	Page 1
1	THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
2	MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION
3	PUBLIC MEETING #161
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	August 20, 2015 10:30 a.m 11:53 a.m.
20	HYNES CONVENTION CENTER
21	900 Boylston Street, Room 310
22	Boston, Massachusetts
23	
24	

PROCEEDINGS:

2

1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are calling to order the 161st meeting of the Mass., Gaming
Commission. This will be the last meeting that we have at the Hynes or at least until we have

7 extraordinary big meetings. Beginning two

8 | weeks from today, we will meet in our new

9 office space at 101 Federal Street. And we

10 will have most of our meetings there

11 thereafter.

First item on the agenda as usual is the minutes, Commissioner McHugh.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The minutes in question are those for August 6, 2015. They are in the packet. And I'd move their approval in the form they appear there with the usual

18 reservation for typographical and mechanical

19 errors.

14

15

16

17

20 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any discussion?

22 All in favor, aye.

23 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye.

24 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 2 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 4 have it unanimously. Next up is Interim Executive 5 6 Director Wells for the administrative report. 7 MS. WELLS: Good morning, Mr. 8 Chairman and members of the Commission. As a 9 general update, the first thing I'd like to 10 bring to your attention is we now have --11 publicly we have a new staff member Joan 12 Matsuomoto. So, I wanted to introduce her 13 publicly both to the Commission and to the 14 general public. 15 She is coming in as the Chief 16 Project Manager for the Massachusetts Gaming 17 Commission. She comes to us -- She had been 18 the Acting Chief Data Officer at Mass. IT 19 working for the government at the Commonwealth 20 of Massachusetts. She had also been the Deputy 2.1 Government Innovation Officer. She had spent 22 time at OSD, the Operational Services Division. 23 And she had also been the director

for E-Procurement Systems. And I find very

interesting, prior to that her former life in her profession, she was a teacher in Hawaii, which I thought was a wonderful addition to her resume.

5 MS. MATSUOMOTO: Someone had to do 6 it.

MS. WELLS: In her new role as the Chief Project Manager here at the Commission, she will be supporting the implementation of the various projects across the agency.

Right now currently some of the tasks she is working on are the LMS project, the CMS project, the high-performance team and then also an agency after action review since we just completed the opening of the first casino in Massachusetts. So, I wanted to give her an opportunity to say hello and just introduce her publicly to the Commission.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Thank you and welcome.

MS. MATSUOMOTO: Thank you. I just wanted to say I look forward to the opportunity to work with the Commission.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. We could

have used you a year or so ago.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Lots of important projects, so we're certainly happy to have you on board. Welcome.

MS. MATSUOMOTO: Thank you.

MS. WELLS: The next item on the agenda actually pertains to my appointment at the Interim Executive Director. As the Commission is well aware, by statute the Director of the IEB reports the Chair.

When I started and Rick Day started, the Chair delegated that authority to the Executive Director. But now that I'm acting as the Interim Executive Director, in my role as IEB I'd be reporting to myself.

So, I think there's a recommendation by the legal department that the Chair delegate that authority publicly to another member of the Commission, preferably Commissioner Cameron since she has the law enforcement experience in her background. So, I think that's up to the Chair decide.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes. It was actually either I should retain it, which is

what the statute says or delegate it back out to some other party. And I think it makes sense to delegate it to Commissioner Cameron.

Do we need a formal vote for that?

MS. BLUE: I don't think you do, no. 6 But I think if you want to to make it very official that would be fine to.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Let's do that. Just to be clear about this, the statute directs that the Director of our Investigations and Enforcement Bureau reports to the Chairman. We looked at that structure a long time ago and thought that really bifurcated responsibility for running the agency.

It took too much away from Executive Director, although trying to be mindful of the fact that the Legislature created this special relationship between the director of the IEB and the Chair.

But based on our overall sense of things, we decided that I would delegate that statutory authority to the Executive Director once we had the Executive Director. And since we no longer have that Executive Director and

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

we have the Executive Director who runs the IEB, we wanted to find someplace else to put that special relationship.

And I'm suggesting that that be to Commissioner Cameron, because as the Interim Director said, her law enforcement experience has been profoundly important to us all along the way. And this is a very natural kind of a fit.

If there's discussion about that let's do it, but otherwise maybe somebody could have a motion.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: This I take it would be a temporary delegation until the new permanent Executive Director is aboard.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Correct.

MS. WELLS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Does somebody want to move, not Commissioner Cameron or me.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I move that reporting -- I move that the Commission delegate to Commissioner Cameron the responsibility for oversight of the IEB and that the Director of the IEB report to

Page 8 Commissioner Cameron until a permanent 2 Executive Director is engaged by the 3 Commission. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I second that. 5 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Discussion? All 7 in favor, aye. 8 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye. 9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 10 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? Did you 12 vote? COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I did not. 13 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It was four, 15 Commissioner Cameron abstained and the vote was 16 four to nothing. Was that it for you? 17 MS. WELLS: In the capacity as the 18 Interim Executive Director, yes. But then we 19 move into agenda item 4, Investigations and 20 Enforcement Bureau. The first matter I have 21 for your consideration is a matter regarding the MGM license. 22 23 During the course of the suitability 24 investigation for the MGM Blue Tarp license for

the Springfield casino, Infinity World and some related entities and individual qualifiers -- or individuals were determined to be qualifiers by the IEB and they went through the suitability process and are qualifiers.

During the licensing stage for MGM, there were certain license conditions which pertained to those entities. And the Commission ordered that.

So, I have been informed and have corroborated that the Dubai World Infinity World Group, although at the time that they were determined to be qualifiers they had a 5.3 percent interest of the common stock of MGM Resorts, that percentage ownership has now gone below the five percent.

So, the IEB has made a determination they no longer need to be qualifiers based on that threshold of percentage interest. I will note as a consequence, Infinity World Group no longer has a contractual right with MGM to nominate a person to the Board of Directors. However, Mr. Grounds who is a qualifier and we are keeping as a qualifier who has been

nominated by the Infinity World Group to MGM's board in 2013 and elected that year remains one of the board members. That's why he is remaining as a qualifier.

Because the IEB has made that determination that impacts reporting condition 20(0) and 20(P), which relate to things that Infinity World needed to report to the Commission. Since they're no longer qualifiers under the IEB determination, my recommendation to the Commission is that they no longer have to meet those licensing conditions because they are no longer qualifiers. So, they no longer have to report that out to the Commission.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Discussion?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No. I think it is entirely appropriate. Director Wells, I don't believe we've had the opposite occur, correct? When there was a minority stockholder that went and became more than five percent where we'd have to look at that?

