

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION
PUBLIC MEETING #129

COMMISSIONERS

Gayle Cameron

James F. McHugh

Bruce W. Stebbins

Enrique Zuniga

July 15, 2014 12:30 p.m.

BUNKER HILL COMMUNITY COLLEGE
450 Rutherford Avenue, Room A300
Charlestown, Massachusetts

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

2

3 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Let me call to
4 order, if I might, public meeting 129 of the
5 Massachusetts Gaming Commission. This meeting
6 is one we called last week after we received
7 some communications from the city that I will
8 ask Ombudsman Ziemba to talk to us about and
9 describe for us in a second. But it is
10 primarily because of the need to meet in a
11 public session to decide on almost any strategic
12 plans that we make.

13 So, this is basically an
14 administrative meeting, but we are meeting here
15 because of the need to do so in a public session
16 in a public setting.

17 So, Ombudsman Ziemba, would you
18 simply outline for us what the communications
19 that we got that were essential in triggering
20 this meeting today?

21 MR. ZIEMBA: Sure, Commissioner.
22 So, as you know last Thursday was the deadline
23 for the parties to submit their best and final
24 offers to each other, the Wynn applicant and the

1 city of Boston. Late Thursday afternoon we
2 received the communication from the city of
3 Boston that it determined that it was not going
4 to participate in the arbitration process. The
5 Wynn applicant did submit their best and final
6 offer to an agent of the Commission.

7 And thereafter on Friday, Counsel
8 Blue had communications with both the applicant,
9 the city of Boston and the Mohegan Sun applicant
10 that the Commission would have a meeting today
11 to discuss the filing of the city of Boston the
12 prior day. Since that date, we have had
13 conversations with both the Wynn applicant and
14 the city of Boston in anticipation of today's
15 meeting.

16 At issue we discussed, that although
17 I could not predict what the Commission would
18 discuss today, we would like to discuss with
19 them how they could participate in any
20 discussion of impacts relative to the Wynn
21 applicant's application in Everett to the city
22 of Boston and measures that would be necessary
23 to mitigate any such impacts. In those
24 conversations, the Wynn team offered to explain

1 to the Commission its best and final offer and
2 the reasoning behind that best and final offer
3 and what it was including in that best and final
4 offer to mitigate impacts.

5 We've also had, as I've noted, a
6 conversation with the city of Boston. And the
7 city of Boston has determined that it would not
8 participate in a process by which we would try
9 to learn about the impacts of the facility and
10 the measures that would be necessary to mitigate
11 those impacts.

12 Also of note is that there were
13 recent filings by both applicants, their so-
14 called MEPA filings. For the Wynn applicant,
15 they submitted their final environmental impact
16 report filing with MEPA. Comments for that
17 report are due on August 8 from agencies and
18 other affected parties. It's anticipated that a
19 MEPA decision would be issued on the 15 of
20 August under their schedule.

21 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The MEPA
22 decision for the benefit of those watching in
23 places removed is the Massachusetts
24 Environmental Protection Act process that

1 everybody has to go through. It has periods of
2 filings and then comments and then decisions.
3 And this is the final stage for the Wynn
4 applicant.

5 MR. ZIEMBA: One other thing I
6 failed to mention is that we also issued a
7 request for comment a couple weeks ago. We had
8 both of the applicants appear before the
9 Commission and they gave extensive briefings
10 about their transportation plans.

11 And as we stated at the time, we
12 asked for public comment on those transportation
13 plans. We asked what did they look like? Are
14 there any improvements that anyone from the
15 public would offer? The deadline for those
16 comments is August 1.

17 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.
18 So, we'll monitor those and we'll have those
19 comments no later than August 1. That's a
20 helpful platform for looking at what brought us
21 here today. Let me just add a couple of other
22 components of that platform.

23 This surrounding community process
24 has been ongoing for some time. And is designed

1 to lead to a negotiated contract really between
2 an applicant and a surrounding community,
3 designed to mitigate the adverse impacts of
4 whatever casino goes up in the host community
5 and also designed to deal with whatever the two
6 sides, the city and the surrounding community,
7 thinks is an appropriate way for the surrounding
8 community to be compensated for things that may
9 happen in the future.

