$ know MGM is looking for is diversity and inclusion, and it's very important for all of us. And there's certain benchmarks that need to be attained. But in Springfield there are 43 agencies that do job training and job readiness and things like that. And, you know, we partner with all the nonprofits, the labor unions, the churches, area business, and we know we can't do the job alone, but $I$ really think that we can fulfill the benchmarks that are needed, if some changes are made with what we're speaking to today.

It's a holistic approach. We try to look at the whole person. We don't just have
somebody get the job and we say, oh, it's place and pray. We don't pray that they make it. We work with people ongoing. There's people that we worked with for years. So -and I know one of the fears is, well, is the person going to commit a new crime and things like that.

I would just like to speak to the Department of Labor's bonding program that's there. They will bond each employee for $\$ 5,000$. It's a great program. They've done it for over 50,000 people, and they've only had to use it 1 percent of the time. 99 percent, which is a great ratio for that program. So it just speaks to how hungry our folks are.

The other thing I'd like to speak to is Certificates of Employability, and also Change Person letters. These are tools that we use to show employers that, okay, our person is motivated. They've met some of the expectations and they're ready to be hired.

The other thing -- the other tool we use is a portfolio, which helps our people get
ready. But it's reached a point that this portfolio, now, the judges asked for it, landlords, parole, probation. Every -- it's just grown into a tool that is recognized for someone exhibiting change. And that's kind of like what we've been talking about.

But another thing, CORI is an
identifier. And I think it's important that our job seekers, if they've the skills, employers will bypass the status -- different statuses of CORI and hire our folks. It's skills what gets people jobs. And over the years, I've seen people -- I've had one person earning his doctorate, they've earned their master's, some of them become counselors. And it's just been -- you know, I guess people keep asking me when I'm going to retire. I'm not because I love my work. I see people make it. That's the important thing. That people make mistakes and we shouldn't hold it against him for the rest of their entire lives.

So I think, in conclusion, I would just like to say that the 43 agencies that we have here in Springfield really want to work
in tandem with MGM and the commissioners, and everybody involved, to have the best person we can and give them the opportunities of some very good jobs that MGM has to offer. And I think what this offers, what MGM is offering is a living-wage job, but it's offering hope, and that's what a lot of our folks really need. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you. COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Thank you. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr. Chair, just a quick question for Richard. I've had the chance to work with you over the years. MR. DEVINE: Yes. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: And happy to see that the new sheriff seems to be keeping the tradition of looking for employment opportunities for the folks that you work with every day, so kudos to him.

You're familiar with some of the disqualifiers. Part of our challenge has been trying to find data. Knowing what the disqualifiers are is outlined in the statute.

Could you give a guess? Could you give some numbers as to how many folks you feel that would disqualify?

MR. DEVINE: I can get that number
for you. I wouldn't want to give
misinformation. We would have to look that up, take a look at our misdemeanors and felony convictions and figure that out, and see if we can address that number for you.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. And my second question, $I$ guess, would be a request. And it's not really a request because you've -- you've been at the table with us talking about educating, you and your team, the stakeholders you have, and the partners you have in these other 43 agencies, about what this statute actually means.

I think, one of my biggest fears is that people are self-selecting out of the process before they have any idea that they would be eligible to pursue a career with this employer.

So I know you have been at the
table. I hope you will continue to be at the
table and to help us out, if we go in that direction of better education in conjunction with some other strategies I know MGM has mentioned before.

MR. DEVINE: Thank you. And I really do appreciate the opportunity. and every one's been very friendly in having us come to the table. We appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Anybody else?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No. I just want to thank you for the tremendous work, frankly. The programs all sound right on point and really what's needed. So thank you for your passion and your efforts over many, many years.

MR. DEVINE: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I just have a -- you know, if I could just append to the request, to the data request. I'm particularly interested in if there's a way to know or ascertain, or estimate, of the population that's currently underemployed or unemployed, and we have some figures in the
packet, here for -- in the city of Springfield, or in Hampden County, what percentage would you estimate to be falling within this automatic disqualification of a felony conviction, not a criminal record, but a felony conviction? Any number to that effect, I think, will be very helpful to this Commission.

MR. DEVINE: I will certainly get that. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: If I could just add to that. It's not just a felony conviction. It's a felony or -- or other crime involving embezzlement, theft, fraud or perjury. So...

MR. DEVINE: Yes. COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: In my mind, the most significant of those would, probably, be theft. Somebody convicted of shoplifting nine years ago would be on -- according to Section 16 B of the act would be automatically excluded.

MR. DEVINE: Yes. I'll work the numbers to show the people that we think that
would be qualified to -- might be hired by MGM.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Great. Thank you very much.

MR. MATHIS: Thank you very much. Moving along, Chris Judd from ROCA, if you could allow her a few minutes.

MS. JUDD: Hi. Good afternoon. My name's Chris Judd. I'm the director of ROCA. And I appreciate the privilege to speak before you. And thank you, Chairman and the Commission. ROCA is a organization that has been in Springfield for seven years. We started with 50 young men seven years ago, and we started out of the AISS building, Sheriff Ashe. So we we're kind of a little organization in the branch of a -- the sheriff's department. And since, we have relocated to 29 School Street, and we currently have served, in the past six years 436 young men 17 to 24 years old. And of those young men, 38 percent of them are black or African-American, and 57 percent are Hispanic or Latino. So it is a large
population.
And more importantly, you know, we talk about -- I know when Hillary spoke and we were talking about the rehabilitation program, and I know that you -- Commissioner Cameron, you were talking about the fact that you were talking about a law, and I can, without a doubt, say that most of our young men are young men who have violent crimes on their either juvenile record or their criminal record. So in terms of young men already marginalized they will be marginalized even further without a change to this law.

