		Page 1
1	THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS	
2	MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION	
3	PUBLIC MEETING #151	
4		
5		
6		
7	COMMISSIONERS	
8	Gayle Cameron	
9	James F. McHugh	
10	Bruce W. Stebbins	
11	Enrique Zuniga	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19	May 6, 2015 10:30 a.m 11:49 a.m.	
20	BOSTON CONVENTION AND EXHIBITION CENTER	
21	415 Summer Street, Room 104B	
22	Boston, Massachusetts	
23		
24		

PROCEEDINGS:

2

3

1

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good morning,

4 everybody. I'd like to call to order the 151st

5 public meeting of the Massachusetts Gaming

6 Commission. We are here at the Boston

Convention and Exhibition Center for today's

8 agenda. Chairman Crosby is not with us today.

9 He's on a well-deserved vacation. So, the four

10 of us will proceed in his absence.

11 We usually begin with the minutes,

12 which frequently is the highlight of the

13 meeting but for today, we are going to skip

14 those and we'll save those until all five of us

15 are present at the next meeting and proceed

16 directly to the main order of business, which

17 is the report from the Investigations and

18 Enforcement Bureau with respect to Mass Gaming

and Entertainment. 19

20 Before we actually get to the

2.1 content of that I'd like to set the stage a

22 little bit to recall and inform how we got

23 here. Mass Gaming and Entertainment is an

24 entity that is pursuing a Category 1 or a

casino gaming license. This hearing is being convened in accordance with 205 CMR 115.04 paragraph three. That's available for all to see, but governs hearings like this.

The entire Commission will collectively preside over this hearing and over whatever decision it will follow when it concludes. I'd like to explain the process though that led us to this point as well as the process that we'll follow here today.

On July 11, 2013, almost two years ago, the Commission held a similar hearing regarding Mass Gaming and Entertainment, which was then applying for a Category 2 or slots parlor license. An inquiry into suitability is, as the name suggests, an inquiry into the fitness of the applicant to hold a gaming license. And that inquiry is required by the gaming statute, which also contains criteria the Commission considers in making its determination.

At the conclusion of the hearing two years ago, the Commission unanimously concluded that Mass Gaming and Entertainment was

2.1

qualified and had shown that by clear and convincing evidence that its suitability.

In September 2013, however, Mass Gaming and Entertainment withdrew its application for a Category 2 license for reasons wholly unrelated to any suitability issues.

During the same year and with the same results, the Commission conducted a suitability investigation regarding Raynham Park, LLC which was also seeking a Category 2 license but was ultimately unsuccessful. And during the course of that investigation, the Commission considered the suitability of George and Laetitia Carney who then were principles in Raynham Park LLC and now are principles of an entity called Sweeney Investments, Incorporated.

So with that background, Mass Gaming and Entertainment now reconstituted as a joint venture between an entity known as Mass Gaming Holding, LLC and Sweeney Investments -- We'll hear more about that as the report is presented -- now that entity, Mass Gaming and

Entertainment, has applied for a Category 1 or casino license. And as before, the Commission must make an inquiry into Mass Gaming and Entertainment's suitability to hold a license.

This time though the suitability inquiry builds on the inquiry conducted two years ago and in essence amounts to an update of that earlier inquiry. To carry out that update, the Commission's Investigations and Enforcement Bureau has conducted an investigation into Mass Gaming and Entertainment and the individuals called qualifiers -- You'll hear that term as we proceed. -- who have the power to exercise significant influence over the management or operation of Mass Gaming and Entertainment's ongoing business.

The Bureau has generated an investigative report of its findings, and has submitted it to the Commission for the Commission's ultimate decision. And that's a part of the packet that is before the Commissioners today.

The hearing will proceed as follows:

2.1

At the outset, the IEB, Investigations and Enforcement Bureau, Deputy Director Loretta

3 | Lillios will provide an overview of the

4 | investigative report relative to the

5 | suitability of Mass Gaming and Entertainment's

6 Phase 1 application. Any Commissioner may ask

a question of Director Lillios at any point

8 during her presentation.

Director Lillios may be joined by others who participated in the investigation that led to the report or she may not. She will also be available to answer any questions or offer for clarification.

The Commission will then discuss the matter and take a vote after Mass Gaming and Entertainment is given any opportunity it would like to use in order to respond to any part of the content of the report.

As was the case in 2013, the burden is on Mass Gaming and Entertainment to demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence both its affirmative qualification for licensure and the absence of any disqualification for licensure.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Deputy Director Lillios is of course joined here today by Director Wells. Without further ado, I will turn the matter over to you, Director Lillios.

MS. LILLIOS: Thank you very much and good morning Commissioners. Thank you for this opportunity to address you to update the suitability of the applicant Mass Gaming and Entertainment.

As an initial matter, I want to recognize the members of the IEB team that worked on the suitability update. On the State Police side, Lieutenant Kevin Condon and Trooper Dean Cerullo lent their efforts and expertise, and on the financial investigation side by Paul McGrath and Monica Chang worked extremely diligently and thoughtfully as well as Vanessa Barone who assisted in a particular area.

In addition, Drew Chamberlain from HLT Advisory, Inc. was very helpful. And he is present this morning. And of course, I want to recognize Director Wells for her leadership.

I also want to thank the applicant

who has been cooperative and engaged over the 2 past three months in this suitability update 3 The applicant has representatives 4 present today. Attorney John Donnelly is here 5 representing Mass Gaming and Entertainment. 6 Attorney Paul Seeman, who is an advisor to the Rush Group is also here. Attorney Michael 8 Morizio is present representing Mr. George 9 Carney. And Mr. George Carney and Mrs. 10 Laetitia Carney are here as well.

As Commissioner McHugh stated, the Commission previously issued a positive determination of suitability for the applicant in July 2013 in connection with its then proposal for a slots license. The applicant ended up withdrawing that application, but the Commission allowed it and other applicants that were not awarded a Category 2 or Region A or B license to apply for a Region C license without filing a new RFA-1 application so long as they provided information as requested by the IEB, which this applicant has done.

Almost two years have passed since that prior determination and the applicant has

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

now proposed a resort casino in the community of Brockton. As suitability is an ongoing concept, the IEB has updated its investigation to assist the Commission in determining whether the applicant is suitable at this time.

In the present application, there are nine entity qualifiers and 14 individual qualifiers. Four of the entity qualifiers and 13 of the individual qualifiers were previously deemed suitable in 2013. The previously qualified entities including the trusts as well as the individuals were all subject to the full background check back in 2013. And I refer you to the minutes of the suitability hearing from July 11, 2013 when these investigative steps were described in full.

As part of the updated investigation, the IEB required qualifiers who went through the process in 2013 to submit detailed updates to their 2013 applications including updated financial information and net worth information, updated tax information and update licensing data.

The IEB reviewed these submissions,

conducted additional criminal and database checks and verifications, had numerous telephone conferences with representatives of the applicant and visited the site of the project.

