		Page 1
1	THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS	
2	MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION	
3	PUBLIC MEETING #158	
4		
5		
6	CHAIRMAN	
7	Stephen P. Crosby	
8		
9	COMMISSIONERS	
10	Gayle Cameron	
11	James F. McHugh	
12	Bruce W. Stebbins	
13	Enrique Zuniga	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19	July 23, 2015 10:30 a.m 3:45 p.m.	
20	HYNES CONVENTION CENTER	
21	900 Boylston Street, Room 103	
22	Boston, Massachusetts	
23		
24		

PROCEEDINGS:

2

1

3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I guess we will be 4 starting this on time. This is the 158 meeting 5 of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission at the 6 Hynes Auditorium on July 23. Can everybody 7 hear all right? As usual, we will start with

8 the approval of the minutes, Commissioner

McHugh.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Mr. Chairman, the minutes for the July 9 meeting are in the book. And I'd move their approval in the form they appear there with the usual reservation of rights to correct typographical and mechanical errors.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any issues? I just had one. On the 11:26 entry, this is a detail. I don't think the 11:26 entry scans quite right. Just maybe we can check that when we go back.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: You mean it's

23 wrong?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: No. I think the

Page 3 1 language is improper. 2 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. So, 3 maybe compare that to the tape or the 4 transcript or both. Okay. 5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think it's just 6 a matter of straightening out the word choice. 7 There's too many verbs or something. 8 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else? 10 All in favor, aye. 11 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye. 12 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 14 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 16 have it unanimously. 17 Next is item number three, Racing 18 Division, Interim Director Alex Lightbaum. 19 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Good morning, Commissioners and Chairman. Suffolk Downs has 20 21 applied for three racing festival days August 22 8, September 5 and October 3. They are 23 planning on running the three Mass. bred races

a day totaling \$150,000 in purses. Four races

would be restricted to horses that had previously started at Suffolk Downs.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Excuse me. It's \$150,000 total or per day?

DR. LIGHTBAUM: Per day. Four races would be restricted to horses that previously started at Suffolk Downs with total purses per day of about \$110,000. There would be up to three steeplechase races with purses for each race in the \$30-\$35,000 range. The rest of the races would give preference to horses that raced at Suffolk in 2014 providing that they met the conditions of those races.

If they are approved for the race days, Sterling Suffolk Racecourse has requested a distribution of \$1.75 million from the Race Horse Development Fund. This was to go into the purse account per Chapter 23K section 60. Chapter 10 of the Acts of 2015 allows for the money in the purse account to be used for administrative and horse racing operations.

The \$1.75 million would be used as follows: \$1.2 million for purses for the three days of racing, \$325,000 for the racing

operating expenses and future racing facility development expenses and \$225,000 for the NEHBPA annual operating expenses. If there is no live racing this money can be escrowed for three years.

The Acts of 2015 Chapter 10 allows Suffolk Downs to continue simulcasting through July 31, 2016 as long as there's a minimum of one day of racing at Suffolk Downs in 2015 and 2016. Approving these three days would allow Suffolk to continue to offer simulcasting and retain some of their employees.

In looking at the requirements for granting the license, there are several criteria under 128A section 3(i). Number one is financial ability. Suffolk has the financial ability to operate using the money in accordance with Chapter 10 of the Acts of 2015 for some of the operating expenses. Even with that money, there will be a loss of money and run a deficit which they can make up with their simulcasting revenue.

The facility is suitable for operation during the months that they are

planning to race and safe and convenient for large number of spectators. Number three, the staff they're hiring is experienced and should be qualified to honestly manage racing. And the increased purses should help ensure good quality racing.

Number four, as far as having the proper physical facilities for racing, Suffolk has stated that they will do some carpeting and maintenance on the barns to be used.

Number five the track surface is usually very safe with a low rate of injuries. With minimal time for training ahead of time on the track, the Racing Division recommends that Suffolk be required to get an outside track expert to evaluate the surface. Normally, when we open at Suffolk, there is a month, month and a half of training on the surface before there's actual racing. This time they'll just be a day ahead of time.

Finally, since the track kitchen has burned down, they will have a food truck for the people on the backside, which is not ideal to not have a kitchen but it's offset by their

intention to not charge for the food. The dorms will be recommissioned and available for use.

My recommendation, if the two options for this year are the three-day meet or no meet, I recommend the Commission approve the three-day meet with the following conditions:

Suffolk will get an independent expert in to review the track surface prior to racing.

Suffolk will provide a detailed budget to the Commission. Every effort will be made to limit the number of steeplechase races to one per day.

After each day of racing, Suffolk will report to the Commission the number and percentage of recent Suffolk horsemen and horses that benefited from their races. And that the date in August will be pushed back at least one week to August 15, preferably August 22 to give the Commission time to approve the racing officials, key operating officials, and license and fingerprint the occupational licensees and to get our staff on board.

Again, the recommendation is if we

have the two options -- if there is a third option where there could be a longer meet at Suffolk that would be preferable. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Can I just as an aside say that this screen has been clicking in and out throughout Dr. Lightbaum's presentation. So, I wonder if we actually have a good stream.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Maybe somebody can work on this screen. You're saying it's working fine on the Web? Okay. Because the image on our screen keeps going off.

DR. LIGHTBAUM: Pardon me. I forgot condition number six, if I may. Condition number six, Suffolk Downs is in arrears with the Commission in regards to the Twin Spires ADW from March through June. It's an estimated \$20,000. They need to provide the Commission with a signed contract and become current with their payments. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I get to a number that Mr. Chairman was alluding to? So, the purses are going to be under \$150,000 per day altogether, right?

```
1
                DR. LIGHTBAUM: The total is
 2
     $500,000 in purses each day that they're
 3
    planning on giving out.
 4
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Where does the
5
     150 come from?
6
                DR. LIGHTBAUM: There's 150 that
 7
    would go to the Mass. bred races. There would
8
    be three with $50,000 for each race.
9
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. So, if
10
     it's 500 per day, the request is $1.7 million
11
     for three days. So, where is the other 200?
12
                DR. LIGHTBAUM: The $150,000 for the
13
    Mass. bred races is a separate pool of money
14
     and it's estimate. The races all will have
15
    different purses. And depending on which races
16
     fill will be what actually is paid in purses
     for the day.
17
18
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
                                      So, it's fair
19
     to say the $1.7 million all goes to purses
20
     throughout the three days different races, etc.
21
                DR. LIGHTBAUM:
22
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The 1.7?
23
                DR. LIGHTBAUM:
24
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY:
```

Page 10 1 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Yes. 2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'm sorry, 3 1.2. 4 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Yes. 5 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: This gets back 6 to something we talked about yesterday. 1.2 7 divided by three is \$400,000 per day. So, 8 there's a \$500,000 number. There's the \$1.2 million which is \$400,000. 9 10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: They usually paid 11 out --12 DR. LIGHTBAUM: If you pay out the 13 \$400,000 and then add to that the \$150,000 for 14 the Mass. bred races, it comes to \$550,000. 15 So, it's right around that. 16 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: You said that 17 yesterday when we talked yesterday. 18 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: That's 16 19 percent to the breeders? 20 DR. LIGHTBAUM: That's the money 21 that would normally go to the breeders, yes. 22 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I had a 23 question, Dr. Lightbaum, about you mentioned if 24 there's a third alternative to a longer meet

1 | certainly that would be preferable.

DR. LIGHTBAUM: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Were you talking about the letter in our packet that there's sincere interest from the Stronach Group?

DR. LIGHTBAUM: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Do we have any more information about the other than what Mr. Lagorio has informed us in his letter?

DR. LIGHTBAUM: There's been ongoing talks. Some of the board members have been looking into it also. One in particular has sent in a letter saying that with that option their opinion on whether to do the three days or not has changed let's do a delay and see if something could be worked out with the Stronach Group for a longer-term meet.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: That's a board member who has now switched from being supportive of this to not being supportive because of this possible option?

DR. LIGHTBAUM: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Maybe I would

1 have a question of Mr. Lagorio. We certainly want to hear from him. 2 3 DR. LIGHTBAUM: And Mr. Tuttle can 4 talk to that also. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 5 Right. 6 Maybe, Mr. Chair how would you like to do this? COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I just have 8 a couple of questions for Alex on the memo 9 before we jump over. 10 Dr. Lightbaum, \$325,000 for racing 11 operating expenses and future racing facility 12 development expenses. Does that number break 13 out somehow? You're talking about two 14 different items being funded with that money. 15 DR. LIGHTBAUM: I don't have a 16 breakout for it, but what they're looking to do 17 is be able to use some of that money towards 18 the development of their idea of getting their 19 own land to build a racetrack on. 20 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: But we don't 21 know how much? 22 DR. LIGHTBAUM: HBPA is here today 23 and they may be able to give you a breakdown on 24 that.

1 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. The 2 other question I had the conditions under your 3 recommendations, obviously where we're putting 4 some of the license conditions, everything is 5 pretty much clear-cut and straightforward 6 except where we get to item number three. Ιt 7 says every effort will be made. Why don't we 8 just say the number of steeplechase races is X 9 or Y? 10 DR. LIGHTBAUM: We may want to ask 11 Lou Raffetto about that. One of the reasons he 12 wanted the steeplechase races as a possibility 13 was in case he didn't have enough of the 14 regular flat races to fill the card up. That 15 he felt like he could count on a certain number 16 of entries from the steeplechase races. 17 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: We in the 18 past Suffolk has not had steeplechase races? 19 DR. LIGHTBAUM: They had it two 20 years in the 90s. They had like a day or two 2.1 of it. 22 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Does this 23 get back to a facility question as to whether I 24 guess I should -- whether the track could be

1 constructed or positioned in time to conduct 2 steeplechase races. 3 They'll the turf DR. LIGHTBAUM: 4 course. And the turf course will be ready to 5 be used by them. 6 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 7 Doctor, was 8 the reason you wanted that number to be a lesser number because it doesn't affect our 9 10 local horsemen, correct? 11 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Right. 12 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: There are no local horsemen who are prepared or trained to 13 14 be in those races, correct? 15 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Exactly. When you look at the numbers, it's almost a coincidence 16 17 that they're figuring about \$90,000 to go out 18 to the steeplechase, three races \$30,000 each. 19 That's about what they ran for a day at Suffolk 20 last year around \$100-\$110,000 a day. 21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But those 22 would not be the only races though on that day? 23 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Correct. 24 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: With the

1 numbers that you have listed in your memo, you 2 really have to get to 15 races a day to use up 3 the whole \$550,000, right? 4 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Close to that, yes. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's seven 5 6 and a half hours of racing? 7 DR. LIGHTBAUM: It would be a long day of racing, yes. 8 9 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Is that realistic? 10 11 DR. LIGHTBAUM: If some of the Mass. 12 bred races are not full races, they may race 13 those as non-betting races. And they would be 14 held before the card, before the official card. 15 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: They would 16 generate the purse money but not betting. 17 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Right. They would 18 be run for purse money only and be non-betting 19 races. And of course we would test them since 20 they're going for purse money. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What Commissioner 22 McHugh asked is it plausible to have 15 races? 23 DR. LIGHTBAUM: If they start early 24 enough, it is. They can do it. Certainly, it

1 will be a long day for the staff and everybody. 2 Again, it'll depend on what races fill. I think there's a little bit of 3 4 uncertainty here because we haven't done 5 something like this here before. And maybe 6 Suffolk Downs has a better idea of what commitments they've gotten from people to come 8 for those days, but there is some uncertainty about how many horses will come and be 9 10 available. 11 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Does that mean 12 that there's also some uncertainty about the 13 amount of actual prize money that would be 14 In other words, if cards don't fill given out? 15 -- This is premised on about 15 races, the 550. So, let's assume there's only 10 races that can 16 17 be filled, does the 550 drop down to say four? 18 DR. LIGHTBAUM: It could. It could 19 also be that the races with the higher purses are the ones that fill. So, that may bring the 20 21 level up.

22 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Does the 1.7

change if the 550 changes downward?

DR. LIGHTBAUM: The 1.2 for the

1 purses? 2 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The 1.2 --3 Well, it's 1.2 plus the Mass. breds. 4 DR. LIGHTBAUM: The Mass. bred purse 5 money will probably go out one way or another 6 regardless of whether they're betting races or not. And then you're right. The 1.2 could 8 vary depending on what races fill. 9 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And if the 1.2 10 varies downward does the 1.7 vary downward as 11 well? In other words, are they linked? If the 12 1.2 goes down --13 MR. TUTTLE: Thank you, 14 Commissioners. Perhaps I can be helpful. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Introduce 16 yourself. 17 MR. TUTTLE: Chip Tuttle, Chief 18 Operating Officer Suffolk Downs. 19 allocation requested in the breakdown \$1.2 20 million for overnight purses and then the other 21 money for the HBPA for its operating expenses 22 and to pursue its longer-term option. 23 If for example we pay \$1.1 million 24 in purses instead of \$1.2 million,

traditionally that \$100,000 would just remain in the purse account until such time there was another time for someone to run for it.

So, it goes into the purse account. The purse account has specific uses based on the legislation. But if the Commission wants to consider conditioning the award of purse money on a certain level of it being used, certainly that's reasonable as far as we're concerned.

But none of this is set in stone until you see what races actually fill and at what purse levels. So, there can always be some variation. For the last several years we've actually paid more in purses than we've anticipated on a budget basis.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So, the 1.2 then is an estimate that could float up or down depending on circumstances as they unfold?

MR. TUTTLE: Correct.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Other questions?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: For other

individuals, I think so. Did we want to hear

1 from the potential licensee first and then ask 2 additional questions? 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If you had 4 anything to add. That was all I had at 5 MR. TUTTLE: 6 on that particular. I'm happy, as always, to 7 offer any clarification or answer any questions 8 that you have. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That question is 10 for Mr. Lagorio? Is that what I'm hearing? 11 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Just one 12 second. Do you know anything about the 13 Stronach -- Am I pronouncing that correctly? -14 issue? 15 One of our owners MR. TUTTLE: Yes. 16 received a call this weekend from a 17 representative of the Stronach Group saying 18 that that representative of the Stronach Group 19 had been contacted by some of the horsemen 20 wanting to know if there was an interest. 21 He expressed a polite level of 22 I spoke to two individuals from the interest. 23 Stronach Group this week just to follow up on 24 this. I can tell you there is no plan that we

- have right now to lease the facility to anyone.
 And as that would require someone else being
- 3 the licensee, that's highly impractical on one

4 level for this year.

So, we're always happy to entertain discussions with people who have an interest in the facility, but we certainly don't think it's viable that another plan could be put forward at this juncture would involve another potential licensee leasing our track operation.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Why is that?

12 Is it time? Is it negotiations?

MR. TUTTLE: I think it's several factors, Judge. It is time and I don't think there's been any due diligence as to what the actual financial terms would be and which obligations would behoove us. We've been running a simulcasting operation now for seven months with lots of liabilities involved in that.

So, it's a pretty complicated -- If there had been conversations ongoing for the last two or three months that would be one thing. But this popped up Sunday at the behest

1 of, I believe, at the behest of Mr. Lagorio's 2 group. He contacted the Stronach Group and 3 asked them if they were interested. 4 So, yes. It's multifactorial but I 5 don't anticipate that we would be able to come 6 to an arrangement in the short-term. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If you didn't have 8 simulcasting, wouldn't that change the dynamic 9 of those discussions quite a bit? 10 MR. TUTTLE: It may, but we do. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: For now, right? That's the issue in front of us in effect. 12 13 don't have it without a live race day. 14 MR. TUTTLE: Correct. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If you have a live 16 race day, at least one, then you have the 17 simulcast. 18 MR. TUTTLE: Yes. And we have every 19 confidence that we can satisfy the law that was 20 passed in March and that we're fully capable of 21 conducting at least one day of live racing. 22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: My point was that 23 what Mr. Lagorio was saying, and I want to talk

to him about this as well, is that without that

1 leverage there is no incentive for you to 2 negotiate a deal. And what they're trying to 3 do is they think a deal can be negotiated. 4 have no idea whether it could or not, none, 5 zero. 6 But their point is that without that leverage that there's no incentive for you to 7 8 negotiate a deal and that's how this whole conversation is linked. I know you understand 9 10 that. 11 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I know that 12 there hasn't been discussion. I'm just 13 probing, isn't it conceivable -- Take Stronach 14 out of the play. -- that somebody if they were 15 interested and competent and capable of meeting financial terms could come in and be the 16 17 operator under your license with the 18 Commission's approval? 19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That's what 20 they're proposing. 21 MR. TUTTLE: Yes. I guess that 22 would be up to the Commission. 23 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. 24 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Isn't that the role of Mr. Raffetto? That's effectively what they're proposing.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: No. That's not what Mr. Tuttle was saying a minute ago.

MR. TUTTLE: We entered our discussions with the horsemen over the winter under the premise that the horseman would be the licensee based on the one-day placeholder they were granted by this Commission back in October.

It became apparent to us during the course of those discussions that they were not going to be able to follow through. So, when we were looking at legislative options that would allow us to continue to simulcast, we changed the parameters of our thinking and anticipated that we would be the licensee.

So, we hadn't contemplated leasing the operation to anyone else nor had anyone else expressed an interest. The Stronach Group did not express any interest over the winter January, March, May, whatever.

So, this is sort of news to us that they may be interested now. I certainly am not

one to ever close the door on any possibility,
but I do think at this juncture that the idea
that there would be an agreement -- Again, I
don't know that they have any idea of what the
financial issues potentially that they would be
facing.

When we were considering leasing the racing operations to the horsemen, we were looking at a sizable rent payment. And we haven't even gotten to that stage of the discussion with the Stronach Group. And given our historic losses, it's hard to imagine any circumstance where any operator as great as they may be would be able to somehow flip that in the short-term.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I understand all of those. I was just as long as you're here and we're talking about a probing a little bit in part with an eye towards next year.

There's time.

MR. TUTTLE: There's certainly time for that. And if Stronach Group or another operator has a legitimate interest, we'd entertain that.

1 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: 2 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Chip you 3 said you had conversations with a couple of 4 their executives. How was the conversation 5 left? 6 MR. TUTTLE: The conversation was 7 left that we would follow up with them in the 8 next couple of weeks. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, it's your 10 impression that they are interested, 11 apparently? 12 MR. TUTTLE: I think, yes. They 13 have expressed some interest but they've 14 expressed that interest ironically under the 15 premise that gaming may occur at the property in the future. 16 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. But as 18 recently as a couple of days ago apparently you 19 talked to them and it sounds like there is 20 going to be an ongoing conversation. They're 21 still interested. 22 MR. TUTTLE: Yes. 23 I would be COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 24 interested in hearing more about this since

it's a fairly new proposal, and our racing 1 2 director thinks it's a viable opportunity if 3 there is any opportunity here. So, I would be 4 interested in hearing from Mr. Lagorio about There is such a 5 those conversations. 6 significant opposition to these three days that I think it's important to hear people. Are we 8 prepared to hear that now, Mr. Lagorio? 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Doug, do you want 10 to move over and let Mr. Lagorio use that mic? 11 Introduce yourself. 12 MR. LAGORIO: Hi, I'm Bill Lagorio, 13 30 year plus trainer in Massachusetts. I live 14 in Revere, Massachusetts my whole life. I am a 15 local person right here in Massachusetts. 16 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Mr. Lagorio, 17 I certainly read the documents you provided us 18 for today. And one of those documents had to 19 do with the Stronach Group and your 20 conversations. 21 Could you elaborate on that and what 22 you think is possible or is not possible based 23 on your conversations?

MR. LAGORIO: Sure, Commissioner.

The conversation was to open up some dialogue
with Stronach. We have a local connection and
Tim Ritvo who is a Revere native from
Beachmont, longtime jockey at Suffolk Downs.

He's now the COO. He operates out of Gulfstream and Laurel Park in Maryland. So, he's between Florida and Maryland. And then up in Canada you have the president Mike Rogers.

I opened some dialogue with Tim.

And we started to talk about Massachusetts racing. I sent him a copy of what we have now to be about 300 plus horsemen including addresses and phone numbers.

And Tim said to me we had interest, we've had interest in the past. We've tried to get in. And we spoke to -- He said, what was the president's name of the HBPA? And I mentioned Mr. Spadea. He said we passed it by them a while ago. We had a plan put together that would bundle the simulcast signal with other states, making that a very profitable entity.

