	Page 1
1	THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
2	MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION
3	PUBLIC MEETING #135
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	
20	September 25, 2014 10:30 a.m 3:00 p.m.
21	HYNES CONVENTION CENTER
22	900 Boylston Street, Room 200
23	Boston, Massachusetts
24	

PROCEEDINGS:

2

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Α.

1

3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I would like to 4 call to order the 135 meeting of the

5 | Massachusetts Gaming Commission in one of our

6 regular venues, the Hynes Convention Center in

7 | Boston at about 10:35. Commissioner Cameron

8 | will be here shortly. And we will go ahead and

9 | get started.

I do want to make one personal comment before we begin the rest of the meeting. I think I will read it. Before we begin I want to clarify my renewed status as a participating member of the Mass. Gaming Commission. As you know I have for the past several months recused myself from any and all deliberations on the license award for Region

That decision is now made. So, my recusal is completed. I have total confidence in the work that the four Commissioners did to arrive at that conclusion. And I look forward to working with them to implement that decision effectively.

I will remain recused from issues if 1 2 any arise pertaining to the land transaction in 3 Everett. And of course, we will remain alert 4 to any other residual matters arising from the 5 Region A decision. If issues do arise, they 6 will be considered by us on a case-by-case basis. So, I'm glad to be back. 7 8 We'll start out with the approval of 9 the minutes, item two, Commissioner McHugh. 10 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The minutes 11 are in the book, Mr. Chairman. And I would 12 move their acceptance as they appear there with 13 the usual reservation of rights to change and 14 fix typographical and other mechanical errors. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do I have a 16 second? 17 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second. 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any discussion? 19 All in favor, aye. 20 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: 21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 22 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 23 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes have it 24 four to zero. Next up is item three,

administration Executive Director Day. If we come up to anything -- Oh, here's Commissioner Cameron, so never mind. Executive Director Day.

MR. DAY: Good morning, Chairman
Crosby, Commissioners. As we begin this
morning, I have a couple of informational items
before move into the administrative topics.

The Commission's project monitoring regulation and guidelines are designed to insure our licensee's commitment like those particularly in the RFA-2 are tracked and continue to be part of the project.

However, as projects are actually developed changes are often reasonable. In order to accommodate these changes, we have a variance process which allows the licensee, Penn in this case, to ask for a variance when circumstances reasonably support a deviation from the commitment.

If the request is a minor change, I approve and notify the Commission. If the request is a major change, I would bring it back before the Commission. So far, I have

approved two variances for Penn, one of which
has been discussed by the Commission and allows

3 Penn to move the sports bar onto the casino

4 floor.

And a second removes a proposed video feed of the gaming floor to the Plainville Police Department. Video of a gaming floor is provided to the gaming agency by regulation. And in this matter, the Plainville chief has been contacted and has no objection to the change.

So, my long-winded purpose is to notify you that I've considered and approved two variances and to make sure you know what they are.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.

MR. DAY: I'd also like to note that our licensing division has received six gaming vendor primary applications at this point and 51 primary qualifiers that go with those applications. And there's of course other -- Our licensing division now has six gaming vendor primary applications and 51 primary qualifiers along with those the total fees at

1 this point to the Commission for processing is 2 121,300. Should also note as a way of future 3 work as things are moving forward the licensing 4 process is and our licensing team has been in 5 discussion with 10 other potential primary 6 applications. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: What was that 8

figure you just mentioned 123,000?

MR. DAY: 121,300 give or take.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Pages?

Dollars, licensing fee MR. DAY: dollars. That's two general sections of notes that I just wanted to make this morning. next two items Mr. Chairman and Commissioners that are on your agenda continues the Commission's process of developing a new policy structure and completing an independent review of our finance and administration's policies and practices.

First topic up will be Ed Burke is here again to report on our project, our highperformance project and request approval of 11 new policies.

And then secondly, Derek Lennon and

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

his financing division team will come forward with the independent review that the Commission requested of our financial policies. So, with that unless the Commission has questions of me, I am certainly to defer to Ed.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay, welcome.

MR. BURKE: Good morning, Chairman Crosby, Commissioners. It's a pleasure to be here again. I'm joined by Joan Kuhn who is our subject matter expert in matters to do with human resources.

