

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION
221 PUBLIC HEARING

CHAIRMAN

Stephen P. Crosby

COMMISSIONERS

Lloyd Macdonald

Bruce W. Stebbins

Enrique Zuniga

Gayle Cameron

June 28, 2017, 12:30 p.m. to 2:28 p.m.

Massachusetts Gaming Commission

101 Federal Street, 12th Floor

Boston, Massachusetts

PROCEEDINGS

1
2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are calling to
3 order the 221st -- holy cow, 221 meeting --
4 221st Public Meeting of the Gaming
5 Commission, June 28th at 12:30 at our offices
6 in Boston.

7 I think we're going straight to the
8 issue of the Community Mitigation Fund
9 applications. And do you have anything
10 Director Bedrosian?

11 MR. BEDROSIAN: No. I think this
12 is just continuation of our last meeting, so
13 Mr. Ziemba.

14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. So
15 Ombudsman Ziemba.

16 MR. ZIEMBA: Thank you, Mr.
17 Chairman and Commissioners. Just as a brief
18 reminder, this is the latest in our reviews
19 of the Community Mitigation Fund for this
20 year's program. We began her reviews in
21 February, February 10th. We did an intake of
22 all the applications, discussed them. On
23 March 16th, we amended the number of
24 applications based on a filing that wasn't

1 previously included in our summary. We met
2 object 14th of June to discuss primarily the
3 workforce development pilot applications, and
4 then we met again on June 22nd to go over the
5 other applications under the other categories
6 of grants.

7 The Commission reached conclusions
8 on a number of different grants. Included in
9 them were the specific impact grants. I'll
10 just very, very briefly go over the
11 Commission's decisions today. The Commission
12 awarded \$150,000 award to the City of Everett
13 that will help provide funding for a bike
14 sharing service in Everett that will help
15 lessen potential construction and operational
16 related traffic congestion.

17 The City -- excuse me, the
18 Commission awarded a \$100,000 Transportation
19 plan and grant to the City of Lynn to help
20 them remedy potential future traffic impacts
21 on Lynn roads. The Commission awarded a
22 \$25,000 amount of funding for a study and
23 data analysis to try to determine what
24 impacts the Plainridge Park facility is

1 having on the Norfolk District Attorney's
2 Office, their reviews -- excuse me, their
3 resources and their case loads. The
4 Commission awarded \$148,750 to provide to
5 funding for the purchase of a fire
6 suppression vehicle serving the Plainridge
7 Park facility. The Commission also awarded
8 reserve funding grant in the amount of
9 \$98,397.92 to provide funding for public
10 safety-related equipment serving the
11 Plainridge Park facility.

12 And then the Commission also
13 awarded a specific impact grant to the City
14 of Springfield in the amount of \$31,523 for
15 the continuation of the Care and Health
16 Center and other business valet parking pilot
17 program.

18 So we have concluded our review of
19 the, specific impacts, and what I recommend,
20 at a prior meeting, I went over the -- I went
21 over a summary of all the transportation
22 planning grants that are before the review
23 committee. I recommend that we go into the
24 transportation planning grants, then we can

1 go into the travel and technical assistance
2 program, and then we can go into reserves.
3 So there are a couple of reserve applications
4 that remain. And then if we can go into the
5 work course development pilot programs from
6 our prior discussion, we had a pretty robust
7 discussion of that robust summary of those
8 applications and perhaps we could go into
9 those.

10 Just by way of background. I know
11 the Commission knows this. When the
12 Commission decided to allow for
13 transportation planning grants, it did so for
14 a number of different reasons, but the
15 traffic has been one, if not the most,
16 predominant concern of all communities
17 related to the development of these casinos.
18 And even though the developers of these
19 projects have been through very substantial
20 statewide permitting, have been through very
21 significant host and surrounding community
22 agreements that address transportation
23 related items, they've been through the
24 Commission's review process, which was

1 extremely robust, especially when it comes to
2 transportation issues, but over and above
3 that there remain concerns relative to
4 traffic. And again, what we've said in the
5 past is that traffic projections are just
6 that; they are traffic projections.

7 And so one of the theoris that we
8 had is that because transportation projects
9 take so long to get up and running to do the
10 studies, to do the planning, and to do the
11 design, and then for implementation, what we
12 wanted to do is we wanted to make sure that
13 there is a potential of a backstop. So if
14 any of our projections are incorrect or any
15 of MassDOT's projections are incorrect and
16 that there are more traffic impacts than
17 expected, we will have projects that have at
18 least passed those initial thresholds of
19 planning so that if we needed to institute
20 other potential remedies to the traffic
21 situations, we could do so much more quickly.

22 When we look at those
23 transportation planning projects, we are not
24 necessarily saying that the Commission would

1 fund these in any regard, but what we are
2 saying is that we would like to allow the
3 communities to commence with these traffic
4 studies and plans so that we are as close to
5 as ready as we can. And hopefully this'll
6 never occur, but in the event that our
7 traffic projections are and more mitigation
8 is necessary.

9 So with that as a backdrop, I've
10 given you a summary of the transportation
11 related projects. I've noted that there is
12 unanimity within the review team on almost
13 every one of these projects, and we've noted
14 where there was some dissent in regard to one
15 of these projects.

16 So with that, perhaps we can
17 proceed with Boston would be the first
18 transportation-related application that I've
19 previously summarized.

20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Sounds good.

21 MR. ZIEMBA: As a reminder, this
22 would be a grant that would provide funding
23 for a portion of the City's engineering
24 design costs for the proposed reconstruction

1 of Sullivan Square, Rutherford Avenue. This
2 is a major traffic corridor expected to
3 support casino-related traffic and traffic
4 from other traffic generators over the long
5 term. The request is \$150,000. The City of
6 Boston has also asked for \$100,000 from their
7 reserve account from the same exact purpose,
8 and the review team in unanimity recommended
9 funding of this purpose.

10 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: This one
11 seems clear to me that it's really necessary.
12 They certainly convinced the review team in
13 every category that it was worthy. And,
14 certainly, I would have no problem supporting
15 the \$250,000 in funding for these planning
16 activities.

17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's clearly
18 related. No question about that. The only
19 question in my mind, I just was curious. I
20 thought there was already a planning process
21 under way already paid for. So how does this
22 fit into all the other planning that's been
23 going on and is going on and so forth?

24 MR. ZIEMBA: I mean, you're quite

1 correct, Mr. Chairman. The planning process
2 has been going on for a number of different
3 years. It just recently over the last year
4 got refreshed by the City of Boston
5 Transportation Department.

6 There are certain City matching
7 costs to the cost of federal planning
8 dollars, and what this would do is help to
9 fray a portion of the City's costs in the
10 redesign.

11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. So it's
12 not that they don't have the money to do
13 this, particularly; it's just that we have a
14 bucket that might be used for this and it
15 would save them using some other money for
16 it.

17 MR. ZIEMBA: The way they've
18 expressed in the application is that
19 partially, if not, a big component of the
20 need to review the plans for Rutherford Ave.
21 and Sullivan Square was due to the decision
22 regarding the Wynn Boston Harbor Casino, and
23 they took another look at the numbers in the
24 context of a number of other projects that

1 have developed in the region and determined
2 they needed to take another look at the
3 design. So they felt it was very appropriate
4 to ask the Commission for a portion of the
5 funding to help to fray the City's expenses.

6 Again, there's also limited dollars
7 at the City level to pay for any and all
8 transportation projects and other City
9 priorities, and the review team felt that
10 this is entirely appropriate that they ask
11 for funding for this purpose.

12 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Is there
13 not, John, also a very substantial parallel
14 funding provided by the Federal Highway
15 Administration to the City of Boston that
16 this would be part and parcel of?

17 MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah. Boston
18 indicated that they have been in
19 conversations with the Metropolitan Planning
20 organization for the area to make sure that
21 funding is available, federal funding is
22 available for the overall construction of
23 this project. They hope to begin
24 construction on or about 2020, and that they

1 believe they have indications that they will
2 have very significant federal dollars
3 available for the full construction of this
4 facility in tandem with the \$25 million that
5 we have previously required Wynn to provide
6 for the long-term plan. Hopefully these
7 federal dollars and the Wynn-related dollars
8 would be sufficient to pay for the actual
9 construction of this project once it's
10 finalized. But as of now, they're looking to
11 help pay for some of the design-related
12 costs.

13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. I
14 think it falls squarely on the guidelines of
15 the transportation planning grants and the
16 community mitigation. I think the difference
17 is that a City like Boston and a Town of
18 Plainville are very different when it comes
19 to how they make decisions and funding
20 decisions. So we just need to view them
21 accordingly. So I will be in complete
22 support of this request.

23 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The general
24 criteria, a demonstration of other funds from

1 host or surrounding -- oh, host or
2 surrounding community agreements, not other
3 funds. Yeah. Okay. Whatever. All right.
4 I'm fine with it.

5 All right. Somebody want to move?

6 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I'll move.
7 I move that we approve the application of the
8 City of Boston for \$150,000 transportation
9 planning application for the reasons that are
10 summarized in the review committee's
11 memorandum to us.

12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?

13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
15 discussion? All in favor? Aye.

16 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

17 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.

18 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

19 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The
21 ayes have it unanimously.

22 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And the
23 100,000 as well for the reserve planning?

24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm sorry, I

1 thought it was both.

2 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No. It was
3 250 all told.

4 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I was going
5 to ask that question. This was the
6 transportation grant for 150. There's also a
7 request for 100 for the use of the reserves.

8 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Do you want
9 us to do the reserve piece?

10 MR. ZIEMBA: Yes. That would be
11 great.

12 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Okay.
13 I'll just amend the motion to include that we
14 approve the drawdown of \$100,000 from the
15 current reserve account.

16 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor?

18 Aye.

19 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

20 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.

21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

22 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

23 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The
24 ayes have it. The amendment approved

1 unanimously.

2 Everett.

3 MR. ZIEMBA: Just as a reminder,
4 not to go over my previous summary, but the
5 Everett proposal is a grant to provide
6 funding for the preliminary design and
7 engineering of a bus-only lane on the west
8 side of Broadway Route 99 from the Everett
9 city line to Route 16 Sweetser Circle. This
10 is a primary traffic corridor for expected
11 casino-related traffic. The grant request is
12 in the tune of \$150,000. The review team was
13 unanimous in recommending this.

14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Questions?

15 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yeah.
16 John, just noting under MassDOT's comments,
17 they encouraged the City to explore
18 feasibility of an alternating feed direction
19 bus lane.

20 MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah.

21 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Is that
22 something Everett would be amenable to or is
23 there not enough money to do that piece of
24 the evaluation of what they're --

1 MR. ZIEMBA: So Everett in its
2 answer indicated that it wasn't entirely on
3 board with that recommendation, but at the
4 previous meeting what I asked the Commission,
5 I would have recommended to the Commission is
6 if you give the authority to my office to
7 look over a number of different conditions
8 that we could place on some of these grants
9 consistent with recommendations from MassDOT.
10 We haven't had the opportunity in the process
11 that we outlined for review of these grants
12 to have a give and take with the communities
13 regarding some of the MassDOT conditions and
14 other conditions.