I would also like to speak to ROCA and just kind of give you an idea of what our model is. Our model is a cognitive restructuring behavioral change and skill development intervention. It focuses on the high risk young men in nonmandatory program.

So all the young men, the 436 I just spoke to, are here because they want to change their lives. And it is a long process to do that. They have either aged out of juvenile justice or juvenile probation systems with
strong propensity for reincarceration as an adult, or they're connected with the adult justice system, or they're high-risk members of the community being served, who have strong propensity for incarceration as an adult.

In the first two years, we have a -it's a high-volume touch. So they are -- we are integrated with relationships. A lot of it a predicated on relationships. And Rich just spoke about the other agencies that are involved. We are involved with those same agencies. We could not do what we do without the Career Points and the REBs, and the one-stop shops, if you will.

In addition to that, we also work on life skills, workforce readiness. Kind of working on the skill gaps that are an issue. We run a transitional employment program, where our young men get real work, real pay. So they get minimum wage with an opportunity to grow within that -- within six months.

After working in our transitional employment program, which is a 18-month program, which, to us, is a entry-level job,
we would love to hand them off to a career opportunity. MGM would be that potential career opportunity.

And the idea to have any employer to have these subjectivity, the willingness to meet the individual, see how they've rehabilitated themselves, and whether they got a charge at 15 years old or 18 years old, and now they're 25, 26, 27 and have come and completed as much programming and certifications, and actually has done very well in our transitional employment program, to be excluded from an opportunity for a career just doesn't does another -- it's our due diligence to make sure that doesn't happen.

I would also just want to talk about the relationships with our carpenter's union. And I would defer to Danny because -- or Mike do you want to take that over?

MR. MATHIS: You ready to hand off to Danny?

MS. JUDD: Yeah, because I don't -Rich covered a lot. And I know that, in spite
of the time, I -- and I also know that I will be seeing some of you later so...

MR. MATHIS: Thanks, Chris. So
yeah, if we can, I'd like -- like you to hear from the -- two of the gentlemen I mentioned, who are going to be impacted by this discussion. I think, humanizing it is an important part of the process. We're going to conclude with Jafet, so if $I$ can start with Danny, who comes out of the ROCA program, that's a nice transition.

MR. ALMADOVAR: My name is
Daniel Almadovar. I was a participant at ROCA. I still am. I just -- I managed to get out ahead of game and I join the the Local Carpenters 108. I'm a proud member of the 108.

What I've heard a lot, you know, over time is, hey, Danny you don't really look like the person who fits, you know, as a ex-felon or -- you know, somebody who's gone to prison. You know, I don't know what I'm supposed to look like, you know, to fill in that part. But $I$ know that during this time

I've seen so many things and I've learned so many things.

I had no plan when $I$ was younger and I was making mistakes, and I wasn't really worried about the repercussions. Over time, you know, given the opportunity to join ROCA and just really, you know, have somebody put in my mind that, you know, that if you have a plan, at least you have somewhere to go. You have destination where you want to be.

Going through -- you know, going
through -- through all these stages and actually requiring a job, and then becoming interested in something that I loved, which is carpentry now, I've become a man with a purpose, a young man with a purpose.

You know, I never -- I never thought that this would be something that I would find myself in. And just having the opportunity to have something that at the end of day I can say I accomplished, that alone is my form of rehabilitation. I made mistakes. I learned from them, and I'm just trying to make better decisions to succeed in life.

I would have never known that at 18 years old, being convicted and going to state prison, when $I$ just had the remnants of a plan that I was trying to put together, would end with me coming out, being motivated and joining the union, and actually trying to do something. Trying to do something, you know.

And it's hard -- it's hard for people to -- to look at you. I was telling Mike the other day, you don't expect somebody, when they first introduce themselves, you know, in any situation, hi, my name is Daniel. I'm an ex-felon. I went to prison for three years. I'm out. I'm rehabilitated and I'm doing well. No. When you have a conversation you introduce yourself. And you know the conversation flows. If it touches that topic, it touches that topic. But you don't really know a person until you've given them the opportunity to show themselves to you, you know.

My past actions don't dictate the man that I am today. I turned that and I used it as motivation to make me into the man that

I am, and into the man I want to be.
MR. MATHIS: Danny, great job. I do a lot of public speaking. That's impressive for first time up on the panel. So if I can, I'm going to hand it off to Jafet, and we'll close our presentations.

MR. ROBLES: Good afternoon. My name is Jafet Robles. I'm the lead organizer with Neighbor to Neighbor. We're a grassroots, member-led, peoples power organization representing people of color, immigrants, women and the working class. But the label I would say I'm most proud of is being a son, father, friend, and a voice for the community. So I'm here to basically make a argument of why I feel that those who have paid their debt to society, deserve a second chance, and I'll be sharing my personal story to make that argument.

But first, I just want to start off by thanking Mike for his efforts. I want to thank the commissioner. I want to thank all of the elected officials who have been putting a lot of time and energy into this issue. I
know it impacts our city a lot and it's really dear to my heart. So sincerely, thank you.

I was born in Bayamon Puerto Rico. My parents moved us to the U.S. chasing the American dream of hoping me and my sister would receive a better education and have a better life. We moved to the north end of Springfield. A lot of people don't know this, but the north end actually -- of Springfield has more of a Puerto Rican population than any other city in the nation, based on density.

North end is also pretty special linguistically. It has 69 percent of the residents five years old and above primarily speak Spanish at home. This is a higher percentage of 97 percent of the neighborhoods in the U.S.
So today's a -- it's a rainy day.

But on a sunny day, if you went to the north end, you would probably hear salsa music playing out loud, you'll see the old heads playing dominoes, and on every other block you'll see and pincho trucks.