This morning, we have 11 policies which are the final new policies that are being developed. If you recall, we had three categories. There were existing policies that were in the employee handbook. Those are in the process of being reformatted and annotated, updated for the new policy handbook.

There are existing state policies which we include by reference. But there were 30 or so new policies that we needed to develop from scratch. This is the last batch of those that we'll bring before you.

There is a presentation here which

1 we can go through very quickly. In your 2 packets you'll see the presentation. There's 3 also a checklist of all of the policies, kind 4 of a scorecard, if you will, of where we are. 5 The detailed policies themselves are both in 6 the appendix. I won't spend much time on the work 8 flow as we've already gone through it before. 9 Suffice it to say that there is a detailed 10 process that we go through before policies make 11 it to this level. Joan and I worked very 12 closely with Human Resources Manager Trupti Banda who is with us here and her assistant 13 14 Dean Ventola and the high-performance team, 15 which includes Commissioners Cameron and 16 Zuniga, Executive Director Day, General Counsel 17 Blue, Chief Finance and Accounting Officer 18 Lennon and Executive Assistant Dooley have also 19 been through all of these policies before we 20 bring them here. 21 So, without further ado, unless 22 there are questions, I think we can start going 23 through the policies themselves.

This meeting as a change in pace, we

actually have the policies that are in the presentation, which is the executive summary, in the same order as the policies that are in the detailed packet.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Nice, great.

MR. BURKE: So, hopefully that will assist your ability to follow along. The first one deals with voluntary termination. This basically codifies the steps to be taken when an employee in good standing decides to leave MGC for any reason.

It basically lays out their responsibilities and the steps that the Mass. Gaming Commission will take to complete the process.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I had a couple of quick questions on the voluntary termination policy. First of all -- Actually, it's only one. I take that back. There's a bullet in the policy statement page about notification of less than two or four weeks as appropriate may result in ineligibility for rehire. Why couldn't we just kind of narrow that down to two weeks?

1 MS. KUHN: We have two different 2 categories. We have managers who we are 3 requiring to give four weeks' notice. And then 4 all other rank and file giving two weeks' 5 notice. So, that's why this is split that way. 6 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Others on this 8 I just had a quick one. The bullet 9 point says pay at termination is at the sole discretion of the MGC. What does that mean? 10 11 MS. KUHN: Sometimes when somebody 12 gives their notice, you'd like them to leave 13 sooner rather than later. And you might choose 14 to give them two weeks in lieu -- to just move 15 along. 16 So, it's leaving it to the MGC to 17 decide would we like this person to leave and 18 by leaving now rather than the two weeks' 19 notice they gave, would we like to give two 20 weeks' pay. But it's your discretion. You 21 might say no, we'd like you to leave now. 22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Does everybody 23 else understand that's what that said? You've 24 talked about it.

1 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes, we had. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I would just 3 rewrite it so says that. I didn't know that's 4 what it meant. Severance as an alternative or 5 something rather just so that it is clear. MS. KUHN: 6 Okay. 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Go ahead. 8 MR. BURKE: Any other questions on 9 voluntary termination? Very good. The next 10 one is for internal transfer. This policy 11 deals with a variety of circumstances which may 12 arise in terms of an individual within the 13 Commission changing positions. One of the key 14 aspects of this is the intention that internal 15 promotions will be something that MGC 16 encourages. 17 In other words, we want to develop a 18 career path for individuals working here. Very 19 often the best candidate for a new position is 20 someone who is already on board with the Mass. 21 Gaming Commission. It also deals with lateral transfers 22 23 and occasionally demotions, which may occur for

a variety of reasons. So, this basically lays

out again the policies and procedures to be followed for those transfers.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I had one question on this policy. The employee needs to notify their manager within 30-day notice. And during that 30-day period they can be called upon to assist with onboarding and training of whoever their successor is.

As we've quickly found out, and maybe there's flexibility in the policy that bringing somebody on new and to our Commission staff never takes 30 days. But just giving our policies some flexibility for that person to be able to come back beyond that 30-day and help out with an employee's recruitment and onboarding orientation would be helpful.