15 So what it was my hope is that the
16 Commission would grant the authority to my
17 office to work with the City, work with
18 MassDOT to determine whether or not the exact
19 conditions of any sort of planning study such
20 as an alternative use lane. I don't believe
21 that that probably would be one of the
22 conditions, but I wanted to leave room for
23 the conversation between the City, MassDOT,
24 and Commission staff.

1 Based on my prior recommendation,
2 what I would do, I would inform the review
3 team, or the ombudsman's office would inform
4 the review team regarding all those
5 conditions, and we would inform the
6 Commission regarding all these conditions as
7 well.

8 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.

9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But the
10 request is to plan a bus-only lane at certain
11 hours, correct?

12 MR. ZIEMBA: They have certain
13 hours bus-only lane currently under our pilot
14 program, but this would be for a bus-only
15 lane serving the entire day. There's a
16 number of right of way considerations that
17 limit the ability of a bus-only lane on that
18 roadway currently, and so this would be the
19 design of the bus-only lane --

20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: For those
21 solutions.

22 MR. ZIEMBA: -- for entire period.

23 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Oh. So it's
24 for the entire period?

1 MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah.

2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: How does this
3 interface, or does it, with the idea of going
4 down, what is it, the silver line trail and
5 down the commuter rail and back in through
6 the MBTA lane? Does that --

7 MR. ZIEMBA: No. You're exactly
8 right in that question. So the review team
9 asked Everett that question. So would this
10 preclude the ability of the expansion of a
11 lane, bus rapid transit lane, basically
12 running along the tracks and then potentially
13 we could come back on out onto --

14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

15 MR. ZIEMBA: -- lower Broadway and
16 across the bridge into Rutherford Ave. And
17 so the City of Everett said those are serving
18 two different purposes. It's unknown first
19 of all whether that lane would be a possible.

20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

21 MR. ZIEMBA: But they're different
22 purposes. One would connect up to the
23 existing Chelsea Silver line along the tracks
24 and down, and then the expansion of the

1 bus-only lane would serve multiple points
2 coming north of Broadway from the center of
3 Everett and others where you could transit
4 down on that bus-only lane south into Boston.

5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So if they did
6 this, it doesn't have any negative impact on
7 the plausibility of the other?

8 MR. ZIEMBA: It does not.

9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah.

10 MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah. And we'd want
11 to make sure that this doesn't have any
12 negative consequences to the Wynn traffic
13 plan as well.

14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah.

15 MR. ZIEMBA: That it's not intended
16 that this bus-only lane take place of a Wynn
17 traffic lane, for example.

18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

19 MR. ZIEMBA: That's not the
20 intention of Everett nor would it be
21 something that we would find supportable.

22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Now, there
23 were other considerations relative to bike
24 lanes in lower Broadway. Remind me, where

1 does the stand, please.

2 MR. ZIEMBA: So the City of Everett
3 did move forward with a bike lane that is --
4 Joe has the better terminology. But it is an
5 elevated bike lane that separates the traffic
6 from the bike lane and that is in the process
7 of design.

8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And it's also
9 separate from these.

10 MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah. This would
11 require additional right of way. It's a very
12 constrained corridor, and it might be very
13 difficult to try to find that right of way.
14 But this was recommended by MassDOT. MassDOT
15 did -- in Everett, Everett transit action
16 plan just recently in the last year or so
17 where they took a look at a number of other
18 opportunities to increase transit connections
19 within the City of Everett.

20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But as part
21 of these sort of studies or evaluations, they
22 will take into account that elevated bike
23 lane or the feasibility of it or how it --

24 MR. ZIEMBA: Yes. They'll take

1 into account plans.

2 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So the study
3 may very well say it's not possible, it's
4 just not enough room?

5 MR. ZIEMBA: Well, I think the
6 study will cover the difficulties that they
7 have, but it may have try to figure out how
8 it would actually work. But it will
9 highlight. I think the City is well aware of
10 some of the obstacles in terms of --

11 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Curb cuts.

12 MR. ZIEMBA: -- money and others
13 that it would take to try to build such a
14 lane.

15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Janice, is there
16 anything you can do about the temperature?
17 It feels hot to me. I don't know if maybe
18 it's just menopause.

19 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: It's been a
20 common kind of occurrence this summer in this
21 room.

22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. Good
23 point. Okay. Further discussion?

24 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I'd just

1 say that I consider the Broadway Route 99
2 corridor in Everett to be ground zero of the
3 challenge for the Wynn Casino. And I was, as
4 a member of the review team, was completely
5 supportive of this application.

6 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I agree.

7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do I have a
8 motion?

9 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
10 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Commission
11 approve the 2017 Everett transportation
12 planning grant as included in the packet.

13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?

14 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
16 discussion? All in favor? Aye.

17 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

18 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.

19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

20 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The
22 ayes have it unanimously.

23 Malden.

24 MR. ZIEMBA: Malden --

1 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Did we skip
2 Lynn?

3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We did Lynn.

4 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Oh. We did
5 Lynn?

6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: When we did Lynn
7 with the --

8 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Oh, that's
9 right.

10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We did the two of
11 them together.

12 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: That's
13 right.

14 MR. ZIEMBA: The City of Malden is
15 requesting funding for the rehabilitation of
16 Exchange Street. Exchange Street is a
17 corridor that will serve pretty much directly
18 the Malden Center transportation hub of the
19 Wynn facility. As a reminder, Wynn has a
20 number of offsite parking requirements where
21 it will place 800 offsite parking facilities
22 through a number of different potential
23 places, including Wellington Circle, Malden
24 Center and potentially other Everett

1 locations. And this center for both patrons
2 and employees will be a connector to the
3 facility. Malden Center will have direct bus
4 connections right to the Wynn facility. And
5 what the City of Malden is trying to do is
6 they're trying to improve pedestrian access,
7 safety, and revitalizing the whole Exchange
8 Street location.

9 And MassDOT has recommended that
10 this would provide important benefits in
11 regard that this is a transportation center
12 for the Wynn facility.

13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And it's a
14 transportation center because of the
15 agreement it has with the City relative to
16 the parking, satellite parking, near Malden
17 Center?

18 MR. ZIEMBA: Yep. As far as Wynn's
19 initial application to us, it picked two
20 major transportation centers, one Wellington
21 Circle and Malden. Malden was the first
22 surrounding community agreement that was
23 linked with Wynn as this transportation
24 center where they're going to try to connect

1 up to local transit through the Orange line
2 and get a lot of folks to use that.

3 When we did the licensing process,
4 we put a great amount of importance on mode
5 share where we were trying to get people
6 outside of their single occupancy vehicles
7 and onto other modes of transit and that's
8 why this Malden Center in conjunction with
9 Wellington was so important.

10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But the City
11 got a substantial amount of money for that
12 surrounding community agreement.

13 MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah. There were two
14 payments that were included. There was a
15 transitional roads payment and a
16 transportation hub payment. We asked Malden
17 whether or not the purpose of those funds
18 could be utilized or was meant for this
19 purpose, for Exchange Street. And the
20 transitional roads payment was very much
21 that. It was a connect up Malden to Everett
22 related roads. And this is not a connector
23 between Malden and Everett, this particular
24 street. And the transportation hub payment

1 was meant for a lot of sort of the redesign
2 of the Malden Center T stop itself, and it
3 was -- Malden states that this was not
4 contemplated when they entered into the
5 agreement for those upfront funds.

6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And Exchange
7 Street is, as the review team here seems to
8 disagree on, seems to be more of a local
9 shopping district, this portion of Exchange
10 Street?

11 MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah. I would say
12 yes. We label it a little bit of a decent,
13 but the decent said that it is more of a
14 local shopping district. That is a little
15 bit in contrast of what MassDOT said where
16 MassDOT weighed the importance of it as a
17 transportation hub. But yes, it is not a
18 through street. It's not a two-way through
19 street that would provide direct access to
20 the Wynn facility, but instead it would allow
21 -- improvements in that area would allow a
22 significant number of folks who will be
23 parking in those area facilities to transit
24 by bike or by mostly walking back and forth

1 to the Wynn shuttles, which are right on the
2 opposite side of the Malden Center T.

3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do you know
4 whether this came up during the SCA
5 negotiations?

6 MR. ZIEMBA: Pursuant to the answer
7 given us to by Malden, they said this was not
8 part of the what they anticipated with the
9 use of those funds.

10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Because
11 that suggests to me this is not something
12 that was evident as a priority, to put it
13 mildly, and which kind of goes to the
14 concern. Again, the first criteria here is
15 planning grants must be clearly related to
16 addressing transportation issues or impacts
17 directly related to the gaming facility. So
18 it's like --

19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. That's
20 why -- that was my reluctance at well in
21 the --

22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: They didn't even
23 bring it up during the surrounding community
24 agreement.

1 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I'd be
2 interested in Commissioner Macdonald's
3 thoughts since he sat through all those
4 meetings and listened to all the
5 conversations at this one.

6 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Well, I'm
7 in favor of the application, but I would note
8 that I, you know, appreciate the reservation
9 that at least one of our members -- I
10 actually can't remember the vote, but I know
11 there was one member of the review team who
12 had reservations about it, and it was account
13 the John described; namely, that Exchange
14 Street is apparently a shopping street. It's
15 not a connector, a direct connector, between
16 the transportation hub and the casino. And
17 so it doesn't have as direct a -- it doesn't
18 play as direct a role in transportation to
19 and from the casino.

20 Nevertheless, the explanation of
21 how they came to realize once they got
22 further into the planning for the
23 transportation improvements that this street
24 would be directly impacted by the

1 introduction by the casino and the
2 development of the transportation hub, and I
3 was satisfied and am satisfied that it's
4 sufficiently proximately related to it to
5 merit our approval.

6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Like in one
7 of my other, you know, reluctance -- like
8 other instances, I'm thinking about some of
9 the precedent that we can create throughout
10 this mildly directly or somewhat directly
11 related to the casino. Granted we're not
12 seeing a huge demand for the moneys now on
13 this fund, that could easily exchange in my
14 view.

15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It will change.

16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It will
17 change once the casinos come in, and there
18 may be big nuts to try to mitigate. So I'm
19 more on the camp of being a little cautious
20 to mostly on both how it directly or
21 indirectly doesn't quite fit on the context
22 -- in the context of this also starts to
23 create a precedent in my opinion that as long
24 as we're kind of close to the casino, even if

1 it's not directly related, we might be able
2 to be seeing more and more grants of this
3 nature. So I'm reluctant about this.

4 MR. ZIEMBA: In regard to direct or
5 indirect, I guess I would disagree slightly
6 with Commissioner Macdonald that that is a
7 direct transportation-related measure in that
8 you're trying to accommodate that very
9 significant mode share of connecting up
10 people to transit.

11 So even though it is not a direct
12 vehicular connection, it's not meant as a
13 connector by getting in your car and driving
14 right there. It is really meant to improve
15 the ability of people to come, park, get out
16 of their vehicles, get into the MBTA Orange
17 line or come from the Orange line and get
18 into the Wynn shuttles.