And they had a whole idea of coming into Massachusetts. Part of it would be to

- 1 hopefully to lease Suffolk Downs and with their 2 intent down the road if they had to build 3 racetrack certainly that is their business, 4 they would. So, the conversation kind of 5 surprised me. 6 And I said during the June 11 7 hearing here or at the convention center, I 8 mentioned that Stronach might have an interest. 9 And I mentioned to Tim that it was really 10 brought upon us that you didn't have an 11 interest. And he said to me Bill that's a 12 flat-out lie. 13 And I said, Tim those are strong 14 words, but I will take your word that you are 15 interested. 16 So, he said, based on the group you 17 have and the people that are interested, I'm 18 going to go back to corporate and see if we
- I waited. This was six weeks ago.

can't pull the plan out of the closet and take

- 22 I waited some time. I had people that advise
- 23 me. And they say let them do their due

a look at it again.

24 diligence. They're a big corporation. Rushing

19

is not going to get us anywhere.

He got back to me, believe it or not, this past Thursday. I happen to be working at the time. And he said Bill, we've reviewed this. We see Massachusetts certainly as a diamond in the rough with great potential. We'd like to be all in, those exact words.

I said, that's wonderful.

He said, we'd love to fly up and meet with you. And I mentioned that we had a Commission hearing today on the 23rd. And I said I would love for you to attend.

He said for me as COO, I have got to go through corporate. That's Frank Stronach and his daughter Belinda and so on and so forth and Mike Rogers up there in Aurora Ontario where they are based.

He called me back on Sunday. He said corporate had a few questions. They were little concerned that I had a huge group yet we still have a HBPA. I have not yet set up a separate faction. So, they still represent the horsemen to some degree.

And he said we also have Suffolk

Downs to deal with. He said we've opened up some dialogue with Richard Fields, the primary owner or principal owner at Suffolk Downs.

He said the preliminary talks went well. Mr. Fields expressed his sadness in racing being lost etc., etc. And I mentioned to Tim that we were under some time constraints. And he said that they would have ongoing talks with Mr. Fields. And that they have a wonderful group of people that do that sort of thing that put leases together. They get together with the racetracks. And they can do it in short order with the right people.

So, from there he hung up the phone and I was hoping to hear more. I also asked Tim if he could not attend the hearing if he could send a letter of intent to certainly show his great interest in Massachusetts.

He drafted the letter and he read it to me and it was wonderful. However, when Mr. Tuttle called the two people, Mike Rogers and Tim Ritvo, Mr. Tuttle expressed his concern that it would confuse the Commission (A) and possibly throw down the three days of racing.

1 And they said to me we have one 2 person that wants to go forward with this and 3 we have one that wants to tread carefully 4 because obviously we need Suffolk Downs as the 5 host racetrack. Certainly, they are the 6 answer. So, Tim and I left that conversation 8 there and I got back to him. I found it 9 necessary and Jay and on have been on again, 10 off again, Jay Bernadine that is. Jay is one 11 of vice presidents of the current HBPA board. 12 I called Jay who is based in 13 Maryland. That's where Tim is sitting. 14 mentioned that to Jay. He was very surprised. 15 He said I kind of didn't believe that there was 16 so much interest. So, he went and sat down with Tim Ritvo. 17 18 Tim reinforced everything that we 19 had talked about to Jay. And Jay was kind of

Tim reinforced everything that we had talked about to Jay. And Jay was kind of taken back because Jay was told there was no interest from Stronach. And Jay has been in the middle of all this.

And I spoke to Jay this morning.

And Jay has turned his position around because

20

21

22

23

he sees a future and he sees sustainability of Stronach coming in providing a race meet and a future.

And Jay and Alan Lockhart, another board member, sent letters into the Commission. Others were very skeptical because it's late in the game, but it's only late in the game because I couldn't come forward until Tim said to me we are all in.

But that interest and the biggest entity in racing that operates Santa Anita, Gulf Stream Park, Pimlico, Laurel, Golden Gates. They own Xpressbet, Amtote. They're the biggest in the business. Interest here would lead you to believe we have a market.

And Stronach and Tim Ritvo told me, listen, you have the Race Horse Development Fund that's fine. We don't care. That's wonderful for you now, but years down the road maybe 10 percent goes this way, 10 percent goes that way. We make tracks stand on their own two feet. We don't cry. We don't ask for anything.

Their simulcast signal going out

1 last year at Gulfstream Park provided 67 2 percent of their purse pool. They sent out 3 \$634 million of their signal across the 4 country. And they're able to by bundling it 5 access the highest percentage in the country. 6 They would do the same thing at 7 Suffolk Downs. What Suffolk Downs is doing 8 now, simulcasting five days a week and what they have is okay, we're really getting nothing 9 10 from that. And they're not maximizing what 11 they have. 12 That signal -- Timmy told me this 13 and Mike Rogers told me this. That signal, 14 without that signal there is no interest. 15 day of racing is run at Suffolk Downs and the 16 simulcasting goes on until July 2016, Stronach 17 Group passes us by like a ship in the night and 18 we lose out all of the horsemen, all of the 19 current HBPA board and everybody that's in this room loses out. 20 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Excuse me, Mr. 22 Lagorio. Why is that? As I understand it, and 23 correct me if I'm wrong, and Mr. Tuttle if you 24 see this differently, as I understand the

1 statute, it says for each of two years, 2015 2 and 2016 that Suffolk Downs may continue simulcast so long as it runs at least one live 3 4 race day. 5 I have some questions about how that 6 works, but I'll come back to Mr. Tuttle in a minute. So, if there were a live race day 8 today, that would mean that there would be simulcast for Suffolk Downs for the rest of 9 10 this year, but it doesn't do anything about 2016. 11 12 MR. LAGORIO: It does take -- The 13 current legislation the way it's written takes 14 the simulcasting through July 2016 with a day 15 of racing. 16 MR. TUTTLE: I would agree with your 17 interpretation of that, Mr. Chairman, that it 18 requires us to race at least one day each year 19 in 2015 and 2016. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's the way I 21 read that too. And I think that's the way we 22 read it as well. 23 MS. BLUE: Yes. 24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, for whatever

it's worth, there is the opportunity, there is the theoretical prospect of having a new operator with simulcasting pick up starting next year even if there were a live racing date this year.

MR. LAGORIO: I think under those terms that Stronach in some of their talks, they'd be willing to do something if they could get a commitment to assuming the facility in January. But without something in writing prior to that, they would be tied up in too many ins and outs. To them, the simulcast signal is the be-all end-all.

And obviously for Suffolk Downs, it is as well. They realize the value of holding simulcasting. The problem with that is while they're holding simulcasting and while we're issuing this money for three days of racing, a lot of people are out of work, losing their homes and farms.

And that \$1.5 million, if we held onto it, in 2016 or maybe late in 2015 translates itself into 15 racing days under last year's purse pool. Fifteen racing days

for us if you run three days a week covers five weeks. There's a lot of people that would give their arm for that extra five weeks certainly.

And as part of what we'd be looking into the future of, instead of wasting 1.5 on three days, let's put that to something useful that would provide everybody an opportunity to make some money. And if we can look ahead into what might be with Stronach, certainly 15 days of racing tagged onto what they could put together would be wonderful for us.

It's just for me, to rush now and possibly miss one of the best opportunities we have to benefit the horsemen and the Commonwealth, because this is a real entity and they do it right.

And Mr. Ritvo said to me I could see down the road -- Their idea of a racetrack is one with great creature amenities like they've done over in Plainville. They see restaurants and shops and a destination resort that's a racetrack. It doesn't have to be. They said slot parlors are wonderful. Casinos are wonderful. We make the racetrack work. And

1 they've -

2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Let's just - This 3 is for questions and answers.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Can I just interrupt for a second. Why is this an either or proposition? As I think about it and listen to you suppose -- We have no viable plan now for 15 days of racing. We're in July. This has been an issue that's been on the table since last September. And I'm just stating facts. I'm not blaming anybody.

What is wrong with, hypothetically, the
Commission saying go ahead with the three days,
go ahead with negotiations with Stronach with
Suffolk Downs. If a Stronach plan for next
year is put in place, the three days goes
forward and next year is next year. And we
take an application and we consider that
application and we see.

If Stronach and all other parties come up with a plan for the balance of this year that wipes out two of the three days say that we've approved, that comes back to the

Commission and we consider wiping out those days and letting Stronach go forward.

MR. TUTTLE: That what you've outlined, Judge, is certainly within the realm of possibility. Let me see if I phrase it differently, the Commission granting this request does not preclude any potential business agreement between us, the Stronach Group or any other entity. It doesn't preclude that for sure.

The Commission potentially withholding this license, this dates' request in order to have us engage with lease negotiations with somebody that may or may not come to fruition I think could be potentially damaging to us.

If we come back to you in September or October and say, geez, we weren't able to reach a deal with the Stronach Group, then the opportunity for the Mass. breeders to run three times for their money, all of those things goes away.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I understand that. And that's -- So, you've captured the

essence of it. And we wouldn't condition --1 2 I'm thinking out loud now. We wouldn't 3 condition the approval of the three days on 4 anything else. But we would be prepared to 5 wipe out X number of days of those three if 6 some other deal were to --MR. TUTTLE: The approval of the 8 three days would not preclude us for coming back and asking for more if the circumstances 9 10 were to change. 11 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's a 12 better way of putting it. 13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: What about the 14 approval of one day? If that's only the 15 requirement that preserves the simulcasting, 16 could there be just an approval of one day for 17 a lesser amount from purses, thus it's almost 18 kind of like and in between reserving some of 19 the money from the Horse Race Development Fund 20 for a later time. 21 Commissioner, one day MR. LAGORIO: 22 or three days or whatever. The case is as soon 23 as the one day is run, that simulcasting is 24 still tied up for the remainder of the year.

There is no reason to negotiate if you're

Suffolk Downs. There's certainly less interest
in the Stronach Group. That's the key. The

piece that holds is the simulcasting.

It was a bad idea on June 11 for me. It's a bad idea on the 23rd. But the money's an issue. And when we get to the breeders, I would just like to add one thing about the breeders.

Legislation was approved to allow the breeders to run their races out of town at Finger Lakes or wherever. The president of the Mass. Breeders, George Brown, has been in discussions and he's got the okay to run them in New York for nothing via the HBPA there.

Most of the Mass. breds are stabled there now. The ones that aren't, for example, that are on farms in Massachusetts, those who are less fortunate and can't get there, if a schedule comes out that's meaningful out of state, then a person that has a two-year old or a three-year old can say, hey, they're going to run that race in November. Now maybe I can ship that horse to Finger Lakes, train and get

1 that horse ready.

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2 Those opportunities aren't here 3 So, that if you own a horse and right now. 4 you're on a farm and there's one man that owns a farm in Middleboro that's 60 acres. He's got 6 10 Mass. breds sitting there. And he's saying this three-day thing is great. I've nowhere to 8 train. Nowhere to get prepared.

They've laid in front of us answers for the breeders. They have the money. They have the place to run their races. Now it's what about the rest of us? And it gets down to the simulcasting.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Go ahead. You were talking about simulcasting. You were reacting to Commissioner McHugh's suggestion. And then you sort of got way-laid on the breeders.

So, the simulcast, finish up your thought on the simulcasting.

MR. LAGORIO: Well, the simulcasting running a day, once you tie that up for the rest of the year, there goes the negotiating There's nothing to negotiate. tool.

So, if you're Suffolk Downs and you're going to make X amount of dollars on simulcasting, which none of the horsemen that are suffering right now will be privy to. It's hard to look at the three days and spend that money and say that it's worthwhile, where we feel that none of the local people will benefit at all.

And we're going to lose the opportunity to bring in Stronach. Why not take a step back and say, hey, Stronach is here.

Let's let negotiations go forward. It's not going to hurt anybody to put this off another 30 days or whatever. Because those races that they want to put forward could be run in September and October. They could be run in October and November. All of that could be done.

But where we have something new in front of us, isn't it worth all of our lives and all of these people that are here today and the many that aren't here to give them an opportunity to see a potential lease that could bring racing back this fall. Maybe it's a

1 | longshot, maybe it isn't.

2 But you could negotiate a lease.

It's not impossible.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: But by saying that once the simulcasting rights are triggered or made whole by the one day of racing and negotiations are off the table strikes me as a prediction of what the outcome of the negotiations is.

There's an export fee that is part of the pickup if you've got live racing going. There's also the lease payments. There's also a number of different arrangements that you could have between the operator and the owner of the track.

There's almost an infinite variety of possibilities that one could put together that would be attractive to both, it seems to me, without saying that one feature takes all of the negotiating power off the table and has people sit back and say go away.

MR. LAGORIO: It's a big bargaining chip. It really is. The thing with the signal, Commissioner, is that Stronach would

turn that into a nine percent outgoing and it becomes a viable entity for them. And that's what they're looking for. That's how they make tracks profitable.

That signal is the be-all end-all

That signal is the be-all end-all for them. Without control of it, they don't see the real desire to move in. And like I said, they've done a pretty good job across the country.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Got you. Thank you.

MR. LAGORIO: You're welcome.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But wouldn't everything that you say really apply as well for next year? Because this year is closing quite quickly. We're already in the seventh month. And for all intents and purposes that signal has already been going out for six or seven months.

MR. LAGORIO: Yes, it has.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So, all of the things that you alluded to or explained including incentives or disincentives from the operator or the track also work for next year

1 in theory. 2 MR. LAGORIO: They do in theory. 3 But why wouldn't we look at something right 4 They've expressed interest right now. 5 And just delay this long enough to let them 6 explore it further. It's just a chance we have to maybe resurrect something for the fall. 8 if we could get something, it'd be wonderful. 9 If it doesn't turn out. We come 10 back here in 30 days and we'll take it from there. We'll be no worse for the wear. 11 12 The Mass. bred races can be run --13 They can run whatever races they wanted to run, 14 but we'd have a chance to further explore what 15 I feel is the best racetrack operator in the 16 country. I don't think the time in tabling 17 this would hurt. 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What's the 19 incentive for Suffolk Downs to negotiate if we 20 just postpone this and they still have the 21 license for the simulcast? 22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The threat of 23 losing it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Pardon?

24

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

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The 2 prospective of losing. I think that's the 3 incentive. 4 CHAIRMAN CRSOBY: So, we would say 5 you better make a deal or we won't grant a 6 license? 7 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Maybe, I 8 suppose or --9 MR. LAGORIO: It would just 10 certainly allow the negotiations. Where this 11 has come to light and it's happened so quickly, 12 I think just allowing some due diligence would 13 be in order given everything that's at stake. 14 There's a lot at stake. 15 MR. TUTTLE: I would just point out 16 there's a little bit concern about where your 17 conversation is going Commissioner Zuniga and 18 Chairman Crosby that perhaps you would withhold 19 our request in order to compel us to do a lease 20 with an outside company that has had since 21 September of last year to express reasonable interest to us and hasn't until this weekend. 22 23 That's a pretty disturbing 24 possibility, as far as we're concerned, so long

as our current request meets all of the statutory requirements.

MR. BARNETT: Mr. Chairman, may I?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MR. BARNETT: Bruce Barnett from DLA Piper, Counsel at Sterling Suffolk Racecourse. The Legislature in Chapter 10 of the Acts of 2015 as described by Dr. Lightbaum before has extended the racing license for Suffolk Downs through this year, and invited Suffolk Downs to make the application that's before you for an additional day of racing.

The terms of any use of the Race
Horse Development Fund are obviously for the
Commission to determine. We've made our
request and I think that the reasons for that
are on there. But the statutory criteria for
exercising the continue invitation for having
additional racing days are pretty clear.

And I share in Mr. Tuttle's concern about the suggestion that there'd be a conditioning or a withholding of granting of that approval in order to effect a business negotiation. It's concerning. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If you're in our 2 shoes, how do you use our authority to grant or 3 not grant licenses? We have an interest, as we 4 have expressed many times, to try to support 5 the thoroughbred racing industry as best we 6 possibly can. Back before the license decision was made, we said repeatedly that once it is 8 made, either way it goes, we'll roll up our 9 sleeves and try to figure out how do we sustain 10 thoroughbred racing here. 11 So, we, I think and maybe you 12 disagree with this, we look at this as having a 13 fiduciary duty to the industry in part to help 14 it prosper if it can. And should we not be 15 mindful of that when we make licensing decisions? 16 17 We're exercising our judgment on 18 what might most enhance the long-term viability 19 of the industry. Should that not be one of the 20 factors we use in making a license decision? 21 MR. BARNETT: I think first and 22 foremost the licensing decision should be based 23 on the authorizing statute. And where the 24 applicant requests for the supplemental

daysmeets the licensing or in the case where
you find that it meets the licensing
requirements in the statute then I think that's
the primary consideration.

Given the fact that Suffolk Downs has incurred the substantial annual eight-figure losses for such a long time, no one else has, I think, done more to support the racing industry in Massachusetts over the last many years. This year --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, what was your answer to my question? Should we use the long-term health of the industry as one of the criteria when we make a decision on a license award?

MR. BARNETT: I think it's something that maybe goes into the mix, but it cannot, I don't think, supersede the statutory criteria.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I don't think it has to supersede. Maximizing revenues to the economy and fair treatment for all who have an economic interest is pretty broad things. But I hear your point and the point that both of you have made.

1 MR. LAGORIO: If I can just say one 2 thing? On the Stronach Group, the inference is 3 they just came in the game. And the point is 4 very simple. And it can be reinforced by Mr. 5 Bernadine, the Vice President of the HBPA, and 6 Mr. Ritvo that they've tried. They've tried to come in and solve our problems. We have 8 someone at our doorstep. And basically they 9 were given lip-service and turned away. 10 So, it wasn't until I and my group 11 resurrected the idea that we brought this 12 entity forward. So, they've been around for a 13 while. And they didn't just show up. 14 certainly, they're very interested. 15 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: T ′ m 16 continually having difficulty with the 17 fundamental premise here that an economically 18 beneficial deal has been turned down for a 19 reason that either is not apparent or is less 20 beneficial than the potential deal. I don't 21 understand that. And I find it hard to believe. 22 23 I know everybody has been trying

really hard to get something that will work.

And the money just isn't there. But it seems to me the economic interests of everybody are ultimately the driver.

And it would be foolish for Suffolk Downs or you or any of the other interests in this to turn down a deal that was economically viable and made sense.

So, the notion that we predict the outcome of negotiations that haven't been conducted and economic incentives that haven't been put on the table are because we want to put pressure on somebody to do something that economics may drive them to do anyway just is becoming more and more of a non-starter for me.

MR. LAGORIO: I don't think we're trying to force anything. I think we're just trying to give Stronach a chance to expand upon what they would like to do.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. I've made my point and I understand yours. Thank you.

COMMISIONER CAMERON: Does it make any sense to - I think maybe we have three options here. We have a license before us

without a clear group that thinks it's a good idea. The opposition is strong. There are those who are in favor as well. So, that piece is not clear. It's not an easy decision.

Denying the license just for the sake of denying it to me does not make a lot of sense either. I'm wondering since this is new and I know we've heard from so many folks that this is something people think is worth exploring, instead of a month can we come back in two weeks and make a decision on this matter?

Two weeks to -- I wouldn't be interested in forcing anyone to do anything. The initial conversation went well by all accounts. Can further conversations, and in two weeks it's possible or it's not possible this year?

It is late in the season, Mr.

Lagorio. It really is. And we want to be fair to everybody here. For my mind, a month is too long. That really is -- Now we're at the end of August. That would not be fair to this applicant.

```
1
                But is two weeks something where
2
     it's possible, it's not possible? And then we
3
    need to make a decision.
 4
                MR. LAGORIO: I think that's fine.
5
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
                                       It's just an
6
     option.
 7
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
                                      I suppose I
8
    need to understand a little better the 2015
     legislation. Could we either -- Do we have it
9
     or could we refer to it?
10
11
                MS. BLUE: Yes, I have it.
12
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It does grant
13
     Suffolk the signal, if you will, so long as
14
     they conduct one day of racing.
15
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Each year.
16
                MS. BLUE: Yes, that's correct, each
17
    year.
18
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
                                     Each year.
                MS. BLUE: Yes.
19
20
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But isn't
21
     there subject to the approval of the Gaming
22
     Commission as far as what they have before us?
23
                MS. BLUE: It's subject to your
24
     approval in terms of the one -- It's between
```

Page 54 one and 50 days of racing subject to your COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: One and 50? COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It's now COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But we don't doesn't change what effectively has already happened, which is the seven months that have

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Could I explore something? Mr. Tuttle and Mr. Barnett intimated I think that there's a sort of an objective set of criteria which if met limits our discretion on whether to make a decision.