10 And a lot can be done in a
11 surrounding community agreement that can't be
12 imposed by either arbitration or by the
13 Commission. And we've seen that on a number of
14 occasions thus far. So, reaching a surrounding
15 community agreement has many benefits that can't
16 be reached in any other fashion.

17 If the surrounding community
18 agreement can't be reached, then the arbitration
19 process kicks in. The letter we received last
20 week simply says as provided by, and then
21 there's a citation or regulation, the city of
22 Boston respectfully declines to participate in
23 the arbitration process with Wynn MA, LLC.

24 So, they simply said they weren't

1 going to participate in the arbitration process,
2 which the Commission has designed to deal with
3 impasses and which every other surrounding
4 community and applicant faced with an impasse
5 has utilized. Sometimes to the benefit of the
6 applicant, sometimes to the benefit of the
7 surrounding community, but they've utilized it.

8 Our regulations, although this is
9 the first time that's happened, our regulations
10 contemplated the possibility that this might
11 happen. And the pertinent regulation says, and
12 I'm going to quote now, "In the event a
13 community designated a surrounding community
14 fails or refuses to participate in the
15 arbitration process set out in the regulations,
16 the Commission may deem the community to have
17 waived its designation as a surrounding
18 community provided however the Commission may
19 nevertheless impose as a condition on any
20 licensee a community impact fee and any
21 requirements it deems appropriate requirements
22 for mitigation of impacts from the development
23 or operation of a licensed gaming
24 establishment."

1 And that's really important because
2 it focuses on the Commission's obligations. The
3 Commission's obligation is to implement the
4 statute. The statute was carefully crafted to
5 mitigate the adverse impacts of a gaming
6 establishment on both the host and surrounding
7 communities calibrated in a different way, but
8 that's what the statute was designed to do. And
9 that outlines, as I see it at least and I think
10 we all see it, and we'll talk about that in a
11 second, our obligation.

12 We have an obligation to do our best
13 to protect the city from the adverse impact of a
14 gaming establishment on its borders even if the
15 city doesn't want to protect itself or
16 participate in the process of protecting itself.
17 So, we have that obligation.

18 Nobody comes in from out of town and
19 says these are the terms in which we are going
20 to erect a gaming establishment. This is what
21 we're going to do. The Commission has
22 obligations with respect to looking at the
23 positive and negative impacts of that. There is
24 permitting authorities have obligations. And

1 it's the Commission's obligation to make sure
2 that all of those have a responsible role in
3 whatever outcome materializes.

4 So, the bottom line is that we have
5 an obligation now whatever else happens to try
6 to figure out, at least as I see it, what
7 appropriate mitigation conditions would be and
8 to go about that in a responsible way given the
9 city's election simply to do nothing and
10 withdraw from any participation in a design to
11 protect the citizens from adverse impacts.

12 So, why don't we talk for a minute
13 at a high-level. It's, I think, too early to
14 come up with a concrete detailed plan on how we
15 proceed. But let's talk little bit about the
16 things that we can do and should do to gather
17 the information really that we need in order to
18 contemplate and talk about and think about the
19 conditions that will be necessary to protect the
20 citizens of the city from any foreseeable at
21 least adverse impacts. Let's open that. Who
22 wants to open that discussion?

23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I can start
24 and just say look, we are well underway with our

1 evaluation which includes mitigation. So, we've
2 already started to look at a number of impacts
3 to all of the surrounding communities and
4 certainly Boston. So, we have some information
5 we need.

6 And we'll continue to evaluate and
7 make sure we are looking at every detail of
8 those impacts, and that they will be mitigated
9 properly. I think we need to continue hearing
10 from people. Staff can help us with that new
11 responsibility and reaching out, making sure we
12 have all of the information we need and we've
13 considered every aspect to the best of our
14 ability anyway of what those impacts will be.