We have a total of 10,000 residents
in my community. So there's a deep sense of community in my community. Everybody knows each other. We also have a deep pride of being Puerto Rican. But according to the most recent census track, the north end is actually the poorest district in the entire state. And just like every other poor community of color across the nation, the north end is economically abandoned, socially neglected, yet, under intense surveillance.

I have always been someone that has a lot of energy, very hyper. My mom said when I was a baby, even when $I$ had a fever and my temp was up to a hundred, I would still be running around the house doing backflips off the bed like I had no damn sense. And those who know me and are here, know that still hasn't changed. I'm still very hyper. I can't sit through a Super Bowl commercial. Earlier, the beginning of this hearing was torture for me. My friend, Mark, wanted to slap me because it was shaking.

But just top it off, I went to the Lincoln School, which is here in the north
end. And I'm not even joking, this school was probably built when Lincoln was alive. This school was really old. And as I mentioned, I was really hyper. So just to my luck, this school had no gym, right. No gym for me to go channel that energy. So we literally -- the gym was the first-floor hallway.

So in the summertime we can go outside and play, but in the wintertime we would literally be in this little hallway. The gym teacher had us doing these stupid stretches. And just top it off, on top of that, we didn't go to a cafeteria so I sat in that same class all day. And to give teachers credit, the classes were overcrowded, and I'm sure teachers don't get paid a whole lot, and they definitely work a lot.

And I think back to my old school days and all the memories, I recollect a lot of them were negative. I recall feeling frustrated and angry. I struggled with sitting still, I was easily distracted, and I was always forgetting my homework. I was constantly getting in trouble for neurological
traits I had no control over.
I remember -- eventually, I was diagnosed with ADHD and put into special ed. classes. I remember being laughed and in the cafeteria, in the bus stop, in the hallways. They called me mentally retarded, a SPED, all kind of names. As harsh as it may sounds, even my own teachers told me direct and indirectly that $I$ would never amount to anything. I slowly started to internalize that I as stupid. Once I was labeled a troublemaker, I was blamed for anything and everything that happened. Detention led to suspension, suspension led to expulsion, and the streets took me with open arms.

In the 1980s, in the peak of the crack epidemic, my dad founded and started up a nonprofit, residential drug treatment program in Holyoke called Agape. I didn't see him much, but $I$ knew he was doing important work and I loved him. I didn't take it well when he split with my mom and moved back to Neustra Patria Puerto Rico.

There's a term that says when you're
out of sight, you're out of mind. Well, when my dad left, his role of father figure was replaced by local drug dealers, who led me down the wrong path or used me for their personal gain at a critical time in my life, when I was young, vulnerable and desperately in need of guidance.

Growing up the in poor communities as a color, we often had to prove our masculinity just to gain respect. That was definitely the case in the north end. Crying or expressing your emotions was a sign of weakness. I think we used this as a coping mechanism. It was like, you know what, things are rough. You know, society, everything's falling apart but we got this.

As a teenager, I remember we had a need for excitement or adventure. Most of my friends never been on vacation or even traveled out of state. But one thing we did have was our bikes. And boy, did we ride far. We rode really far. We were always exploring and looking for something out there. Not sure what it was, but we were definitely looking
for something.
My peers and I attended schools that were decrepit, and lived in housing apartment buildings that were crumbling. Some of the conditions were often inhumane. As we rode our bikes to surrounding neighborhoods of higher economic status, like Longmeadow, we cone help but realize the massive difference in quality of life only 20 -miles away from where we lived.

Now, you might have seen us on the corner, on what we would call our block, hanging out, being loud and obnoxious rapping. You probably would have locked your door, if you were down the street at the light and thought to yourself, look at these hoodlums. Where are their parents at? But little did you know, deep down inside we were all uncared for, unloved for, unattended. Just wanted someone to give us guidance and a little bit of love.

My mom, on the other hand, was a hardworking, loving, smart, single woman who never felt bad for herself and made excuses.

She's, by far, one of the toughest people I know. She worked two jobs and showed up to work 15 minutes early every day, even when she was sick, just to make sure we never went without. Now, that's gangsta.

My friends, on the other hand, were
less fortunate. Most of their parents were incarcerated or struggled with substance abuse. Most of the time, both. They faced a myriad of social problems that was related to poverty. One of my friend's was in middle school. He was fighting cancer. His father was in jail. His mom then got addicted to crack. He was only 14 years old. He had to take care of his little sister, pay the rent, not to mention, keep good grades.

I had another friend who his mom shot heroin right in front of him. This kid was the toughest kid I knew. I remember the day he told me his mother had contracted Aids. I hugged him tight as he weeped and cried for a half-hour.

Another one of my friends was a orphan, who ran away from a foster home.

Other than us on the block, he literally had nobody. Came from nothing. Told we would never be nothing. We didn't have much but we had each other. We were all we had.

Now, I've never met a person, when I was in jail or being released, that really had the intentions to go out and mess up. Usually, people have the intentions to transform their lives, do the right thing. But they get so many doors slammed on them and they eventually they end up losing hope.

I remember when I was released. I was first released into a halfway house in Hartford. And you can't go home on the weekend until you obtain work. In the first three months, I was not able to obtain work. I was out there trying. I was dressing up and nobody wanted to give me a chance.

And I remember, I finally got a job selling Kirbys. I'm sure you guys are familiar with it, with the Kirby vacuum. And all my life I did sales. Probably, not legally, but I had a little experience in it. So I started doing really good selling these

Kirbys. I got a job and I was loving it. Every -- just about every day I sold a Kirby. And I finally found a new identity. I was feeling good.

And then, one morning I was going down to go off to work. I had my tie, my suit, and the director of the program told me that I had to quit that job. She told me I was using drug-dealing skills in my new job, and that we had to get away from that mentality. So I was told to leave that job.