MS. WELLS: I don't think we've seen that yet. If a licensee does have that situation, they are required to report it to

2.1

And then we would reevaluate that determination. 2 I will note that other jurisdictions 3 4 including as recently as, I think, it's 5 Maryland was the most recent took similar 6 action. The Maryland Lottery Gaming Control Agency along with other agencies have done the 8 same thing and determined because they are no 9 longer qualifiers, they would no longer have to 10 have certain reporting requirements. So, 11 there's precedent in other jurisdictions. 12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. I think 13 these sort of things could happen on a 14 recurring basis. As the letter says, this came 15 about because of some convertible debt by 16 someone else. And therefore the shares of 17 Dubai World were effectively diluted to below 18 that threshold. That could change actually to 19 this very qualifier. And then maybe the IEB 20 could look at that at that time. 2.1 MS. WELLS: Correct. 22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But I think 23 this will be happening from time to time. 24 MS. WELLS: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do we need a motion? 2 3 MS. BLUE: Yes. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Somebody, Commissioner Cameron. 5 6 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I move that 7 we adopt Director Wells' recommendation that 8 Dubai World no longer serve as a qualifier -it's Dubai Infinity World Holding no longer be 9 10 designated a qualifier. 11 MS. WELLS: To clarify for the 12 record, there are six entity qualifiers and 13 five individuals. I'll put on the record Dubai 14 World, Infinity World Holding Limited, Infinity 15 World Cayman Holding, Infinity World Cayman LP, 16 Infinity World Investments Corp., Infinity 17 World Investments, LLC. And the individuals 18 are Andrew J. Watson, Junaid Rahimullah, Hamad 19 Buamim, Christopher O'Donnell and Steven 20 Those are the ones the IEB had DuCharme. 21 determined qualifiers. 22 So, the motion would be that license 23 conditions (O) and (P) would not necessarily 24 have to be fulfilled by those entities anymore

Page 13 because they are not qualifiers. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. 3 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So, we'll include that in the motion that (O) and (P) are 4 no longer conditions of the license. 5 6 MS. WELLS: Perfect. 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? 8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Discussion? All 10 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 MS. WELLS: The next item on the 18 agenda, I will bring forward Assistant Director 19 Band and Director Connelly regarding the 20 Plainridge Park Casino license statistics. 2.1 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good morning. 22 MR. CONNELLY: Good morning. 23 Assistant Director Band and I put together some 24 statistics that we thought will be

representative of the activity going on currently in Plainridge.

We thought these statistics would be of value not only to the Commission but also to the general public. So, our recommendation is that in some shape or form we make these available publicly on the Gaming Commission website.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And on a recurring basis, I take it that these are forms you've designed to have monthly reporting.

MR. CONNELLY: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Bruce, when we talked about this, I had asked you to check other jurisdictions to see what are sort of standard metrics that get --

MR. BAND: It's really across-the-board as to what each one does. Ohio does a detailed arrest and eviction report really out of their Attorney General's office.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: They're when you say detailed, more detailed than this?

MR. BAND: When actual charges are brought against the person through the District

2.1

1 Attorney's Office and so on. So, it's a 2 hodgepodge out there as to what different 3 jurisdictions report. Most do report revenue. We've added some other sections in here that I think is of interest, statistical interest to 5 6 the public. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What about New 8 Jersey and Pennsylvania? 9 MR. BAND: New Jersey does financial 10 reporting pretty much. They will say how many machines and tables casinos have. And that's 11 12 kind of the end of it. 13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: No crimes? 14 MR. BAND: No. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: No crimes. And 16 Pennsylvania? MR. BAND: No crimes. 17 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Really? 19 Were you going to walk through this? 20 MR. CONNELLY: Absolutely. 2.1 MR. BAND: The first one we already 22 currently report with the exception of breaking 23 down and how we tax. We just put the nine 24 percent that goes to the horse development.

That would be the only difference in the financial end.

MR. CONNELLY: The second page -- CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Wait one second,

5 two things. You took the numbers off.

MR. BAND: Yes, because it was actually broken down differently. They are on our website currently.

I've talked about this with Derek. I think we actually should report the distinction between the 40 percent, which is the tax to local aid, and the nine percent which I understand now is not a tax. It's called an assessment in the law. So, we shouldn't refer to it as a tax. We should refer to it as an assessment.

But both of our reports, either they should be consolidated or -- Karen, you figure that out. They certainly should both break out the 49 from the 40, but each time making the distinction that one is a tax. One is an assessment. One is Race Horse Development.

23 One is local aid.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: This chart

2.1

Page 17 1 does that, right? 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Except it calls it 3 a tax. 4 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Apart from 5 that. 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. 7 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: This is minor 8 but eventually Category 1's will contribute to 9 the -- will also be assessed on the Race Horse 10 Development fund. It's not only the nine 11 percent on the Category 2's. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's a lower 13 percent. It's the same as you have there for 14 the tax. 15 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That comes out 16 of the fund, right? It doesn't come out directly. In other words all of the money 17 18 goes --19 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It comes out of 20 the 25. 21 MR. LENNON: Yes. The 25 percent 22 goes to a lot of different funds. (INAUDIBLE) 23 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: To keep it 24 parallel that would not be recorded. Right.

1 That's a good point. 2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Just for 3 clarification, the slot promotional is all 4 things free play in this case? 5 MR. BAND: Yes. 6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That's the 7 intention? 8 MR. BAND: Yes. 9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I think the 10 format is great. It's very helpful. 11 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yes. 12 MR. CONNELLY: So, on the second page, we attempted put together some statistics 13 14 to demonstrate the level of economic impact in 15 terms of jobs created and the number of vendors that have benefited from the establishment of 16 17 Plainridge Park Casino. 18 So, you will see 522 active 19 employees as of August 13, breakdown full-time 20 and part-time. What I would like to note just 21 very briefly is you will see further in today's 22 meeting, there is a discussion regarding local 23 aid hiring and purchase update. When you look

at the employee figures, as you review them you

may have noticed they don't exactly match and that's for two reasons.

One is reporting date. They came from two different reporting cycles. And the other is full-time and part-time breakdown, versus FTE, full-time equivalent. So, full-time equivalents adds up if you have two people who work a half schedule, together they equal one FTE. So, just to head off any potential confusion or address any confusion you may have as you review it, because it certainly took me a moment as I looked at the numbers myself.

Certainly, a lot of jobs being created. We will continue to put these number out a monthly basis. What I expect is that they will be relatively stable. They will fluctuate perhaps seasonally as business is stronger where they may need more part-time folks. But I think in general the number should be pretty steady on this front.

And in terms of the vendors, 199 vendors registered and licensed representing nearly \$150 million in economic activity. So, really good number again. Again, this is

2.1

something that we will go into more depth in in the presentation later on in today's meeting.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So, do you have a mechanism to identify an employee part-time or full-time that becomes inactive let's say --

MR. CONNELLY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- who can later become active again perhaps for reasons as simple as the ones you outlined, seasonal hiring.

MR. CONNELLY: We do with the reporting that we receive from Plainridge Park, we also receive the number of what they call termed employees, meaning employees that have either been let go or have left voluntarily. They quit, maybe their schedule didn't quite work out for whatever number of reasons.

Those people because their license is transferable in the sense that if we had another facility open in Massachusetts they could seek employment there if their reasons for leaving were under good circumstances, meaning it didn't impugn their character,

1 integrity or reputation.

So, those folks even if they have left still have access to their license for the term of the license. They paid for it. And as long as the investigation, if it's not complete if they're on temporary for example, as long as it doesn't turn up anything to lead to will be to a detrimental determination, they can hold it.

So, we could see, and we'll try and work a way to see if that employee comes back into the fold. So for example, like you said, if it's a seasonal employee who maybe is available -- has greater availability in the summertime and is coming into work, I will definitely put that in because I think it's something we could do. We just don't right now have a mechanism to do it. So, we'll work on that.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Does the list of active vendors also include any folks used during the construction period or are these all operations?

MR. CONNELLY: This is construction

1 and operations.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I had some questions about just the format. First of all, this the first time but for the ones where it's relevant, are you going to have a cumm.?

MR. CONNELLY: Yes, I will have a cumm. This is open to discussion. If there are figures in here, for example, what we just discussed that would be relevant, I can work on putting them in. And also if the format itself doesn't lend itself to easy understanding, that can certainly be changed.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If you are going to add cumm. columns that will complicate it a little bit, but I think that's important for the places where it's relevant.

Also, is it going to be fiscal year or calendar year?

MR. CONNELLY: I haven't made that determination yet. Right now, since it's opened June 24, we're really just kind of going running since opening. I think that's an excellent discussion and one that touches on the kind of the broader reporting discussions

we've had internally and how to actually draw those lines.

