| i | | |
|----|---------------------------------|--------|
| | | Page 1 |
| 1 | COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS | |
| 2 | MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION | |
| 3 | PUBLIC MEETING #194 | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | CHAIRMAN | |
| 7 | Stephen P. Crosby | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | COMMISSIONERS | |
| 10 | Lloyd Macdonald | |
| 11 | Gayle Cameron | |
| 12 | Bruce W. Stebbins | |
| 13 | Enrique Zuniga | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | June 23, 2016 10:00 a.m. | |
| 19 | MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION | |
| 20 | 101 Federal Street, 12th Floor | |
| 21 | Boston, Massachusetts 02110 | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| | | |

PROCEEDINGS

2

1

3

4

5 6

7 8

10

9

11

1213

14

16

15

18

19

17

20

22

21

2324

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are good to go.

We are calling to order the 194th meeting of
the Massachusetts Gaming Commission on
Thursday, June 22nd, again at our offices on
Federal Street. Before we do anything else, we
wanted to mark a momentous occasion. Turns out
there are several. As of, essentially, today,
MGM, I think, has had its first anniversary as
a licensee.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Penn.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Penn.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Penn had it's first -- yeah, sorry.

THE FLOOR: Thank you. We all look the same.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. That's a good thing. You've seen one casino operator, you've seen them all. But it's been a great -- it's been a great run. It's been a great year. And its been an incredible experience.

You know, we -- everybody on the commission side is very much aware of the fact

that we were new to this. And Penn came on first, and we have been learning as we have been going, and you've been very accommodating in learning with us. But on the whole, we couldn't be happier with the way it's worked out, and with the professionalism of the operation, the absence of any troubles of any particular kind. Our crime research, as you know, suggests there haven't been any serious problems. A lot of money and a lot of jobs are being generated, and it's tremendously exciting. And that's what we were asked to The legislature gave us a job. was generate revenue and generate jobs. was what we were asked do. And with your help, we've been doing it, so it's great.

The second, however, is much more significant than that. And that is that our long time stenographer, Laurie Reardon, who has been with us through thick and thin for most of these past four or five years, is the leaving the stenography business to become a permanent employee at

24 Mass Development. That's great for

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

Mass Development. That's great for Laurie.

That's not so great for the Gaming Commission
because she's really been fantastic. The -our stenographer - and Brenda is sitting here
now doing the same thing - sits there
repeating and recording every single word of
our meetings, and it eventually gets
transcribed into text. This is an incredibly
critical role in our commitment to
transparency. It couldn't happen without our
stenographers.

And Laurie has gone through us -gone through the licensing process with us,
which has been extraordinary, with many, many,
many late-night meetings and crazy people
testifying, and, you know, all sorts of stuff.
So we would like to wish Laurie well. If you
would please come down here, please, for
minute. Here you go. Thank you very much.
You've been terrific.

MS. JORDAN: Thank you. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And Brenda Ginisi has been with us before, and maybe will be here

2.1

Page 5 1 for a long time. But you have big shoes to 2 fill, big flip-flops to fill. Thank you, 3 Laurie. You've been great. You did great. 4 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you, Laurie. 5 6 MS. JORDAN: Thank you. 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And it's a credit 8 to your company too. You bring a great 9 attitude, and this is a tremendously demanding 10 job, and we -- we really appreciate your work and your professionalism, and good luck. 11 12 MS. JORDAN: Thank you. 13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. We are on into Item 2, the approval of minutes. 14 15 Commissioner Macdonald. 16 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I move that the minutes of the meeting of June 9, 2016 be 17 18 approved, subject to corrections, typographical 19 errors and other nonmaterial matters. 20 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Discussion? All in favor? 22 23 MR. MACDONALD: Aye.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:

1 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The four votes to zero, Commissioner Crosby abstains himself because he was not involved in that meeting.

Next up is Item 3, an overall administrative update from Executive Director Bedrosian.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Good morning, members of the Commission. I, too, would like to congratulate and thank Ms. Reardon. She's been a valuable contributor and partner in our development. I would also like to congratulate Penn National and Plainridge for their year anniversary. So I've been here about half that time. Mr. George and his staff and the folks at corporate have been very generous in their time in helping me as an executive director get up to speed. So thank you and congratulations to them.

Just a couple of items on the agenda for both the Commission and people who might be either in the office or watching on line, Items 6B, review of the MG & E written decision, and Item 8C, Brockton fair racing

2.1

request, are going to be deferred until another meeting. So if people have interest in those, those will be deferred to another meeting.

Under Item 3A, general update, I
just -- I became aware that

Commissioner Cameron and Director Wells
recently went to a law enforcement summit,
which had some interest. I'm going to ask

Commissioner Cameron to give a brief
explanation of what that was.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you,

Executive Director -- Director Bedrosian.

Yeah, we -- Director Wells, who's in the back
of room, we were invited to participate as -you know, me, mostly, for my former status, I
think, as a law enforcement executive, and,
certainly Director Wells in her present status.

It was a law enforcement summit hosted by the American Gaming Association, but the topic was illegal gaming. And this was a pretty elite group of law enforcement professionals, state, federal, local, county, high-ranking folks to really talk about the

2.1

scope, and kind of a brainstorming session on, maybe, next steps when it comes to this business.

I certainly have been involved in this business over the years with illegal gaming, illegal bookmakers, illegal slot machines, but I actually was surprised at the numbers. We're talking about an estimate of -- to exceed a hundred billion dollars annually in the United States. That's with sports betting.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's -- that's illegal?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Illegal.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Illegal.

illegal. Correct. That's not -- you know,

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: That's

lots of legal gambling going on in Las Vegas

and in a couple of other states, but -- but

20 illegal. I was actually surprised at those

21 numbers. 4.2 billion on the Super Bowl alone.

22 97 percent of that was illegal. The black

23 market on slot machines, you know, they did a

24 study on Texas, because I think Texas is one of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

those states without any legal gambling. And, you know, putting the numbers together, 1.9 billion annually just on illegal slot machines.

And I know that, that is an issue here. We've had discussions with our partners at the AG's office on -- and ABCC, on what is the extent to the problem? This is an area I think we could do some work here, is try to identify how large the problem is here.

Had an excellent presentation from the UK sports betting. It's legal in the UK.

Very -- very nice presentation on what they do to keep it safe and secure. Very interesting presentation from a group call the Genius

Sports Group. Their analytics are amazing.

What's changed in their ability to identify something awry with a sports bet. You know, a full analytics team that can track betting.

Now, those countries that have legal sports betting would hire this company to -- to look at their analytics. And they give gave us examples. There was a Ukrainian soccer match, in which the betting was going along just fine, according to, you know, how

2.1

teams were rated. And then, toward the end of match -- now, we're talking about betting during matches, which is very common now, mobile betting during a match, and, you know, the numbers changed dramatically for the away team. And, you know, certainly in soccer in particular, as you get closer to the end, it's hard to score a goal, right, because there's not much time left in the game.

So they noticed this, turned it over to the investigators. Immediately, in conjunction with talking to the league, stopped taking bets, so that bet -- those bets were canceled. And within the last two minutes of the game, there was kind of a loosely -- a loose attempt at defense by both the defenseman and the goalie, and the goal was scored. But, luckily, they -- they were able to protect the integrity because they had stop the betting. And now you have something to -- to really work with, with an investigation into those players.

So interesting to see what they can really do, when there is a safe and legal

2.1

betting environment. That was discussed at length, how law enforcement really has limited resources when it comes to investigating or tracking the amount of the illegal gambling going on.

So, you know, there is some talk, and there is a group that is very much in favor of legalizing sports betting, regulating it. Nevada gave a nice presentation on what they do to keep it transparent, how they protect their legal market. So it was interesting.

As we've done with this Commission, we -- we take a look at whether it be on-line or social gaming, we're going to learn more about that today. I think this is a topic that was very much of interest for us to receive new information. It could be that past, but some point is -- the leagues will -- will understand that maybe it is better, and we just need to be prepared. We have to understand it. And if, at some point, it comes to us to regulate, I think it's really important that we attend these sessions so

2.1

that we know enough about it, and what -what's out there, as far as -- you know, it's
a changing market, as we know.

So I found it interesting. It was a day long. Director Wells, do you have anything to add? Okay. She's saying, no, she does not. So I just thought the -- the other commissioners would find it interesting to hear about the day we spent in DC last week.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is there any -- is there a consensus within the law enforcement community one way or the other?

this was an educational, kind of, a format.

Meaning, you know, we want you to know what
these numbers are like. We'd like your help in
brainstorming. So I thought that was a smart
idea, to reach out to law enforcement and say,
hey, we think this is an issue, and we want to
know about your experiences.

And -- and there were many prosecutors there, a former attorney general from -- you know, just every level of folks who have dealt with this issue. And so I

2.1

wouldn't -- I think it's early to say there's a consensus, but it is -- I think everyone found the education to be worthwhile. that -- that was another next step. How do we educate those folks, for example, here in the Commonwealth? Is there -- is there work to be done along those lines, because I, in particular, who do have experience with this, I was still surprised at the numbers how much -- and, you know, when the money is unregulated, it's not tracked. You know, many, many stories about how that money is used for other illicit activities, sports betting money, whether it be, you know, human trafficking or narcotics. So it really was a worthwhile discussion, but it's early in that discussion.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: For the industry to be that -- or that amount of money being -- being played, some of it's -- I mean, how much of it's being moved electronically? I mean, via -- it's not somebody just walking into the corner store and laying down cash for that kind of thing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well, a lot of it -- I mean, I think the bookies are alive and well, frankly. They're alive and well here in the Commonwealth and -- but there is a growing piece of it that is -- that is done on line.

You know, used to be that the bookmakers all had local wire rooms, we used to call them. And that's where people would call in and place their bets. A lot of that's done offshore now, so it makes it a little more difficult, frankly. But I don't know that there are exact numbers on how much of this is -- is done locally and how much is done offshore. Again, it's really early, and it hasn't been tracked.

I mean, the Brits were kind of chiding us for saying, we can keep it safe, we can keep it secure. People love to bet so let's -- you know, you'd be smart to regulate it and really work along these lines. But, certainly, there's not a consensus here yet for that. And -- but it is certainly a dialogue, I think, was worth having, and more information is really important.

1

2

3 4

5

6

7

10 11

9

12

13

14

1516

17

1819

20

2122

23

24

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Commissioner, you mentioned the difficulties getting around understanding the numbers and the extent. had discussions with the lottery, another one of the -- you mentioned the ABCC and -- and the AG, but the lottery's very much an interested party in this. They -- they see, anecdotally, some machines that, even though they say for -for entertainment purposes only, they are effectively illegal slot machines, oftentimes, at lottery-licensed places, which, in their mind, undermine the -- you know, the brand of the lottery and -- and the ability of the lottery. It affects the lottery in many ways.

So that's a topic that locally here is also of interest, you know, in our -- in our charter to protect the lottery.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Commissioner, you were -- you were correct in pointing that out. And not only are, you know, state, federal, local officials looking -- you know, getting together on a scale like this to talk about the issue, but I know we have had conversations here in the Commonwealth with

Page 16 everyone understanding that it is an issue, and is there something more we can be doing to --2 3 to really address this issue. So that --4 that's a point well-taken. 5 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Commissioner, 6 you referenced a presentation by the UK. 7 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes. 8 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Some UK 9 people. And I gather that sports betting is 10 very much a part of the conventional landscape, 11 you know, in the UK? 12 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No, it's not 13 just sports betting. It's -- they bet on everything. Politics. I mean, just --14 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 15 The Brexit. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 16 17 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: As we speak. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes. 18 19 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Were there 20 any concerns noted by -- by the UK presenters, 2.1 as to problems that have consistently manifested themselves? 22 23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well, I think 24 everyone's major concern is the integrity of

the game, the sport. And their -- Europe probably has some more glaring examples of what they call match fixing. And so, that -- that continues to be a concern, but they feel like it would be much more of a concern if they didn't -- if it wasn't legal, and it wasn't regulated, and it wasn't tracked.

Again I -- one of the most interesting presentation I found with -- were the analytics by this Genius group. I mean, amazing what they can see, if something is a awry, when it comes betting on that particular match. And -- and stopping that bet immediately, when they can see that happen. So that -- those analytics were not available even five years ago, and they -- they get better every year.

So that is a concern, but one they feel like they're doing a good job with. The other concern they mentioned is -- you know, they feel like their tax rate so that they can regulate properly is -- is -- is about the right rate. Meaning, if you tax too high, you'll still have an illegal market. If you

2.1

-- if you really decide to make too much money, or to tax at a rate that's high, then you'll leave room for the illegal operators to exist.

They feel like they don't have a problem with illegal operators now because they offer all the games that people are interested in. And, secondly, their rate is such that there's no room for the illegal market to operate. So those were some of the concerns, but some of the ways they address them.

analytics that were described, is -- for the analytics to -- to work, is it necessary for the market to be, essentially, a legal one, because then that provides the people applying the analytics to have regular and direct access to the pattern and magnitude of -- of -- of the betting?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: They can do some tracking of the illegal market. But, first of all, they work for their clients, who pay them to do this, and the illegal market

2.1

certainly not interested in being tracked.

Also, yes, they have access to all of the information. Because it's legal, it's -- it's transparent. All the bets are transparent so they have all that information. So they are -- you know, they can track in realtime, and they do track in real time.

And -- and what that's helping,
that's helping law enforcement around the
world as well, because without those analytics
it may be have been very tough in the past to
say, hey, that goalie really didn't make an
effort. Where now they have real -- they have
something to investigate.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Circumstantial evidence, yeah.

and more than that, if you go in and talk to some of those betters, to get someone to flip and say yes, and you have probable cause to look at -- to look at someone's bank records then, and find out if, in fact, that individual was -- was paid.

So they just feel like it's a

2.1

Page 20 1 much -- much more able to keep it safe and 2 secure with the analytics. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Interesting. 4 Great. 5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Sounds like a 6 great --7 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: It was an 8 interesting day. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. 10 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: It really was. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you. That 12 was terrific. 13 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay. 14 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Thank you, 15 Commissioner Cameron. Before I go on to 16 PlayMyWay update, I will just note on that 17 subject, whether it's appropo of anything, I 18 believe I read that Las Vegas is going to get a 19 NHL hockey team. 20 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yes. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes. 22 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I saw the same 23 thing. 24 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Director

Vander Linden is not here so I will give a PlayMyWay launch report. Commission, as you may remember --

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Can I stop
you just before you get into -- you know, this
-- this opportunity, this discussion is
something I'd like us to think about, kind of,
adding to our agenda periodically.

I mean, because each of us is now going off attending different meetings and conferences, and giving some thought to squaring away time on our agenda to have this type of -- type of discussion and presentations as each of us is off going to different conferences or meetings, I think it would be a great way -- great thing to add to our agenda, to give us this chance to have these updates and conversations.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: We might call it commissioner update versus executive director update.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Absolutely.

Don't want to take away your time.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So everybody

2.1

understands, under the operation of the Open

Meeting Law, we can't go off on a business trip

and come back and report to our other

commissioners about what happened on a business

trip. We thought we could, but we were told we

can't so --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Unless it's in an open meeting.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Unless it's an open meeting, right. So that's -- that's a good idea. It helps mitigate the inability of us to communicate -- communicate with one another.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: So I will continue. Director Vander Linder [sic] is off. As you may remember, Commissioners, on June 8th and 9th, the Commission officially launched PlayMyWay, which is a new, responsible gaming initiative that provides casino patrons with a voluntary option to budget and track their play.

I'd like to commend

Director Vander Linden, the folks from our IT

staff, all our volunteers, our partners at

Plainridge, and the developers at

2.1

Scientific Games.

2.1

While the technology, if you've seen it, and I know you all have, looks simple, it is a complicated process to overlay that on a casino floor with different machine manufacturers, software, a slot management system, and make it work and operate seamlessly, given all the different permutations of betting that can take place.

And I think our goal was for that to happen so this then can be one of our tools in our Responsible Gaming toolbox. And that, down the road public health officials can evaluate it on its merits and not that we couldn't get it to work. So I think that we've really accomplished that.

And I will tell you that, as of this morning, a report from Director Vander Linden we -- 1,695 people have enrolled, and 146 people have unenrolled. So I think -- I think that is encouraging statistics.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Let me just add to that. And you mentioned this, but I think it's worth mentioning again, there's never been a

system used like this in the United States. In had to be developed. The technology had to be developed, a working relationship had to be developed with an operator. And we -- we proposed this, as has been discussed publicly. There was a lot of -- of debate about whether this was worth trying. And if it was worth trying, under what terms and conditions.

Penn National has really stepped up here at some considerable cost, at least, in time and angst, to partner with us on this. Starting out with their CEO, Tim Wilmont, who volunteered to agree with us to try this as a trial. But the burden of it fell on Lance George, the general manager and his staff, to work with us on an ongoing basis. And it was not easy. That -- it took tremendous commitment of their resources. Michele Collins and Jason Gittles, in particular, were tremendously helpful.

And this is -- you know, this is working on a controversial, experimental program, even while Lance and the rest of the team are working to get their casino up and

2.1

running, and to maximize their appropriate revenue streams and so forth. This was not easy, and it was done tremendously professionally. We -- we take our role as regulators very seriously. If we have problems, our licensees will know it. But where humanly possible, we want to collaborative and partner when we do things like this. And with the help of Penn National, we were able to do it.

How it's going to work, what success, what failure, we don't know, but we have a very robust evaluation going on, but we couldn't have done this without the really professional collaboration of, particularly, Lance and his team. So I just want to mention that again, and we know it was not easy so thanks.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Chairs -Commissioners, we're on to Item 3C, Social
Gaming. And just as a reminder, this is a
follow-up presentation to a presentation that

2.1

you had on May 10th, in which we had the following speakers, we had Timothy Lowe and Monty Sharma from Mass DiGi; Luc Delaney, the CEO of International Social Game Association; and Keith Whyte from National Council on Problem Gaming.

Mr. Stempeck and I, at the end of that presentation, informed the Commission the next step would be to invite our licensees and in to update the Commission on what they're doing in this area. Today, you'll hear from representatives of two of our licensees, MGM and Penn. To state the obvious, at this point, they are not similarly situation.

MGM will present what

MGM International is doing with its partner,

MyVegas. You'll hear a caveat, I think, that

MGM Springfield will make a determination to

participate in this program or not, when it is

operational. And we should consider this

presentation on behalf of MGM as

informational.

With that, I'd ask Mr. Stempeck to introduce the speakers from MGM. And after

2.1

they are done, we will call up the representatives of Penn.

MR. STEMPECK: Here today, from MGM, we have from -- or on behalf of MGM, we have Paul Mathews, the president and CEO of Playstudios; Josh Swissman, the senior vice president of loyalty marketing from MGM Resorts International; and Jed Nosal, the outside counsel for MGM Springfield. So without further adieu, I'll turn it over to them.

MR. BEDROSIAN: And I also see
Seth Stratton down there at the end, so I just
wanted to notice him too.

MR. MATHEWS: Well, thank you. My name's Paul Mathews, as mentioned. I'm a founder and the president and chief financial officer of a company called Playstudios. I'd like to spend some time going through a little bit of background on what we do, and our partnership with MGM Resorts International.

And I also want to explain how our game works, and how our -- the rewards component of our game works. So if we could go -- you want to do that? There we go.

2.1

The company was started in 2011 by myself and a gentleman named Andrew Pascal. By way of background, this is actually the first company we've ever worked at that wasn't in the gambling industry. Andrew and I are from the gambling industry. I started as a -- a regulator, an agent with the Nevada Gaming Control Board. Andrew was an operator at The Mirage. And then, in the mid-90s we joined each other and built a slot company machine company that we ultimately sold to IGT. So we make slot games.

2.1

We sold that in 2001, and thinking that on-line gambling was going to spread throughout the United States, in the year 2000 we started another company called Wager Works. Actually did a partnership with MGM with that company as well, and here we are 16 years later and there's not a lot of on-line gambling in America so the company based its operations in Europe, where, as you mentioned, there's a lot of on-line, and we built slot machines again just for use on the Internet versus the slot floor. And we sold that

company to IGT as well in 2005. So Andrew then went and became the president and chief operating officer of Wynn Resorts, Wynn and Encore in Las Vegas, and I worked for IGT as a senior executive after the acquisition.

In early '11, we both found ourselves out of work and got a white board out and tried to decide what to do. And I've been telling him that people are starting to play slot machines on Facebook, and on mobile They're not gambling, they're just devices. playing them for entertainment purposes. for some reason, there's a small percentage of them that are buying virtual currency to extend their play, or go deeper into the game faster than somebody who doesn't pay. And he thought I was crazy so we started to dig up the research and, low and behold, we heard about DoubleDown Casino, now IGT, Slotomania, which, which is now owned by Caesar's. so, we decided to do it. We've made slots machines our whole careers so why not try it in just a different pricing model in a nongambling way.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

But we were late, in 2011 the market had already started to move so we came up with the idea that, what if we let our players not win, but accumulate loyalty points so that they could buy and redeem real -- real-world rewards in casino properties and other leisure-oriented places?

So we went over to our friends at We've known the senior team there for a MGM. long time, explained the idea. Said, why don't you give us bunch of inventory that might go unused, like a show ticket, if the seat's empty, a buffet that, you know, you never, you know, run out of food at a buffet, a hotel room that might not be occupied, you give it to us and we'll give it away to our players. Now, we can't give it to them for winning and losing on a slot machine, because, obviously, I wouldn't be here. I'd be probably be somewhere else. We can give to them, though, based on their loyalty to our game. And I'm going to spend some time explaining that.

So they thought it was a good idea.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

We had a different kind of product, and we built a business around it. Our strategic investors include MGM and Activision Blizzard. Activision's one of the biggest video game companies in the world. Call of Duty is their flagship franchise.

We're up to 180 employees in three states and in Hong Kong. We have six game applications live today, whether it's on Facebook or in the Apple or Google app stores. There's about a million-and-a-half people a day that play one of our applications,

5 million a month. These are unique players.

So, by now, we're the seventh largest social casino operator in the world.

And we're also -- I'm -- I'm a -- a founder and the chairman of the International Social Games Association, which I know you heard from Luc at your last meeting. And we started that organization for just this purpose, to educate and communicate in the business we're in so that the message is clear, and that it gets out that we're quality companies doing the right thing by the

2.1

consumer, which we know we are. So that's the background.

I will skip that, because we just talked about it. This is just the representation of our brands. These are -- if you've ever downloaded an app from the i -- iPhone store, these are icons that you see in the store, and these are our five games. The first one is actually available on Facebook so that's how we get to six. We have a blackjack app, an app based on Konami content, which is licensing here in Mass -- Massachusetts.

We -- a Hong Kong app called Lucky Life, which is available in Asia, and then a new app called Pop Slots that we're launching next week.

Those are important because an overlay of all of these is our loyalty program. So on each one of these apps you will accumulate the loyalty that I talk about, which is then used to redeem real-world rewards.

So the rewards program is a collection of about 40 different partners.

2.1

MGM makes up about a fourth of those. They're leisure-oriented partners. They're hotels and casinos, and attractions in Las Vegas, cruise ships, airlines, food and beverage. We don't do Best Buy cards or Amazon gift credits. It's leisure. It's about playing a game that you enjoy, and then getting to experience something in the leisure sector that's sort of akin to a game experience.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Who are a few of your others?

MR. MATHEWS: Wolfgang Puck,
Cirque du Soleil, Caribbean Cruise Lines,
Legion Air, which is a Vegas-based airline, the
monorail in Las Vegas, the helicopter -Maverick's Helicopters in Las Vegas. You know,
really -- the Station Casinos group in
Las Vegas, which is a locals-oriented operator.
So it's just not just casino. It's -- it's
anything that where leisure makes sense. I
assume, some day, we'll have theme parks and,
you know, things like that.

So what I'd like to do is explain how the game works. I was going to try to

2.1

just show you my phone, but I didn't think that would work. But, basically, I'm loading our app now. And what you're going to see on the screen is that, that's the main menu. so if you want to just look at your TV. You basically select what you want to do. Do you want to play a game? Do you want to look at your rewards? We have things called Journeys, which is a progression mechanic in the game. But if you were to hit the games icon, you would be taken to a menu. And if I do that here on my phone, you can see we have, you know, over 30 slot games that you can choose from. It's a menu.