19 So in that regard, I do believe it
20 is a direct connector. I won't read Malden's
21 response unless you'd like me to where they
22 answered that direct question where we asked
23 them could you please explain to us how this
24 is clearly related to transportation issue or

1 issues or impacts directly related to the
2 gaming facility. I can go over that if you'd
3 like me to, but in summary, it goes over the
4 importance of the improvements of rehabbing
5 Exchange Street, making it ADA compliant,
6 making sure the crosswalks are safe, making
7 sure the bike accommodation and bike racks
8 are safe and other street scapes improvement.

9 So I guess I could take some issue
10 with it being a direct transportation. I
11 think the review found that it was, but not a
12 direct vehicular transportation connection.

13 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: That's
14 actually what I meant. I was not artful in
15 the way I expressed myself.

16 MR. ZIEMBA: No worries.

17 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Help me
18 understand. The Malden Center station is
19 where it's at least anticipated that the
20 shuttles to bring employees will be picking
21 people -up.

22 MR. ZIEMBA: And patrons.

23 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- and
24 patrons as well.

1 MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah.

2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And they'll
3 get there however they get there.

4 MR. ZIEMBA: Correct.

5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And your
6 point is because at least some people will
7 use that street to get to that mode --

8 MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah. People may park
9 there, get in the shuttles there because they
10 won't be able to park in the Wynn facility
11 itself. That's prohibited from employees.
12 They get out of their cars, walk down to the
13 shuttle, go from there. Other folks in
14 Malden or other places may want to park
15 there, get in the shuttle, and take it
16 directly to the Wynn facility. And there
17 are, you know, a number of different
18 connection that is you could make.

19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Could anybody
20 then take that rationale and say anywhere
21 anybody accesses as a hub or any station, for
22 that matter, to get to the casino as an
23 employee or as a customer would necessitate
24 axillary improvements?

1 MR. ZIEMBA: Well, I mean, I do
2 think there's a difference. Say for example
3 you get in at Hay Market. Hay Market, you
4 get off the Orange line or Park Street. That
5 it is a different entirely from what is
6 anticipated with these two transportation
7 hubs. Wynn is spending significant dollars
8 to do improvements, put shell service
9 directly at those locations. So I think it
10 is different than where you may access to the
11 T up and down the line.

12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, and
13 that gets us to the other point. If Wynn is
14 already spending significant money to
15 mitigate what was at the time of the surround
16 community agreement admission to be the
17 traffic and shuttle activity, then maybe at
18 least conceivably, some of that has been
19 already addressed.

20 MR. ZIEMBA: So Wynn's improvements
21 pursuant to the Section 61 findings are
22 primarily for a remake of the facilities to
23 allow for the shuttle-based parking, working
24 with the MBTA. If you're taking a look at

1 the Malden Center T, I believe it's all to
2 the west of the T station. These
3 improvements go along Exchange, which are to
4 the east of this station, that we deduced
5 allowed some improvements last year for the
6 Malden Center area as well, and this would be
7 a little bit further along the way, a little
8 further -- it's all within a quarter of a
9 mile, but a little bit further away connected
10 to the stop. But these type of improvements
11 were not required of Wynn when we did our
12 conditions.

13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: John, have you or
14 the group thought about if we fund a planning
15 grant like this, for example, the next
16 logical request, particularly when there's
17 money in there, is to build it, you know.

18 MR. ZIEMBA: Right.

19 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If it's
20 sufficiently proximate for us to fund to meet
21 our standards and we therefore fund it as a
22 planning grant, sort of by implication, we
23 would fund --

24 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The

1 construction.

2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: -- the
3 construction, too, right? Is that --

4 MR. ZIEMBA: No.

5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Why is that not
6 sort of -- How do have you guys figured on
7 the relation --

8 MR. ZIEMBA: In a lot of our
9 conversations, what we have said internally
10 within the Commission, we've said that we
11 would like to fund planning grants. Like at
12 the beginning of this meeting, I referenced
13 the fact that we try to planning grants. By
14 no means does that mean that we fund any
15 actual construction.

16 One of the criteria for all of our
17 grants is that we try to make sure that the
18 communities are trying to engage to seek
19 additional funding. We take a look at how
20 they are placed on the TIP, the state
21 Transportation Improvement Plan. They have
22 to give us details of what they're seeking.

23 But I think today people understand
24 that we could not be the funding source for

1 all of these projects. If you total them all
2 up, we would run out of money in the first
3 year.

4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I didn't mean
5 that we have made an implied promise.

6 MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah.

7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Just that we've
8 crossed the threshold of, yeah, it would
9 qualify. We may not have enough money, but
10 by funding the planning grant, we are
11 essentially saying this project is
12 sufficiently a consequence of the casino that
13 it would meet our criteria.

14 MR. ZIEMBA: No. I think at the
15 point we are taking a look at funding actual
16 construction projects, hopefully we have a
17 lot of competitive data about which projects
18 would be necessary if, indeed, further
19 mitigation is necessary. And we can take a
20 look at a number of different factors about
21 what are the most competitive projects.

22 These ones are sort of
23 self-identified. Of each of the communities
24 are identifying which projects they want to

1 proceed for planning, but at some point, the
2 actual dollars, if you commit to an exact
3 amount of dollars for construction dollars,
4 you can't pay for every project.

5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: No. I
6 understand.

7 MR. ZIEMBA: So undoubtedly, it
8 will be a competitive process, and so no
9 matter how far along you are in the planning
10 stage, you will have to -- we will have to
11 evaluate what are the most directly connected
12 projects. But what we've been trying to do
13 with planning grants is to get folks down the
14 road so that all of the data is there and so
15 they're ready to go once we're able to move
16 forward.

17 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. It's a
18 bit of a dilemma. I know that we can
19 certainly manage expectations today as much
20 as possible by putting in guidelines that
21 none of this creates a commitment in any way,
22 but I am worried about the expectation that
23 we create out there for a year from now or
24 two years from now when they say that the

1 studies that you, yourself, funded and you
2 thought worth it --

3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

4 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- has now
5 come up with these priorities and now we need
6 funding to do it. And that's where, in my
7 view, the ripple effect or the multiplier
8 effect, rather, of the closest to the casino,
9 not when we're talking about construction
10 dollars -- And I understand that there's many
11 other sources of funding and exceptions from
12 cities and from the feds, et cetera --
13 becomes, you know, a big nut in my opinion.

14 So it's a philosophical review,
15 right. We do need data to be able to make
16 smart decisions, and there's a lot of work
17 that goes into this already, granted there's
18 more engineering that can really, you know --

19 MR. ZIEMBA: All these projects
20 take years.

21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. But
22 there's also a management of expectations
23 that I think we need to think about as we
24 make these early decisions. That's been my

1 only point.

2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. Well, I
3 agree. And we've talked about the precedent
4 issue, and we've dealt with this in the past
5 making a point of saying just for the record,
6 we are not establishing any precedence here
7 that we will feel compelled on. This is not
8 a judicial body with a -- what do you call
9 it -- stare decisis or whatever. You know,
10 we will be free to make our judgments in the
11 future independent of judgments we've made in
12 the past. So people shouldn't assume, and we
13 want it on the record, that that's the case.

14 Having said that, I mean, to me,
15 this is a marginal one in the extreme, and
16 you know, I don't know. I mean, it's -- you
17 know, I'd feel better if there was at least a
18 little of data that suggested -- you know, if
19 this was after the fact and we were beginning
20 to see problems in that area as a
21 consequence. That would be an easier lift.

22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Let me talk
23 about that because the original -- And maybe
24 we're beyond that. But the original notion

1 of this rounds of funding was to deal with
2 construction-related impacts, and we've
3 extended that a little bit because we do need
4 some long-term planning of sorts or some
5 rational planning, hence, you know, all of
6 these reserves and transportation planning
7 grants. But in my view, we're still very
8 much in the construction phase of this -- of
9 the needs for mitigation.

10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, we -- you
11 know.

12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Maybe we've
13 passed that phase already and we are
14 really --

15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think we're
16 kind of passed it. If you look at just the
17 bus lane, we just funded the study for the
18 bus lane and that's not construction. I
19 think we're --

20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, but
21 that's directly related to the casino.

22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, true.
23 True. Anybody else? Commissioner Stebbins?

24 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yeah. Just

1 a quick question, John. You note we gave
2 them a transportation planning grant for the
3 Malden Center are last year. Do you know the
4 status of whether that's been expended?

5 MR. ZIEMBA: So we asked them that
6 question. They didn't provide any
7 significant detail regarding how that one is
8 going. They did provide a little bit of
9 detail regarding the status of their economic
10 development planner and those activities, but
11 that Malden Center study was -- there was a
12 parking study, and then we had a Malden
13 Center study relative to pedestrian and bike
14 rider safety improvements directly in the
15 Malden Center area, and this takes it a
16 little bit further, as I noted, down Exchange
17 Street.

18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Somebody want to
19 make a motion?

20 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I agree this
21 is a marginal one. I really do. I don't
22 have a strong opinion. I guess I'm persuaded
23 by our two members who sat through and asked
24 additional questions and were persuaded that

1 this is something that is viable and they
2 agreed to recommend it. So you know, I would
3 move that we approve the City of Malden's
4 request for \$150,000 for a transportation
5 grant.

6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?

7 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
9 discussion? All in favor? Aye.

10 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

11 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.

12 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed?

14 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Commissioner
16 Zuniga opposed.

17 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Um-hmm.
18 Right.

19 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The other
20 Commissioners in favor.

21 Okay. We're on to Medford.

22 MR. ZIEMBA: Medford. This grant
23 would provide a full year's worth of funding
24 for a contract transportation planner and

1 funding for an engineering feasibility study
2 for proposed new multiuse path. A new
3 multiuse path, the South Medford connector,
4 may greatly enhance connections to other
5 regional pathways and provide another method
6 for employees and patrons to access the
7 casino, especially if the proposed pedestrian
8 bike cycle bridge across from Assembly Square
9 to the Wynn facility is put in place. This
10 application, the South Medford connector
11 application, was strongly supported by the
12 City of Somerville as well to as a way to
13 connect up a multiuse pathway throughout the
14 greater region and eventually connecting all
15 the way through into Boston south into Boston
16 through proposed pathways along Rutherford
17 Ave. and others.

18 In regard to the contract planner,
19 the one on that is just recently the
20 Commission did authorize the use of their
21 current funding into the next fiscal year.
22 We authorized \$60,000 of funding into the
23 next fiscal year, and what this grant would
24 be would be the remaining \$20,000 which

1 represents the full year's worth of funding.
2 Last year when we gave \$60,000, it was the
3 prorated costs of that transportation
4 planner. This would enable them for a full
5 year's worth of that funding.

6 I will note just that we did, in
7 our summary page, include a wrong number. So
8 I just wanted to make note of that to you.
9 On page 25 of your note, in Medford, we
10 included \$60,000 for the review team
11 proposal. That actually should be \$80,000
12 because it didn't include the 20,000 that the
13 team recommended for the full year's worth of
14 the transportation planning. That was just
15 the funding for the South Medford connector.

16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Discussion?