I think I would probably want to talk a lot to Derek about that and whether it makes sense to line up with fiscal years for financial reporting. Or frankly if our year starts -- If we want to start in June for example, so that we're actually tracking a year of operation, I don't have a strong opinion right now on that. But it's a question that I want to dive deeper into.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think fiscal year is by far the more logical. I think we've treated June 24-31 or whatever it was a sort of a rump section on the financial side, and then switched into fiscal '16, which I think makes sense. That's the way the Legislature and the Governor and the media typically, frequently will be thinking about it. The State House media will be thinking about it too.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I agree with that. And we owe an annual report to the Legislature. And it's by October but it's on a fiscal year basis. And if we got in that

2.1

rhythm that would be great. But we can also examine alternatives if we need to.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: As you work on the format, every page should have date information on it. Some of your charts have dates and some don't. Just make sure it's standardized, because a standalone chart without a date is problematic.

MR. CONNELLY: As in the as-of date?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. And then

my last thing is I appreciate the fact that

this is a first draft in effect as to format,

and it's worth thinking about this. And I

think it's important to coordinate with Derek

and make sure that we're talking about the same

things, and apples and apples and so forth.

But I think it would be good to put this out for public comment. I would like to have people say whatever they want to say about it. So, maybe Elaine if you can put it out there and get the information back to Paul and Bruce and see if anybody else has suggestions as to content or format.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I would add

just on the vendor piece kind of moving away 2 from counting construction vendors and make the count consistent month-to-month with the 3 operational side. 5 MR. CONNELLY: Yes. I think that 6 makes sense. MR. BAND: Then the next chart on 8 the next page tracks the number of complaints 9 that we get from the public. That's the over 10 telephone, via email and in-person at 11 Plainridge Park currently. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: These are 13 complaints to the Gaming Commission. 14 MR. BAND: Yes, they're about some 15 operational manner. Out of the five that we 16 had here, they all ended up satisfied by 17 Plainridge Park. They spoke with the customer 18 and to their satisfaction settled it. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Like what's an 19 20 example? 2.1 MR. BAND: Somebody had said that 22 they lost \$25 in a machine because they had put 23 money in there and it never gave them change. 24 Plainridge Park came back and they actually

returned the funds after they did some research 2 and everything to the patron. And usually gave 3 them some free play as well for their trouble. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good. 5 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Director 6 Band, that is a fairly low number considering 7 the amount of play, correct? 8 MR. BAND: Yes, extremely low. 9 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes, which is 10 a good sign. 11 Any other questions MR. BAND: Yes. 12 The next chart is tracking the number 13 of arrests and evictions at the gaming 14 establishment. As you can see for July we had 15 one arrest and 15 evictions. 16 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Again, very 17 low, one arrest. And I know that arrest ended 18 up being worked collaboratively with other 19 agencies. The individual actually had warrants 20 and a good example of law-enforcement working 21 well together. 22 MR. BAND: Yes. 23 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I had a

comment on page five but it also applies to

this page four, could there be a way to track 2 the number of visitations, let's say? 3 The number of what? MR. BAND: 4 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: To track the 5 number -- Is there a way to capture the number 6 of visitors of the casino? I am just trying to get my mind around how to put these numbers 8 into a little bit more context. I know there's 9 a lot of people that come and go. MR. BAND: At best, it would be a 10 11 quesstimate I would say on their part. 12 Historically, having done this in other 13 jurisdictions, the numbers usually aren't even 14 close to reality. So, I don't know if that's 15 realistic to do that. 16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 17 MR. BAND: We could keep track of 18 how busy things are and crowded, but I don't think actual numbers. 19 20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 2.1 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And the 22 evictions were mostly made up of individuals 23 who were behaving in a way that was 24 inappropriate would you say?

MR. BAND: Yes. That's usually every eviction.

And on the last page, we have statistics on minors, underage youth. It's always a topic in the press and everything.

This gives them statistics to look at as to what kind of effort the property is making to turn these people away and how many people we're actually catching in various situations on the floor.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: This one, this is a startup period. And I take it that -Well, it's a startup period. I recall in
looking at some of the qualifications and some
of the history in other jurisdictions, a lot of
emphasis was placed on this in terms of action
taken by a commission when underage people were
found actually on the premises.

Could you comment on that?

MR. BAND: Yes. I think every jurisdiction takes a real proactive stand on that to send a message to the industry that it's not tolerated. It almost always results in fines to the properties when you find people

on the floor gambling and to that extent. 2 I don't really think the industry 3 ever wants -- and everybody that works on that 4 property has to make the effort even once they 5 get past the front gate to make sure if 6 somebody looks young, they check. 7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And self-8 reporting is a piece of this as well, right? 9 MR. BAND: Yes. 10 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So, do we have 11 plans -- As I say this is the first month. 12 We're on a bit of a shakedown. But do we have 13 plans to deal with this aggressively as we move 14 forward? 15 MR. BAND: I'm addressing that right 16 now. 17 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Great. 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's something 19 we're going to talk about in terms of fines and 20 penalties and strategies. 2.1 MR. BAND: Yes. 22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Because that's 23 something that we would obviously like to be a 24 part of. Is there a difference between minors

and underage youth? 2 MR. BAND: In New Jersey we always 3 said that minors were under 16 -- excuse me, minors were under 21, underage youths were 16, 18 below. 5 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But there's no 7 distinction. 8 MR. BAND: No. We can just leave it 9 underage youth if we wanted to. 10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Just looking 11 at these numbers, is it fair to assume that the 12 number in the column taken into custody, the 13 two individuals, were the same ones that were 14 found gambling at the slot machines? 15 MR. BAND: Yes. 16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And they are a subset of those four who were escorted? 17 18 MR. BAND: Yes. 19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: In other 20 words, these are not differences. There's a 21 cumulative. 22 MR. BAND: It's usually if you are 23 on the floor, you're usually walked off and 24 evicted. If you're actually caught gambling,

```
1
     drinking, something like that further actions
2
     are taken.
 3
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What is the found
 4
     consuming alcohol beverages? What is that
5
     violation?
 6
                MR. BAND: If an underage person is
7
     drinking on the floor.
8
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, underage
9
    person, right.
10
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Director, the
11
     259 prevented, I'm assuming some individuals
12
     just tried to walk past security, others may
     have had false identification?
13
14
                MR. BAND: Yes.
15
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Do we have
     any information on, is it primarily coming up
16
17
     from the racing area or is it pretty much
18
     throughout?
19
                MR. BAND: It seems to be mostly the
20
     garage area. They have devices that actually
21
     scan the licenses at every entrance.
22
     check everybody that appears to them to be
23
     under the age of 30.
24
                So, they're trying to give
```

1 themselves a wide margin of error with that. 2 For the first round, they've done pretty well 3 with keeping the kids off. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. 5 MR. BAND: Any other questions? 6 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The colleges 7 are about to come back. And I suspect some 8 will take a break from their studies to try to 9 get in. So, we'll see how that proceeds. 10 MR. BAND: Yes. That's always been 11 a problem. Everybody obtains a fake ID in one 12 way or another and makes and attempt. 13 system does identify most fake IDs. 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, whenever they 15 ask for an ID, it's recorded? 16 MR. BAND: Yes. They actually put 17 it in the machine. It records it. It checks 18 for all of the identifying marks on the license 19 or whatever type of ID they get. It also take 20 a picture of the individual presenting it for 21 if down the road they know who gave it to them to look at. So, it's not a bad system. 22 23 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. 24 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That sounds

1 very good. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And they are 2 3 confiscating those IDs. 4 MR. BAND: Yes. They actually get 5 to meet a state trooper if they have one. 6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It should 7 serve as a future deterrent. 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else? 9 Thank you very much gentlemen. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: General Counsel 10 11 Blue. 12 MS. BLUE: Good morning, 13 Commissioners. Before we start with our agenda 14 items today, I want to introduce publicly to 15 the Commission the two new attorneys that have 16 joined legal department. They are seated 17 behind me. We have Justin Stempeck and Carrie 18 Torrisi. 19 Justin joins us from a law firm. 20 His background is as a litigator. So, he's 21 been very helpful to us on various litigation matters and license denials and those sorts of 22 23 matters. But he will also be doing everything

else, because we all share in the legal

department.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

20

21

22

23

And Carrie joins us from another state agency. She is very familiar with the regulatory process both in drafting regulations and enforcing them. So, Carrie is now taking a real deep dive into our regulations and seeing any changes we need to make or any mechanical type errors that we need to fix.