In this case, I've picked a screen shot of part of that menu to show you. And I'll show you the SHAQ9 game. We've done a licensing deal with Shaquille O'Neal, who's a wonderful guy, and we've built a slot game around him and his brand. And so, the next slide, if you clicked on the Shaq game, you'd see the slot machine. You've seen this story before, that's the nameplate field of the slot machine.

So what I want to point out are the meters at the top, and then this will, sort of, tie rewards out. So that the 289 is your level. So this player, who's -- the screen shot is on Level 289. Players like to level up. If you like to play Candy Crush or any of these games, your level is important to you.

The -- I'm going to go over to the purple chips. The purple chips are what we use to play the slot games. We give you those for free. We give you those when you come back every four hours. Every day you get to spin the wheel and get more. You can do things on Facebook to get chips, like share things with your friends, invite your friends to the game. You can also buy those. You can see the buy button. And if you do, you by them through iTunes or Google Play, or Facebook, just like you would a song. Most people don't. About 97 percent of our players never will pay us to play the game. And you use those to play the slot machines. And so, you're winning and losing that currency. has no real-world value. It can't be cashed

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

out. You can't sell it. There's no way to monetize those purple chips. They're just used to play the game. They're virtual credits.

As you participate in our game and play it, and come back every day and invite your friends, and do, sort of, everything to engage with our games --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Excuse me, could I ask you a question? You're a player sitting there playing, you don't get cut off at a certain level of play. What is -- what's the motivation for buying?

MR. MATHEWS: Well, you -- you could run out of chips.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You get the free chips to start with and you run out? Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, yeah.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: For a period --

MR. MATHEWS: In this case, I have -- you know, my screen shot I have 374 million

It's very unlikely that you'll run out

chips.

1 very soon.

2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MR. MATHEWS: But most people have, maybe, you know, four 5,000 and they'll play for 10, 15 minutes and run out of chips, and then wait until we give them more, which is an hourly bonus.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. That's what I was going to say. So when -- when you run out, you are then replenished every --

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: -- hour or so, did you say?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. It depends on the game, and it depends on the whether you're running a promotion. But ours is every four hours you get the bonus, and there's a clock that you can check and people actually --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So the -- so the person -- the 3 percent run out of their chips and don't want to wait.

MR. MATHEWS: Don't want to wait.

That's right. And that's the way all social casino games work, and it's really all the way

all games work. When you run out of lives in Candy Crush, you can wait until they give you more, or you can do things, like invite people so that you don't have to pay for that marketing expense. You're being viral and paying it for them, or you can just hit the buy button and buy lives. And, in our case, you buy chips.

we've gone through this before, but just to make sure, the only distinction between one of these games and Candy Crush, in the economic model -- well, there isn't one in the economic model. The economic model is exactly the same. The only difference is Candy Crush isn't a replication of a gambling game.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. It doesn't look like a duck, a gambling game. There are -- in every game there are plenty of random-based out sounds.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MR. MATHEWS: Mystery boxes. Whether your soldier turned the corner and there was two guys or one guys, there's very much

2.1

Right. For sure.

randomness going on in those -- in those things as well, but it doesn't look like a slot machine.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY:

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, and another distinction is, in Candy Crush, you don't get anything in return, besides advancing to the next level. In your case, you accumulate loyalty points.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, right, so that's where I'm headed next. And we're -- we're unique in that. There are other people doing rewards. But, at scale, we're by far the biggest, and -- and that's why we're here with MGM.

So purple chips, no value. Win and loose, buy, if you want, don't buy, if you don't want to you. You -- you accumulate loyalty for playing the game, for engaging with the game. The amount of time that you play. Do you come back every day? Do you invite your friends? So there's a whole bunch of things in the game that allow you to accumulate loyalty. None of which are the

outcome of the slot machine. So you have to have prize consideration and chance. And we've eliminated at least one of those in every scenario in our game.

What happens is, you increment this -- this gold coin -- this gold -- your gold balance through playing the game, not winning or losing, and then you go back to the main menu, where I'm at now, and when you have enough of them and you want to see what's available in the rewards catalog, you hit the rewards button and it takes you to that screen.

There's about 40 of these cards in the game. And, as I said, there's a collection of hotel casinos and other leisure-oriented things. I've shown, uniquely, Las Vegas, which is a collection of things you can do in Vegas, excursions and helicopters, which I'm going to talk about in a minute. And there you see Bellagio, Aria, you can barely see Vdara.

So you hit one of those buttons, and then you go into the rewards catalog, or you

2.1

can search by category. If you see at the very bottom, it says "sorting by category."

Let's say you don't know where you want to go, but you're interested in food. So you can hit the restaurants, or the room category. And it's just like on-line shopping. You're just going through a catalog looking for something to redeem.

So in this case I've hit -- I'm now showing you other rewards cards. There's Wolfgang Puck, the Las Vegas monorail. say you want a helicopter tour of The Grand Canyon while you're in Las Vegas, or the You can fly up and down the strip. strip. you hit the Maverick helicopter button, and then you see a collection of different rewards that we offer in collaboration with them. Here's a \$50 off a Las Vegas dream, which I assume is a Hoover Damn kind of tour. For \$85 you can fly up and down the strip, which is a discount stated rate. There's a buy one get one free, which you can see is sold out. then, at the bottom you can see how much of the loyalty it costs. You know, one case 50,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

another case 200,000. And then, when you decide that's what you want to do, you hit the purchase button right in the game, on your phone, put your name and address and e-mail. And then, our system sends you an e-mail with instructions on how to redeem.

In the case of a room, you call MGM and book your room. In the case of a helicopter tour, it gives you a code. You walk into the -- the place, or make your booking and give them the code and it's all automated and you get your -- you get your reward.

So that's a general overview of how rewards work in the game. We are unique.

There are others who are giving out rewards, but, like I said, not at scale. Josh is going to talk about, sort of, how it works for him.

If you think about it from our perspective, we got into a business that was highly competitive and late, so we came up with a secret sauce, which is rewards. And so, it helps us engage our players and keep them active in the game, which helps us then,

1 ultimately, sell more chips.

2.1

You know what, I missed the one point I wanted to make about the games. I know there's been a lot of -- there was press. And it always coming up that, somehow, these social casino games have math dynamics that are designed in a way to entice players to -- or to get people feel that they're -- I'm pretty good at this Shaq game. You know, I really can win on that. And then go try to find it at the casino, and find that the payback dynamic's very different. It's -- it's not -- it doesn't make sense for us, and I'll explain why. We don't do it in our association, and I don't know that any social game operator does it.

We have some Konami games in our game, and they're the exact same math models. We get them from Konami, that end up on the casino floor. But the more important thing is, there's no incentive for a social casino operator to pay back — to have a loose game or — or a positive payback game because, if you played our Shaq game at 104 percent

payback because we were trying to get you into the casino, we wouldn't sell a whole lot of chips because you'd never run out, if it was a positive payback games.

So we're in the business of -- well, we're not in the gambling business. We're in the business of draining chips in an entertaining way so we can sell more. Just -- sort of just --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Might that be what you're in it for but not, necessarily what MGM is in it for? I mean, in theory. And I -- I take at face value what you say.

MR. MATHEWS: Absolutely, yeah. Have.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We'll look into it.

But, in theory, a division of a casino company could get -- induce people to play social casino games, make the formulas very loose.

You do give a -- and you're -- you're not making any money on the selling of new purple chips, because what you're really trying to do is induce people to come in to the slot machines, which are much more profitable than

chips. So that's a perfectly reasonable model,
right?

MR. MATHEWS: No doubt about it.

It's a good question to ask. It's just no responsible operator on our side, or, certainly, a licensee would -- would ever do that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: Makes no sense economically, and it's -- it's a bad thing do from a policy standpoint.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But it's important

-- it's an important distinction to make. To
say it's not a good idea economically is a
little disingenuous, you know. It might be or
it might not, depending on what your motivation
is, depending on who owns you and so forth.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. From our perspective it is.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And what your return on investment is and so forth and so on.

MR. MATHEWS: Right.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Coupled with, we don't do it because it's the wrong thing to do

and we'll prove it to, that's -- now you're starting to get to the whole story.

MR. MATHEWS: Right.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But I just -- I don't want it to sit out there that -- for us to take an assertion that this isn't good economically and let it sit there as, on its face, true. I mean, disagree if you want to, but I think that's an important distinction.

MR. MATHEWS: No, no. From Playstudios, who doesn't share in the revenue on the casino floor, I think my argument sticks.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MR. MATHEWS: It makes no sense. The next questions for Josh and MGM guys is, do you do it because you're not in the business of selling chips; you're in the business of getting people in your resort?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MR. MATHEWS: So it's a valid --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Are you

finished with your --

MR. MATHEWS: I am.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: -- presentation? 2 Other questions or comments or --3 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. I --4 MR. BEDROSIAN: So I just -- I think they're going to do now -- they're not done 5 6 with the presentation, though, correct? 7 MR. NOSAL: No. Josh --8 MR. SWISSMAN: I'll speak. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. 10 MR. NOSAL: Yeah, yeah. Go for it. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, okay. 12 And just before MR. NOSAL: 13 Mr. Swissman picks up where Mr. Mathews left off, talk a little bit about how this is used 14 15 for marketing purposes. I want to stress, certainly, build on something that 16 Director Bedrosian indicated that, you know, no 17 18 decision has been made about utilizing this in 19 Massachusetts from the MGM Springfield 20 perspective. 2.1 And to the extent that, that 22 discussion continues and evolves for purposes 23 of marketing, it's something that the company 24 would come back, engage, certainly with staff,

and continue to keep the Commission apprised of -- you know, prior to taking those steps.

And so, today's presentation is really informational in the spirit of the educational forum that the Commission does.

And Mr. Swissman is going to talk about how this is utilized in other jurisdictions, primarily, Las Vegas.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. And that's important. MGM's a long way from open. We realize this is, sort of, in the abstract at this point.

Let me just ask one other question to Paul. Do you know anything about the 3 percent? One might, again, hypothesize that the only people who can't wait an hour are people who are beginning to get in trouble.

Not because of gambling trouble, but which --but because they're becoming addicted to the play of social games, like people do all the time. Is there -- do you have any data on who the 3 percent are on what's going on, what motivates them?

MR. MATHEWS: Well, we've got a lot

2.1

1 of data about --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Their play.

MR. MATHEWS: -- their spending -- spending patterns.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MR. MATHEWS: I'm not sure how to answer the question. I -- I mean, these are people who, this is the way they're choosing to spend their money. And this is the type of game they like, versus playing Call of Duty or pinball, back in the day when you just pumped quarters in one after another.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MR. MATHEWS: And, you know, the overwhelming majority of 1.5 million people are happy just to play the game in the flow at which the game allows you to play, and there's a small percentage that aren't. There are definitely people who spend, you know, money on this. And -- and sometimes you can look and go, wow, that seems like a lot for a game, but you have no idea what their --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Resources are.

MR. MATHEWS: -- sort of, economic

1 profile is.

2.1

So, I mean, what we know is, it's a very engaging game. People love it. And those that buy -- you know, I don't think we've -- I've never heard of -- of like a buyer's remorse complaint. Like, oh, my God, I got over my head here, and now I owe my credit card a lot of money and Apple, you know, because I bough it through Apple. I can't think of one case we've had of that. Did that answer your question at all?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. And it's -- I had this conversation with Keith Whyte, when he was with the National Council of Problem Gambling.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And it's -- our business is gambling, you know, and his business is gambling too, unless they change their mandate, which they're considering. But there may be a problem in the world about people being prone to getting into some kind of distortion in their play of social games. That may be a problem in the world.

We've all talked about and seen kids and friends, who sit at a screen too long, and there might be a problem there. That isn't our problem. And I don't think it was

Keith Whyte's problem yet. But it is -- just as an aside, it is interesting because we are, in this world, of being sensitive to behaviors that can become dysfunctional for people. And I was just curious whether -- whether you know about 3 percent. So -- but your answer it fine.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Of that -- of that 3 percent, though, how -- how often are they actually going in and redeeming their prizes?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, that's interesting.

MR. MATHEWS: The overwhelming majority of rewards that are redeemed and consumed are from nonspenders, you know, just because of the numbers, 97 to three. The 3 percent, and I don't know the stats off the top of my head, but they're definitely redeeming rewards. But, you know, if a hundred

2.1

rewards were redeemed today, you know the vast majority are going to be from nonspenders, just because of the math.

commissioner stebbins: And,
obviously -- I mean, you're drawing them into a
physical location, or you're drawing them to a
physical location to redeem stuff so you begin
to get a sense, maybe, of geography of where
your players are coming from.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. A lot of -COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: So they've
got to be in close proximity to an MGM
facility.

MR. MATHEWS: We're very strong in the feeder markets to Las Vegas because of the overweight of Vegas rewards in our game, which we're trying to change. We now have the UK rewards, we're getting Australia rewards. But, you know, Phoenix, San Francisco, LA, Salt Lake City, you know, Canada, a lot of the feeder markets.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You mentioned this quickly, but I know you may -- you may

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:

2.1

Thank you.

also talk about it, but the three elements are consideration, price and chance. Chance is, of course, always present in your -- in your games; is that -- is that correct?

MR. MATHEWS: It is, when you're winning and losing purple chips, but it has no bearing on the loyalty accumulation, which is the only way you can purchase a award.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So I guess that's where I was going. You say, in your games there's at least one, but maybe more, always removed from -- you know, in -- in your model. Is that -- is that one chance?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. Chance has no bearing on the accumulation of loyalty. Maybe I -- let me try to state it another way. If you play our game, if you started playing right now for the first time and you just kept playing it, whether you purchased or not, eventually, you're going to have enough loyalty to buy every reward you have. It's determined. You will earn every reward just by playing the game. That's a very different dynamic than if you think about a gambling floor, where if you

said, if I just play blackjack long enough I'm going to end up winning a bunch of money. It's just the opposite. The longer you play the house has an advantage.

So -- so there's no luck involved.

You just have to keep playing the game to
accumulate loyalty, because it's -- it's not
won or lost. It's given for just moving
through the game. What monetizers do, people
who spend, is move faster through the game.

You get to level 200 faster because you load
-- you load up with more chips, which is the
way every game works.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So the accumulation -- I mean, without revealing the secret sauce, the accumulation of loyalty has an algorithm that you've established and it's a set formula?

MR. MATHEWS: That's right.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Which is just a function of play?

MR. MATHEWS: Just a function of play. And then there's things you can do to get more. Which, like I said, invite your

friends, share your achievements, help us market our game. Those other things like that.

But, yeah, it's just mathematical.

That's why I say, if you just wake up every
day, play our game, run out of chips, wait,
play our game, run out of chips, wait, you're
going to be able to buy the most expensive
reward we have. It's just -- it's just a
matter of time, which is very different than
gambling, that dynamic.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Could we take a real quick break before you start?

MR. SWISSMAN: Certainly.

(A recess was taken)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. We are reconvening meeting 194. And back to our guests from MGM.

MR. SWISSMAN: Sure. Well, I'll be brief. Paul did a lot of heavy lifting here, and I am effectively disclaimered so -- before we start, may name's Josh Swissman, senior vice

president of loyalty marketing of MGM Resorts.

I actually had the pleasure of working with

Paul and Andrew many years ago in our on-line

gaming efforts, and spent more than my fair

share of time in the Isle of Man, which is

where we held our license. This is a much

shorter plane flight than the Isle of Man

flight was, so I'm happy to be here, and thank

you all for having me.

So my job is -- is to talk to you about how we utilize the MyVegas platform to -- to -- really just to more deeply engage our customers. And if you think about it, there are really three types of customers that we would like to engage through MyVegas, and through the rewards platform within MyVegas.

The first is quite obvious. And that is growing new customers, acquiring new customers. There's a different way to effectively grow your active database. And that is also to focus on reactivating dormant customers, or inactive customers. For one reason or another, they've stopped coming to our facilities in -- in Las Vegas, or in

2.1

Mississippi.

2.1

And before we get to the third group, I'll tell you, those first two are really what we were, sort of, laser focused on, when we started this effort with -- with Paul and Andrew a few years ago. And we've been relatively successful in that regard so far.

If you were to look at all the people that have redeemed an MGM Resorts reward within the MyVegas reward ecosystem, north of 40 percent of those people are, in fact, new or reactivated customers, so we're pretty proud of that. That leaves just shy of 60 percent being previously active, or currently active customers within the MGM Resorts customer database, which are also engaging with MyVegas and redeeming MGM Resorts rewards, and coming on property and enjoying those experiences.

And while it wasn't a big focus of ours initially, what we've found over time is that we are actually doing a better job of engaging our -- even or active customers

through -- through MyVegas and through the rewards platform. Particularly, in Las Vegas.

If you think about the average Vegas visitor, they're only coming once every 1. -you know, 6, seven years, depending on what -what the latest convention visitor's authority
data is. And this is a great way to keep our
active customers energized about our brands,
other properties, and all the experiences that
we have to offer. So we've actually seen an
increase in engagement from that active
customer group as well, which is a tremendous
benefit for us as a company too.

Paul's already talked a little by about the usage of that, sort of, remnant or perishable inventory for our company and for -- really for any hospitality company, the effective, optimized utilization of that inventory is paramount to a company's success. And so, we're happy to say that we are -- we are achieving a good optimization, sort of, mix in utilizing and stimulating business during offpeak periods through these MyVegas rewards.

2.1

Another KPI, or another metric that we often look at is what we call -- and this again is a Vegas metric, is Share of Wallet. People come to Vegas, they visit Las Vegas, they have a set budget, and there is fierce competition to gain more of that customer Share of Wallet when they come out to Vegas. And to the extent that you do that, that is where a-- a general market share is won and lost.

And what we've found is that these rewards that -- that people are redeeming within MyVegas are exposing customers. Even our -- even our active customers, our current customers, to experiences and offerings that they normally don't get exposed to. And once that happens, they actually stick around and -- and stay with us and enjoy other assets and other offerings within the company.

You know, if they redeem an offer for a show, the likelihood that they'll stick around for a dinner afterwards, or a show, increases dramatically. And so, for those that redeem these rewards, we've seen Share of

Wallet actually increase quite nicely as well.

From a broader standpoint, we -- we value our relationship with Playstudios because the positions are a company is a forward-thinking, progressive company, which is important to us, and important to our chairman. And our work, specifically with MyVegas, has actually generated some initial momentum in other, sort of, interactive initiatives that the company is undertaking as well.

This is pretty simple. This virtuous cycle of customer development. New players into the game, getting engaged within the MyVegas game, some of them being active, and, again, those new and reactivated customers. And really, again, the big win for MGM Resorts is when those people convert from being on-line players into offline customers of ours.

Before that happens, though, and this is for every MGM Resorts reward that is redeemed within the MyVegas platform, we require every player to join our loyalty

2.1

program. That's MGM Resorts loyalty program, which, you may know is called MLife.

Now, in order to join MLife, you actually have to be 21 years of age or older. And, therefore, in order to redeem any of these MGM Resorts rewards within MyVegas, you also have to be 21 years of age or older.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: How do you -- you said in order to -- I'm sorry. In order to redeem you have to be 21.

MR. SWISSMAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But if you -- if you picked a -- picked a Marriott room somewhere, not in Las Vegas, how -- how do -- how do you know that that person is 21?

MR. MATHEWS: Oh. You mean, another rewards partner?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MR. MATHEWS: Oh. Other rewards partners, all the casinos have the same restriction.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: The helicopters, there's not a -- I think it's 18, probably.

2.1

There's not a -- there's not an age restriction.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. So you -you -- you don't -- you don't have to be 21 to
play, you don't have to be 21 to pay, you have
to be 21 to redeem your credits in the casinos
facility?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, at certain -- at certain reward partners.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. So the -- so on site you confirm -- when you come in to get your free room, it's the duty of your customer -- of your sales rep, but upfront -- it's not working, Mike? It's the duty of your sales rep to confirm that the person is 21?

MR. SWISSMAN: Whether or not -we'll use the room as -- as an example there.
Whether or not it's someone redeeming a MyVegas
reward, or just buying a room directly from one
of our Web sites or our third-party partners,
we ID every single person that checks in, and
we require that, that person that's checking
in, whose name is on the reservation, is 21.
That's just a normal course of business for us.

Page 63 1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Okay. 2 Okay. 3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Do these points 4 expire? 5 MR. MATHEWS: No. We -- we should, 6 but we haven't yet. 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You will. 8 MR. MATHEWS: We -- in our terms and 9 conditions, we have the right to expire them, 10 but we've never got around to writing the --11 the software to do it, so there's a lot now, 12 billions. 13 MR. SWISSMAN: Sorry. And if I didn't say it before, you do actually have to 14 15 be 21 years of age or older to actually join 16 MLife, our -- our loyalty program as well. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. 18 MR. SWISSMAN: So that's, yet, another check and balance. 19 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So there's two 21 day -- there's two checkpoints. 22 MR. SWISSMAN: That's right. That's 23 right, depending on the type of reward. 24 can go quickly through this. Paul talked about

the different types of rewards that MGM Resorts offers. You have, on the left side, the age-old Las Vegas comp. I think it's as old as Vegas itself, the free buffet.

The most exciting one, to me, is the one on the right-hand side. And this is what we think really differentiates us from our competitors, and helps differentiate MyVegas from its competitors. For those of you that can't read it, this is a reward, which has -- has actually been redeemed. Someone redeemed it for their 50th anniversary, right, Paul?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah.

MR. SWISSMAN: And this is the experience to choose the -- the song that plays while the fountains at Bellagio go off. Now, nowhere else in the world can you offer this reward. And in no other program can anyone acquire this reward. So those are the types of things that are great exposure for our brands, and great exposure for our company, and really excited people about coming to -- to visit Las Vegas and to visit our properties. And we're thrilled that we have the ability to

2.1

1 offer this through MyVegas platform. 2 MR. MATHEWS: If I could just add one 3 of those good stories. Just about two weeks 4 ago, a player redeemed lunch, spent the 5 afternoon and played basketball with Shaquille 6 at his house in Orlando, and brought his 7 grandson and his son. 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 9 MR. MATHEWS: And we had some of our 10 guys go. It was fantastic. You can't buy 11 that. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: How many points was 13 that? MR. MATHEWS: That was a lot. 14 15 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Mr. Chair, I 16 thought you were asking how many points that 17 person scored against Shaq. 18 MR. MATHEWS: That would be not --19 that would be not a lot. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That would not be a 21 lot, no. 22 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Well, a 23 little plug for Springfield, he's getting 24 inducted to the Basketball Hall of Fame this

year.

2.1

On the marketing cycle, you talk about converting some of your on-line players to the MGM Las Vegas resorts. You obviously have properties in other parts of the country.

MR. SWISSMAN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Not focusing in on the Springfield, but Detroit, Mississippi, how collectively is this program playing to those more regional destinations?

MR. SWISSMAN: We do have these -our properties in Mississippi, so that's
Beau Rivage in Biloxi, Mississippi, and
Gold Strike in Tunica, Mississippi, also have
rewards within MyVegas.

Detroit's an interesting market in that there's -- there's a great velocity as far as customer visitation. If you were to look at proximity of most folks that frequent our Detroit property, they're really quite close. So -- and they spend time there already. So we've chosen not to place any Detroit rewards within the ecosystem, solely because those customers are already

super-engaged. They're already coming with -- with really, pretty good velocity already. So it just hasn't been a priority for us.