Upon my release, I was a single
father. I had full custody of my kids. My son's mother had a situation. So right when I was coming out, I had full custody. I had two kids to deal with and I had to take care of myself. So we recently -- the law was changed, thanks to guys like Devine advocating where, now, when people are released from prison, they can actually get a license to get -- to work. But when I came out, I couldn't. That law wasn't in place. So I was with my kids -- I would have take the bus to appointments. I would have to take the bus
for doctors, groceries and job searching.
We live in a capitalistic society, where our self-worth is often measured by our job, or our status, so I had a lot of low self-esteem. I used to be a hustler. I was a provider. Now, I was a grown man, broke and sleeping in relatives sofas. Trying to start my life over and get on my feet but no one wanted to give me a chance.

As employees were denying me, my friends in the streets, who I used to hang with, kept calling me and tempting me to go back into the streets. I kept a picture of my kids on me at all times. I also attended random churches with my kids on Sunday and prayed that an employer would call me back with some good news.

Life is never the same after a felony conviction. Criminal records often disqualify people from participating in the workplace, it prevents them from accessing social services and creates barriers to fully integrating into the community, even after they've paid their debt to society by
completing a Court-imposed sentence.
For many people, a criminal record means they have no job, no incoming. Finding work is the most important step to avoiding recidivism, but it's also the most difficult challenge. Additional barriers further isolate people who have been convicted of a felony. Excluded from jury duty, educational grants, public housing, apartments, business loans. You literally go from a physical cell to a social cell. It's no mystery why returning citizens often end up living in poverty, isolated, hopeless, living with uncertainty. They are treated like second-class citizens. They feel like they have no hope.

Now, I say to everybody here, say if you were to get in trouble when you were 19, say, going for a ride with your friends, going to a party, say they would have busted in there and you would have gotten in trouble when you were young, say, 19, would you want to be known for that one incident for the rest of your life? And that's exactly what's
happening to thousand of Americans here in Springfield.

We've all made errors in judgment as young people. Property damage, breaking and entry, and attempts to sell small amount of marijuana are low-level crimes that can be felonies. For some of you, those mistakes were a right-of-passage that you learned from. But for many residents of Springfield, these transgressions have followed them for the rest of their life in the form of a criminal record.

In 2015, more prisoners were released in Springfield than any other city in the state, with the exception of Boston per capita. More prisoners are released to Springfield and Holyoke than Boston, Worcester, Lawrence, Fall River, Lynn or Brockton.

Research shows that when people convicted of nonviolent offenses are given support needed to find employment, recidivism drops dramatically. Left with limited options, they will resort to what they know
best. Steady, gainful employment is the leading factor in preventing recidivism. We can not dismiss people who are qualified for employment simply because they made a mistake in the past. This is bad for the individuals -- individual because it undermines their productivity. It's bad for our society at-large.

A study by Evolve showed workers with criminal records are more productive than workers without records. Policies prevent people with criminal records from -- policies that prevent people with criminal records from finding employment waste talent and genius. I'm sure Devine sees that all the time. These people could be role models, community leaders and productive citizens of our society. How in the world do we expect people to support themselves, their kids, their families, if policies like this prevent them from finding work?

The automatic band on felons working in casino hurt Springfield economically. People without jobs often have to rely on
public assistance and cannot support their children, which burdens taxpayers. If individuals end up back in prison, it costs 50,000 annually to house them. Allowing MGM to give jobs to qualified applicants, even if they have a felony on their record, will promote public safety and better the quality of life in Springfield for those individuals and our community as a whole.

Me and my friend, City Councilor, Adam Gomez, who's from the north end as well, unfortunately, we have lost many, many friends to the streets in our communities that have died and sent -- for senseless reasons. And you know, I mean funeral after funeral. And I was recently asked after a shooting, you know, what can we do to deter the crime, the murder rate? And it's a very complex question and I don't got the answer.

But what thing I do know, is that when people come out and we don't provide them with a chance at a meaningful job, to start to feel like they have a purpose and they feel like they have nothing to live for, those
people are more likely to commit crime. I feel eliminating this ban would make Springfield safer.

So today, I am advocated for people in Springfield like myself. Those who have a criminal conviction on their record but are working hard to contribute positively to our families and communities. I'm asking that the Gaming Commission not force MGM to use criminal history of job applicants to screen them before even looking at their qualifications.

It is wrong to dismiss people who are qualified simply because they made a mistake in the past. We need to make sure Americans, who have paid their debt to society and want to become productive members of our communities, get another chance. This approach will be good for MGM, good for Springfield, good for our families and communities.

And I leave you with a quote by Sean Michaels that says, you don't have to be a believer in Jesus Christ to be gracious and
understand that everybody messes up and most are looking for a second chance. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.
MR. MATHIS: Thank you, Jafet.
Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, thank you for your patience. You know, these gentlemen represent thousands of people that could be up here telling their stores, so I thought it was important that you heard it. Just want to recognize and acknowledge, obviously, you don't write this law, you don't have the ability to change this law. Just to be really precise. Our request is, to the extent that the law creates an ambiguity, call it a jump ball, I think you've heard a lot of compelling testimony today why we'd ask you to administratively interpret that jump ball and provide these folks an opportunity. I don't know what kind of interviews you guys hold, but if these two gentlemen came into my office, that'd be a grade day of interviews.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Agreed.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Thank you all.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you, gentleman.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Are you going to have Seth address that memo; was that part of your plan?

MR. MATHIS: Yeah. To the extent you wanted to talk about the legal piece we've got --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, that's central so...

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: That was the whole issue.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. So I think that would be useful. It's a new approach that we just barely gotten our arms around. Well, what do you guys want; do you want to give us, sort of, a highlight, sort of, on what the essence, sort of, of your --

MR. BEDROSIAN: If fairness,
Mr. Chairman -- am I on?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah.
MR. BEDROSIAN: In fairness, I
actually told MGM they wouldn't have to do this, to assume that the commissioners would be familiar with the law. I don't think we had time to talk because we didn't connect this week. But, certainly, I'm sure Seth is ready to do it, if necessary.