17 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So this is
18 effectively a continuation of a prior
19 decision; is that correct?

20 MR. ZIEMBA: Yes. The multiuse
21 path is that is a new proposal for this year.

22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Multiuse?

23 MR. ZIEMBA: Multiuse
24 pedestrian-bicycle path that would connect up

1 basically the lower side of the Mystic to a
2 number of the other regional connections
3 including eventually to Boston and hopefully
4 over to the Wynn facility through the
5 pedestrian bridge or through other
6 connectors.

7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But you're not
8 recommending we do the land use planning?
9 You recommended against that.

10 MR. ZIEMBA: And I'm recommending
11 against the land use planning, which is
12 different from the South Medford connector.
13 The land use planning, we recommended against
14 that and the fact that that is not
15 transportation planning in the view of the
16 review team, that that was economic
17 development planning. Economic development
18 planning might have been an eligible activity
19 under the use of the reserve, but last year,
20 Medford used their reserve for other
21 purposes.

22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes. But what
23 you're doing is continuing the transportation
24 planner that you had already committed to.

1 MR. ZIEMBA: That's exactly right,
2 but the South Medford Connector, which is the
3 multiuse path, is a new proposal.

4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

5 MR. ZIEMBA: You're exactly right,
6 what the Commissioner said.

7 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And the point
8 maybe is a small one, but it uses existing or
9 available resources, in other words. It's
10 cost effective in that sense.

11 MR. ZIEMBA: Yes. Very much so.

12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Because
13 there's already somebody there.

14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else?
15 Somebody have a motion? I guess it's going
16 to fail for lack of a motion.

17 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No.

18 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I'll move
19 that we approve the application of the City
20 of Medford for use of planning grant funds in
21 the amount of \$80,000 in connection with the
22 Medford and South Medford Connector part of
23 their larger application for the reasons
24 stated in the review team's summary.

1 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
3 discussion? All in favor? Aye.

4 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

5 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.

6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

7 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The
9 eyes have it.

10 MR. ZIEMBA: The next proposal is
11 for Revere and Saugus. Revere and Saugus
12 have submitted a joint application for a
13 planner that could help the two communities
14 plan for Wynn-related traffic. We believe
15 that this is -- the review team believes this
16 is an innovative approach to regional
17 cooperation in dealing with transportation
18 impacts that may affect both of the
19 communities. Although, joint applications
20 were not specified as eligible activities
21 under our guidelines, the review team
22 previously stated that the Commission should
23 consider this joint application. But one
24 thing that we do recommend is that Revere and

1 Saugus would be required to express to the
2 Commission how they would deal with the
3 Commission's requirement that a hundred
4 percent of reserves -- a hundred percent of
5 reserves, \$100,000 worth of reserves, be used
6 to pay for any new transportation planning
7 grants.

8 So in essence, this would be
9 \$100,000 that is currently on tap between the
10 two communities, and an additional \$50,000 in
11 new funds. But the two communities have not
12 specified how they would split up the
13 \$100,000 for the reserve. We would need to
14 go back as a condition of the grant to the
15 two communities to see how they would split
16 up their reserve.

17 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And remind
18 me, how much or where do we stand with each
19 of the community's individual reserves?

20 MR. ZIEMBA: So Medford -- excuse
21 me, Revere has not utilized any of its
22 reserves. We've previously allocated \$30,000
23 to Saugus for some of their economic
24 development planning activities. They

1 applied for use of 100,000 last year, but
2 what we said is go ahead and do the planning,
3 and then the remaining \$65,000 was going to
4 be for the implementation. They're currently
5 still in the process of doing the planning on
6 what that would do to maximize economic
7 development potential for Saugus.

8 So last year, we denied the use of
9 65,000 reserve, but currently there's 100,000
10 on reserve at Revere and 65 unallocated for
11 Saugus.

12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But if we
13 said or if we implied or understood that it's
14 going to be 50/50 divided amongst the two,
15 Saugus could conceivably say, wait, out
16 reserve was already committed for the
17 economic development portion.

18 MR. ZIEMBA: Quite possibly.

19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Or our
20 intention was to always use that --

21 MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah.

22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- and so my
23 50 needs to come out of an additional grant.

24 MR. ZIEMBA: Yes. And we

1 previously asked both of the communities to
2 explain to us how they would deal with the
3 reserve question. The answer that we got was
4 noncommittal about what the split would be
5 from each of the communities, but in fairness
6 to all the rest of the grantees, that is a
7 requirement of our program whenever you get a
8 transportation planning grant that uses
9 \$100,000 of your reserve, and so we're --

10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: For --

11 MR. ZIEMBA: -- asking the two
12 communities to please figure it out for us.
13 Potentially they could apply for a waiver to
14 the Commission at a future date, but I'm
15 hopeful they can figure out how to do the
16 split and the fact they've been working very
17 well together in developing this regional
18 plan in and of itself, which would be a nice,
19 innovative model. But we didn't include that
20 joint application in our guidelines this past
21 year. We didn't really come to conclusions
22 regarding some of these thorny issues of what
23 if you can't figure out what the split would
24 be, but hopefully communities can work

1 together and figure that out.

2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, I like
3 the innovative piece, the economics of scope
4 in this case. You know, if they can share
5 the resources to, you know, split however
6 way, it would be too much inside baseball, in
7 my opinion, to try to come up or get in the
8 middle of how to split that --

9 MR. ZIEMBA: Right.

10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- you know,
11 that grant for technicalities, if you will.

12 MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah.

13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You have
14 applied for something but not allocated and
15 so on. But if that question, you believe,
16 can be resolved at a later time with without
17 too much pain.

18 MR. ZIEMBA: I'm hopeful. I mean,
19 I think at a previous meeting, I referenced
20 the fact that sometimes we put conditions on
21 these grants that can never be met, but I'm
22 certainly hopeful the two communities that
23 have expressed such cooperation to date can
24 figure it out.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Figure it
2 out.

3 MR. ZIEMBA: Figure it out.

4 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I would
5 agree. I like the fact that they're thinking
6 regionally and sharing resources.

7 MR. ZIEMBA: Right.

8 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And I would
9 assume they can absolutely figure out how to
10 continue to do that and share the reserve
11 money.

12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm not exactly
13 -- Sorry, Commissioner Stebbins, did you --

14 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I had a
15 quick question, John. You seem to make
16 reference to kind of an issue that we ran
17 into with Medford last year in terms of
18 making sure that this contract employee is
19 specifically doing planning work related to
20 casino impacts.

21 MR. ZIEMBA: Yes.

22 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Is that --
23 it talks about a contract employee in your
24 recommendation condition funding upon

1 certification that all planning costs will be
2 casino related.

3 So just so I'm clear, are they
4 planning to hire somebody or they're going to
5 contract with a consultant to do the
6 evaluation?

7 MR. ZIEMBA: They indicated in
8 their response letter that they would hire a
9 consultant.

10 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.

11 MR. ZIEMBA: But they also
12 indicated that they would be amenable to
13 doing the specification that all expenses are
14 related to casino-related matters.

15 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: But for
16 everybody, both these two towns and ours, is
17 it not just more direct to say we are hiring
18 you for the purposes of X as opposed to kind
19 of doing a recordkeeping exercise of what
20 they're spending their time on?

21 MR. ZIEMBA: Well, we just have a
22 number of measures to make sure our funds are
23 used appropriately. So we have that
24 certification, but then we also have the

1 actual invoices, so when they submit the
2 invoices, we also have a double check that
3 things are related to the purposes of the
4 grant.

5 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I don't know
7 exactly where -- what is the recommendation,
8 how much from what?

9 MR. ZIEMBA: 150,000.

10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: From
11 transportation planning grant?

12 MR. ZIEMBA: Well, it's a new
13 transportation planning grant of 150.

14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah.

15 MR. ZIEMBA: But under our rules
16 that have been in place for a couple of
17 years, we always require that \$100,000 of
18 your reserves be used for any transportation
19 planning grants. And the purpose of that is
20 so that the reserves don't lie fallow --

21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

22 MR. ZIEMBA: -- while they're
23 seeking new dollars from us.

24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So if they're

1 asking for 150,000 and between the two of
2 them they've got 165,000 in their reserves --

3 MR. ZIEMBA: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: -- why do they
5 need an extra 150? I don't get that.

6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: They
7 wouldn't. We would just ask them to use
8 that.

9 MR. ZIEMBA: We would just use what
10 they currently have.

11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So this is a
12 reserve though, not a transportation planning
13 grant?

14 MR. ZIEMBA: No. It is a
15 transportation planning grant that --

16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That takes
17 the reserve into account.

18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. So it's
19 not taking any of the transportation planning
20 grant money, they're just using their reserve
21 first?

22 MR. ZIEMBA: No, they wouldn't. We
23 would give them \$50,000 in transportation
24 planning grant dollars.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. So this is
2 \$50,000 planning grant --

3 MR. ZIEMBA: No. Technically, it's
4 \$150,000 transportation planning grant, but
5 we take the reserve dollars and apply them
6 towards any new funding. If you want to
7 state it your way as well, it's almost six
8 one of one, half dozen of the other.

9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So of the --
10 they've had for 150, I guess.

11 MR. ZIEMBA: Correct.

12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And so we're
13 saying you can have 150, 50 will come from
14 transportation planning grant funds, the
15 other 100 you've got to come up with
16 yourselves out of your reserves?

17 MR. ZIEMBA: Out of your reserves.

18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.

19 MR. ZIEMBA: Because as you know,
20 all reserve applications have to be approved
21 by the Commission as well.

22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's why I
23 thought -- that's what I meant. This was a
24 reserve approval in effect.

1 MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah. No. But it is
2 a --

3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's both a
4 reserve --

5 MR. ZIEMBA: It is a planning grant
6 application.

7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. Okay.

8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Or another
9 way to put it, I think you put it at the
10 beginning, 50,000 of new money.

11 MR. ZIEMBA: Yes.

12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And the
13 expectation is 100,000 --

14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- comes
16 from --

17 MR. ZIEMBA: Old money.

18 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- old money.

19 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: From your
20 reserves, right.

21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Reserves. My
22 assumption --

23 MR. ZIEMBA: It's still kind of new
24 money because they still require you guys to

1 sign off on anything anyway.

2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. I think
4 we've got this one. Anybody else? Do I have
5 a motion? Make it explicit.

6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Sure. I'll
7 make sure --

8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Cover all bases.

9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I move that
10 the Commission approve the request, the joint
11 request, from Revere and Saugus in the amount
12 of \$150,000 from the transportation planning
13 grant for their planning efforts, with the
14 understanding that \$100,000 would be first
15 expended from the previously approved reserve
16 to be divided as they see fit.

17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Was it previously
18 approved, the reserve?

19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes, the
20 reserves were approved.

21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?

22 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
24 discussion? All in favor? Aye.

1 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

2 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.

3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

4 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The
6 ayes have it unanimously.