Whereas, if you look at our other two properties in Mississippi, while they definitely have local contingents as well from a visitation standpoint, they have a much greater proportion of folks flying in, and -- and are more of that leisure, kind of, destination-type, customer. So it works actually quite well for our properties in Mississippi too. That's really all I had. If there are any other questions, happy to answer them.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Are there any other questions, Commissioners?

about the -- the algorithms - I guess this is the two of you - the algorithms in the games, whether or not a player of a social casino game is affected -- is presented in any material way with a different winning percentage than casinos on the floor, and games on the floor. You're saying that the answer to that is no,

2.1

1 there's no material difference in the winning 2 percentage algorithms; is that correct? 3 MR. MATHEWS: Yes. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And you're saying 5 the same thing? 6 MR. SWISSMAN: The math is similar, 7 yes. 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is that different 9 from what I've said? 10 MR. SWISSMAN: No. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. If -- and 11 12 why not? I mean, wouldn't it be a good 13 marketing tool? I mean, why don't you do that? MR. MATHEWS: We wouldn't let him. 14 15 MR. SWISSMAN: Well, that's the first 16 The second reason is that, from an MGM Resorts standpoint, it's -- it's the 17 18 It's -- it's those beautiful buildings 19 and those great rooms and shows that we offer 20 that are truly the -- the draw for our customer 21 base. 22 To utilize some, you know, different 23 type of slot machine in math, if -- if Paul 24 was ever going to let us do it, which he

wouldn't, just -- it doesn't fit well with our brand. It's not what we're about, and it's not representative of the -- sort of the leisure, sort of, aspect of this game and -- and most of the assets that we offer as a company.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I don't -- I don't understand that. What -- I mean, players are pretty sensitive. I was astonished to find out how -- how sensitive players are to change in payouts and holds and so forth. So with relatively minor shift in the algorithms, you could, apparently, have positive impact on getting people to feel good about the game because it's -- they feel like they're winning with some regularity. I don't understand where that's incompatible with something else that you're doing. That would induce people to come into the floor.

MR. SWISSMAN: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: How is that incompatible with what you're doing?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I take a stab at that, because I think the numbers --

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You're going to answer my question to MGM?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You know, if the existing -- if the engagement is with existing customers to the tune of 60 percent, like you just described, it occurs to me that having that -- something that is fundamentally different could feel, I don't know, disingenuous for the player; is that a fair statement?

MR. SWISSMAN: Well, yes. I mean, that -- that is something that -- that perceptive players would pick up on. And, yeah, that would feel disingenuous. And, again, for us, from an acquisition standpoint, it's really been all about the reward ecosystem. That's what attracted us to this relationship in the first place.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Say that again. What was that point?

MR. SWISSMAN: The -- the reward ecosystem, this unique, sort of, proprietary way with which MyVegas displays rewards, and how we can incent visitation through these

2.1

rewards, is really the winning play for us is MGM Resorts. That's -- that the important part for us.

MR. MATHEWS: You know, I would just add, if you had a game on a social casino that paid, say, 110 percent back to the player, it becomes very uninteresting quickly to a player, if you think about it, if you just win every time playing a game, it gets borings very fast.

What's interesting about gambling games is, it's the winning and the losing, and the way you feel through the ups and the downs, that is an attraction for people. If you win every time you hit spin it's boring. So that's one reason not to do it. And then I think, as you said, players are pretty smart about this. They can feel very subtle changes in payback. And if you did and they walked in and played it, it wouldn't take them very long, at all, to feel bamboozled.

So I think what you have to have to make this reality, is a social casino operator, who doesn't care about making money. So they're wanting to not drain chips. It's

tied directly to a casino, who is either not regulated, or is willing to risk their license by doing something that's, sort of, consumer deceptive.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is -- I mean, I think the points you're saying make -- are common sense -- are sensical. And the commissioner -- if 60 percent of your players are already players, then, you know, that's a -- sort of a failsafe system. But we have a lot of constituents who are skeptical of the good-faith assertions like these, and who would say, trust but verify.

Would you -- if this became a big issue, and for the moment it's not, but if it became a big issue, would you have any problem having your systems tested by the same kind of -- you know, IGT systems or whatever -- test systems that -- that we use on the -- on the hardware, to prove if anybody really doubted that the algorithms are fundamentally the same?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. I think we would -- we would, not because we're trying to

2.1

hide anything. In fact, through the ISGA, we now have a certification program that is run by one of the labs that you will be familiar with. It's not -- because it's not gambling it's hard to say, well, go get tested for gambling, because it's not gambling. And so, we're sensitive to that. I think what we would be happy to do is share whatever information about the dynamics of our games and how they relate to floor, with anybody, sort of, privately, I guess.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, it might be worth thinking about. I mean, this is not -
MR. SWISSMAN: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm just mindful of the fact -- you understand this a lot better than I do. All of you who are in the industry understand this a lot better than I do. There are plenty of people out there that flat out don't believe and are going to raise challenges. There are -- there are consumers, there are consumer advocacy groups, there are media, et cetera, that simply don't accept good-faith assertions as such. You know that

well. And to trying to anticipate how to deal with that, you might think about doing something on your own. I mean, it doesn't have to be our -- we're checking it, but you can have some of the labs --

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, well, we do -CHAIRMAN CROSBY: -- testify, you
know, that X, Y and Z whatever it is. But I -I think it is -- I think it's a vulnerable
spot -- again, I'm not telling you anything you
don't know. It's a vulnerable spot to that
portion of the world, which is very skeptical
about casino games and gambling and so forth.
And that might be a way to -- to give us the
tools, first of all, to reassure us that what
you're saying is right, but also to inoculate
yourself against that kind of thing.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, let me elaborate. The ISGA has taken us awhile to get there, but working closely with one of the labs who have, sort of, a sister lab that isn't -- that's more software testing than gambling-machine testing. We're all going through certification. In fact, our company's almost done. And one of

2.1

the best practices that Luc mentioned when he was here, is this disclaimer that, you know, your success in social has no bearing on your success in the real world, and then we test against that. I wouldn't -- I would never say it's as robust as the slot-machine maker goes through the process. It may get there. have to see if this consumer feeling either gets bigger or smaller. It's the same consumers who think the games in the casinos are funny -- have funny math too. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Could you, just rough numbers of the growth from year to year, since you started offering this -- this on-line social gaming product? MR. SWISSMAN: Specific to MGM Resorts --

COMMISSIONER CAMERON:

MR. SWISSMAN: -- redemptions?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON:

MR. SWISSMAN: I can get you those

figures.

24 Well, just, I COMMISSIONER CAMERON:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Page 76 you

mean, you just started offering it in, did you say, 2011?

MR. SWISSMAN: The first game went live in the middle of '12, yeah.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay. So middle of '12. So you've just seen tremendous growth, or little by little every year? I don't need exact numbers, I was just wondering.

MR. SWISSMAN: We've -- we've had a couple hundred thousand redemptions since that time, I believe.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ MATHEWS: The chart looks kind of up and to the right.

MR. SWISSMAN: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: It doesn't go like this

MR. SWISSMAN: It's good growth.

It's not huge.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: It tracks very nicely with our daily active user numbers, which are just on a trend that uses --

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And you -- you expect that there's no reason why that wouldn't

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

but --

1 continue or --

2.1

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. We have to add more apps and make the apps more interested.

It's a super-competitive space. There are thousands of slots machine apps in the store.

And growing DAU is now very expensive. You can buy them with banner ads and apps that you might be playing and it's -- the secret's out.

It's a very competitive market.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thanks.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else?

Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

MR. BEDROSIAN: So just give me about two minutes and we'll get the Penn folks up and introduce that subject to the commissioners.

So before I ask Mr. Stempeck to introduce the -- the representatives from Penn, in my initial comments, I think I stated what I'd characterize is the obvious, that these two organizations, at this point, are not similarly situated. Obviously, Penn National has an operation in Plainridge, which we mentioned before, operating in

Massachusetts. And what they are looking to do is, consistent with what I think you heard from MGM, if there are differences, I think I suggest they'll tell us the differences. their -- their plans were outlined in a letter to me -- well, first, they had written a letter long ago alerting the Commission about I think what sure started this ball rolling most recently, their most current plans are outlined in a letter to me dated June 17, 2016, which is in the packet, from Mr. Baldacci, who's here, their deputy chief compliance officer. In that, this is -- could be viewed as a marketing promotional tool. did not put it on for a vote of the Commission because the Commission -- that is not traditionally voted on marketing and promotions.

Having said that, I think everyone realizes this is active commission. They -- you are engaged in new areas. You have done, obviously, a lot of work in daily fantasy sports, you've thought about other on-line segments. So it seemed obvious that, as

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

staff, or as executive director, I wasn't going to bless this or do anything without bringing it to the Commission.

My -- my plan had been, pending your hearing and asking questions, is -- was to allow Penn to move forward. But as -- as you have somewhat the articulately said,
Mr. Chair, trust but verify.

I come from, you know, the

Attorney General's Office with a consumer

protection background. I would want to make

sure what they say is happening is actually

happening. We've had conversations with the

underlying maker of their games,

Scientific Games, about the algorithm. We

wanted to see how to check those and recheck

those, if we think necessary, and potentially

find out about -- I don't know what their

3 percent is, if there's any indicia of what's

happening with those 3 percent.

Having said that, as I said, you're an active board. If I am misguided in any way, I suggest you will probably tell me so.

So with that, I'll have Mr. Stempeck introduce

2.1

1 the folks from Penn. 2 MR. STEMPECK: Here on behalf of 3 Penn National are Chris Sheffield, the managing 4 director of Penn Interactive Adventures; 5 Carl Sottosanti, general counsel, 6 Penn National; Jim Baldacci, as Mr. Bedrosian 7 mentioned, the deputy chief compliance officer; 8 Frank Donoghue, the chief compliance officer of Penn National. And in the event that there are 9 10 any technical questions, I understand there are two representatives from Sci Games that are 11 12 That's Robert Gustafson, the assistant 13 general counsel and vice president of legal; and Michael Friis, the vice president of 14 15 regulatory -- regulatory affairs. MR. BEDROSIAN: And, again, of course 16 I see Mr. George in the back of the room. 17 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Thank you. 19 Fire away. 20 MR. SOTTOSANTI: Well, good 2.1 morning -- good morning to all the 22 commissioners and the staff members. Good

morning to all the commissioners and the staff

members. Mr. Bedrosian stole a lot of my

23

thunder so my remarks will be remarkably brief.

You know Penn National well, and I won't belabor our backgrounds. Consistent with Chairman Crosby's opening remarks, happy first anniversary to all of us, to all stakeholders. It is, honestly, no small feat to launch a whole industry, and this has been no exception.

I guess, with the benefit of time now, I can look fondly on some of our adventures and misadventures in Springfield and Tewksbury, and with the R word, referendum, for those of you who remember that. Honestly, we're thrilled at our first year of operation in the Commonwealth, and we look forward to many, many more years of successful partnership with the Commission and the Commonwealth.

We appreciate the opportunity to present today on our new business line, social gaming. The MGM team mentioned that they were late to the party. I guess, by definition, then, Penn is exceptionally late to the party, but we are hoping to catch up, and we'll brief

2.1

1 you on that today.

2.1

So this presentation is part of our continuum of our transparent approach with the Commission. As Mr. Bedrosian said, as we look back on the dialogue, it actually started in July of 2015 relative to our plans for the social gaming business line. And since then, we've updated the Commission and the staff literally, at every development. And I believe that kind of dialogue pays off in the long run.

So with that, I'm pleased to introduce Chris Sheffield. Chris is the managing director of Penn's interactive division. I think you will find, from Chris, what I've found over the last 18 months of getting to know him. He is quite literally the gold standard in this business. He'll give you a little bit of background on his experiences. And pursuant to what Commissioner Cameron said before, he is one of those Brits that chides us on our conservative approach, fairly often. With that Chris -
MR. SHEFFIELD: Thank you, Carl. And

good morning, Chairman and Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good morning.

MR. SHEFFIELD: I'm not too sure today I have to describe myself os a Brit or European. And -- but I'm probably going to find out by the end of the day.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Keep your iPhone on, let us know if you get any bets. Or if anybody hears about the Celtics third draft -- first draft choice.

MR. SHEFFIELD: So my background,
I've been in the U.S. for 18 months. Prior to
that, I was managing director of Betfred, which
is the fourth largest bookmaker in the UK,
1,400 retail outlets and a very large Internet
business. And, interestingly, in the
sports-betting business in the UK, 30 percent
of the on-line revenues come through sports
betting, where 70 percent of it comes from
casino games, poker, Bingo, et cetera.

Prior to that, I was involved in a number of technology companies, and I also worked for awhile at IGT. And the same place, at the same time as Paul Mathews from

2.1

Playstudios, so we know each other quite well.

And by way of background, we look at a social casino industry and define it as free, play-for-fun, social games that have casino themes. The social gaming industry is huge. It's a multibillion dollar business. And, interestingly, the social casino games part of our industry, this year is going to be worth about \$4 billion, mainly in the U.S. market. So it's a very significant business. And -- and as you can tell from the graph, it's growing beyond the year quite significantly as well.

And the way the model works, as we'll describe today, is that customers can play the games for free, for fun, and for pure entertainment aspect of it. But customers can also do things like buy virtual currency to extend their game time. They can also unlock games and do other things as well by -- by payment. And, in that way, it works no different to any of the other social games that are out there. These just happen to have a theme with slots in them.

2.1

In terms of where these games fit with the rest of the market, I describe, you know, the social casino games being around \$4 billion of the market, the biggest game in the social casino category is actually Slotomania, which is operated by a subdivision of Caesars Entertainment. That generated \$200 million in revenue last year.

And when you compare that to

Candy Crush, which is a very well-known game
that generated \$600 million in revenue last
year, and the number one social game that's
out there, Clash of the Clown has generated
about \$1.3 billion last year. So the casino
games is a very small part of the very, very,
big category where people are playing all
types of different games, and most people
playing for free, and some people are also
spending to extend their game time.

Another way that these games can make money that's becoming increasingly popular is also advertising. So that's another way these products commercialize, if they put our adverts up as people are playing

their games. And, obviously, those people that are at the hun of those first commercials are paying for the eyefuls that they get.

So in terms of Penn's plans in this space, we spent the first six months, when I first arrived at Penn, really exploring the market that was out there already, and, as Paul pointed out, we were very late to the market. This was very well-developed, and probably for the last five or six years.

One of the things that I had to overcome was the idea that people like Lance and the general managers of our properties around the country, had a -- had very legitimate questions. Was, you know, will these games cannibalize our customers, if you people playing these games, will they come into properties anymore? And that -- you know, our property business is very, very important and that was something that we really had to prove out.

So one of the first things that we did was a survey of 3,000 customers. And we actually did observational testing with them

2.1

as well, we met them. And it was surprising to me that we found out nearly 50 percent of our customers across the country are already playing social casino games. They're playing DoubleDown. They're playing Jackpot Party, which is -- Scientific Games put out, playing MyVegas. And there's lots an lots of social casino games out there.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is that 50 percent of your -- so this is like your card, your rewards card, your marquee rewards cards players are playing casino social games?

MR. SHEFFIELD: They're playing social casino games anyway.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And by playing, does that mean they played it once, or you mean 50 percent are, sort of, regular players?

MR. SHEFFIELD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Wow.

MR. SHEFFIELD: Yes, I would say.

And it's very -- interesting. And we did the observational group testing, they all came in with their own phones, and they all had five or six games already loaded on their devices. So

2.1

that was -- that was very powerful to Penn.

And so we, you know, obviously thought this is really interesting, the customers are already doing it. And, you know, as has already been discussed today, we saw an amazing opportunity here to engage with our customers more. There aren't many businesses that you will see today that isn't dealing with their customers in more than one channel with the Internet, through mobile devices, through all these different channels that exist nowadays.

So the very first, kind of, leg of the structure that we wanted to -- to look at getting involved with casino games engaged with our customers, we certainly would be in favor to engaging in those, rather than somebody else.

You know, and if you look at the casino marketplace now, a lot of the casinos out there are now offering these types of products, either linked into rewards programs or standalone. The two big casinos in Connecticut are both offering those products, both of those products as well. So we

certainly want to be engaging with our customers. We don't really want to be engaging with our competitors.

As touched on this morning, we see this is a very powerful tool for building loyalty with our customers, and retention. So when the customers are on property and they're still interfacing with us as a business, it's still interfacing with us as a brand. It just makes a lot of sense. And so, that was, kind of, a very, very powerful part of the structure, is that, you know, especially, in the marketplace where it may be competitive and the customer has a choice, then we won't -- you know, we want Penn probably to be the first choice that our customer has.

Again, as touched on this morning, is some opportunities to use these products to acquire new customers. So that was something that we really wanted to try and explore as well. I think that MyVegas model that we -- we looked at this morning is very powerful. And it's proven that it can drive customers to

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

2.1

property in Las Vegas. So, again, we want to see if these products can do the same thing for Penn's property. We have properties across the country. I have one in Massachusetts. And I think's there's probably a potential to skew the -- the customers a little bit younger.

You know, there's a -- since I've been here people have been talking about less millenials are interested in the casinos because they're all playing games on their phones an they're interested in technology and e-sports and things like that. So this is an opportunity to appeal to a younger demographic.

And, you know, not being embarrassed about it, this is a \$4 billion market. So, you know, Penn is obviously very interested as a -- you know, as a profit-making business, to see if there's an opportunity to engage in that market and make some revenue.

And I think a final, really interesting point is the idea that, you know, last night in Pennsylvania the house passed a

2.1

bill that -- that would allow -- enable our gaming in the state. It's already happening in New Jersey, it's happening in Delaware, it's happening in Nevada. So we're interested in looking at these products as a way of potentially building databases for the future so that we have a database of customers that we know like to get involved with products on their electronic devices, be it their computer or their mobile device. And in the future, if, for example, another state like Massachusetts goes that way as well, then we're already got a -- you know, hopefully, we're not running behind everybody else, as we are with social gaming. Hopefully, we're right there from the start.

So with all those reasons, we decided that we were going to get involved with social gaming. We've spent the last six months working with our partners to develop products, and we've now got quite a bit of experience rolling this out across our properties.

We have two products. One is called

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

Hollywood Casino, and Hollywood Slots. And we're going to talk through both of those products today, but please ask me any questions as I go along.

So hollywoodcasino.com is a social casino platform. You can play on line or on your mobile devices, and it mainly has slots games on there, but there's a few video poker game as well.

This product was provided to us by our partner, Scientific Games. They're a very large slot -- slot manufacturer. We have a very good relationship with them, and they provided us almost with a white label, a turnkey solution. So they provide us the whole package out of the box. We don't get involved in the configuration of -- of the algorithms or anything like that. Our job is to market it. And the rest, the hosting and everything else is all performed by Scientific Games.

We've branded the product
Hollywood Casino, and some other casinos out
there have exactly the same products in

2.1

own brand. So it's very much a white-labeled model. And the model is for social casino model so -- so you can't win anything of value. It's free to play. But some customers can spend money. And, in this case, they can spend money to either buy virtual currency, or they can unlock games. So there's some games that may be at a very high level, and if a customer plays for a long time they can unlock that game. But, also, if they just wanted to play it quickly they could -- they could unlock it now, for spending a 1.99 or 2.99. Something like that.

Some of the games that we have in that product are off the casino floor, but a very small number. So it's a very low percentage of the games within our platforms, once we get interaction on -- on the casino floor. There's about 60 games on the platform now, and we have no involvement in the algorithms, or changing the mass models for those games or return to player, but they are very similar. Very, very similar to the -- to

2.1

the -- to mass models and the algorithms on
the -- on the land-based floor as well. And
I'm sure we can touch on that and -- later on,
if you have more questions around it.

What we've found, so far, is that marketing works really well at our properties. So to market these games to existing casino customers, it is going to appeal to them. And what we've found is that e-mail marketing is the most powerful marketing tool that we have. We have databases of customers, we have their e-mail address that we e-mail them and tell them about these games. And a really high percentage of customers actually sign up and start to play their games.

There's other things we can do with the properties. So signage around the place, posters, giving flyers to customers, and now beginning to look at actually doing some external marketing, putting (inaudible) on the buckets on our TV commercials and radio commercials as well.

And this is and example from St. Louis of how we're promoting these games

2.1

on -- on the property. We have some very big digital signage. And -- and if a player downloads a game when they're on the property, then we have a relationship with them. Not every single person in our properties have -- have a marquee rewards card have a loyalty card. So it's very difficult to contact those customers if they haven't signed up. Whereas, if they've download -- downloaded the game, or sign up to it, we then at least have their e-mail address and we can start to communicate with them. And so, that's a really good example of -- of -- of what we do on property.

And here's the example, in St. Louis again, of what we're doing beyond the property. So this is an example of a billboard, which is very prominently displaying a game, telling people that it's free. And it's ideally -- the idea is that customers would download the game, would go to the Web site, and then we can start to have this relationship with them.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can you describe that relationship a little better, or

will you get into that in the rest of your presentation?

MR. SHEFFIELD: I could get into that now. Certainly, relationship would be very much about marketing. So -- so once a player signs up to the game, we want them to play the game more. So it's more of a -- from -- from -- form of art, but it's more about getting them to play the game more. Within the Web site there's other adverts where we display advertisements for some our properties, like Tropicana Las Vegas, for example.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So advertisements.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MR. SHEFFIELD: It's really bout building our relationship.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MR. SOTTOSANTI: Thanks, Chris. I'd like to take a moment to talk about some of the legal, regulatory practices, some of the best practices we employ, and why we employ those practices.

I guess, at the outset, and I was

2.1

heartened to hear a few of the commissioners mention this during the MGM presentation, I think it's becoming a very common conclusion, now that this type of business is not gambling. It's not illegal gambling, it's not gambling, it's not any of the above.

To support that, and we've provided these to Director Bedrosian, I'm pleased to report that, in the last 12 months alone, four courts have construed the laws of six different states, and the recurring motif in each and every one of those conclusions, all four cases were dismissed. They were brought by the very creative members of the plaintiff's bar that I'm sure you're all familiar with, in the various industries you all oversee outside of your jobs here. creative claims were across the board, dismissed, dismissed, dismissed, all four. And the recurring motif is they're not -- it's not gaming. There is no payment required. Again, no payment required, and no opportunity to win.

So as we take an opportunity today

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

to educate the Commission, the staff, the

Commonwealth, the rest of the stakeholders, I

think it's important that we, sort of, begin

and end with that conclusion in mind. And, by

the way, the cases that looked at social

gaming were on products that I submit to you

are remarkably similar to the products you're

hearing about today, either Big Fish by

Churchill; Playtika, the Caesar's product, or

the Double Down IGT product. So that's it for

the legal jargon. I promise I'll put that

aside.

In terms of our responsible practices, I guess I also want to dispel some myths. There are those, either in the popular press, or who have other agendas, who want to imply, somehow, that we're doing something inappropriate here. And, again, I submit to you guys, facts are stubborn things. We'd like to present some facts to you today to dispel those misguided conclusions.

Among other things, at registration, we have the customer certify that they're over 21 and they're not part of a group that is

2.1

self-excluded patrons. Now, I know the more curious members among the Commission will say, is that failsafe? It is not failsafe. It is a practice that we've instituted, not because we believe our product is gambling, or should be overseen by any regulators. To the contrary. We don't believe that.

We do know, however, that, at some point, there is likely to be some discrete overlapping in the promotion of our products, as Mr. Sheffield told you. And we don't want customers who are self-excluded, or who are under 21. Well, that's not a failsafe.

As MGM explained to you before, the failsafe is, if someone decides to actually purchase credits, and become part of the Affinity card, in our case, Marquee rewards, there is a perfect failsafe, and that is the physical check at the casino, when they seek to either become a member of the Affinity cards, or when they seek to redeem the rewards.

A few other points about our -- what we think are good practices. The terms and

2.1

conditions that we've accepted for you today on the PowerPoint that you have in front of you, are prominent, they're required to be read before you can play. And I'm pleased to tell you that we drafted them in plain English.

We control the payback percentage on the floor. That's a fact. It's published every month. You guys have that information at your fingertips. We do not control the payback percentage with our Scientific Games product. As Mr. Sheffield told you before, that's an off-the-shelf product. We only white label it. We have no input in the configuration of it.

Finally, as Mr. Sheffield mentioned, of the games that are on line in the first launch we did with Sci Games, there are seven themes. Those seven themes are replicated fairly closely by 24 of the machines on the floor at our Plainridge facility. That's 24 out of 1,363 machines. In other words, there's an overlap between our on-line games and our on-the-floor games of 1.8 percent.