15 And I am very confident that we have
16 the proper staff consultants to help us with
17 that whether it be environmental or traffic.
18 We've already looked at schools and housing.
19 We've started the process but I think hearing
20 from more people would be helpful as well to
21 make sure we are not missing something, to make
22 sure we understand all of the impacts.

23 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yes.

24 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Could we

1 dissect a little bit that regulation perhaps
2 with the help of the legal minds here? Because
3 as you point out now the obligation comes to the
4 Commission and I think we are very much up to
5 the task with a lot of the information that we
6 have or can gather in the near future. And I
7 think we at some point need to talk about the
8 schedule.

9 But we did not designate that the
10 city has waived its designation as a surrounding
11 community in order for us to essentially step up
12 to the plate of understanding those impacts and
13 assessing or reaching a solution with the
14 applicant; is that a fair statement?

15 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yes. And
16 Counsel can correct me if my understanding is
17 wrong, but we don't need to do that. In fact,
18 we've imposed conditions on entities that have
19 reached surrounding community agreements in our
20 prior licensing decisions. In those cases,
21 there have been host community agreements,
22 surrounding community agreements where we've
23 imposed additional conditions, mitigation
24 conditions notwithstanding that.

1 MS. BLUE: That is a correct
2 description. I think the first step is to
3 gather facts to look at what might be
4 appropriate conditions and get the information
5 to do that. And a question about designation
6 status is something that can be addressed later.
7 It need not be discussed now.

8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It need not be
9 discussed now, fair enough.

10 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. So, I
11 think what you're suggesting is we ought to
12 really get facts and issues, talk to more people
13 and pursue the kinds of things we've been
14 thinking about thus far.

15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: John mentioned
16 something that the applicant was willing to
17 present their best and final offer to staff that
18 was ready to the arbitrator.

19 MR. ZIEMBA: Yes. They probably
20 meant that they would present it to the
21 Commission. What might be appropriate, given
22 the level of detail, perhaps we can as a staff,
23 we can meet with the applicant in an expeditious
24 manner and go over all of the details of what

1 their arguments are regarding their best and
2 final offer, and what underlies that best and
3 final offer.

4 MS. BLUE: I think given some of the
5 timing and the amount of information we may want
6 to look at, it's much more expeditious for staff
7 to get involved and to gather as much
8 information as possible and review it and then
9 get that off to the Commission.

10 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: That makes
11 sense. Would it be helpful to have a couple of
12 our consultants be present as well to hear
13 especially if there are details about, for
14 example, transportation, those kinds of issues,
15 would that be helpful.

16 MS. BLUE: Most definitely, yes, we
17 will involve them.

18 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's an
19 interesting format. Still speaking at a high-
20 level and with more detail to come, we could
21 certainly ask staff to do that to reach out to
22 the applicant, continue to reach out to the
23 city. The city may change its mind and one
24 would hope that it would. They have a wealth of

1 information that would be useful and helpful to
2 the citizens of the city if it were brought into
3 this process.

4 And also to other groups who have an
5 interest, and have expressed an interest and
6 have done so responsibly and thoughtfully, to
7 reach out to them and see what information we
8 can get. And perhaps have a public hearing with
9 the Commission at which we could present -- ask
10 them to present issues that would be helpful for
11 everybody to see and helpful to us in our
12 thinking and discussion. Because again, we
13 can't discuss these things except -- among the
14 four of us except in a public setting. And we
15 need to do that before the end . Would that
16 make sense as a process?

17 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: It would
18 make sense.

19 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think it
20 would.

21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. As of
22 Thursday there were 30 days in our schedule for
23 "and arbitration process"; is that correct?

24 MR. ZIEMBA: So, the arbitrations

1 were due to last for 20 days. And then
2 following that there was a process by which the
3 arbitration award could be converted into an
4 agreement. If there was a fundamental
5 inconsistency petition that would be an
6 additional three days parceled out, but in
7 essence approximately 30 days.

8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: As we
9 undertake this process of gathering information,
10 perhaps scheduling the applicant to present
11 before this Commission, etc., is the assumption
12 that we would accomplish that in the next 20
13 days? Or is it too early to even tell schedule
14 wise?