With respect to the five new entity qualifiers and one new individual qualifier, the IEB required the submission of business entity disclosure forms from the entities and multijurisdictional personal history forms and Massachusetts supplement forms from the new individuals, as well as additional supplemental materials and communications as determined by the investigators to be needed.

All of the qualifiers were subject to criminal checks, media checks, credit checks, litigation checks and political donation checks as well. All of this was done to assist the Commission in evaluating whether the applicant has satisfied its affirmative obligation to demonstrate its qualifications as of today, as well as the qualifications of each of the entities and individuals identified by the IEB as qualifiers by clear and convincing

2.1

evidence according to the Phase 1 suitability criteria in Chapter 23K sections 12 and 16 and 205 CMR 115 and 117.

You have a 70-page report before you outlining the IEB's findings. The redacted version has been made available to you today to consider as part of this meeting and is part of the record of this meeting and is available to the public. The redactions were made because the IEB considers a great deal of personal and confidential information that is appropriate or indeed is not legal for public disclosure.

There has been a minor comment from the applicant brought to the IEB's attention in the report reasonably so and staff will address that in the near future.

I am aware that you have read the report. So, I will give a summary overview and some of the key points.

The applicant before you is Mass

Gaming and Entertainment, LLC. It was

established in 2011 for the purpose of pursuing
a gaming license in Massachusetts. And it has
no business history of significance and has no

regulatory history. The applicant continues to be managed by Neil Bluhm as Chairman, Gregory Carlin as CEO and Andrew Bluhm as Secretary and Treasurer. The applicant is in compliance with all of its tax obligations in the Commonwealth.

An updated criminal history search was conducted for the applicant and in fact for all of the qualifying entities. And in all cases neither the entity nor its ownership nor any of the officers have a criminal record that would negatively impact suitability or subject them to disqualification. And the same holds true for the individuals.

The applicant's ownership structure has changed since 2013. In 2013, the applicant was directly owned by a group of five trusts, all related or closely associated with members of the Bluhm family from Chicago and also ownership interest by one qualifying individual.

Today the applicant is owned by Mass Gaming Holdings, LLC. The investigators discovered no new information in the updated investigation that negatively impacts on Mass

2.1

Gaming and Entertainment's Phase 1 suitability for licensure.

Mass Gaming Holdings, the parent company of the applicant is a newly formed entity with no business history and no regulatory history. Mass Gaming Holdings is owned by four qualifying trusts, specifically the Carlin Dynasty Trust and three Bluhm family trusts.

These three Bluhm trusts were created in 2013 after the prior suitability finding when the previous trusts split into two new separate trusts, each splitting into an exempt and nonexempt trust.

These new trusts were created to protect Bluhm family assets and to make assets available for the Bluhm family's business endeavors. And these three new Bluhm family trusts are the new entity trust qualifiers.

I note that when the trust severed, the trust documents did not change. The trustees remained the same, and the beneficiaries remained the same. Therefore, although the severance of the trusts resulted

in three new trust entity qualifiers, the severance did not result in any new individual qualifiers.

The three new trusts are the 2013

AGB Family Dynasty Trust Exempt #2 where the A is for Andrew Bluhm. He is the son of Neil Bluhm and the grantor and trustee of that trust. The 2013 LNB Family Trust Exempt #2, L for Leslie, Neil Bluhm's daughter who is also the grantor and trustee of that trust. And the 2013 Meredith A. Bluhm-Wolf Family GST Trust #2 where Meredith is Neil Bluhm's daughter and the grantor and trustee of that particular trust.

The investigators looked into the trusts, where the money came from and found no issues of concern with those trusts. The assets of the trusts consist of bank accounts and investments in closely held or Bluhm-related entities. The investments are not in publicly traded entities. But based on a review of financial documents that took into account the 2013 review, the evaluation assigned to the trust investments is not unreasonable.

2.1

All three of the Bluhm family qualifying trusts are currently undergoing a suitability investigation by the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board for the two casinos that Bluhm and Rush have in Pennsylvania, and by the New York State Gaming Commission for the recently licensed Bluhm facility in Schenectady.

Andrew Bluhm, Leslie Bluhm and
Meredith Bluhm-Wolf, the grantors and trustees
of those trusts have each been found suitable
in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Louisiana,
Illinois and Ontario. And Andrew Bluhm has
also been found suitable in Mississippi. The
investigation did not reveal any derogatory
information that would reflect negatively on
any of those three trusts Phase 1 suitability.

The Carlin Dynasty Trust also has an ownership in Mass Gaming Holdings, the parent of the applicant. The Carlin Dynasty Trust was formed by Gregory Carlin and his wife. And that trust was previously found suitable in 2013 by the Commission.

Since 2013, the Carlin Dynasty Trust

1 has been found suitable by the Illinois Gaming

2 | Board. And the trustee, Gregory Carlin, has

3 been found suitable in Mississippi,

4 | Pennsylvania and Illinois. The investigators

discovered no new information that negatively

6 | impacts on the Carlin Dynasty Trust.

None of the trusts will be involved in any operational or managerial activities relating to the gaming operation but will be confined to an investor ownership role.

As in 2013 on the operational side, it is intended that Rush Street Gaming, LLC which in turn is owned by Rush Street Gaming Partners, LLC will provide the operational and owner site functions of the casino should a license be granted.

Rush Street Gaming's ownership structure has not changed since it was found suitable in 2013. As in its 2013 application, it remains a wholly-owned subsidiary of Rush Street Gaming Partners. Rush Street Gaming is managed by Neil Bluhm as Chairman, Gregory Carlin as CEO, Andrew Bluhm as Secretary and Treasurer, and David Patent as President and

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Chief Operating Officer.

At the time of Rush Street Gaming's 2013 application, it had been found suitable for licensure by the Mississippi Gaming Commission, the Illinois Gaming Board and the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board.

At the time of the initial application, the Rush Street Gaming Partners ownership group was comprised of three Bluhm family trusts and one natural person qualifier. Since the 2013 suitability finding, the ownership structure of Rush Street Gaming Partners has changed.

Now Neil Bluhm and Gregory Carlin each have ownership interest in Rush Street Gaming Partners in excess of five percent each. The officers of Rush Street Gaming Partners are Neil Bluhm as Chair, Gregory Carlin as CEO and Andrew Bluhm as Treasurer and Secretary.

In 2013, Rush Street Gaming Partners had been found suitable by the Illinois Gaming Board and the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board. Currently, both Rush Street Gaming and Rush Street Gaming Partners are undergoing a

suitability investigation in New York relative
to the Rivers Casino and Resort at Mohawk
Harbor. And they both have pending
applications with the New Jersey Casino Control
Commission and the Alcohol and Gaming Control
Commission in Ontario.

The investigation has compared Rush Street Gaming and Rush Street Gaming Partners' 2013 and 2015 business entity disclosure forms and noted no additional material changes. The investigators discovered no new derogatory information that affects either of those entities.