2.1

I submit to you that, if our objective was to be deceptive, then we are doing it very, very poorly with these prominent terms and conditions, with not controlling the payback percentage, and with having such a small overlap between the games.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Can I ask you the

-- ask the Sci Games people while we're on

this. So you're -- what you're telling us is,

you buy or lease, or whatever you do, an

off-the-shelf product, which is -- has the same

internal workings as other people who buy the

off -- that same off-the-shelf product. It's a

Sci Games game, but you brand it as the

Hollywood Casino, whatever, and that you have

no input, therefore, on the play algorithms,

the win algorithms; I heard that right, right?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. So Sci Games are the ones who calculate those algorithms.

And there are two, I think, folks from

Sci Games here. Will you tell us what the relationship is, the comparative relationship is, between -- for the games that are the same,

MR. SOTTOSANTI: You are correct.

it's an easier comparison, but as a practical matter, it's seeing whether -- whether the game is the exact same game on the floor or another game, what are the ratios, the payout ratios, in these games that -- that Penn gets from you by comparison to the same ratios in the on-floor games? And give us your name, please.

MR. GUSTAFSON: This is Rob Gustafson from Scientific Games.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm sorry, say that again?

MR. GUSTAFSON: This is Rob Gustafson from Scientific Games.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Rob Gustafson. Okay.

MR. GUSTAFSON: Again, thank you for having us. We're happy to be here to support our partners. When the game is the same theme as a game that is on the floor, it is a math model, or a return-to-player model that is available to our customers.

When we make a slot machine that's in a box that goes on a floor, the customers have the ability to choose from a variety of

return-to-player settings, as I'm sure you're aware. That's what you guys have been doing. The on-line version of the game that we bundle into the play-for-fun product is one of those models. It's usually a higher model. But it's one of the models that's available to our customers. And the range of lowest to highest is not that great. I think it's 10 or 12 percent from the lowest setting that you could put on a box to the highest setting that you can put on a box.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 12 percent not of a hundred, but of the -- of the return ratio?

MR. GUSTAFSON: So if you had a slot machine that you could set on a floor at somewhere between 88 and 96 percent, the on-line version might be the 96 percent, and the -- this comparable title on a particular customer's floor would be whatever they set it at. We, of course, don't control that, but they can choose the lower setting, that range typically, of hold, is between, I believe, 85 and 96.

When we make a game that is just for

the on-line business that does not have an on-the-floor component, it uses a similar model. We call them Game Frames. And we'll design a new game around a Game Frame, but the game frame itself is going to be similar to other on-line slot machines that we've made.

And the model for customers like

Penn is a little bit different than the

model -- the customers that partner with a

discussion that you heard earlier today, in

that this is a revenue-generating vehicle for

our customers as well. So it would make no

sense for us to try and have a artificial

payment, or artificially high payback to the

player, because we expect to make revenue from

this product and we share the revenue with the

customer.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So your deal with Penn National is a revenue-shared deal?

MR. GUSTAFSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So -- all right.

So that's somewhat analogous to the MGM. That you have an outside player, who's not motivated by getting people onto the casino floor, you're

2.1

motivated by revenues out of the social game?

MR. GUSTAFSON: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So on the identical games, the algorithm is set, the hold is set at the same -- within that same range -- the payout is held between 88 and 96, and probably on the higher end. And on the other ones, it's -- that are not identical to the games on the floor, you're operating within that same basic range, 88 to 96. Again, presumably, more often than not on the high end?

MR. GUSTAFSON: Yes. And I think we

-- we typically choose the higher returns for

the -- for the social gaming. Some game

mechanics don't lend themselves to that same

number, so I can't say it's always this number.

A three-reel -- a three-reel slot machine has a

different math behind it than a five-reel slot

machine with exploding wilds and all that. So

they're not always identical, but they're

always in that same typical area.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And if -- and why do you do that? Why do you pick the higher return, typically, for a social game?

MR. GUSTAFSON: I don't know the answer to that. That decision was made before my time. I can speculate. We, of course, want the game to be fun. We had to make a choice, and that seemed to be a logical choice, I imagine, at the time. I don't think there's a lot of issues — a lot of the issues we're facing today weren't really considered issues when they first designed this product. So some of the things we're talking about now probably weren't taken into account. I'm not sure I

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, just,
logically, how would that affect your economic
model. You said it would be dis -counterintuitive for us to let the games be
very loose, you were saying, because they would
be winning all the time. Somehow, you said
there was something inconsistent with your

have anything to add to that.

I don't --

2.1

MR. GUSTAFSON: If you return -- so a lot of the articles, and a lot of the press that has been presented up until this point have said, oh, they're artificially high

economic interest to have the games be loose.

returns, you can get, you know, 130 percent payout, you're always winning. If that were the case, if you had a higher than hundred percent payout, you would never have a zero virtual credit balance, and there would be no incentive for him to have to spend a dime to buy a virtual credit.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MR. GUSTAFSON: And having said that, we still want the experience to be fun for players. And a fun experience for the players is a reasonable return, and a similar experience to what you -- to what you achieve or receive on a casino floor. For the people that are trying to replicate what they can do on a casino floor, without having to spend real money, we want it to be as realistic and as entertaining as we can at the same time.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Somebody else mentioned competition, you know, social gaming. Mr. Sheffield, what you were talking about, how fragmented, how many players are in this phase, and how fiercely they compete with -- with each other, obviously. Is that a dynamic that bears

2.1

1 into this payout percentage, perhaps? MR. SHEFFIELD: Not from our 2 3 perspective, no. 4 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Not from your 5 perspective. 6 MR. SHEFFIELD: We don't play any 7 part in setting a percentage on this project. 8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Mr. Gustafson? 9 MR. GUSTAFSON: I don't feel that --10 there is competition. We would maybe have to react to something if -- if somebody was doing 11 12 something else that made them want to play a 13 different product instead of our product, we would react to that, but I'm unaware of that 14 15 being the case at this time. 16 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Can I ask 17 you a question, Mr. Gustafson, this phrase that 18 you use game frame, what does that -- is that 19 a -- is that a -- is that a range of payout 20 that the customer can then choose within to 2.1 program the games? 22 MR. GUSTAFSON: It is not. It is 23 What I mentioned Game Frame, it is, sort not. 24 of, a computer program model that we can build

a slot machine on. It's, sort of, the underlying code behind the slot machine. So we might have one what they call Game Frame. I apologize if I -- I have to retract any of this down the line. I'm not a technical expert, but this is my understanding of how it It's sort of an engine that we would make a slot machine from. It's sort of the basic building block of what you make the virtual slot machines on. And we might use different graphics. We might use different sounds we might make it not exactly identical to the one before, but it will be based on the same core component of the codes below.

So we might have one Game Frame that operates a three-wheel traditional slot, and we might have a different Game Frame that operates a five-reel slot, and we might have a different Game Frame that deals with expanding wilds and things like that.

So my point in mentioning it was not to confusing you, I apologize. But just say that --

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: You're not

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

confusing us, you're educating us, or, at least, speaking for myself.

MR. GUSTAFSON: That the -- the math model that goes behind them will be similar. It can be adjusted, but it will be similar from one to the next.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I guess, that's my question. You say it can be adjusted. Can the customer -- can Penn adjust --

MR. GUSTAFSON: No.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: -- the -- the percentage?

MR. GUSTAFSON: Once the game is made, then that is absolutely set. We would have to go back, even for the games that are — our similar games that are on the floor, if we wanted to change the return on that game right now, we would have to remake the game. We would have to be — start with the source code, make changes based on the source code, and then recompile it into a totally different piece of software. It's not adjustable, once it's presented to our customers.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Mr. Sottosanti,

you operate in a number of jurisdictions and

are very aware of what transpires, you know,

current trends, et cetera. Are other

commissions or regulators looking at this

6 elsewhere in the country?

2.1

MR. SOTTOSANTI: We have certainly provided like education to a few of the other commissions in which we operate. And I think they've all made the right decision that it's good to know about these trends, but none are looking to regulate it. I think it would be a dangerous precedent to do so.

MR. BEDROSIAN: In fact, I think I've heard, and you'll correct me if I'm wrong, we're the last jurisdiction they're coming to.

MR. SOTTOSANTI: No pressure.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You know I just, sort of, for the record, we will end up doing whatever we do on this, but I don't consider this a precedent as to whether or not we have the authority to regulate consumer promotions, you know. We'll cross that bridge every day as we get to it, but I'm not buying into a

principal that we don't have the authority over the role to regulate promotions, just for the record. I'm not saying we do, but I'm not saying we don't.

MR. SHEFFIELD: Okay. I'll move on. So as we talked about, when customers first play the game they -- they have to register. They can register two ways. One is via the Web site, and one is via the mobile apps. And as we discussed, at that point is where we ask the customers to give us their e-mail address and also, at that point, tick the box to say that they're over 21, they accept the terms and conditions, and they're not a self-excluded patron.

Probably, the most interesting piece of work that we've done so far was to do -we've been operating for around six months
now. We've generate the 350,000 customers who
are playing the game. So we're growing it
very quickly. Every week we're acquiring tens
of thousand of new customers. So about two
months ago, we took a sample of those
customers, 70,000 of them, that we could

actually identify as casino customers as well, and looked at what impact the game had on their behavior, to see whether it cannibalized the behavior, did they come to the property less? Did they spend less, or, you know, didn't engage with them more? And we found some really interesting results. And this isn't just common to us. There's -- there's other people looking at it this type of thing.

In Europe, in the UK, where we have the betting shops, there was the same concern there, that it would on-line cannibalize and we've found that it didn't. It worked very much hand in hand with it. And what we've found from our data so far, is that, the product does a number of things.

And the first thing that -- that was really interesting is that we found a thousand customers, so quite a big percentage out of 70,000, that were new to the casino. So they'd actually gone to the casino, signed up and got a rewards card. So it doesn't necessarily mean these customers had -- hadn't been into the property before, but what it had

2.1

done is it encouraged them to sign up with a reward card because they're playing a game, and they're seeing messages about the benefits of being a reward member, which is fantastic in terms of business because we happen to understand more loyalties retention. So I would will say that some of those customers are totally -- are totally new, and some of them are customers that haven't registered for our loyalty program before.

The second thing that we saw is the customers that were playing the game, actually, when compared to customers that didn't, started to visit the casino more frequently. Overall, not a huge impact on the on that -- on the -- on the spend or the visiting the properties more. But more frequently in spending a little bit more, in terms of theoretical spend is what versus the data we use to look at, and how much do we spend typically on average visitation.

I think the really, really interesting one is, especially where we have properties where we're in competition with --

2.1

with other states, and other competition, we call them walks of the war grounds, whereas customers who are being targeted by -- by quite significant competition. We seen this -- this fact of where we're reactivating customers.

So these people are probably not people that are not going to casinos anymore. They're just not going to ours. So what we've found is that out of the 70,000, 3,000 customers were reactivated again, because again engaging with our brand, engaging in our business, and we've them back to -- to -- to our property.

MR. SOTTOSANTI: Chris, to that end, do you want to speak to some of the competitive products that have been introduced recently by the Connecticut tribes?

MR. SHEFFIELD: Yes. So the

Connecticut tribes, so you have -- you have -
I won't name who's who, but one of them has the

same product as us. And Mohe -- Mohegan Sun, I

will name names, has the Scientific Games

product, and Foxwoods has just lunched a

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

2.1

European game from a company called Novomatic, who, hopefully, will still be a part of my world in the future. And -- and that launched very recently. And that has the full rewards linked into it.

And what I'm beginning to see -- I know I meet a lot of the people in my position at the other casino places around the country, that most of the casinos are now looking at this as way to, firstly, drive revenue, but more importantly, build this relationship with the customers.

And so, it's very interesting. And, you know, we've had a lot of support now from the management of our properties, who, you know, when I first did get here, they were concerned that this might have a cannibalization effect. And what we're seeing is, it's -- it's having a very positive influence.

I'm going to very briefly talk about our second product and Hollywood Slots. And I think, you know, one of the things that we've touched on is, is this isn't gambling. These

games aren't gambling. These are entertaining to a lot people. I've played these games all the time. My wife plays a game called Hay Day, which is about having a virtual farm, and she has virtual chickens, and friends that play Clash of the Clowns. And we all spend a little bit of money doing it. And, to me, it's just, you know, I have a choice watch a movie and download that, or to buy music. It's just something that I do in my spare time. It relaxes me. And I think that's what these games are doing.

What I'm seeing now, I spend a lot all my time looking at innovation and shopping around the world and looking at what other companies are doing. Without a doubt, MyVegas is very innovative. But what's happening now is, the slot is almost becoming like a dice.

Most games, in — in the old days, you'd have a dice and it would have six options on it where you'd have two dice, and you'd have, you know, potential of getting 12 numbers, and something would happen in their game. What people have realized is that a slot mechanic

is like a dice. It's based on chance, but it has so -- so many more combinations. You can make a much more sophisticated game. What we're going to see now very much, you know, in the top 20 social casino games, now there's at least two, they use a slot more like a dice than anything else. And the game around the slot is more important than the slot itself. So we decided that we wanted to be in the thick of it as well and, hopefully, start to catch up with everybody else.

We've had a platform built for us in San Francisco, by a company called Open Wager, which we are beta testing. It went live about six weeks ago, and it's a very, very different game to the Hollywood Casino. It has slot machines in it, but it also has a world in there. So it's about you take on the life of an actor, and you develop within the film industry and you have to do certain things within the game to become a producer, to become a superstar, to become an icon, those types of things. And people playing the game to do more social things. So they're sharing

a lot of more content with their friends, they're chatting to their friends within the game. I've heard about some social casino games where people have actually got married in real life. So they've met somebody in the game and then they've ended up getting married. I'm not sure ours will do that. But it's really, really interesting.

And the key thing about this game is that people are playing to do quests, to do tournaments. And what people want to do is compete with each other. And especially, the younger demographic, millenials. And we thought this could be a way of really trying to get to a different target demographic in the future.

So we've been testing it. It's, so far, looking very, very interesting. We're developing tens of thousand of customers very quickly on this game. They're very different. They are -- they skew, younger, so the people that are playing Hollywood Casino tend to be 45 to 60. These people are in their 30s that are playing this game. And it's very, very

2.1

similar to a lot of the other games that are out there and their motivation for doing it.

Again, it's configured the same way as the Hollywood Casino so that you can play for free, you can purchase virtual currency, and you can buy other things within the game as well, but you can't win anything of value, and you can't transfer your points to anybody else.

Exactly the same registration process as Hollywood Casino, so we ask people to confirm that they're over 21 and not on the self-exclusion list. And -- and the interesting thing about this product is we're not marking it by other properties at all. So this property is being marketed by Facebook via the app stores. And so it's not -- we're not marketing it to existing customers. This is about, can we use this product to acquire new customers and hopefully build this relationship with them.

And the final slide is a -- is a -- is a thing that we really would like to do now with both of those products and the Hollywood

2.1

Casino in particular is integrate it with our Marquee rewards program. And so, the technology has been built, and we're -- we're ready to implement. And the idea is that we would like to enable customers to earn tier points, which is one of the status things within our Marquee rewards program, which allows a customer, if they get a higher tier, as a real land-based customer they get some benefits, like a free valet, or they get access to a VIP room, or they might get some -- some free buffets and things like that.

So we'd like to try and extend this relationship with our Marquee rewards customers when they're not on the property. So the idea behind when they're not on the property they're earning something, which, hopefully, engages them, and maybe helps them to come back to the property again in the future.

It's a very soft model. So what we'd like to do is, the person can only earn tier points when they purchase virtual

2.1

currency. So absolutely no link whatsoever to the games. If you spend \$10, we can give you 10 cents of -- of your tier points, that's it. Doesn't matter how much you play the game. Doesn't matter what you're do in the game. Doesn't affect what you're getting in the tier points. So it's a very, very, very, very simple model.

And the reason we want to do it is

-- is to try and build this relationship
and -- and see if we can get to a customer
outside the property and give them a reason to
come back to the property when they've been
playing for awhile. And we think it would be
very, very powerful. We've heard about the
MyVegas model and how that's -- that's working
with rewards, and this is probably a simpler
model than that. And, you know this is the
request we've made of the regulators as we're
operating, to see if we can switch this on and
at least get the experience and see what
benefit it would have to the land-based
business.

In terms of customers that are

2.1

self-excluded or indirect under 21, they would not be able to participate in this program. So the only way you can use your tier points is, you have to physically go to the property. If you haven't got a Marquee rewards card already that means you've already been -- you've already been verified. You have to get a Marquee rewards card, so you have to go through that verification process. So that process stops anybody under the age of 21, who ultimately is self-excluded from benefits and from -- from this feature.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is that it?

MR. SHEFFIELD: Yep.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Questions or

thoughts?

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Yeah, I've got -- I've got a question. On your slide on page nine on the hard copy of the Hollywoodcasino.com impact on land-based behavior. I'm afraid I don't -- I don't quite understand that. If you could take me -- take me through that. You say that you reviewed -- and I'm just reading the -- reading the slide,

2.1

reviewed 70,000 customers who are -- who are I-gaming, and compared to customer database, et cetera, et cetera. Your first bullet point is 1,029 customers signed up for Marquee rewards, that drove 21,000 theoretical win and 3,000 gaming visits. What does that mean? Of the 70,000 customers who are I-gaming, then what? What do those 10,000 -- I mean, 1,029 customers do?

MR. SHEFFIELD: So they actually signed up for the Marquee rewards program, and then we could track what that theoretical spend was going to be.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Say that again.

MR. SHEFFIELD: We could then track that theoretical spend. How much, in theory, how much they'll spend when they visit the property. And we've tracked the -- the 3,000 visits that I've generated as well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So the thousand people --

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: So a thousand people made 3,000 gaming visits to

2.1

Page 125 1 your brick and mortar? 2 MR. SHEFFIELD: Yes, yes. 3 Marquee reward members before they played the 4 game. 5 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Okay. 6 this is increased 8 percent and 24 percent 7 respectively. What are the two classes of 8 people that you're referring to by using the 9 word "respectively?" 10 MR. SHEFFIELD: I need to come back 11 to you on that. 12 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I'm sorry? 13 MR. SHEFFIELD: I would need to come 14 back to you on that stat. 15 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Okay. Then, 16 I don't feel stupid. 17 MR. SHEFFIELD: Sorry. 18 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Yeah, I don't understand it. 19 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Others? 21 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I had a 22 question. You don't have fountain songs to 23 give away. Thinking -- thinking specifically

of Plainridge, and I believe you have some of

your Marquee reward points tied to other area restaurants and business partners. Is that, kind of, the same redemption strategy plan to use with some of the folks that are playing on line?

I mean, obviously, you're driving them to the facility, but if I'm not mistaken, you have partnerships with some other area -- you know, an area hotels; are they going to be able to use their points in a similar fashion?

MR. SHEFFIELD: Not at the moment.

That could be something we considered way down
the line, but it's not something not right now.

MR. SOTTOSANTI: The only perk right now, Commissioner Stebbins, is a change in your tier status. And that gives you access to amenities like valet parking, awareness of special promotions. I'm sure I'm missing a few.

MR. BALDACCI: Yeah, free valet parking you would get, or pre-valet parking. You could get invitations to special events. You could get --

MR. SOTTOSANTI: Preferred access to

1 the restaurants.

those perks you get.

MR. BALDACCI: Jim Baldacci. Sorry.

Some of our properties have

concierge lounge, which is limited to high -high-end players, so they can go in there,
whereas other folks cannot. I'm not sure if
Plainridge has one of those or not. But perks
like that, the higher tier you are, the more

The other thing for, like, the restaurants and stuff, people generate comp rewards for their casino play. That's not part of this program right now. And that -- with those restaurant partners you referred to, I think that's where we -- we involve the local community, once they earn comp points. That's probably something we're going to ask this commission in the near future, to add that.

MR. SOTTOSANTI: So to answer your question succinctly, and to sum it up, today we're asking, and we've been working with the staff on linking to our rewards card, but only in the manner that the social play impact your

tier status. And, again, not the outcome of the social play. The fact that you are a social player. That can change your tier status. Down the road, we will explore, with the staff, and probably speak with you again about the next phase.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SOTTOSANTI: The phase that you were addressing, Commissioner Stebbins.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you.

MR. SHEFFIELD: I think, just going back to the point that's not on the eight and the 24 percent, I think that's coming back to me now. So -- so that's actually comparing the behavior of customers that didn't play the game. That they -- we actually saw them come back and grow by 8 percent. But the ones that did play the game were increased by the 24 percent.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I'm afraid our common language is getting between us. So the 8 percent and 24 percent, the 8 percent is what? Who are those people?

MR. SHEFFIELD: So those are just normal customers who haven't played the game. Their visitation increased by 8 percent, so we've not taken credit for that. And of the customers that did play the game, their visitation increased by 24 percent.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I see.

MR. SHEFFIELD: So the 8 percent is saying it increased anyway. So we're doing a great job marketing to those guys. But the game actually improved those conversions well.

MR. SOTTOSANTI: I think all of this speaks to the fact, and I think you've heard this in common from MGM and Penn, this is an important engagement tool with our customers, and not one that hurts land base. I think those are the takeaways. And one it, in fact, not only does it not hurt land base, but it — it helps pursuant to the studies we've done to date.

MR. BEDROSIAN: So Mr. Chair -- I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else?
Thank you, folks.

Page 130 1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you very 2 much. 3 MR. SOTTOSANTI: Good to see you guys 4 today. 5 MR. BEDROSIAN: So Mr. Chairman, that 6 concludes the administrative update. And I 7 believe I have horribly misjudged the amount of 8 time that would take, so I don't know if the 9 commission -- I would suggest that --CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Lunch? 10 MR. BEDROSIAN: Yeah, I'm done with 11 12 estimating time so I can't even tell you what 13 the next --CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think we ought 14 15 to --MS. WELLS: Well, we do have two 16 guests, so I guess that's my only concern, if 17 18 they're traveling, if we want to get this done before lunch. 19 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: How long is it 21 going to take, more or less? 22 MR. BEDROSIAN: I'm done. I'll defer 23 that. 24 It depends on the MS. WELLS:

Page 131 1 commissioners' questioning, but my best quess 2 is 30 minutes. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. 4 MR. BEDROSIAN: Do you want to take a break and then do it? 5 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, I mean, if --7 yeah, we'll take a quick break, but if you're 8 all right to wait for another half-hour or so 9 for lunch, we'll let these -- we'll let the 10 guests get their business done. All right. So 11 we'll take a quick break and then we'll come 12 right back. 13 MR. BEDROSIAN: Thank you. 14 15 (A recess was taken) 16 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. We are 18 reconvening meeting 194th at about 12:15. 19 Who's leading off? 20 MS. WELLS: Good afternoon, 21 Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. The 22 next item on the agenda, under the 23 Investigations and Enforcement Bureau, has to

with a regulation under 205 CMR 138.

1 Specifically, 205 CMR 138.40 and .47.

Currently, the language prohibits

ATMs at casinos to process a credit card cash

advance transaction. The gaming agents on

site at the Plainville casino, at PPC, had

been doing some routine testing and had tested

the machines, and I can have Bruce Band give

you some further detail on that.

But, generally, what they discovered is that, during the testing it was, in fact, possible to use certain credit cards to get cash in casino ATMs. So as a result of that, we had meetings with the licensees and the vendors that provide the ATM service at the -- at the -- at the casino, to discuss this issue. And we have this us today -- I'd like to thank both David Maletic from U.S. Bank, and Darren Simmons from Everi for joining us here today to explain this issue.

And, basically, what we've discovered is that there's somewhat of a dual interpretation what a cash advance is, and, also, there's some technical limitations on what the banking industry can do to -- to

2.1

accommodate the reg. that's currently -- the commission has currently promulgated.

So I just want to turn it over, initially, to Bruce Band, just talk about the response to the discovery by the licensees and the vendors, and the immediate remedial measures that the PPC casino took. And then, the U.S. Bank and Everi reps will talk about the banking industry, understanding what a credit card cash advance is, and the technical issue with compliance with the current regulation, and we'll talk about a potential alternate regulation for Commission's consideration.