I just don't want to see us limited to that 30-day window, because when you think of screening, hiring, recruiting, going through a background check, it never gets done in 30 days.

MR. BURKE: Okay. I think that's a good observation. The 30 days, there were multiple reasons for that. One of them was to

make sure that the manager of the person in their existing position was aware that this discussion was going on and they might be moving.

But you're right, the other aspect was to be looking at the onboarding process in terms of filling that recommendation. And I think that's a good addition.

MS. KUHN: I think actually it would be good in this case if the managers worked together, because they are new into a new department as well. So, you don't want them 50-50 of their time as they're kind of learning their new job.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: It was more for flexibility purposes and just realizing that 30-day window may not work.

MR. BURKE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: This is a broader comment than just this particular policy, but it applies to this one. We when we top out are going to be 150 people. We are all going to know each other's names, hopefully.

We're going to be an integrated. It's probably too much to hope that we'll know everybody's names all of the time because there'll be some turnover.

We are going to know the strengths and capabilities of a lot of the workers.

Things are going to open and they're going to change. It's conceivable to me that a couple of managers see in a particular employee a fit that isn't working particularly well in one place and a need in another place that given the skills that that person has would be a better fit for that person and for the organization.

And cabining things to the degree they're cabined in this policy and quite frankly in many others strikes me as probably necessary if you're five, six, 700 people, big, big organization. But I wonder if we are not creating a structure that is more rigid than we need it to be for the kind of organization that we are and look to become.

So, I just put that out there for a brief discussion. I know you've all given

careful thought to that but it struck me here
that the steps and the procedures and who
initiates what and how long is left and the
like really may not fit the kind of
organization at least I hope we become as we
move down the road.

MS. KUHN: I would suggest one

reason to have a policy even if you are a smaller organization is you always want to have the perception and the reality to your employees that you are being fair. And sometimes -- And I would agree that people see different things in people and say this might be a better fit. And I think there's ways around that.

This is looking more at I am looking at a job posting and I see something that I like. And I'd like to go forward with it. I think there's always going to be behind the scenes discussions between managers about this person is really smart in this area and not so good where they sit now. Can we talk about that.

I don't think this precludes that,

- but I think you do want to even in a small
 organization make sure that your processes seem
 fair.
- COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I don't disagree with that. I don't disagree with that. All right.
- 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Does anybody else 8 rise to that issue?
 - COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No. I think structure is a good thing. And I think people like to know how they go about that next step. And when the structure isn't there, people are left to think well I know how the person got the job.
 - And I know you weren't taking it to that extreme, Commissioner, but I think even at our level, a structure like this is helpful.
 - COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I do agree with Commissioner McHugh's point, which applies to this policy but permeates through others at a big picture level.
- I think as we now get into the
 additional focus of building the organization
 that's something that has been -- building the

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

regulatory framework is something that has been also in my mind. What is that balance and level? And what does the organization look like a year or two or in a steady-state?

So, I take your point. I don't know

So, I take your point. I don't know exactly what that means to this particular page, this one policy but it's something that's been on my mind. I still haven't wrapped my head around the 150 people just to put that note. By some measures, it seems like a lot but it may be the right number. I don't know. We'll figure that out.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think when you're a regional organization as well, which we will be, we will have offices in different parts of the state, the structure is important.

Because you can end up with a situation where something is being done in one part of the state one way and differently in another due to the individual manager who may prefer something else. I just have seen instances where (A) the lack of structure or those who don't follow it it can create a real problem in an organization.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: No. I hear
that. I understand that. And I appreciate
that. And you've certainly had experience with
a statewide organization that has managerial
levels at different levels. I take your point

And I'm going to bring up a couple of other instances in a minute as we proceed of examples of things without having an answer for the problem, just a hope and a thought.

We want this to be an organization that is fair. We want it to be an organization that is high-performing. That's why we are on this. But we also want it to be an organization that is really an attractive place to work. And those things go to make it an attractive place to work.

But there's sort of a personal touch, a true team sense that I think we need to cultivate and keep in mind that we want to cultivate as well. And it is sometimes the formality that embedded in process that can be off putting in that sense. So, as I say, I don't have any answers I just raise the issue.

and your experience.

1 | CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I am very

sympathetic to that perspective. In addition to being certainly fair and in addition to adhering to high-performance, best practice standards of an organization, we want to be able to be nimble. We want to be informal. We want to be flexible. And merging those two can be difficult.

Furthermore, when you set up a standard throughout this, not just this page but the entire set of personnel policies, once they're on paper you're supposed to adhere to them. And it's darn hard to adhere to them.

If you look at all of these steps that are supposed to be taken in writing and this that and the other thing, it's hard to do, which sets up its own set of problems, of issues and challenges.

I sort of felt like that ship has kind of sailed. We sort of made the commitment that we are going to adhere to what our bureaucratically respected best practices for a high-performance public management organization. And with that will come a

certain degree of formality and rigor and to certain extent bureaucracy that maybe some of us are less than perfectly comfortable with, but we've kind of decided that's the kind of organization we're going to be, and we're going to figure out.

We are this weird organization. We don't run this organization. We are the Commissioners. Rick runs the organization and his directors run the organization. And it puts a lot of pressure on our Executive Director and our directors to adopt management practices that implement all of this. And that's a challenge.

So, having said all of that, I'm sympathetic to the sort of visceral feeling about it, but I also think we've made a decision. And for the very most part, these are standard, respectable, important steps for high-quality organizations to take. So, let's go with it.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I don't think it's one or the other. I don't think because you have policies and procedures you can be

less than nimble, you can be bureaucratic, overly. I would like our policies to be 2 3 straightforward. That's why I think it's 4 important if someone doesn't understand it that we make sure it is clear. That's a really 5 6 important piece. They do not have to be overly 8 complicated. And I know that that is the case which is we've done a lot of work on less 9 10 complicated policies, pretty straightforward. 11 And I think the other piece we get 12 to here is leadership. We're looking at 13 directors who we want to be people friendly, 14 who we really want to implement these policies 15 in a way that people feel like they understand, 16 they have a fair opportunity. That there is 17 dialogue. 18 So, I think one doesn't exclude the 19 The most important piece -- The 20 structure is fine, but the people are the most 21 important piece. 22 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I think that's

ultimately the only solution. But I do think

we need to keep thinking about the larger

23

atmospheric issue as we go forward and as we implement these things going down the road, which I am not saying anything that everybody doesn't agree with. So, I'll just shut up and just go off.

MR. BURKE: I think it's a fair point. Echoing what Commissioner Cameron said, I think that's exactly the balance that we're trying to achieve. We've had a lot of very thoughtful discussions at the high-performance team level. A number of policies we've decided to defer, not to put in concrete because we want more flexibility.

Whenever you're dealing with a contract or a criminal law or any number of things where you're creating a structure, a legal structure for how you're working, it is by its nature kind of seems to be relatively inflexible, relatively cast in concrete. But in fact, we hope that these provide just a basis for how people act and that there is much more that goes on beyond that.

In terms of internal transfers, we would hope that there's regular ongoing

discussions among the management team so
they'll know if a person is looking at going to
another job. And they don't have to refer to
the policy to say we need 30 days' notice or
what have you.

We're going to be talking about performance evaluation in just a moment.

That's another one where if you're just as a manager looking at the letter of the law saying, okay, we're going to meet twice a year. And we're going to create these documents and put them in the file that doesn't make a person a good and effective leader.

There should be significant interaction beyond that hopefully daily. Two-way communication, how are things going, what do we need to work on? How are we connecting to the objectives of the organization? And that's a lot of the rest of this project, when we get into performance management and strategy development, will deal with, if you will, those aspects of leadership that help provide that balance.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Great.

1 MR. BURKE: The next one is 2 workplace privacy. Basically, the purpose of 3 this, it lays out a number of the key things in 4 terms of email and equipment and other things 5 that employees at the MGC will have access to 6 and be given access to by the Commission. And it basically establishes that there should not 8 be an expectation of privacy. 9 That this is a workplace. These are 10 our tools and office space, and what have you 11 that are being given to you in order to 12 accomplish your job, but it is not personal 13 property. It is not something -- email for 14 example where you have an expectation that 15 whatever is in there is private. 16 The first COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: 17 bullet says employees may only use MGC issued 18 keys and locks to secure MGC property. 19 it that's an aid of this no privacy concept. 20 MR. BURKE: Yes. 21 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: But suppose I 22 just wanted to lock up my lunch, couldn't I do 23 that? Do we really need that bullet, in other

24

words?