Before moving onto the individual qualifiers, while we are talking about the Rush Street Group, I would like to bring to your attention some of the regulatory violations that the IEB reviewed. As part of the investigation to update suitability, the IEB reviewed recent gaming regulatory violations that resulted in fines for the three US casinos where the regulated entities operate in Pennsylvania and in Illinois. There were some incidents that caused the IEB concern.

2.1

In particular, there was an incident at the SugarHouse Casino involving 12 slot machines registering below the 85 percent minimum payout percentage for a period of six months. There was an incident at the Rivers Casino in Pittsburgh involving count room paperwork being improperly returned.

There was another incident at the Rivers Casino in Pittsburgh involving a poker dealer ignoring the red light with cards dealt twice while short two cards. And there were incidents of mishandling of shufflers by dealers.

There were five incidents at the Rivers Casino in Pittsburgh involving slot technicians setting games incorrectly without approval from the regulator. And there also were fines for self-exclusion and underage incidents. In the matters that I brought to your attention, there were all fairly significant fines imposed.

Moving on from the violations to the individual qualifiers, Neil Bluhm, Andrew Bluhm, Leslie Bluhm, Meredith Bluhm-Wolf and

Gregory Carlin all have ownership interest in, as we discussed, in the applicant's parent company, Mass Gaming Holdings.

Neil Bluhm, Andrew Bluhm and Gregory
Carlin also have control over the Rush Street
oversight entities. Leslie Bluhm and Meredith
Bluhm-Wolf are passive investors with no
managerial or oversight control.

These five individuals all were subject to a full background investigation in 2013. Since that time, they have applied for licensure in several jurisdictions as detailed in the report. All foreign jurisdictions were contacted and reported no derogatory information relating to any of those individual's licensure or their ongoing suitability.

An income analysis and a net worth analysis were performed for each of these individuals, and there was no derogatory information uncovered with respect to their financial integrity, financial responsibility or financial stability.

The investigation also updated the

2.1

1 suitability of six additional individual 2 qualifiers with oversight control only. individuals are David Patent, the President and 3 Chief Operating Officer of Rush Street Gaming, Timothy Drehkoff, the CFO of Rush Street 5 6 Gaming, Zeletta Wyatt, the Vice President of Strategic Planning for Rush Street Gaming, 8 Suzanne Trout, the Chief Marketing Officer for 9 Rush Street Gaming, Joseph Scibetta, the Vice President of Operations for Rush Street Gaming 10 11 and James Jabczynski, Director of Slot 12 Performance and Analytics for Rush Street 13 Gaming. 14 All of these individuals went 15 through the full background invest. in 2013. 16 And since that time, they have applied for 17 licensure in several jurisdictions as set out 18 in the report. Again, all of the foreign 19 jurisdictions were contacted and no information 20 -- negative information relating to ongoing 2.1 suitability was reported. Their finances were reviewed for 22 23 financial stability, responsibility and 24 integrity with no derogatory information and no

negative findings. And no new information in the updated investigation that negatively impacts their Phase 1 suitability.

Joshua (SIC) Risley was determined to be a new qualifier for the applicant. In May 2013, he was hired by Rush Street Gaming as their Vice President of Analytics. You have the IEB's full investigative report incorporated into the update report starting on page 51 relating to Mr. Risley.

Immediately prior to his position at Rush Street Gaming, Mr. Risley was an FBI agent in Detroit for four years, a position that he voluntarily left because as he reported he saw the Rush Street Gaming position as a good opportunity.

He has been working in the gaming industry since 2001. And he has held positions as the Director of Gaming Revenue, the Director of Slot Performance, the Consolidated Operations Analyst -- and the Consolidated Operations Analyst for several Caesars property. And he also has been an Income Control Clerk for Caesars Entertainment in

1 Missouri. Prior to that he has held several 2 positions for financial institutions including 3 as a portfolio analyst and a stock analyst. Mr. Risley submitted all of the 4 5 required forms and supplemental documents to 6 the IEB. And investigators conducted background checks where we looked at employment 8 history, criminal record, education, political 9 contributions, references, media coverage, 10 directorships and shareholder interests, civil 11 litigation, bankruptcies and property 12 ownerships. 13 Investigators also conducted a 14 financial responsibility evaluation with 15 positive results. 16 Mr. Risley attended St. Louis 17 University where he was awarded a BA in economics. And he disclosed that he has been 18 19 licensed in Illinois with an active license, 20 Pennsylvania active license, New Jersey expired license and Missouri expired license. And he 21 22 has a pending license in New York. Again, all 23 jurisdictions were contacted and no derogatory

information reported. Overall, there were no

significant investigative issues uncovered related to Mr. Risley.

Mr. George Carney has been deemed a qualifier because he has an interest in Sweeney Investments, LLC which in turn would have an ownership interest in the applicant should the Commission issue a Category 1 license to the applicant.

Mr. Carney is already licensed by the Commission under Chapter 128A to conduct simulcasting at his Raynham facility. He was previously deemed suitable in 23 (SIC) in connection with the Raynham Park application for a slots license.

The investigation has confirmed some changes since the time of the Commission's suitability finding in 2013. Specifically that Mr. Carney has resigned from his positions as General Manager, President, Treasurer, Secretary and Director of the Brockton Agricultural Society. The Brockton Agricultural Society owns the site which the applicant proposes to build on.

Ms. Laetitia Carney has an ownership

interest in Sweeney Investments, LLC as well,
which as explained would have an ownership
interest in the applicant should a license
issue.

Mrs. Carney has no management role
in Sweeney Investments. And neither Mrs.

Carney nor Mr. George Carney is expected to
have any management role in the applicant.

Mrs. Carney was found suitable in 2013 as well.

Mrs. Carney disclosed one investigatory proceeding regarding a liquor license suspension in the town of Raynham resulting in a one-day suspension of liquor license at the Raynham Derby Club for serving a minor.

Financial analyses of Mr. and Mrs.

Carney were performed. In the Raynham Park suitability report, it was noted that George Carney reports a substantial amount of assets, but most of the overall asset value was in the form of non-liquid investments such as real estate, loans receivable and interest in closely held businesses or trusts.

Offsetting the assets are actual

liabilities and a very high level of contingent liabilities representing debts of certain Carney business ventures that Mr. Carney has personally guaranteed as to payment.

The updated financial investigation reveals that the structure of the most recent net worth statement for George Carney remains unchanged in that he has low levels of liquid assets, and the majority of his assets are in the form of related party receivables and investments in closely held business ventures.

His liabilities are primarily in the form of related party payables. And he maintains significant contingent liabilities in some business ventures. That said, when combined with the net worth of Laetitia Carney, the Carneys have liquid assets and real estate holdings that exceed the total amount of debt owing. While there may be some requirement to sell certain assets, if liquid assets were insufficient, their financial position is considered stable.

Under an agreement with the applicant, Mr. Carney has no obligation to

2.1

contribute any equity to the applicant beyond the after-tax proceeds from the sale of the project site, details of which I'll address in a moment. The investigation discovered no new information in the updated investigation that negatively impacts Mr. and Mrs. Carney's Phase 1 suitability.