15 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Because there
16 is no arbitration, I'm assuming that we're not
17 bound by those dates. Would that be accurate?

18 MR. ZIEMBA: That's correct.

19 MS. BLUE: That's correct. I think
20 what we would like to do is start down that
21 process to gather some information, be able to
22 report back to you at the next Commission
23 meeting, which is next week as to where we are
24 and what we've accomplished. And then maybe

1 when we have that we can look a little bit more
2 closely in terms of timeframes and schedules.

3 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: But I think
4 to your point, I think we're trying not to throw
5 our deliberation week off from where it's
6 currently scheduled and using this timeframe
7 that would have been allowed for arbitration and
8 actually do some of this data gathering input.
9 If we choose to take more public comment, we've
10 obviously heard from the residents of this
11 neighborhood about the traffic issues but there
12 might be other issues. I think to Commissioner
13 Cameron's point, we do need to schedule time to
14 hear from the community on other issues.

15 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I think
16 everyone of us wants to stay on that schedule
17 that we have for the early September decision.
18 The time limit is most important for completion
19 of the arbitration process, closing the
20 statutory host community hearing and then moving
21 on, as I understand that, correct me if I'm
22 wrong.

23 And if we're not, because there is
24 no arbitration, bound by those closing dates for

1 arbitration, there's no reason (A) that the city
2 can't continue to negotiate with the applicant.
3 In fact, if they're not going to participate in
4 negotiation -- in arbitration, takes away one
5 tool but it doesn't prohibit them from
6 negotiating or continuing negotiations nor does
7 the timeline set up for arbitration require us
8 to finish our work necessarily, and we can talk
9 about that more, necessarily by the deadline we
10 set up to the arbitration issue.

11 So, we can go beyond with our work,
12 beyond the early August date for ending the
13 arbitration process and still continue to do our
14 work before making final decisions about
15 conditions. Am I right about that?

16 MS. BLUE: No, that's right. The
17 parties can continue to negotiate through this
18 whole timeframe. If they're having mutual
19 negotiations that would be fine. The schedule
20 as we outlined it assumed there would be an
21 arbitration and then built those periods into
22 it. But if there is no arbitration, the really
23 only hard dates are when you close the host
24 community hearing, and then you need to tak

1 action no sooner than 30 or later than 90. So,
2 that's really the only hard date that you have
3 and the timelines that flow from that.

4 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's a much
5 more succinct description than I gave. But to
6 try to fit my point into that, there's no reason
7 after we close the host community hearing that
8 we can't continue to work on information
9 gathering to go into conditions.

10 MS. BLUE: That's right.

11 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: No necessary
12 reason.

13 MR. ZIEMBA: No. As we've done in
14 the past, we continue to work on the conditions
15 up until the final days of the award.

16 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right, indeed
17 even through the hearing we've done that.

18 MS. BLUE: Yes, that's right.

19 MR. ZIEMBA: Correct.

20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Especially
21 with the dates that you outlined initially which
22 are relative to the final environmental impact
23 report, both the comments and the decision.

24 MR. ZIEMBA: Correct.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Correct.

2 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right.

3 Commissioner Stebbins, anything you want --

4 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I had just
5 two quick questions for Counsel. So, you
6 gathered from the communication from the city
7 even if there was information, I understand they
8 don't want to participate in the arbitration or
9 these discussions or negotiations, but are they
10 open to us asking the city for any type of data
11 that we might need and they hopefully would be
12 willing to share that or provide that to us?

13 MR. ZIEMBA: I think it's fair to
14 say they're going to watch today's proceedings.
15 And that we will continue to have conversations
16 with them to see if they have a way of providing
17 input to us. So, we will continue to do that.

18 Again, we tried to do this meeting
19 as quickly as we possibly can and as things
20 become more clear about us trying to evaluate
21 impacts and how to mitigate those impacts,
22 perhaps the city might provide more valuable
23 information. But I think it's fair to say that
24 they've decided not to participate in and the

1 initial thoughts of an arbitration process that
2 we've identified in the last day or so.

3 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.