MS. BLUE: That's right.

already gone in terms of simulcasting.

MS. BLUE: Yes.

MS. BLUE: That's right.

MS. BLUE: No, you do not.

COMMSSIONER ZUNIGA: And that

I then heard Mr. Barnett say, well, maybe there are other things like the long-term health of the industry that we could consider.

But how do you read the exercise of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

approval.

before us for three.

have to approve for three.

our discretion? First of all, in the criteria themself, if the memo that we got is quoting from the statute, it does look to me that there are some subjective issues like maximum revenue to the Commonwealth.

But how do you read our ability of how our discretion would be and can be exercised?

MS. BLUE: So, those are the criteria that are in the statute. They come from 128A. Some of those criteria are subjective. And I think as Commissioner McHugh pointed out, when you're talking about the welfare of the industry itself, it does fit in to the criteria that talks about maximizing revenues and the economic interest of the people involved.

So, the criteria do -- some of them are more objective. The financial integrity is fairly objective. But some of the others are more subjective.

So, I do think you can consider the industry itself, how it is helped or not helped by the application at hand. And you can weigh

1 that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

24

I also think that you need to look at each of these criteria and determine whether they are supported by the evidence that's in front of you. That's the evidence includes the application that's filed, the comments that you've received, the questions that we posed and got answers to.

So, I think it would be helpful maybe to go through each of the criteria and determine whether you think you have enough information on each one to answer those questions.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is this the exact language in the statute in Director Lightbaum's memo? It cites the criteria from 128A section 3(i).

MS. BLUE: Yes, that's the language.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That language is

20 directly from the statute. Other thoughts or

21 questions?

22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: My read of the

23 | 2015 intention was along the lines of

benefiting the local industry is that there was

1 an implication or an understanding there could 2 be more value in terms of race days. 3 difference between one and three is very 4 little. It doesn't seem to - I mean we've heard it from a lot of people here back in 5 6 June. That 50 didn't come out of nowhere. 8 There must have been an understanding that 9 something could be done for some kind of days 10 in between. 11 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Between one 12 and 50? 13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. 14 MR. TUTTLE: I perhaps can offer 15 some insight, Commissioner, on that. 16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes, please. 17 MR. TUTTLE: We talked with the 18 horsemen over the winter about a range of days. 19 And again, when the premise was that the 20 horseman's organization would be the licensee 21 and was going to license the facility, they 22 looked at 40 to 50 days. 23 The HBPA in our discussions with

them over the winter made the determination

that that was not economically viable as it has not been economically viable for us for the last several years.

And given that there's all of this money that's starting to build up in the Horse Race Development Fund, their decision was they'd prefer that we only request \$1.2 million for purses, \$1.75 million overall, and continue to let that funding build for their potential future use as opposed to now.

During the conversation about 40 to 50 days, there was some question as to whether there would be enough horses. There was some question as to how long it would take to conduct the meet. And the expenses were potentially going to eat up much more money than the horsemen had building up in the Race Horse Development Fund.

So, as someone who was very active in passage of that legislation, I just wanted to explain where that one to 50 days came from.

MR. LAGORIO: Might I add something?

The premise that we could not afford to lease the racetrack through the HBPA, the numbers

were what the numbers were. The horse count, we can argue back and forth all day. We all believe that if you give people days and you give people purses, they will come. We would have had sufficient horses.

It just boils down to what is the benefit of the three days? And when we look at a group like Stronach, they're not looking to borrow money from the Race Horse Development Fund. They're looking to come in and try to lease and operate.

And then we'd be able to fully utilize the Race Horse Development Fund for its intended purpose which is purse money and purse money alone. Not for expenses, not for administrative costs, but solely for purse money, which would in turn make the industry come back.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, it seems to me that the problem, Commissioner McHugh, you're talking about a reasonable deal that's an economically attractive deal to the parties. The problem is that the parties' interests aren't the same.

And the critical variable here is the simulcast license. That's the critical variable in the negotiations, the critical leverage point in the negotiations, the critical value in the negotiations.

So, how that -- So, who we give that leverage to is the question here. That's not the business we want to be in. We're trying to figure out what's in the long-term in the best interest of the industry.

But I think you can hear that we are reluctant to grant a minimal number of day license. On the other hand, the Legislature left that as a possibility. They didn't have to. They could have said 10 to 50 or 25 to 50. The Legislature said one to 50. So, they set a pretty low bar.

But from the standpoint of Suffolk

Downs, every day that goes by they get their

simulcast money and we're not probably going to

at least try to take it back if the race

doesn't happen. So, if anybody who has watched

this I think would understand that we would be

very, very interested in a bigger deal if a

bigger deal could be made.

We don't want to prejudice anybody's interest pro or con. We want to try to figure out what's in the long-term best interest of the industry in a very difficult and challenging circumstance for everybody.

So, everybody who's watching knows that's where we're coming from. And although I hate to delay things, I am sort of inclined to agree with Commissioner Cameron that if there's something to be done out there, it can't any longer be your characterizations of conversations, which never get materialized in anything solid. We've got to be at the end of that.

But I would be inclined to go along with Commissioner Cameron saying let's give it at least a couple of weeks and see whether or not there truly is an alternative. Dr.

Lightbaum said if the only alternatives are no live racing or three days, her recommendation would be three days.

But I for one would like to know whether there is a viable option out there. I

don't see the loss if we let another couple of weeks go by.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Two weeks is two weeks, but we've been doing this two weeks by two weeks for a long time. And I really have to wonder about the premise on which you're proceeding.

It seems to me inconceivable that Suffolk Downs would be willing to do a deal with anybody that would somehow net them less money than they are getting from the simulcast now. That just doesn't make any sense.

So, whether it's two weeks from now or tomorrow, somebody has got to come in and show somehow an economically better feature or at least an economically equal feature if they're going to get in there at all.

And I don't see why that kind of discussion can't go on if we say you've got the day or three days of racing. That's going to give you the license for the rest of the year.

It seems to me to put our thumb on the scale of an industry that's been losing money for years in an effort to cause an

1 outcome that's going to continue to have it 2 lose money doesn't make any sense. 3 CHAIRMAN CRSOBY: I don't follow 4 that. 5 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Maybe I don't 6 understand what the goal of waiting two weeks is. 8 MR. LAGORIO: Might I add something, 9 Commissioner? 10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: There's a 11 wildcard, which is something that the 12 Legislature already did in the form of throwing 13 a lifeline to the industry and that's the Horse 14 Race Development Fund. 15 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I know that. 16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And the deal, 17 whether it could happen in two weeks that's a 18 separate matter. And I get that. But the 19 potential deal could come before us very 20 differently in terms of the monies request for 21 those purses. 22 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: But the Horse 23 Race Development Fund has been there for years. 24 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:

1 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's right, it hasn't been. There's been a supplement 2 3 for --4 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No, no. When 5 the licensing fees from the casinos came there 6 was a lot of money that funded them. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's right, 8 but there's been other supplements before that. 9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That come out 10 of the live racing operations, yes. There's an 11 incremental money that now is being funded with 12 the slots parlor nine percent and etc. 13 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. I get 14 it. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any other 16 thoughts? We have a proposal on the table from 17 Commissioner Cameron. Does anybody else want 18 to weigh in on that? 19 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I just have 20 one more legal question on the criterion in 21 which we can consider the application in 22 reading it under 128A is the criteria of the 23 maximization of state revenues, which certainly 24 comes into question if we're looking at

revenues maximized to the state with a threeday racing schedule as opposed to days more than that up to 50 as the law allows.

That could mean in terms of Mr.

Barnett's argument that they are meeting the criteria that's one of the criteria for us to consider in the application in addition to the safety of the track and other things.

So, maximization of state revenues is a little bit different between three days and 50.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's the criteria that we don't know that's being met now. We don't know. We're hearing that this may well not maximize revenues and we're just hearing words about it. But that is the criteria that cannot be sure is met. At least a criteria we cannot assure is met.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: And just for clarification, your conversations with the Stronach executives, because I want to be clear on what you said when you expressed their thoughts or their opinions is the Race Horse Development Fund, the purse money is nice but

1 it's not a necessity, if I can paraphrase that.

MR. LAGORIO: Yes, those are the exact words. You have a Race Horse Development Fund. That's wonderful but they understand that five years down the road maybe 10 percent of that is moved somewhere else or the state has a deficit and they're looking at taking that money.

And the models that they've set at their tracks, they make the tracks stand on their own two feet. And the tracks are profitable without gaming. And they make that clear. If you read their philosophies and their corporate philosophies, they make the racetrack stand on its own two feet.

And using the simulcasting and maximizing that by bundling what they have available with their major racetracks, they're able to optimize all of the simulcast revenues where there's such a stream of cash.

For example, just quickly money wise, if Suffolk Downs is running and say there's just a few people there, but if they do using their signal say they do \$2 million that

1 day off-track, other tracks betting on 2 Suffolks' signal, at nine percent you're 3 dealing with \$180,000 that could be split 4 between the management and the horsemen. That's \$90,000 for purse money that day. 5 6 So, they make it work. They don't 7 want to hear about Race Horse Development Fund 8 money. They said it's wonderful if you have 9 it. It'll certainly augment the purses, but 10 that's not the driving force for our interest 11 in racing. It's a racetrack and that's what 12 they're interested in, solely a racetrack. 13 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: But correct 14 me if I'm wrong, from what I read, Stronach 15 does have some facilities that do operate in conjunction with casinos. 16 17 MR. LAGORIO: They do. But for 18 example at Laurel right now, they're over there 19 working on the idea that they could lose that and they are making it work otherwise. 20 21 But they do have facilities that do 22 have gaming, but those tracks are able to use 23 the numbers they have make it without the

gaming.

And their interest here is real. 1 2 And their interest has not on coming if there's 3 a casino. Like they did, for example, over in 4 Florida at Calder, they went in, and while Twin 5 Spires was operating a casino, took control of 6 the racetrack. They're interested in the horse 7 racing end of it. 8 So, they would take it and operate a 9 racetrack separately and make it work. 10 that's what they pride themselves on. 11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Excuse me. As a 12 breeder, may I respectfully ask several minutes 13 to speak? They have been very under 14 represented. 15 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No. This is 16 not a hearing, Sir. We had a hearing and we 17 did hear from you. 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: There's an 19 opportunity for you to follow up. You can tell 20 us what - You can submit your comments to us 21 afterwards or if we have a hearing you can 22 appeal to us, but not now. This is just a 23 private conversation -- not a private

conversation, but a limited conversation on

1 this application.

2.1

The issue about whether they stand alone or not is interesting but not really at the point. I wouldn't take at face value these assertions that anybody who says we don't need the Race Horse Development Fund is crazy in my mind. But that's not the point here.

The point is there a viable alternative that can happen. That's the question.

I guess now the question is do you want to make a motion? Is there anybody else, other discussion have?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I just support the notion that if there's anything to explore that would be worthwhile, whether it's two weeks or more, frankly that window is closing slowly but surely, I think it would be worthwhile. And I don't think it'd be prejudicial to Suffolk Downs because they continue to simulcast.

I get the notion about incentives and I'm intrigued by the interest however much of that may be of the Stronach people. So, if

that's going to be the motion, I will be in support of waiting a little bit more time.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And I thought two weeks. We do have to make this decision.

And I think it's only fair to the licensee that we don't wait another month, frankly. But I think two weeks where this is a new -- And there is so many feelings around these issues.

We're trying to be fair to everyone involved.

And I think two weeks would be appropriate. If it can't happen by then, I'll be prepared to make a decision two weeks from now. That would be my one thought that if there is an opportunity two weeks, and then it would certainly have to be something for another year after that.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: If we agree to go with tabling this for two weeks, at some point I do want to get back to the question of kind of the breakdown of the request from the Race Horse Development Fund.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay. So, I move that we table this license application for two weeks. And we will bring it back before us

August 6.

2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I second that.

3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Discussion?

COMMISISONER MCHUGH: I don't see what's going to happen in two weeks. We are going to be here in two weeks. And at most, we're going to have a we're interested statement.

We heard testimony today that a letter of interest was requested. That didn't materialize. And I don't know what possibly can happen of utility in two weeks.

And I also think we're treating this as an either/or situation, which for reasons I discussed before I don't think it is. I just wanted to make that final comment. It sort of telegraphs what I'm going to do next.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I just have a question about the motion to table. We're saying we're going to table this for two weeks. Is it your interest in kind of recommending or making a suggestion (1) why are you doing it in two weeks in terms of sending our license applicant direction as to what we expect out of

1 them in two weeks. 2 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: We have 3 information that there is a viable, legitimate 4 corporation who is interested in racing for a longer period of time. Exploring with Suffolk 5 6 Downs a lease option, I would not in any way say we should be in the middle of expecting 8 anything other than in two weeks for them to 9 have a good-faith opportunity to explore that 10 option. 11 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Doesn't this 12 apply to both placeholder applications, the HBPA and Suffolk Downs? 13 14 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: They 15 withdrew their application. 16 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: We have the 17 one application before us. 18 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: We only have 19 the one application. 20 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Correct, yes. 21 And that would be the end of my motion would be 22 just the two weeks to explore that option and 23 be prepared to come back at the point and make

24

a decision.

1 MR. TUTTLE: The only thing I would 2 point out to the Commission is that two weeks 3 will require us to amend our dates request just 4 so that everyone is aware of that upfront. 5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further 6 discussion? All in favor, aye. 7 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 9 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: 10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? 11 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: No. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes have it 13 four to one. Thank you folks. I suggest we 14 take a quick break. 15 16 (A recess was taken) 17 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think we are 19 ready to reconvene. Do you have anything that 20 can match that, Dr. Lightbaum? 21 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Hopefully, this will 22 be very short. Right, we can get this one done 23 today. 24 In front of us we've got three

different sections of the Racing regulations that today we're going to start the formal process for approving. So, this is just the beginning. And we'll definitely have more comments sections.

We posted these, I believe, in April on our website. And we notified all of the people involved, the stakeholders that these were on the Web for their comments.

I've met with a few of the stakeholders to get comments and will continue to meet with others to get their comments.

CMR 3 is harness horse racing. CMR 4 is the flat racing. And then we have a new section general rules CMR 2. And basically what that did was take some of the things that are similar for the two breeds and put them in one section so that it kind of condenses it. We don't have duplicates in the two different areas.

A lot of this effort was to bring them in line with RCI. A lot of the rules were the same. It was just a matter of changing the words and things like that, so, it was actually

1 in the RCI format.

2 Again, we've worked on this.

3 Director Day worked on it. Jennifer

4 Durenberger, Danielle Holmes and Catherine Blue

5 all worked on coming up with this. And now

6 | we're going to get the comments with the

7 stakeholders again. If you have any questions?

8 | COMMISSIONE ZUNIGA: I did mention

9 | this to Counsel Blue and I just wanted to

10 mention it here for the record. I personally

11 | would be interested in exploring whether there

12 | would be any tweaks into the current language

13 with relative to licensing hearings, appeals,

14 just having personally gone through a few of

15 them myself.

In general, it occurs to me that the

17 group of horse people that we deal with is a

18 very small group that goes to different

19 | jurisdictions. And sometimes the history in

20 another jurisdictions may be pending but gets

21 taken into account everywhere else. And

22 everybody is looking at each other.

23 Anyway, the point being is quite

24 | simply after the experience of the appeals that

we've read whether there would be a place for us to look at the current regulations, whether it's here or elsewhere. I'm just going to follow up on that afterwards.

MS. BLUE: And I think that's a good point. We will look at the hearing section in this reg., only because we haven't looked at it in a little while. And we do have a pretty good new set of hearing rules under the gaming regs. And what we want to do is cross reference them so that we follow the same kind of hearing rules to the extent that's possible here in racing.

But there are a couple of other issues that have come up as we've gone through appeals. And I think we should look at the hearing section of this to see if we can accommodate them.

So, we can do that while we're going through the comment period. And we can get stakeholder comment on those things as well.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Great.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Overall, I think this is an excellent document. I love

Page 77 1 that we're really staying in line with best 2 practices around the country. And I know this 3 document reflects those language changes that 4 will make it easier for us to be in line. So, 5 thank you for the work that's been done. 6 reads well. 7 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Thank you. 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We need a vote, 9 right? 10 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr. Chair, I 11 move that the Commission begin the formal 12 public process and publish revised racing 13 regulations for 205 CMR 2, 3 and 4. 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? 15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second. 16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any further 17 discussion? All in favor, aye. 18 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye. 19 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 21 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 23 have it unanimously.

DR. LIGHTBAUM: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Next is Director 1 2 Wells. Item (a) is the KG Urban update. 3 MS. WELLS: Yes. So, good 4 afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. Originally, I had anticipated 5 6 coming before you with a matte related to the investigation. 8 However, as I'm sure the Chairman is aware, we received a letter, which is addressed 9 10 to Chairman Crosby yesterday indicating that KG 11 New Bedford, LLC is abandoning the Cannon 12 Street project and withdrawing the Phase 1 13 applications of it and its entity and 14 individual qualifiers pursuant to 205 CMR 15 111.05 citing that they are unable to create a 16 viable financing package for the project. 17 So, given that we received this 18 letter, the update I had for the Commission 19 really is a moot point right now. And I would 20 just alert the Commission and the public that 21 we have received this notice and that KG is 22 withdrawing. I have checked with Counsel that 23 the withdrawal is appropriate under the 24 regulations.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You have checked 2 with Counsel? 3 MS. WELLS: Yes. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Are there any 5 other steps for us to take, any formalities 6 that we have to do? MS. BLUE: I will check in more 7 8 detail. I do not believe so. They could withdraw because we had not set a date for 9 10 hearing at this point. So, they were free to 11 withdraw as they liked. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. 13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And for all 14 intents and purposes, you're suspending the 15 investigation that was ongoing? 16 MS. WELL: Yes, that has already 17 taken place. 18 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The balance, 19 if there is one, of the application fee that 20 they paid us is nonrefundable. 21 MS. WELLS: That is correct. 22 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's a self-23 executing thing. I think that the statute and 24 the reg. both say that. Is there anything that

we need to do, should do to make sure this is
over, particularly given our history? Should
we vote to accept formally that withdrawal? Or
should we do anything else that signifies some
formal action by the Commission on that so that
nobody can later say, well, we need a Mulligan
here or something?

MS. BLUE: I think it would be helpful to vote that you accept their withdrawal. I think that's sufficient at this point. There may be other things we need to consider down the road.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I hate to throw out another hypothetical to that but let's say for instance Region C gets opened up again at some point. If they were to be an applicant in a next round, can we just make it clear that it's for this current round of applications for Region C?

MS. BLUE: I think you can. I think you addressed that in the past. When you talked about Region C, you talked about prior applicants. I would think in that hypothetical situation, you would probably consider how you

1 | treated all prior applicants at that point too.

But it wouldn't hurt to clarify that this is applicable to this Region C application period.

interesting point, because we did have before the rollover of things. So, that if we do move, we might think about moving to accept this withdrawal for all purposes under all circumstances which would require them to start from scratch again if your hypothetical came to pass. That's an option.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I was thinking more overly to say for this current Region C application round that we have, we are accepting their withdrawal, I think to get to your point, that they don't come back at another point and say we're back now.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Maybe I didn't follow you. In the past we've said if you were an applicant before and you paid your \$400,000, you got to roll over and pursue another license without another application fee. We said that in essence. There's been some quallifications

1 | but we've said that.

My thought is that if this
withdrawal, particularly given this history and
all of the extensions and everything else that
went into this, we might want to think about
saying this is the end of you. And if you want
to come back in the future, you start from
scratch just like every other applicant.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I'm trying to recall when some of those rollovers were granted, were those for applicants who had already gone through the suitability?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That may have been.

MS. BLUE: No, not all of them.

This would be different than what we've done in that past, which is we made that determination at the point of time when we were going forward with a particular round.

I think it's appropriate to accept it for this round. I think you may not want to foreclose your options should you do something differently in the future. And at that point you would consider all prior applicants, not

1 just this particular one.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. In the past, we had a future solicitation. We had Region C.