MR. BAND: Yeah. This was, pretty much, a group effort by everybody. When we discovered that we could get cash advances on certain credit cards, not all of them, we immediately went to Penn, and they got Everi and U.S. Banks involved in the conversation.

It was pretty extensive talks we had to try and understand the limitations. Their terminology was a little different than ours.

I mean, where they didn't think they were

2.1

giving a cash advance then, but it's the terminology in the system that made that difficult.

After we kind of sured that there was no electronic fix that we could make to prevent it altogether, working with the -- the whole group, we moved to make it so that -- that it would be very difficult to get a cash advance on a credit card.

They added signage to every machine. There's a sign right on the top, says, "Using credit cards is illegal in Massachusetts."

They added signage to machine itself. They also removed certain buttons that were on there. Now, your choice, when you stick your card in, is either take it out of my checking or my savings account.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Excuse me, Bruce.

Is it illegal in Massachusetts?

MR. BAND: Well --

MS. WELLS: By reg.

MR. BAND: By our regulation.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. So it's not

illegal. Okay.

2.1

MR. BAND: Yeah. We are only state in the country that that is illegal, except Pennsylvania. You can't get cash advance on a credit card on the casino floor, but you can right off the casino floor. And I think we've got it to a point where it's livable. The only other answer would be to totally remove these machines off the floor, which would be devastating to this industry, because not many people like to carry cash with them anymore.

The way these cash advances work, if you're going over your limit that a normal ATM will give you, you can request it, it will give you a receipt, and then you have to complete the transaction at the cashier's cage, where they run it through their electronic system, check your ID to make sure you are who you are, and the bank gives them the okay to, you know, give the additional money above what your normal ATM limit is.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And that's what's not happening?

MS. WELLS: That's not an issue. So the cage transactions, which is, sort of, that

2.1

common understanding of a credit card cash advance, that's the large amounts of money you'd get out, like a credit card loan.

Those -- we haven't had an issue with those.

The cage procedures and protocols are taking care of that. But it's that limited, you know, area where they can potentially get the money off the credit card. And I think the folks at Everi and --

MR. BAND: The other thing that should be noted, when they did those transactions, they weren't handled like a credit card transaction. And by that I mean, you know, if you get -- there's a \$5 charge, if you use your debit card in a outside machine and stuff, that's the only charge that's put on these people's cards. Normally, if you get a credit card, it can be as much as 20 percent interest starting immediately on your card. That did not occur.

MR. BEDROSIAN: I think -- and if I could hop in here, because I was involved in discussions too. One of the things -- one of the significant, technological things that was

2.1

happening is, these credit cards were used with pin numbers. It wasn't just going in and putting a credit card into an ATM. It was putting a credit card into an ATM that had a pin number associated with it. I think we all may know that you -- some credit cards have an option to have a pin number.

And so, what happened, when these patrons were going up to the ATM, looked a whole lot like a debit card transaction and functioned a whole lot like a debit card transaction, like, probably, we all think of a debit card transaction. But what was happening on the back end was that these cards, and -- and thank you to the folks for being here, as they've explained to us, the financial institutions, obviously, have evolved so much that product offerings now are that -- you know, whether you call them credit cards, financial cards, debit cards, there are a brunch of hybrid activities on these cards, where you could have one card that can be, again, a debit card, credit card, can attach to a brokerage account, can attach to multiple

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

of -- of financial products, and the ATM itself doesn't know what's going on. The ATM is acting as a communication device between the cardholder and the financial institution. I think you'll probably hear a little bit more about that. But that was one of the challenges we had when we were thinking about this was, it wasn't someone going up with a credit card and just using it like a credit card. They were using it very much like, I think, you folks and I would think of a debit card transaction.

MS. WELLS: I mean, I think it would helpful if, the -- the visitors from U.S. Bank and Everi could, sort of, explain to the Commission, you know, the banking industry of -- under definition of a credit card cash advance, and then the technical issue with compliance of the current regulation.

MR. SIMMONS: Hi. Good morning.

Darren Simmons from Everi in Las Vegas.

MR. MALETIC: And David Maletic with U.S. Bank based out of Denver.

MR. SIMMONS: So thank you for having

2.1

us here and helping you all understand a little bit more about the complexity of the payments industry. This is — this is unique, in terms of the specifics that you want to get into, but not necessarily unique to us because we do operate in multiple jurisdictions where there are all sorts of different regulations around the use of credit and debit cards, and cash advances and the like.

So I think what Bruce wanted us to get in more detail around is the definition and the interpretation of a cash advance transaction. So what is offered at Plainridge today, as far as a credit card cash advance is not. We do not do credit card cash advances there.

Now, what is -- what is available to you is that certain cards issued by banks could be a credit card, could be a debit card, the functionality of those cards can be linked.

So you could have a relationship with your bank, where they issue a card that could give you access to a line of credit, and

2.1

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

also could give you access to your checking account or your savings account. And a lot of this is because issuing banks are trying to make it less friction for cardholders and easier for them to use and access cash when they're traveling and using their financial services.

So we wanted to clarify the definition around the use of a card for a ATM cash withdrawal transaction, which is what you currently allow today, versus a cash advance. The cash advance transaction that -- in services that we provide, is a different transaction than an ATM withdrawal. Okay.

So what we described here with respect to how it's processed in network is, it is -- and every time an ATM transaction is performed, whether it could potentially be used with a credit card labeled, or a debit card label, rides the rails of the ATM debit networks. Okay? And the payment networks, they categorize that transaction specifically as an ATM transaction. And it's described within the specifications of the processing of

2.1

that transaction as an ATM transaction. So when that issuing bank gets that request to authorize that transaction, they know that this is a ATM cash withdrawal transaction.

Now, we differentiate that from a credit card cash advance transaction, which is another merchant category code, and it requires different procedures to complete.

That's a transaction that results in much higher fees to the cardholder, requires identification for that cardholder, and gives the cardholder actually access to higher amounts. Typical ATM cash withdrawal limits on a daily basis are three to \$500, which is what's available today at Plainridge.

So we wanted to make sure that you were clear with respect to the definition of cash advance, in terms of the payment networks versus an ATM transaction, which was -- which is what available at Plainridge today.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Just explain,

again, the -- I thought you said when you -
when an -- when a credit card is inserted in an

ATM and it makes a call for a credit cash

2.1

withdrawal, that, that is a different merchant code and goes through some other different process, right?

MR. SIMMONS: So if you know your pin with your credit card --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MR. SIMMONS: -- okay, banks give you the ability to do an ATM cash withdrawal.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: An ATM cash withdrawal.

MR. SIMMONS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Not a credit withdrawal -- I mean, not -- in other words, a debit you're talking about now, not a credit?

MR. SIMMONS: So this is the complexity of the language. So in the eyes of the payment networks and the financial institutions, and the card brands that govern this, whether it's a debit card, or whether it's a credit card, when you use your pin in an ATM and request an amount to withdraw cash, that is an ATM cash withdrawal. Now, versus --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But what was the piece where you said there's a different

1 merchant code?

MR. SIMMONS: Right. So -- so that particular transaction, when you put in your card, put in your pin and request an amount, is categorized as an ATM cash withdrawal. It is not a credit card cash advance. It is not a cash advance transaction.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can you explain the credit card -- card cash transaction?

MR. SIMMONS: So -- so that's a different type of transaction, where, in other jurisdictions, we've -- we have the ability to enable the device to give the -- the cardholder or, the patron, the ability to select a cash advance transaction.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, I see.

MR. SIMMONS: Okay? They are prompted, through the screen prompts, to see that there is higher fees associated with this transactions. And, at that point, if the transaction is approved, the cardholder then must go to the cashier cage, bring their card, bring their identification. And, again, as I said, much higher fees.

So at Plainridge the ATM fee, I think, is around \$4.00 per -- per transaction, you know, on, say, \$200, average transaction size. If you did a credit card cash advance for \$200, the fee is, probably, \$15.

the separate, what you're calling cash advance or -- sorry -- yeah, which you'd call a cash advance, which is this larger transaction, which requires going to the cage, that's something that you can enable in some ATMs, and do enable in other -- in some ATMs, but that functionality does not exist in the ATMs in Massachusetts?

MR. MALETIC: That's correct.

MR. SIMMONS: Exactly. That's

17 correct.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Got it. So that the problem is, the challenge is that the -- the ATM has no way -- in Massachusetts, has no way to distinguish between a cash withdrawal, which is a debit, and a cash withdrawal, which is a credit?

MR. SIMMONS: That's decided by the

1 financial institution.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MR. SIMMONS: Yeah. And I think -you know, the ATM can't prevent you, as a
cardholder, if you have a credit card, to put
your credit card in and put in your pin, and -and when, during the screen flow, you have a
selection of checking or savings. You could,
and some banks have this capability with the
issuance of cards, is to select checking and
get a cash withdrawal transaction. That does
exist. There are banks that are issuing these
cards, but that's, obviously, unique.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: But,

Mr. Simmons, I thought I heard you say that -that at the ATMs in -- in Plainridge right now,
that you cannot -- you cannot make a -- a
credit cash advance.

MR. SIMMONS: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: If that were so, we wouldn't have -- we wouldn't have -- we wouldn't have the problem.

MS. WELLS: It's the definition of what's a cash advance.

MR. BEDROSIAN: So -- you and I see someone go to an ATM and -- and this is what happens, this is sort of what spurred this, you see someone go to an ATM, put in a credit card and get cash. That felt like, to us, under our reg., which did not have a definition of cash advance, a cash advance.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But they call that a cash withdrawal.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Right. Exactly.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's a cash withdrawal, which is your -- your normal ATM transaction that we think about, just normal, two, 300 bucks with a two, three or \$4 charge. They don't call that a cash advance. They call that a cash withdrawal.

A cash advance is a more sophisticated functionality, where you can get relief from your credit card company to take out big money with big fees, which is then ultimately processed at the cage.

MR. BEDROSIAN: So Commissioner

Macdonald, so this then will go to what

Attorney Grossman will get to, which is what

was the intent of our statute? I don't think anyone, because we're all learning this together, anticipated the difference in what cash coming out of an ATM with a credit card could actually mean. Maybe it means something to us being new, means something else to the experienced, you know, purveyors of the financial products in the institutions.

So -- so we are here because, given the history of the regulation, the concern of the some of the stakeholders, we want to make sure we're being as true to that history, which, of course, you can interpret as we possibly can.

And part of the solution we think-and I don't want to jump too far ahead is, we
continue to prohibit what's not happening.

And that's clear, and that's great. But can
we, because of the concern with stakeholders
about people basically purchasing money with
credit cards, whether it's a high amount, low
amount, inhibit, not -- not prevent because
it's clear we can't prevent, but at least
inhibit that -- those smaller transactions as

2.1

much as commercially and reasonably possible. 2 And would that, which is what we're suggesting 3 in the modification, satisfy the 4 commissioners, the stakeholders, and everyone who are concerned about this issue? 5 6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I clarify 7 something, because you mentioned this? 8

not a prohibition of the statute. prohibition of the regulation.

> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Correct.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Yeah, correct.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Which, you know, I think it's the point you made, Mr. Chairman, and I think it's very -- very

relevant to consider, it's not against the law.

It's the regulation we wrote. With a number of

things in mind, that Attorney Grossman can

refresh our memories further of the regulation

and the like, but I also want to --

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So -- so the better terminology would be a violation of

regulation, rather than illegal.

MR. BEDROSIAN: That clearly is a -it's a regulatory component.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It would be a violation on the licensee, not by the individual person.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Exactly.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Of the regulation.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Exactly. And the good news is, this is within our control.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MS. WELLS: I think it would be helpful to the rest of us if Mr. Malitec and Mr. Simmons could, sort of, explain to the Commission why there's not, sort of, an easy solve. Why we can't just, sort of, turn a switch and hit a button, and prevent these kind of cash withdrawals off our credit line.

MR. SIMMONS: Yeah. I think what we're seeing is, as technology changes, you know, banks are offering more sophisticated, financial project -- products, you know, to their customers. And these multifunction cards are -- are where it's going. It's really popular in other parts of world, and it's certainly coming here. Further complexity will

2.1

come with respect to the different form factors on how you can actually initiate a transaction.

You know, mobile phones, you've probably seen, recently, a lot of large banks are now giving you the ability to initiate a transaction on a device with a mobile phone, and so you actually never see the card. The banks obviously want to make transactions more secure, you know, less -- make less desirable for a foster trying to get ahold of the cards, and so these different form factors are now becoming available.

And, ultimately, as a service provider in this, you know, the complex chain in the transaction, we're not privy to the arrangement you as a cardholder have with your bank and the accounts that you access.

We are providing a service into the casino, to the patrons there, where we know what they're performing as an ATM cash withdrawal transaction out of an account they have with their bank, that their bank has said they're good with approving and allowing this customer to get their cash advance. ATM cash

2.1

withdrawal, there are typical daily limits on these transactions, three to \$500, irrespective of the card, and the fee is, you know, the \$4 ATM fee that you -- that you see, versus, again, what we're trying to talk about here, a cash advance transaction, a more-sophisticated transaction. In fact, that's a purchase transaction. In the eyes of the payments networks and the cardholders, that's actually a purchase transaction.

You're buying something. We're not doing that in this case.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Let me just follow up once more with Mr. Simmons. If I took my MasterCard, classic credit card, down to Plainridge, put into the -- put it into the ATM, and put in my pin that I know on that credit card, are you saying that the ATM at Plainridge would not process that?

MR. SIMMONS: I don't know. You could potentially --

MR. BAND: I can say -- it would on certain cards. We've found certain banks and I just --

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: That's what

2 I wanted to clarify.

MR. BAND: Yeah. You could,

possibly.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I've heard you say -- I've heard you say it, and that's why we're here, because that it's been reported to us that -- that --

MR. BAND: And that's what our gaming agents did, yeah. But not every card that they used worked.

MR. MALETIC: If I can clarify. So from the get-go, we've established only two options for your guests at the -- at the property. They can do a withdrawal from a checking account, or withdrawal from a saving account. So if you're putting in your credit card with a known pin number and it would happen to tie to a credit card, that it would happen to tie to a checking account, then, yes, that transaction could be completed. If there is no checking account, then, in most cases, that transaction is going to be rejected as an invalid transaction.

So in banking there's -- there's two roles. And we sit on the role of the acquirer. Our job is to provide the equipment and the means to transfer your request to your bank. And your bank has the decision whether or not to accept that transaction or reject it, based on your relationship with them.

So if you didn't have enough money, if you had reached your limit, if it was an invalid type of a transaction, those are all reasons why that transaction could -- could be rejected. But it could also be approved because you actually have a credit card that is tied to a checking account at that facility. But it's not within our capability, as an acquirer, to exhibit that control over the issuing bank, which could be anywhere in the United States, whoever issues cards.

MR. SIMMONS: Or around the world.

MR. MALETIC: Or around the world.

Exactly. And it's their job to -- to make that decision. And that's why it makes it commercially very difficult to weed out a transaction that maybe not should have gone

2.1

through by the issuing bank. We can't tell them what to do. They're bank -- they're going to do it.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: We would have to regulate banks, you know, in order to prevent that.

MS. WELLS: So this has been -- and I appreciate the reps from U.S. Bank an Everi for coming, because this has been very confusing. We needed to have a lot of discussion about this, and first we were, sort of, speaking different languages, but we, sort of, got on the same page so I do appreciate that.

I think it would be helpful, if
Mr. Grossman could chime in just, around the,
sort of, the history here, the policy that
went into the original reg. to see, you know,
what the Commission wants to do going forward,
being mindful of the history.

MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you. And good afternoon. As Director Wells mentioned, I think it may be helpful, in order to understand the proposal we have before you, to reflect on the policy considerations that went into

2.1

drafting the original regulation. And to do that, we have to look at what we believed, at the time, to be an ordinary understanding of what a cash advance actually was. And in --well, we understood what a cash advance to be, and I think it still, you know, holds true in many respects. It's an instance in which one takes cash out on their credit card. Where, essentially, what you're doing is buying money. And as such, credit card companies consider that to be a higher-risk transaction, for whatever reason.

Accordingly, there are some enhanced fees and interest that gets attached to those types of transaction, as opposed to when you just go to the grocery store and buy groceries on your credit card. In both cases, they're short-term loans, but, for whatever reason, the banks consider taking cash out and -- to be a higher-risk transaction.

So there are three characteristics that we understood cash advances to typically all share. For one, they typically had higher fees. So in addition to the ATM fee, which is

2.1

two, three, \$4, there was an added fee of between two and 5 percent on the amount of -that you're taking out, that you pay. As was mentioned, you know, could be \$15 on a \$300 withdrawal. So that's in addition to the ATM fee that the Everis and U.S. Banks of the world assess.

Then, there's a higher interest rate that gets assigned to this type of transaction, when you take cash out on your credit card. Instead of the 16 percent or so, or APR you typically pay on your credit card, cash advances are typically assigned a 22, 25 percent interest rate for the benefit of taking that cash out.

And, thirdly, typically, the interest will accrue immediately upon you receiving the cash, as opposed to what is typically a 30-day grace period you would get, when you make a regular, ordinary charge on your credit card.

So based upon all of those things, what -- there was a concern that those types of fees were considered onerous, they were

2.1

high interest rates. And for consumer-protection-responsible-gaming-type concerns, the Commission, with the input from different stakeholders, developed this regulation where we said, okay, it's not a goods idea to allow cash advances in the casino, period.

Now, we assumed, I think, at the time you kind of just flipped a switch in the ATM and you wouldn't allow cash advances, we've been educated on the actual process now.

So what I -- based upon all that, I think what you'll find before you now, the proposed regulation will accommodate the concerns and still, at least, discourage a patron's ability to be able to take cash out on you credit card.

As you've heard, it's not technologically, reasonably possible to prevent all what we would initially have considered cash advances for taking place at a casino. So that's why we crafted the regulation, where we said to them, you have come up with a plan to prevent this process

2.1

from occurring. Here's three things that you must do, but, certainly, there might be other things that may be appropriate as well.

We also attempted to future-proof these regulations by taking out the word cash advance. We don't use that term anymore. So to the extent there's any disagreement as to what the term even means, we don't use it anymore. We're really just going at what the main concern is. And that is the withdrawals that are typically characterized by the high interest rates, high fees, and I think we've achieved that here. And we can go through that too.

MR. BEDROSIAN: So I think the other thing to point out is, what we are asking for is a vote for an emergency regulation. We've shared this with our licensees. Obviously, while MGM and Wynn aren't operating, they have a future interest in this. So they have participated. I think there's a letter of support. But, importantly, if we're missing something, there will be a comment period, if we have to come back to the Commission with any

2.1

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

final comments. So this is a interim step towards getting us, I think, hopefully where we want to be, and/or the Commission, if it decides revisiting some of the policy issues. But given what the regulation intended to do, we're trying to enforce it the best we can.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: One quick question. In the back of your presentation is Exhibit 2, suggested at Plainridge. So with a quickened option of these on an emergency basis, would the screen that pops up that says casino cash -- the big Ghost Buster sign.

MR. BAND: They're already in place by both manufacturers.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.

MR. BEDROSIAN: And the hard signage too. I mean, around the machines, is -- is now very prominent also.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah. I'm also persuaded by the fact that it's our expert's opinion, or to the best of their knowledge, the vast majority of these are linked to a checking account. So it is much --

2.1

even though it's a credit card, it's used as a debit card. So that's persuasive to me that -that most transactions are really within what
we originally wanted to them to be, the intent
of the original regulation.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else?
Comments, questions?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah, I think this clarifies it. And, you know, it's especially encouraging that there's a lot of research and input from, you know, additional stakeholders, not just licensees.

I do have a feeling, though, of whether -- even with the regulation as it stands, it's a bit like swimming against the current here. As -- as we're -- we're the only one trying to prevent the use of credit cards at some level, because I'm -- I'm thinking about the -- what's in the framework, in the responsible gaming framework, as in information may work really better in some instances. If I see the display of what I am going to get charged, you know, on a particular transaction, that may be, you know,

2.1

itself, a -- a tool that works to be, you know, persuasive for somebody to say maybe I'll go -- I'll go cancel.

So I think the way that this -- this reg. is -- is written is very -- is very good. It accomplishes everything. But I did want to mention, for the record, that, perhaps, trying to -- to do away with this -- with the use of credit cards, as we were initially intended, is all -- is not that feasible altogether.

I went back and looked at -- with the help of Attorney Grossman, had some discussions of that initial meeting, and I remember even mentioning that they could very well be across the street, you know, next door. Somebody could go to a bank and get that before they go to the casino, and get the credit card cash advance in -- in anticipation to the trip to the casino. And that there are other measures that we have put in place, including -- including the Game Sense program and the like, that hinges on informing people. It's not preventing a particular behavior that they could do anyway.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I would -- I would agree with that. I think, for the short-term, this is an interim solution, which I would certainly be supportive of. I think, maybe in our overall reg. review that we're talking about, doing piecemeal, at least. I, for one, would want to rethink this one too. So I'm with you on that, and I don't know where I would come down.

Certainly, the idea of having what the industry considers cash advances, the thousands of dollars out of the credit line, you know, that's problematic, I think. But routine two, \$300, I don't think we should be prohibiting that. But that's for another day. All right.

MS. WELLS: Are there any questions about the specific language in the -- in the proposed regs? Under 138.40, really, it just defers now to 138.47. And in Subsection 3, it just, basically, requires the casino to -- and the licensee to have reasonable measures to inhibit the -- inhibit this kind of activity, and there are three different provisions that

2.1

are required. So I think the whole team is here to answer the questions, if you have any questions about the proposed interim solution here.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, the one question I had was on C. That it is designed to inhibit, and I get that. It further goes on to say that, you know, they have to ensure that no transaction like this will take place.

MS. WELLS: Yeah. This is referring to --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: We still --

MS. WELLS: Well, this is referring to the cage. So this -- we wanted to specifically enumerate. So that description that Bruce Band gave, where you get the ticket and go to the cage and take money, we want to make sure that that's still --

MR. BEDROSIAN: Or you can go right to the cage. Sorry. We want to make sure -COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. Okay.

MR. BEDROSIAN: And there's human intervention there, but we just wanted to

But --

1 articulate that.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Fair enough.

Thank you for that clarification. It's for the cage only.

again, an example of a smart regulation process. I mean, you got educated, you understood where the difference was in language, you brought in the folks that have been doing this routinely to understand, and brought in Attorney Grossman to help you reword. So I think it was well done, and this is -- this is as, to me, as good as it can get under the technological limitations.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do we have a motion?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr. Chair, I move that the commission adopt, on an emergency basis, the recommended changes to 205 CMR 138, under 138.40 an 138.47, and to initiate the formal promulgation process to approve these changes.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second.

Page 165 1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Other discussion? 2 All in favor? 3 MR. MACDONALD: Aye. 4 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 5 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Aye. Opposed? 8 ayes have it unanimously. And we would invite 9 any constituents out there, who are interested 10 in commenting on this, one way or the other, we 11 welcome that feedback from anybody. 12 MS. WELLS: Thank you. 13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. Now I'm going to suggest that we adjourn temporarily. 14 15 How about 1:30? We'll come back at 1:30. 16 17 (A recess was taken) 18 19 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. I guess we 20 are -- we are ready to convene public meeting 21 No. 194, although I don't hear the mike. There we go. Okay, 194 is -- just after 1:30, 22 23 although, the mike is in an out. 24 MR. SANGALANG: Okay.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Now, we're going. 2 And the item on the agenda is the finance 3 division with our CFO, Derek Lennon. 4 MR. LENNON: Good afternoon, Commissioners. 5 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good afternoon. 7 MR. MACDONALD: Good afternoon. 8 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 9 afternoon. 10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good afternoon. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: 11 Good 12 afternoon. 13 MR. LENNON: Today I'm joined by Trupti Banda and Agnes Beaulieu. And we're 14 15 here to follow-up on the Commissions FY'17 16 budget proposal. Just a quick overview, once 17 again, get everyone back in the ballgame from June 9th, from the last time we was here. 18 19 Budget includes funding for 73 FTEs 20 and one contractor. The split of that is 21 69.25 FTEs for gaming, one contractor, and 22 3.75 FTEs for racing. 23 As far as the process goes, in FY 24 '17 is similar to the '16, the division of

administration and finance met with each director to establish budget request, HR did the same thing. Request was then reviewed by me, the executive director, and the treasurer, Commissioner Zuniga. The revised figures were then sent to our licensees and reviewed at a meeting with the MGC offices on May 11th.