Turning to the project site, the applicant has designated the host community of Brockton as its proposed site. And a vote is scheduled there for May 12. The facility is to be built on Lot 7, a 45.573 acre parcel comprising most of the current Brockton Fairgrounds. Lot 7 is owned by the Brockton Agricultural Society.

The Brockton Agricultural Society
has an interesting history. It was formed in
1874 to promote and encourage agricultural
activity for the benefit of the community. Mr.
George Carney, a qualifier in this application
due to his ownership in Sweeney Investments, is
the majority shareholder in the Society.
Laetitia Carney, also a qualifier, owns some
shares.

2.1

Mr. Carney has in the past been a general manager, director and officer of the Society at various points. But as of around November 14, 2014 he is no longer holds any of those positions or offices for the Society.

In addition to holding the Brockton Fair, the Society has some business ventures. The Society has licensed the occasional use of the fairgrounds to vendors who conduct things like flea markets, farmers markets, rodeos and similar special events.

The Society also has entered into two more significant leases or licensing agreements. In 2009 and again in 2013, the Society entered into a lease with the city of Brockton whereby the city leases a salt shed from the Society. And the city has the right to use the surrounding area 24/7 to store road salt and for incidental operations. And the city has rights of renewal through October 31, 2016 on that lease.

In 2001, the Society also entered into a ground lease for the placement of a cell tower on Lot 7. The Society files taxes as a C

2.1

corporation and pays property taxes at the commercial industrial rate. The investigators examined the Society's tax returns for the years 2008 through 2012 and they appear to be in order.

On January 14, 2015 the Society through its President and Treasurer executed a letter agreement with Mass Gaming and Entertainment. In the agreement, Mass Gaming and Entertainment has agreed to purchase Lot 7 subject to the award of the Category 1 license to the applicant.

The directors of the Society have already approved this transaction. Under the letter agreement, the Society will first obtain the two-thirds affirmative vote of the shareholders to approve the sale of Lot 7.

A secondary mechanism for the land to be contributed to the joint venture has not been fully developed but will be brought before the IEB and the Commission for the necessary review and approvals in advance should it materialize.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Director, can

2.1

you expound on that a little bit more please or repeat that?

MS. LILLIOS: That there is a secondary mechanism for the land to be contributed to the joint venture that has not been fully developed but will be brought before the IEB and the Commission for the necessary review and approvals in advance should it materialize.

So, the IEB did not fully investigate or vet that possibility because it had not materialized. But it has been made clear that if that route is to be followed before that process commences, the applicant would need to come back to the IEB. And the IEB would bring that to the Commission as necessary.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But it's not anticipated that that alternative would be materially different at this point from what you just described in terms of ownership and requirement for contributions and roles.

MS. LILLIOS: For contributions and roles that is true. Nor is it anticipated that

```
any votes of the shareholders would not be
2
     required.
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So, basically
 3
 4
     that's a different way of giving MGE control
5
     over the site that they need?
 6
                MS. LILLIOS: That's my
7
     understanding, correct.
8
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Apart from an
9
     outright sale.
                MS. LILLIOS: It's my understanding
10
11
     that an outright sale would nonetheless
12
    materialize but it just might happen
13
     differently at the Society end.
14
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH:
                                      Okay.
15
                MS. LILLIOS: Over the years, Mr.
16
     Carney has made loans to the Society. In 2001,
17
     the Society executed a promissory note payable
18
     to him, which counsel for Mr. Carney stated was
19
     to enable the Society to make capital
20
     improvements and repairs to the racetrack
21
     facility at the Brockton Fairgrounds.
22
                This note to Mr. Carney has been
23
     executed -- excuse me has been secured by a
24
    mortgage on the Society's real property.
```

The investigators requested certain of the Society's records. Many documents were provided but Attorney Morizio reported that for some of the IEB's requests it would be a major task to attempt to recover all documents requested.

Investigators looked into Mr.

Carney's purchase of a parcel of property from the Society in the late 1970s at 500 Belmont

Street. The investigators learned that in 1984 the Commonwealth's tax board issued a decision that validated the purchase price Mr. Carney paid to the Society for that parcel.

The tax board actually valued the land at an amount that was slightly less than the price he paid. Ultimately, the investigation uncovered no facts regarding the land transaction which necessarily negatively impact suitability.

Nonetheless, in furtherance of 23K's mandate to ensure public confidence in the integrity of the gaming licensing process, the IEB recommends that the Commission consider adding four conditions to a determination of

the applicant's suitability.

The recommended conditions of Phase

1 suitability are moving forward and until
directed otherwise by the Commission, one, all
of the transactions involving the Society and
Mr. Carney, Mrs. Carney, any of the Carney
affiliated entities and/or any qualifier
including but not limited to the disposition of
Lot 7 are required to be documented in detail,
and the Society is required to provide such
documentation to the IEB promptly upon its
preparation.

The second recommended condition is that the Society's books are required to be maintained according to generally accepted accounting principles. And it is reported that that is the case presently.

Condition number three is that the Society is required to promptly update the contact information for its shareholders, and to use the updated contact list to notify the shareholders of all meetings including the notice to shareholders in advance of the vote for the sale of Lot 7.

And the fourth recommended condition is that the Society is required to continue to maintain all of the required filings to the Secretary of the Commonwealth, which again it appears — the investigators have reviewed those filings and it appears that those are currently being made.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Director, you mentioned that certain documents were requested but would take a lot of effort to produce. But those documents were not documents that are required by law; is that accurate?

MS. LILLIOS: That is true for some of the requests. For instance, minutes were requested. And minutes of one directors' meeting were provided. But minutes are not required to be taken as the Society is not a governmental body subject to records retention laws or minute taking requirements of, for instance, the open meeting law.

My comment with respect that it would be a major task to produce such records went more to the IEB's request for lease and licensing documents. And Mr. Morizio can maybe

2.1

shed a little more light on this, but it is my understanding that there are many small leases, arrangements for small vendors to come on-site, and that there may be documentation that exists for those.

I think a football tournament was given as a recent example where the documentation may exist but was not easily accessible. I had requested over a 20-year period. So, some documentation was required for the more significant leases and licenses but that was the response for the other matters. And that also affected the IEB's recommended conditions.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Those are historical leases and historical operating arrangements not, at least as far as you understand it, lease arrangements or other operating agreements that are currently in effect.

MS. LILLIOS: The cell tower lease and the salt shed lease are current.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Apart from those two, these other documents are historical

1 documents. 2 MS. LILLIOS: Correct. 3 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. 4 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I ask a question on the conditions or will we have --5 6 on one of them? MS. LILLIOS: Sure. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Condition 8 9 number one, you mentioned that all of the transactions of the Society going forward be 10 11 documented in detail and provided or made 12 available if requested, if upon request from 13 the IEB. Prior to or soon after the 14 15 transaction takes place? 16 MS. LILLIOS: The recommendation is 17 that moving forward from today and until 18 otherwise directed by the Commission that 19 documentation is to be kept for the 20 transactions involving the Carneys and/or the 21 land and affirmatively to be provided to the 22 TEB. 23 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: After the 24 transaction has taken place?