5 MS. BLUE: Yes.

6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Regions A and

7 B came before.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I guess my point and let me just speak plainly. I recognize the good faith and the effort that undeniably was put into this. But this application did extend the process to this point. And I was in favor of extending it on the assertion and the assurance that there was funding there and it could be done.

And now that turns out to be untrue for reasons possibly beyond their control, but one way or another they couldn't put the package together. And it seems to me that this is the first time we've had that set of circumstances.

And I wonder given that whether we ought to say okay, we bent over backwards to accommodate you. You didn't come through. And

1 if you want to come back, you've got to come 2 back as a brand-new applicant along with 3 everybody else. And even if we roll over other 4 people, we're not going to roll over you. You 5 will have to start from scratch. And I just 6 wonder. I'm not --CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What would be the 8 argument in favor of doing that? 9 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That it's a 10 little bit harder to cull them out if we are creating a brand-new round and opening it up to 11 12 everybody and saying okay, everybody but you 13 now on reflection is going to have to start 14 from -- is going to get the benefit of a 15 rollover if you paid the fee before. 16 It's easier to do it right now when 17 we have one entity before us and one set of 18 circumstances than I think it would be later 19 on. 20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I get that. 21 CHAIRMAN CRSOBY: Why would we want 22 to single -- This is not rhetorical. Why would 23 we single out one applicant to say that unlike 24 other applicants who have put in their \$400,000

I think that

but not gone forward or not been successful, you could not behave the same way all those other ones could. You don't have the same

the premise of all of this, there was a vote. We never had anybody in a position like this. There was a vote. There were multiple extensions based on representations that they had the money, were putting together the plan.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH:

The last plan that they filed was that they had a landlord and that they were going to finance the rest of it themselves.

That was a representation to us that had them going forward.

And I assume that they had a basis for doing that. I assume that. But it turned out to be apparently a very shaky basis because it didn't come forward.

So, now we've had a city get all wrapped up in this. A mayor come around from a position where he was dubious but got convinced to go forward with this. An election that got people out and exercised about this.

range of options.

1 And it seems to me that if this entity comes 2 back again, this entity ought to start from 3 scratch unlike other entities that have gone 4 through the process and been unsuccessful and withdraw after these votes and after all of 5 6 this other stuff had happened. And it seems to me this puts them in a different category. 8 least I put that out for discussion. 9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I think that's 10 a very intriguing thought. 11 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: As a first 12 step, let's merely accept that they have 13 withdrawn from this current round and will not 14 be allowed to come back to us before the 15 deadline for the RFA-2 application to try to 16 get back in the door. I'm not saying that 17 would or would not happen, but I think to 18 Commissioner McHugh's point and the Chairman's 19 point, accept the withdrawal and kind of not 20 put ourselves in a position to entertain that 21 question or that request for this round.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think they wouldn't have written the letter they wrote if they thought they -- They can't make this

22

23

happen in their judgment. So, we're probably
talking about an extreme hypothetical.

But if somebody called them up tomorrow and said I'll finance the deal and it was a real person real money, I would say, we'd want to consider whether they could go forward if they can meet the September 30 deadline.

I'd want to be able to think about it. I don't see why we should make a point of saying now you can't come back in.

MS. WELLS: Chairman Crosby, my only comment on that is the Commission has set that deadline. And I had suspended the investigation prior to this based on some information in another week. I can't meet that deadline now.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The September 30 deadline.

MS. WELLS: Correct. I do not see as a realistic possibility that they could come back in later and then we could finish the investigation and could meet all of your deadlines.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm saying I think

1 this is extraordinarily unlikely, but what is the benefit? I don't see what the benefit is 2 3 in precluding any other options that we can't 4 anticipate. We might very well say sorry, it's too late. If they did come up with something, 5 6 we might say it's too late. Why would we 7 preclude ourselves from considering whatever 8 might happen at this point? 9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I just think 10 we have too many hypotheticals here. I just 11 don't see us listening to what both the market 12 and the applicant are plainly telling us that 13 they are not. 14 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So, we just 15 say we accept it. 16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: What is wrong 17 with accepting what they are telling us? 18 mean, I got girlfriends who broke up with me. 19 You just have to accept it when they tell you. 20 No relation to any of this. 21 We just simply have to accept what 22 people tell you. 23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I agree we 24 just accept this at face value. We accept this at face value, which means they are precluded from this entire round. And there is no coming back before September 30.

I think we've given them lots of opportunities. We've been fair. We are accepting this now. And I'd be inclined to just do that at this point.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I thought you were saying -- I thought Commissioner Stebbins said let's just accept it period, not add anymore amendments to it. But then I thought you said you do want to add amendments to it.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No, no.

Accepting it means they've withdrawn from this process which ends September 30. So, they have withdrawn from this process so they don't have an ability to get in before September 30. They have withdrawn from this particular Region C process.

So, I think this precludes them from coming back as you hypothetically pointed out a week from now.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, you're saying that simply accepting their letter precludes

1 them, because they're precluding themselves. 2 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes. That's 3 how I read this and that's how I would 4 interpret this. 5 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: That was my 6 intent. But I think to Commissioner McHugh's 7 point, if at some point we find ourselves 8 having another application phase, I think we 9 could address his concern at that point. 10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm fine with 11 If that's what the letter says that's that. 12 fine with me. 13 MS. WELLS: I do note for the record 14 Attorney Conroy is here just as a courtesy to 15 the Commission. But I don't believe there's 16 any matters to address on behalf of the 17 applicant. 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Any further 19 discussion? So, does somebody want to move? 20 Commissioner Stebbins? 21 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr. 22 Chairman, I move that the Commission accept the 23 letter dated July 22 by KG New Bedford, LLC

thereby informing us that they are abandoning

Page 91 1 the Cannon Street project and withdrawing their 2 Phase 1 application for the Region C license. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? 4 COMMISISONER CAMERON: Second. 5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further 6 discussion? All in favor, aye. 7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye. 8 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 10 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 12 have it unanimously. So, I guess the next 13 question is, this was not quite on your agenda 14 but since we got this last night, we couldn't 15 have anticipated obviously when we set up our 16 agenda. So, there's a question about what if 17 anything do we need to talk about, do we need 18 to do? 19 At the moment, we're on a process. 20 We do have an applicant. We're on a schedule. 21 I think they've qualified, right? 22 MS. WELLS: That's right. They've 23 been found suitable. 24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: They've been found

1 suitable. Do we want to do anything else other than continue down the road that we're on? 2 3 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think it 4 could be something we could consider. We could 5 have staff talk to the one applicant left to 6 hear any concerns they may have, any requests they may have. I think that that could be an 8 important piece moving forward here. 9 It's a little unique to have one applicant. And there has been lots of -- This 10 11 letter alone points out some of the risks. So, 12 I would think that they may want to talk to 13 staff about this. And I think that may be an 14 important piece of information for us to have. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You mean are they 16 still in? Is that what you're getting at? 17 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think No. 18 they're in. I just didn't know if staff -- Now 19 that this is a development, is the schedule 20 just what it is? Well, we eventually talk 21 about a different schedule because of the one 22 applicant. 23 I just thought maybe staff could 24 have those conversations and just find out if

there are any questions of us or something we should be considering that we haven't, something along those lines.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I think the general directive to staff to talk is great. But we haven't posted this issue. We couldn't anticipate the withdrawal letter. So, we've acted on that. But I think going any further without having it on the agenda is unwise.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's part of what I'm asking is there anything that we should have going on so that we can get it on the agenda?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Have staff think of what's next and talk to the applicant and come up with an agenda item.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Which they do on a regular basis for everything else with our Ombudsman, our Director, Executive Director, Counsel.

MR. DAY: In addition, we have forwarded them the RFA-2 application. And when we forwarded that application, we also offered the chance and would plan to meet with them to

go over any questions they may have just as a natural step.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Sure. And that's just part of the normal process that would go forward, right.

MR. DAY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Let's also keep in mind, Commissioner Cameron raised the point, we did have one other region that ended up being only one applicant. And we did complete a very thorough and detailed review of their RFA-2 application and we still awarded a license.

But the letter today certainly may make some distinguishing scenarios between that application process and this application process.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think we would sort of welcome any comment from the public that anybody has about this. Like we always do. We'll be setting our agenda. We still have a week or so before we start to firm up the agenda for two weeks out. So, if anybody has got comments or suggestions or ideas,

1 please get them to us. Okay. 2 MS. WELLS: The second item on the 3 agenda under the IEB section is just the update 4 of temporary licenses that have been issued are two gaming employees, Andrew Plante, Director 5 6 of Security at the Plainville Gaming and 7 Redevelopment facility and David DiOrio, a Slot 8 Operations Assistant Shift Manager at the 9 Plainville Gaming and Redevelopment facility. 10 That update is in your packet as well. That's all I have for the Commission this afternoon. 11 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else for Director Wells? It's 12:30. Shall we convene 13 at 1:30, 1:00, 1:15? 1:15, all right we will 14 15 reconvene at 1:15. 16 17 (A recess was taken) 18 19 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Ladies and 20 gentlemen, we will reconvene public meeting 158 21 at about 1:15, 1:20. We will go to item number 22 five on the agenda, Executive Director Day, an 23 administrative update.

MR. DAY: Good afternoon, Chairman

Crosby, members of the Commission. I just have a couple of items on the general update. In early September, we plan to move forward with an agency wide after action review.

In this process, we want to identify new ideas, what has gone well, what may have been a weakness over the last fiscal year with particular focus on Plainridge Park Casino opening, by the way.

Our objective is to generate new ideas, strengths and weaknesses. We want to be sure that we keep what is working and take action to eliminate such weaknesses. The review is intended to include any agency copy including regulations, regulatory policy, technology, knowledge gaps, workforce, training, education, on the job experience, administrative policy and staffing.

We also want to ask ourselves if there were things we were worried about but didn't materialize and what are the odds those might come up this next time around.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Things not to worry about?

MR. DAY: Yes, not to worry about.

2 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I hope we have

3 | lots of those.

MR. DAY: We will set priorities, establish appropriate workgroups and assign each of the groups the responsibility to develop solutions and identify issues. This review, when we're done, will form the foundation for our preparations for Region A and B casinos, which will be a huge difference for the Commission as it goes into those size of facilities.

In addition, another topic, we have been notified that Mass IT is providing us with a great opportunity to switch to a system called MassVault. It will automatically retain and store our emails. In addition, the system will also provide us the ability to search and hold emails as necessary. It is our understanding as well that this MassVault system will eventually go to all agencies in state government will utilize the same system.

With that that's just a couple of administrative points. But I would also like

1 to note that the next item on our agenda, we 2 have Jack Rauen from Penn National. And Dane I 3 see is calmly sitting in the back. 4 You might recall that these two 5 gentlemen have been with us on reporting for 6 probably a little over a year now. I think this is probably Jack's last time will be 8 before the Commission to update you on the 9 status of the Plainridge Park Casino Project. And with that Jack --10 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You're going 12 really miss us, won't you Jack? 13 MR. DAY: Jack, it's been a pleasure 14 working with you. 15 MR. RAUEN: And you as well. 16 MR. DAY: And we wish you the best 17 on your next challenge. 18 MR. RAUEN: Thank you very much. 19 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The project you've described is really exciting project, really 20 21 great thing. I'm glad you're on top of that. 22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Two projects. 23 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Two projects, 24 right.

1 MR. RAUEN: Picking up on Rick's 2 note, gosh this is my three or four, maybe the 3 fifth time now for this. And I must tell you, 4 it's been an absolute pleasure and a privilege to be Penn's spokesman on this project. 5 6 and every time I get a little more comfortable with this. You guys have made it a very 8 comfortable forum. So, I thank you for that. 9 And I will definitely -- You've made 10 this a very comfortable forum for me. And I 11 think I've gotten a little better each time. 12 So, thank you for that. And I'll give you the 13 highlights. 14 So, this is the quarterly report as 15 of June 30. I don't see it on the sheet, but 16 there is usually a photo below. There you go. 17 The first highlight I'll point out to you, and 18 I will move quickly through this report because 19 a lot of the information you know, and you've 20 obviously visited us many times recently with 21 the opening. 22 But the first thing on the cover

page is the rendering is gone. And there's an

actual picture.

23

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's a huge milestone.

MR. RAUEN: The past couple of quarters we've said we've got to get rid of the rendering. But we had to replace it with something better, and it didn't come together until the end. The last one we at least have a real picture.

The first highlight I wanted to draw your attention to is on Appendix 2. We've talked about LEED several times. During the second quarter, we received notification from the U.S. Green Building Council that we received 38 points in the design phase of our project. We submitted 38, we got all 38.

It's better than we expected, but it puts us a on a solid path going into the construction phase. And we are presently preparing that submission to go to USGBC.

It'll probably take another two months or so to do. But going into it with 38 points out of the design phase, we are highly confident that gold is going to be our end result.

On Appendix 4, this section reflects

the closure of our construction period schedule, which as you know we hit pretty much spot on. There's a series of photos that show you different completed views of the interior and exterior. We are obviously pleased with the construction and the fit-out work.

And the end result I think is largely captured in these pictures. We ended up with a bright, vibrant, colorful, exciting facility. And that's what we always intended. We couldn't be happier with the outcome.

There's also some exciting pictures of our offsite roadway improvements. You've been with us through all of the trial and tribulations, but actually we are very happy with the outcome of that work.

The first day was a challenge. They always are. Since then, the feedback from State Police, feedback from Plainville Police has been that traffic has just worked very well open at our peak times.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: At your peak times?

MR. RAUEN: Even at our peak times.

While they weren't the largest dollar improvements, they seem to have had the intended good impact.

On Appendix 5, I think there was a late addition to your package. Just this morning I gave Rick the financial certification letter from our CFO. The timing of things was such that our earnings call was this morning. And we couldn't release the financial letter until then, but you should have it now.

And it has the standard information. But I will draw your attention to the fact that total project cost between our last report to you which was \$250 million, and today we are reporting \$258.8 million in total project costs.

The \$8.8 million increase from last time is isolated in two areas. It is the actual, the final actual accounting for our pre-opening operations costs and the final amount of cash put into cage and the supporting operation. So, that's the only change that took us from \$250 to \$258 million.

On Appendix number 8, this is the

1 standard information we give you on the 2 construction workforce. And this particular 3 report reflects the final construction results 4 on diversity. 5 Just to point out a couple of 6 highlights, we ended up with about 432,000 direct work hours onsite. And while we fell a 8 couple of points short on the woman 9 participation goal, the overall results for 10 minorities, women and veterans exceeded the 11 plan. 12 We are pleased with the results 13 we've had all along. We are pleased with the 14 final results. And we acknowledge the hard 15 work by Turner and their various subcontractors to create the results that were achieved. 16 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's great. 18 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Just out of 19 curiosity, on the 400 -- did you have a 20 prediction as to how many hours this would 21 require? 22 MR. RAUEN: I didn't. I will look 23 that up. 24 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's an

extraordinary number of hours. And if you put
a dollar figure on it, it's a huge amount. I

just wondered because I marvel at how a lot of
this is projected and predicted.

MR. RAUEN: I think that Turner -That precise one I don't know, but I will tell
you that the number of peak workforce was
always estimated at about 300-350 and they
couldn't have been more accurate. That's where
we ended up.

They also said that we'd end up with about 1200 workers on the site during the course of the project. And I think what report here is 1150. So, certain of their assessments early on did come true. That particular one I don't know. I'll look that up.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's interesting.

MR. RAUEN: On Appendix number 9, this is the final results for the construction contracting diversity. And as we've been pleasantly reporting to you all along, we've exceeded the plan goals. For each MBE, WBE and VBE at the end of the day here, and this is the

final accounting, 32 percent of the project direct construction went to M, W and VBE companies.

The final results are \$31 million worth of diversity commitments, of which 84 percent of that has been paid as of June 30. And the rest will be paid out as part of the closeout.

On Appendix number 10, there's various information on here. I wanted to draw your attention to where we stand currently on the occupancy certificate from the town of Plainville.

Back on June 19, we got a 30-day temporary certificate of operations for all areas from the town. There were normal conditions attached to that monitoring of building systems and things along those lines that were attached to the temporary CO.

We've made good progress over the past month of addressing those concerns.

Earlier this week, the town extended the temporary certificate of operations until August 18. And they are now in doing their re-

1 inspections. Those things are going very well.

2 And we would expect a full CO before August 18.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's great.

MR. RAUEN: Appendix number 12 -Oh, I'm sorry. One other thing on Appendix
number 10 is we received a substantial
completion letter from MassDOT back on June 18
for the improvements we did. They have one

more inspection to make that's scheduled for Monday the 27th.

And on that day, they will do the final inspection of the signals and all of the other work done so that they essentially then take possession of those improvements. They become dedicated to MassDOT.

On Appendix 12, this is the final results for our fit-out diversity program. And much like the other areas, we ended up exceeding the overall goals for M, W and VBE suppliers. This is non-construction.

And at the end of the project, 36 percent of all of the fit-out went to minority, women and VBE supplier organizations. That turned out to be about \$5.5 million of which 77

percent of that has been already paid with the balance of that to paid as we close out the project.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Jack, what percentage of the vendors involved in the fit-out are going to have kind of an ongoing business relationship with Penn? Do you happen to know?

MR. RAUEN: I think a good number of them were project related, but some should carry on. Good question. I'll follow up on that.

I think that's it in terms of the report itself. Happy to answer any questions. I did have a couple of other comments to make, but that's pretty much it on the report. Happy to answer any other questions.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I have one and you hopefully will recall this. If you could refresh my memory, during the construction phase, there were two minority contracts let out for electricity and mechanical if I remember that were a subcontractor that was a minority, correct?

1 MR. RAUEN: They were two very large 2 One was I think Coughlin was the 3 electrical contractor and I believe Cox was a 4 veteran enterprise, if I remember. 5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. 6 those are counted in the subcontracts piece or 7 the workforce piece? MR. RAUEN: Well, the dollars 8 9 related to their contracts are in the 10 subcontracting piece. Their workers are 11 captured in the workforce. One tracks dollars. 12 The other one tracks people. 13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. Good. Ι just remember those being very important and 14 15 clearly critical I would argue in achieving the goals that you did achieve. 16 17 MR. RAUEN: No question. They were 18 both contracts between I think \$6 and \$8 19 million dollars. And that certainly helped our 20 results. And at the end of the day, both of 21 those firms performed very well. 22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. 23 COMMISSIONER STEBBSIN: Jack, 24 another quick question as we're talking about

this kind of after action review that involves 1 2 Would you have a good sense or should we 3 consider inviting in Turner to talk about 4 different challenges they ran into in terms of 5 the MBE, WBE and VBE participation in terms of 6 helping us understand hurdles or challenges or obstacles that might have been in the way of 8 some of the different firms that you didn't end 9 up doing business with? Who would have a 10 better sense of that you or Turner? 11 MR. RAUEN: We'd be glad to 12 participate. I've always told you that. 13 think Turner would have a lot to say on that 14 They were the ones that did the work. subject. 15 They were the ones that drove the results. So, 16 I would certainly involve them. 17 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's an 19 interesting point, Commissioner Stebbins. 20 was thinking as Director Day said, we're going 21 to be taking a hard look at everything we do. 22 This is an opportune moment for us to kind of 23 review our own systems and practices and on and 24 on.

And I would more than welcome any thoughts formal or informal. Maybe it's not a bad idea to invite Penn into one or more of the discussions. Because we might not agree with everything you say, but we're really looking for constructive criticism and how we can do things better.

So, if you've got any ideas like that that you'd be willing to share, particularly the criticism area, constructive criticism things that in your judgment that we could do differently or better in any area that you would like us to hear. I would really welcome that.

MR. RAUEN: Pretty much with every project we do, we do what Rick is describing for your next steps. We sit down between our design consultants, us at Penn and our operations people and say how did we do? What worked? What didn't work? And every time -- There's some commonalities, but generally we learn some lessons every time and we did here. We'd be glad to participate.