MR. STRATTON: Yeah. I'd be happy to provide highlights. Absolutely. It's okay that you didn't give me a heads-up. If you'd like me to just give you a brief overview of the argument, I'm happy to do so.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Just capsule it.

MR. STRATTON: Yes. And I think that what we attempted to do, essentially, is to do that in a one-page document that is in the packet. It's the -- it's the document that looks like this. Should be helpful to go through. Perfect.

So, essentially, our argument is
that, if you look at 23K, there are two different concepts. There's a concept of an applicant. And I say capital A applicant, because applicant is a defined term in Chapter 23K. And there's also this concept of registrant. And I like to think of registrant with a little registrant. There's a difference under the statute between an applicant and a registrant.

And our argument, in essence, is that Section 16, both 16 A and $B$, apply to capital A applicants, and applicants only. And it's clear in the language of 16 A and B , right before the semi colon, that it applies to defined term capital A applicants. And those applicants are key gaming employees and gaming employees.

There's also this -- and -- well,
let me -- I'll get to that in a moment. So key gaming employees and gaming employees are capital A applicants, and then we have registrants. And registrants, referred to under Section 30, are gaming service employees.

And if you look at Section 30, you'll see various criteria, or various provisions under Section 30 that apply differently to applicants and registrants. And what we've tried to represent graphically is the different sections of 23 K , as they reference and/or apply to these two different categories of persons who are referred to under -- under the act.

And so, applicants who are defined are subject to suitability and investigation under Section 12, there's certain -there's -- under Section 13A they have a burden to prove suitability. However, Section 13B and Section 13C, which talk about duty of candor to the Commission and prohibition on withholding information would apply to both categories. Section 16, by its terms, applies to only applicants. And then you get to Section 30 and it talks about -different provisions talk about applicants, and different provisions talk about registrants.

And without going section by
section, I think you can look back at these sections using this chart as a guide and see how this statute really differentiates between these two terms. And the reason that is extremely important is that, what we are talking about here today is the automatic disqualifier. We're not saying that these folks, who are in service positions, shouldn't be subject to the act, shouldn't be subject to the purview of the Commission, shouldn't be prohibited from withholding information, should have a duty to continue to cooperate with the Commission. They simply aren't subject to the automatic disqualifier for felonies and other crimes involving theft and dishonesty.

And there's one -- you know, there's one word in Section 16 that seems inconsistent with this. And that is in Section 16B. There's reference to the word "registration." It doesn't say registrant. It says "registration."

And it also says, "an application for registration." What does that mean? I
don't know. I don't know what that means. But it's plausible that it could mean that there's another category referenced in Section 30, which we don't talk about a lot, is not defined, and is not currently identified in the regulations, but it's in Section 30C, where you talk about -- and I used in the block quote in my letter, I put one, two, three, four in there, which I hope didn't cause too much confusion, but to show that there are really four categories of employees that are referenced in Section 30C.

There are key gaming employees, gaming employees, employees who have restricted access, and I don't have the -sorry, I couldn't remember off the top of my head. So employees who have restricted access to an area of the gaming establishment or knowledge of security procedures. Those folks cannot be subject only to the registration requirements.

And so, who are these -- who are -what is this category of employees who have restricted access to an area of a gaming
establishment and knowledge of the security procedures, who are not key gaming employees, and who are not gaming employees, and who are not gaming service employees? Well, perhaps they are applicants for registration under 16B.

And so, if you could read those two provisions together so that the -- the act does not conflict, and you have categories who are applicants at a heightened standard, who are subject to automatic disqualifier, and you have a different category of employees, who are registrants only. Those are gaming service employees, who don't touch the operations of gaming, and they are subject only to registration. Registration that includes criteria set by the Commission, may or may not include criminal history. But what is clear, is that Section 16's automatic disqualification does not necessarily apply to those registrants.

So that's the argument in a nutshell that we've articulated and we believe is at least as plausible as other interpretations
that we've heard of 23 K . And to the comment that Mike made, the question is, is there a path to address this? We think that there is within the confines of the statute as written. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: SO,

Mr. Chair, in all fairness, since MGM made their legal argument, $I$ really think it's important to hear from our staff, who have spent an awful lot of time with us, with MGM, and also analyzing the statute. So I think, if we can get a real quick synopsis, that would be helpful and clear for the record. MR. BEDROSIAN: Sure. Let me -- I'm going to ask Ms. Lillios to respond to the highlights. But let me start by saying again, it's hard not to listen to all those folks who talked and not feel like you want to do something and they're absolutely right, and this is a very difficult situation. And we do disagree on the interpretation of the law, and unfortunately don't even think it's a jump ball.

Having said that, I did hear
articulated from at least one person, and as I
refer to the May 2014 memo, that this is a legislative solution. If we put in the packet examples of other jurisdictions where the legislature has been very clear about what the intent of their gaming acts are to correspond to the -- to the analysis that we're trying to do here. So in the end, after I have Ms. Lillios give some of the disagreements, I would say --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Ed, excuse me. I
just got a message that our streaming isn't working. Can anybody -- can you see Mike? MR. STRATTON: You want me to say that again?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's all right?
Okay. All right. Fine. Thank you.
MR. BEDROSIAN: We are streaming?
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes.
MR. BEDROSIAN: Okay. All right.
You know, my suggestion to a clear path forward would be a legislative fix and working together. I suggest the legislature should hear exactly what was said here. And -- so
having said that, let me first actually turn it over to our general counsel, Ms. Blue, to make some comments, and follow it up, if necessary by Ms. Lillios.

But what I -- what I was hoping to avoid was a back-and-forth. But I understand it's important for you to hear legally from our position, so I'll ask Ms. Blue to start.