MS. LILLIOS: Upon preparation of the documentation on an ongoing basis would be the recommended condition.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But documenting a transaction prior to actually entering into a transaction is different from just providing the documentation after the transaction has been entered into.

I'm specifically asking about the timing element of this. You want to know in advance or do you want to know soon after?

12 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: If for example 13 there's a lease.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. If there's a lease to be executed or has been executed, do you want to know prior to or soon thereafter?

MS. LILLIOS: Well, I think this is connected to the bylaws of the Society. So, for instance if the bylaws of the Society say that the directors can act on a certain matter at a meeting, then I would envision that the IEB would receive advance notice of the directors meeting.

2.1

So, in that way the IEB would have advanced notice of a meeting but would have after-the-fact notice documenting what actually happened at the meeting. Does that address your question?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I want to make sure that we are not in a position where we are approving a transaction either because it has been provided in advance and nothing has been said, let's say, implicitly or otherwise.

MS. LILLIOS: I understand.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: If that's the intent, I want to understand just what transactions you might be thinking about.

MS. LILLIOS: I think of particular concern is that we are notified in advance of notifications of shareholder meetings where transactions involving the Lot or involving the Carneys are anticipated.

Moving onto the description of anticipated deal itself. Mass Gaming and Entertainment and Sweeney Investments executed a joint-venture letter agreement on January 23, 2015, which anticipates that an LLC will be

formed for a joint venture entity that will only interest in the applicant.

The terms of the joint venture agreement assume that the project costs would amount to \$605 million of which \$450 million or 75 percent would represent debt financing. And the remaining \$150 million or 25 percent would be provided by the Bluhm Group and Sweeney Investments or the Carneys. The terms of this agreement are described more fully starting on page 34 of the report.

The Carneys are required under the agreement to contribute all of their after-tax proceeds from the sale the site in return for common equity in the joint venture entity.

Other terms of the agreement allow but do not require the Carneys to contribute an additional capped amount.

The intended organizational structure appears on page 36 of the report.

The net worth of each of the owners with greater than five percent as well as the net worth of the individuals who are the grantors and trustees for the identified trust were

2.1

This net worth is far in excess of examined. the range of the equity capital identified.

We do note that the majority of these assets are in the form of real estate or private business interests and thus are nonliquid. In order to address the issue of timely access to equity capital, the applicant has provided a letter from Bank of America that the LAM Partners have access to an amount in undrawn funds available to them in an existing credit facility that demonstrates to the satisfaction of the investigators that they have access to the required capital for the The LAM Partners is an acronym that project. stands for Leslie, Andrew and Meredith Bluhm. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I ask a

question on that?

MS. LILLIOS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It's not envisioned that the sale, the amount of that contribution that equity contribution, which is in the form of the land would change between now and the closing of that if they're awarded a license, is there?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 MS. LILLIOS: The financial aspect 2 of this proposal is based on current market 3 conditions. And I believe that that will be looked at again at the Phase 2 stage. 5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okav. 6 MS. LILLIOS: In conclusion, taking 7 into consideration the entirety of the IEB's 8 investigation, the IEB concludes that the 9 applicant and each qualifier have established 10 their Phase 1 qualifications for licensure by 11 clear and convincing evidence, including the 12 statutory criteria of integrity, good 13 character, honesty, reputation, financial 14 stability and financial responsibility. 15 The IEB recommends that the 16 Commission fined the applicant Mass Gaming and 17 Entertainment suitable for licensure subject to 18 the conditions discussed. 19 I know that Mr. Donnelly is here and 20 his team. And he has some remarks, but of 21 course I'm happy to try to answer any questions 22 that the Commission may have. 23 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Can I just ask

a question? First of all, any questions?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I just had one quick question and it's more of a process. Any ongoing or gaming violations that occur in other jurisdictions after the date of the suitability report are automatically required to be filed with the IEB?

MS. LILLIOS: We do have a requirement. I'm not sure if it's a strict regulatory requirement but we do view notification of all violations as part of the ongoing suitability for all of the applicants and licensees.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Are there other questions before we turn to Mr. Donnelly, which we will in a second? I had one question and this is just at the moment picking up on the last piece of the financial structure.

As I understand it from reading the report and listening to you that the essence of the position is that all of the financing pieces are not in place, which is not unusual at this stage. But when the IEB looks at the equity that's pledged and the equity -- and the

2.1

net worth of the pledgers, and looks at the 2 credit facility that's available to be drawn 3 on, and looks at the difference between the 4 equity and the credit facility and the amount 5 required to fund the project, the IEB has a 6 high degree of confidence in the financial 7 suitability of the applicant to execute this 8 project. Is that a fair summary? 9 MS. LILLIOS: Yes, it is. 10 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. 11 Donnelly, would you like to make any comments 12 at this point?

MR. DONNELLY: I would. I will be brief. I wanted to do a couple of things.

One, happy to be back. Was here on July almost two years ago.

My client's proud of being the first entity and group of people found suitable in Massachusetts. We've touted that some other places. So, we hope that we continue that process. We are gratified by the report that has come out. And we are very excited about the Brockton project. And happy as could be with our partnership with Mr. Carney.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So, I am representing Mass Gaming and Entertainment, but I also represent the Bluhm interests in a number of states. So, I wanted to put that on the record.

Number two, staff has been terrific.

I've said that before. I say it in other
jurisdictions. Everyone was jammed up with a
lot of work. And everybody on that side has
been terrific to deal with. They put very
heavy demands on us, but not reasonable. Fair,
flexible, so you all should be proud of that
staff. And I say that to other people. It's a
great staff you have.

Why are we here today? We're here for an update from what happened two years ago. And the test is, as you all know, but for the public out there, the test is real simple. It's a good character and outstanding integrity. That's what an applicant has to prove in all of these jurisdictions.

And the group that controls MG&E, which is essentially Bluhm-related entities and persons and trusts that are created for the benefit of Neil Bluhm's kids and grandchildren

2.1

have been found suitable first in Mass. in July a couple of years ago. They've been found suitable in Pennsylvania, Ontario, Mississippi, currently pending in New York. The related Bluhm entities regulated by the Securities and Exchange Commission as well. So, we've been through this routine many, many times.

And I think the general public doesn't know what a gaming commission such as yourself do. And it's worth a couple of minutes just to say that it is extremely -- I say this and it sounds like a negative word, but positive for what goes on. -- it's an extremely intrusive process. A process that is unprecedented in any other industry.

People go through bank accounts.

They go through net worth statements. They go through trust documents. They go through birth certificates, educational records. So, that there is really no privacy that's available to the applicants that the general public enjoys and would expect.