7 Somerville.

8 MR. ZIEMBA: Somerville. The
9 review team recommends a grant to provide
10 funds to initiate a formal planning study of
11 the intersection of I-93, Route 28 Fellsway,
12 McGrath Highway, and State Route 38 Mystic
13 Avenue, which already experiences one of the
14 highest crashing rates in the state and may
15 be impacted by casino-related traffic. A
16 consultant team will be engaged to conduct
17 public engagement alternatives analysis and
18 concept design.

19 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Again, how does
20 this differ from the project, the study
21 that's now going on? If we -- The Mystic
22 Valley study group, Sullivan Square study
23 group, is going to eventually come up with a
24 recommendation. Somebody's going to

1 eventually decide what to do for the
2 long-term fix, not the near-term fix and that
3 long-term fix will have a whole bunch of
4 planning money to get ready for it. How does
5 this relate to that?

6 MR. ZIEMBA: Well, not necessarily.
7 There are, I believe, 12 different
8 alternatives that are being put forward.

9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

10 MR. ZIEMBA: And some of the
11 alternatives are major improvements, such as
12 onramp onto 93 rather than very specific
13 intersection improvements, and so this is a
14 very specific intersection improvement.

15 One thing just to go back to a
16 little bit of history. When Somerville was
17 engaged in arbitration with Wynn, there was a
18 number of different intersections they were
19 concerned about. There was also, you know,
20 come contentious times between Wynn and
21 Somerville related to nine intersections. We
22 asked the City why this was one of such
23 importance. They indicated, well, they have
24 the potential of getting state funding for

1 this one. It is such a major generator of
2 traffic. There's significant congestion in
3 that area. And if, indeed, as we stated when
4 we first created this transportation planning
5 grants, if we're wrong about some of these
6 projections, these could have impacts in
7 other communities. And notably, Somerville
8 believes if the trip distribution models or
9 the trip generation models are wrong, that
10 could have a very significant impact upon
11 Somerville.

12 So what we're trying to do is we're
13 trying to study and design things so that if,
14 indeed, we move forward with the actual
15 construction projects that we would be at the
16 ready now that things are designed.

17 This is not the actual construction
18 of it. It provides the planning study that
19 would enable a further look on those
20 construction dollars.

21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Wasn't there
22 an air quality baseline that the City wanted
23 to look into? Is that part of this?

24 MR. ZIEMBA: That's part of the

1 reserve.

2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: We're going
3 to get to that later?

4 MR. ZIEMBA: Sure.

5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Then what did
6 we fund for Somerville last year?

7 MR. ZIEMBA: We didn't.

8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But they had
9 a request in to us for --

10 MR. ZIEMBA: No. They were
11 actively engaged in litigation with us, and
12 they submitted no application. That
13 litigation, that MEPA litigation, has since
14 been resolved. And you know, part of our
15 recommendation is we think this is a fair and
16 appropriate use of mitigation funds to deal
17 with the potential significant
18 traffic-related issue that may be experienced
19 within about a mile from the Wynn facility.
20 And if anybody is wrong regarding some of the
21 projections, we're very much concerned about
22 what would happen to the surrounding areas,
23 including Somerville.

24 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: During this,

1 this must have been a point of contention
2 during the MEPA process. Was this one
3 intersection that the City wanted that the
4 MEPA process did not pass?

5 MR. ZIEMBA: That's exactly right.
6 The City did, on a number of different times,
7 raise issues related to intersections. This
8 was not one of the ones that was considered
9 for mitigation. There was some language
10 included in the Section 61 findings that
11 mitigation cannot be expected of this
12 licensee, for lack of a better word. I'm
13 sort of paraphrasing. But this particular
14 intersection had been a longstanding,
15 difficult intersection. As I mentioned, it
16 was one of the highest traffic crash areas in
17 the state, and in the end of the day,
18 mitigation was not required for this
19 particular intersection.

20 But that's where we're going
21 between -- the difference between what
22 mitigation is required under MEPA, what was
23 required under our surrounding community
24 agreement, and what --

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: For
2 arbitration.

3 MR. ZIEMBA: -- they're trying to
4 do for planning. In the surrounding
5 community agreement between Wynn and
6 Somerville, this intersection was referenced
7 in that Wynn committed to do whatever
8 improvements would be required under MEPA,
9 but eventually when it went throughout the
10 entire MEPA process, improvements were not
11 required at this intersection. But it was
12 the subject of a surrounding community
13 agreement.

14 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Well, one
15 of the reasons that I am strongly in favor of
16 this application and concur with the review
17 team's recommendation in that regard is that
18 I've traveled personally through this
19 intersection several times on ways -- on my
20 way to meetings out at the site of the Wynn
21 casino, and it's a nightmare intersection of
22 routes. What is it, 28, the Fellsway, and
23 McGrath Highway, the State Route 38, which is
24 Mystic Avenue in Somerville, and I-93 kind of

1 going over on top. Even now, it's very
2 congested. I'm not surprised at all it's one
3 of the highest accident-prone intersections
4 and that there really is very strong
5 rationale in my view for these funds as
6 requested.

7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So if that's a
8 rationale for doing it -- if that's a
9 rationale for doing it based on today's
10 existence which, I agree, are terrible, but
11 neither MEPA nor the surrounding community
12 negotiations found this serious enough to do
13 anything about as additional factor. Not
14 that it's not a problem. It clearly is a
15 problem. But whether or not the problem
16 that's being fixed is caused by Wynn is the
17 question. It's sort of the same one we just
18 got through talking about. You know, I think
19 it's, by definition, marginal. If it weren't
20 marginal, MEPA would have picked it up or the
21 surrounding community discussion would have
22 said, hey, this is crucial and that didn't
23 happen.

24 So we are adding another, you know,

1 circle of modestly impacted or potentially
2 impacted areas in our actions here. So you
3 know -- you know, I guess I think it's
4 logical that if it's a terrible site now,
5 it's going to be a little bit worse when Wynn
6 starts because Wynn's going to generate more
7 traffic, even though it wasn't considered a
8 major problem, incremental problem.

9 But from a planning standpoint,
10 John, you know more about this than I do. I
11 have this sense that there's planning here,
12 planning there, planning everywhere. You
13 know, who the hell's in charge of all of this
14 and which plan is to going to interface with
15 which plan. But if you tell me from a
16 planning standpoint this is compatible with
17 all the bigger picture and so forth, at least
18 from that standpoint, I'm cool with it.

19 MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah. And as you
20 know, we seek the input of MassDOT on each
21 one of these, and they recommended this
22 should be considered for funding. They just
23 recently did another road safety audit for
24 this intersection. They've taken another

1 couple of looks between 2016 and 2017. They
2 recommend that this be considered for the
3 grant.

4 Just sort of as a personal aside,
5 when we were thinking or when I was thinking
6 about trying to utilize transportation
7 planning grants for things that may happen
8 but aren't necessarily projected at this
9 current moment, this is one of the ones that
10 I was thinking of. Because if, indeed,
11 everyone is wrong regarding the improvements
12 that will occur in Sullivan Square, the
13 argument that Somerville in front of the
14 arbitrators is that this could have a very --
15 the Wynn facility could have a big
16 deleterious impact on Somerville-related
17 traffic, both cut-throughs and off of 93,
18 some of these major intersections.

19 The projections, the way they work
20 out now, if the improvements work out as
21 projected, and we anticipate they will, you
22 know, hopefully there wouldn't be such
23 impacts, but in order -- especially something
24 of this magnitude does require very

1 substantial time and effort and resources to
2 try to figure out what would be necessary.

3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I just want
4 to make sure I have a vision in my mind of
5 which one this is. If you're traveling
6 northbound on 93 and you skip the Sullivan
7 Square exit --

8 MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah.

9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- and
10 instead won't to get to Route 16 --

11 MR. ZIEMBA: Yes.

12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- this would
13 be the exit you would take off of 93?

14 MR. ZIEMBA: Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Where there's
16 a convergence under 93 --

17 MR. ZIEMBA: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: -- of Route 38
19 and --

20 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: 28.

21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- 28.

22 MR. ZIEMBA: That's right.

23 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 28 coming
24 from Somerville and Route 38 in --

1 MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah. So if you were
2 annoyed at any sort of issues related to --

3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right.

4 MR. ZIEMBA: -- Sullivan Square you
5 might just skip it --

6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Just skip it.

7 MR. ZIEMBA: -- and continue north,
8 eventually find your way to Revere Beach
9 Parkway and come in from the north down to
10 93, 99.

11 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes.

12 MR. BEDROSIAN: It takes you right
13 by Legacy Place there -- Not Legacy Place.

14 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Assembly.

15 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Assembly
16 Row.

17 MR. BEDROSIAN: Assembly Row, thank
18 you. Yes.

19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: John, the
21 --

22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It is one of
23 the most confusing intersections I've ever
24 seen.

1 MR. ZIEMBA: It is, yeah.

2 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: John, the
3 MassDOT recommendation also talks or asks
4 about whether this intersection is not
5 already part of mitigation associated with
6 proposed by Middlesex Avenue project in
7 Somerville. I'm not sure what that refers
8 to.

9 MR. ZIEMBA: So we asked the City
10 of Somerville please confirm that the
11 intersection is not already part of the
12 mitigation associated with the proposed 5
13 Middlesex Ave. project in Somerville, and
14 Somerville's answer says, "This intersection
15 is not currently part of any mitigation
16 associated with the proposed 5 Middlesex
17 Avenue project."

18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. Do we
19 have a motion?

20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Sure. I can
21 move that the Commission approve the
22 Somerville transportation planning request in
23 the amount of \$150,000 for activities related
24 to the interstate 93, State Route 28, and

1 State Route 38 intersection as described here
2 in the packet.

3 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second.

4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
5 discussion? All in favor?

6 Aye.

7 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

8 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.

9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

10 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The
12 ayes have it unanimously.

13 Go ahead, John. And I'm going to
14 take a break.

15 MR. ZIEMBA: Great. The next one
16 is West Springfield transportation planning
17 grant. This grant would provide funding for
18 engineering design services for the
19 improvements to the on street Route 20
20 corridor from Westfield Street to Park Street
21 to enable the town of better accommodate
22 casino-related traffic as to begin to improve
23 pedestrian, bicycle, and public transit
24 access and safety.

1 Route 20 is a significant
2 contributor to project-related traffic. It's
3 estimated approximately about five percent of
4 traffic will go through that corridor. We
5 thought this was a good grant for a number of
6 different reasons, one because of the
7 pedestrian and bicycle safety issues. The
8 review team went out to the area, took a look
9 at what improvements would be necessary. We
10 do note that there is some significant
11 pedestrian safety issues just within a very
12 near circumference of this area, and very
13 unfortunately, they had a recent fatality in
14 the nearby area.

15 In addition to the safety aspects
16 along that stretch, this also could provide
17 further important other mode connections to
18 the facility through improved bicycle
19 connections which could go along the pathway
20 along the river all the way down to MGM
21 Springfield.

22 I want to commend the West
23 Springfield team. After we met with them, we
24 didn't express that we knew about that

1 existing pathway. I worked just about
2 400 feet away from there for a good number of
3 years but never noticed it, but maybe I
4 didn't bike very much in those days. But
5 they indicated that that's an important
6 corridor, and after we met them, they had
7 someone get on a bicycle -- I keep on saying
8 bicycle. Bicycle -- bicycle and travel along
9 that route. They estimated that it's about
10 14 minutes from West Springfield in that
11 location all the way to in facility directly
12 all the way down that pathway.