MS. BLUE: So I think, first what I'd like to do is thank MGM for the -- the good conversations and discussions we've had about this issue.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you, gentlemen.

MS. BLUE: They have been very helpful in pointing out different points of view, and I, you know, hope that they know we've considered them very carefully.

The staff, both the legal department and the IEB, has looked at Chapter 23 K and this particular issue. It looked at this argument, as well as a number of other arguments, and really has approached it from a perspective of, is there a pathway to get to,
you know, the ultimate goal.
I think to paraphrase a little bit what Mr. Mathis said, you know, there are ways to get there. Sometimes you, perhaps, take certain sections and different places and you omit other definitions. And the question really is, how tortured of a-- of an interpretation do you need to make and what's a reasonable pathway to get there.

So in this particular argument, I think we would -- to simplify it we would look at it from two perspectives. And we think that what MGM is proposing is that, number one, registrants aren't applicants. And if you're not an applicant, then, you're not subject to 16B. We think the language in the statute doesn't support that.

We think that you have to apply for a registration. Yes, there is a defined term applicant, but you're still applying for a registration. And then there are other portions of Section 30 that talk about how registrations -- registrants can be denied. So we don't think that definitional discussion
really works.
The second part of their argument that I think is, you know, more important, is that there aren't, in fact, three categories, there are actually four. The first two are very simple, the keys and the gaming. And then there's this -- there's these two other sections that they interpret the statute to create. And one of the section of folks that have restricted access and then there's everybody else.

I think that, when you look at the statute and you look at the other definitions in the statute, what you see is what they view as the third category, which would be a registrant with a background check, is really someone who falls into a gaming employee's category. It's not really a separate category. And then you have the all other employees, which the statute makes very clear are required to register and provide whatever information that the IEB requires, and also says that those registrants can be denied for the reasons in 16B.

So we think that, yes, they are trying to find a pathway to get there. I think it doesn't quite hold up in a way that is reasonable under the statute. And, you know, I would conquer with Executive Director Bedrosian, that the real way to address this is through some kind of a clear, legislative fix that gives guidance to the Commission as to exactly whether you have discretion, or whether they create other categories, as some other jurisdictions have done that, you know, then really makes it clear what we can and can't do.

MR. BEDROSIAN: I think we're fine.
I don't think Ms -- unless you had something else to add?

MS. LILLIOS: No. I concur with Ms. Blue had to say.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody have questions or Seth or Catherine, or anybody else?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Does anybody have available 16B, either -- I was trying to look it up in my materials.

MS. BLUE: Yes, we do.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And well, this is, I guess, where Seth was going with the or registration; is that correct, Seth? But it's really referring to everyone else that's not a key or a gaming license.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: In which case, they would have just said gaming service employees.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: In which case, right.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But they didn't.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. Which I interpret to be applying to service employees in whole.

MR. STRATTON: I understand that interpretation, and I think it's -- I think it could go either way. But I think what -- what Chairman Crosby just said is -- is why don't they use gaming service -- it could have been very easy for Section 16B to say, to refer to the define term gaming service employees.

And I think one of the key points is, if you look at the highlighted terms,
application for a license, $I$ read that as application for a license, or application for a registration? And then, if you follow along in that sentence it says, "Applicant." So it's talking about applicant. It doesn't ever say gaming service employee. And then when you go to Section 30, it separately talks about registrant.

So there is -- I don't think -- I don't think staff would even contend that there is a inconsistent use of the terms applicant and registrant in the statute, and that it could be read that those are contemplated to be two different things.

And I don't think it's clear that in order to be a registrant -- I think what Catherine said, you have to apply to be registered, $I$ don't think that's clear under the statute, or necessarily true. You could register and be a registrant. There's no need to have an application or be a capital A applicant in order to be a registered with the Commission.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So you just
asked staff if they -- if they -- you thought that they would not disagree. I'm just going to ask if that's the case.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But I think --
let's go back to 16B, if you could, because I don't have it in the packet. If you take out -- because there's an other -- oh, there it is. Thank you. Sorry. If you take out the, other than a gaming licensee or licensee to the gaming employee -- or a key gaming employee, under this chapter, right, that's the other.

MR. STRATTON: Oh. I see your question.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That's the other.

MR. STRATTON: I'm sorry.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That means that this section is clearly applying to everybody else.

MR. STRATTON: But I think the confuse -- sorry to interrupt. The confusing part, gaming license means a license to operate a gaming establishment. It doesn't --

Section 16B clearly applies to gaming employees. 16A applies to key gaming employees. 16B is gaming. And so, the "other than a gaming license" means, other than Blue Tarp's application for a license to be a gaming establishing.

So I agree that I often, reading it, confusing those two. But I think it's very clear that, at a minimum, 16B applies to gaming employees. And the question is, does it apply to anyone else? And we're suggesting, and is that anyone else, gaming service employees also? We suggest no. We suggest they are residents under -- under Section 30, and that $16 B$ only applies to gaming. And could, if you created a category referenced in 30C, of these other category, who have restricted access, who the statute refers to not as key and not as gaming, that it could also apply to them, but not to gaming service, who are never mentioned in Section 16.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But the gaming service employee is a catchall, right?

Elsewhere, I don't know. You know, it's -- it defines -- the statute defines key applicant, qualifier, key gaming employee, and then everyone else has to be registered and is a service employee. So this specific language in $16 B$-- and it it's perhaps particularly the or registration that provides the real trouble to your argument, I would argue.