By the time that we come before a body such as this and hear a report like this,

2.1

there has been a full, comprehensive, in-depth examination as to everything that goes on in these persons and entities lives. Including not only the good character side of it, but the reputation side too, which is the kind of stuff — The book years ago about everything I learned in kindergarten are the rules, it's what other people think.

And the Bluhm entities and Bluhm and the people associated with them and their reputation as business people beyond the good character that there's no criminal records, no civil records, there's no wrongdoing, but their reputation is very high too.

It's not an entity that engages in shoddy business practices. It's not an entity that you hear on the street, oh those no-good SOBs. They've been successful but they're no good. You don't hear that about this entity.

And I'm happy to work them and it makes my job easy. We laugh on and like say how else could people like me make a buck.

Thank God for the casinos. This is a good entity to operate with. It's an entity I think

the people that are associated with, you're going to be proud to have in Massachusetts if we are selected in the RFA-2 process.

We feel the same way about Mr.

Carney, same thing. We didn't know Mr. Carney.

Like anybody else in this room, you ask what

about George Carney? And we get the same

report back. Good guy, successful guy not a

crisp dealer, a guy who you can trust. So,

we're happy with that reputation as well.

I won't go on much further. We are very happy with the report. I think the report speaks for itself. That we have my entity and the Massachusetts and the Bluhm group and the trusts that are all created all do possess the criteria under the statute. And I think have been demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence.

The financing is there. Neil Bluhm, his group have a reputation for that too. As I'm sure this board knows, but maybe the public doesn't know, in the financial crisis -- The reason that Neil Bluhm has two casinos in Pennsylvania is that during the financial

2.1

crisis, the Pittsburgh casino, which was under development by another man, a well-known casino exec. by the name of Don Barden who has since passed away got in financial difficulty, as did everybody else in the country.

And Neil Bluhm was able to come in and save that project from bankruptcy because of the strength of his financial background.

So, I don't think there need to be any concern on that side of the ledger. And there is certainly no concern on the integrity side of the ledger.

So, with that I'll be quiet and will be ready for questions. And we appreciate you inviting us here.

I was remiss in not introducing who is with me here. To my immediate right is Paul Seeman who is an attorney with LAM. As your Director pointed out, LAM is an acronym for Neil Bluhm's children Leslie, Andrew and Meredith. And Paul works for LAM and sometimes advises Rush.

Also Mike Morizio here who is a long-term attorney for George Carney and for

2.1

the Sweeney group that they have put together. 2 He's been working very closely with the 3 director resolving and putting together the 4 paperwork for an entity that's been in 5 existence for close to 100 years. We'd laugh 6 that we'd have to go out and dig up some records out of the graveyard and so on. 8 So, we're again happy to have Mike 9 Happy to have Paul here and we're here. 10 prepared to answer any questions the 11 Commissioners may have. Thank you. 12 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. 13 Thank you very much, Mr. Donnelly. Questions 14 for Mr. Donnelly or for either of his 15 colleagues who are here today? 16 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Mr. Donnelly, 17 I had a few questions about some of these 18 violations and fines that have occurred since. 19 I won't go back because we dealt with the ones 20 prior to 2013. But a couple present themselves 21 and we've now been through this a number of 22 times and are very familiar with seeing routine 23 violations. For example, underage minors 24 inadvertently are admitted.

But some of these others I had some questions about. The first one would be the 8/6/14 violation with the 12 slot machines below the required 85 percent minimum. Do you have more information about that? That's a long period of time and a pretty hefty fine as well with that.

MR. DONNELLY: Yes, I do. Thank you, Commissioner. What happened there is there existed at that time period the ability or maybe disability of a slot machine to have different pay tables on it by virtue of how you put some calibrator or push some buttons when the machine was open. That no longer exists. It should not have existed. It wasn't our doing. But it was possible for a slot technician to put the wrong percentages in there.

That happened with 12 machines out of I think there's 31 or 32 altogether. A slot technician, when they open the door there's what they call it an EEPROM, it's just an electronic computer chip. In those particular slots there was the ability put the wrong, what

they call, pay table in. The wrong pay table was put in. And it was a minor reduction. It was like 84 plus percentage instead of 85 percent. No one knew that that had happened.

The state of Pennsylvania periodically audits the machines. And they came in in a random audit and found that we did not know that. For almost virtually all of the violations you see, we self-report. There's a strong culture of self-reporting when we find out something went wrong. Didn't know that had happened.

When we found out it happened, we owned up to it. Acknowledged it, paid a fine. And speaking to some staff beforehand, stuff happens. And you can't with 4000 employees that the Bluhm organization has, you can't be perfect.

What you can do is have a culture that is against that. You can have control, internal controls. And you can have investigations and discipline when appropriate. We did all of those things.

After the fact, they put in a

2.1

procedure that now in the future, there has to 2 be a double-check when that slot technician --Well, first of all, that I say can't -- That 3 can't happen. That particular violation can't happen anymore because machines do not get on 6 the floor that have the ability for someone to make that mistake. But I will say that I have 8 seen in my history people take the EEPROM out, 9 the little chip, go into the back room and fail 10 to check it. Not in the Bluhm casinos, but 11 I've seen it in New Jersey.

So secondly, we have systems in place that a supervisor has to double-check that machine before it goes live. That's in an internal control that is in effect now. So, it should not happen again. As I understand it, it was only on a single coin bet. So, it wasn't a large problem.

And Paul reminds me the second control we're doing is quarterly audits now. That we check the machines ourselves to make sure that they are properly calibrated.

You can never say never but that particular problem will not occur again and we

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

now have two safeguards in to protect it from happening that we didn't have before.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So, the procedure was changed to make sure that that should not happen again.

MR. DONNELLY: Precisely, double-breasted two controls.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Some of the other violations I had a question about. You had a poker dealer ignoring the shuffler red lights on two occasions. And some other issues here that I think really, really hit on training issues. Underage lots of times, right, that's security that needs to do a better job and pay attention to those issues. Certainly, this incident with the dealer.

You mentioned a lot of steps that you take in order to ensure things won't happen but training was not one of them that you mentioned. I'm just wondering if some of these incidents do lead you to believe that courtroom paperwork for example that was improperly returned -- count room rather, which is serious, right? That's a \$50,000 fine.

MR. DONNELLY: That was serious.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes, yes. Is that someone just not doing their job? Or they're not trained? You mentioned that you do

5 do investigations. What was the outcome there?

MR. DONNELLY: You got a couple of them. Let me talk about what we call blowing the red light. And what occurred was when you use a shuffle machine, a shuffle machine will put on a red light on the table, which indicates that either there's been a misshuffle or there's a card count. It actually counts the cards and missed one.

The dealers in question on this failed to pay attention to the red light. They have been trained. They knew it was a mistake. They knew they shouldn't do it and they did it anyway.

We had two clumps of incidents. The first clump of incidents were -- I'm stealing some of Paul's thunder because he knows in greater detail if we have to if there's more detailed questions. But the first was on table games. And after those events occurred,

2.1

everyone was retrained. Everyone had to do
what we call a read and sign, read that they
shouldn't blow this red light, which is
intuitive. And sign that in the future there
will be zero tolerance and will be terminated.
And people did do that.

But not in the poker room. In the poker room then we had these two violations, same thing. There is zero tolerance now. More read and signs, more training. And the employees who engaged in those problems were fired.

We did an investigation. There was a firing in one case a dealer, one supervisor and I think a second supervisor. And the other dealer was not fired because the supervisor had told that dealer to ignore the red light. He was fired, he or she, I forget.

So, again I can't say that someone won't watch that red light come on and say I'm going to deal anyway. If they do, they're going to get fired. And they know it. It wasn't an oversight or it wasn't a lack of knowledge. They knew they shouldn't do that.

1 As to the count room issue, yes.

That count room issue, we're all perplexed by it. By the way, not only were there people in the count room, there were regulators in the count room as well. What would happen was there is no loss of any money or anything like that. But if someone had written on what is called a fill slip, a slip that comes down to the cage and it didn't true out with other documentation, they would send that form back to the floor to have the floor correct it and make it correct.

Absolutely, positively, wrong. And like I said, there were people in there that observed it. The way that was captured is we had an external auditor come in the room and looked at them and said what's going on here? We self-reported. We cleaned house of the people who were doing that. And that will not happen again. I can't imagine that will happen again.

The final thing you ask about sometimes underage or other people come in.

And I'm happy -- Look we're still not perfect

and we never will be happy with that. I will say a statistic that we're very proud of. When we were last here, we had a number of problems at Rivers.

As of yesterday, Rivers was at 611 days without an incident, so close to two years now. And they do it like when I was a kid. I worked in a steel mill and they'd say how many days without an accident. They post it up there. They post it up how many days without an incident. They are very proud of it.

We'll occasionally get an event that will happen. But we are doing everything we can. So there is training, more importantly there is a culture. Training, get the culture in, have the controls and investigate and discipline if necessary. We have those in place. And we're serious about it. And we will be here as well.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you, Mr. Donnelly.

MR. DONNELLY: Thank you.

23 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.

Other questions? I had a couple of questions

that I think probably directed best at Mr. 2 This maybe is in RFA-2 land when we Morizio. 3 get there -- if and when we get there, but let me ask it now anyway. That is under the report 5 -- in the report there's an indication that the 6 city of Brockton has a lease for a salt shed that's renewable at its option until October 8 2016. And there's also the cell tower lease that's on this land as well. 9 10 How does that impact the ability to 11 develop the land? 12 MR. MORIZIO: First of all, good 13 morning, Commissioners. And thank you for 14 inviting us here today. Our current design 15 calls for a very significant Green zone or 16

calls for a very significant Green zone or buffer zone along the back part of the Brockton Fair. This salt shed lease, which ends 2016 and the cell tower is either in that Green zone or just on the edge of it. And if it is on the edge of it, it would be in a parking lot area

anyway. So, it will have no effect on the

ability to construct the casino or to open the

23 casino.

17

18

19

20

21

The cell tower I'd also mention we

have the right as the landlord, if we choose 2 to, to move its location anywhere on the site 3 at our cost. So, if for some reason we felt it was necessary to do that, we would have the ability to move the cell tower as well. 6 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. 7 Thank you. My second question has to do with 8 the third condition that the IEB is 9 recommending, which is update and maintain a 10 list of all the shareholders. Is there any 11 reason why given the history of the 12 organization and the importance of the upcoming 13 vote or the vote that will be necessary to 14 actually consummate the sale that the 15 shareholders should not be notified by 16 certified or registered mail of that meeting? 17 MR. MORIZIO: No. I think that's a 18 We should document more than one good idea. 19 way that we have contacted all of the 20 shareholders. We would be pleased to do that. 2.1 We've always held -- My firm has 22 been counsel to the Brockton Agricultural 23 Society for close to 60 years. 24 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: 6-0?

1 MR. MORIZIO: 6-0. 2 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: You haven't 3 been counsel for that long. 4 MR. MORIZIO: I haven't, no. But our late senior counsel Joe O'Kozal (PHONETIC) 5 6 who was and his father before him. throughout that entire period, we have always 8 had annual shareholder meetings. Our firm has been there. We've been part of the 9 10 notification process. There's always been 11 notice published in the Brockton Enterprise. 12 It's been a stable and consistent method of 13 notification to shareholders. 14 So, adding a direct mailing by 15 certified mail as well as the notice in the 16 local newspaper will be followed. And we'll 17 certainly provide that information to IEB. 18 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Mr. Morizio, 19 just roughly how many shareholders are 20 currently? 2.1 MR. MORIZIO: I would say 22 approximately 80. 23 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. 24 Thank you very much. I had one other question

now. And I'm going to ask that question of Director Lillios. And it goes back to what Commissioner Zuniga was talking about in the first of those conditions.

What if that condition were changed to say at the end that the Society was required to provide documentation to the IEB promptly after the transaction occurs?

The concern that Commissioner Zuniga raised was implicit approval of a transaction rather than reviewing it afterwards and being informed of it. We might then want to take — the IEB might want to recommend some action be taken afterwards, but would not be in a position of having to watch all of these things and approve or disapprove.

MS. LILLIOS: I think that captures the essence of what the IEB should be doing. So, I think that's great.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. Any other things that you would like to say, Director Lillios after hearing Mr. Donnelly and Mr. Morizio's comments?

MS. LILLIOS: No. Just to thank

them again for the process and to thank the Commission as well.

3 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. 4 Well, I think the report, you are to be 5 congratulated and the staff is to be 6 congratulated. This is really a very thorough and readable report. It clearly reflects a 8 great deal of probing and updating the 9 information that we had before. It's easy to follow. It's succinct. It's well done. 10 11 obviously reflects a great deal of cooperation 12 from the applicant as well to provide this information. 13

It is an intrusive process as Mr.

Donnelly suggested -- He didn't suggest, he said. And it is I think unparalleled in any other industry. But the ability to do this, the ability to do it in a timely fashion depends not only on the energy of the investigators and your team, but also on the cooperation of the applicant. So, it's a combined effort that brings us to this point.

Any further comments by Commissioners? Otherwise it seems to me it's

1

2

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

time to think about framing a motion with respect to the task -- the issue that's before us.

That is whether the applicant has shown by clear and convincing evidence and whether we're persuaded that it's shown by clear and convincing evidence that it is suitable to hold a Category 1 casino license in Massachusetts. Any other comments?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No. Just the same comments to thank both the applicant and -- the applicant with its number of qualifiers and the IEB for the work that they've done.

Really good work.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. It seems to me that we need to, as we did before, to find all of the entities, Rush Street

Gaming, Mass Gaming and Entertainment and

Sweeney Investments, Inc. qualified as entities. And that we need to find that each of the individual qualifiers is qualified. And that we need to approve of the four conditions under which our vote -- on which our vote rests. So, let me, if I might, try to frame a

motion that encompasses all of those.