So, we are very happy to have them on board. They'll be very busy. This is Carrie's first Commission meeting. Justin sat through our longer one last time. We are very pleased to have them.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Welcome. Where are you from Carrie? EOPSS?

MS. TORRISI: DPS underneath.

17 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Welcome

18 aboard.

19 COMMISISONER CAMERON: Welcome.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Joan, the review of our regs. is something that ought to be factored somehow or another into the after action report if it isn't already. That is

24 something we've talked about already to take a

deep breath, take a long look at all of our regs. and do we need any whatever all we might need, but should fit in to part of that process. Okay.

MS. BLUE: The first item under legal today is the Section 61 Findings for MGM. As we discussed at some of our prior meetings, the process for this will be for our consultants to help us review all of the changes such as they are in the project between the RFA-2 and this point in time. And bring those changes to the Commission so that they can be reviewed along with the Section 61 Findings, which have been drafted.

And the Commission can determine whether they need to make additional changes to the Section 61s, add additional conditions to the license. And then issue what we call the final license and go from there.

We had hoped to have those consultant reports to you this week. We do not have them because the applicant or licensee is still working on finishing its design for the project. We talked a little bit at the last

meeting with them about their schedule and where they were. They are still working on design changes.

However, they do have a draft set of Section 61s. So, they are looking at those to confirm some of the numbers, square footage, things like that that are in the Section 61s.

So, we are hopeful that by the next meeting on September 3 we'll have the consultants review. They'll be able to give that to you publicly. We will have revised Section 61s. The Commission can take a first look at that so we can start that process.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: We're hopeful of that. Is that hope realistic?

MS. BLUE: We are working with MGM every day to determine where we are with that. They are still putting together their plans to go to the city of Springfield. So, we are continually reminding them that they need to get that to us. And that they need to get this done by the end of September. That's our goal to get these wrapped up and finalized.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I thought I

had heard someplace that they were to give
something to the city yesterday or today,
right?

MS. BLUE: That was what we understood racially. I conferred with counsel this morning. They did not give anything to the city yesterday. So, they have not completed those plans.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I didn't understand until recently what Section 61 Findings really meant. It's just one of those phrases that gets thrown around.

For people who are watching, I think it's right to say that simply, once MEPA, the Mass. Environmental Protection Agency, has made its determination about what is required to get the MEPA certificate that every agency involved with that development needs to write up whether or not they think the developer is complying with those MEPA regs., is in compliance with those MEPA regs. And I guess can take a further step and add other environmental considerations if the agency so chooses.

That becomes really the final step

in the environmental permitting process. Is that approximately right?

MS. BLUE: It is. What it shows is that the applicant or the licensee has taken all reasonable and feasible steps to mitigate the impacts of their project on the environment.

In our case, we turn them into license conditions. So, we will be monitoring them and enforcing them over the course of the license.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

also because we've issued a conditional license and one of the conditions is compliance with the MEPA process, completion of the MEPA process, we're required by our regulations and by MEPA regulations to take another look at the entire project once we get to an assertion that the MEPA process has been successfully completed. And look at it again and look at it comprehensively.

And then decide whether any additional conditions are necessary or whether

1 any existing conditions need to be altered to 2 take account of changes in the project that 3 reflect on conditions already in place, right? MS. BLUE: That's correct, yes. 5 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So, this is 6 not simply a pro forma kind of thing. We need to take it seriously. And we need to get it 8 done, because the consequence of not having it 9 done is that no digging, no destruction of 10 existing buildings, nothing that involves 11 physical alteration of the site can take place 12 until that process is finished. 13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Except the 14 environmental cleanup part. 15 MS. BLUE: I think that depends. 16 It's not as big of a factor in this situation. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I just didn't want 17 18 to get locked into the no digging literally. 19 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Some steps. MS. BLUE: And MGM understands that 20 21 they have a schedule. You did approve a 22 schedule for them at the last meeting. So, the 23 clock is ticking. 24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Okay.

Great. Anything else on this one?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I don't know

what more we can do to get this moving forward.

I recognize that the negotiations with

Historical Commission have occupied a lot of

time and it can't move forward until those are finished, but those are about to be finished now as far as we can tell.

And I also understand the issues with the highway and the need to coordinate with the highway and have some realistic idea. But we crossed that bridge in a major sense at the last meeting.

And it seems to me that at some point we need to think about imposing a construction schedule. And perhaps that's the appropriate remedy for not moving this thing forward in a smart fashion -- in a rapid fashion.

Because the imposition of the construction schedule then triggers a number of other things. So, I must say I'm expressing a little bit of frustration that we're not farther along than we are today.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I may be under 2 the wrong impression, but I thought we were 3 also considering at some point doing this on a 4 rolling basis because there were different 5 aspects? Is that no longer the case? 6 MS. BLUE: We probably won't have 7 We think the MOA with Mass. Historic is 8 pretty much complete. There's one or two open 9 issues. And we think that'll be done. And we 10 did receive draft Section 61 Findings from DOT. 11 So, we have incorporated those into our most 12 recent draft. So, it looks like we will be 13 able to tie them pretty much up all together. 14 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Are you sort of 16 letting that sit? Or are you proposing that we 17 do something? 18 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: We'll No. 19 take a look at this again at the next meeting. 20 Maybe the next meeting, if we're not in a 21 position to do this, maybe at the next meeting 22 if we're not in a position to conduct that 23 review and actually move forward and finalize 24 it that we ought to have a representative of

1 MGM here to tell us where we are and why we 2 aren't further down the path. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That would be in 3 two weeks if we're not ready to go forward. 4 MS. BLUE: I think that's fair. 5 6 That's what we've discussed in the legal group. 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I am totally with 8 you sympathetically or empathetically. But as 9 a practical matter, given the incredible delay because of the Viaduct, does a slowdown on 10 11 Section 61 have any practical consequence on 12 the schedule? 13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I would like 14 to think so. 15 MS. BLUE: I believe it does. 16 can't be any construction or demolition until 17 the Section 61s are done. And some demolition 18 has to occur before they can start even their 19 sort of civil preparation work. So, I think it does. I think it's 20 21 important that they get resolved preferably by 22 the end of September so that they can keep to 23 the schedule that you've already approved for

24

them.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes. I thought basically the construction cycle was a 30-month cycle. They've now got 36 months because they pushed it out for the reasons that we've all discussed. Does that relieve some of the practical implications? I don't know. I have no idea. Maybe we can have them speak to that.

I'm totally in favor of pushing this as hard as we can. Don't get me wrong. But I don't want to ignore the implications of a six-month window if they're there.

commissioner mchugh: But it seems to me that it's more than just, and I hear what you're saying. It may not make a difference, a dramatic difference in the end date, and there's no magic to September 30. But this now is in a stage where it needs to move forward. And we need to have a schedule in place. And we need to have the implications of a schedule.