MR. STRATTON: Agreed. That their use of registration requires an interpretation of Section 30 to read those harmoniously. I suggest there is an interpretation of Section 30 that allows to you read them harmoniously. But that is -- the use of term registration there --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The whole point of 16A, as best I can -- the whole point of 16 A and B is to say the same -- there's the same automatic disqualification criteria. Except, for the lower levels, you can be rehabilitated after 10 years. Why didn't they just say gaming employees and gaming service employees? That was very straightforward. MR. STRATTON: And it's a defined
term.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I don't know -I'm not answering the question. I'm just asking the question. There's no answer to it, you know.

MR. BEDROSIAN: I think the answer is because they said registration. And that's what gaming service employees do. It's a verb. They're registering.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's not a defined term. There's an obvious --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It may not be elegant language but it's straightforward. It --

MR. BEDROSIAN: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You know,
it --
MR. BEDROSIAN: As Loretta said, licensee isn't a defined term either so...

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And harmoniously, reading them in tandem it's -you know, rather not -- with the other sections of the statute that follows that tiering, applicants, keys, gaming employees,
everyone else, this would be a logical paralleled structure, right?

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Mr.
Chairman, I have a couple of comments, if I could. First of all, I want to observe, somewhat lightheartedly, that Jafet Robles -is that your name?

MR. ROBLES: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: You remind me very much of my son and my grandson, who have a level of hyperactivity that you approach, at least.

On a more serious note, that Mayor Sarno introduced himself as a law-and-order mayor. I will introduce myself here as a law-and-order Gaming Commissioner. And I have to say, and I've gone on record about this beforehand, that I'm very, very troubled that in our interpretation of our statute, that we are, in effect, requiring our licensees to violate federal and state employment law.

And I was impressed by, you know, Hilary Muckleroy's presentation to us in that
regard, in which she said that if she were to apply 16B literally, that MGM would be violating a federal and state employment law. And I think that's -- I think that's true. We are not employers so we're not covered by the EEOC and the employment -- and the state CORI law. But at the same time, by enforcing it we are, in effect, causing violations of the spirit of federal and state employment law.

And I have -- well, let me add something. Unfortunately, Seth, I'm not convinced by your interpretation of the statute. My view of it is similar to what General Counsel Blue reported -- reported on. I have presented before as to my conclusion that there is, in fact, ambiguity in the statute by virtue of a conflict between direct unreconcilable conflict between Section 16 and Section 30F, such that we have residual discretion as an administrative agency to resolve that ambiguity.

That said, it's a matter of record, but I accept the recommendation of our staff under the -- under the circumstances, and in
the memorandum at the last meeting, that we address this issue from Executive Director Bedrosian.

He noted that the staff on the merits of the issue are divided, the legal staff is divided. But that the conclusion of that recommendation was, is that we seek a legislative -- legislative fix. And I am totally supportive of that, of that, but against the backdrop, that $I$ think it is -- it is most unfortunate that we are placing our licensees in a situation in which they indirectly would be caused to violate state and federal law.

And I'm totally convinced that -that it is the preferred public policy of the Commonwealth that the Gaming Commission would be -- would have the authority to exercise its discretion in the area of gaming's nongaming service employees, to be able to -- to be able demonstrate rehabilitation. And I just wanted to make those points for the record.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else?
Okay. Thank you all very much. We decided
that we would not try to bring to this to fruition today, which I guess means we'll have it back on the agenda in two weeks. And we've got to get it resolved in one way or the other.

Thank you all -- thank you, all of you, for coming, speakers. As you can see, we're all wrestling with this in good faith trying to figure out what's the right way to go here. We appreciate everybody contributing to our thought process. Thank you.

MR. STRATTON: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. We're going to come back to -- let's see 4C. But let's take a very quick break and reconvene in five minutes.
(A recess was taken)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. We are calling to order again public meeting No. 217. I think we are on Item 4C, Director Griffin;
is that right? Yes, it is, 4C.
MS. GRIFFIN: Yes. However, I'm going to kick this right back over to Commissioner Stebbins, who has done the bulk of the work on this recommendation and memo.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you,
Jill. And I had five pages of comments on this topic, but I'm going to throw them out the window.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: And I would even defer on this topic. But other than I know the packet went out with this information on it, so $I$ want to make sure it at least gets distributed at this meeting. We can talk about it at further meeting, as we meet our obligations to comply with the Open Meeting Law.

Just real quickly. What you have in front of you is a cover memo and a -- what I'd call the draft invitation letter. At some of our previous meetings, the chairman and I have talked about meetings we've had with
legislators about the Gaming Economic Development Fund.

Quick recap of the Gaming Economic Development Fund, it is a fund to be created upon the opening of our Class 1 casinos. A certain percent, I believe it's 9 percent of the 25 percent that is taxed on gross gaming revenue goes into at Gaming Economic Development Fund.

The back part of the solicitation letter is the legislative citation, which outlines what the -- the fund can be used for. It is a fund that is subject to appropriation. It's not a fund we control. But in our conversations with the center president, the speakers, various chairs that the chairman and I have had, we've expressed an interest in looking at developing strategies for the use of this Gaming Economic Development Fund. Money will start flowing into that fund in FY '19.

And the purpose is, we talked about it a number of occasions, trying to find a way to build off the economic momentum that we
feel our Class 1 license -- licensees, and even our Class 2 licensees are generated in their host community and the surrounding area.

So you have a background to the strategy, you have an attached, again kind of strategy invitation letter that we can talk about more next time, which would be extended out to regions, chambers of commerce, regional employment boards, travel bureaus, host and surrounding communities, begin to get them to think regionally, strategically about how they can use this fund, again, to further the economic impact our Class 1 licenses.