4 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Do you feel
5 like, thinking about what needs to be done, our
6 conversation today, do you have enough time to
7 gather the appropriate information?

8 MR. ZIEMBA: I think the information
9 has been gathered. Much of the information has
10 been gathered. How you deal with some of the
11 impacts that have been identified or that will
12 be identified, we are going to continue to work
13 on that. I think what our plan would be is that
14 we report to you at our next meeting about our
15 progress and how we stand there.

16 Obviously, we would benefit very
17 significantly from ideas on how the plans that
18 have been put forward by the applicant in
19 mitigating impacts, how people view those plans,
20 are they sufficient? Do they need to go in a
21 different direction? If we have input from the
22 neighborhood, if we have input from other
23 groups, if we have input from the city that
24 would be very valuable information that in some

1 regards we do have now but in many regards we do
2 not..

3 So, with the information that we've
4 gathered today and hopefully some new
5 information that might be forthcoming as part of
6 the MEPA process, more information that might be
7 available if we receive significant comments to
8 the transportation comment period and other
9 outreach that we do to all of those groups,
10 we'll be able to provide you an update on where
11 we are with information needs.

12 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The document
13 that the applicant recently filed is called a
14 final environmental information report --

15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Impact.

16 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Pardon me?

17 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Impact.

18 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: -- impact report
19 is about 5000 pages long, I think and has about
20 at least a couple of thousand pages dealing with
21 traffic, does it not; is that fair?

22 MR. ZIEMBA: Yes.

23 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So, there's a
24 great deal of information about traffic in

1 there. There's the traffic presentations that
2 the applicant made some time ago. And certainly
3 all of that information is available to us. And
4 there will be commentary on that. Maybe the
5 city will comment on that to the environmental
6 protection folks and they might favor us with a
7 copy of whatever they send to the environmental
8 people. We could certainly ask them if they
9 would do that.

10 But evaluating that and finding
11 where the shortcomings are, if any, in that
12 information would be one thing that would help
13 us figure out what some of the conditions could
14 be. Because we know that traffic is a
15 significant aspect of the concerns about this
16 applicant's proposal. So, we can try to do
17 that. Other thoughts?

18 Well, it seems to me that we have a
19 number of avenues that we could ask staff to
20 pursue beginning right now and then come back to
21 us with a more detailed report as to what
22 they've been able to accomplish and maybe a more
23 structured plan for the future would be.

24 They include asking the applicant to

1 participate as talking to us about its final,
2 best and final offer. Continuing to ask the
3 city if they changed their mind to help us with
4 the things that they see as the main concerns
5 here. Having the consultants review
6 independently the information from the sources
7 that we have.

8 And that process, as you said
9 Commissioner Cameron, is ongoing now. We're
10 meeting twice a week with consultants to look
11 over all of the material that's been filed. We
12 continue that process, and ask them to look at
13 the new information contained in the
14 environmental filings.

15 We can encourage detailed comments
16 on the proposed traffic plans. And in fact, as
17 you mentioned, the comments are being sought
18 right now and that period is open until the 1 of
19 August. We can always extend that given this
20 unexpected development if that would be helpful.

21 The citizens of Charlestown
22 undoubtedly have some thoughts and comments.
23 There are a number groups that have worked very
24 thoughtfully here for years, we can ask staff to

1 reach out to them and get their views and
2 inputs. And we could take a look at other
3 surrounding community agreements. We've already
4 done that. But take a look at them with an idea
5 toward either common themes that should be and
6 could be included in whatever conditions we
7 impose here. And do all of that information
8 gathering and outreach and then continue to talk
9 among ourselves.

10 I do think it would be helpful to
11 have at some point in this plan that's created a
12 provision for a public hearing or two at which
13 we could invite people to come and tell us their
14 thoughts and try to get a little bit of a
15 dialogue perhaps between people who have
16 slightly different views on things and craft
17 some things that might work.

18 It may be in the end that some of
19 these problems can't be solved. But it may also
20 be and is more likely I think that we could find
21 some creative ideas for many of them. And we
22 need to do that. We need to do that to fulfill
23 our statutory obligations. Does that make sense
24 that plan, Commissioner Zuniga?