But I think there it's not just

1 construction, it's also Lance and his team 2 because they certainly have a ton of 3 interaction with your staff regularly. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right, agree. 5 Anything else? Anybody else questions? COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: You going to 6 7 miss the weather? 8 MR. RAUEN: Not this winter I won't. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Where do you go 10 next? 11 That's a good question, MR. RAUEN: 12 Mr. Chairman. I don't know. Usually at Penn 13 National we have a plethora of projects. 14 this case, there's a little bit of a break. 15 But I've been with Penn 14 years now, and there 16 has never been a quiet day. 17 So, while you may not see the next 18 project immediately, I've learned that there's 19 always a Tropicana or something right around 20 the corner for us. But thank you. It's been a 21 pleasure and you really have made this a very 22 comfortable venue for us to come and talk. 23 I thank you for that.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I want to just

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

thank you back, because it's always been a
pleasure for me and I think for all of the
other Commissioners to listen to you. You're a
no-drama guy.

It began at the beginning when you first came here and we were experimenting with the supervision of the able folks from Pinck were giving. And the Chairman asked you is that really helpful or is it a pain in the neck and your answer was yes.

And it's been the same way every day since. So, the hoopla was on June 24. And this is sort of a punctuation mark at the end of that. So, thank you for the succinct and able job you've done --

MR. RAUEN: Always tried.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: -- and the way you've interfaced with Rick to pull this thing off and get it in on time and open the way it was.

MR. RAUEN: It has worked out very well, especially interacting with Rick and the staff. Couldn't have asked for better. Take your time on the next guys.

1 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I know you'll 2 miss that Plainville Holiday Inn. 3 I think they'll miss me MR. RAUEN: 4 more than I'll miss them. Thank you very much. 5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: See you later. 6 Thank you, Jack. Okay. That's the end of 7 Director Day, now General Counsel Blue. 8 MS. BLUE: I think I will defer to 9 Deputy General Counsel Grossman on this 10 regulation. 11 MR. GROSSMAN: Good afternoon. We 12 are here to revisit 205 CMR 139, which is the 13 disclosure and reporting regulations. 14 Just by way of review and 15 background, this was heard at a public hearing 16 on April 23, these set of regulations. 17 before you on April 30 you will recall, at 18 which point there were a number of concerns 19 raised by our gaming licensees relative to the 20 public disclosure of some of the information 21 contained in these regulations. 22 So, we were asked, the staff was, to 23 step back and have a closer look at what we 24 were asking for, and determine whether it was

necessary for us to require the submission of certain documents. And part and parcel of that was how we would go about protecting it, if you will, from public disclosure if appropriate.

So, we set out to do that. Spent a lot of time with Commissioner Zuniga. We discussed these regulations with our gaming licensees, MGM and Penn National in particular. We appreciate the time they spent offering their insight.

And we spend time with our consultants going through the particulars contained in these regulations. And spent a lot of time on each and every requirement, each document, each piece of information and the overall mechanism.

So, with that I thought I would offer a few comments on the draft you have before you, certainly welcoming any comments or questions along the way. And at the end, we will need to consider whether you would adopt these here today or open it up for a further comment period. Again, recalling that these have gone through the public comment period.

So, they are full teed up for adoption if that's what we decide to do.

So, starting at the beginning, I would just make note of the first section, which references 205 CMR 142. This replaces a section we had in the previous draft that provided for comprehensive access to records of the gaming licensee. After further review, it became clear that we already had provisions in the regulations that governed that subject matter.

So, instead of duplicating them here, we simply made cross reference to that. And it's important to review these regulations with the understanding that the Commission and by extension the staff, have access to all records and all parts of the gaming establishment that there are.

And frankly, there hasn't been any concern relative to that raised by the gaming licensees. That's fairly standard as we understand it in the gaming industry for a gaming commission to have access to just about all records in the gaming establishment.

So, with that backdrop, we move into this set of regulations, which really just governs what records and what information has to actually be provided on some kind of regular schedule or at least maintained, as opposed to those that they will maintain in the ordinary course, but we are not identifying specifically as being records or information that we want to have them accessible to us.

So, the first thing to keep in mind, and I think this is one of the critical components of these regulations -- And this is a brand-new section that did not appear in the last version. -- is 139.02. It's up on the screen. It's on the first page of the draft. And what it does is it sets up a mechanism under which the Commission may if it agrees, withhold certain documents or information from public disclosure.

That is documents or information that have been provided to the Commission either because it's statutorily required or because the Commission or the IEB or staff have an interest in reviewing the documents to

ensure compliance with the gaming laws or other regulations.

And we set up the mechanism here under which that would happen, which is all premised on the exemptions contained in Chapter 23K section 21(a)(7). We cite it right in this section. And essentially what that says is that if there is material or information provided that the gaming licensee considers to be a trade secret or would be detrimental to the licensee if it were made public, they may or the Commission may protect that information.

So, the approach we took here was that we would essentially put the onus on the gaming licensees to tell us which documents or information they believe to be a trade secret or contain confidential information. That is as opposed to us going through and trying to identify exactly which pieces of information should be presumptively withheld.

Those were the two approaches that were considered here. And this draft sets forth the approach whereby the gaming licensee will tell us what information they would like

us to consider withholding.

So, under this language, they would then identify certain information that they believe to be confidential. We will have an application of some sort that we'll put together. And if the Commission agrees that the information would fit into this category that's identified here, we would enter into a nondisclosure agreement under which we would agree to withhold it in the event that a public request for it was made.

So, that's what this provision sets out. And I think it's kind of the cornerstone of the new version of these regulations is this particular section here, which is provided for by statute. So, what we do is we essentially expound upon what the statute talks about.

Moving on, page two, and I'll just hit some high points to draw your attention to really quickly. The fiscal year section, which is 03 we changed. In the initial draft, we set out what the fiscal year had to be. Here we say that the licensee can use whatever fiscal year it wants as long as it tells us. There

was no reason we could decipher why we needed to tell them what their fiscal year needed to be.

So, the next two sections, 04 and 05 set out specific documents and information.

And they're broken down into two categories.

The first category contained here in 04 are documents and reports and information that must be provided to the Commission on a regular basis.

The second category, which is in 05 that we'll get to in a moment, are documents that we say that the gaming licensee must maintain but that do not have to be provided to the Commission unless the Commission asks for them.

So, with that I would just point out in paragraph two one of the changes from the previous version is that we added a definition of construction into what we mean when it comes to submitting that quarterly report relative to construction statistics.

We also clarify that that report would be required not just during the initial

construction period, but as part of any ongoing subsequent construction that goes on at the gaming establishment.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Maybe we should mention here something that I spoke to you about, which is something that our licensees have also spoken at least the people from Penn National have mentioned. I'm specifically referring to subsection six, 139.04(6).

Our statute does require that the licensees pay a daily tax. And in so doing we need effectively a daily report of the remittance. On the other hand, Mr. Snowden I think made a compelling argument last time he spoke before us saying that we should consider reporting those revenues to the market basis.

CHAIRMAN CRSOBY: You're talking about public reporting.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. But our acceptance of a record constitutes a public record potentially, unless it was entered into a nondisclosure agreement that Todd just highlighted at the beginning. So, that's the

way we deal with the very clear example -
That's the way that we would deal with on a

very specific example relative to the

nondisclosure agreement, which I think is the

way to go. I'm not suggesting that we should

change anything. This is a way to reconcile

two competing priorities in my view.

MR. GROSSMAN: And that's right. If in fact this is the approach adopted by the Commission, we will have to go back and look at some of the documents we already have and determine whether a nondisclosure agreement would be appropriate.

Just to pick up on paragraph six that Commissioner Zuniga was talking about, there we require the daily, monthly and annual gross gaming revenue reports. And this is a good point -- A good place just to point out that a number of the records that are discussed here in the next two sections are merely records that are required in other parts of the regulations.

So, the requirement that they be submitted is not originated here in section

139. This is merely a cross reference to provide a checklist of sorts to the gaming licensees and to our own staff to help identify all of the records and reports that are required to be submitted.

And certainly, these gross gaming revenue reports fit into that category in that we've already required they be submitted under 205 CMR 140. So, here we're merely saying that they do need to be submitted.

But in paragraph six, we also added a new provision that is worthy of note at this point. And that is the part that deals with the payback statistics. There are a number of provisions of the statute in Chapter 23K that need to be addressed here in regulations. And the Legislature said that the Commission needs to adopt a regulation that requires the posting of payback statistics of slot machines played in a gaming establishment.

So, this provision here is an effort to address that requirement. And it's important just to note a few things here. The first being that the statute requires posting

of payback statistics. It doesn't directly address where that is supposed to be done.

And then it says that there have to be statistics. And it doesn't say which statistics have to be posted. Then it doesn't say how often. So, we attempt to answer all of those questions here in this particular section.

And what we do is we say that on a monthly basis as part of the monthly gross gaming revenue report, the gaming licensee will provide us and ultimately we'll be able to figure this out on our own through our central monitoring system as I understand it, but they will provide us with the drop and handle, the win or loss and the win or loss percentage from slot machines played in the gaming establishment. And those are the statistics that we will post.

And I think those are the stats that we picked, because those seemed to be the ones that are most relevant to the area of interest. And that is ultimately the question we get most often is what is the payout percentage of slot

machines in Massachusetts. And it's difficult sometimes to understand what the -- Our level is set at 80 percent, as you'll recall. -- what that actually means.

And these statistics help explain what that 80 percent minimum theoretical payout actually means. So, that's why we picked these. And in theory over time, if you look at these statistics, they should indicate at least an 80 percent payout, probably much higher than that, but that would be the minimum required.

It would be subject to public disclosure on our website. And people would be able to see that that threshold is actually being met. So, this is the mechanism that we've provided here in the regs. to address that requirement in the statute.

Paragraph 11 we talk about quarterly reports. I would just note that from the previous version that you've seen, we've removed the requirement that monthly reports be submitted and limited it just to quarterly reports.

The theory being that we would be

able to obtain the information we need both through the daily and monthly gross gaming revenue reports and through the quarterly reports themselves. So, that's why we've cut back to the quarterly reports.

We've also added paragraphs 13 and 14 to this list just for identification purposes. It also has the effect of bringing those documents under the nondisclosure agreement clause. So, any particular documents including the internal controls themselves that a gaming licensee may feel fi into the category of trade secrets or detrimental if disclosed may be the subject of a request for a nondisclosure agreement as well.

three talks about documents that need just be compiled and maintained. We include things in here like tax returns. So, that was I think a change from the last version where we said they had to be submitted to us. Here we just say they need to be maintained and compiled.

There was -- The same situation is true with the securities filings for publicly

traded companies. The 10k, 10q and those types of documents need only be compiled and maintained but not submitted to the Commission unless the Commission asks for them.

We made a couple of distinctions, notably in paragraph (e) and elsewhere between publicly traded securities and publicly traded companies and non-publicly traded companies in an effort to make sure that these regulations would cover both a publicly traded company and one that is not publicly traded. And with a few adjustments we've made, I think we've been able to achieve this based upon the comments we received.

So, here we make a distinction in paragraphs (e) and (f) between publicly traded securities and non-publicly traded securities and just the records regarding those interests that must be maintained.

Paragraph (f) you'll note we also added in a five percent threshold, which was suggested to us as more consistent with the requirements under the Federal Securities laws and information that the licensees are more

easily able to maintain.

On page five, paragraph six is an important provision. This talks about all of the information that is compiled based upon the player card, rewards card and loyalty program. And it's contained in three separate sections of the gaming law.

We were able to consolidate it into one main section here into two parts. And you'll recall that the notable one in paragraph (b) is in the Gaming Act. It's not in Chapter 23K. The Commission is supposed to obtain this information so that is can be provided to a third party to anonymize the data. And then make the data available to qualified researchers so essentially recommendations can be made to the Legislature as to ways in which perhaps we can address or improve the effective operation of gaming in Massachusetts.

So, these two areas were identified as being highly confidential areas of great concern to our gaming licensees should this information become public. They are required by statute. And that's why they are included

here. But I think it's just worth being aware of the fact that they're here.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Todd, at the bottom of that page -- because you might be jumping over it, but I had a quick question on number eight at the bottom of page five, the gaming licensee's disbursement report relative to vendors. And you reference another regulation, which I don't have in front of me, but is that the information we're hoping to collect to share or licensing needs to determine if vendors are actually moving up in categories based on the amount of business?

MR. GROSSMAN: That's right. That's one of the uses of that document. It lists essentially all of the expenditures made to vendors by the casino. One of the things we do with it is determine whether a nongaming vendor should be reclassified as a gaming vendor secondary based upon the threshold.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I'm just trying to make sure we're not asking for two different disbursement reports that are going to provide the same information from our

1 licensees.

MR. GROSSMAN: No. This does not create an independent requirement. It merely references the other requirement. So, folks are aware of the fact that it has to be submitted.

Paragraph 12, we talk about the minutes of boards of directors meetings. I inadvertently crossed out a little bit too much here. I would keep in the first line and a half that is stricken, which is merely a cross reference to our internal control regulations.

And it applies to the audit and compliance committee meeting minutes. That is information that we may certainly be interested in and should be kept in.

The rest of it though was unnecessary and we address most of this in our internal controls section in any event. So, that's the reason it was recommended for striking.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Todd, one above that or two above that number 10. You talk about the annual business plan of the

gaming licensees. Are we being prescriptive in what we're asking for on a business plan or leaving it up to the licensee?

MR. GROSSMAN: The latter, we haven't been prescriptive here short of saying that it has to include financial projections. We also leave open the ability for us to prescribe, as we say, in a format prescribed by the Commission. So, it is something that we may want to be more prescriptive about in the future. Otherwise, it would be fairly openended.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: We'd lump this under the highly confidential or highly protected category of documents.

MR. GROSSMAN: It strikes me that that would fall into that category. The bottom of page six are a number of items that were largely contained in the previous version. We made a few tweaks to them.

First, we took out the equation by which the operators had to calculate their gaming bankroll. And we left it to them to calculate it the way that they presently

calculate it. And just make a certification to us that they'd be able to maintain an adequate bankroll.

On the next page we talk about the annual audit. There are the two audits that you'll recall. There's the audit that's done by the gaming licensee. And then there's the audit that's done by the Gaming Commission.

So, this first one is the one that's done by the gaming licensee. And we modified our previous language to allow for the gaming licensee to submit, to the extent that they're a publicly traded company, their consolidated annual audit, which is typically part of their 10k as I understand it, provided that it include a supplement or an appendix in which the auditor has looked at the figures for the property, the gaming licensee itself and attests to the accuracy of that information, and offers an opinion as to whether there are any material weaknesses in the licensees system of internal controls.

So, that is a change from the version we had previously. This is more in

- 1 | line it appears with the way the other
- 2 | jurisdictions handle this issue in not
- 3 | requiring the gaming licensee to do a full
- 4 | blown audit of the property here specifically.
- 5 And the theory is that we will be able to get
- 6 the information that we're interested in to
- 7 insure the viability and integrity of the
- 8 licensee through this process.
- 9 Keeping in mind that on the flipside
- 10 | that the Gaming Commission has the authority to
- 11 | conduct any audit it wants. Though as we've
- 12 | heard discussed here that audit is not
- 13 | necessarily intended to duplicate the audit of
- 14 the financial controls of the gaming licensee
- 15 but instead to look at some of the other types
- 16 of controls that are in place under the
- 17 | internal controls policy.
- 18 Though certainly we reserve the
- 19 | right here to go in and re-audit any of the
- 20 | financial figures that may be included in the
- 21 previous audit that was submitted.
- But we added some language here at
- 23 the bottom of 139.08, which is on page eight.
- 24 We say that where possible efforts will be made

not to audit areas that were the subject of and satisfactorily addressed by the annual audit that the gaming licensee has already submitted.

So, we go on the record here in the regulations and say we will make efforts not to duplicate what's already been done.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Seems like a modest proposal.

MR. GROSSMAN: And there are certainly a number of other adjustments that were made here but those were I think the highlights that I thought I would just bring to your attention.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Was there anything there, Todd, that the licensees raised in their concerns that you did not adopt? Were there any bones of contentions left? I couldn't cross tab it closely enough.

MR. GROSSMAN: I really don't think there were any major or any bones of contention. That being said, we did not copy and paste every single change that they recommended. But I think in essence we mostly agreed with all of the recommendations that

1 | were made and ran them through our consultants.

2 And Commissioner Zuniga and I looked at all of them.

So, no. I don't think there's anything necessarily out there, which is not to say that they initially agree with everything in here. But by and large I think --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Let me offer a color on that because I think it's very relevant. The licensees were always willing to send us whatever information we wanted. That was never the issue in this reg.

The larger issue which you very appropriately identified at the very beginning was if and whether something becomes a public record, how we deal with that. And also because we have three public companies, how does all of these reporting requirements reconcile with the reporting requirements that they are required to do under SEC rules.

And I would argue after a lot of hours that you've spent with the feedback yourself looking at this, we've arrived at the medium that allows us to reconcile everything,

1 all of those interests. 2 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: It looks like 3 a great job. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes. Do you want 5 to go to the next section? 6 MR. GROSSMAN: That was it. 7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: There is no 8 next section. 9 MR. GROSSMAN: So, with that it's 10 important to understand that we did reorganize 11 this entire draft pretty much. In substance I 12 would submit that it's virtually the same as 13 the draft you've seen before. It does include 14 this new nondisclosure agreement provision. 15 And of course there are the modifications as I

But by and large, I think it's the same subject matter that you had before you before as far as notice and things like that go and the public hearing process.

So, subject to your comfort level, it's ready for adoption or further comment if necessary.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I would just

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

just discussed.

1 like to mention again, perhaps a little more 2 directly that I think Todd has done a wonderful job here reconciling a lot of the concerns, a 3 4 lot of the requirements and presenting and 5 reminding us of the history and evolution, if 6 you will, of all of this. So, thank you for all of your hard work on this. 7 8 MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you. 9 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I would 10 agree. Always ready to give a tutorial and to 11 really bring forth the issues that have 12 changed. And I'm always interested in who 13 thought what and who's idea? What did the 14 consultants think? What were the licensees 15 thinking? You always have those answers, and 16 the incorporations that you make are thoughtful 17 and make a lot of sense. So, thank you. 18 MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you. 19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So, are we 20 voting to move them into the final promulgation 21 process, correct? 22 MR. GROSSMAN: If you approve them, 23 we can just file them with the Secretary.

would then just have to revisit the small

1 business impact statement. But then we'd be 2 done with these and onto the next ones. 3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I would then 4 move that this Commission approve the regulations 205 CMR 139 for the continuing 5 6 disclosure and reporting obligations of gaming 7 licensees and promulgate them officially and 8 revised here today. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? 10 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second. 11 MR. DAY: Commissioner Zuniga, is 12 that with the amended SBIS? 13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I was going to 14 do that separate but thank you. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do you want to add that in? 16 17 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. Then I 18 would also amend my motion to include that this 19 Commission approve the amended small business 20 impact statement for same regulations 205 CMR 21 139 as presented here in the packet. 22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second again, 23 Commissioner Stebbins? 24 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second

Page 138 1 again. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further 3 discussion? All in favor, aye. 4 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye. 5 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 7 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously. We are now onto item 9 10 number seven, I believe, that would be Research 11 and Responsible Gaming with Director Vander 12 Linden. Actually, this is going to take a 13 while. Why don't we take a quick break. We'll 14 come back. 15 16 (A recess was taken) 17 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Ready to 19 reconvene. I think everybody is getting a 20 little punchy. We are reconvening at about 21 2:15. We are on item number seven, Director Vander Linden and friends. 22

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes, and

friends. Good afternoon. The first item I

23

1 have is a status update on play management.

Play management is obviously something that for several months was an issue that came before you numerous times.

And you had in January of this year approved a play management system, which is basically, budget setting tools that would be used on a test basis at Plainridge Park Casino.

This is by the way consistent with our responsible gaming framework strategy two, which is to increase informed player choice.

So, to bring it back before you and just give you an update, while it hasn't been on the surface here, a lot of activity has been going on behind the scenes to make sure we see this actually happen in the near future.

So, I have for you a memo. And what I wanted to do was just kind of highlight the work that has been done and is completed as well as go over some of our tasks that we still need to complete.

So, materials that have been completed to date. One of the big deliverables on this was to come up with a consensus on the

1 standards. This is a document that provides 2 the functional requirements for play 3 management. For example, what intervals do players receive notifications about as they 4 5 approach their budget limits. What happens 6 when a player would reach those limits? How is it positioned? One of the big ones is that 8 it's voluntary.