We need to have a project that's moving forward under an agreed schedule as soon as possible so that everybody knows where we're going even if the construction doesn't start for three months or four months, it seems to

1 So that everybody understands that this is 2 moving forward and here's how it's going to 3 move forward. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And there 4 5 certainly are jobs in the line. That matters 6 to some folks. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, I think we've 9 got a plan for next meeting on this one. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I mention 10 just one brief thing. I agree with all of 11 12 that. We should just keep in mind that there's 13 a lot of work happening off-site. There's a 14 lot of relocations that have to take place in 15 order for the demolition, for example, that I 16 know has to been taking place. That was part 17 of earlier submissions of schedules. But that 18 doesn't take away from anything being said 19 here. 20 MS. BLUE: Yes. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. 22 MS. BLUE: Next in your packet, we

have an item regarding public records policy.

And I think as we've see because it's been

23

covered pretty well in the press, there's a lot of discussion about the Commonwealth's public records policy and how public record requests should be handled.

A few weeks ago, Governor Baker issued a memo to the executive branch agency setting out some guidelines that he would like to see followed by those agencies and how they respond to public records.

And what is in your package is a spreadsheet that compares what the Governor's memo contained with what the Commission's policy is. And I think if you take a look at it, you will see that we are very much in sync with that memo in quite a few places. We have a more stringent policy than what the Governor has suggested.

But there are some places where we could if we desired, make some changes and get a little bit more in compliance.

So, for example, the Governor's memo requires a designated records officer to be appointed. We have always had that. That's been our Communications Director Elaine

2.1

Driscoll. But we have made -- looked at making a couple of changes to the website to have the legal department be the designated records officer and creating a dedicated public records email address.

Right now they come into Elaine's email, which I think probably clogs up her mailbox a little bit, but we can have a separate email that will come in and the legal department will check it. So, we are going to work on that.

We do have a process whereby we track public records. We've looking internally in the legal department on how better to maintain them in a spreadsheet format. But we do maintain them and we do keep files and we keep copies of what we provide.

One of the places we're a little bit different is the Governor's memo request the agencies to reach out to the person requesting the records within five days, preferably to ask for clarifications or to have a conversation about what they are looking for.

We currently do that now. We reach

out usually in-person to pretty much everyone who makes a request so we can determine that we understand it and we get a firm handle on what they are looking for. We do it within 10 days. That's the 10 days required by statute, but we can also make the effort to reach out sooner if that's helpful to make contact earlier.

On search fees, the Commission charge less for search fees. The only difference here was that the Governor's memo requested that agencies not charge for the first four hours of a search. By and large the Commission doesn't charge at all only in rare occasions if it's very large. But we can also follow that in cases where we might determine that it makes sense to charge we could not charge for the first four hours.

We charge at the same rate if we do.

Although the Governor's memo provides for a

higher rate if you are going to go into

databases or make extensive redactions. But

we've always had a single rate.

Response times, the Governor requests that people respond to straightforward

2.1

requests within 10 days. We do that where we can. Because we have so much of our stuff online and so much of our stuff is electronic, if it's a very distinct document we do respond within 10 days.

The only time it takes a little bit longer is if we have to do searches. So, the Governor has suggested an outside limit of eight weeks. We've had very, very few requests that took longer than eight weeks. That would be have to be a very, very large, very, very open kind of request.

The Governor's memo outlines production costs. Ours have always been cheaper than that. We, on electronically searchable documents, everyone wants to get to that point. We do that where we can. What we are working on is being able to redact things electronically because that speeds up the process. So, we are working on getting the equipment and the software to do that.

And then the Governor requested that as many documents as possible be posted online.

And we are extraordinary at that. So, we have

2.1

We will

1 lots and lots there.
2 So, all in all we are in-line with

3

4 tighten it up a little bit in the areas where

5 they're a little bit more stringent than we

the Governor's suggested policies.

6 are. But otherwise, I think we have a pretty

7 good process going forward.

8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I totally agree 9 with that. We do. But I also think what

10 you're saying is right. We'll never get credit

11 for being more stringent than the Governor, but

we might get criticized if we are less than

13 stringent or the other way around, and are not

in compliance with some other things. So, I

15 think we should get those couple of little

16 fixes in.

17 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: The only one

18 | would be the t10-day to the five-day. That's

19 where we are significantly different.

MS. BLUE: That's right.

21 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And you think

22 | that's possible, correct?

MS. BLUE: I think it is, because

24 what the Governor's memo requires that you

reach out. It's the initial response and reach out to the requestor. So, we can definitely do that.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I like the idea of designating the legal department as opposed to the communications department for handling the inquiries.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The only issue with that is people won't know about the website place to ask. Elaine will continue to get them I'm sure from the press.

MS. BLUE: And we work very closely with Elaine. So, that we make sure that we help her to get the documents she needs, but we also make sure we let her know when we have public records requests. So, she knows what we're sending out too. So, we'll still work closely with them.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: It should be clear that the reason we're looking at the

23 Governor's memo is that that is promulgated

through A&F. And we are not subject to that as

Page 51 1 the force of law. But it's a thoughtful 2 approach to a very important issue. And that's 3 why we're looking at that and comparing what 4 we're doing to that even though we're not 5 required to do it. 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes. 7 MS. BLUE: That's right. 8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Do we need to 9 vote on a designation or no? 10 MS. BLUE: No. We will implement 11 those changes and monitor it. That's all we 12 have for legal. Thank you. 13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else for 14 Catherine? 15 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. 16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you. Chief 17 Financial and Accounting Officer Lennon. 18 MR. LENNON: Good afternoon Mr. 19 Chairman, Commissioners. I am joined by Jill 20 Griffin. 21 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: It's good 22 morning. 23 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's a

24

habit.

MR. LENNON: We are well ahead of schedule. It's a little bit like Ron Burgundy, read off the teleprompter. I'm joined by Jill Griffin, MGC's Director of Workforce, Supplier and Diversity and Paul Connelly, the Licensing Division Director.

We are here to provide an economic impact update to you based on hiring, local aid and vendor payments generated by the Plainridge Park Casino later referenced to by me as PPC just for short.

This update is not intended to replace or provide details that are part of normal vendor and diversity quarterly reports, nor is it intended to provide information relative to PPC's commitments in host and surrounding community agreements.

This memo and briefing are for the purpose of providing a large-scale view of the contributions PPC is making to the Massachusetts economy.

Before we get into the memorandum, I'd just like to say what a pleasure it was working on this project, working with Jill,

Paul, Bill Curtis, Corinne, Mike Sangalang and Elaine made this memo as well as this methodology in collaboration remind me what a wonderful place it is we work in with some truly insightful and talented people.

That is not to say that I don't get every day working with my team. I don't want anyone listening at home to think that that's a little different. But it did let me see more of what each part of this agency is doing on a day-to-day basis, the talents individual contributors possess, the information each division is reviewing, gathering. And the struggles they face to provide clear, concise information in a format that is digestible that contains enough specificity to splice it in any manner of ways to report an effective process.

I also want to point out how easy it's been to work with PPC staff. The details behind this information sits on PPC databases and servers. They have been helpful and responsive to our requests for information.

We are still working with them on some of the formatting reports, timing of

reports, which we pointed out earlier with Paul's presentation with Bruce. However, I find that to be normal process for a regulatory body at this stage.

So, now that we've done all the -And at any point, if you have questions for
Jill or Paul, once again I'm kind of just
reading. But the meat of this came from their
efforts.

Under hiring and purchasing, the PPC has purchased \$147.6 million since becoming a licensee. \$110.4 million of that has been spent in Massachusetts with the majority \$108.9 million going to construction and land surveyor services.

Of the remaining \$1.5 million in Massachusetts spend, \$505,000 or 33 percent has been spent in Norfolk County, which is the county Plainridge resides in, Plainville town is in. An additional 42 percent has been spent in neighboring Bristol and Plymouth counties.