13 So this would be a good effort to
14 improve other transit connection to the MGM
15 Springfield site. I know we focused a lot on
16 other transit connections to the MGM
17 Springfield site. I know we focused a lot on
18 other transit in the Eastern Mass. site, but
19 this would be an improvement in Western Mass.
20 as well.

21 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I'm sorry,
22 did you say that you rode the route and it
23 took you 14 minutes?

24 MR. ZIEMBA: I certainly I did not,

1 but --

2 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Someone else
3 did?

4 MR. ZIEMBA: Someone else did --

5 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I see.

6 MR. ZIEMBA: -- before West
7 Springfield after we asked questions --

8 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I see.

9 MR. ZIEMBA: -- to show how easy of
10 a connection it would be.

11 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I see.

12 MR. ZIEMBA: And someone walked
13 44 minutes, I believe.

14 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: They walked
15 it in 44 minutes?

16 MR. ZIEMBA: They sent someone to
17 walk that route as well.

18 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: This one
19 seems clear to me. It's a really good idea
20 to include other modes of transportation, and
21 they demonstrated the need for it and the
22 connection.

23 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I can say
24 this was an application when I first read it

1 that I was skeptical about because of it
2 just -- I didn't get the connection, the
3 tangible or plausible connection, to the
4 casino traffic, but as John indicated, we did
5 a -- the review team, you know, was out in
6 Springfield in West Springfield, and we went
7 over to this Elm Street. And just while we
8 were standing there, we were able to observe
9 the volume of traffic coming on, I think
10 it's, Route 20 from the west, which would be
11 a major feeder for it, and the intersection
12 with Elm Street there was much more
13 problematic than I had thought beforehand.
14 And then in the source of our getting in and
15 out of the car and driving over to
16 Springfield, it was very clear to me that
17 there really is a proximate connection
18 between this particular part of West
19 Springfield and anticipated traffic in
20 connection with the casino.

21 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yeah. I
22 would echo that when I first read it as well.
23 You know, West Springfield, to their credit,
24 has done a lot of work on the Park Street

1 area corrections and connections to Route 20
2 which heads over to Westfield, which I think
3 you're right, is probably going to be a
4 direct route from anybody coming from
5 Westfield looking to visit MGM. But I didn't
6 quite understand how this -- and this section
7 has always been a problem, but with all the
8 other construction they were having going on
9 there, my first thought was they're chasing
10 an available pot of money. But, you know,
11 after hearing your report, in our
12 conversations previously about how they did
13 that timing out and that this could be, you
14 know, a convenient part of the access point
15 for people to get from West Springfield over
16 to the casino, in addition to all the
17 vehicular traffic that comes through that
18 pretty busy part of their commercial
19 district, I'm convinced that this is a sound
20 use for the money and happy to see West
21 Springfield stepping up to say we'll pick up
22 whatever the balance is of the consultant
23 costs that went in.

24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do I have a

1 motion?

2 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I'll move
3 that we approve the application of West
4 Springfield for a transportation planning
5 grant in the amount of \$150,000 as explained
6 in the report of the review team.

7 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
9 discussion? All in favor? Aye.

10 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

11 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.

12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

13 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The
15 ayes have it unanimously.

16 MR. ZIEMBA: Okay. That's it for
17 transportation planning. We previously have
18 already looked at the Boston reserve and the
19 Plainville reserve, so there remains the
20 Somerville reserve.

21 Commissioner Zuniga, you referenced
22 this application just a couple of minutes
23 ago. So this use of Somerville's \$100,000
24 reserve would provide funding for baseline

1 data collection for two areas that may be
2 impacted by casino-related traffic near
3 highway air pollution and vehicular traffic
4 patterns.

5 The City can use such data when
6 preparing such pollution and traffic patterns
7 once the casino is operational. The City is
8 has been on the forefront on air pollution
9 issues involving adjacent highways for quite
10 some time, but some of their existing studies
11 are a little bit out of date, and what
12 they're trying to do is establish a baseline.

13 But establishing these baselines,
14 they are consistent with other grants that we
15 have given in the past in regard to West
16 Springfield to help establish these baselines
17 that would enable the community to really
18 understand what impacts the facilities are
19 having.

20 One question that may come up is
21 that, okay, well, you're establishing this
22 baseline. You do the studies. Does that
23 necessarily mean that you would ask for money
24 in the future to compare what's happening in

1 the future once Wynn is operational to your
2 current baseline statistics, and I think the
3 answer, to be honest, is quite possibly yes.

4 There is other sources of funding
5 that the City can pursue in addition this
6 their own funding. They can pursue
7 foundation funding. They can pursue state
8 transportation dollars. I guess there is
9 even a potential that a part of the reviews
10 under our Section 61 findings could
11 potentially include this intersection, even
12 though that is not contemplated at the
13 current moment, but if they petitioned
14 MassDOT or others as part of their review of
15 future studies, that is within the
16 possibilities, but, indeed, short at some
17 point in the future we may have another
18 request if, indeed, we still have
19 transportation planning dollars to do an
20 assessment of what the future conditions are
21 and how they relate to the baseline.

22 Now, one other question you may
23 have is that, okay, how do you differentiate
24 between Wynn-related traffic and all of the

1 other growth that's in the area, and I think
2 that's actually part of the dynamic of the
3 future study that we would have to find a way
4 to take a look at the percentage of traffic
5 that's being generated by the Wynn facility
6 in comparison to Assembly Row and a lot of
7 the other significant projects that are
8 ongoing in Somerville on who is the actual
9 generator of issues.

10 But I believe that this use of
11 reserve is entirely consistent with previous
12 uses, and it does establish some baseline
13 conditions under which you can figure out,
14 try to figure out what your impacts would be
15 in the future, very similar to what we've
16 been doing with all of our baseline studies
17 on problem gaming and a number of different
18 issues.

19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, I'm
20 worried that establishing the baseline for
21 air quality is going to be -- unlike problem
22 gaming, is going to be very hard to parse out
23 and attribute. There's a lot of factors that
24 are going to play in, including, you know,

1 wind and things like that.

2 In the end, a baseline now and a
3 comparison later is going to be important for
4 the City. The question still is going to
5 remain at a future date how much of it could
6 be attributable to the casino, and at that
7 time why does that even matter anymore?
8 Because you simply have whatever discretion
9 you have in terms of air quality, and you
10 know, and then what's next is really unclear
11 to me. Comparison to other baselines that
12 are very important, in my mind, and because
13 there's ways to get to the nexus to control
14 for other variables.

15 Again, in the question of air
16 pollution, I think there's just so many
17 factors. I'm not an expert in environmental
18 engineering. But I'm highly skeptical with
19 the notion of what that future may look like.

20 Today it may be very relevant to
21 study and pull in a baseline. That may be
22 useful at a later time. It's the lookback
23 that I find very hard to fathom.

24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's the what?

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The lookback.
2 You know, once you -- once the City or we
3 arrive at a future date to another study and
4 decide that, you know, the parts per million
5 in the air are significantly higher, whatever
6 that is, finding an attribution is going to
7 be very difficult in my opinion. But I know
8 it is a priority for the City. And they talk
9 a lot about environmental justice, which has
10 a whole bunch of history and background in
11 it. I just -- this is the general theme that
12 I've been bringing up now. How does this
13 open expectations out there in terms of
14 funding requests in the future?

15 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: That is an
16 interesting thought because it would be so
17 much building that will continue to happen in
18 that region. You know, expansions and other
19 building, how will they determine who's
20 responsible for what?

21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah.

22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, I'm sure
23 that --

24 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: But isn't

1 that an issue for another day?

2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. And
3 that's precisely my point. My point is that,
4 you know, they're -- we don't know what that
5 may look like. We're not experts in that.
6 The question will very much be one of
7 attribution, and at that point, is that even
8 going to matter? Because what is anybody
9 realistically going to be able to do if it's
10 not already the fact that there's a lot of
11 cars and a lot of other activity, prevailing
12 winds, the summer, the winter.

13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Are you just
14 observing this for future reference, or are
15 you saying --

16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No.

17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: -- therefore we
18 shouldn't do this?

19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, I'm on
20 the camp of therefore you shouldn't do this.

21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. Okay.

22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You know, I'm
23 expressing my skepticism again relative to of
24 how much expectations we begin to create on

1 this. I'm ambivalent to some degree because
2 I know this is very much a priority for the
3 City, and the general notion of we're only
4 doing planning activities and establishing
5 baselines are good for that very purpose in
6 and of itself. This is a different planning
7 activity in my view when it comes to air
8 pollution because there's likely going to be
9 many other factors.

10 And you know, I can tell you being
11 from Mexico City, the biggest factor in air
12 pollution and the winter, the inversion, the
13 high pressure that descends on the valley
14 that -- and it's the same number of cars.

15 So I'm not joking that just the
16 wind and the atmospheric pressure could be a
17 big factor or it could already be a factor in
18 this.

19 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Would it --
20 You know, going through the material, I was
21 surprised to learn that there is a Tufts
22 mobile air pollution laboratory. But to
23 answer your question, would it be interesting
24 to get more details from the lab as to how

1 they do those types of studies? I'm assuming
2 they've done them elsewhere. I don't know.

3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I think it's
4 very straightforward to test the pollution in
5 the air. My point is it's going to be very
6 difficult to assign it to the casino or not,
7 if this is a purpose that they're doing.

8 I think there's a larger purpose,
9 which is let's study it now and let's see
10 what is at a future date they just happen to
11 be available moneys here and see what else we
12 could do relative to, you know, bringing some
13 better air quality to the overall City and so
14 on.

15 I think it's just going to be --

16 MR. ZIEMBA: I mean, I think this
17 should actually be put in the context of what
18 Somerville has been trying to do throughout
19 both this process is for many years before
20 this process is they're really trying to
21 understand the impacts on their citizens from
22 vehicles traveling up and down 93 and other
23 nearby areas. And we're not -- Again, going
24 back to the previous discussion, by us

1 agreeing to establish a baseline, it gives
2 them an opportunity to even do a comparison
3 to future trends which would give them one
4 data point in order to then compete for any
5 state or federal funding that is needed at
6 the time or to make a case before us or
7 others that may find other further
8 refinements in Wynn's traffic plan.

9 So unless you allow them to get to
10 the base level, it becomes very difficult for
11 them to understand the impacts to their
12 citizens and then make a reasonable case to
13 us or other decision makers about what might
14 be necessary to try to remedy an impact that
15 they believe is being experienced by their
16 citizens with this close proximity to 93.

17 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: When I
18 first read this application, I kind of smiled
19 to myself somewhat cynically suspecting that
20 what this really is a request for funding of
21 a project to develop facts on which to base
22 later claims, either against, you know, Wynn
23 or claims for further support in the nature
24 of mitigation from us. But the more that I

1 thought about it, I was convinced that, you
2 know, what's wrong with that? This is the
3 planning -- it's an application for a
4 planning grant. It's an application for
5 funds in order to be able to create a
6 baseline, an objective baseline, which later
7 positions taken by the City would be -- could
8 be based upon.