As a result of that review, we revised our spending estimates down by 2.28 million. We submitted this proposal to you two weeks ago on June 9th, asked for public comment. At the time of the writing of the memorandum in your packet, we had not received any public comments. Although, yesterday we received public comment from one of our licensees, which should be in your packet. It came from Wynn Mass. It requested that our --

Well, first, let me talk about the letter. The letter that they submitted was extremely professional, and I think it was representative how all of our licensees have been during the budget process. They advocated for their points of view, but in the

2.1

end, they've been understanding of our eventual decision. The letter asked for an additional \$891,000 of spending reductions, on top of the 2.28, as well as a consideration of moving the MGC's offices outside of downtown

A lot of those - it's up on the board right now - were points that we discussed during our revisions. A lot of those items we cut down to begin with. I think we'll give time, towards the end of this presentation, if you want to discuss any of those items, going further into detail, or why we didn't consider cutting them further.

In your packet, you'll find all the materials from the June 9th presentation, just as a refresher, because that was a proposed budget. One thing that did change, we added a revenue source. \$60,000 for travel gaming.

We requested a travel gaming consultant. That was pointed out to us by our licensee, Wynn, that we hadn't -- we had broken out the cost, but we hadn't put in the corresponding revenue, so that brought our assessment down

2.1

Boston.

from 22.45 to, I think, 22.39 million.

But one thing I would like to talk is, there's a new memorandum in the package, and this comes up as many discussions with our licensees come about, the distinction between the gaming control fund total budget and the MGC's regulatory costs.

On a duly manner in which the Extended Gaming Act was drafted, the Commission is responsible for assessing costs on licensees. They are not part of our day-to-day regulation of Category 1 and Category 2 casino licensees. The law was drafted with the intent to have the industry fund all of the costs associated with expanded gaming, and the MGC was, basically, the instrument for billing those costs.

However, the problem with that -- us being the instrument, is that, when I come to you and present a budget and an annual assessment, the talking point becomes the Massachusetts Gaming Commission costs \$27.17 million to regulate this industry. So what I've put together is a spreadsheet that

2.1

tries to call out a memorandum that calls out the regulatory cost distinction between our statutory-required costs.

And with that statutory-required cost, I tried to put reference so that anyone following here could go back and check -- check the general laws to show that 8.57 million out of that 27.17 million are statutory-required costs that we don't really control, which leaves a regulatory cost of 18.6 million, which is a much different talking point than the 27. almost 2 million.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I want just to reinforce that, Derek, because this is really helpful to have you make that point. Our operating budget is a little -- is 18-1/2 million dollars. And even when I've been traveling, you know, I've been in Vegas, people have made fleeting references to our budgets. And, boy, you guys are expensive regulators. I think there are some issues -- there are some things in Massachusetts, which are extraordinary, but there are function-extraordinary costs, like our public

2.1

health trust fund, which starts out at around \$5 million. And those are real costs, and they cost to operate real money, there's no question about that, but they aren't part of our budget. They're out of our control. Same with the attorney general, we had zero to say about that. So -- but these numbers get picked up and kicked around and become factoids. And this 27 million or 20-something million has been kicked around a lot. 18 million is an accurate characterization of our operating budget for those items issued in our control. And that's a really important clarification, so thank you.

MR. LENNON: So, at this point, I guess, if you'd like to talk about any of the --

MR. BEDROSIAN: So if I could jump in a and make some comments. This was my first budget process as executive director. I'd like to thank our CFAO and our Treasurer Zuniga, who were very patient with me. I think we had some good, spirited discussions. I probably asked the same question a number of times, and they

2.1

were gentle and reinforcing, if they already answered that question about five times.

But I would say, the context of the discussion with our licensees, obviously, is important too, and I reinforce what Mr. Lennon said. It was very professional and collaborative, even when we disagreed.

Obviously, for two of them, they are -- they are at the beginning point of two construction projects, and there are folks who aren't going to see some revenue for awhile.

And I think that was reflected and -- and thought, in some of their comments. And the suggestions they made, if I were in their positions, are not irrational suggestions, and I might be making the same suggestions, if I were in their -- their position.

Having said that, Derek and I, with the guidance of Commissioner Zuniga, took those initial comments very seriously and went back, and, you know, scrubbed the budget, we think, fairly, and we had ongoing discussions with many members, directors about cutting their budgets and being more reasonable under

2.1

the current circumstances. And a number of folks -- everyone -- everyone, I shouldn't say, a number of folks, everyone was aware, chipped in, I think made sacrifices. Particularly, we want to point out Diversity and Workforce Development had a higher budget I went back and had discussion with Director Griffin, and I also consulted with Commissioner Stebbins. And -- and there was a significant decrease in that budget. Although, I know that our -- one of our licensees was would like more, but I did want to point it out. There are other areas, too, where -- with Derek and I we went back and -and made cuts to get to that 2 point -- I forget what it was.

MR. LENNON: 2.2 million.

MR. BEDROSIAN: 2.2 million. So we did hear. They might not think we heard them enough, but we did hear them, and it was a professional process, and we thank them and our staff who were involved in that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Just one other contextual thing to mention it, there is --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

there is a problem for our licensees, our two licensees that are not operating yet. And that is that, for -- for delay -- reasons of delay, having to do everything from the referendums, to our process, to lawsuits, to internal problems, a whole, at least those four variables have caused our launch dates to get postponed, which means that there's that many more years, months or years running without income, which means their expenses upfront prerevenues are increasing. And it puts us in the funny position of thinking we were ramping up to have an organization ready to roll in 2016, and it turns out it won't be for awhile. So the delay have cost us all. It's been awkward.

You know, there are inefficiencies built into that. And there are certainly understandable concerns for our operators, who are spending tens of millions of dollars in these early years, along -- well, billions of dollars in these early years, and so I'm completely sensitive to it. And I really appreciate that -- that you guys and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

Commissioner Zuniga took it seriously. You know, we don't consider this free money, play money. We know this is somebody's real money. And these particular -- each one of these millions is a critical part of the calculation of how much money can we afford to invest, in order to get the Commonwealth the product that they want? So we understand, and we're sympathetic to that.

And having said all that, and I think, particularly with the reminder that our real operating budget is only about 18-1/2 million dollars and the rest of it is beyond our control is -- you guys have done a good job and I appreciate it.

that I -- and I do appreciate a detailed premeeting to understand the budget better and -- which is very, very helpful to me, but I think we all have to be cognizant of the next couple of years, that, that revenue will not be coming in, and just continue to find ways to -- to make sure we're being as efficient as possible, whether that be hiring, whether that

2.1

be certain programs that we may want to slow down a little bit. Whatever that may be. I think there's always ways to take a look at that. I happen to have an office next to Commissioner Zuniga, so I have some of these conversations, and they are helpful and something we do have to pay attention to.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Are you going to continue an overview, or were we getting to a discussion of some of the line items?

MR. LENNON: I think, if you'd like to get into discussion of some of the lines, this is the appropriate time.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah.

MR. LENNON: This is the only information from the June 9th. This is the only public comment we received.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. Well, I did want to talk a little bit about the comment that we received because it's something I had mentioned. At least on one of the items in the -- on the prior meeting, and that's the grants to the community college number, which they're proposing to eliminate altogether; is

2.1

that -- am I correct on that, the 225 on the -- that would leave --

MR. LENNON: So that was actually four separate items that added up to about 400,000 to begin with.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay.

MR. LENNON: If you remember, last year, the workforce and diversity program had \$125,000 in their budget for grants, so to eliminate it completely would get rid of existing funding that they have this year.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right.

MR. LENNON: So what they did was, they consolidated the community college grants with the diversity and opportunity grants to make one line item that went up by 100,000.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. But what the letter suggests eliminating the whole thing?

MR. LENNON: Correct. The letter is suggesting cutting from even the sixteen-funding level.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And my point two weeks ago, and one that I think we need to

discuss now or eventually, later, is, something I made, which is, I think we need to build a better business case. Document it as to what we are funding, what the intention is on -- on both the supplier diversity and -- and the community college funding, which is -- there's -- there's a new element under community college this year that was not last year.

And for everybody's understanding, just clarifying what we intend to do, I think, would go a long way towards furthering that — the goals, because I've heard some of them just verbally. I've seen, in the prior presentation — I remember one in Springfield, when we had a couple of guests come from local, nonprofits to talk about, you know, what they plan to do, which is — can be summarized as outreach and things like that. Somehow, it occurs to me that, that business case is not permeating. Certainly, even the content — the comments that we have. So I'd like to have that discussion again.

We could approve this budget as it

2.1

is with -- with the caveat of coming back
to -- during the year to get better guidelines
as to how we're going to dole out the grants,
what is going to be the criteria, who
qualifies, who doesn't, because I also fear
that \$20,000 at a time to this community, or
to this other recipient, or another
organization, runs the risk of being, you
know, very -- money that just doesn't -doesn't have a lot of incremental benefit.
And that's -- that's what I mean by -- by the
business case that I was asking last week, and
want to continue to point out.

jump in because, obviously, I've had the chance to work with Jill, and in thinking about some of the grant funding for this coming year.

And, kind of, where we started initially was reaching out to our partners at the community colleges and thinking where we are now. Where our projected opening dates of our two licensees are. What would be some of the things on the workforce development side you'd want to think about or strategically plan for

2.1

and -- and come up with some budget numbers.

And they were kind enough to do their due diligence. They shared some budget numbers with us. We initially, as Derek pointed out, asked for a number, a half or a third of what their proposal was. And then, obviously, have whittled it down since then.

I think the number where we are right now, as Derek said, it's only, you know, \$100,000 over - I know, the famous line out of Washington, a hundred thousand, here, a hundred thousand there, pretty soon, you're talking about real money - is really the beginning of this window of time in this two-year period of focusing on workforce development and using the partnership with our licensees to, hopefully, leverage additional money.

One of the items particular to the community colleges was having the -- our licensees support a permanent, full-time casino career training institute staff member. Not to fully fund the salary, but to, again, hopefully leverage input or -- or an

2.1

investment from the community colleges. And that work, which has not been really done on a full-time basis to this point, to be someone working with the community colleges, working the local organizations, keeping an eye on a lot of some of the workforce development strategies that are going to be necessary to get people to a point of being able to enter one of the casino's specific training programs.

And, initially, having that conversation to, you know, essentially, again, you know -- you know, I'm going to paraphrase, but to invite the community colleges and say, we want to leverage this relationship with our licensees and with the Commission, but, you know, we'd like you to meet us halfway.

So, you know, and I think Jill, based on her experience with the greater
Boston -- with the Boston foundation has been pursuing those opportunities. Where we're going to use, even this limited amount of money, I think, to leverage resources from other stakeholders, be they other government

2.1

stakeholders or other nonprofit agencies.

But, again, we have a two-year window, so this is kind of what I would see as, kind of, a ramp-up period where our licensees are going to be partners at the table with us, other stakeholders. We had a great meeting with the governor's skills force -- workforce skills cabinet. They're dedicating some top, local staff to again work on these issues with us.

I think what Wynn provided to us, and I appreciate their thoughts, as we all do, I think there's somewhat of a misstatement on their part in that this money is all going towards community colleges. In the past, we've handed out grants to local business organizations to find and recruit minority women and veteran businesses to participate in the construction process.

You know, Jill has plans, and she's always been great about coming back before the Commission, before money is released, to talk about some of her upcoming plans. Some of those immediately will be targeted towards,

2.1

again, minority and women recruitment, veteran recruitment into the construction trades.

So it's -- again, you know, you do
the math on the 225. I think it's .012
percent of what we're asking our licensees on
their assessment. But I think as we enter
a -- kind of, this two-year-out window,
working with them and other stakeholders, I
think this is money that can be leveraged for
good programs. Hopefully, leverage resources
from other stakeholders, either financially
and in kind.

And, again, I think we'll have us well-positioned with our licensees that, when they start doing a lot of the casino-specific training a year out, or less than a year out, they're going to have a qualified workforce, as well finish up the construction project, and see a -- a solid result in minority women and veterans being involved in the construction process.

So it's kind of the expanded nutshell, but I wanted to give you that background as to, kind of, how we landed on

2.1

this number. And, again, it's a significant reduction from what we originally asked them for.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah, no. And it's also a significant increase from prior year and -- which, you know, I think the -- the question that I've asked, maybe I'm not understanding exactly what the business case is, that is in lieu of, or leveraging the main effort -- the main effort, which resides fundamentally at the licensee level. person who's going to be doing the recruiting, who's going to be doing the funding, is, by definition, going to be the casino. And we seem to be suggesting that we're going to do part of their job, even though they're telling us we're going to do this job. And that's -that's the -- the essence of what I'm asking. Why are we in a better position than they are to -- to do part of this work?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Well, I think there is a business case to be made. You know, we're not trying to take away their immediate hiring from them. I think, all along, we've

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

all understood that, you know, for any of our licensees to get 3,000 qualified people, we've heard the number, if you need 10,000 coming into the funnel, and how well prepared are those folks? You know, just taking a look at, if we invite the community colleges to approach us for half the salary of an individual to be a full-time casino career training institute coordinator, I would say they're getting more bang for their buck by, one, having us leverage what the state college may kick in, and then they get a full-time employee working on their behalf for \$25,000. That's a pretty good business case.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I have a question about that, Commissioner. They have their own line item, community colleges, from gaming funds, how -- is that not enough to coverer that position; is that the case they've made to you?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: The -- the only money that has come into the community college fund, as it was laid out in the statute, comes from license fees. And that was

2.1

one of my questions early on, is, this is going to be great. This is going to be a resource for them. And as Derek and I kind of found out, the money that went into that account from the license fees, and it's not our money to control, was quickly appropriated away by the legislature to kind of help the community colleges recover from previous budget shortfalls.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So it did not go to --

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: It went to the community college.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: -- specific training for --

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: It did not go to specific training for casino career institute or any -- any related programs?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We had no input on where it did go.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Subject to appropriation. I mean, I'm happy to see the community colleges being made whole, but it was a little out of our control.

2.1

1

2

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think

3 4 5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

2.1 22

23

24

Commissioner Zuniga makes two good points. is, and I think you said this is going to happen in the nature of things. We do want to see the logic and who's getting what, why and to accomplish what. And Director Griffin comes before us all the time, when she's been making these grants, and we get a chance to see them. If we had any problem, we can say so.

The second point I think is important, and I kind of intuitively agree, although I don't know the details of these, that you don't want to have so many little grants that you really don't have any throw weight. You know, just -- and I don't know what -- what \$20,000 gets us. I don't know -but, intuitively, it feels like maybe it would be better to have three 50s than -- than six, seven, eight 20s, you know.

So I think those are both important points. And I heard you saying that you're comfortable going forward with this, but you'd like to make sure we keep an eye going forward, and I -- I dig that.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And just as a, sort of, uninformed piece of context, we met with the -- the community college,

Commissioner Stebbins and I met with community colleges, must be pushing four years -- four, five years ago, four years ago, I guess and we talked about implementing this. We knew the community colleges have no money. You now, I'm a former A and F secretary, I know they're just scraping by. And I thought they would have come to us a long time ago for a lot more money. I thought we would be doing a lot more. Like, we would buy the Atlantic Community

College curriculum or -- so this doesn't change the legitimacy of your two concerns. It just, in my own mind, I actually thought that they would have come to us for a lot more money a

long time ago, quite frankly.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You emphasized my point about the grants. And, you know, I would draw the distinct -- the parallel on the

community mitigation grants, which is clear guidelines. Frankly, that fund we do control. You know, and there's -- there's a lot of expectations, and et cetera. And there's been a lot of work and thought that continues to be put in place on those guidelines, you know, to eventually allow the grants that we will. That's the sort of parallel that I would like to see along the --

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: After that big diatribe, I mean, I completely agree. And I think it's -- you know, for the ideas that Jill has, you know, a lot of these things will come back before the Commission. You know, we're now kind of coincidentally at a better starting place to work with our licensees on these workforce development issues. I know MGM gets it, because MGM is dealing with issues similar to this, as they prepare to open National Harbor.

You know, Wynn is a little bit further out in the time frame, and we'll look forward to working with somebody on their workforce development issues, when that

2.1

person's on board. But, you know, I agree with you, and I also agree with your point Mr. Chairman. You know dribble, drabbling some money out doesn't have the impact that, you know, a larger amount can have. And we'll keep that in mind as, you know, as receiving requests for money, but also being proactive and putting some RFPs out there.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else?

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Yes. I'd

just like to repeat something that I said at an
earlier meeting. And that is, in my seven
months as a member of the -- of the Commission,
amongst the most, if not the most impressive
presentations that we've had at -- at our
public meetings have been those that -- that
Ms. Griffin and -- and Commissioner Stebbins
have -- have organized on the efforts that are
being made in the area of workforce development
and affirmative -- affirmative action.

And, to me, it seems like that there is very substantial, concrete, credible evidence out there that we're really, I think, having an impact in proactively stimulating

2.1

the development of -- of a workforce to be involved in the construction and operation of gaming establishments that, very substantially, advance that portion of the -- of the gaming statute that I specifically identified workforce development and diversity as an objective.

So I'm very pleased and impressed with what's been done with the money that we have, and the personnel that are on board devoting themselves to -- to this statutory objective.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.

Commissioner Stebbins, do you have a motion?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: We don't need a motion.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I did want to have a couple of other --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Sorry. I jumped ahead.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You know, just to address some of the public comment that came in, again, from -- from the one licensee, I can speak to any one of them. We can speak to any

2.1

one of the items. I see our gaming consultant as a-- as a -- you know, allowance, if you will. It's a budget item. It'll depend on how we utilize them now under the budget of the executive director's office.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Yeah. And also to clarify, that you may remember, Commissioner, that they had them in different parts of the budget in former years. And I said, look, that doesn't seem to make sense. Let's pull it all under me. They can -- they can act as a resource to the Commission, to me, and to other parts of the staff. But I think the number -- well it didn't go up. It actually went down. But still, it was consolidated under me, which I thought made sense, to just have one ownership of it.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And I do -- I do think that we still need to rely, at least, partially to a lesser degree than we did in the past on some of the -- on some of the -- the help that we -- that we get from them.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Coming from Commissioner Zuniga, that's big news.

2.1

MR. BEDROSIAN: Yeah. Well, and I think you all remember, and you probably know much better than I do, if you look at the curve of consultant expenses --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It's at a dramatic -- dramatic downward --

MR. BEDROSIAN: Yeah, we've gone down. And we recognize what our licensees are saying about the future, when, at some point, we will be our own entity, consultant-free and do what we do.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The Attorney
General's Office is something that we don't
control. They, you know, they send us a bill,
we pay it.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Included there, though, is -- is Mass. State Police overtime. And in following up with our IEB team on that particular item, you know, their investigative. They have continued to refine their investigative techniques. Meaning, where they get a bang for their buck, where they think they can be more efficient. Which, Director Wells feels like will have an impact

over time. In other words, a more efficient investigation, which, without as many steps at certain places, and I know you've had this briefing, but that should have an impact.

So they are looking for efficiencies along those lines. So they're very cognizant of overtime, and all of their spending, and all of their investigative procedures. So I think that's something that's -- it's not taken lightly, and they do have a plan in place.

MR. BEDROSIAN: And we also thought about the staffing, especially this fiscal year, because, I mean, really, this fiscal year is a fairly flat year, in terms of -- in terms of preparation, given where the casinos are scheduled. And then, in a year from now, we may be here with a little more clarity about when opening will be and when they need to ramp up.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And I also went wanted to talk about a number that's not here, but I've already talked about it, which is a reduction that you only described of

2.2 million from the original -- from the
original requests.

MR. LENNON: Correct.

many ways, that we have tightened up a lot of what we initially thought. It's still a budget number. We may end up coming back, maybe 10 months from now, or nine months from now, you know, to ask for a budget revision of some sort. And that was a specific ask of the licensees. They'd rather see the budget tight, and that's -- you know, and have an additional assessment along the year, rather than with some cushion that can later then be returned to them, as we have done in the past.

So that's -- that's important to acknowledge. We've -- we've reduced where we thought it was appropriate. Never -- you know, trying to cut just for the sake of cutting. And, you know, what I really throughout this budget, and I think, this is an overall good outcome.

MR. LENNON: Yeah, I think that's an important too. There's no built-in deficiency

2.1

in this budget, but there's a lot of tight measures that we're going to keep an eye on.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: In real terms, it's an increase from last year. In many number -- in a number of ways or items. Consultancy's the biggest one, and a number of other areas. We now have to make room for the indirect costs, which also was talked about We tried to get that waived from the Commonwealth, as they did in the first few So there was a precedent for that. years. And the new administration did not want to interpret it, the confluence of regulations here at the state level in a different way, and now we have to carry it so --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: For anybody who's watching, this is a -- there's an item of \$1.6 million, which is a, quote, overhead assessment that the state, through The Office of Administration and Finance, doesn't even assess on us. It just scoops it out of our money. We put money into -- into the state's coiffeurs where it gets held for us and the state simply takes it.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

We don't happen to agree that that is fair or right, or justifiable but -- and we've made that case in writing and orally to the various people at administration and finance, including the secretary. And we will continue to support our licensees, as they continue to try to get back, what,

1.6 million, which, as best I understand, is simply an extra tax, which is not authorized under law. So that's the 1.6 million that

Commissioner Zuniga is talking about.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And -- and with all of that, we're still, kind of, at a lower level than we were before. And that, as I mentioned last time, means that there's a lot of focus in building here, the capabilities. You know, a lot of -- a lot of assumptions about work that will be done by existing staff, like the vast majority of it, still in anticipation of a number of things that we would have to be ready for, when the other Category 1 open. I had prepared a comparative chart, if people wanted to talk about that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I would be

1 interested in just --

2.1

MR. LENNON: Do you want to take a vote on this first, or do you want to do the comparative chart?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Let's do the chart -- let's talk about the comparative charge. Just synthesize, what was the net of that? You compared us to three other agencies to sort of -- agencies across the country are billed and funded in different ways.

For example, you've heard us talk about the Attorney General's office. That is something that we assess for, so some people look at it as if it were in our budget. Other states, other jurisdictions, the AD -- the money that the Attorney General's Office has to spend on behalf of the casinos is outside the Commission budget.

So there's discrepancies like that throughout all these budgets. Makes it hard to compare the -- our Commission's budget to other Commission's budget to get us, sort of, a common sense of whether it's appropriate or not. And Commissioner Zuniga did a really

detailed analysis, but I couldn't quite get a takeaway of, sort of, the bottom line what you did.

argue that you did, because that's -- that's one of the -- the biggest point about a chart like this is that it's very hard to compare apples to apples. We can do it. And we've attempted to do this. And, by the way, this is a chart that the finance team here had prepared in prior years, so I really took away their format and updated some of the numbers because -- and many of them were still the case.

Another -- another big point is,
even when we do, when we try to compare them
to relevant jurisdictions because, for
example, it would very hard, or unfair, I
would argue, to compare to Nevada, because
Nevada is entirely -- entirely different.
Their approach is very different. The number
of operators is substantially different.

When we compare certain items as a whole, as a part of a discretionary budget, at

like topic like responsible gaming, it's really quite similar, I would argue. And they, you know, states value certain things differently and apportion them in different agencies, within state police, or within a commission, or within lottery agents -- agency, et cetera. And even when we account for those differences, the overall is quite similar.

The big difference still at the very high level for us, is that we are operating in this unique time in which there's only one operator, the Category 2, there's a construction and development of two or more operators. And if we were to take a ratio of regulatory costs to gaming revenues or gaming positions, it would be really unfair to take our 1,250 gaming positions or 160 million in gaming revenues, those regulations become really out of whack.