2 So, I move that the Commission find 3 that Mass Gaming and Entertainment, LLC, Rush Street Gaming, LLC, actually it's more than the three, Mass Gaming and Entertainment, LLC, Rush 6 Gaming, LLC, Rush Street Gaming Partners, LLC, Mass Gaming Holdings, LLC, Sweeney Investments, 8 LLC, 2013 AGB Family Dynasty Exempt Trust #2, 9 2013 LNB Family Trust Exempt #2, 2013 Meredith 10 A. Bluhm-Wolf Family Trust #2, Neil Bluhm, 11 Andrew Bluhm, Leslie Bluhm, Meredith Bluhm, 12 Gregory Carlin, David Patent, Timothy Drehkoff, 13 Joseph Scibetta, Suzanne Trout, Zeletta M. 14 Wyatt, James J. Jabczynski, John Risley, George 15 Carney, Laetitia Carney, Carlin Dynasty Trust 16 have shown by clear and convincing evidence 17 that they are qualified to hold a Category 1 18 casino license in Massachusetts. 19 And that that conclusion is 20 conditioned on four principles. Number one, 21 all of the transactions involving the Society

George Carney and Ms. Laetitia Carney, any of the Carney affiliated entities and any

and that is the Brockton Fair Society and Mr.

qualifier including but not limited to the disposition of Lot 7 are required to be documented in detail, and the Society is required to provide such documentation to the IEB promptly after the transaction occurs.

Two that the Society's books are required to be maintained according to the generally accepted accounting principles.

Three that the Society is required to promptly update the contact information for its shareholders and to use the updated contact list to notify the shareholders of all meetings including the notice to shareholders in advance of the vote for the sale of Lot 7 to Mass Gaming and Entertainment, which notice shall be served and delivered by certified or registered mail.

And fourth that the Society is required to continue to maintain all of the required filings with the Secretary of the Commonwealth.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Discussion?

24 All in favor, aye.

2.1

1 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 3 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 4 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The ayes have 5 it unanimously. 6 MR. DONNELLY: Thank you very much. 7 We look forward to seeing you for the RFA-2. 8 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Thank you. 9 MS. LILLIOS: Commissioners, if I 10 could make the reminder that since you have 11 voted for suitability, under 205 CMR 115.05 12 subsection 6, no notice has to be issued by the 13 city of Brockton to the citizens with respect 14 to the upcoming vote. 15 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. 16 That is simply an observation and no vote is 17 required for that. 18 I should add that suitability is of 19 course a continuing process. It's been 20 continuing for the past two years. It will 2.1 continue into the future. So, comments from anybody as events materialize are always 22 23 welcome and suitability remains an open issue. 24 Thank you all very much.

1 MS. LILLIOS: Thank you. 2 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right we 3 have one other item on the agenda. Item four, 4 we have a report from the legal division. 5 Let's take that. Do you want to take a break? 6 This will only take a few minutes. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No, we can do 8 that. 9 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right, Mr. 10 Grossman. 11 MS. GROSSMAN: Good morning, 12 Commissioners. We have before you 250 (SIC) CMR 13 140 which you took a look at at your last 14 meeting. 15 There were a number of adjustments that were recommended to the draft. You'll 16 17 recall this section of the regulations has gone 18 through a public hearing. You've previously 19 approved the amended small business impact 20 statement. And upon your approval, this 21 regulation will be ready for enactment. 22 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. We did 23 go through this at our last meeting. 24 were some changes. We requested that we take a

1 look at those changes in writing. We basically
2 approved them in principle. Here they are.
3 Questions, comments?
4 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: They track, as far as I can tell, they track precisely what we talked about the last time, but it's good to be able to review them in writing and in the context and in front of us. Any questions of Mr. Grossman?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 205 CMR 140 is included in the packet in its final version as we discussed last time to then become promulgated effective today, right -- if we vote on it?

MS. GROSSMAN: It wouldn't be effective today, but it would be effective two weeks from tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Two weeks from the filing with the Secretary.

MS. GROSSMAN: Right.

22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: We would be approving both the small business impact

24 statement and the regulations?

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1 MS. GROSSMAN: Yes, sorry. 2 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Any other 3 comments, questions? All right, do I hear a motion? 5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. I will 6 move that the Commission approves the 205 CMR 140 gross gaming revenue tax remittance 8 reporting regulations as presented here in the 9 packet, as well as the amended small business 10 impact statement for the same said regulations 11 205 CMR 140 as presented here today. 12 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. 13 there a second for that motion? 14 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second. 15 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Discussion? 16 No discussion being heard. All in favor, aye. 17 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 18 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 19 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 20 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The ayes have 21 it unanimously. Now as I began to say albeit a 22 little out of order, item number four on the 23 agenda is being withdrawn. That's not quite 24 ready for presentation today. We'll return to

```
Page 70
     that at a future meeting. Therefore, unless
 1
     there is something else we should do, I would
 2
 3
     entertain a motion to adjourn.
 4
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So moved.
 5
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Second?
 6
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second.
 7
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All in favor,
 8
     aye.
 9
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
10
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
11
                COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
12
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The ayes have
13
     it unanimously and we are adjourned.
14
15
                (Hearing adjourned at 11:49 a.m.)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

Page 71 ATTACHMENTS: 2 Massachusetts Gaming Commission May 3 6, 2015 Notice of Meeting and Agenda 4 2. Massachusetts Gaming Commission May 4, 2015 Updated Investigative Report for the 5 6 Massachusetts Gaming Commission Applicant: 7 Mass Gaming and Entertainment, LLC 8 205 CMR 140 Gross Gaming Revenue Tax 9 Remittance and Reporting 10 205 CMR 140 Amended Small Business Impact 4. 11 Statement 12 13 14 **GUEST SPEAKERS:** 15 John Donnelly, Esq., Mass Gaming & 16 Entertainment 17 Michael P. Morizio, Esq., Brockton Agricultural 18 Society 19 20 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION STAFF: 21 Todd Grossman, Deputy General Counsel 22 Loretta Lillios, Deputy Director IEB 23 24

	Page 72
1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I, Laurie J. Jordan, an Approved Court
4	Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing
5	is a true and accurate transcript from the
6	record of the proceedings.
7	I, Laurie J. Jordan, further certify that the
8	foregoing is in compliance with the
9	Administrative Office of the Trial Court
10	Directive on Transcript Format.
11	I, Laurie J. Jordan, further certify I neither
12	am counsel for, related to, nor employed by any
13	of the parties to the action in which this
14	hearing was taken and further that I am not
15	financially nor otherwise interested in the
16	outcome of this action.
17	Proceedings recorded by Verbatim means, and
18	transcript produced from computer.
19	WITNESS MY HAND this 7th day of May, 2015.
20	
21	
22	Suria Jordan
23	LAURIE J. JORDAN My Commission expires:

Notary Public May 11, 2018

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

24

6878661f-d28a-4585-8011-9abca75c0536