9 You know, Commissioner Zuniga, your
10 point, I'm certainly no expert in all of
11 this, but I find very plausible your point
12 that at the end of the day, whatever the data
13 is on air pollution, it's going to be very
14 difficult to sort out what was caused by the
15 increased traffic going to the Wynn casino as
16 opposed to what we all know to be the
17 tremendous development that's been going on
18 in Somerville in and around Assembly Square
19 in particular. But as I, you know, commented
20 a couple of minutes ago, that's a battle
21 that -- or that's an issue that would be
22 confronted later, and it would be confronted
23 on the basis of data that presumably would be
24 generated by an objective process.

1 So the way that I came down on this
2 is that this is a reasonable -- it is focused
3 on the potential impact of the casino, but
4 that, you know, and it seeks to get support
5 for funding an objective and scientifically
6 based dataset for a resolution of future
7 issues.

8 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And Wynn is
9 supportive, and they say that data could be
10 used in future mitigation improvements.

11 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You know,
12 maybe I'm a little cynical on the support
13 from licensees because this is money that's,
14 you know, that's already been expended.
15 Anything that they can do to be better
16 neighbors, you know, they'll likely be in
17 support. I think it's our role to try to be
18 thinking about, you know, how wide we're
19 going to be casting nets for these mitigation
20 dollars and that's been my point all
21 throughout.

22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, as you
23 know, I share some of that concern, but I
24 think for my money, we're sort of past that

1 threshold. We've discussed it. We're on the
2 record that there are no binding precedents
3 being set here. We are, by intent, being
4 fairly loose with our definitions here in
5 order to try to give everybody the benefit of
6 the doubt.

7 I had the same -- you know, I wrote
8 down should we be checking the methodology
9 here? I had some of the same suspicions and
10 concerns, particularly given the adversarial
11 relationship that's preexisted here.

12 Having said all that, it seems a
13 perfectly reasonable thing to me to build a
14 baseline. If we have to fight a fight about
15 causality, we'll do that when the time is
16 nigh.

17 Anything else? Do I have a motion?

18 COMMISSIONER CAMERON:

19 Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the
20 request by Somerville for the use of \$100,000
21 reserve fund for the purpose of
22 transportation, pollution, and air, water
23 quality data as outlined in the report.

24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?

1 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further

3 discussion? All in favor?

4 Aye.

5 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

6 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.

7 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed?

9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No.

10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The motion passes

11 four to one with Commissioner Zuniga

12 dissenting.

13 Okay. We're on to tribal.

14 MR. ZIEMBA: We're on to tribal.

15 So I want to just be very specific about how

16 I convey this recommendation about what it is

17 and what it is not. What we are recommending

18 is that the Commission reserve \$200,000 for

19 potential technical assistance program

20 relative to a potential travel facility down

21 in the region to be conducted by Southeastern

22 Regional Planning and Economical Development

23 District, that we do that reserve, but as you

24 know pursuant to our guidelines, we've stated

1 that such funding for technical assistance
2 will only be made available after approval of
3 any application by SRPEDD or comparable
4 regional entity if it is determined by the
5 Commission that construction of such gaming
6 facility will likely commence prior to or
7 during fiscal year 2018.

8 So what this is, this isn't a grant
9 of dollars to SRPEDD. First, what would need
10 to occur is the Commission would have to
11 reconvene, it would have to make a
12 determination that it believes that
13 construction will commence during this fiscal
14 year, and at the time, what the review team
15 recommends is that we go over in detail what
16 the actual plan of technical assistance would
17 be by SRPEDD for those communities before you
18 make that approval. But we do believe that
19 we should make that reserve of 200,000
20 available for this fiscal year.

21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And please
22 say again what was that proviso. If who
23 believes that the construction would start?

24 MR. ZIEMBA: The Commission.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The
2 Commission.

3 MR. ZIEMBA: You would need to make
4 a vote that you believe --

5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay.

6 MR. ZIEMBA: -- that construction
7 and will commence.

8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. So a
9 proactive vote will just -- today will
10 only --

11 MR. ZIEMBA: A vote today will
12 create a reserve --

13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: A reserve.

14 MR. ZIEMBA: -- which will require
15 a future vote and full review of whatever
16 technical assistance program we work with
17 SRPEDD about.

18 MR. BEDROSIAN: And John, is there
19 a trigger at some point that would unencumber
20 that money if for some reason the tribal
21 casino does not happen?

22 MR. ZIEMBA: We didn't include
23 anything in here, but these were anticipated
24 to be fiscal year '18 grants. So --

1 MR. BEDROSIAN: So by the end of
2 FYI18, it might be revisited?

3 MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah. So potentially
4 what would need to occur is that if folk
5 wanted to do this again for next year if
6 nothing occurs, that could be potentially an
7 application in the FY19 mitigation grants,
8 but that would be based on whatever the
9 Commission makes a determination to include
10 in the 2018 guidelines.

11 MR. BEDROSIAN: Okay. Thank you.

12 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: And just
13 to note the obvious, that that condition has
14 become even more important because of the
15 recent development yesterday in which the
16 tribe withdrew its revised application for
17 the land in trust decision from the
18 Department of Interior and that while they're
19 pursuing their appeal in the First Circuit of
20 Judge Young's decision last summer
21 invalidating the land in trust decision based
22 on so-called second category of the
23 definition of Indians, that that appeal, in
24 my view, the merits of that appeal are very

1 uncertain, and so that it's essential that
2 the condition that John has described here is
3 essential, in my view, but also meets the
4 policy objective of having these funds
5 available if, in fact, the tribe does
6 prevail.

7 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I see no
8 harm in reserving this money. It sends the
9 signal that we do intend to, you know, pay
10 attention to the issues in the region if, in
11 fact, it does occur, the land in trust and
12 the construction.

13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
14 discussion? Do I have a motion?

15 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Yeah.
16 I'll move. I'll move that the Commission
17 approve the application of the Southeastern
18 Regional Planning and Economic Development
19 District for a planning grant subject to the
20 conditions that Ombudsman Ziemba has
21 articulated.

22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?

23 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second.

24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further

1 discussion? All in favor?

2 Aye.

3 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

4 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.

5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

6 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The
8 ayes have it unanimously.

9 All right. Workforce development.

10 Do we want to take a quick break anybody
11 before we do that?

12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Sure.

13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Sure. Okay.

14 Take a quick break.

15 (Break taken.)

16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are
17 reconvening our Public Meeting Number 221,
18 and we're back to Ombudsman Ziemba.

19 MR. ZIEMBA: Thank you, Mr.
20 Chairman, Commissioners. We are now on the
21 workforce development pilot program
22 recommendations. A couple of weeks ago we
23 recommended that the Region A pilot program
24 for the MetroNorth Regional Employment Board

1 be fully funded at its \$200,000 requested
2 amount. And then in regard to Region B, we
3 recommended that the Commission consider
4 funding both the Springfield Public Schools
5 application and the application by
6 Springfield Technical Community College. We
7 recommended full funding of the STCC
8 application of \$200,000, and we recommended
9 partial funding of \$171,833.03 for the
10 Springfield Public Schools recommendation.

11 There is, you know, one issue that
12 was discussed briefly at one of the prior
13 meetings, and I think I referenced a sentence
14 that I said at the time that I couldn't find,
15 but I was referencing it anyway. I've since
16 looked back, and I still can't find that
17 sentence. So somehow it disappeared into the
18 ether, but the sentence I'm describing was in
19 relation to the Region B applications, and
20 what we were recommending as a review team
21 that when we provide the grant, we have a
22 certification that all of the funding is
23 meant to be new funding from both of these
24 projects.

1 Upon review of the applications, we
2 believe it was the -- we believe that these
3 projects were meant to be new projects, that
4 they wouldn't otherwise occur, but I think
5 that the question is how do we know that
6 these projects wouldn't go on anyway if we
7 weren't to provide the assistance? And so we
8 did recommend that we require all of the
9 applicants to certify that these are new
10 funds that would not otherwise have occurred
11 outside of this grant.

12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Is that
13 requirement that you're suggesting for all
14 communities or just the workforce
15 development?

16 MR. ZIEMBA: No. For the workforce
17 development applications. And specifically,
18 when we look a look at there is some
19 questions regarding specifically the
20 Springfield Public Schools application, and I
21 think in their application, they were
22 referencing that they could be reimbursed for
23 some of their dollars. The question was in
24 relation to a fiscal control section of our

1 application where we said what sort of
2 controls do you have and how would the money
3 flow, and the City made reference to the fact
4 that they could put the money up front and
5 that we would then reimburse them for those
6 dollars out of their existing resources. But
7 that inevitably leads to a question of, okay,
8 if they had the ability to provide the
9 upfront dollars, could they have otherwise
10 provided for these programs?

11 I believe based on everything we
12 heard in our interviews and with the
13 application review is that they anticipate
14 these are new dollars or new projects that
15 wouldn't necessarily occur without us. But
16 you know, we thought it would be at least
17 important to have that further certification.

18 I don't know if that really gets
19 you everywhere, but it's certainly important
20 not to tell a falsehood to us, and hopefully
21 that goes a long way.

22 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Now, John,
23 to pick up on that question. I don't think
24 it disappeared too far into the ether because

1 I remember you talking about it. Where it's
2 been captured may not be known. But I
3 guess -- and I think it would still warrant
4 some further conversation with Springfield
5 Public Schools if we do, in fact, choose to
6 award in this money, is that, you know, I
7 read their initial application.

8 We asked for clarification on
9 whether this was a reimbursement, and I think
10 that led you to the suggestion on making this
11 programmatic money new. But thinking that,
12 you know, there is considerable need for this
13 type of program in the Springfield area,
14 understanding a limited availability of
15 outside resources or other pretty much
16 otherwise we wouldn't have placed this as a
17 potential mitigation fund resource is having
18 a conversation to see if, in fact, you know,
19 there is funds that the City of Springfield,
20 there's Springfield Public Schools may need
21 the add to their existing program that may
22 allow us to expand the capacity of more
23 students in seats, to, you know, again try to
24 address the greater problem here.

1 So again, having -- it's still
2 somewhat unclear to me, but I think you're
3 provision is strong, but as we move ahead to
4 looking at actually writing an official
5 contract, it may make sense to have both of
6 the Springfield parties come in, because I
7 think even though they've also talked about
8 their willingness to work together, kind of
9 getting some ideas on how that might be
10 possible I think would also be to our
11 advantage.

12 MR. ZIEMBA: Also on this
13 application, we noted that in the future,
14 once the MGM Springfield is operational,
15 there'll be significant new dollars that are
16 afforded to potential workforce development
17 programs out of the host community agreement.
18 They have \$2.5 million in annual funding for
19 community development grants, which purpose
20 of the grant is recognizing that workforce
21 development requires a healthy and educated
22 workforce. And so a part of what we were
23 hoping to achieve would be that we work with
24 the City of Springfield to determine what

1 workforce development resources will be
2 available not only over the short term over
3 the next year, but over the long term. And
4 I'm not sure if we've ever had that type of a
5 robust discussion about how we jointly work
6 together to see what resources would be
7 necessary for workforce development.

8 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Right.
9 Good conversation worth having.

10 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think we
11 had a robust discussion about all three of
12 these applications, and I believe they each
13 demonstrated that they met the criteria. I
14 think the two Springfield, I clearly remember
15 the conversation about less skilled employees
16 at one program, the other a little higher
17 skilled, higher educated. So certainly a
18 need for both filled kind of a different
19 role, each program.

20 You know, I think all three
21 applications have significant merit, and I,
22 for one, certainly would agree to fund in the
23 amounts requested all three of these.

24 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I would

1 second that. One of the things that our
2 licensing team raised with me about the
3 MetroNorth program, because that starts to
4 speak specifically to casino careers is that
5 careers, is that there's -- and this is going
6 a little granular and more contract language,
7 but there's some requirement that they
8 share -- and I was extend this to the other
9 two as well -- share information with us
10 about what they're promoting for the program
11 so that it's consistent with the longstanding
12 issue we're having about qualifications for
13 gaming service employees and the other key
14 positions. Again, making sure that
15 inaccurate information is not going out the
16 door.

17 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. I
18 express my support for this the last time we
19 spoke. You know, this is really a prior to
20 for Region B, as we heard when we went to the
21 local -- when I went to the local community
22 mitigation advisory groups. There's a real
23 opportunity cost element to this. There's a
24 window closing in the big ramp up to the

1 casino. And there's activity that endures
2 afterwards, and I think this is clearly
3 related to the casino, whereas perhaps in
4 other areas we haven't seen a big nexus, or I
5 haven't. I think this is a worthy cause.

6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah, I agree.
7 And the only issue, and I think it's water
8 over the dam at this point, is what we were
9 talking -- is there any reference in the
10 statute to workforce development for this
11 fund?

12 MR. ZIEMBA: No. But there's
13 reference to -- I knew you were going to ask
14 that question. There is reference to
15 business impacts and other impacts that
16 should be considered by the Commission, and
17 this is a part and parcel of business
18 impacts, not only what we're concerned about
19 is the ability of folks to compete for these
20 MGM or Wynn related jobs, but the impacts on
21 general business community because they're
22 going to be displacing a number of different
23 workers.

24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. I'm

1 thinking of the bright line that you were
2 trying to articulate yesterday between the
3 Community Mitigation Fund and Public Health
4 Trust Fund.

5 MR. ZIEMBA: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: As this moves
7 from hard things like highways and bridges
8 and stuff into softer things.

9 MR. ZIEMBA: One of the other
10 delineated purposes under the Community
11 Mitigation Fund is education, and
12 specifically, we're taking a look at
13 educational resources. So unlike some of the
14 other sources that might be a little bit more
15 public health related, related to programs
16 and services that would be necessary to
17 address problem gaming related purposes, I
18 think these purposes are very specifically
19 allowable under the Community Mitigation Fund
20 grants.

21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And there's
22 also, as you mentioned before, there's a real
23 funding that comes for the steady state as
24 part of the host community agreement. But

1 again, there's a period for which there's a
2 vacuum of sorts. I mean, MGM is doing
3 something also specific, but, you know, this
4 is an important phase for us to think about
5 for that big ramp up.

6 MR. ZIEMBA: One further
7 recommendation that I had was so I referenced
8 potentially we would add conditions that are
9 consistent with what we've been talking
10 about. But specifically on the Springfield
11 Public Schools and the STCC applications, I
12 think what is really necessary is that
13 shortly right after today we get a meeting
14 together or call together between the STCC
15 team and the Springfield Public Schools team
16 to try to determine how they're going to
17 dovetail with each other and -- to
18 Commissioner Stebbins' point. And then we
19 also really need to have that longer term
20 conversation of how are things going to work
21 with the City of Springfield, us, the
22 licensee, and hitting this issue of workforce
23 development, not only for this next year, but
24 also over the long term. And then if

1 Commissioner Stebbins would join us in that,
2 I think that would be tremendous.

3 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Well, that
4 was the suggestion I was trying to make, but
5 you put it a lot more eloquently than I did
6 or a lot more directly, let me put it that
7 way.

8 No. And just to reflect, because
9 we've talked about these at a previous
10 meeting. I think what we're doing is
11 probably historic for any gaming jurisdiction
12 in the country, but I think a lot of us heard
13 early on as we were out talking to chambers
14 of commerce and anybody else that their
15 biggest fear was my best employees are going
16 to get potentially scooped up by one of our
17 licensees and how do I do that backfill. And
18 Commissioner Cameron talked about this, of
19 giving people other job opportunities with
20 other employers when clearly there's a need
21 to make sure that people are getting some of
22 the basic career education and learning that
23 they need to, you know, jump into some type
24 of career path, even if it's not in gaming.

1 So I think what we're doing is
2 pretty historic, and I'm happy -- I'm happy
3 to see that the community colleges,
4 MetroNorth REB really came up with some
5 innovative solutions here to try to get at
6 the problem.

7 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I'm
8 repeating myself somewhat here from what I
9 said at the earlier meeting when we primarily
10 looked at this, but I was particularly
11 impressed by the MetroNorth application and
12 by the Springfield Technical Community
13 College's application. They were very well
14 reasoned, highly articulated, and I have no
15 qualifications with regard to them.

16 I was less impressed with the
17 application by the Springfield Public
18 Schools, but less impressed from a -- from
19 the point of view of articulation of what the
20 objectives are and how they propose to, in
21 greater detail, to go about achieving the
22 objectives, but that I'm also convinced that
23 from meeting, you know, with them and reading
24 the applications, that they are focused

1 primarily on a -- while related, a different
2 class of persons in the public schools in
3 comparison to what the Springfield Technical
4 College's application relates to.

5 But where I come down on this is
6 basically the last point that John just made,
7 is that if we approve these applications, the
8 first thing that we ought to do is to get the
9 STCC principals together in the same room
10 with the public school principals and get
11 assurance that in proceeding forward that the
12 services that are being provided are going to
13 be complimentary and coordinated in the sense
14 of being expended rationally towards the
15 articulated objectives.

16 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I agree
17 with that. I think all three applications
18 were strong, but Springfield Public Schools
19 had some holes in their application, more
20 just information that they could have
21 provided --

22 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Right.

23 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: -- that did
24 not make it into what they provided us.

1 Mr. Chair, I move -- we can take these
2 individually, I guess. I would move that we
3 approve the MetroNorth Regional Employment
4 Board's MetroNorth Casino Careers Consortium
5 Workforce Training application for \$200,000.

6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?

7 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
9 discussion? All in favor?

10 Aye.

11 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

12 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.

13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

14 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The
16 ayes have it unanimously.

17 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr. Chair,
18 I next move to the Commission approve the
19 Springfield Technical Community College
20 Hamden Prep Workforce Development Program for
21 the amount of \$200,000.

22 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
24 discussion? All in favor?

1 Aye.

2 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

3 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.

4 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

5 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The
7 ayes have it unanimously.

8 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: And I'll
9 make the third one, too. I move the
10 Commission approve to Springfield Public
11 Schools application for their Ahead of the
12 Game Initiative for \$178,833.03.

13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: \$0.03. Second?

14 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
16 discussion? All in favor?

17 Aye.

18 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

19 COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.

20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

21 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The
23 ayes have it unanimously.

24 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I think this

1 is a point I've made before, but I because
2 this is the first time, I'm really looking
3 forward to whatever data we can gather or
4 obtain and intelligence as to the metrics and
5 success of these programs towards the end of
6 this funding rounds. So to the extent that
7 we can incorporate as part of those
8 discussions as part of our grant conditions
9 any kind of relevant data and quantification,
10 it would be very helpful for us in my
11 opinion.

12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah, I agree
13 with that. And I was stuck just thinking
14 about this. You know, starting way back when
15 we first started thinking about this about we
16 want to make sure that we really maximize the
17 workforce benefits, and
18 Commissioner Stebbins, I think, was the first
19 person to bring up the backfill issue and the
20 fact that this is a lot of people for a small
21 market, particularly MGM. And you know, over
22 the years now, we really, and particularly
23 Commissioner Stebbins and Jill, we've really
24 put together a pretty comprehensive effort to

1 start to feed that system. You know, we've
2 always said we need 10,000 applicants to get
3 the 3,000 jobs or whatever it is, and I think
4 we should take some satisfaction in that.
5 It's pretty unusual. And we've been working
6 on this now hard for a few years, and it's
7 culminating in real progress.

8 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: It was nice
9 to see down at Plainridge the number of folks
10 that got those jobs that are unemployed or
11 underemployed.

12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah. The other
13 comment I made before, John, this whole
14 project is a lot of work, and I really
15 appreciate you, your review team, Joe. That
16 was a lot of work, and you really dug deep on
17 these things and were up to speed on the
18 issues. It was well done. Mary, thank you.

19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah, Mary,
20 there's a lot of information that goes back
21 and forth in terms of questions, details,
22 sensors.

23 MR. ZIEMBA: I'll skip the fun part
24 of my comment, but it takes a lot to get

1 prepared because the Commission does take
2 this very, very seriously, and we know that
3 we are going to get all of the serious
4 questions because we're stewards of these
5 dollars and they're new dollars. And
6 whenever there's new dollars, people don't
7 understand the nuances of what can be allowed
8 under a statute and what could not be
9 allowed.

10 So lot goes into this, and we try
11 to prepare for this meeting every year. And
12 the review team was tremendous in the amount
13 of dialog that went back and forth about the
14 hard questions that we asked of all of our
15 applicants. And I just also want to commend
16 our applicant as a well, because they're
17 getting to know this process, and they are
18 really activity participating throughout the
19 year in trying to develop a program that
20 makes sense, and they've come up with
21 recommendations themselves that we should be
22 very conservative in how we approach this.

23 So I guess I commend the
24 Commission, and I'll skip the fun part. I

1 think you probably could guess what I was
2 probably going to say, but I'll skip that.

3 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Well, you
4 know, it's interesting because as we're
5 sitting here approaching July 1st,
6 understanding that this next round almost
7 beginning to start at the end of -- you know,
8 as we move into the fall because you start
9 laying out the groundwork for the guidelines
10 with the local community mitigation advisory
11 committees and the statewide groups so that
12 sometime before the end of the year they know
13 what they can apply for. So it's not just
14 the application deadline time frame and all
15 the follow-up starts much, much earlier than
16 that.

17 MR. ZIEMBA: It does. Thank you.

18 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. It
19 sure does.

20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any other
21 business? Do I have a motion to adjourn?

22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I move to
23 adjourn.

24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Second.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor?

Aye.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are adjourned.

(Whereupon the hearing was adjourned at 2:28 p.m.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Amie D. Rumbo, an Approved Court Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript from the record of the proceedings.

I, Amie D. Rumbo, further certify 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 Stenographic means, and transcript was produced from a computer.

WITNESS MY HAND this 2nd day of July, 2017.

Amie D. Rumbo



Amie D. Rumbo, Notary Public

My Commission expires: 10/23/2020