When you do take the revenues that are expected, in other words, on a steady state, we will be right on line with very prospectable peer agencies that we've

2.1

developed relationships and -- with, and our costs are right in line with what others do.

I could gets into the details.

Again, Maryland assesses responsible gaming in a different way than we do. They're very comparable, in the end. The tax -- the taxes are substantially different than in -- in one jurisdiction from another. For example,

Maryland taxes 67 percent of slots revenue that goes to the state. Whereas, ours is 25 percent. That's a substantial difference.

So what I attempted to do is get to a ratio that is regulatory costs divided by the revenue that goes back to operators, because if you take the revenues that goes back to operators, in other words, the difference between all the revenue that is generated, minus all the tax that is left, then you get the notion of what it really costs in terms of profit, those regulatory costs to an operator. And when you take that for us, we happen to be on the very low end of other states, like Michigan and Maryland -- Pennsylvania and Maryland, I'm sorry, which is

2.1

the number that appears at the very bottom of the -- of the chart, with the greatest caveat that I already mentioned, which is, I'm taking the projected gaming revenues, not the ones that we currently have. And that is -- at the bottom of the chart, there's a cost of regulation as a percent of revenues generated by other agencies. And I'm sorry for the very, very newly small font for the audience, or even my fellow commissioners, but I tried to put in as succinct form as I could, some of these numbers. I don't know if you can see, Mr. Chairman, the 1.94.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yep.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Versus places like Michigan -- I'm sorry, like Maryland, which is a 3.47. And I might mention, you know, Maryland is an -- it's an important case as is Pennsylvania, because both -- both of those states have our current licensees operating in them. MGM is currently about to open National Harbor in Maryland. It's an investment that's larger than what's in Springfield. And I say, you know, it's a good

2.1

comparison, as is Pennsylvania, where Penn also operates.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I just want to be careful that it is an apples to apples. I think it's very difficult to do this. And I give you credit for really trying to make sense of it, but I don't want others to think we're calling them expensive, or we're trying to compare ourselves in a way that -- because I just think it is hard to -- to really determine apples to apples so --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, on that note, just the point that we made, which is there's a lot of costs that we don't control, it's the same case for other states.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Right.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So I'm -- it's just a ratio as a guideline. I don't -- I don't mean to make a judgment call about somebody being expensive or not. Perhaps, I mentioned the expensiveness of their gaming revenue, but that's by law in Maryland, as is ours here. It should be noted that -- that, usually, in the gaming industry, as it was the

case here, is tied to a minimal investment, which still makes it a profitable operation from an operation standpoint.

MR. LENNON: Again, just to -- just touch on Commissioner Cameron's point, in the past we didn't -- we talked about coming up to ratios of trying to -- and we use this more as a thermometer to say, did we see anything that's sticking way out with how we're doing it? And what we saw from the past was, you know, our payroll was drastically lower than other commissions from our growing point, and our contractural costs were drastically higher than other commissions. So what we tried to do with it is to continue to drive down our contract costs and rely more on direct payroll, direct employee cost. But this is mainly just a thermometer. You know, stick your finger up in the wind. What's the temperature feel like? How we doing?

And what it really demonstrates is the difficulty. And, you know, it's something we -- I guess that's why we put out that memo of the 18.5 or \$18.6 million. The difficulty

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

when someone comes to us and says, you cost this much, other places cost this much. Well, it depends. You can pick from any piece of the -- of each statute and say, oh, this is part of regulatory, or this isn't.

So I think that's -- I think that's a key point that this chart shows. You really can't -- unless you have two of the same laws, you can't judge ourselves.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But that doesn't mean there's no comparison.

MR. LENNON: No.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right? That doesn't mean there's no thermometer or -- that means that, you know, understanding who does what and how is always a good measure of benchmarking. And -- and that's it. I mean, and the main -- mainly takeaway here for me is the one that I said at the very beginning. We're not far off from others, even after you account that we are in this very unique time of dealing with an agency, while two operators, two major operators are not yet open. And we have to keep, you know, a lot of

2.1

infrastructure, a lot of fixed costs here.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I'd just like to say that I -- I find -- I've found the effort that you -- that you made in preparing this to be -- to be very helpful. And against the backdrop of the caveats that you've made very explicit, that -- of the apples to apples and the difficulty of making apples to apple comparison in mind, that this is a -- this is -- can be seen as a work-in-progress. That, from year to year, we may, just by having prepared it, it invites comments from the other jurisdictions. And in my -- in my view it's worth -- it's worth the effort.

And it's also gratifying to see that the ratios that you've calculated here, at the very least show us in the -- well within the ballpark of other jurisdictions. And just repeating the other jurisdictions, very significant, it's Michigan Maryland and Pennsylvania. You know, substantial, industrial states. And I find it very -- I find it very helpful.

I do have one just question of

2.1

clarification, and I should have asked you
this beforehand. The ratio -- the line item
of cost of regulating as a percent of revenue
generated by operators and -- versus the cost
of regulating as a percentage and gross gaming
revenue. I understand the second, the cost of
regulating as a percent of gross gaming
revenue, but what is the -- the earlier
number? Is that -- what does -- what's the
difference between one and the other?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The taxes. The
taxes and the GRs. So if you take four lines

taxes and the GRs. So if you take four lines above any one of the charts, the taxes -- the tax revenue generated is typically what gets back -- what goes back to the state. If that number is subtracted or --

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: So you take the gross gaming revenue, and then you subtract --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Subtract the taxes.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: -- the contribution to the state?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. Then

2.1

you're left with all of the money that operators have to pay themselves back. From that they have to pay salary, they have to pay, you know, their leases or whatever they have to do, return on investment interest cost, et cetera. So that figure, I would argue, is more relevant to compare as a ratio, because that gets to the profitability of the operators.

The cost of regulation as a -- as a ratio to the profitability. Because that is, I would argue a better measure of -- you know the argument that you're costing us a lot of money.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: And on a further note, I mean, this is part of our packet. This has been distributed to the -- to the public. And it's very important that they understand that this is something which they can -- they can take account of.

And just on that point, while I've got the public forum here, the cost of -- the percent as to the metric of the cost of regulating this percent of revenue generated by operators, in the Commonwealth, namely us, that's 2.57 percent. In Michigan, that number

2.1

is 2.77 percent. In Pennsylvania, it's
4.4 percent. And in Maryland, it's
7.04 percent. That's impressive.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Other budget issues?

mention just one thing. I was reminded of -our licenses themselves have, at times, trouble
getting to the apples and apples. So in some
of the discussions that -- that we've had with
them as part of budget process, they do their
own analysis, they do their own comparison to
other jurisdictions, they take a number from an
annual report and what have you, and further -you know, and present it to us as, you know,
here you are compared to Maryland, it's a
significant difference.

For the research, for example, just on that number, proved to me, as I'm reflecting here, that, that number did not tell the whole story. That number is the assessment on licensees. But for budgetary purposes, Maryland also gets an appropriation from -- from the state. So their total budget

2.1

is not what -- it's not reflected just in the assessment. It should be counted as their 2 3 total budget, which includes an appropriation. 4 So those -- even the licensees get 5 some of these numbers wrong because it's very 6 difficult to compare one jurisdiction to the 7 next, which is why I think this exercise is 8 very important to continue going as we go. 9 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I agree. 10 THE COURT REPORTER: Anything else on 11 budgets? Commissioner Zuniga? 12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Sure. Then I would move that the Commission approve the 13 14 fiscal year '17 budget, as presented here in 15 the packet, for a assessment to licensees, as 16 we've done according to our procedures. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? 17 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Second. 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further discussion? 19 20 All in favor? 2.1 MR. MACDONALD: Aye. 22 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: 23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON:

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:

24

Aye.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously. Thank you, Derek and team.

MR. LENNON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Now, we'll move on to Item No. 6, the legal division. General Counselor, Blue.

MS. BLUE: Good afternoon,

Commissioners. Item 8 on your list is -- you
have, in your packet, a request to contribute
to the Commission, an antique slot machine.

And looking at our statute, pursuant to

Section 4 of 23K, Subsection 6, the Commission
can accept contributions of money, property and
other items of value, so long as they are held,
used and applied for the Commission's purposes.

So it is up to the Commission to discuss this
offer, and to determine whether you are going
to accept it pursuant to the statute.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So what was the law again, that -- for the Commission's use?

MS. BLUE: Well, the Commission can

accept contributions of money or property on a number of matters, So long as they become the property of the Commission, and the property is held, used and applied for the Commission's purpose.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Purpose.

MS. BLUE: That's what the statute requires.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And this was offered to the Commission through me. And it just -- you can see it on the screen. It just seemed like it would be kind of an interesting addition to our front lobby or somewhere. Just, sort of, representative of what we do. It's kind of a fascinating comparison, incredibly interesting to the current slots. thought it would be a great addition. I talked to it with -- talked about it with Director Driscoll. She agreed. And then talked with General Counsel Blue about making sure we can do it, and that's where we are here.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Would you provide the nickels so that visitors here can

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Page 213 1 actually operate the one --2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I don't know if it 3 works or not. 4 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It says a 5 guaranteed payout. 6 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Notice the 7 jackpot is \$10. 8 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: It's 9 interesting. 10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And there is no 11 appraised value on this, as far as we can tell, 12 right? 13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, the woman who offered it to us tried to sell it first. 14 15 mean, she's -- her families -- her parents have 16 died and said her -- she's downsizing and she said -- told me that she tried to sell it 17 18 first, and she probably could have gotten 19 something for it, but she'd rather give it 20 away. 21 MS. BLUE: There's no discussion of 22 value in the statute. It just assumes -- it

says something of value, but it doesn't put a

limit in the statute on what that value would

23

be.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So whether this is worth nothing or a little bit, it doesn't matter?

MS. BLUE: That's right.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Or even a lot, for that matter.}$

MR. BEDROSIAN: I mean, so we could take a different option. Obviously, lobby is one, conference room is another. In our lab to demonstrate the difference of what currently is functioning versus earlier eras. You know, so there are -- there are certainly, options if the Commission -- obviously, it will stay with the Commission.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I think it's kind of cool. You know, it certainly -- we've had so many discussions on the evolution of the gaming technology, but, you know, this is certainly a prime example of how far we've come. Let's be clear and send a message to everybody that, because they can't get rid of it on eBay, that we're going to take it from

Page 215 1 them but --2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You're not inviting 3 other junk to be dropped to our offices? 4 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Let's be selective. 5 6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. We have 7 to agree on it. I think it's great. I think 8 it could look great on a public space, if we 9 had it somewhere, or wherever we could display 10 it. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yep. Okay. There 12 is a motion. 13 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr. Chair, I move, pursuant to Section 4, Subsection 60, 14 15 Chapter 23K, that the commission accept the 16 contribution of an antique slot machine. Such antique slot machine to become property of the 17 18 Commission, and held, used and applied for the 19 Commission's purposes. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? 21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second. 22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further discussion? 23 All in favor?

MR. MACDONALD:

Aye.

Page 216 1 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 2 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 5 have it unanimously. Can we Tweet that out, 6 Director Driscoll, the picture? 7 MR. BEDROSIAN: Black Beauty has 8 arrived. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Pardon? 10 MR. BEDROSIAN: Black Beauty has 11 arrived. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Black Beauty has 13 arrived, right. 14 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Plainridge's 15 new software. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The Commission is 16 going uptown. 17 Okay. 18 MS. BLUE: As Executive Director 19 Bedrosian has said this morning, we took Item B 20 off of our agenda. We will take that up at 2.1 another date. The remaining two items, C and 22 D, these are the amended small business impact

statements for racing regulations.

These are regulations the Commission

23

previously passed by emergency. They deal with changes in medication levels with -- for both thoroughbred and harness horseracing, and they also deal with the new helmet rules.

We're bringing our helmets up to -- up to meet the national standards. So if you approve the amended small business impact statements and the final drafts that are attached, and we will finish the promulgation process for these regulations.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Motion,
Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Sure.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So I move that the Commission approve the amended small business impact statement and final version, reg. 205 CMR 3.115, 3.295A, 3, and 3.298 and 6, harness horseracing, as included in the package, and authorize the staff to take all necessary steps to file the regulation with the secretary of the Commonwealth and complete the regulation promulgation process.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: No debate? All in

2.1

1 favor? 2 MR. MACDONALD: Aye. 3 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: 4 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 7 have it unanimously. 8 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second motion? 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Please. 10 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Commission approve the amended 11 12 small business impact statement and final 13 version of 205 CMR 4.116C7, and 4.52521, and 4.528B, rules of horseracing, as included in 14 15 the packet, and authorize the staff to take all 16 steps necessary to file the regulation with the secretary of the Commonwealth, and complete the 17 18 regulation promulgation process. 19 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further discussion? 20 2.1 All in favor? 22 MR. MACDONALD: Aye. 23 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 24 COMMISSIONER CAMERON:

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 3 have it unanimously. Thank you. 4 MS. BLUE: That does it for the legal 5 department today. Thank you. 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. We are 7 moving on to Item No. 7, Ombudsman Ziemba. 8 This says a two-hour -- two-hour --9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No, two 10 o'clock. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, two o'clock. 12 I was about to have Oh, yes, okay. Thank you. 13 a -- suggest a break. MR. ZIEMBA: Despite my past history, 14 15 I'll be much shorter. 16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I was going to send out for dinner. 17 18 MR. ZIEMBA: Thank you, 19 Commissioners. Commissioners, I'm pleased to 20 welcome Joe Delaney to his first presentation 21 to the Commission. Joe joins us as the Commission's construction project oversight 22 23 manager. He joined us at the beginning of 24 April.

Prior to Joe's arrival here, Joe worked at the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection for 10 years, whereas director -- deputy director of municipal services, Joe was part of the management team that oversaw a \$400 million per year program of financial assistance to Massachusetts cities and towns for waste-water and drink

Joe managed the project development construction, inspection and disbursement of state funding for over \$3 billion in infrastructure improvements since 2006.

water-related infrastructure projects.

Joe is a registered professional engineer with a degree in civil engineering. With this background, he previously was a town engineer, assistant director of public works for the town of Reading, where he managed significant capital projects, and had planning design, permitting, bidding and inspection responsibilities.

Prior to that, Joe spent about a decade as a private consultant, an engineering consultant, construction and engineering

2.1

consultant, focusing on environmental compliance and construction quality.

We're extremely pleased that Joe agreed to join us here at the Commission with decades-worth of very relevant experience.

Joe will give us some detail about his responsibilities as construction project oversight manager, and how he intends to do his very difficulty job.

But before he begins, I just would like to take a moment to once again thank the private consultant teams who have helped build our oversight function and have been an intricate part of the development of the Commission itself.

PMA Consultants and Pinck and Co.
have truly provided excellent advice and
service as we have transitioned and are
transitioning into our new roles. Their
assistance helped the Commission get to this
point where we could move to internalize our
project oversight management activities.

I personally thank Jennifer Pinck, Nancy Stack, Mike Fitzgerald, Dane Wigfall,

2.1

Melissa Martinez, Margaret Ward, and all of
the past and present employees of -- at
Pinck & Co. I also thank Steve Rusteika,
Chad Crittenden, Angel Arvelo, and
Jason Lawson from PMA Consultants for all of
their excellent service. I thank them all.
And especially Jason and Mike for all the
hours they've spent helping us to steer
through this process, and all of their
dedication and thoughtfulness. And with that
is an introduction. I turn it over to Joe.

MR. DELANEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners. And before I start my presentation, I'd like to echo what John just said, especially with -- with Pinck and PMA, with Jason Lawson and Mike Fitzgerald, particularly, who have been working with me very closely for the 2-1/2 months that I've been here, to get me up to speed on this project. They've been absolutely invaluable in doing that, and, you know, they've given me every courtesy and very professional along the way, so I truly am thankful to them.

The presentation that I have for

2.1

you, I tried to narrow things down to a one-pager to tell you what it is that I do, and it's probably not quite possible to do that. But, you know, to boil this all down, my role is to be the eyes and ears of the Commission on site for the duration of the construction, to ensure that all of the many project requirements are being met, and that the projects are being delivered on time, and that, that is being communicated to the commission staff and commissioners so that you know, in almost real time, what's happening on these projects.

Now, on your presentation, I -- I identified 11 particular items. The first eight of them relate directly to the Wynn and MGM casinos, and I want to talk a little bit about those duties. I don't think I need to go through each one. There's a couple that I really wanted to focus on as being -- well, they're all important. As being, perhaps, a bit more important to the overall success of this position.

And the first one I want to talk

2.1

about was schedule. There's a lot of shared interest here on the schedule. From the gaming commission to the licensees, to the host and surrounding communities, and to the Commonwealth itself, everyone's key interest is making sure that these project open on And I will be spending a good portion of my time monitoring the schedules of our licensees. We get updates every month from our licensees, and we're going to drill down into those to make sure that things are staying on target. If they're not staying on target, finding out why. Finding out what the recovery plans might be from our licensees. You know, I think it's our goal to try to keep the pressure on to make sure these things get done.

And I think with that said, given the large amount of private investment that the licensees are putting up on this, I don't think anyone's going to put any more pressure on them than they will themselves, but I -- it's -- it's a big role of ours, to make sure that these projects are delivered on time.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

The second item I'd like to focus on is the-- are the -- are project conditions and commitments.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Joe, excuse me, let me just --

MR. DELANEY: Sure.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You said, "A big part of our role is to make sure these projects open on time." How do we control that? How do you actually have an impact? You might be able to detect, if it's not going to open on time, but how do you make sure that we make sure they open on time?

MR. DELANEY: Well, I think part of it is just that, the constant dialogue that we're having with them. I mean, if they're truly behind, if they're having a long lead item that's going to be delayed, it's going to be — delay the project, is there anything that I can particularly do about that? I don't think so. You know, if they need elevators manufactured and they can't be manufactured when they need them, they'll be a delay in the project.

But I think the idea is that -- that

there are -- there are ways to recover, when

things start to fall behind. And I -- I want

to make sure that our licensees, and that

their contractors, are thinking about all of

these ways that they can do that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Yep. anything that can be done marginally is great. But I don't think -- I don't think it's -- I'm not sure it's constructive to suggest that -that we control whether these things are going to be open on time or not. I'm not sure that's a -- we certainly want to, and we're going to work on them as much as we can. But sad to say, as we've seen from any number of lawsuits and internal budgets problems and so forth and so on, you know, the big variables probably are not within our control. So -- and I don't want us to suggest to the public something to the contrary.

MR. DELANEY: Absolutely. So the second item that I wanted to talk about was the project conditions and commitments. The day I started on the job here and started looking at

22

23

all of the licenses, and the host community agreements and surrounding community agreements, and permits, and all of these things, I realized that, you know, these folks are up against, maybe, hundreds of conditions that are on -- on their projects. And, in my initial discussions with them, I discovered that Wynn has over a thousand specific commitments on their projects, and MGM has over And each of them -- each of them are now developing databases of all of these commitments that they have, and -- and I expect that one of the large parts of my role will be working very closely with them throughout the course of the project to make sure that these things are closed out appropriately, and that we're not there at the 11th hour trying to scramble to close out all these requirements. The intention is to identify those things that we can close out early in the process, have that done, and I can verify that proper documents are in place and so on, to get that all in place.

24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So will you have

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

access to their database, or are you going to have your own database or --

MR. DELANEY: I will have access to their database. I'm going to, of course, review permits and other things, and, kind of, spot check that to make sure I'm comfortable they've got -- they've sort of captured all of those commitments. But, in fact, each of the licensees will be setting me up on their facilities with a computer setup, where I will be able to access that, among many other records, to -- to -- just to monitor what they're -- what they're doing.

We can play a really huge role. And it just -you know, through no fault, other than just
complexity, it's easy to drop the ball on some
of these things. And, you know, I'm sure they
have systems in place, but we even know from
ourselves, you know, we have a number of
commitments on our statute and it's hard for us
to remember, and they're not 700 or a thousand.
So this is a place where I think you can be
really tremendous value added.

2.1

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

MR. DELANEY: Yes. And the third element I'd like to talk about a little bit is the workforce and supplier diversity. I'll be assisting Jill Griffin in her efforts with workforce and supplier diversity. Certainly, not supplanting anything that she does, but I will have access to all of the records from the project site. Things like certified payrolls, and all of the things that determine the supplier diversity, the workforce diversity And I intend to sit down -- this hasn't goals. happened yet, but I intend to sit down with each of the licensees to, sort of, understand their process on how they aggregate all of this data up into the reports that we get. And I'll be doing some spot checks here and there on certified payrolls and things of that nature to -- just to verify that those goals are being met.

14151617

18

19

2021

22

23

24

The last three bullets are, you know, not directly related to the Wynn and MGM casinos. We do have certain responsibilities at the First Light casino that are outlined and are compact to oversee those project

review design plans and things of that nature. I will certainly be involved with that.

The -- each of our licensees is required to put aside a portion of their revenues for long-term capital improvements. Now, of course, once a facility opens, we're hoping that they don't need a whole lot of capital improvements right away. But they do need to plan on what these funds are going to be used for down the road, and I expect that will be a portion of what it is that I'm doing.

And then, just since I've gotten here, there's been a number of other duties that I've been assigned. I'm -- I'm looking at the long-term monitoring, traffic monitoring, the look-back studies. Plainridge is doing one of those right now. Also looking at the community mitigation fund applications with John and our team here, to make sure that those are appropriate. And also monitoring the work of the Lower Mystic Regional Working Group, and there will be things of that nature as well.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Excuse me,
Joe, on that one, what is the status of the
Lower Mystic Regional Working Group?

MR. DELANEY: Well, they're meeting pretty regularly and -- or very regularly, and they're, sort of, honing the scope of work at this point, of the -- you know, the limit of all the intersections that they're going to look at. They're making progress. It's going slow but sure at this point.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Joe, one of the things you just talked about is evaluating the community mitigation funding applications.

For where those mitigation funds are being applied to infrastructure, improvements off site, would you see yourself, obviously not only looking at the application, but doing some sort of review or monitoring of that improvement project, as they kind of move shovels?

MR. DELANEY: Yes. I think -- well, initially, most of the work that's being done is planning. And I expect that I'll be looking at the scopes of work when they come in, if

they're doing traffic studies and things of that nature.

Further down the road, when -- when the licensees have opened their facilities and we're generating more funds, where we're doing actual construction, I would expect that I will be involved with the design -- you know, reviewing some of the designs, being there out in the field verifying construction and that kind of thing, just as I'm doing now with the offsite improvements for the licensees.

things, Mr. Chair, that I mentioned -mentioned to -- mentioned to John, and I asked
Catherine to look at, as you know, when we get
requests for race course capital improvement
funds, if there's money set aside for an
outside architect or an engineer, they kind of
go by and verify if somebody bought a tractor
or not. It's not a significant cost, but a
there's a cost associated with that. So I
asked Catherine to see if we can look into
whether Joe could assume those difficult
responsibilities, on top of the other things

2.1

1 he's already doing.

MS. BLUE:

2.1

in our group to take a look at that.

Unfortunately, the racing statute requires an independent, third-party to review it. And I will agree it's not the most efficient way to do it, but Joe being a member of our staff would not be able to take that role over.

I asked Attorney Torrisi

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: More legacy is --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. I love the idea.

MR. DELANEY: But I think now, those items that I presented there, those are the, sort of, the nuts and bolts of what I'm doing. But I think equally as important, or perhaps more important than that is how it's going to get actually done, you know, in the field.

And I think the big part of that is the real importance comes through the working relationships that I'm developing, both internally and externally. With the licensees and the contractors, right now I have weekly meetings set up with Chris Gordon at Wynn, and

Brian Packer at MGM. And those have been going great. They've been really helpful at getting me information that I need to -- right now. to help me get up to speed, but also to monitor exactly where the construction is. I do weekly site walks, generally, with the contractors, so they're letting me know, really, what's happening on a day-to-day basis when I'm out there. And I think, you know, those working relationship with those people are going to help me a whole lot in letting me get to the information that I need to be able to keep you all informed of what's happening out there.

We've also done outreach to the host communities. We've met with the staff in Springfield, the staff in Everett. You know, the contractors have weekly or biweekly meetings with the cities and their building inspectors and other people. I sit in on those once in awhile, just to make sure that that — those relationships are working well between them.

And, also, there's some, you know,

2.1

relationship with MassDOT, MassDEP, some of the regulators, on -- specifically on the offsite improvements, the traffic improvements that are being done at both Wynn and MGM. We also have, you know, the Chapter 91 licenses and other things with Wynn, with MassDEP. And also, there's the -- just the local traffic engineering departments and so on that need to be coordinated with.

And we've also offered, to all of the parties involved, to -- to, you know, act as mediator, if necessary, should problems arise. I think that's some value that we can add. If -- if things aren't going smoothly, to try to help smooth out those wrinkles.

There aren't any problems right now, but if that should rise, that offer always stands for them.

And then, of course, the other piece is the internal relationships. We have a project management team meeting, biweekly team meeting that Commissioner Zuniga sits on with us, and John and Bruce Band, and Jill Griffin. And that keeps staff informed of what's going

2.1

on. And I think, in general, just the gaming commission staff that we have, I think we have a great team here.

I've joked around with folks that

I'm an army of one, but I'm not really an army
of one. You know, I think between the
ombudsman's office, the executive director and
general counsel, there's a pretty deep bench
here that I think we can deal effectively with
problems that -- that may arise as they come.

Thank you very much. I'd be happy to answer
any questions.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Sounds like a busy couple of months. Just overall, it sounds like you're building the relationships you need to build. And it actually sounds like you're enjoying your job too; is that accurate?

MR. DELANEY: Yeah, I would say so.

It's -- it's been a challenge, I mean, getting up to speed on these projects. They're huge projects. And the folks that I'm working with on the projects are very busy people, but they've gone out of their way to help me get up to speed. And I think -- you know, I think it

2.1

1 | will be a good working relationship.

But, you know, I've made it clear to -- to everyone that I want to operate under the no-surprises rule. If there's anything -- if there's anything that I need to know that's going on, on these projects that any of the Commission needs to be informed, again, you know, no surprises.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And you haven't had any yet?

MR. DELANEY: None yet.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: All right.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You know, you touched on the a couple of these, on the really nice broad categories that you outlined, but I -- I would emphasize one role that we've seen already come to the -- to the ombudsman's office, and you are clearly an extension of that in the construction period.

And that is, lack of information at times, misunderstanding that by one of the multiple stakeholders, many of them external to our licensees, these agreements with

2.1

interpretations of our host and surrounding communities, have a tendency to come to the commission eventually. As in, what would you guys say, from the city, from the surrounding community, from the licensee. And just having the ability to have been on the ground, those eyes and ears, I suspect -- I know it's going to be invaluable to us to be able to draw on background. What's -- what's behind this request or, you know, or whatever it may be. An opinion or a hearing, or a -- or whatever the case may -- may entail, which was a big part of the -- of why we had, initially, PMA. It was also a little organic because Penn, at the time, was, you know, really off to the races, even while we were in the midst of a referendum, and had to draw on their expertise to kind of figure out this program and what this oversight management role would be.

So I think it's -- it's great that, now that we have brought that expertise in house, a little bit of applaud into the prior discussion on the budget, by phasing out, like we effectively doing by June 30th. Both Pinck

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

and PMA, there's a substantial cost effectiveness, because we're bringing a full-time employee with great expertise and are willing to devote a lot of full-time to this effort, whereas, you know, the consultants were only part-time because they have multiple people, et cetera.

So I think it's going to serve the licensees well as well. As in, you know, one anticipated event that can quickly -- where we can quickly become informed about background dynamics, et cetera, because that's going to be important.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Joe, what, if anything, can you tell us about the status of construction at the First Light casino?

MR. DELANEY: I can't tell you much, at this point. I have been down to the site, just drove around the sight a couple of times, and there's clearing going on, some buildings being torn down. But other than that, I can't tell you much -- much more than that at this point. I know the executive director has reached out to them. But right now, that's

2.1

1 about all I can say.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: To follow up on Commissioner Zuniga's point, we -- we made the decision to switch from the consultants to an in-house person on the theory that we can do similar work for less money, more efficiently. Can you articulate what we're -- are we going to lose something? Are we going to emphasize differently? Is there going to be a difference between the way -- what you've done, and what -- what they were doing?

MR. DELANEY: I think, right now, it's hard to say exactly. I think, further down the road, when the projects are fully under construction, the original proposals probably add more hours on the job. I'm splitting my time between two jobs, and we had, essentially, full-time consultants for each job.

So I guess that's going to have to make me, sort of, focus my efforts on, you know -- we first look at, kind of, the surface layer of things and we say, all right, does everything -- does everything look okay at

that level? And if we see areas where I'm not real comfortable with that, I'll have to go into more depth at those locations, and dig down to some more -- you know, deeper into some more records and other things, have some more conversations to see if there's really a problem in that area, you know, or not. And if there is, then, we obviously need to try to take steps to see how we can rectify that problem.

So I think the consultants were taking more of approach, let's just, kind of, drill down at everything. Where I have to take a -- more of a selective approach to say, okay, are there some areas where we're not getting that level of comfort, then we can drill down in it, rather than just doing a overall drill down into everything.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Mr. Chair, one of the things I'd suggest is going to be different is, when you have a consultant who is off site, not part of your organization, in my experience, in the limited time I saw Pinck and PMA, certainly a great job, you tend to get a lot of reports,

2.1

and a lot of paper comes over your desk.

Versus, when Joe is here, my interaction with him has been to pop in the office, you know, what's going on? And you get that organic, you know, I don't want to say more real time, that we weren't in great communication with consultants, but it's a different level of

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yep. Interesting.
Okay. Anything else? All set? I guess we
don't need a vote to accept that. Thank you.

communication, and it's a different dynamic.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. Very interesting.

MR. ZIEMBA: Thank you, Joe. Next item, Commissioners, I'm asking for your consideration of reappointment of several members to the local community mit -- mitigation advisory committees under the Gaming Policy Advisory Committee.

Last year around this time, the

Commission appointed Colin Kelly, Kate King,

Ellen Petashnick and Rick Sullivan to serve as

Commission appointees to the local committees.

Their brief bios are included in my

2.1

memorandum. As you can see, they are very well-qualified to provide the type of advice to the Commission, and to local committees that we've come to expect. I thank them for their willingness to serve in this unpaid, voluntary position that will be tremendously valuable to the Commission.

In your memo, I've also described the appointments to getting policy advisory GPAC subcommittees that have, either a commissioner, or a staff, member from the commissioner -- from the Commission serve.

Last year, the Commission appointed Commissioner Cameron to represent the Commission on the public safety subcommittee, Mark Vander Linden to serve on the addiction subcommittee, and me to serve on the community mitigation subcommittee. I also note that Commissioner Crosby, by the statute, is a member of GPAC itself.

While the representative to the public safety subcommittee must be a commissioner, the other two subcommittees could be represented by a commissioner, the

2.1

1 executive director, or other staff member.

I'm pleased to answer any questions you might have.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So these are all reappointments, right, those appointments are only for a year?

MR. ZIEMBA: For one year, that's right. And they all serve at the pleasure of the Commission.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And as before, when we read through these, the ones that -- that I know are impressive, so there's some really good people on here so hopefully we get them -- get them to work.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Just to comment that I -- I credit John for -- I mean, these people are tremendous. And to be able to get them to serve in this way, I think, is a credit to your skills. And, also, as serving one of these policy committees, public safety, very well-organized. Always prepared, and makes my job much easier by having John,

really, do the bulk of the legwork. So I just wanted to comment on how professional a job all of these committees are because of John's leadership.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Mr. Chair, the one I might point out as a discussion with Mr. Ziemba, is the community mitigation advisory subcommittee, he has — he was a designee last year. I think, if there's a commission member who has an interest in that, not that anyone has to, obviously, Mr. Ziemba would be more than willing to work with that person, as a representative of the Commission. But, again, he's also willing to volunteer again.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, let's think about that. Speak up, if anybody's interested on the face of it.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I have an interest in it. I don't want to replace John, but I will have an interest in it. We can work together.

MR. ZIEMBA: I'll be right there.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I don't see -
that's right. Just like the Lower Mystic

2.1

Valley, there's me and there's John.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Well, I will share a direct communication I had with John because in reading over the -- the memo, I was struck that there's -- there is no local community mitigation participation from Region C, and I was asking him about what the status of that is and --

MR. ZIEMBA: So it's got a little bit

-- this memorandum, it deals with

reappointments from last year's appointees.

The Commission hasn't had that discussion

regarding Region C and surrounding communities,

the definition thereof. There's some

significant differences between the surrounding

communities and Region A and Region B, and,

indeed, even with the slots facility from the

compact communities in Region C. I believe

that we're slated to have that conversation

before the Commission in short order, but this

memo really dealt with reappointment of current

members there, whose terms are expiring.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And at least considerably, the -- the communication advisory

2.1

```
subcommittee could brainstorm on
1
 2
         recommendations, let's say, about potential
 3
         ways to address Region C concerns. Is that --
 4
                   MR. ZIEMBA: That's right.
5
                   COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
                                          That's a fair
 6
         statement?
 7
                   MR. ZIEMBA: That's exactly right.
8
                   COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Do you need a
9
         motion?
                   CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I don't see --
10
11
         yeah.
12
                   COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
                                            Mr. Chair, I
13
         move that the Commission approve the
         reappointments of Colin Kelly, Region A;
14
15
         Chamber of commerce representative; Kate Cane,
16
         Region B; Chamber of commerce representative,
         Richard K. Sullivan, Region B, regional
17
18
         economic development organization, and
19
         Ellen Petashnick, Region B, human service
20
         providers, members of the local community --
21
         community mitigation advisory.
22
                   COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
                                           Second.
23
                   CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further discussion?
24
         All in favor?
```

Page 248 1 MR. MACDONALD: Aye. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: 2 Aye. 3 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 4 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 6 have it. 7 MR. ZIEMBA: If we could also 8 memorialize, I think you already have, 9 regarding the appointments to the subcommittees? 10 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You want to repeat 12 the same sort of motion, you mean? 13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. We need another, motion. 14 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Commissioner Stebbins? 16 17 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Oh. And I 18 would also move the Commission approve the 19 appointment of Commissioner Cameron to the 20 public safety subcommittee, Mark Vander Linden 2.1 to the addiction services subcommittee, and 22 Commissioner Macdonald to the community 23 mitigation advisory subcommittee. 24 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second.

Page 249 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Other discussion? 1 2 All in favor? 3 MR. MACDONALD: Aye. 4 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 5 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 8 have it unanimously. 9 MR. ZIEMBA: Thank you very much. 10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you. 11 MR. ZIEMBA: That's my report. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. We have 13 racing folks coming forward. We will be back in a few minutes. 14 15 16 (A recess was taken) 17 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Now we're reconvening public meeting #194, about 3:05 in 19 20 the afternoon, June 23rd. And the next item on 21 our agenda is the racing division, 22 Dr. Lightbown, the director of racing. 23 MS. LIGHTBOWN: Good afternoon, 24 Commissioners.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good afternoon. 2 MR. MACDONALD: Good afternoon. 3 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 4 afternoon. 5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good afternoon. 6 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good 7 afternoon. 8 MS. LIGHTBOWN: Well, the first thing 9 on the agenda is the request by Suffolk Downs 10 for approval of their key operating personnel and racing officials. This is the standard 11 12 procedures we go through before opening the 13 meet. What I'm anticipating, is that we'll have -- we're getting the applications in now, 14 15 so I'm recommending that you approve them 16 pending completion of the licensing procedures, 17 and approval by the state police and the 18 background check. 19 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: And a lot of 20 these people that have come to us before? 2.1 MS. LIGHTBOWN: Yep. These are all 22 people that are known to us and have been 23 working at Suffolk in the past.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And remind me,

1 the first day of racing? 2 MS. LIGHTBOWN: July 9th. 3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: July 9th. 4 MS. LIGHTBOWN: It's coming up soom. 5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So needs to be 6 today, this meeting. 7 MS. LIGHTBOWN: Right. That's why 8 they're not -- the licensing isn't completed 9 yet. We're a little -- this meeting's a little 10 further in front of opening than the meeting 11 last year was. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. 13 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Standard procedure moving forward, so I -- I agree with 14 15 the recommendation that we approve these. 16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You want to, move accordingly? 17 18 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I do. I move 19 that we approve Sterling Suffolk Racecourse, 20 LLC request for the key operating personnel and 2.1 racing officials for the 2016 racing season, as listed in the memo. 22 23 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further discussion? 24

All in favor?

2.1

2 MR. MACDONALD: Aye.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes

have it unanimously.

MS. LIGHTBOWN: So the next agenda item is a request by Suffolk Downs to lower their takeout to 15 percent on all their wagers. This is similar to what they asked for last year for a couple of their racing days, and they were pleased with the results and would like to do it again.

Just as a note, Canterbury, in
Minnesota has recently reduced theirs and
gotten some press from it. They're -- right
on their Web site they list that they have the
lowest takeout in America now. And -- but
they don't have it on both their whips and
their exotics. So I think, once this is
approved, then Suffolk Downs can claim they
have the lowest takeout in America.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: So what that

1 means is that the -- that more goes to the --2 more goes to the --MS. LIGHTBOWN: More is returned to 3 4 the vendor, yes. And the percentages don't 5 come out of the racing commission's share, we 6 still get our same share. So just so you all know, it doesn't affect our share. 7 8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And for the 9 record, in the past, when there was a full 10 racing season these takeout was reduced, but 11 only in certain times, right, on certain race 12 days? 13 MS. LIGHTBOWN: Suffolk didn't reduce 14 their takeout before last year. Last year was 15 the first year they began doing it. 16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Oh, last year 17 was the first year? 18 MS. LIGHTBOWN: Yes. 19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And they really 20 don't offer this? 21 MS. LIGHTBOWN: Many years ago, 22 Plainridge had done it, but last year was the 23 first time Suffolk had done it.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And I believe

Page 254 1 they thought it helped with the racing handle, 2 so they want to do it again this year. So I 3 recommend that we approve this. And I'll make 4 a motion that the Commission approve the 5 request of Suffolk Downs to reduce the takeout 6 of 15 percent of all wagers, win, place, show 7 and exotics. 8 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further discussion? All in favor? 10 11 MR. MACDONALD: Aye. 12 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 13 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 14 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 16 have it unanimously. 17 MS. LIGHTBOWN: Thank you. 18 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. 19 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thanks for 20 coming in. 2.1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: No problem. 22 you mentioned that 8C is being postponed? 23 MS. LIGHTBOWN: Correct. 24 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And then, we

are to our last item, workforce and supplier diversity, Director Griffin.

MS. GRIFFIN: Good afternoon,
Chairman Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good afternoon.

MR. MACDONALD: Good afternoon.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good

afternoon.

2.1

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good afternoon.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good

afternoon.

MS. GRIFFIN: In accordance with 205
CMR 135.021, project schedules and reporting,
the Commission may create guidelines to aid the
Commission in its review and monitoring of the
projects. As you remember, I was here June 9th
at the commission meeting, and I proposed new
reporting guidelines that veer from the
existing state regulations. Now, I asked the
commission to consider adopting and
implementing the supplier diversity reporting
guidelines during the design and construction
of the gaming establishments. And through your
feedback, I have also included the operations

1 phase.

2.1

So at the June 9th meeting you suggested that we put this matter out for public comment. We did post it Monday,

June 13th, and comments were due by June 17th.

Included in your packet, are two responses that I received, two formal responses. One letter in support, from MGM. Brian Packer,

MGM's vice president of construction, wrote a -- a thoughtful letter, and I'll -- it is in the packet.

Another letter from a woman-owned business, Sandra Fabiano, owner of Fabiano Oil who incidentally was our very first nongaming vendor that we licensed. Fabiano Oil has had successful vendor relationships with a couple of our licensees. Ms. Fabiano asked some good questions regarding the background, and the impact that this might have to currently-certified vendors, and whether there would be a time limit proposed.

I -- I don't think -- and the folks
I have spoken to don't think there will be any
impact to currently-certified businesses.

And, at this time, I'm not recommending a time limit. Although, we could certainly come back to the issue, and I could bring that back to the Commission at a later time, if we thought that was necessary.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I ask a question on -- on that very issue? Is it at least possible that, in her comments,

Ms. Fabiano is maybe thinking a potential lost business opportunity, in terms of opportunity costs?

MS. GRIFFIN: It is very possible that she's thinking of opportunity costs, and potentially lost business. Although, in my thinking, and the cases that have come up, the examples that have come up, are businesses that have current relationships with the licensees, and it's a matter of reporting and, kind of, taking credit for that work. So that's the case that has come up.

I also think that, you know, the goal of supplier diversity is not to -- is not for specific businesses, but for the general --

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Use.

MS. GRIFFIN: -- use. I'm not speaking very clearly, but, you know, we're interested, generally, in supplier diversity and not in endorsing any specific company.

commissioner zunigh: We're not interested in creating a cartel, if you will. That's not, perhaps, the right word. Of a small number of supplier-diverse businesses that will be the only ones that can do business with the casino, at the expense of the potentially other entrants.

MS. GRIFFIN: That's right. That's right.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Is the certification process a long process?

MS. GRIFFIN: It's been said, and it depends on who certifies. I know that the state has looked into speeding up that process, and they've made significant progress. And I know -- so -- so that is the case. But depending on when the process is started and, you know, it can vary, but it can take nine months or even longer.

2.1

2.1

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: There's some -- as you point out, there's some dynamics in play. We have a licensee that is anxious to count a company, who is probably putting some pressure on a vendor to say, hurry it up and get your certification. You have the certifying agency, which needs to do its due diligence. And then, oftentimes, you'll have somebody seeking certification who kind of gets -- puts in half the material and has to come back and fill out some additional paperwork.

So, hopefully, all these dynamics are moving people to do this as quickly as possible, and really not allow anybody to lose out on an opportunity for business.

MS. GRIFFIN: Right. Oftentimes the certification involves, not just the application, but a site visit, an investigation, while these projects are very fast-paced and on their own timeline. So I think that's the -- maybe the difference between other projects.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So we're not concerned that someone says they're in process,

but, really, they haven't gotten their
paperwork in, but, yet, they're getting credit.
Do you know? It's more --

MS. GRIFFIN: So we're recommending, right, we're recommending they don't get credit until they're actually certified. So, really, the onerous is on our licensees. They cannot count, you know, the diverse business, or the business as diverse until they have the certification in hand, and then they can go back, get back --

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Right. That's the -- I thought that was the case, that they can go back.

MS. GRIFFIN: Right.

there's no incentive for one to just drag their feet, really, because they need to get that certification that in order to eventually get credit and back credit. So it's not a question where someone can drag their feet, which I think might be what this — this letter is kind of referring to. Is there's something, where did this come from? You know, is there a time

limit? So I think -- I think you've considered
all these things, it sounds like.

MS. GRIFFIN: Right. You know, I -outline I did a -- quite a bit of due diligence
and talked to my people, you know, and based on
that feedback, I'm not really concerned. You
know, some of the certifying agencies that we
accept actually said thing like this is -- this
is very forward-thinking, and they thought it
that it might encourage businesses to get
certified. It may increase the pool of the -of certified businesses. But, you know, to
Commissioner Zuniga's point, I think it
increases the pool, but we're not increasing
the minority businesses. They're just becoming
certified and recognized so --

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Right.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: There's another potential here that I mentioned last time, when you introduced this first idea of the meet two weeks ago. And that is, that we have the ability, remember, to license some of these vendors. It doesn't meant that we're going to license everybody, because they could be

2.1

nongaming vendors, and we could decide that they be registered only. But the prospect of having to be licensed by the Commission as well, I think is a strong incentive to, you know, to not play games, if that's a concern.

And the other piece that I've also

-- I've also mentioned, is a lot of what the
certifying agencies do is, some, not all, of
what our own IEB does, corroborating
ownership, that there's no, you know, no front
person, for example, looking at Articles of
Incorporation and things that like. And those
are the things that I would really like us to
continue to think about, understanding what
one does and the other one doesn't in these
dual roles that we have. And this could be a
really good pool of companies for us to -- to
do that.

MS. GRIFFIN: And we've had initial conversations. I've mentioned it, also, to Director Wells, so we'll get that meeting going.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: You know, to

the point that, you know, on construction projects, I think there's been a long tradition of engaging minority and women-owned construction companies, or subcontractors in construction projects.

Where this is new, and where this is helpful is veteran-owned businesses and companies that'll be on the operational side that never had a benefit from being registered before, you know the floors to the linen company or what have you. And fortunately, now, with the construction window, hopefully this is, you know, another early, wake-up call for them to get into the process so that they don't have to worry about this issue.

MS. GRIFFIN: Yeah, I do agree with you, Commissioner Stebbins, that the veteran business enterprise is where I think we'll see most of the action.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: And I think that's what sparked MGM's inquiry at the beginning.

MS. GRIFFIN: Exactly. I did want to mention that I also received feedback from

2.1

Jenny Peterson from Wynn Boston Harbor. And she indicated that she thought these recommendations looked good. She did suggest a minor change in streamlining the reporting requirement.

So rather than indicating footnotes and that sort of thing, she suggested that the gaming licensee shall notify the director of work force supplier and diversity development in writing, the company name in dollar value applied towards the diversity spends, so all of these changes. And I thought that sounded good, but I leave that for you.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So you agree with her recommendation?

MS. GRIFFIN: I thought it sounded like a good idea.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr. Chair, I would move the Commission approve the supplier diversity certification and retroactive reporting guidelines for construction and operations, as outlined in the memo included in our packet.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?

2.1

Page 265 1 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor? Aye. 3 MR. MACDONALD: Aye. 4 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 5 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? You win. 8 MS. GRIFFIN: Thank you. 9 All right. I think CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 10 we're ready to call a day. 11 MR. BEDROSIAN: Mr. Chair, I just 12 note for the record that I anticipate that our 13 next regularly-scheduled meeting will probably be July 21st. But, obviously, if anything else 14 15 comes up that demands the Commission's 16 attention, we would meet before that. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. So for July 18 and August, we're going to be skipping our 19 second meetings. So instead of having, 20 generally two meetings every month, we going to 21 have one for July and August. The next one is 22 July --23 MR. BEDROSIAN: Twenty-first. 24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Twenty-first.

```
Page 266
         Okay. Motion to adjourn?
 1
 2
                   COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Move to
 3
         adjourn.
 4
                   COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
                                          Second?
                   CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor?
 5
 6
                   MR. MACDONALD: Aye.
 7
                   COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
 8
                   COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
 9
                   COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
                                          Aye.
10
                   CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. Thanks
         everybody.
11
12
                   (Proceeding concluded at 3:20 p.m.)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

Page 267 1 **GUEST SPEAKERS:** 2 Paul Mathews, CEO, Playstudios 3 Josh Swissman, Senior Vice President of Loyalty 4 Marketing, MGM 5 Jed Nosal, Esq., MGM 6 Chris Sheffield, Managing Director, Penn Interactive Adventures 8 Carl Sottosanti, Esq., Penn International 9 Jim Baldacci, Chief Compliance Officer, Penn International 10 11 12 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION STAFF: 13 Edward Bedrosian, Executive Director 14 Justin Stempeck, Esq., Staff Attorney 15 Karen Wells, Director of Investigations and 16 Enforcement Bureau 17 Bruce Band, Deputy Director of Investigations and 18 Enforcement Bureau 19 Michael Sangalang, Digital Communications 20 Coordinator 21 Derek Lennon, CFAO 22 Catherine Blue, General Counsel 23 Todd Grossman, Deputy General Counsel 24

Page 268 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION STAFF CONT'D: Joseph Delaney, Construction Project Oversight Manager Alex Lightbown, DVM, Director of Racing Jill Griffin, Director of Workforce, Supplier and Diversity Development

CERTIFICATE

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1

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

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

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

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

19

20

WITNESS MY HAND THIS 25th of June

2.1

22

23

24

BRENDA M. GINISI

Notary Public

2015.

My Commission expires

June 18, 2021