As of July 23, PPC had a payroll of \$545,000 for salaried and hourly workers.

That's one pay period. That's not aggregate.

That's just one pay period how much they paid out to their employees. That's representing a headcount of 533 people and 467 full-time equivalents.

approximately \$14.2 million in salaries added to the town of Plainville. PPC generates a local aid for the Commonwealth both through its lottery sales at the racecourse and the casino as well as through taxes on gross gaming revenues. As the memo indicates, the casino contributes 49 percent of its gross gaming revenue to the Commonwealth, but only 40 percent of those go to local aid while the other nine percent go to the Race Horse Development Fund.

as the racecourse offered lottery to its patrons. Since the casino has opened, lottery revenues have increased 197 percent from the same period of last year.

So, in the memo we're looking at the period from June 22 through August 2. That's how PPC had to pull it out of the lottery's

online database. We couldn't change that time period to reflect what the gross gaming revenues. We tried to, but that's how the reporting system works.

After deducting payouts and commissions, the park generated \$102,000 for local aid from the period of June 22 through August 1.

through the time period of July 31, which is how we report on our website -- We started June 24 through the end of June and then July 1 through July 31. -- the casino has generated \$24.3 million in gross gaming revenues.

40 percent of that is taxed and goes directly to local aid, which has resulted in \$9.72 million to date, which PPC has contributed to the state's local aid coffers.

And combined with the lottery represents \$9.82 million that PPC has generated for the benefit of local aid.

That's as about information as we have in the memo. If you would like to ask any questions, if you would like any detail.

2.1

Once again, I want to thank Jill,
Paul, their team. I want to thank Mike and
Elaine. It's a very nice graph that they put
in that puts the increase as well as how it's
gone to Massachusetts.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Derek, you

had some information. Plainridge previously
had lottery point-of-sale machines, Keno. What
have they added to that to bring them up to
this number?

MR. LENNON: In the lottery agreement, Plainridge had two player activated -- The racecourse previously had -- I just want to get this correct. So, let me refer to my notes please.

The racecourse had two player activated terminals which is where you can go throw money in and grab a ticket out of it.

They had two Keno servers. So people could put bets on Keno and watch it. Then they had two of the old blue machines, which they call ISYS machines. They're the old GTECH defunct machines where you could actually process the payments, go up and order tickets online, get

the instant pics.

Since the casino has opened, they've added another blue machine in the gift shop.

They've added at least four player activated terminals and they've added an additional two to three Keno offerings in the food court areas and in the bar areas, not the formal restaurant.

So, they've almost tripled sales while less than tripling the number of offerings they have. Could that be driven by sheer volume of people going through, possibly. But when you take a look at what their lottery commitment was to promote sales, to increase sales from where they were, I think they've stuck to their commitment.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Questions or comments?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I think this summary is great. It's a great summary. I think there's quite a bit of work that I know that goes behind to be able to summarize it at this level.

I did want to mention something just

going forward, I mentioned this to you briefly Derek but I wanted to mention it here for the record. I think we should be, like we are here, objectively reporting results. That's something that we have all the mandate to do.

And resist any temptation, if you will, to make projections, certainly, in the area of revenue. I'm not suggesting we are making them now, but if inquiries come relative to where we will end up, if you will, all of that is clearly on the purview of the licensee not the Commission.

As a matter of fact, they are heavily regulated when it comes to financial projections because they are a public company and they have to abide by all kinds of disclosure requirements, etc. That will be true for the other two licensees who are also public companies.

But we don't want to own any kind of those projections, if you will, either by reference or because of the nature of how we answer questions. What we've done here is great, objective and we report the results.

The licensees will have a lot of leeway into how they affect those results going forward with a number of things that they do promotions, and marketing, etc. That's their business obviously.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I couldn't agree with that more. We are in a startup mode for a brand-new industry. We have no track record. We have no real ability to gauge the seasonal impact and the impact of other things on this facility or on this industry.

And until we get a little bit more seasoned and a little bit better feel for environmental circumstances, it seems to me we ought to stick exactly to objective data that we can report, even if it means that we are looking backwards a month at a time for a while rather than create expectations that we really don't have any basis for creating.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: There's a lot of expectations already out there because of all of the projections --

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I understand

24 that.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I get your point. 2 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: It seems to me 3 we need not feed into those projections because 4 we don't know anything about their accuracy. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And there's a 5 6 parallel to perhaps the lottery where there's a lot of expectations and lottery officials do 8 report and come testify before the Legislature 9 relative to projections. But they actually own 10 and manage that business whereas we operate 11 through a licensee. Anyway, I think the point 12 is made. 13 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And they've 14 got 40 years of experience. 15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. But I think 16 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 17 the point is well taken that to date, they have 18 met their obligation to promote the lottery. 19 Also, they have met their representations on 20 hiring. 2.1 MR. LENNON: Correct. 22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The results 23 are really very strong, very good. \$18 million 24 in gross gaming revenue is a great start by any

1 measure. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We had heard from 3 the Treasurer's office that there was some 4 slight drop, some drop, I don't know how slight 5 in the lottery sales in a few certain kinds of 6 establishments I think actually right in Plainville. But that other than that revenues 8 in general were up for the lottery. 9 We talked about asking the Treasurer 10 if she wanted to come here and present us whatever they've got on the impact of this, 11 12 particularly in that little host and 13 surrounding community area, and see if there's 14 anything else that she thinks we can be doing. 15 Did you talk to the office and tell her we were 16 talking about this today? 17 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Preliminarily, 18 yes. 19 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Should we do that 20 do you think? 2.1 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: 22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Anything 23 else? Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON:

24

Thank you,

1 good work.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Last but not least the Racing Division, Dr. Lightbaum.

DR. LIGHTBAUM: Good morning,

Commissioners. I wanted to give a brief update
on the preparations for the Suffolk Downs meet.

They've signed an agreement with the Twin

Spires. So, that issue looks like it has been
resolved. Doug O'Donnell will be following up
with the contracts and the paperwork and all
and the billing.

They have contacted McPeterson with University of Maine as the track specialist to go over the track. It's just a matter of scheduling the appointment. It may be as early as tomorrow or sometime next week and I will attend that as well.

We've got a list of the racing officials. And it looks like it's basically the same ones that have been there before. So, our background checks should go relatively quickly on those. We are asking that they get those applications in as soon as possible so that we can do those. And then for our next

meeting, we will have that list for your approval of the racing officials, which is a routine process we go through.

As far as the occupational licenses go, the Commission granted the license to Suffolk on a Thursday. And we opened our licensing office at Suffolk Downs the following Monday. So, we are open for licensing. We have all of the applications on our website, the HBPA has put them on their website as well.

So, they are definitely available out there for people to go ahead and download, fill out. They can mail them in. They can fax them in. We are really encouraging people to do this process ahead of time because there is a shortened timespan here. With a normal meet, we probably open the office about six weeks ahead of time and people are coming in to train horses. So, it's a gradual procedure of getting people licensed.

This is going to be a very shortened time span. I'm also going to meet with Chip and Lou later on to try to figure out how we can best handle these, this amount of licensing

2.1

in a short period of time.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The IEB is prepared for this? You're in conversations with them?

DR. LIGHTBAUM: Yes. I've spoken with IEB and with the troopers as far as fingerprinting goes. We scheduled a couple of fingerprinting sessions, and I talked to them about the background check process also.

We'll also do an overall inspection of the facility probably the week before they open. Our stewards are going to be Susan Walsh. She's been a longtime chief steward for us. And then Bob Cobbrley who has been our chief judge down at Plainridge. He is also certified as a steward for thoroughbred racing. So, he is going to be our other steward.