So I'm happy to answer any questions, but, certainly, we can talk about it in a little more detail next time.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. So your time frame would be --

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: My time
frame, we're still on time. We would be issues thing the solicitation letter after our next meeting in June, give organizations and stakeholders a chance, kind of, over the intervening summer months to come up with
strategies and ideas, and then in September plan for the Commission to have three, kind of, strategy briefings with those stakeholders and hear their ideas and suggestions and input. So $I$ think we're still on target. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: And the timeline of the funding, Commissioner Stebbins is -- is what, is the opening of, in effect, the MGM casino, and that's when the funds at least -- would be subject to appropriation for allocation to the fund?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It will go into a
fund automatically, and then the legislature kind of appropriate it out of that fund to whatever purpose it decides.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I see. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: It'll start flowing into that in FY '19. Obviously, both MGM and Wynn will open in FY '19. It won't be, kind of, full capitalization of the fund until the next year. But to begin to get some strategies in place and some ideas for the
legislature to consider or run with would be great for that initial amount of the money going into the fund in that year.

MS. GRIFFIN: And as Commissioner Stebbins highlighted in this letter, it's actually 9.5 percent of the operational casino revenues go into in fund.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: And we have an internal team. It's not just Jill and myself, but Elaine has been working with us, Ombudsman Ziemba and our CFAO to calculate out monies based on projections. Also, on -- you know, help individuals in the legislature understand the other -- availability of other funds, Community Mitigation Fund, financial commitments and host and surrounding communities as well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. Terrific. Glad you're working on this.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you, Commissioner, and Director Griffin, for taking the lead.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yep. Anything else on 4C, or four in general?

MS. GRIFFIN: I think it's a wrap. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. Then on five, was there anything else in your -yes, in your administrative update -MR. BEDROSIAN: No. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: -- sort of, missed general and missed player card?

MR. BEDROSIAN: No. And as far as my administrative update goes, just by way of what I've been doing the last couple weeks is -- appears to be all budget related. The CFAO and I have spent a lot of -- a focus of our time on budget-related stuff. We will have an update -- if not presentation, at least an update at the next meeting on the budgets process.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Great.
MR. BEDROSIAN: So 5C. Chapter 23K, Section 29, which is entitled, Cashless Wagering Systems Setting and Adjustment of Betting Limits Monthly Statements and Annual Report to the Commission, has a provision in it that requires our licensees to send monthly statements to their player reward cards about
wins and losses.
When we were alerted by a member of the public, that he didn't think that was -this was happening, we actually wents back and saw that it wasn't happening. But also went back and saw that in two public commission meetings in 2014, the Commission had talked about this. One tangentially, one more directly. And I think left staff with the impression that this provision was what I would call an opt-in provision. Someone would have to affirmatively request it, whereas, it appears that it is actually an opt-out provision, one can decline it.

Having said that, we gave -- staff, appears, gave Penn bad advice on this provision. We need to go back and fix that. We are working trying to figure out whether it's a regulatory fix, a policy fix. We just want to alert the Commission to that. And that we're going to work both with Penn, and as we do, often, with our Category 1 licensees, because will have a direct affect on them also.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
MR. BEDROSIAN: I can't quite give you a timeline yet. So -- but I -- we will be diligent in trying to address this.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. And we credit this member of the public, who brought this to our attention. And we appreciate it. We just wanted to make it clear that everybody knows that we're on top of it, and we will figure this out well before we get into the big casinos, and as quickly as possibly for Plainville.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Commissioners, thank you. That is all I have.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Anything on
Item 6? I'm taking off next week for IAGA, the International Association of Gaming Advisors, where actually there are four different conferences going on at the same time. I'm on two panels. One, a responsible games panel, and one a, what is technology change doing to the gaming business, which I will report on when $I$ get back. that's going to be next Tuesday, I guess. Anybody else?

Commissioner Cameron's going too.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah. I have a panel on illegal gambling, so that should be interesting. Conference last week, a technology panel as well, I served on. And it was really, because this world is changing, how are regulators staying up with it? And I actually was pleased that we had addressed many of the issues that the industry was looking for us to address. Being nimble, listening to the newest ideas, not having a long process to change a regulatory -- whether it be a regulation or a policy. CMS does some work that they were interested in. So I think we're in good shape when it comes to keeping up with technology.

So I think -- there was also an interesting presentation on racing. I know The Stronach Group does successfully. In fact, we had a dinner at their facility. It's a beautiful facility. They do manage racetracks successfully. So we do have a call in our efforts to just gain as much as information as we can. The executive
director, I believe, expecting a meeting, correct, to --

MR. BEDROSIAN: A call. Yep. They
contacted me and -- yep.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: To update on -- yep. So just in an effort to keep on what's happening with racing and if there's anything --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Whether there are any options out there that we might consider, if and when we get the authority?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Correct. So
we're doing our due diligence there. And that's all I have, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else?
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No. You just missed a good tour this morning. The reset of us went on a great -- there's tremendous progress going on. You can see it from the street. But when you walk through it you can get a sense now of the space. It's quite interesting. There's a lot of progress in most areas. You know, they have a lot of moving pieces. But it's good to be here and
see all that progress.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yep.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: You know, and that's where one of the things that I was impressed by, you know, on the tour, is, in fact, the openness of the facility to the street. And that there will be access to restaurants along, you know, Main Street. I guess you don't call it food court anymore because that's lower class, but it's --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Marketplace. Marketplace.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: That it's over in the corner by the justice center and so all the courts are all around. I think that's going to be a hotspot during the week for the local legal community and the defense lawyers.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. That's right, because that's right across the street from the courthouse, right?

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Yeah. It's
literally right across the street. It's an exciting idea. I think the whole openness of
the facility, once you see it up, really manifests the distinctive design that went into this. Of course, I wasn't a member of the Commission at the time that you all approved it, but I know that was one of the distinguishing things --

MR. MOORE: The selling features. COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: And it's coming -- it's becoming a reality.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah, it's great.
Okay. Motion to adjourn?
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: So moved.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor?

Aye.
MR. MACDONALD: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are adjourned.
(Proceeding concluded at 4:10 p.m.)
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