So, the Commission approved this. There were some minor refinements after that point through consultations with Bally, with Penn Gaming and last but not least our evaluators, the Cambridge Health Alliance.

Other pieces that have been completed is that we had secured our evaluation team through Cambridge Health Alliance Division on Addiction being led by Dr. Alan Schafer and Dr. Debi LaPlante. The lead on this would be Dr. Matt Tom. We worked with them after that procurement was complete to refine and settle on an evaluation protocol.

Another deliverable that is actually and tangible now on the floor at Plainridge
Park Casino are the kiosks. We had decided

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

through the play management standards that one area in which you would be allowed to enroll, change your budgets or disenroll from the system would be from a kiosk.

And while we don't have the play management system up and running, the kiosk still functions quite well as a source of other types of responsible gaming information and tools.

All of that has been complete and is ready to go right now. There are other key pieces though that have not been complete, but are on track. And I'd like to go over those real quickly with you as well.

Aside from the play management standards, which are kind of the functional nuts and bolts of what it looks like and how it functions, we have a framework for electronic gaming machine content that includes the messaging, the graphic standards, the actual messages that appear when you reach your limits. How it's presented to the players upon enrollment. How when a player decides to disenroll, if they decide to disenroll from it,

what types of messages they would receive at that point.

This has taken a lot of work in collaboration, again with the same parties, with Penn Gaming being a major contributor to that. The Division on Addiction recognizing that the content is so very important to how it sits or how a player receives it and what they do with that information.

Similarly, the framework again for the content and messaging and graphic standards on the kiosk is another place in which would be slightly different than what a player would receive on the slot machine or the electronic gaming machine. But we are very close, are substantially complete coming up with a final set of standards for that.

Behind all of that is the developing piece of it. So, you take the play management standards. We take this framework for the content. That needs to be all brought together in the development piece of the casino management system. Again, this is the Bally casino management system that's being rolled at

1 Penn right now.

So, these are all of the changes.

An example of a change that needed to be made

was the existing pre-commitment system that

Bally had that would have been the off-the
shelf version would have taken into

consideration free play in a player's limits

that they would set.

The Commission had said no, we do not want to allow free play to be considered in a player's limit. We want it to be the actual dollar in that a player would budget. So, this would be an example of a change that would need to be made to the casino management system from the off-the-shelf version of their precommitment or responsible gaming system that they had already developed.

There are other changes as well.

Making sure again that the graphic standards are fully integrated. Making sure that the messaging content is fully integrated to get to the point where it looks and feels exactly how the Commission and how our other stakeholders had envisioned it to work.

1 I had a conversation with the 2 developer, the project manager from Bally this 3 morning. While I had thought it was 4 significantly complete, it's well underway but to say that it's significantly complete is 5 6 probably a bit of an overstatement. I don't think that the changes the timeline that we're 8 on for completion and rollout of the project. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 9 Is there a 10 new timeframe based on your conversation? 11 MR. VANDER LINDEN: No. T think 12 that we're still looking at a September to 13 October timeframe. Once we have that settled 14 and the play management is fully integrated and 15 into the casino management system, we would 16 then move to testing. And we would want to have it tested 17 18 by all of the key stakeholders. Obviously, the 19 Massachusetts Gaming Commission would be at the 20 testing table. Penn would be at the testing 21 table. Cambridge Health Alliance as our 22 evaluators would be at the table to actually test the product. Make sure it looks and feels 23 24 the way we want it to. Make sure it's

positioned right. And we would be looking to do that probably sometime next month.

After that, we would need to move it back out to GLI for certification or attestation. Once we have it as we feel that it should be, we want to make sure that it interacts with the rest of the casino management system without interfering with the other functions of that system.

From that point of view, we would move to developing a training manual or a training guide. Actually, some of that could already be happening or happening at the same time as the testing certifications.

And then from that point, we'd move to testing. Testing key staff, specifically targeting obviously our GameSense advisors, the staff that would be on the floor at Penn Gaming or at the casino and anybody else that between Penn and the Commission and the Cambridge Health Alliance felt would be necessary to have training.

To have all of that work done and again some slight adjustments to the work as

I've just described, I expect that the play management system could be operational in September or October of this year.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Very exciting.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Sounds great.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yes, it's

great.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It'd be interesting to do at some point, to show how the things are going to work. How the pop-ups are going to work, what the text is, what the steps are. That'd be an interesting thing for us to review, I think.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: The two central criticisms of play management have been uptake and effectiveness. How do people respond to the messages that they would receive? What does it do to their actual -- How does it impact their behavior and their decisions about how to move forward? And those are two key things that we're paying very close attention to in the development of this.

And that has been kind of the central theme as part of our work to date,

especially with Cambridge Health Alliance who
has been so valuable in getting this content to
be positioned and to feel the way we want it to
feel.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So, Cambridge Health Alliance is helping to on the front-end and then Cambridge Health Alliance is going to be evaluating the output and the efficacy on the backend and see how it all works?

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes, exactly as we had planned when we brought them on board, both in the development the content as well as the evaluation.

This goes back to a precautionary approach where there isn't a lot of evidence for this type of technology. But there's ample to reason to believe that it's consistent with where the Commission wants to go. It's consistent with the statute.

So, we want to with that precautionary approach evaluate, evaluate, evaluate to test the effectiveness of it, to test the uptake of it.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And Penn is at

1 the table on both phases of that? 2 they'll be consulted on the front-end and 3 they'll certainly be one of the evaluators of 4 the test results. 5 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes. 6 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good. 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay, great. 8 Thank you. 9 So, more to MR. VANDER LINDEN: 10 come. Next on the agenda we have the GameSense 11 public outreach and awareness initiatives and 12 this will be led by myself and Elaine. 13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Excuse me, Mark. 14 I meant to say one thing. It's implicit, but 15 training on how to get people to sign up and 16 how this is going to be marketed, it's not 17 really in your description. It's kind of a 18 passing that we'll do some training. But as 19 you know, one of the reasons that this has 20 fallen down every place else is it's never been 21 actually marketed properly. 22 And how you roll it out, how you get 23 the words to people, how you approach people, 24 etc., it's worth a lot of time and attention to

- figure out how to do that. Its own component of this beyond getting the technology right, getting the marketing right is really important.
- 5 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes, I agree.
- 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's not really
- 7 | listed on your list of critical path items.
 - MR. VANDER LINDEN: When I was speaking with Bally earlier today about that that was brought to my attention.
 - There really is two pieces. There is the technical training, which really is not a lot. It's a very similar system as many of you have seen it demonstrated.
 - But then there's also how do you talk about this system and what type of tool can they use if they choose to.
 - CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The whole marketing approach, somebody needs to take a step back and think top to bottom how do we market this thing. Go ahead.
- MR. VANDER LINDEN: So, moving onto
 the next piece is the GameSense public outreach
 update. A lot of attention and energy has been

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

placed to promoting GameSense.

GameSense as the Massachusetts

Gaming Commission's brand to talk about
responsible gaming. So, Elaine and I wanted to
just walk through with you a little bit about
what is out there right now and what type of
effort we've put into this.

So, the adoption of GameSense is in large part a credit to the British Columbia

Lottery Corp. About a year and a half or two years ago I began taking a look at where are the gold standards. What are the great models out there to promote responsible gaming? And all things pointed to the British Columbia Lottery Corp.

They had already developed a very strong strategic approach to promoting responsible gaming. Their goals were very consistent with our goals, which are to promote a positive approach to play and provide peace of mind to the public, to create an approach that instills trust, is a proactive, effective and transparent way to talk about gaming.

We wanted it to be an approach that

was not one that was the government providing information and telling people how to gamble responsibly but one that would come across as friendly, genuine and helpful.

And also important through it all was to say this is something that we're going to roll out at our casinos with our licensees. So, we don't want to take away the reason that people go to casinos is in order to have fun. So, we wanted to make sure that that was built into it as well.

A lot of this content, the graphic standards, the approach had been created by the British Columbia Lottery Corp. So, I would like to give them a lot of credit for this. We wanted to make sure though that it translates well into Massachusetts.

British Columbia is some 4000 plus miles away. They're a very experienced gaming jurisdiction. And a lot is different in Massachusetts than it is there. So, that's where through the assistance of Elaine and many others, we decided to take that piece of it very seriously. So, Elaine would you want to

talk about the rollout?

MS. DRISCOLL: Sure. So, just to recap and as Mark was saying, we adopted an established responsible gaming brand. Our challenge was to introduce that brand in the Massachusetts market by developing a localized program and also working closely with Plainridge to ensure that they too adopted the use of the program and that they were adhering to the brand standards.

And just for the record, they've been very amenable to that and helpful in that way and responsive.

So, in order to develop that community outreach program and create the collateral that was necessary to roll out this program, we enlisted the assistance of MORE Advertising, as you probably recall, after a procurement process.

We then set out to develop the various brand elements. And like Mark said, being very sensitive to although we were a step ahead by having a standard guide from the BCLC in terms the overall look of the logo, the

colors that were necessary and the fonts and things like that where it was complicated was translating that into advertisements, particularly for TV and radio. Making sure that it was appropriate to the Massachusetts market, particularly a market that had absolutely zero familiarity with this program as opposed to the BCLC.

They approached with some humor, which was interesting but a humor that may not have been relevant to this market. So, we needed to be really sensitive to that. And I'll get into how we made some of those decisions shortly.

So, basically again, through MORE

Advertising, our communications department,

myself and Michael Sangalang, and working

really closely with Mark, we were really able

to develop a comprehensive program that

included a lot of collateral from numerous

brochures, multilingual, billboards, radio ads,

television ads to introduce to the Southeastern

Mass. market.

And one of the most important things

that we did upfront was we hosted several focus groups, which was really interesting, to test some of our theories prior to developing these pieces of collateral. And we were really able to put to good use the feedback that we got from these focus groups. They were definitely very helpful.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What kind of data points?

MS. DRISCOLL: I would say, and actually that brings me to my next point, they were very helpful in we were juggling a number of concepts, for example, for the television ad, which included do we go with the BCLC TV ads that were very -- like I said, used humor and were kind of sarcastic and funny. But again, would it work in Massachusetts?

There was some concern about that particularly as a rollout. Two years from now we may feel differently, but as a rollout, we thought we had to be sensitive to that. And then again, sort of tested those concepts on them.

And they helped us to narrow down

which concept that we ended up going with. And we'll play that video shortly. And that was a nonsense versus GameSense concept. And you'll see that from the ad that we created.

Another thing that we struggled with was on the radio ad was -- This is kind of minutia maybe for some, but I think it's interesting, which is do we include in the radio ad a brought to you by the Massachusetts Gaming Commission? Or is it may be better that we don't do that because again didn't want to have sort of a government feel to it. Or would that affect its perception of friendliness and things like that. So, all of these very interesting concepts.

And actually, our focus groups thought it was great to make it clear that it was a radio ad from the Massachusetts Gaming Commission. So, another piece of feedback that made that decision for us.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I would have guessed it the other way.

MS. DRISCOLL: Yes. And that was what was so interesting because that's just it,

we were really batting all of those concepts and theories around. And we said, you know what, let's put it before the focus group and see what they have to say. And they were terrific and MORE did a great job pulling those together. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Did the focus group not like the humor in the TV ad?

MS. DRISCOLL: I think they didn't get it completely, which was the -- because humor isn't always universal. And particularly we were talking about from another country. So, we realized that there could be some perception issues there.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: We asked them what they thought GameSense was to start the focus group without providing much if any context at all. And it became clear that some people kind of got that it had to do with gambling, gaming and others didn't get that.

So, that then led to we need to be a bit more concrete as we roll this out in Massachusetts. And in terms of having it brought to you by the Massachusetts Gaming

1 Commission, they were very receptive I think to 2 the fun tone of it, the lighter tone of it. 3 So, it had as much to do with the 4 tone as it did -- it had less to do with 5 brought to you by the Massachusetts Gaming 6 Commission. Striking that tone is so very important I think and the focus groups helped 8 solidify that. 9 MS. DRISCOLL: So, basically now 10 we're going to show you a video that was 11 created by Mike Sangalang, which is great 12 because it really just sums up the work that's 13 been done on the development of the collateral. 14 After we play the video, we'll tell 15 you a little bit more about what we have for 16 analytics on number of visits to the website, etc. 17 18 19 (Video plays) 20 21 MR. VANDER LINDEN: So, another lesson from the British Columbia --22 23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: How many 24 takes, Mark?

```
1
                MR. VANDER LINDEN: I cringe every
 2
     time I hear it.
 3
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON: McDonalds
 4
     loves us too.
5
                MR. VANDER LINDEN: Another really
6
     important lesson from the British Columbia
 7
     Lottery Corp. is that they completely got rid
8
     of the term responsible gaming.
9
                And that is counterintuitive -- It
10
     was initially counterintuitive to me. I think
     it's counterintuitive in the United States.
11
12
     It's a well-accepted term that is germane to
13
     the industry. And so changing it from
14
     responsible gaming to GameSense was key in how
15
    we roll this out.
16
                So, you'll see on the video that we
17
    didn't mention the term responsible gaming at
18
     all even though it's still in my title.
19
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I was going to
20
     say, do we need to now change --
21
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON: We already
22
     took problem out of his name. So, we're making
23
    progress.
24
                MS. DRISCOLL: So, essentially you
```

got a chance to see some of the different collateral, radio ads, TV ads and also the billboards.

We spent approximately \$130,000 on the first ad buy focused largely in Plainville and the surrounding areas. So, MORE did a great job of getting the GameSense website up and off the ground quickly. And a lot of that also had to do with the assistance of BCLC and their willingness to share with us, for example, the interactive tools that are on the site that are really interesting.

So, to date, and it hasn't been live that long, but we know we've had approximately 7000 page views, which is actually pretty good. And interestingly enough, 71 percent of that traffic came in from people actually typing in GameSenseMA.com.

So, what that means is that you can deduce from that essentially that either people saw the website -- I'm sorry, people saw the billboard and were curious and went home and typed it in. Or heard the radio ad, again, curious typed it in. So, in other words, what

we're seeing is that it wasn't that it was necessarily clicked on a transfer from an online ad, for example.

Another thing you may be able to deduce from that is the great work that the GameSense advisors are doing. Again, curious people went home and checked it out. So, that's a really interesting analytic actually.

And then also the Facebook ads we know there is a reach of approximately 115,000. It's made almost 600,000 impressions. These are all good numbers and numbers that we'll continue to keep a very close eye on so that we can decide how to utilize the budget for phase two.

So, do we split the social media money between Facebook and Twitter, do we keep it on Facebook. Basically, that's how we'll continue to decide. And also using some of the data from the SEIGMA research project to also inform our decisions on that.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Who is managing the social media?

MS. DRISCOLL: That's a great

question. We are. Mike Sangalang actually is doing the vast majority of it.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Because that by itself also generates more followers. If you're active, then people will follow.

MS. DRISCOLL: I think one of the things we need to really start to focus on now that we have it up and running and we actually have an editorial calendar, like a plan all laid out of X amount of tweets that we recycle through weeks and months.

Making sure that we're magnifying those by utilizing our own Twitter following that's already built in, making sure that we are closely coordinating with the Mass. Council so that we're also utilizing their built-in following. Making sure that there are tweeting and things like while we're trying really hard to get the brand out there as many ways as we can.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I just Googled

GameSense and there some other company called

GameSense I think that comes up, the main one.

Then eventually you get to BCLC. But page one

```
1
     doesn't have our GameSense. It might be
2
     worth --
 3
                MS. DRISCOLL: Yes, we can talk to
 4
    MORE about that.
5
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Figure out is
6
     there a way to get it on an early page?
 7
                MR. VANDER LINDEN: Ours is
8
    GameSenseMA.com, but I think there is a way you
9
     can have it rise to the top of the page too.
10
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Great work.
11
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: It really is.
12
     It's really exciting.
13
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
                                       I love the
14
     advisors in their green shirts, terrific. It
15
     looks good, men's and women's sizes, excellent.
16
                MS. DRISCOLL: Actually, we didn't
17
     show it, but just so you know it too, the
18
     television ad we did in Spanish too.
19
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, great.
20
                MS. DRISCOLL: As the radio ads.
21
                MR. VANDER LINDEN: Moving into
22
     fiscal year '16, this is obviously a campaign
23
     that we don't want to roll out and then just
24
     let it sit there.
```

We need to pay close attention to how we continue to grow GameSense in

Massachusetts. So, we are continuing to work with MORE Advertising in fiscal year '16.

We're moving from what we had described as sort of the implementation or launch stage to the more comprehensive campaign.

The initial stage really is -- It was about getting the website out there, a couple of television commercials and radio.

But targeting all of that towards the Southeastern Massachusetts market, where obviously that's where the casino is. It makes sense to target there.

Moving forward, we really want to pay attention to becoming more linguistically diverse in our brochures. We want to explore expanding the radius around the Plainridge Park Casino to expand into Eastern, Central and Western Massachusetts.

We want to look at developing some additional marketing materials as well. Again, a lot of this while Southeastern Mass. makes a lot of sense, using what we know from other

sources not the least of which is our SEIGMA study to inform the strategy.

MS. DRISCOLL: And we'll be able to actually fold the play management program into the phase two as well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes. That's an important thing I think that everything comes under -- This is the top brand. And everything is a subset of that. It's brand GameSense play management. That's great.

any plans to take Mark and his melodious voice out to rotary clubs, Elks clubs anybody else to not only talk about this but talk about the other play management pieces?

MS. DRISCOLL: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: That I could see in the immediate area in and around Plainville.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yes. I think this would really be of interest to a lot of people who aren't directly affected by it, the rotary clubs, the various groups.

MS. DRISCOLL: And I think too the

other thing that's important that we need -
Now that we have the basic collateral down and

some of those materials, the other thing that

we've been talking about doing for phase two is

leveraging any of our strategic partners that

might have real estate for visibility for us.

So, for example, working with the Department of Public Health to see if for example, health centers is there space for posters on the resources that are available. That's not play management collateral, but that is our other resource available collateral that would make sense for that.

So, just making sure that we're not missing any places where we can brand for whichever piece of that is appropriate to do so.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well targeted and very cost effective because they're under the same mission, if you will.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: One of our key collaborators in this is the lottery. And the prior executive director and I'm sure the new executive director and the interim was

committed to using or collaborating on the use of our branding materials. So, that's 14,000 retail outlets.

So, I'm not sure what the timing is of how we do that, but that's a huge marketing opportunity. They've been incredibly, just again for the record, they've been incredibly cooperative and collaborative. Great, good job.

Also, we all without it being a whole thing on GameSense, we can incorporate that video into our remarks when we're out there. That's a great synopsis of the program.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The lottery leads me to wonder if someplace somewhere down the line this whole concept and perhaps the brand can't be expanded to -- And this would really be hard to do and hard to figure out how to do. -- other kinds of gambling that are not part of our portfolio.

That's for down the line. but I don't see why some of the same concepts wouldn't work once they're tested here, particularly as expanded to the lottery and not

- a physical place where you get up and take a break or go get a Coke and come back. The lottery is a different milieu.
- 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Great.
- 5 | Thank you very much.
- 6 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good work.
- 7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Is that it?
- 8 | Whew. We've got a couple of visitors here.
- 9 That's great.
- MR. VANDER LINDEN: The hub of our
- 11 | GameSense strategy really is our GameSense Info
- 12 Center. And our GameSense Info Center would be
- 13 | absolutely nothing without the staff that we
- 14 | have there. It leads very smoothly into a
- 15 discussion about our GameSense Info Center and
- 16 | the fantastic amazing work of our GameSense
- 17 advisors.
- 18 MS. WARNER: Excellent. Good
- 19 afternoon. So, it's been a journey. And it's
- 20 exciting that we're here today talking about
- 21 the GameSense Information Center.
- 22 I'm going to give you just a little
- 23 bit of an overview but I'm very aware of the
- 24 | fact that you don't want to talk to me, but you

really want to talk to these individuals. So,

I'm going to go through things quickly.

So, since I was here last, we've established a GameSense Information Center. We've hired four GameSense advisors, two of whom are here with me today obviously.

We had a very robust training program put in place throughout the month of June that brought in experts from -- We're so extremely here in Massachusetts, we have a number of really well-versed people in this area. So, these folks learned a lot about -- They got the basics from Mark in terms of responsible gaming and the GameSense brand.

They learned about motivational interviewing. We brought Dr. Ty Lostutter from out in Washington, the University of Washington to talk to them about that because he really specializes in motivational interviewing as it relates to gambling disorder.

We had folks come in and talk about self-care and compassion. Trained them on doing the help line, a number of different areas, special populations, all that. But

truly the true kind of heart of the training program was when we took them out to learn everything that we knew they needed to learn directly from the source, which was from British Columbia Lottery Corporation.

And the folks out there as they've been through this whole process as Mark and Elaine both alluded to, they were fantastic.

And really provided a great opportunity for the GameSense advisors.

So, we came back and part of the soft opening and from there these folks have been kind of working nonstop. I'm trying not to burn them out, but they've been doing a great job. Meeting the hours of 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m. covering that 16-hour shift. Been figuring out our operations and whether it makes sense to have a little overlap between shifts. And I'll let Eddie, our manager, talk about that in a few minutes.

Interfacing with Plainridge staff has been a really key piece. Since they've been open, establishing those relationships. It's the number one thing BCLC advised us on

1 that those folks are your biggest allies and 2 advocates for the GameSense Center. And that 3 They've been great. And again, has been true. 4 I'll let them talk a little bit more about 5 that. 6 Mark and I were talking the other 7 day about how we were concerned in the 8 beginning. You look at these sketches, and we 9 thought there's not going to be enough space. 10 We actually have been trying to figure out how 11 to use the space we have. It's actually a 12 little larger I think than we originally 13 thought. 14 But also using it -- Again, I'll let 15 these folks tell you in a second. -- but using

But also using it -- Again, I'll let these folks tell you in a second. -- but using it so that it's comforting for the staff but most importantly inviting for patrons. Making sure we have the right furniture. We definitely didn't have the right furniture.

So, you all have to come back and take a look at what's there now. Because it's really different from opening day.

And we had a table there -- It's been a lot of back and forth. Establishing

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

games and interactive activities has been one of the things that we've been thinking about as well as using some of BCLC's materials.

Karen at our office made these gorgeous gift baskets. This was again another major piece that BCLC said people aren't going to just walk up to the table at the Center. You've got to entice them in. So, I'm afraid she's going to leave me and start her own business because she does gorgeous gift baskets. And it definitely worked.

The location also couldn't be more ideal. When they said about 85 percent of their patrons would come off those elevators, I think they were spot on. And because of checking IDs and just probably logistics, people are pooling right in front of that space right in front of the GameSense Center. So, it's really an ideal location.

VSEs have been, voluntary selfexclusions have been well underway. And these
folks have -- We've been honing in on the
training and doing the detail work there.
Mark's intern Judy, I'm going to give a big

shoutout to because she's been remarkable as it relates to that. She is also the technical guru and has gotten those iPads up and working and right. Has been visiting and a lot working on those, so she's been fantastic.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: A nice shoutout, well deserved.

MS. WARNER: Well deserved. The kiosk has been another great tool, the kiosk and the iPads, as I think all of that -- It's easy to know how to converse with someone, but to bring the technology into that conversation has been a bit of challenge at first. But I think it's starting to really work.

And then last but not least the evaluation. And that is again something that we're really trying to work on, making sure that every patron gets an opportunity to give some feedback. That's not been without kinks, but we're been working on them. And DOA has been a great partner with that in trying to help the GSAs to really figure out how does that naturally come up in a conversation.

So, I'm going to stop talking. And

1 I'm going to let these two talk. And I 2 promised them that you would ask them 3 questions, because they're a little nervous 4 abqout speaking to you. I said you all would have plenty of questions. 5 6 But some of the things that I'm 7 hoping that they'll get a chance to talk with 8 you about are something about patron 9 interactions, some of the games and interactive 10 activities they're doing. Eddie has been a 11 tremendous tour guide. And you can talk to him 12 a little bit about touring people through the 13 casino. 14 Interfacing with the staff and maybe 15 some of the demographic and geography of the 16 visitors. So, I'm going to turn it over to you 17 This is Eddie DelValle and Megan Daniels. two. 18 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: One quick 19 question, Marlene, you said DOA? 20 MS. WARNER: Oh, sorry. I'm sorry. 21 I realize I was saying a whole lot of acronyms, the Division on Addictions at Harvard Medical 22 23 School's Cambridge Health Alliance. 24 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay. I'm

1 | just familiar with a different DOA.

2 MS. WARNER: Sorry. So, someone 3 please ask them a question.

4 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: How's it

5 going?

MR. DELVALLE: Thank you for having us here. We really appreciate this. It's great feedback, it's been a very positive journey. At first, it was definitely nerve racking because there was so much thrown at us. But actually everything fell into place.

And between the experience of Megan, myself and the other two, everything is falling into place. Some things may be taking a little bit longer, but it's more of an understanding of what GameSense is. I think that's the biggest challenge that we're having.

Where when people actually coming in, they still think that it's for counseling, which it's not. As they walk in, they're like oh, this is where you counsel people. And that's not the case. So, we usually have three to five minutes, sometime a 20-minute conversation as to what we do. And when they

leave, they leave with pamphlets. They actually want to learn more about it.

They're really intrigued and they're really positive about the experience and the visit that they actually have at the GameSense Center, whether it's there or on the floor.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: What is the tour that Marlene was talking about?

MR. DELVALLE: It's funny, because we are required to walk the floor. So, a lot of things is learning where all of the slot machines, where the tables are or certain games. And sometimes patrons come and hey, where's the nearest ATM or where's your Wonder Woman slot machine or -- What's the other popular one? -- Wheel of Fortune. They're always asking.

So, I usually take those opportunity and I walk them to the slot machine or wherever they're going. And I have that five-, 10-minute conversation with them to introduce the product.

So, it actually works out really good. Sometimes I just walk the whole casino

with the patrons, take them down to the racetrack. At the very beginning, they wanted to know where they get the player's card. And a lot of the time let me go for a walk because you have to walk way on the other side to the racetrack area so they can get the card.

So, I will take that opportunity and introduce GameSense. So, that's the tour.

That's working out very good because honestly, a lot of people already know me by name.

They'll come in. They'll say hey. Usually good evening, I've been doing a lot of the late shift.

And it's weird, going to like the demographics, going to Canada and just taking a glimpse, now I can see where you start seeing a lot of the same folks. Even though sometimes they say they don't have a problem, but when you see them on day-to-day basis, you kind of create that comfort level where they start communicating with you because they see you there.

I even have one lady the other day, she was having her cup of coffee. And she was

doing the slot. And some of these slot

machines with today's technology got like six

or seven lines. I was always used to like the

triple seven or the bar. I wasn't really

familiar.

And she was actually -- Because I was like, how do you know you win? And she was like if you get this golden coin here, but you can't get it over here. I'm like what? So, she took the time to explain. She opened up.

So, I actually kind of like that because during that conversation I'm like you know, you're doing it with a budget, you're taking breaks. She's learning. This is like at 1:00 in the morning. She'll come and she'll hang out in the lobby with me and have a conversation which is great.

So, I know I'm giving back to the community or we're giving back to the community because it's been a great team and it's been a team effort. And everybody's definitely -- Sunday I went in. And Sunday it's not a very popular day. Especially when the weather is nice, people would rather be outside. And I

1 | walked in.

And the first thing I see is Megan interacting with patrons even though the parking lot wasn't as crowded. It was kind of quiet. But just the fact that people are still there. And like Megan and Amy, they're there.

And I know that they're communicating with the patrons, educating them. It's definitely, you know, we're pushing the brand through.

The only thing I want to say is that I don't know, and Megan could probably also agree with this is that definitely -- I speak Spanish and English. But moving forward, and I brought this up, somebody that could speak Cantonese because it's a very high population.

And they're the ones that kind of tend to ignore us completely even when you're like good morning, good afternoon. They're not rude, but they're real quick. But I know a lot could be -- There could be a lot more that we do for them if we spoke the language.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Share with us a little about what each of your background

1 is.

MR. DELVALLE: My family is from

Puerto Rico, but I was born and raised here in

Boston,

5 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: What were 6 you doing before this?

MR. DELVALLE: Before this I was actually running a scholastic program down the street, Benjamin Franklin. I worked for a company managing the program where we provide paid internships to technical students.

Before that I run a company called R and K Communications for almost 14 years. It's the person that put the calling cards on the map. It actually was here in Dedham,

Massachusetts. So, no matter what calling card you bought in the United State, 90 percent are probably went through us. So, I ran their call center and helpdesk support.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And Megan?

MS. DANIELS: Hi Commissioners. My
background, I was born and raised in Boston.

My background is I went to undergrad. for
psychology. I went on to get my master's in

1 applied counseling and psychology for mental 2 health counseling. I'm nationally certified. 3 And I worked in a dual diagnosis 4 family behavioral substance abuse center 5 working with all sorts of disorders, whether it 6 was depression, anxiety. There were a few 7 gambling problems there, eating disorders, etc. 8 I also have a background in customer 9 service. I was working at the Black Rose 10 Restaurant for quite a while. 11 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: At the what? 12 MS. DANIELS: The Black Rose, so I 13 was working there for a while right before I 14 started this job. And that's basically my 15 background. 16 I like working with people. I like 17 interacting and that's what all of my jobs have 18 basically focused round kind of like a helping 19 professional. And now I'm working as a 20 GameSense advisor. 21 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Customer 22 service at the Black Rose, does that have 23 anything to do with serving alcohol? 24 MS. DANIELS: I'm sorry. Could you

1 repeat that? 2 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Customer 3 service at the Black Rose? 4 MS. DANIELS: So, we sell stuff as 5 well, all of the different shirts, mugs, things like that. We did a lot of raffles. When I 6 was working there, we did a lot of events as 8 well. So, when people wanted to rent upstairs, 9 there were certain people that would work to 10 cater those parties. 11 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: When I was 12 down there, you were -- both of you, you had 13 this marble game. Are you still using that? 14 Is it that effective? 15 MS. DANIELS: So, what we had was 16 the marble game. And where it was you had 20 17 marbles in total. 19 were colored say white 18 and one was clear. What you would do is ask 19 people if they knew their odds of winning on a 20 slot machine. So, this activity kind of 21 simulated that in real life. What we would tell them is there are 22 23 19 non-winning marbles. Because you don't want

to use the term losing to make it more

negative. And you have one winning marble.

After you shut the bag, you would ask them to pull out a marble. The majority of the time, they would pick out a non-winning marble.

And then you would ask them again, so now what do you think your odds are at winning? And most of the times they'd reply

8 now it's 18 to one. So, then you would inform

9 them that's untrue. You have to drop it back

10 in and that's how a slot machine works. Every

11 | single time it resets. Your odds never

did transition into a new activity.

12 increase or decrease your chances of winning.

And you would have them do it again, and you would kind of repeat that process. And most of the people were very shocked about it.

They really liked it. We were using that marble bag routine for quite some time, but we

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: What's the new activity?

MS. DANIELS: So, the new activity, we have a lot of different cards. We usually pick about five. And it's either you chances of rolling snake eyes in craps, getting a full

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 house on your first dealt hand in cards,

2 | winning the lottery, getting struck by

3 | lightning, I can't recall the last one at the

4 | moment. But we do have a bunch of different

5 ones that we rotate in to kind of change it up

6 for the people.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And what you would ask them to do is rate it from best chances to worst chances of hitting that type of jackpot. So, you just have them set up the cards in the order that they think their best chances of winning was.

And then they would flip it over and we would discuss their chances and tell them which ones were correct or incorrect. And that way we could get GameSense in there to try to like further their understanding of their odds of winning. And with that we'd start telling them how you should take breaks to gamble safely and make it more fun.

Remember it's about entertainment not a means of making money. And limit your spending. Set a budget so you're not spending above your means.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And what kinds

of reactions are you getting?

MS. DANIELS: Very diverse
reactions. Some people although they're
pulling the card over and seeing that they may
have been incorrect on their choosing, they
won't believe it. I've been doing this for
years.

And that's how we try to transition into the myth busting type of program we have on the kiosk, which is a little quiz where they can test their knowledge. If they get it correct, it tells them they got it right. If they got it wrong, it corrects them. And there's about 10 questions with that.

The people who do get it right,
they're very excited about it. They walk away
happy. We give them a little prize, whether
it's a GameSense pen, a phone charger,
something of this sort that kind of makes them
feel like they're a winner because they are.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Do you find the hot and cold slot machine myth? Is that one that's prevalent? Is that this one is ready to pay off kind of thing?

MR. DELVALLE: It's interesting, because walking through the slots, walking through the floor a lot, you see people there, they're focused. And they're touching the screen just to give it good luck. They're praying on it.

It's funny, because I try to communicate with them. Once I make that eye contact with them, some of them are actually there for entertainment. And they know it's a myth. But some of them really truly believe and they usually try to keep their conversation at like five seconds or less. Okay, no problem.

But it's a challenge to get them to take that myth away from them, because they strongly believe that they're chasing that American dream.

commissioner zunigh: Can I pick up on the first point you made about the perception of what you're doing, the difference between counseling and informing. Could you just elaborate a little bit more and the context as well of are you perceived to be part

- of the casino or part of the Gaming Commission?

 Of course, you're sort of neither.
- COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Who are these people?
- MR. DELVALLE: It's funny, because I
 always get those questions. Honestly, I
 usually tell them we're part of the state.
 What we're doing is we're introducing that this
- 9 is entertainment. We actually want you to have 10 fun. We want you to be pretty much responsible 11 with it.
- We've got the stage. There's other
 things to do. It's an entertainment place. A
 lot of people when they first come in, they'll
 look. And they'll say oh, this is where you
 get counseling. And I'll walk over politely
 and introduce myself.
 - The other day I had a gentleman and he looked at his wife and he said, see hon, this is what you need. Here's some sense. So, you get a lot of humor out of it. It's pretty funny.
- It's a lot of interaction. And the cool thing is honestly that since introducing

18

19

20

21

the product and just for myself, and I talk to
hundreds and hundreds of people on a daily
basis, and I can only really remember two

negative feedbacks out of it.

Everybody is really open to the idea. Everybody's open to what service we're providing, which is more of kind of like we're here. We're here to remind you that this is entertainment not to believe that you're going to hit a big jackpot type of thing.

And a perfect example, I was walking one day through the penny slots side. And a gentleman just happen to hit for \$500. I went congratulations. We started a conversation. He thought I worked for the casino.

Once I explained to him what I did, he turned around. He was ready to gamble. And I said, you might not want to give it all back. And he turned around. And he said, you know what? You're right. He took it out, went and had coffee with me and then he left. He said if you wasn't here, I probably would have just stayed there.

So, it was a good feeling. It's

actually great. I'm pretty sure Meg and everybody, pretty much they all feel the same and some of that positive feedback that we're getting.

And not just from the patrons, also
I remember when we first met you said the
casino staff is going to be very important to
this. And you're absolutely right, especially
with some of the senior employees that are from
out of state.

They really, really praise us as to what we do and the way we communicate with customers. I met them from Bangor, Maine, a guy from Oklahoma. They're like all senior security staff or slot managers. And all the time, they're giving us positive feedback as to how we actually communicate with the customers and how we relate the message. We say keep having fun but be responsible with it.

It's not about counseling. I
definitely always try to stay away from that
word counseling. It's always like depending on
the conversation. What we have here is
information. It's for you to take home. It

actually explains how slot machines work. Some of the information it probably gets into details about 21 Blackjack.

So, it all depends. Some people definitely stubborn and they're stuck in their own ways. But I'm going to say the majority has been a lot of positive feedback.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: You talked about Sundays during the summer being a little slow. I kind of would project you might have some busier ones come football season comes.

Marlene, you talked about the gift baskets, you had people signing up for that. I don't know how many times you've done that since opening day. But what do you do with that information? Is it to communicate back to people that register or is it just to help award the winner or what do you do with that?

MS. DANIELS: So, when we first opened up with the soft opening, what we did was have the basket so we could generate people to come over and talk to us because when they see a basket, they're interested.

So, we would let them know it's free

- 1 | you just have to answer a quick question first.
- 2 What we would do is ask them what they think
- 3 about when they see the word GameSense? You're
- 4 | also doing a marble bag and a few other
- 5 activities at once to get people to want to
- 6 come join in. So, once they see people having
- 7 | fun, they want to be a part of it.
- 8 We were only taking the person's
- 9 name and phone number as part of the
- 10 information for the raffle. But in order to
- 11 | sign up for the raffle, you had to participate.
- 12 So, that's how we were really getting our name
- 13 out there right at first.
- 14 We haven't done another raffle
- 15 | since. But we've been doing a lot of other
- 16 different educational activities that are
- 17 interactive. And one of the great things that
- 18 | we present it with is it's free. You don't
- 19 have to spend anything. Come over and spend a
- 20 minute with us. It's free. It's one of the
- 21 only things that's going to be free in here.
- 22 MR. DELVALLE: And you still walk
- 23 out with a little gift.
- 24 MS. DANIELS: And again, we provide

1 them with something afterwards that's all 2 branded with GameSense. So, even if they 3 didn't want -- someone wasn't really taking 4 what we were saying, they're walking away with 5 something that's branded by us. So, they're 6 going to look at it eventually and see us 7 there. 8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I think 9 parking is the only other one. 10 MS. DANIELS: Unless you valet, I'm 11 not sure about valet. 12 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: You obviously 13 walk around the floor. And you just stop and 14 talk to people? 15 MS. DANIELS: I said no as he said 16 yes. 17 COMMISSIONE MCHUGH: Two different 18 approaches. 19 MR. DELVALLE: There's two different 20 approaches. Everybody has their own style. 21 Yes, for the most part -- Some people come up to me and ask me do I work here. Once I 22 23 usually make that eye contact, I introduce

myself. Usually, the first thing out of their

1 mouth is do you work here? 2 And I say yes, but I don't work for 3 the casino. Then I take it from there. 4 MS. DANIELS: So, going off what 5 Eddie said, how I responded no I don't approach 6 people, what we've noticed is I've been doing a lot of the 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. shifts. 8 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: 10:00 a.m. to 9 6:00 p.m.? 10 MS. DANIELS: Yes. And Eddie's been 11 doing a lot of the 6:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. I've 12 been reporting back to Eddie saying I can't 13 really get anyone to talk to me on the gaming 14 floor. Nobody really wants to speak to me 15 during the day. 16 Because he's telling me oh, yeah. 17 talked to this one at night. I did this. 18 was hanging out over here talking to so many 19 people. I was just like what am I doing 20 differently? 21 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: It's you? 22 MS. DANIELS: That's what I said. 23 So, we've come to notice is the different 24 demographics of people. During the 10:00 a.m.

to 6:00 p.m. hours I'm around are a lot of older elderly persons who when they're in there, they just want to get right to a machine want to get their player cards in, are kind of tunnel vision at that time.

When I do walk around, I just smile and try to make eye contact. When I do, I say how are you doing? Do you need water? Do you need anything to try to get their attention.

Drawn them off just for a moment because I have seen those people who have been sitting there for many hours without taking a break. I have observed that.

So, I would say the timeframe of when we're working and the different types of people who come in is a different type of day.

Because during the hours I've been working from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. I feel people are just solely gambling. That's it or gaming.

When Eddie comes in there's also live entertainment. There's a band that plays -- There's different bands that play every single night. So, there's a lot of other things to do in there, and a lot of other

socializations you can make at a different time of the day.

When I do walk down to the racetrack, I get a lot of different looks because I'm a lot younger than the people in there. So, a lot of persons will approach me and say what are you doing in here? What are you? What is GameSense?

And I take that opportunity to sit and talk to people. So, I've been able to make a lot of good connections and conversations with people.

So, Eddie has a much easier time approaching people at night where I do not have that luxury during the day.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Eddie, do you are working the racing area too?

MR. DELVALLE: Yes, I do.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So, you both go into the racing area.

MR. DELVALLE: It's interesting because I have met people in there that have not step foot inside the casino floor. They're solely the racing area. That's it. They don't

1 even want to know about the other side, which 2 is interesting because I was assuming that they 3 go back and forth, but that's not the case. 4 People are just strictly there. They go right in there and that's it. 5 6 MS. WARNER: The thing I was going 7 to add was -- the interesting thing is that 8 Megan has done the vast majority of our voluntary self-exclusions. So, she's spending 9 10 a lot of that time during the day doing those. 11 And actually we were worried she 12 wasn't going to make it here on time. Someone 13 requested her in particular. They didn't want 14 to do it onsite at the casino. So, she came 15 into our office in downtown Boston and she did 16 the VSE there. 17 So, she's kind of making a name for 18 herself already as it relates to voluntary 19 self-exclusion. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: How many people 21 are on the VSE right now? 22 Twenty, as of right MR. DELVALLE: 23 now we actually did 20 applications. It's been

interesting, they've all been done usually

1 between Sunday and Thursday. It's funny on the 2 weekend usually after Thursday night, Friday 3 night, Saturday night, it's strictly about 4 entertainment. Eighty percent of the people 5 that go there -- Some people they don't even 6 gamble. They just go straight to the stage, to 7 the bar, Flutie's. They don't even bother. 8 The casino floor is busy but we notice the interaction is kind of like unless 9 10 there's entertainment and you're playing music 11 and break dancing or something they want to 12 know about you. 13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That I've got to 14 see. 15 MS. WARNER: We're going to do that 16 next. That's our next training. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You anticipated 18 something I was thinking about about the 19 different age and how the demographic changes. Would an older person be more accessible for 20 21 the daytime audience? Or is it really not 22 that, it's just that they're much more 23 committed to sitting there and gambling? 24 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: An older

1 | advisor?

2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: An older advisor,

3 right.

MR. DELVALLE: I think right now it's one of those things that I personally started working more day shifts too. I think it's more of coaching and how to approach the people and how to feel them out.

I did notice the first Monday that I walked in there I really thought I was at a senior center of Mardi Gras. I was tripping over the walkers, oxygen tanks. They were all zoned in. It's definitely different. It's something to actually definitely look at.

Some of the interactions that I've had with them, to be honest with you, have still been positive. But it's not as high in the evening where people are actually willing to talk to you and chat with you.

They're more of leave me alone. I'm having my coffee and I'm gambling type of thing. So, it may make a difference. It's something to actually definitely look into the future.

```
1
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
                                       Would part of
 2
     that be coffee in the morning, beer at night,
 3
    you know a little more chatty?
 4
                MR. DELVALLE:
                               Honestly, it could
5
    be. I never really see anybody really get out
6
     of hand with the alcohol. I have noticed a
     couple of incidents where people were escorted,
8
    but nothing major or crazy actually.
9
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I didn't mean
10
     -- I just meant a willing to chat because
11
     they're in a social kind of a --
12
                MR. DELVALLE: Yes, definitely.
13
     could be, yes.
14
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do you have some
15
    metrics? Are you now keeping records of
16
    meaningful contacts?
17
                MR. DELVALLE: Yes.
18
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Like how many have
19
     you had? How many do you have during the
20
     course of the day or the week?
21
                MR. DELVALLE: We have to change --
22
    We've been working with Cambridge Alliance.
23
     And we had to change some of the meanings.
24
     Because at first the meanings kind of didn't
```

match. So, now we're actually starting to have a better sense of what we need to type into the iPad.

The reason was because we would have these five-minute, 10-minute interaction with a customer and they would interact back. And to me that was actually meaningful. That means they actually were interested.

But the meaning for them was kind of a little different where their meaning was like they needed to take prizes and they need to participate in the games and things like that. It's kind of like a 50-50. Some people like to participate in a game and they'll interact with you. But some people just a normal conversation like we're having right now. They were very interested in it.

They actually enjoyed talking to us. And they'll take a pamphlet home and that's it. That was it. So, to me that's meaningful. But just because they didn't take the extra step to do a survey or play a game or whatever was stated on the meaningful --

CHAIRMAN CRSOBY: So, whichever

1 information you use, how many do you have? 2 MR. DELVALLE: Right now we don't 3 even see the numbers to be honest with you. 4 That's with the --MS. WARNER: We have numbers. I 5 6 would say they're wildly off from reality. numbers that these folks are able to actually 8 plug into the iPad -- We got to a point, you 9 guys saw the opening, for the first two weeks 10 they were literally just doing slashes on a 11 piece of paper for the amount of people they 12 would interact with, without the ability to 13 actually go in and input anything. 14 So, we're trying to make it a little 15 bit easier. We're trying to take a breath even 16 mark those somewhere. But I think that we're 17 way off the mark in terms of reality at this 18 point. I don't even know. Do you remember 19 what the last report said from DOA? 20 MR. VANDER LINDEN: I don't. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's perfectly 22 understandable. That's one of the debugging in 23 this thing. 24 MS. WARNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You said way off as in you have not been capturing as much of the many interactions.

MS. WARNER: I was definitely worried at one point in the planning for this that they could be bored. They've not been bored. It's been nonstop.

Everyone knows, the projections are way off in a good way at the casino. So, in turn these folks have had a ton of customers to be interfacing with. And again, have done it in a really good way.

And again, we're also still learning kind of how to -- People come and sit in the GameSense Center because there are open chairs. So, you chat with them. And then you figure out another topic. At some point, you run out of things and they're just sitting there. And that's okay.

There've been issues with families coming in. The Connecticut casinos have places where you can drop children. This one does not. I don't know if the word hasn't gotten out yet that there's not a daycare center

onsite. So, they seem to think the GameSense Center is it.

So, I will say that your gaming agents have been fantastic. Surveillance is doing their job because they come down immediately. I don't know if you want to talk about that at all. They see a kid left and they come right down and come and support these guys as it relates to that.

MS. DANIELS: I just wanted to add in relation to what we were speaking before about communicating with people on the gaming floor and how I've noticed the different age range of people. What Marlene is saying about us having open seating has benefited me during the 10:00 to 6:00 shift with the older population, because if they do want a seat, they're going to come sit near me. Is it okay if I sit here? Of course. And then I start a conversation with them.

So, the majority of my interactions have been in the Game Center itself during the day rather than out on the floor. And then once they're sitting, I can offer them coffee

because were given a Keurig. So, that helps as well because it gets them to stay longer and talk.

We can offer them water. Then at that time, I can also show them the different videos we have related to GameSense on an iPad if they're willing to discuss it that far with me.

So, the seating area has been definitely helpful. But at times when kids come in and we're trying to get a family out of there, the seating hasn't really helped but security has been great to come down and intervene with the interaction. So, it's been great so far. It's been very helpful.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is really impressionistic probably but you were talking about during the daytime people just want to come in. You've talked about seeing people there for hours. You're now getting to know some people who come back again. Do you have a sense of how many people are in trouble? Do you come to work and you are depressed because there's a whole lot of people in trouble or

1 not? What's your reaction to what's happening
2 there?

MR. DELVALLE: Honestly, there's times that I will look at certain people and be like gee, I wish they would actually take the time to notice me or engage in a conversation. But I totally understand where you can't tell them what to do or what not to do.

But there's certain people like the lady, now she's taking the time to open up with me. And she'll go in the lobby. And she'll hang out and she'll take breaks. As I'm talking to her -- There's also a Spanish couple that comes in. Every Thursday and Friday and Saturday they usually come about 12:30. I already know the time they get there.

They take the time to come and talk to me. And I always joke. Are you doing it with a budget. You're having fun type of thing. He's like oh, yeah. My wife wanted to come. Sometimes the gentleman won't even gamble. His wife just wants to do a couple of slots and then they'll leave.

So, certain communication like that

1 it actually brings some certain comfort to 2 Because some people are probably doing 3 it definitely with a budget, I just can't 4 assume that they're not. But there's certain 5 individuals there that I'm like gee, I wonder 6 how I can actually attract their attention. What could I do differently for them to at 8 least say hi? 9 They're there. And they get up and 10 straight to the ATM and then right back to the 11 seat. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What were you 13 going to say to that? 14 I was just going to MS. DANIELS: 15 say from my personal experience, walking around 16 the gaming floor and like Eddie said, seeing 17 those people who you can tell they may be 18 having a problem with their behaviors, it is 19 difficult to see. But you know you can help 20 them if they're willing to take it. 21 So, my approach kind of was walking around that area a little bit more because we 22 23 do have a green shirt on. So, we are a lot 24 more noticeable. For someone that has walked

by me who I've noticed a few times, I'll just make an effort to smile and say hello to actually grab their attention.

I won't overstep their personal boundary by interrupting them while they're playing a game. But the second I can walk by them if they are going to a different machine, I try to make that effort just so that they can see my face and see me in a green shirt and associate that hopefully with GameSense.

What we just got also was a sign that says GameSense on it that is posted right on the wall. So, when you're leaving the casino floor, you're now seeing a big sign that's now advertising for GameSense.

Before you could see the kiosk. You could see our table set up, but now it's really hard to miss. So, everybody is going to be able to see it. And hopefully with that it will help more people associate us with the GameSense itself and not just two people walking around with green shirts on.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You don't find it a depressing environment?

1 MS. DANIELS: No. 2 MR. DELVALLE: No, it's not. 3 MS. DANIELS: It has a mental or 4 emotional toll like that when you're in a VSE 5 with someone who is struggling. As long as you 6 can be empathetic and you can show them you 7 truly care about the process that they're going 8 through and that you're there to support them, 9 it's great, because it's more rewarding than 10 anything. 11 So, I haven't had a personal 12 experience where it's been oh no, I have to go 13 to work. This is depressing. Because that 14 hasn't happened at all. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good. 16 MR. DELVALLE: Actually, I really 17 enjoy it. 18 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, I spent 19 some time talking with both of you the first 20 day and watching you. And I think that the two 21 of you are terrific. And your ability to 22 interact with people and do all of the things 23 that you're talking about here and have these 24 conversations. We stood and talked to a nice

woman and her daughter who was down there for her 70th birthday and we got into Monte Carlo and all of this various things. And it's a terrific program. But your ability to interact with people and your striving to find new ways is just terrific. It's going to make this thing really work.

We've got a great set up and advertising, but it is really comes down to you on the floor. So, keep it up. It's great.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

It's very interesting.

MS. DANIELS: I just want to add one more thing. We've gotten a lot of positive feedback about our VSE program, how the state of Massachusetts takes the time to actually discuss every step with them and go through it.

So, most of our VSEs have excluded from either Twin Rivers, Foxwoods, Mohegan and not one person has had a complaint about our process because they like how we're not just putting them up against the wall to take a picture, sign a paper and send them on their way. So, they've really appreciated all that

we're doing as not only GameSense advisors but the actual contract itself.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's really great.

5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's great. 6 That's really terrific.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Excellent.

MR. DELVALLE: And one of the key words that sticks out that people normally say about the VSE and how they've done it before is they made me feel like a criminal. I've had three people say that directly after they were done. And especially I try to give them a water cup, a couple of gadgets. I'm like here you go. Have a good day.

I actually had one gentleman that after he signed, he was like you know what sucks? Just like that you know what sucks, I can't come back here and visit you. Just like that. But it was good. It's a good feeling actually when you get that kind of positive feedback after they took that decision to themselves to make it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's incredible

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 insight to hear. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That is great. 2 3 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you very 5 much. We'll have you back. All right. Are we 6 getting close, Mark? MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes. When 8 Elaine and I were talking about how we wanted 9 to create a brand and an approach that's 10 trustworthy and knowledgeable, friendly, I 11 think that these, our GameSense advisors really 12 -- We created it and they embody it. That's 13 fantastic. 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. Thank you, 15 Marlene. You get a lot of the credit. 16 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Excellent 17 recruiting. Janice helped a little. 18 MR. VANDER LINDEN: We have one 19 final agenda item and it's the Responsible 20 Gaming Education Awareness Week August 3 21 through 7. And it's a national campaign 22 originally started by the American Gaming

We in Massachusetts have obviously,

23

24

Association.

as you've seen for the past hour taken responsible gaming incredibly serious in how we approach this. And I think that Responsible Gaming Education Awareness Week is just another way that we can take some of the great work that we've done and say you know what, we can always do it better. We can always use this week as a reason to continue to advance this purpose.

So, I wanted to highlight that that that is coming up. Marlene has some specific ideas and initiatives. And Plainridge Park Casino has also has been working closely with our GameSense team to develop a plan for that week.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: They have been?
MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes.

MS. WARNER: There's not a whole lot to report here other than we are going to take it seriously, I think obviously as Mark says and you all know responsible gambling is a year-long process. There are two main points in the year that we're going to highlight it in a more intense way than normal, which the

Responsible Gaming Education week which is always the first week of August. And then throughout the month of March, which is National Problem Gambling Awareness month.

Our goal through the Mass.

Partnership on Responsible Gaming, which is a program of the Mass. Council on Compulsive Gambling is to look at all of the licensees, the lottery and anyone else who's interested and make sure that there's some universal pieces.

I think the RGEA week, which is the coming up in August is really a great opportunity to get employees involved. First and foremost employees have higher rates of gambling disorder than others than the general public. That is a well-documented fact, in particular with casino employees.

So, that is something that Roberta at Plainridge and I have been talking about working on trying to think about getting a baseline. They did in their initial orientation 6000 different topics. One of which was responsible gaming. And trying to

1 | find out what do people think GameSense is.

2 What do they think is happening?

What do they need? I think that to me that is the biggest question.

5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You're talking 6 about they the employees?

MS. WARNER: They the employees, sorry. What do they need? Is there infrastructure? Are there tools? Are there resources? What do they need? And trying to provide that.

I know Roberta is also planning on kicking off just prior to and then continuing on with their responsible gambling committee that will be onsite at Plainridge. And then certainly leaning on the GameSense advisors to provide some information to employees.

Even above and beyond the survey, pre-shift meeting and other things like that where she can really help incorporate the idea of GameSense for the employees. Again, we can't stress enough how key those employees are in terms of raising the education levels of responsible gaming.

So, obviously the other licensees aren't going to have that same benefit having no building, not employees. But there are opportunities for them to be public in the outreach that they do in the host and surrounding communities about this issue.

It's hopefully something -- And we're talking about this at that MPRG meeting onsite at Plainridge. So, my hope is in the spirit of taking a tour of the GameSense Center tomorrow while talking to some of the GameSense advisors they will have an opportunity to also just brainstorm some ideas that would be easily done even if they don't have a facility, employees that can be something -- because the GameSense brand doesn't wait until the doors open.

It's something that we can definitely be increasing knowledge of. As Mark and Elaine said so well, the circle has been small around Plainville but we really wanting to build that brand statewide would be so incredible if people had an awareness of GameSense long before the doors open in

1 Springfield and Everett. 2 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Maybe through 3 the lottery in addition to all of the other 4 things. 5 MS. WARNER: That's right. 6 Interim Director Michael Sweeney has been fantastic as Chairman Crosby alluded to. And 8 to your point earlier, Commissioner McHugh, 9 they're in the process of revamping their 10 entire technical system and putting that out to 11 bid. And they're looking at compliance issues, 12 but they're also looking at GameSense brand and 13 how all that might happen. 14 The lottery for Responsible Gambling 15 Education week has always been a good partner. 16 And they have printed up materials before. 17 They have put things on their website. They've 18 put POS, point of sale materials up at their 19 7600 retailers. So, all of those are options. 20 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Very exciting. 21 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. 22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'll be there 23 tomorrow, right -- for that meeting? 24 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes. The Mass.

1 Partnership for Responsible Gaming. That's 2 been a fantastic convening body that Mass. 3 Council has led to talk about responsible 4 gaming issues. 5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. Anything 6 else? 7 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. 8 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Thank you. 9 MR. VANDER LINDEN: I have one final 10 issue just to bring to your attention. 11 not on the agenda, but I wanted to acknowledge 12 Director Steve Keel from the Massachusetts 13 Department of Public Health. He's their 14 Director of Problem Gambling Services. He and 15 I have worked very closely over the past year 16 and a half. And he has announced his 17 retirement next month. I just want to say 18 Steve, what a great privilege and pleasure it's 19 been working with you to advance this cause, to advance these issues. And that the partnership 20 21 with the Massachusetts Department of Public 22 Health is so very important to us. Having 23 people like Steve to work with to advance that 24 has made it so much easier and its meaningful

1 work.

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH:

3 | Congratulations Steve. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON:

5 Congratulations.

6 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: He's even 7 qot his GameSense colors on.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Just to add to that, thank you very much Steve for your work.

Your work has been very valuable to Mark, to us and to Massachusetts as a whole.

CHAIRMAN CRSOBY: I want to add to that too Steve that one of the unknown really, and unappreciated dimensions of what we're doing in Massachusetts is working hand in glove with the Department of Public Health, which is basically unprecedented. And you have been a critical part of making that relationship materialize and become realistic and become operational. So, we really, really appreciate it. It's a strength of casino gambling in Massachusetts that's extremely unusual and that you guys are really a critical part of. So, thank you.

1 All right, motion to adjourn? 2 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I have a 3 quick note. We're saying good bye to Steve, 4 but there's a gentleman in the back of the room who has also followed us, stalked us. 5 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I thought he was 7 one of the Commissioners. 8 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I thought he 9 was on staff. I keep looking for him around 10 the office. But Barry Haught from the United 11 Auto Workers has been a very thoughtful 12 participant at all of our meetings. On a 13 couple of occasions, he brought in some folks 14 to testify about issues around workplace 15 safety. He has gone to all of our surrounding 16 and host community hearings as well. And he's 17 getting ready to transition to a new job next 18 month. He thought this might be his last 19 meeting. So, I'd like to acknowledge Barry. 20 And we'll miss you. I can give you my 21 GameSense pen on the way out the door. 22 wish you luck and we'll see you around. 23 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Don't forget, you 24 can always watch us streaming live. Good luck.

```
Page 219
    Motion to adjourn?
 1
 2
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So moved.
 3
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor, aye.
 4
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye.
 5
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
 6
                COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
 7
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: No opposed. Thank
 8
     you all.
 9
                (Meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

1 **ATTACHMENTS:** 2 3 Massachusetts Gaming Commission July 23, 4 2015 Notice of Meeting and Agenda Massachusetts Gaming Commission July 9, 5 2. 6 2015 Meeting Minutes 7 3. Massachusetts Gaming Commission July 21, 8 2015 Memorandum Regarding Suffolk Downs -August 8, September 5, and October 3, 2015 9 with attachments 10 11 July 22, 2015 Letter of KG New Bedford, 4. 12 LLC Regarding Notice of KG Urban's 13 Withdrawal of its Region C Application 14 5. Massachusetts Gaming Commission July 16, 15 2015 Letter Regarding KG New Bedford 16 Application Issue 17 6. Massachusetts Gaming Commission July 7, 18 2015 Memorandum Regarding Temporary Key 19 Gaming Employee Licenses Issued Penn National Quarterly Report as of 20 7.

8. Massachusetts Gaming Commission July 23, 2015 Memorandum Regarding Status Update on Play Management

June 30, 2015

21

22

23

		Page	221
1	GUEST SPEAKERS:		
2	Bruce Barnett, DLA Piper		
3	Chip Tuttle, Suffolk Downs		
4	William Lagorio, Trainer		
5			
6	Jack Rauen, Penn National		
7			
8	Eddie DelValle, GameSense		
9	Megan Daniels, GameSense		
10	Marlene Warner, Massachusetts Council on		
11	Compulsive Gambling		
12			
13	MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION STAFF:		
14	Catherine Blue, General Counsel		
15	Richard Day, Executive Director		
16	Elaine Driscoll, Director of Communications		
17	Todd Grossman, Deputy General Counsel		
18	Alex Lightbaum, Interim Director of Racing		
19	Mark Vander Linden, Director of Research and		
20	Responsible Gaming		
21	Karen Wells, Director Investigations and		
22	Enforcement Bureau		
23			
24			

1	CERTIFICATE		
2			
3	I, Laurie J. Jordan, an Approved Court		
4	Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing		
5	is a true and accurate transcript from the		
6	record of the proceedings.		
7			
8	I, Laurie J. Jordan, further certify that the		
9	foregoing is in compliance with the		
10	Administrative Office of the Trial Court		
11	Directive on Transcript Format.		
12	I, Laurie J. Jordan, further certify I neither		
13	am counsel for, related to, nor employed by any		
14	of the parties to the action in which this		
15	hearing was taken and further that I am not		
16	financially nor otherwise interested in the		
17	outcome of this action.		
18	Proceedings recorded by Verbatim means, and		
19	transcript produced from computer.		
20	WITNESS MY HAND this 25th day of July,		
21	2015.		
22	Edurica Condan (1)		
23	LAURIE J. JORDAN My Commission expires:		
24	Notary Public May 11, 2018		