1 MS. KUHN: I would say that you do. 2 I would say that if you allow people to say you 3 wanted to lock up your lunch in the bottom 4 drawer of your desk and you brought in your own 5 key, and we were very concerned that there was 6 something in there beyond your lunch because of a variety of things that occurred over time 8 that you've made that yours. 9 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I understand 10 that. But this says may only use MGC issued 11 keys and locks to secure MGC -- I see. I could 12 lock up my lunch with an MGC key. 13 MS. KUHN: Absolutely. 14 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. 15 MS. KUHN: And lunches have 16 disappeared. So, it's probably a good idea. 17 MR. BURKE: There's usually a 18 positive reason for this too. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I understand. 19 20 MR. BURKE: Would a wording change 21 make it clear? 22 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I just suggest 23 you think about the wording of that. 24 I read it as you could only use MGC locks and

1 keys to secure MGC property. You couldn't 2 secure your personal property with an MGC key 3 in an MGC facility. Okay. 4 MR. BURKE: We can work on that. Τ 5 think the best example would be putting a lock 6 on a file cabinet and somebody else needs to get into the file cabinet. 7 8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Maybe we just need to delete the second MGC in the sentence. 9 10 MR. BURKE: Okay. 11 That's a good idea. MS. KUHN: 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good get. 13 MR. BURKE: That works. Other 14 questions? Okay. The next one is 15 compensation. This policy lays out a whole 16 series of specific codicils based on different 17 aspects of compensation. 18 It connects to the Equal Pay Act and 19 other federal and state statutes as it relates 20 to compensation and essentially just kind of 21 lays out where to go if there are any issues or 22 complaints. There are contact points below. 23 Essentially, just makes it clear to employees

24

how this will work.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. 2 MR. BURKE: Similarly, the next one 3 is on pay practices. This gets into some of 4 the specifics in terms of exempt and nonexempt 5 employees. It refers to the Family Medical 6 Leave Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act and other state and federal guidelines that must be 8 adhered to as part of pay practices. And it 9 deals with vacation, personal days, sick time 10 and things like that. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Commissioners? 12 These are just details, but the nonexempt 13 employees refers to 40 hours a week. Is that 14 meant to be 37.5? 15 MS. KUHN: It is 37.5. That is 16 their work week. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Under nonexempt in 18 my version it's 40. MR. BURKE: Is that for calculation 19 20 of overtime? 21 MS. KUHN: It is. You don't 22 actually go into overtime until after your 40. 23 So, if you stayed through 39 hours, you'd be 24 still be paid straight time.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You don't get any 2 overtime for your first two and a half hours of 3 overtime? 4 MS. KUHN: No. You can. That would 5 be a decision you could make. But the law only 6 says it's at 40 that it kicks in. 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The FLSA is 40 8 9 That's the point of that. So, the 10 statutory mandate cuts in at 40 hours. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. 12 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: We could cut it in at 37.5 if we wanted. 13 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The other one is 15 as long as we're going to do this, we should 16 just make sure this is right. But I don't 17 think -- It says normal business hours 8:45 to 18 5:00. That's nine hours and 15 minutes. 19 it says you have a 45-minute nonpaid lunch 20 break. That would take you down to 7.5 hours. 21 Is 7.5 right? Is that the right daily? Okay. Scratch that. Next. 22 23 MS. KUHN: We are onto performance 24 evaluation.

MR. BURKE: Performance evaluation, this policy basically I was using this as an example a moment ago. This lays out kind of the minimum expectations required for performance counseling for managers to their direct reports. It lays out the timing when evaluations are due. It includes a self-evaluation process for all individuals in the organization.

This is one in particular where as we get into the performance management aspects of the project, we will be building a structure on top of this as a way of cascading the overall goals and metrics of the organization down to the individual level, which we found to have very positive benefits from a teambuilding and a motivation standpoint around the state.

People like to know this is the key thing that they should be accomplished and this is how we're going to measured it. And this is how it ties in with the overall goals of the Commission.

But for our purposes, this lays out the policy in terms of kind of the foundation

2.2

for what our eventual performance process will be.

Any questions? No. Okay. The next one is harassment free workplace. This basically lays out what the policy will be regarding any type of harassment for any number of reasons, which are delineated here in terms of specific protective status.

Again, this ties to a number of federal and state guidelines and puts MGC into compliance with those.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.

MR. BURKE: Questions? Similarly, workplace bullying. Basically, just sets out an expectation that bullying will not be tolerated within the Mass. Gaming Commission. It provides definitions in terms of what constitutes bullying and lays out a procedure in terms of reporting and dealing with incidents that should arise -- should they arise.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is one of the policies that puts an affirmative duty on people to do things that they may not know

1 | they're really supposed to do.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Where your first bullet point says employees are the subject of bullying, that's one thing. Witness workplace bullying or view actions that may lead must bring their concerns to their manager.

I assume that's the right word because you've thought that through but I think there's a training element here. Again, this a place where we're setting up a standard that we are all expected to adhere to and is not necessarily intuitive or common practice or experiential that it be done.

So, things like this that create affirmative duties on people need to be in a training program but quick once these things are adopted.

MR. BURKE: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.

MR. BURKE: Other questions? Okay.

21 The next one is a violence free workplace.

22 | Again, this lays out the policies for MGC with

23 respect to that. It reflects the Mass.

24 | Executive Order 442, which requires all state

1 agencies to have in place a violence-free 2 workplace policy. It creates definitions of what is 3 4 considered workplace violence and the 5 procedures for dealing with any cases that should arise. 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. 8 MR. BURKE: Workplace relationships. 9 This deals with dating in the workplace, lays 10 out the policy at the Mass. Gaming Commission in terms of how this works. 11 12 In some organizations, dating is 13 prohibited. That is not the case here. This 14 basically lays out the expectations for 15 appropriate conduct, and how to deal with 16 instances where you have a supervisory 17 relationship, for example, where there might be 18 an issue with an ongoing relationship. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Why isn't it 19 20 prohibited here? 21 MS. KUHN: Excuse me? 22 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Why isn't it 23 prohibited here? There was a policy choice. 24 MS. KUHN: There is a policy choice.

1 The choice was to go in this direction.

2 MR. BURKE: I guess I would leave 3 that to Executive Director Day maybe or one of 4 the Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I think what's important here -- I think we've all been in the workplace enough to know that this occurs.

What's important here is the supervisory position in the workplace. For example, if you had let's say a gaming agent in one location dating a gaming agent in another location there's no supervisory issue. Frankly, there is no issue as far as I'm concerned.

When it becomes an issue is in a supervisory position. And that's the immediate report piece here. From my perspective anyway, it would be a situation where we kind of quietly just move one of those folks so that there is not a reporting supervisory piece there.

So, I think that's how most organizations handle this matter that I'm aware of.

2.1

MS. KUHN: I think the other thing is even if it's coworkers who are dating that's perfectly fine. And it's a performances issue if they bring their squabbles into the workplace. So, it does kind of address that.

That's where a lot of people meet their partners is in the workplace. So, I think saying prohibited is a little more draconian than I would suggest. If you're doing that you're actually going to end up potentially losing some good employees if it's uncovered.

MR. DAY: I think the idea is kind of summarized in the first bullet which says employees are expected to conduct themselves in an appropriate workplace manner while on MGC property that does not interfere with their coworker's ability to perform their duties.

I think what we had was a little discussion about the concept of how far we go interjecting ourselves into situations with employees. In this case, if we are talking about -- I have seen it both ways. There is no question. I've seen agencies which prohibit

1 it, agencies which have a policy more similar 2 to this. 3 And from a practical basis, I think 4 this framework allows us to apply it more clearly than it does in the other situations. 5 6 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I get that. 7 What about a flat prohibition on 8 superior/subordinate dating relationships? 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's all we're 10 talking about. 11 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: No, I was 12 talking about something broader. 13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, you were 14 talking about something broader. I'm sorry. 15 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I get it. But 16 the fourth bullet says if we have a 17 superior/subordinate dating relationship, then 18 we'll try and work it out. Again, there's a 19 policy choice there. 20 Why not a statement that 21 superior/subordinate dating relationships are 22 not permissible. And if they arise, we'll try 23 and work it out, but at least create the 24 expectation that they're not permissible.

1 That's where the greatest danger both to the --2 I'm not saying anything anybody doesn't know. 3 That's where the greatest danger lies for a 4 whole host of standpoints including morale. 5 MR. BURKE: Agreed. I think this 6 policy basically establishes that where there is a supervisory relationship, it is not 8 acceptable. And some adjustments need to be 9 made in terms of reporting relationships or 10 where they are in the organization including 11 perhaps one of them leaving the organization. 12 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: If that's a 13 given, then should the fourth bullet say that 14 in straightforward fashion and then go on to 15 say the rest of the stuff. So, that there is 16 not an expectation that there are exceptions to 17 a no subordinate/superior dating relationship 18 rule? 19 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Are you 20 saying that it's prohibited or if it occurs it 21 must be reported immediately and then there will be a change in the situation where one 22 23 does not report to the other?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH:

Well,

certainly the latter, but it seems to me that needs to be -- It seems to me -- I don't want to get into the detail. You know this better than I.

But it seems to me that if we're agreed that that dating relationship in a hierarchical sense is not going to be permitted in the organization, we ought to say that in some way, shape or form in that bullet so that there is not an expectation that it'll work in some circumstances. It won't work in other circumstances. If it happens, we'll get around and we'll think about it. And we'll figure out what to do about it. I guess that's my point.

MS. KUHN: I can take another stab at kind of rewriting that to capture your point.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay, if my colleagues agree.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's a policy change, right -- what you're talking about?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No. I think it's clarifying something that I think was

meant to be addressed here. Perhaps we didn't

1 | capture it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, you see it as the same?

MS. KUHN: Yes. I don't see this as particularly different. I see where you'd like it a little more concrete.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I would just like it more concrete so we don't set up a false expectation that this can happen and then hurt and anger and mistrust when we don't work out a policy that allows the workplace and personal relationship to coexist.

MR. BURKE: That's fine. I would make two points here. One, in many of the policies we are dealing with we are applying federal and state laws, executive orders and things like that.

This is a case where it's management prerogative. It is really up to you which way you want to, you and the management at MGC as a whole, which way you want to go with this.

I guess the second point I would make, my observation would be in cases where it's prohibited in organizations where

1 workplace relationships are prohibited they 2 still happen. And it creates all sorts of 3 issues. 4 In this case, I think I'd prefer having kind of a sunshine law saying okay, we 5 6 know it's going to happen. If it happens, it's fine as long as it stays out of the workplace. 8 It doesn't impact how you're acting here. 9 it is inappropriate in a supervisory 10 relationship. 11 And I think what you're asking for 12 is to strengthen that wording and I'm sure we 13 can do that. 14 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Just so people 15 have a clear expectation that that will --16 there will be a change in that reporting 17 structure. There is no we think it's okay 18 here, we don't think it's okay here. 19 MR. BURKE: We're not going to have 20 a wait-and-see. 21 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Correct. Ιt 22 is there will be a change in the reporting 23 relationship. It's unacceptable for a 24 subordinate and a manager to be in a

relationship and have that structure continue
as far as that reporting.

MR. DAY: I think that's clear. I
starts off with a direction that the

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I agree this clarification is good. It might be better if you make the language clear but nonpunitive because as you said it happens. It happens. And we don't want to scare people into not

relationship is prohibited and go from there.

going along with the second part, which is all right, if it happens we'll talk about it and fix it.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Rather than say it's prohibited, if it occurs it has to be reported immediately. And everyone knows that there will be a change. It doesn't mean it has to happen publicly, by the way, but there will be a change in that reporting relationship if that can be accommodated, by the way, if it's a unique situation.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The change might be somebody leaves. That's a change.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Correct,

either someone leaves or someone is

transferred. