

1 THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

2 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION

3
4 Local Community Mitigation Advisory Committee
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 June 9, 2015 1:30 p.m. - 2:35 p.m.

14 METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COUNCIL

15 60 Temple Place

16 Boston, Massachusetts
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

1 P R O C E E D I N G S:

2

3 MR. ZIEMBA: Welcome everyone.

4 Thank you very much for coming back. We really
5 appreciate it. We have a number of things on
6 the agenda today as follow up from last week's
7 meeting.

8 We are joined here by Deputy Counsel
9 Grossman who has had some discussion with the
10 ethics commission to follow up on the questions
11 that were raised at the first meeting. And we
12 thought before we get into any items of
13 business, this is sort of hot off the presses.
14 We finally had our conversation with the ethics
15 commission a little bit earlier today. So, we
16 wanted to bring that information to you as soon
17 as we got it.

18 MR. GROSSMAN: Good afternoon,
19 everyone. As discussed at the last meeting, I
20 reached out to the state ethics commission on a
21 couple of questions that were presented that I
22 wasn't able to answer. And I certainly wanted
23 to make sure that we gave you accurate
24 information on what is clearly an important

1 issue.

2 The question was in two parts
3 really. Whether by virtue of your service as a
4 member of this board you would be prohibited
5 under the state conflict of interest law,
6 Chapter 268A from being able -- This applies
7 mostly to municipal folks who work for a city
8 or town and not necessarily some of the other
9 members. -- whether by virtue of your service
10 on this board, you would be prohibited under
11 the state conflict of interest law from either
12 preparing or presenting an application for
13 funds on behalf of your municipality before the
14 Gaming Commission.

15 And I think based on the information
16 I got the simple answer is yes. Most likely
17 you are prohibited from both serving on this
18 board and then preparing an application for
19 appearing before the Gaming Commission
20 advocating on behalf of the community for
21 particular funds.

22 And the reason is complicated as we
23 suspected. And it stems from section 4 of
24 Chapter 268A, which we talked about at the last

1 meeting. It is in two parts. It's section (a)
2 and section (c).

3 Section (a) says that you can't when
4 you are a state employee -- And everyone who
5 serves on this board by virtue of your
6 membership is a special state employee. -- by
7 virtue of your service here, the statute says
8 that you may not directly or indirectly receive
9 or request compensation from anyone other than
10 the Commonwealth or a state agency in relation
11 to any particular matter in which the
12 Commonwealth or a state agency is a party or
13 has a direct and substantial interest.

14 So, what that means is that to the
15 extent that anything that is discussed here or
16 subject to your official responsibility as a
17 member of this board, you can't get paid
18 elsewhere to act in furtherance of that issue.

19 And as it applies to an application
20 specifically, to the extent that the
21 expenditure of funds are the subject of
22 discussion at this committee, which I believe
23 they are under section 68 paragraph (e) that
24 would be a particulate matter which would then

1 prohibit you from getting paid by the
2 municipality to work on.

3 And the question in my mind and the
4 thing that I was able to work through with
5 Counsel for the ethics commission is how one
6 defines a particular matter. He applied a much
7 broader definition to the term than I thought.

8 I thought it would be limited to
9 just an application, a specific application.
10 So, that if you weren't working on an
11 application specifically here that then you
12 could go work on it elsewhere. But he said no
13 that's not exactly how the ethics commission is
14 likely to interpret a particular matter. They
15 include the subject matter.

16 So, for example, to the extent that
17 this committee is talking about the application
18 process or what types of factors the Commission
19 should consider in awarding funds or how to
20 review applications or things like that, even
21 though you're not looking at a specific
22 application, just by virtue of your discussion
23 of that that could be considered to be a
24 particular matter which would then prohibit you

1 from getting paid from the municipality to
2 prepare such an application.

3 And it's a similar analysis under
4 section (c) that would prohibit you from acting
5 as an agent that is presenting the application
6 to the Gaming Commission. Again, a particular
7 matter discussed here you then can't act as an
8 agent under paragraph (c) of section 4 of
9 Chapter 268A on behalf of an entity other than
10 the Commonwealth in support of such an
11 interest.

12 So, it's not necessarily black-and-
13 white, but it seems as though there is an issue
14 there that is at least worthy of your
15 individual attention. And perhaps even
16 individual contact with the ethics commission
17 to discuss your specific situation and what
18 your role is with the municipality and what
19 involvement you may or may not have.

20 So, obviously the information I am
21 presenting you is kind of broad in nature. We
22 did not speak about any specific individuals or
23 anything like that though we did look at the
24 statute and the way you were appointed and

1 things of that nature.

2 It is important to just draw a
3 distinction here and point out that this would
4 in no way prohibit anyone you work with from
5 going and preparing an application or arguing
6 for funds before the Commission. So, it's not
7 like the town itself or the city itself is
8 prohibited from doing it. It's just you as a
9 member of this board that becomes the special
10 state employee and becomes subject to the
11 restrictions of the conflict of interest laws.

12 So, it's something certainly to
13 think about before you serve on this board and
14 how that may affect your city or town's plans
15 moving forward. But it was an excellent
16 question. It was one that I hadn't thought
17 about in that level of detail before. So, I'm
18 glad we're able to get this out on the table
19 before it becomes an issue. So, here we are.

20 MR. ZIEMBA: I have a recommendation
21 before we get into a discussion. Because we
22 have so many local officials who will be
23 involved in the planning process, the
24 application process at one point or another, I

1 think we should do two things.

2 I think we should (1), we the
3 Commission should get a formal opinion from the
4 ethics commission about this matter instead of
5 having all these officials having to do that
6 themselves. We should take it upon ourselves
7 and do that.

8 And then the second thing we should
9 do is there is a meeting of the Gaming Policy
10 Advisory Committee coming up in another 10 days
11 or so, seven days or so. And they're going to
12 ask me for a report on what's happening with
13 the establishment of the subcommittees and the
14 local committees.

15 And I will bring this issue to their
16 attention as well to see if there's anything
17 that could be done in that regard. So, we
18 don't put anybody in jeopardy, and this is
19 brand-new to me as well, I think we should do
20 those two things.

21 And then perhaps what we do today is
22 we could dispense with any further actions
23 today that could put any of our local officials
24 in any way, shape, form or manner in jeopardy

1 of even seeming to not be in concert with the
2 ethics law. And then we could take it from
3 there. I think that is my recommendation to
4 the group.

5 MR. HOGAN: That seems to make sense
6 to me too, yes. And I'd ask on the first one,
7 you're right getting something that applies to
8 the whole group, I think, would be helpful and
9 as much specificity as possible around what we
10 anticipate the actual application process
11 being.

12 As you're talking, I'm saying to
13 myself, geez, does that mean if you have a
14 colleague who is heading it up and comes to you
15 kind of looking for some advice on how to go
16 about it you kind of say no. That's going to
17 be a challenge I think for some folks around
18 the table. So, the more detail the better,
19 John.

20 MR. ZIEMBA: Maybe we could use the
21 next couple of minutes to discuss some of the
22 things that we should ask about. I think that
23 would be one good one. What level of degree of
24 involvement in the application process would

1 one have to have in order to be somehow not in
2 concert with this rule?

3 MR. DEPASQUALE: Just in general, as
4 the chief financial person for the city just
5 about everything at least at some point someone
6 is going to ask me about. So, if that's the
7 case, I think by my position alone, I don't
8 know if I can be on this because any request of
9 any funds -- I may not ever do an application
10 but as the chief financial person most doesn't
11 go through without me at least knowing. So, if
12 I know about something -- I guess I'm in a kind
13 of strange situation.

14 City manager, any kind of finance is
15 going to ask me my opinion. I guess that
16 doesn't mean I'm part of requesting it but it
17 is what do you think. Am I not allowed to
18 even --

19 MR. ZIEMBA: This is something I
20 think we would hone in our request to the
21 commission. And to the degree it goes beyond
22 -- We'll try to be as specific as we can. --
23 but to the degree as Counsel Grossman made
24 reference, perhaps if it goes beyond what we

1 get back from the commission and there's a
2 specific request maybe we would then ask the
3 members to call individually.

4 Does that sound like a good plan,
5 Todd?

6 MR. GROSSMAN: It sounds like a
7 plan. I think it will be difficult to present
8 a request that kind of covers everyone though.

9 MR. ZIEMBA: We could get as
10 specific as we can, Todd.

11 MR. GROSSMAN: The other issue that
12 I was having in discussing this with him was in
13 really explaining what this committee is even
14 going to be doing other than discussing what
15 the statute says you're going to do. But I
16 don't have a clear understanding of exactly
17 what you are going to do here.

18 If you already know that you should
19 certainly articulate that. What types of
20 issues specifically are you going to be
21 discussing? What types of votes might you be
22 taking? Things of that nature.

23 MR. ZIEMBA: Todd, you did sit in
24 obviously in the earlier meeting. And we've

1 had a number of discussions about the role of
2 this committee and the level of specificity.
3 What we discussed is obviously it's up to the
4 Commission itself to make judgments regarding
5 applications that are before them. We
6 discussed that we would be involved in general
7 policymaking regarding the establishment of the
8 funds.

9 We wouldn't necessarily be getting
10 into specific applications, specific
11 applications of neighbors. So, we've had those
12 discussions. I understand when we talk to the
13 ethics commission, we would have to be a little
14 bit more precise than that to the extent we
15 can.

16 This is a brand-new endeavor. And
17 part of this is that this is supposed to go on
18 for the next 18 years or so. So, we're never
19 going to be able to come to the level of
20 precision about every exact thing that we're
21 going to be doing over the next 18 years within
22 the context of an initial frame out letter to
23 the ethics commission.

24 MR. GROSSMAN: And I think that's

1 the problem. It's hard to really know what
2 level of conflict there will be without knowing
3 exactly what you're going to be doing or
4 discussing.

5 MR. HOGAN: The inherent conflict
6 comes from a group trying to create policy or
7 recommendation on policy to advise the
8 Commission on how to go about evaluating
9 requests for funds against the fact that it's
10 the same cities and towns that we're
11 representing that are going to be asking for
12 those funds, right? So, there's certainly a
13 possibility that the conflict issue creating
14 policy is going to be able to open up the door
15 for your city or town.

16 MR. GROSSMAN: Basically, you're not
17 allowed to build the infrastructure and then
18 drive on it is what they said.

19 MR. ZIEMBA: Once again, the
20 Legislature created this committee with the
21 specific tasks that we are all talking about.
22 So, when the ethics commission takes a look at
23 this, they should take a look at this with what
24 the purpose of the legislation was all about.

1 MR. GROSSMAN: I think their answer
2 would be you have many people working in the
3 city or town, just have someone else do it.

4 MR. HOGAN: Yes. I think the
5 challenge with -- And that's the obvious
6 answer, except that some of the cities that we
7 represent just don't have the type of depth
8 where you have four people that are involved.
9 So, one side or the other is going to suffer.

10 And I'm just going to speak for the
11 city I represent. If at the end of the day
12 you're left to choose to bring your expertise
13 to the process whereby you're going to try to
14 request funding for mitigation or to create the
15 policy around that then this committee quite
16 frankly may end up being weakened by folks
17 having to step back from it. I am just being
18 candid.

19 MR. ZIEMBA: I think the Legislature
20 intended to have those persons who had the most
21 knowledge about the process to help advise the
22 Commission. That is just from the outset in
23 studying the legislation what I think they
24 intended.

1 Maybe when they created this, they
2 weren't thinking specifically about that type
3 of a level of conflict. Obviously, they leave
4 it to the Commission to try to make sure that
5 we don't have outside conflicts, the type of
6 conflicts that you would imagine.

7 We'll get to the bottom of this.
8 Sorry for the lateness of the news, but I guess
9 this is the proper place to discuss that.

10 MR. CARVIELLO: If you use their
11 theory that would take a lot of us right out of
12 the picture right off the bat. It'd be like
13 he's not an employee of the city he's just
14 representing an interest of the community.
15 Like I said, myself and just about everybody --

16 MR. BERMAN: The question it seems
17 to me is whether when you're applying for
18 money, you're not applying for money to pay
19 yourself. You're applying for money for
20 specific other purposes. Other than that
21 you're basically going to be -- If you're not
22 writing the application, you're going to be
23 advising the people writing the application and
24 intimately linked to that.

1 So, it seems almost meaningless to
2 exempt that person from the process. It's
3 really about whether you're benefiting
4 personally from the application. And maybe
5 what needs to happen is that it's pretty clear
6 that the people who are participating in that
7 process can't receive remuneration for the
8 proceeds of any payment through the Gaming
9 Commission of those fees.

10 MR. DEPRIEST: And even if you
11 remove yourself from the process of writing,
12 you're probably supervising the person who is
13 going to be writing it.

14 MR. HOGAN: At best a charade.

15 MR. ZIEMBA: Todd, thank you very
16 much for getting in touch with them. I
17 appreciate that. I think there are a number of
18 different ways we can approach this.

19 But we'll try to have probably a
20 meeting and/or requesting a formal opinion from
21 them. I don't know if there's anything from
22 the regulatory perspective that the ethics
23 commission has that would provide for this.

24 I know that they have provided other

1 things in the regulations that would allow
2 similar type of advisory committees to function
3 the way they are intended. Or if it would
4 require any sort of a statutory change to
5 enable communities to fully participate.

6 Why don't we take that as our
7 homework for the next meeting. Unless everyone
8 disagrees, perhaps we dispense with any further
9 work today that would implicate any specific
10 members such as the elections.

11 What I think we could do is that we
12 could have the presentation from Mark Vander
13 Linden and crew, because that is just purely
14 informational. You are just learning something
15 that will be the subject of many videos at the
16 Commission and other presentations. So, why
17 don't we take it from there.

18 MR. BERMAN: Can I just ask one
19 question about that? Were you able to ask the
20 ethics commission about whether there is any
21 conflict with members here participating in
22 challenges to a license? If for example the
23 Everett casino is licensed in such a way that
24 is unpredicted impacts on adjoining Malden or

1 Somerville, is there an ethics limitation on
2 our challenging the Gaming Commission on that
3 license given that we are special employees of
4 the state?

5 MR. GROSSMAN: By we do you mean the
6 individual people sitting here?

7 MR. BERMAN: Yes.

8 MR. GROSSMAN: I did not ask them
9 that question.

10 MR. ZIEMBA: Fred, was that question
11 asked at the last meeting? I don't remember.

12 MR. BERMAN: Yes, I asked that
13 question.

14 MR. GROSSMAN: It seems to me it'd
15 be a similar issue though. You can't act as an
16 agent for the municipality on a particular
17 matter which is subject to your authority here.

18 So, the answer would be no, you
19 can't do that I think. But you would have to
20 ask them specifically.

21 MR. BERMAN: That seems like a
22 general --

23 MR. DEPASQUALE: It'd be a
24 hypocritical question because obviously you are

1 here seeking funds or the attempt of allocating
2 funds, but then if you're going to work the
3 other side, it's sort of -- See what I'm
4 saying? You can't ask and then want to take
5 away too being at the same table.

6 MR. BERMAN: The argument about not
7 being involved in the request for funds is
8 about -- is concern about benefit from the
9 receipt of those funds. If we're concerned on
10 behalf of a community about impact that's not
11 about taking away money, it's not about using
12 money for our own benefit. It's about making
13 sure that whatever license is approved is
14 consistent with the requirements of the
15 legislation.

16 MR. GROSSMAN: So, you're talking
17 about getting paid by the city to advise them.

18 MR. BERMAN: No. I guess myself,
19 I'm the special case because I'm not employed
20 by the city. But the other gentlemen here who
21 are employed by the city, if they work for the
22 city and the city is concerned about a license
23 provision, one of the elements of the license
24 application that suggests that there would be

1 adverse impacts that were not identified
2 previously and they want to oppose that and say
3 with these provisions this needs to change, are
4 they enjoined from doing that by the ethics
5 law?

6 MR. GROSSMAN: The answer is you may
7 be, yes. You cannot as an agent or get paid in
8 a particular manner which is the subject of
9 this board's work. So, to the extent that that
10 would fall under the work of this board and is
11 the subject of your authority here, you can't
12 then get paid by a non-state entity to work on
13 that same matter.

14 MR. BERMAN: But this board is not
15 approving licenses.

16 MR. HOGAN: You come back to this
17 particular matter.

18 MR. GROSSMAN: All of this stuff is
19 very fact specific. It's hard to really say
20 yes or no. But what I can tell you is that it
21 may be an issue and it's something you may
22 consider asking the ethics commission
23 specifically if it affects you individually.

24 But it's just very difficult to

1 answer the variation of situations that may
2 arise in the future that implicate the state
3 conflict of interest laws. But you should just
4 know you can't work on both sides of the issue
5 as a general manner.

6 Other people can on behalf of the
7 city or town. It's not that the town is
8 prohibited from doing it. It's just that the
9 people sitting at this table can't

10 MR. BERMAN: I guess I just would
11 request that also be asked more generally. My
12 alternate is a city employee --

13 MR. ZIEMBA: Right.

14 MR. BERMAN: -- who is involved in
15 infrastructure and transportation very much.

16 MR. ZIEMBA: To the degree if we
17 work together on various policies that affect
18 community mitigation and the particular
19 municipality sues the Gaming Commission based
20 on that policy what ethics implications are
21 there?

22 MR. BERMAN: That's right. Or
23 challenges it, not necessarily sues but
24 challenges, yes.

1 MR. ZIEMBA: Yes.

2 MR. BERMAN: Thank you.

3 MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you. These are
4 all great questions. These are very
5 complicated issues and it's hard to really
6 answer them all kind of generally. They are
7 very specific questions.

8 MR. CARVIELLO: It seems hard to
9 have anybody -- There's really nobody you can
10 put in here that's not going to have a conflict
11 somewhere along the line. I mean even if you
12 are not an employee, you are going to have to
13 advise whoever is going to write or not write
14 what's going on. So, you're going to have an
15 impact somewhere. To have a totally impartial
16 person is going to be just about impossible or
17 difficult.

18 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you don't have
19 to be impartial.

20 MR. CARVIELLO: Well, not impartial,
21 but given the description you gave earlier --

22 MR. DEPASQUALE: If you work for the
23 city, you're in trouble.

24 MR. HOGAN: Like I said, whoever you

1 find, it's probably not going to add value
2 which the Legislature envisioned when they came
3 up with this committee. That would just be the
4 reality of the situation. But you're going to
5 have to get somebody who comes to this probably
6 uninvolved in this matter up to this point in
7 time because generally folks who have been are
8 going to be the ones that are going to be the
9 ones advocating for the community.

10 MR. CARVIELLO: Like myself, I'm not
11 going to be the person writing for the actual
12 money, but I'm going to have to say this is the
13 process. You're going to at least tell them
14 what to do. This is what's happening at the
15 meetings. And this is the course you need to
16 go on.

17 Like I say, it's going to be next to
18 impossible to find a person to sit on this
19 board if we go by the state ethics commission.

20 MR. ZIEMBA: It's a complicated
21 world. So, we will try to see how we can
22 navigate us to accomplish the purposes of the
23 legislation.

24 MR. HOGAN: Thank you.

1 MR. ZIEMBA: Thank you. So, given
2 that my recommendation is that we dispense with
3 the election of the officers and dispense with
4 the discussion of the policy issues to be
5 considered as they would involve matters that
6 might end up -- Thank you, Todd. I appreciate
7 it. Sorry you had to deliver bad news.

8
9 (Mr. Grossman exits meeting room)

10
11 MR. ZIEMBA: So, we will dispense
12 with discussing other policy issues to be
13 considered. But as we discussed, I think we
14 can have a good presentation from Mark. And
15 maybe we'll dispense with a lot of questions
16 because that might be -- Why don't you give us
17 as thorough a presentation as you can, Mr.
18 Vander Linden.

19 And Mark, would you mind -- I
20 should've had your bio because it's really
21 impressive how Mark came to us from out of
22 state. He brought a lot of significant
23 expertise in regard to responsible gaming,
24 national expertise that folks in Massachusetts

1 perhaps didn't have. So, we are very pleased
2 that Mark joined us at the Commission.

3 MR. VANDER LINDEN: So, I'm Mark
4 Vander Linden. And I'm the Director of
5 Research and Responsible Gaming with the Gaming
6 Commission.

7 My background is more in the area
8 public health, actually public health and
9 social work. My training and education is as a
10 social worker. I made my way into the area
11 looking at gambling disorders through the
12 Department of Public Health for the State of
13 Iowa where I oversaw all of the problem
14 gambling services, treatment, prevention,
15 workforce development, research, marketing and
16 training issues as well for the state.

17 Before that my background is really
18 in addictions more generally, not just gambling
19 addiction. It's substance abuse addictions and
20 other mental-health issues.

21 I've done a lot of consulting around
22 the country on different elements of gambling
23 disorders, mostly clinical trainings to some
24 degree looking at different research issues

1 dealing with gambling disorders. And then this
2 opportunity came up in Massachusetts.

3 Let me just tell you, this is truly
4 a special situation that we have in
5 Massachusetts. We have legislation that was so
6 carefully crafted to pay attention to this
7 specific issue to make sure that if we are
8 truly looking at the -- paying attention to the
9 economic benefits of expanded gaming in
10 Massachusetts and saying at the same time if
11 you really want to pay attention to that, pay
12 attention to what problems may arise. Pay
13 attention to where the problems are, because
14 for every problem gambler that you have, for
15 every adverse consequence that you have, it
16 chips away at the benefits of the Expanded
17 Gaming Act.

18 And I think that that in my
19 experience in many other states, it seems very
20 simple but it was so easily overlooked. I
21 think Massachusetts learned it's not --
22 definitely not the first in the game of
23 expanded gaming. There are 39 other states, I
24 think, that have state regulated casino

1 gambling. And I think that the statute in
2 Massachusetts paid very close attention to
3 that.

4 So, in Iowa where I came from, I
5 would say that it had a very good program. It
6 had some of the best funding per capita in the
7 entire country to pay attention to this issue.

8 Massachusetts also is putting a lot
9 of resources towards this. But another piece
10 that makes Massachusetts different, separates
11 it, is the attention to the research. Paying
12 attention to the data and allowing data to
13 drive our decisions about if we have this pool
14 of money set aside to truly mitigate the
15 negative and unintended consequences of
16 gambling, specifically problem gambling, then
17 let's make sure that we're paying attention to
18 what the data is telling us about this.

19 Let's make sure that we are
20 gathering -- we are looking methodically at a
21 baseline and how that baseline changes every
22 time on social measures as well as economic and
23 fiscal measures along the way.

24 That's really what this is about.

1 The research project that I'm going to talk to
2 you about right now is just one component of
3 the broader research agenda that the Gaming
4 Commission in partnership with the Department
5 of Public Health in Massachusetts and DHHS has
6 embarked on. It's one component but I have to
7 say it is definitely kind of the cornerstone of
8 the entire research agenda.

9 We've been underway with this
10 project pretty much almost since the
11 Commission's inception. So, it's over two
12 years old now since we launched this project.
13 In fact, I am presenting data to you now and
14 some of the findings that actually will be
15 presented for the first time more publicly at
16 the Gaming Commission meeting on Thursday. I'm
17 going to give you kind of a shortened version
18 of what some of those findings were.

19 I also just want to give you a
20 little bit more about the background of what it
21 is and how it fits within the statute and more
22 specifically what are some of the measures that
23 we are looking at. Any questions? Feel free
24 to ask questions as we kind of move through it.

1 MR. ZIEMBA: To the extent that you
2 don't want put yourself in a position from the
3 ethics commission. I think we're hoping that
4 your presentation would be more full rather
5 than questions from the group. Why don't we
6 leave it at that.

7 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Sure. I like to
8 discuss. I'm a social worker.

9 MR. ZIEMBA: I'll ask you a lot of
10 questions when we get back to the office.

11 MR. VANDER LINDEN: We don't have
12 the technology of the PowerPoints. So, I'm
13 just going to walk through this as we go. I
14 mentioned that the statute has a specific
15 provision for a gaming research agenda. You
16 can see in this first slide that is section 71.

17 It's an annual research agenda to
18 kind of boil it down has three specific
19 mandates. One is to understand the social and
20 economic impacts of expanded gaming. The
21 second is a baseline study of problem gambling
22 and the existing prevention and treatment
23 programs in the state. And the third, which is
24 kind of this more general, is to facilitate

1 independent studies to obtain information
2 relevant to enhance responsible gaming and
3 minimizes the harmful effects.

4 The study that I'm talking to you
5 about now really addresses the first two. The
6 funding for the gaming research agenda is
7 technically supposed to come from the Public
8 Health Trust Fund. The Public Health Trust
9 Fund is five percent of gross gaming revenue
10 from our resort style casinos which would be
11 right now would be Wynn and MGM as well as an
12 assessment of up to \$5 million.

13 There's words saying potentially
14 \$15-\$20 million per year annually once the
15 casinos are up and running. As you very well
16 know, we have no casinos up and running to
17 date. The Commission used its startup money to
18 launch this piece of the agenda.

19 It said if we truly want to have a
20 baseline understanding of the social and
21 economic impacts of gaming, we want to know the
22 effects of it, we need to have a baseline.
23 We're going to front the money for this in
24 order to accomplish that baseline.

1 So, moving on to the next piece, the
2 study SEIGMA, which is the Social and Economic
3 Impacts of Gaming in Massachusetts. We're
4 working with the University of Massachusetts
5 Amherst their School of Public Health and
6 Health Policy. They are also working on the
7 economic side working with the Donahue
8 Institute out of UMass.

9 The survey research is being done
10 out of the University of Chicago the NORC. We
11 also have a number of other consultants along
12 the way out of the University of Nevada Reno,
13 Market Street Research. Our co-principal
14 investigator is a man by the name of Dr. Rob
15 Williams who is out of the University of
16 Lethbridge in Canada. He and his co-principal
17 investigator who is out of the University of
18 Massachusetts, Dr. Rachel Volberg, are two very
19 well known, internationally known researchers
20 specifically on doing this type of survey
21 research.

22 Which I have to say when I saw this
23 kind of coming together in Massachusetts and I
24 was out of state, the opportunity to work with

1 these two just absolutely outstanding
2 researchers was definitely a draw to the
3 position.

4 So, there's three general topic
5 areas. And you can see this on this slide,
6 this paper in front of you, the social and
7 health impacts. There's a general population
8 survey, a targeted population survey. Targeted
9 population survey is looking specifically at
10 the host and surrounding communities where the
11 casinos will be.

12 So, we have a general population
13 survey, which is a survey of roughly 10,000
14 people. In addition to that we have the
15 targeted surveys, which in Springfield and in
16 Plainville and the surrounding communities we
17 went out and we did the same survey with a
18 targeted sample of 1000 people.

19 In Region A we do not have to do
20 that targeted survey. The sample size that we
21 were able to draw out of the general population
22 survey was sufficient enough to give us a clear
23 enough picture of what is happening in Everett
24 and the surrounding communities around Everett

1 to be able to move forward.

2 There is also an online panel
3 survey. That's done through Market Research of
4 5000 people. We haven't finished the analysis
5 of the online panel just because we are paying
6 attention to the general population survey
7 right now.

8 An online panel is unique in that
9 it's people that volunteer or are recruited to
10 participate in this. It's not generally
11 representative of the general population of
12 Massachusetts, but it gives us a lot of
13 information about a relatively high-risk group.
14 High-risk meaning that there's a higher
15 prevalence rate of problem gambling within this
16 group.

17 We're also doing a host of secondary
18 data collection. We are taking a look at
19 crime. We're taking a look at other -- demand
20 for other mental-health services, addiction
21 services, issues such as domestic violence,
22 other types of social issues. All told there
23 is approximately 70 some different vendors that
24 we're taking a look at between the social and

1 economic side of that.