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. I may
2 see the obvious here but I am disappointed that
3 the parties at least as of now were not able to
4 reach a negotiated agreement. But as you
5 alluded to, Commissioner, is the best outcome at
6 least in theory. But I'm encouraged that our
7 regulations anticipated at least in the
8 framework put forward for all kinds of
9 instances.

10 There's many twists and turns about
11 surrounding community and host community that
12 nobody anticipated. And I talked about this
13 recently, what happened in Springfield having
14 more than one applicant. In this case there's a
15 city with two applicants as a surrounding
16 community with different dynamics going on. But
17 I think the plan that you outlined in terms of
18 gathering as much information as we can as
19 quickly as we can as well as perhaps I hope that
20 the negotiated solution is not a door that's
21 completely shut out. That's about as good as we
22 can do.

23 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. I
24 share all of those hopes. In the meantime while

1 hoping, we'll simply act do what we were
2 appointed to do. And I don't think we need a
3 vote here. We are simply talking about an
4 overall, very high-level plan. And I think
5 we've got a consensus as to what the broad
6 dimensions of that plan ought to be.
7 Commissioner Zuniga?

8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You mentioned
9 the possibility of having a hearing or two
10 specifically relative to traffic impacts for
11 one, but whatever others. Are you thinking in
12 addition to the closing of the hearing, the host
13 community hearing?

14 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I would like
15 to explore that. I would like to explore a
16 hearing devoted to perhaps a couple of topics
17 that are particularly thorny that have
18 particularly different points of view.

19 I'd like the staff to take a look at
20 what they get and think about that. Maybe it
21 wouldn't be necessary. But I would like to at
22 least have that part of the framework that staff
23 considers. It may not be necessary, but it may
24 be very helpful for people to see two reasoned

1 approaches or three reasoned approaches to the
2 same solution discussed in a public setting.

3 I know that's been done. And I know
4 that has been done over the years with respect
5 to a number of issues affecting this particular
6 - to the Charlestown community. But we haven't
7 participated in it. We haven't heard it. So,
8 if we're trying to form conditions, it seems to
9 me we ought to be cognizant of those kinds of
10 things. Maybe we don't need a hearing to do
11 that, but at least I'd like that to be explored.
12 Does that make sense?

13 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: It does. And
14 we may hear in comments that are coming in in
15 the next week or so on transportation, what
16 those issues are and may be able to judge if the
17 hearing would be helpful.

18 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yes, yes.

19 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: And
20 obviously, we take comments as to other topics
21 people in the community may want us to address
22 that we haven't looked at yet. So, kind of an
23 agenda setting if we do further public hearings,
24 we'll hopefully get some feedback as to what

1 topics folks in the community would like to have
2 us address.

3 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All right. It
4 sounds to me like we have a plan, at least a
5 high-level plan. And we will return to this at
6 our regular meeting on the 24th, a week from
7 Thursday. And in the meantime, we are asking
8 staff to begin the process of outreach, begin
9 the process of information gathering, let the
10 community know and the city, everybody who is
11 interested know that that's what we're up to.

12 That's why people will be knocking
13 on your door or calling on your phone. Not
14 knocking on your door, I think, but calling on
15 your phone or sending you a tweet. And we'll
16 gather information and we'll proceed to do the
17 job that we were appointed to do. Thank you.

18 I guess the next step would be to
19 ask for a motion to adjourn.

20 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: So moved.

21 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

22 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: All in favor,
23 aye.

24 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

2 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

3 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The ayes have
4 it unanimously. Thank you.

5

6 (Meeting concluded at 1:03 p.m.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 ATTACHMENTS:

- 2 1. Massachusetts Gaming Commission July 15,
3 2014 Notice of Meeting and Agenda

4
5

6 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION STAFF:

7 Catherine Blue, General Counsel

8 John Ziemba, Ombudsman

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

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

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 16th day of July, 2014.

LAURIE J. JORDAN My Commission expires:
Notary Public May 11, 2018