He's been involved in doing inspections at different tracks in other states for several years. It really worked out nicely. We've done it at Plainridge. Just make sure that everything is ready ahead of time, and if there's anything that needs improvements or that was overlooked, we can get

it done before actual opening day.

2 There's a couple of things that 3 might be on the agenda for the next meeting. One of them is obviously the racing officials that I mentioned. Suffolk is also 5 6 contemplating changing their takeout from the 19 percent on the straight wagers and the 26 on 8 exotics to 15 across. So, that may be on the agenda for the next meeting. And there will be 9 10 the proper notification and all for you all.

As a note, Plainridge did this back in 2011 they tried it as an experiment. So, it has been done in the Commonwealth before. If you have any questions?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: First of all, comment. I've met a number of times with Dr. Lightbaum on what it's going to take to get us ready. And she is extremely well prepared and has really thought through everything it's going to take to get this open, which there is an awful lot of work for a short meet.

So, I just want to commend you,
Doctor, for your preparation and your
thoughtfulness and what it's going to take.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

1 With the track inspection that's the 2 group that you recommended that they will be 3 using; is that correct? 4 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Yes, it is. 5 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Excellent. 6 know that the licenses, the applications are not coming in as quickly as we'd like them to. 8 So, there'll be a big push. So, I know you're 9 going to talk to the folks at the track. And I wonder if we can talk to the Horsemen's 10 11 Association as well and just reiterate how 12 important it is to get those in. 13 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Yes, that's a good 14 idea. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We go through this 16 every time. We know it's got to be that our 17 backend has got to be prepared. It's going to 18 get log jammed. It always does. We've got to 19 push as hard as you can. Mr. Tuttle is here. 20 He hears us. And everybody understands the 21 But Karen has to know what's coming. problems. 22 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Yes. 23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And the

facility inspection is the other piece you

mentioned. And the experience there will be helpful; is that correct?

DR. LIGHTBAUM: Yes. Bob Cobbrley has done these extensively in the past. And it worked out very well when we did it at Plainridge earlier this year.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Excellent.

8 Great. Excellent work, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Did you enumerate all of our people? Are we having any trouble getting our people?

DR. LIGHTBAUM: No. I'm waiting on one person just to finish the final background piece. I am anticipating that she'll be able to start next week, which falls right in line with what we're doing.

We really only brought back three new people. And we're going to use our existing staff to fill in, which is what we did last year too. Some of the staff where the racing dates are different between the two tracks, we can use the staff at Plainridge for the Suffolk Downs races. And they worked there last year as well.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. DR. LIGHTBAUM: The hiring process 2 3 has been minimal and it's gone very smoothly. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great, good. 5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Remind me the 6 day of the first race. 7 DR. LIGHTBAUM: September 5. 8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: September 5? 9 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Yes. 10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Is there a 11 point between now and then that you might look 12 at and say well, there's not enough people 13 licensed and say we need to redouble efforts 14 let's say on that outreach? 15 DR. LIGHTBAUM: We will basically do 16 what we need to do to get everybody licensed. 17 I've already talked Commissioner Cameron about 18 the possibility of having a few more people 19 come in to help with the licensing than what we 20 normally would do. 2.1 Normally, we build up the staff 22 right before the opening anyway. But with this 23 situation, I think we're going to build it up 24 even more than what we normally would.

1 So, we are going to be prepared to 2 get everybody done that we can. But certainly 3 as far as the racing officials, we really want to get their applications in. It's really 5 important that we get there background checks 6 done so that when we come in front of you, we can tell you their backgrounds are done, and 8 that we recommend them, them in particular. 9 And then certainly we're encouraging 10 everybody else too, so that there isn't a big 11 line opening day. But we anticipate just human 12 nature that there will be a lot of licensing 13 that opening day. 14 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. 16 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Next, we've got Doug 17 O'Donnell with a request from Plainridge. 18 MR. O'DONNELL: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners. 19 20 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: It's still 21 morning. 22 MR. O'DONNELL: We're used to 23 afternoon when we're here. I stand corrected. 24 What you have in front of you is a request for

consideration from Plainridge Racecourse

Capital Improvement Trust Fund. They have met

all of the necessary requirements that go along

with this request. It will be for \$114,409.36.

Included in the package is a recommendation from the architectural firm of Dixon Salo, which has reviewed and approved the information that Mr. O'Toole had submitted.

Dixon Salo is requesting that this should be approved by the Commission to move forward.

There's also information in there from Mr. O'Toole about the three different proposals that are needed for this capital improvement request. We do need a vote from the Commission on this.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is that peculiar fund where they give us their money and then they ask us to give it back to them and we do.

MR. O'DONNELL: Exactly. We've discussed it before. And I've discussed it with Alex. And we're looking to make different changes and we'll present that to you in the future on how to move forward with this.

Page 72 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: On this process? 1 2 MR. O'DONNELL: Yes. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Because it is sort 4 of silly. Anybody else? 5 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yes. 6 just going to say I'm glad I don't have to get up on the soapbox about Capital Improvement 8 Trust Fund but short of the really interesting 9 name of the vendor you selected --10 MR. O'DONNELL: Big Boys. 11 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Big Boys 12 Toys. 13 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's what 14 they are. 15 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: That is what 16 they are. Just out of curiosity, what was the 17 big difference with the other bidders that they 18 were both Massachusetts firms but you went with 19 the higher bidder from outside of the state. 20 Just trying to figure out what the variations 21 were in the bid offerings. 22 MR. O'TOOLE: Industrywide there is 23 a buying cooperative that gets pretty 24 substantial discounts. I think the discount on

- 1 each of the tractors, they were around \$40,000.
- 2 I think it was over \$10,000 discount with the
- 3 buying power that all of the Penn tracks as
- 4 | well as other tracks across the country join.
- 5 The John Deere and the Mahindra, they just
- 6 | couldn't match those discounts.
- 7 So, just to get the best bang for
- 9 course the attachments that go with that are

the buck, we went with that one. And then of

- 10 specific to Massey Ferguson.
- 11 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thanks.
- 12 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Maybe I didn't
- 13 understand the question or the answer. Big
- 14 Boys Toys was the highest bidder, right?
- MR. O'TOOLE: No.
- 16 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I thought that
- 17 | the bid for the tractors from Padula Brothers
- 18 | was 41, from Westville was 43 and from Big Boys
- 19 | was 45.

- MR. O'TOOLE: The basic tractor was
- 21 | 30. It was the attachments that put it up to
- 22 | 40. So, basically we got one tractor with
- 23 attachments for the same price of the John
- 24 Deere. I didn't bring my paperwork with me but

if I could steel Doug's copy. 2 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I was just 3 looking at the letter of August 10 from Dixon 4 Salo, which has -- that's where I got those 5 numbers. 6 MR. O'TOOLE: Okay. The Massey 7 Ferguson base tractor, the list price was 8 \$47,000. After the discounts, it was \$36,000. The other base tractors were higher. 9 10 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So, this 11 chart is a little misleading because one number 12 is the number with all of the extras, the 13 attachments. And the other two bids are just 14 the basic tractor. So, the apples to apples 15 would be the \$36,000 compared to the \$41,000 16 and the \$43,000. 17 MR. O'TOOLE: Correct. I don't know 18 if you have these documents, but the quote for 19 one was \$36,000 and the John Deere came in at 20 \$39,000. 21 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I see the 22 attachments two pages down. So, that shows all 23 the extras, yes.

MR. O'TOOLE: It was quite the amass

Page 75 1 of quotes and everything, because we really 2 weren't comparing apples to apples in a lot of 3 circumstances. 4 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. I got 5 it. I see that. Okay. 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, we need a 7 vote, Commissioner Cameron. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes. 8 9 that we approve the transfer for the tractor of 10 \$114,409.36 as requested in the memo dated 11 August 20. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? 13 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Second. 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any discussion? 15 All in favor, aye. 16 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye. 17 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 18 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 19 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 21 have it unanimously. 22 MR. O'TOOLE: Thank you, 23 Commissioners. 24 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good luck

with the new tractor.

2.1

DR. LIGHTBAUM: Our third item on the agenda comes from the Mass. Thoroughbred Breeders Association. They have a request in.

They went to the Legislature and had 128 changed so that the races wouldn't have to be held in Massachusetts. This was with the idea that if there was no racing in this Commonwealth that they could race the races at another track and still get the money out to their horsemen.

This isn't the first time it's been done in racing. Virginia did that last year.

They raced their races at Laurel in Maryland.

And they're intending to do it again this year.

The idea obviously it's not ideal, rather do it in Massachusetts.

The idea is at least this way the money would get out to the Mass. breeders and it could keep their farms going and keep them in business until a year that there was racing.

This is only obviously if there is no -- if Suffolk does not do their three days this year. The way we are scheduled now, the

Mass. breeders can run their races at Suffolk
Downs this year. So, they just wanted to put
this in that in case for some reason after the
first day Suffolk didn't run the other days
that this would be in place and they could race
at Finger Lakes. Catherine may have something
to add.

MS. BLUE: This is new for the Commission. The Legislature did amend 128 to allow the stake races to occur outside the Commonwealth. As you recall, we did pay the breeders portion of the Race Horse Development Fund to the breeders. So, they have the funds to do that.

In looking at the legislation, it's not entirely clear that the Commission has to approve it, but I think it's appropriate for the Commission to review it and approve it.

And that way the breeders can go forward.

They're looking at doing it at

Finger Lakes I think in New York if they can't
do it here in Massachusetts. So, I think it
would be good to have them prepared to be able
to have those races of they choose.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But it's a 2 contingent approval of sorts, because their 3 first choice is to race one of the three days at Suffolk Downs. 5 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Right. They would 6 have Mass. bred races all three days. So, some of the horses are eligible for more than one of 8 the races. That's one of the reasons why 9 Suffolk spread their days out like that was so 10 they could accommodate the Mass. breeders. 11 Again, we'd only be looking for it 12 for this year. They may want it going forward 13 in the next year or whatever, but we would 14 rather wait obviously, not make this a blanket 15 recommendation going forward, but do it just 16 for this year. 17 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, the 18 Legislature allowed them to do that only for up 19 until June 2016, correct? 20 MS. BLUE: This is in 128 not in 21 128A. This is a change that is not contingent 22 legislatively. And they would be allowed to do 23 it, in my read of it, in coming years. It's in 24 the agricultural statute. It's not in the

1 racing statute. And that is where that 2 traditionally has always been. 3 So, this gives them the right to do it. 4 I think from their perspective they wanted 5 to be sure they could do something this year 6 but the legislation itself is not contingent. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. 8 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I know we 9 haven't done this in a while, but are there any 10 liabilities, responsibilities that we have as 11 the Racing Commission even though they might be 12 racing in another state? 13 MS. BLUE: I don't believe so. race in another state, they would be subject to 14 15 the jurisdiction and licensing requirements of 16 that state. 17 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I gather you are 19 making an ambivalent recommendation that we 20 support this, right? 2.1 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Yes. I think it is 22 something that we should support. 23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I see no 24 reason not to have a backup plan in case

something were to occur that we don't 2 anticipate with the three-day meet. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do you want to 4 make a motion? COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 5 Sure. I move 6 that we approve the request by the Breeders Association, the Massachusetts Thoroughbred 8 Breeders Association to hold their breeders races at Finger Lakes if in fact for some 9 10 reason they were unable to do so at Suffolk 11 with the three-day meet. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is it an 13 either/or, or might they want to do both? 14 MS. BLUE: Under the legislation 15 they could do both if they wanted to, yes. 16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The motion I think 17 inadvertently said --18 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Their 19 preference is to them in-state here if the 20 three-day meet occurs as we anticipate it will. 21 But this is a backup if, for whatever, reason 22 they had a one day and did not run the other 23 two. This assures the opportunity to get all 24 of those monies out this year.

```
1
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes.
                                         I just don't
2
     know whether we mean to say you may not do it
3
     in Finger Lakes if you do it in Massachusetts.
 4
     The way you said it made it if they do it in
5
    Massachusetts they could not go out of state.
 6
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
                                        The request
7
     is as a contingency.
8
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is that what you
9
     are looking for, either one? It's an either/or
10
    proposition.
11
                MR. BROWN: We'd rather race in
12
    Massachusetts but if it doesn't go the three
13
     days -- We are planning running nine races,
14
     three each day at Suffolk Downs, but if for
15
     some reason they don't run the other days we'd
16
     like to be able to run them at Finger Lakes.
17
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. So, it's
18
     the way you put it.
                          Second?
19
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
                                       Second.
20
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any further
21
     discussion? All in favor, aye.
22
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH:
                                       Aye.
23
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
                                       Aye.
24
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
                                       Aye.
```

Page 82 1 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 3 have it unanimously. 4 DR. LIGHTBAUM: Thank you. 5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Seven minutes of 12, anything else anybody else, unanticipated 6 just to stall us until 12? Motion to adjourn? 7 8 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So moved. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor, aye. 10 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye. 11 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 13 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 14 15 (Meeting adjourned at 11:53 a.m.) 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

ATTACHMENTS:

2

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

- Massachusetts Gaming Commission August 20,
 2015 Notice of Meeting and Agenda
- 4 2. Massachusetts Gaming Commission August 6,
 5 2015 Meeting Minutes
- July 2, 2015 Letter from Fox Rothschild
 Regarding Infinity World Investments, LLC
 and Related Entities with attachment
 - 4. Massachusetts Gaming Commission August 17,
 2015 Memorandum Regarding Casino Monthly
 Statistical Report
 - 5. Executive Branch Public Records Policy and Commission Public Records Policy spreadsheet
 - Massachusetts Gaming Commission August 20,
 2015 Memorandum Regarding PPC Local Aid,
 Hiring and Purchasing
 - 7. Massachusetts Gaming Commission Division of Racing August 20, 2015 Memorandum Regarding Request for Consideration,
 Plainridge Racecourse Capital Improvement
 Trust Fund with attachments

23

Page 84 8. 1 August 5, 2015 Letter of Considine & 2 Furey, LLP Regarding Massachusetts 3 Thoroughbred Breeders Association, Inc. 4 5 **GUEST SPEAKERS:** 6 Steve O'Toole, Plainridge Racecourse 8 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION STAFF: 9 Bruce Band, Deputy Director IEB 10 Catherine Blue, General Counsel 11 Paul Connelly, Director of Licensing 12 Derek Lennon, CFAO 13 Dr. Alex Lightbaum, Interim Director Racing 14 Doug O'Donnell, Senior Financial Analyst 15 Karen Wells, Interim Executive Director/ 16 Director IEB 17 18 19 20 21 22 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
. 0	Administrative Office of the Trial Court
.1	Directive on Transcript Format.
2	I, Laurie J. Jordan, further certify I neither
13	am counsel for, related to, nor employed by any
L 4	of the parties to the action in which this
15	hearing was taken and further that I am not
L 6	financially nor otherwise interested in the
L 7	outcome of this action.
8_	Proceedings recorded by Verbatim means, and
9	transcript produced from computer.
20	WITNESS MY HAND this 21st day of August,
21	2015.
22	Elleri Jordan
23	LAURIE J. JORDAN My Commission expires:

Notary Public May 11, 2018