2 So, the problem gambling services
3 evaluation. This is a really interesting piece
4 of this. This speaks to what is our capacity
5 to respond. We're introducing expanded gaming
6 in Massachusetts. We want to make sure on the
7 problem gambling side we are there and we have
8 the capacity and bandwidth to respond to any
9 increases in problem gambling.

10 Massachusetts, it seems like a
11 relatively simple task but it's hard to get
12 your arms around the specific issue. I think
13 that there's a lot of people with gambling
14 disorders, very few of them actually end up
15 going to a treatment facility in Massachusetts
16 saying I have a gambling problem and I need
17 help. It's the type of disorder, and this is
18 stemming from my clinical background, that
19 people will come to go seek help but rarely do
20 they ever seek help specifically for a gambling
21 disorder.

22 They'll go for a substance abuse
23 problem. They'll go for family issues.
24 They'll go for job performance issues. And

1 what's underlying that and what's driving that
2 is a gambling disorder but they certainly are
3 not seeking out the help for that. It's not
4 always true, but generally true.

5 MR. CARVIELLO: Mark, do you find
6 that in other states that you've worked in the
7 past that the closer you are to the casino the
8 problem is larger there versus as you spread
9 out?

10 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes. There's a
11 fair amount of research taking a look of what
12 is the prevalence rate of gambling disorders
13 within a specific radius of a gaming
14 establishment. And that you do typically see
15 at least initially an increase in the
16 prevalence rate of problem gambling in a radius
17 around the facility.

18 MR. CARVIELLO: What radius do you
19 consider?

20 MR. VANDER LINDEN: I've seen it at
21 different radiuses. I've seen it all of the
22 way up to a 50-mile, 10-mile radius. But
23 really what matters is what is the population
24 density? What are the other entertainment

1 options in this area? There's a number of
2 different variables. But generally speaking
3 it's some type of radius.

4 MR. CARVIELLO: Is there an average
5 number you see, an average percentage that you
6 see?

7 MR. VANDER LINDEN: I want to say
8 anything I've seen studies that -- It varies
9 depending on the studies but some of it is up
10 to 50 percent increase in the prevalence rate
11 of problem gambling. What's interesting, and
12 this is the exposure model, you bring a gaming
13 establishment and put it in and open it up and
14 you see a general increase in the prevalence
15 rate of problem gambling.

16 You also see an adaptation over
17 time. This is generally true across all
18 studies. An adaptation meaning people kind of
19 get used to it. People that have problems have
20 had problems and some form, some journey out of
21 those problems. So, you see kind of it get
22 back down to what was pre-casino or pre-new
23 gaming being introduced.

24 MR. CARVIELLO: Do you also see a

1 rise in drug and alcohol rate?

2 MR. VANDER LINDEN: That's a
3 complicated issue. And I think there are a
4 fair number of studies that have pointed to
5 that. They are hard to find, quality studies
6 that really are able to isolate these issues
7 and say you know what, we see an increase in
8 the prevalence of number of people seeking
9 substance abuse or mental-health services and
10 able to tie it back to a gaming establishment
11 or tie it back to gambling within a specific
12 community.

13 What we do know is that the co-
14 occurrence with problem gambling with substance
15 abuse -- problem gambling with other types of
16 mental-health disorders, depression, anxiety is
17 incredibly high. It's roughly 90 percent of
18 people with a gambling disorder have some other
19 type of co-occurring disorder going on with it.

20 And they are showing up at these
21 other -- The doors that they're knocking on are
22 the physicians of substance abuse facilities
23 and that sort of thing.

24 Wow, I spent a lot of time. I don't

1 think I've ever spent that much time talking
2 about the problem gambling services evaluation.

3 We're looking at that. We hope to
4 have that -- We're doing online panels right
5 now to do more targeted qualitative research
6 with providers around the state to find out
7 what their impressions are, what their needs
8 are in order to grow the capacity. As I said,
9 this is -- I'll come back to this. I want to
10 talk a little bit about our strategic planning
11 process around this too.

12 MR. BERMAN: When you look at that
13 are you also going to be looking at insurance
14 coverage or cost of services because that's a
15 big deal.

16 MR. VANDER LINDEN: It is. You know
17 what's interesting is, and it's slowly
18 changing, but nationally very few insurance
19 companies were covering gambling disorders,
20 which is a problem.

21 There's the DSM, the diagnostic
22 statistical manual of mental-health disorders.
23 This is a mental-health disorder that's
24 recognized within this DSM. And technically

1 most insurance companies cover almost anything
2 that would be covered under that DSM, but for
3 some reason problem gambling, what used to be
4 pathological gambling now gambling disorders
5 has been isolated, taken out and has not
6 received coverage.

7 Similarly, it's never received any
8 type of federal recognition or support. The
9 Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services
10 Administration, SAMHSA, NIDA, these other
11 federal bodies don't recognize gambling
12 disorders and refuse to provide support for
13 treatment, research, prevention services in
14 this.

15 So, it's a state-by-state issue.
16 When I talk about some states are doing a good
17 job, Massachusetts I think is so far ahead of
18 any other state that I see right now as we get
19 started with this. It's in large part because
20 there is such lack of support for this specific
21 issue.

22 MR. CARVIELLO: Do you plan to reach
23 out into the communities somewhere along the
24 line once the casino opens up?

1 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes. I'll talk
2 about our strategic planning process. This is
3 data-driven but data can give you a good
4 picture but it doesn't give you the full
5 picture of what's going on. I'll talk about
6 our efforts to make sure we're doing some
7 community outreach which to kind of fill in the
8 gaps.

9 The third piece of this is the
10 measurement, the economic and fiscal impacts.
11 This is held entirely out of the Donahue
12 Institute. They are the lead on this piece of
13 this. They're using REMI modeling, using
14 primary and secondary data. Probably some of
15 you are familiar with the REMI model to do
16 economic forecasting based on inputs from a
17 number of different variables.

18 We are doing community comparison
19 analysis. So, taking a community that does not
20 have gaming and comparing it to a similar
21 community that has gaming and getting ready to
22 expand gaming and to figure out the impact of
23 expanded gaming. What does it bring to the
24 community? What are additional risk factors

1 does it bring to the community? What benefit
2 does it bring to the community?

3 One other thing about the survey
4 research is that we're not moving forward with
5 hypotheses. We're moving forward with wanting
6 to measure -- try to objectively as possible
7 measure the economic and social impacts.

8 MR. BERMAN: Is there any research
9 or anything that looks at what people spend
10 money on when they're spending money on
11 gambling? What reductions in their other
12 expenditures like lottery or other
13 entertainment or other things that are more
14 essentials? What's not getting spent in our
15 economies?

16 MR. VANDER LINDEN: I think the
17 intent is through the economic and fiscal
18 measures to take a look at those other areas
19 that maybe taking a hit as a result of the
20 people taking their dollars and directing them
21 towards casino spending.

22 Certainly, the lottery is going to
23 be taken a very close look at. There's a
24 provision within the statute that says we need

1 to try to, to the greatest extent possible,
2 hold the lottery harmless in this.

3 And as much money as people spend on
4 lottery in Massachusetts, it's hard to believe
5 there wouldn't be some type of impact as those
6 entertainment dollars, dollars that they would
7 spend gambling would be directed towards the
8 casinos.

9 What is the extent of that impact
10 what we can do to mitigate that is a very good
11 question. I know the Commission in different
12 ways we are looking at that issue head on.
13 We're also looking at -- We're trying to
14 partner with the lottery. I've been working
15 with the executive director of the lottery on
16 responsible gaming issues along the way.

17 The next two slides provide a little
18 bit more detail of the broad categories that
19 the SEIGMA team is taking a look at. And each
20 of these broad categories can be broken down
21 into kind of more specific indices along the
22 way. So, if you want to take a look at that as
23 well as the economic measures.

24 The methodology, the sample for the

1 baseline population survey, and I moved onto
2 the MA methodology slide, was drawn by address-
3 based sampling methodology. So, basically we
4 took from the post office -- we drew the sample
5 from a listing of addresses that we got from
6 the post office. It's an accepted sampling
7 methodology. We asked respondents to either
8 complete it online, on paper or by phone.

9 The data collection was from
10 September 2013 to May 2014. So, clearly well
11 before any of the casinos opened up and even
12 before there was a lot of movement in the
13 referendum that came before the voters of last
14 November. The actual sample size was 9,578.

15 The next is getting into some of the
16 findings for this. If you take a look, it's
17 gambling participation and this is gambling
18 participation over the past 12 months. You can
19 see that roughly three-quarters of adults in
20 Massachusetts have gambled in some form in the
21 last month. The most prevalent is some form of
22 the lottery where 60 percent of the people in
23 Massachusetts have gambled on the lottery at
24 some point in the last 12 months.

1 Casino gambling you can see is down
2 a little bit, but it's still roughly one-
3 quarter of those people in Massachusetts have
4 gambled in some form of casino gambling in the
5 last 12 months.

6 The report that'll be released in a
7 couple of days will give far more detail about
8 where people -- if you are gambling at a
9 casino, where are people gambling at a casino.
10 The vast majority of people are gambling at
11 casinos in Connecticut, but you also have Rhode
12 Island, New York, Nevada and other states that
13 have gambling.

14 I always find online gambling an
15 interesting issue to take a look at. There's a
16 lot of energy around online gambling and
17 talking about online gambling being the next
18 big thing. And you see online gambling
19 legalized, I lose track, but in Delaware, New
20 Jersey, Nevada are three. I think there might
21 even be a couple more now. There are so few
22 people that report online gambling.

23 MR. TICOTSKY: The new draft kings,
24 it's kind of like a hybrid between sports

1 betting and fantasy sports, would that fit in
2 somewhere here?

3 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Actually, it
4 doesn't fit. That fits in nowhere because if
5 it was online gambling, it would be illegal in
6 Massachusetts. And their headquarters is just
7 down the street.

8 MR. TICOTSKY: So, it's considered
9 like fantasy sports?

10 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes, it would
11 be. That was more difficult to put your finger
12 on in this survey.

13 MR. ZIEMBA: It would be for the
14 purposes of the survey. We're not opining on
15 the legality or illegality of any of those
16 particular endeavors, because that might not be
17 within our bailiwick for the purposes of what
18 we're talking about here.

19 MR. VANDER LINDEN: That's true.
20 Thank you, John. The next slide is looking at
21 the perceived impact of gambling. And John, it
22 was just kind of a sociological perspective
23 interest.

24 MR. ZIEMBA: Just since we're being

1 so precise, I thought I'd throw in that little
2 footnote.

3 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Feel free to add
4 any footnotes. The next one I think is another
5 really interesting slide. Looking at the
6 perceived impact of gambling in Massachusetts.

7 And if you take a look, it's roughly
8 40 percent of the people feel it's either very
9 harmful or somewhat harmful. And on the
10 reverse side it's also roughly 40 percent feel
11 it's somewhat beneficial and very beneficial.

12 If you take a look and you put
13 together equal harm or benefit, somewhat
14 beneficial and very beneficial it's roughly 60
15 percent to the 40 percent that feel it's
16 somewhat harmful, which is very much in line
17 with how the referendum broke out, which was 60
18 percent of people in Massachusetts voted to
19 keep casino gambling and 40 percent voted to
20 repeal.

21 The next takes a look at specific
22 types of gamblers. So, based upon their
23 answers to a standard set of questions, the
24 SEIGMA team classified people who are gamblers

1 in the past year as either recreational
2 gamblers, at-risk gamblers or problem gamblers.

3 So, recreational gamblers are what
4 you would expect. They're people that say yes,
5 I've gambled in the past year but the rest of
6 the series of questions had no indication,
7 there was no evidence that their gambling was
8 either risky or a problem.

9 Whereas at-risk gamblers, they
10 engage in behaviors such as persistently
11 betting more than they planned, spending more
12 time gambling than intended, chasing their
13 losses, and borrowing money in order to gamble
14 to keep them in place. They were experiencing
15 some moderate, low to moderate level of
16 gambling problems.

17 And problem gamblers are individuals
18 who experience significant impairment as a
19 result of their gambling behavior.

20 What we found here, if we took all
21 of the people that gambled in the past year,
22 there were specific groups that bubbled to the
23 top that appeared to have more problems than
24 others.

1 For example, males appear to have a
2 higher prevalence rate of problem gambling and
3 at-risk gambling compared to females. African-
4 American men actually African-Americans in
5 general also were at a higher risk for problem
6 and at-risk gambling, the same with unemployed
7 and low-income individuals.

8 MR. BERMAN: So, in reading this
9 chart, it says that 70 percent of problem
10 gamblers are male?

11 MR. VANDER LINDEN: 77 percent of
12 the problem gamblers are male. Again, we'll be
13 talking about this report in much, much greater
14 detail starting on Thursday during the
15 Commission meeting. The full report will be
16 available both on our website as well as
17 through the UMass website portal. It's
18 UMass.edu\SEIGMA.

19 MR. BERMAN: Presumably, there's
20 going to be some sort of publication of all the
21 questions that were asked?

22 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Correct.

23 MR. BERMAN: But there also
24 presumably going forward as gaming venues open,

1 there'll be further surveying?

2 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes. I'm sorry
3 I missed that point. That's a really important
4 point. That's where the true value of this
5 data comes.

6 This is just our baseline. It gives
7 us a general idea of what direction to go in
8 terms of strategic planning. But it's when we
9 have our follow-up surveys, which the research
10 agenda is essentially -- it's baked into the
11 statute and the Public Health Trust Fund. So,
12 we will continue to do follow-up surveys over
13 time to get a better sense of do we see trends
14 that are alarming that we then need to respond
15 to, groups that where you see an increase in
16 this.

17 MR. BERMAN: Does this body have the
18 opportunity to weigh in about questions that we
19 might want to know about the people that are
20 gambling, for example, in the Everett facility
21 or in the other facilities since there's no
22 reason to assume people who live here will only
23 go to Everett. They may go to Springfield.
24 They may go elsewhere. Do we have the

1 opportunity to submit questions and pose them
2 for the survey?

3 MR. VANDER LINDEN: We have a couple
4 of different bodies that really are intended to
5 take a look at our gaming research agenda. We
6 have a Gaming Research Advisory Committee. We
7 have the Gaming Policy Advisory Committee that
8 is a strong advisory voice in this, as well as
9 the Public Health Trust Fund Advisory
10 Committee. Those are the three main bodies
11 that are providing input to the gaming research
12 agenda.

13 MR. ZIEMBA: In addition to
14 addiction services subcommittee to the Gaming
15 Policy Advisory Committee.

16 MR. VANDER LINDEN: I don't think we
17 fully figured out all of the different avenues
18 in which information comes and is digested to
19 figure out how this is moving forward. Those
20 three groups certainly are very instrumental.

21 MR. BERMAN: I guess the reason I'm
22 asking is because the research will help inform
23 what the actual impacts may be on some of our
24 communities. So, it seems as though we have an

1 interest in being part of helping to shape that
2 research agenda.

3 MR. ZIEMBA: That seems a little bit
4 more of a policy issue. Perhaps we can table
5 that until after we get a little more --

6 MR. BERMAN: Sure.

7 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Going back to
8 the strategic planning process where we are
9 seeking input from a variety of different
10 stakeholders, that's also an important place to
11 be able to have input that it's substantial and
12 drives what we are doing with how the Public
13 Health Trust Fund dollars are used moving
14 forward.

15 MR. ZIEMBA: In addition anyone who
16 is not connected to this can offer comments to
17 the Commission through MGC comments or direct
18 letters to the Commission. And we take all of
19 those into consideration. But we'll table that
20 one if that's okay.

21 MR. BERMAN: Absolutely.

22 MR. VANDER LINDEN: So, SEIGMA
23 moving forward. The big day is this Thursday.
24 We've been preparing for this date to be able

1 to release this report again for probably about
2 a year building up to this. Since we've been
3 out of the field, it's been a considerable
4 amount of time through analysis and peer-review
5 and revisions of our report, we are finally now
6 ready to release the final version of it.

7 You can come -- It's an open
8 Commission meeting. You can come to the
9 convention center. It's going to be at 10:30
10 or shortly thereafter on Thursday morning. You
11 can watch it on live stream at massgaming.com.

12 MR. ZIEMBA: We plan to send by
13 email the materials for Thursday's
14 presentations to all of these members as well.

15 MR. VANDER LINDEN: In the
16 materials, we won't have the actual report.
17 It's some 350 pages, but we will have that
18 PowerPoint presentation that will be presented
19 by our SEIGMA team.

20 MR. CARVIELLO: Mark, why was the
21 report just tied in Western Mass. rather than
22 the inner-city? You see where it says here
23 target population survey was in Western Mass.?

24 MR. VANDER LINDEN: That's the first

1 stop in our targeted. We did targeted surveys
2 in Western Mass. in Springfield.

3 MR. CARVIELLO: You're coming down
4 this way?

5 MR. VANDER LINDEN: We did two
6 targeted surveys. We did one in Plainville and
7 the other surrounding communities. We did one
8 in Springfield in that host and surrounding
9 communities.

10 We did not need to do one in the
11 Everett area because we had enough respondents
12 within this area to give us a clear enough
13 picture of the issues that we are examining
14 here.

15 Whereas if you go down to
16 Plainville, the sample size we were able to
17 draw from there wasn't sufficient enough to
18 give enough clarity and granularity to the
19 issues that we were looking at. Here we do
20 because much more of the sample is drawn from
21 this part of the state. Does that make sense?

22 MR. CARVIELLO: Yes.

23 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Moving forward,
24 obviously, the release of this report is going

1 to be significant. We are in the process of
2 doing the targeted survey in Western Mass. I
3 think we might be out of the field with that.
4 We're out of the field in the Plainville area.

5 We are in the process of developing
6 and building interactive web applications on
7 the SEIGMA website. One way that you can
8 present the data is through a really thick
9 document. This is for all measures.

10 What we're trying to do is make it
11 more accessible to everybody who wants to use
12 it. So, we're building it on a platform called
13 Shiny, which is an easy way to take a look at
14 any of the variables you're wanting to take a
15 look at. And even more importantly taking a
16 look at comparing certain areas of the state
17 and looking at the interaction between the
18 variables that we're wanting to measure.

19 So, more information on that but
20 we're really focusing on the utility of this
21 and how do we get this information out? How do
22 we disseminate it for anybody in Massachusetts
23 to look at but also for the research being done
24 on this issue.

1 On the economic and fiscal impact
2 side, again this is the piece that is being led
3 by the Donahue Institute. Over the summer,
4 we're going to be releasing our host community
5 reports. I think that that's going to be
6 something of great interest to this group as
7 other host and surrounding communities in the
8 area.

9 They're continuing to build the REMI
10 model. The problem gaming services evaluation,
11 we're doing the online focus groups right now.
12 We hope to have that final report done at the
13 end of the month -- I'm sorry, at the end of
14 the summer.

15 As I said, this is the cornerstone
16 of what the research agenda is. There's other
17 pieces of the research agenda. We have what is
18 called MAGIC or the Massachusetts Gambling
19 Impact Cohort. The SEIGMA study is a snapshot.
20 It's a cross-sectional study.

21 So, we took a snapshot of 10,000
22 people at one point in time. And that point in
23 time being the period in which we looked at
24 them. From that cross-sectional study we took

1 2600 people out of that. We tried to draw all
2 of the high-risk individuals either high risk
3 or problem gamblers as well as a sample of the
4 general population.

5 And we're going to follow that group
6 over time to see what is the impact on this
7 high risk group or problem gamblers as we begin
8 to introduce expanded gaming in Massachusetts.

9 What is the impact and even more
10 importantly how do we respond to that? What
11 are the risks, the protective factors of these
12 specific groups? How can we create better
13 intervention and prevention programs?

14 Again, this is not us creating these
15 programs. This is us in collaboration with the
16 Massachusetts Department of Public Health who
17 already has a system set up to provide
18 treatment services around the state.

19 There's other pieces of it too.
20 We're in the process of building evaluation
21 protocols and evaluation systems for key
22 responsible gaming initiatives that have been
23 adopted by the Commission. These responsible
24 gaming initiatives are largely initiatives that

1 we're launching inside the confines of the
2 casino. But you'll certainly be seeing
3 information about some of these that expand
4 beyond the walls of the casino.

5 The last one, and this is built into
6 our budget. We'll be launching it later this
7 year, which is the player card data initiative.
8 Massachusetts is fantastic. The information on
9 player card data, how people play, at what rate
10 do they play, what's the background
11 demographics of the player base and what are
12 their patterns of play has been an incredibly
13 interesting issue that largely data that's not
14 available any place else.

15 It was built into the statute that
16 we would collect this data, anonymize it and
17 make it available for research purposes. So,
18 we would create a data repository for this so
19 we can begin using it to get a better
20 understanding of player behavior to do a better
21 job of understanding how to create prevention
22 and responsible gaming initiatives. So, we'll
23 be building that and building that repository
24 later this year.

1 The strategic planning process is
2 the last thing I wanted to talk about. Also on
3 Thursday we are going to be releasing what we -
4 - It's not a strategic plan as much as it is
5 kind of an initial plan within specifically
6 Southeastern Massachusetts to say what do we
7 have in place right now?

8 What from the very first glance at
9 the SEIGMA data can we begin to pull together
10 to respond and prepare for casino expansion in
11 Southeastern Massachusetts?

12 We have a group that -- We are
13 working again with the Department of Public
14 Health and a consulting group that they've
15 worked with to do a statewide strategic plan.
16 That is underway. And it's taking into
17 consideration feedback from a broad range of
18 stakeholders and anybody who wants to submit
19 feedback.

20 MR. CARVIELLO: Mark, how will one
21 have access to these services? I'm not a
22 gambler but say Louie is a gambler. How would
23 Louie go in and say look, I have a problem.
24 Does he go to somewhere in his community or

1 does he go into the den where he's gotten in
2 trouble? Or do we as a community look for
3 funds to help him?

4 MR. VANDER LINDEN: The
5 Massachusetts Council on Compulsive Gambling is
6 a very close partner with us. They are kind of
7 the body that trains, organizes and makes sure
8 that there's a statewide network of help that
9 is available.

10 So, one way if you have a gambling
11 problem, we'd be glad to help. In order to
12 access help is through the helpline. You can
13 call, get information about these individuals,
14 these conditions that have this specific
15 problem gambling certification, mental-health
16 clinicians within a specific area that would
17 meet the criteria that you'd be looking for,
18 insurance, other ability to pay, proximity,
19 hours that sort of thing.

20 MR. CARVIELLO: My other question is
21 and I remember seeing the story from Foxwoods
22 and Mohegan and how these people have gotten in
23 trouble with these lines of credit that the
24 casino gives them. Does this address that

1 also? All of a sudden, I get \$120,000 line of
2 credit to go gamble and now I don't have the
3 ability to pay it back. I saw some of the
4 stories where they were going and taking
5 people's houses.

6 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Right. The
7 Commission has taken a very close look at
8 credit extension and how do we build in
9 protections within our regulations on credit
10 extension. And I think we've done a very good
11 job of that.

12 MR. CARVIELLO: Will the credit fall
13 into this?

14 MR. VANDER LINDEN: No. It doesn't
15 fall into this specifically.

16 MR. ZIEMBA: That's an aspect of the
17 responsible gaming framework and our internal
18 controls regulations. We can send out a copy
19 of our regulations.

20 MR. CARVIELLO: I think that would
21 fall as policy.

22 MR. ZIEMBA: We had a series, a
23 number of meetings on that issue itself. We
24 have some recommendations from a number of

1 different parties including the Attorney
2 General's office. I can send you out a copy of
3 those regulations.

4 MR. VANDER LINDEN: When I first
5 started, I worked with a broad range of other
6 professional experts in the area to develop a
7 responsible gaming framework. And taking a
8 look at high-risk financial transactions and
9 what can we both advise as well as draft into
10 regulations protections to minimize gambling
11 related harm are contemplated in a specific
12 section of that framework.

13 A lot of that has been promulgated
14 into regulations or into the internal controls
15 and a section of that dealing with credit
16 extension.

17 MR. DEPASQUALE: Can I ask a
18 question? Is there any studies that shows when
19 a state brings in gambling how much impact is
20 greater on the residents who may have been
21 going to the other states?

22 So, Massachusetts there are people
23 who have gambling issues and they find it in
24 Connecticut or whatever. Now it comes to

1 Massachusetts. Is there another state that had
2 surrounding states around it that had
3 opportunities for those individuals on how much
4 it really grew when that state brought gaming
5 in?

6 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Are you talking
7 about economic?

8 MR. DEPASQUALE: No, just like the
9 number of population. You said that 77 percent
10 of the male right now. I guess my question is
11 if you're a gambler now, you can certainly go
12 to Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York and
13 there are other states with surrounding
14 casinos, how much have those states when they
15 first put the casino in that state seen an
16 increase in their state gambling issues?

17 Is there anything that says that 42
18 percent were gambling before the state had it
19 because they went elsewhere. And now that the
20 state's got it, the number has gone to 48, 53?
21 How much is having it in your state really
22 grown gambling if you can go around to
23 surrounding communities? Is there any kind of
24 study out there?

1 MR. VANDER LINDEN: So, gambling
2 participation so before there was a casino
3 versus after, what does it do to gambling
4 participation within a state. I haven't seen a
5 study like that. There's very few states that
6 have done a study, a baseline study before a
7 new gambling opportunity is introduced as
8 comparison to afterwards. But it's a great
9 question. Let's see what we find in about two
10 years when we're back in the field.

11 MR. ZIEMBA: Okay. So, for next
12 steps we have some dates but instead of giving
13 them here now, I think what we'll do is try to
14 reconvene with the ethics commission as quickly
15 as we can and get back to you on the next dates
16 for the next meeting.

17 And between that meeting and this
18 time, we'll be in communication with how we
19 progress with the ethics commission. Then we
20 will send out links to the information from
21 Thursday's presentation so you have a copy of
22 that.

23 And then we'll also send out a link
24 to our internal controls regulation that govern

1 some of the credit practices that we talked
2 about today. So, we can send you all of that
3 information.

4 MR. BERMAN: Do you need these from
5 us today?

6 MR. ZIEMBA: Sure, we'll take that
7 if you have that. If you've had the
8 opportunity to read it, otherwise we'll take it
9 at the next meeting.

10 With that why don't we adjourn
11 today's meeting and we'll get back to you and
12 thank you again to Todd for following through
13 with the ethics commission and we'll see what
14 we can do.

15
16 (Meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.)

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

1 ATTACHMENTS:

- 2 1. Local Community Mitigation Advisory
3 Committee June 9, 2015 Notice of Meeting
4 and Agenda

5 MEMBERS:

- 6 Fred Berman, Somerville
7 Richard Carviello, Medford
8 Louie Depasquale, Cambridge
9 John DePriest, Chelsea
10 Ron Hogan, Malden
11 Jay Monty, Everett
12 Charles Ticotsky, RPA Region A (MAPC)
13 Alexander Train, Chelsea

14
15 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION STAFF:

- 16 Todd Grossman, Deputy General Counsel
17 Mark Vander Linden, Dir. Research and Problem
18 Gambling
19 John Ziemba, Ombudsman

20
21
22
23
24

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, Laurie J. Jordan, an Approved Court Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript from the record of the proceedings.

I, Laurie J. Jordan, further certify that the foregoing is in compliance with the Administrative Office of the Trial Court Directive on Transcript Format.

I, Laurie J. Jordan, 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 means, and transcript produced from computer.

WITNESS MY HAND this 10th day of June, 2015.



LAURIE J. JORDAN
Notary Public

My Commission expires:
May 11, 2018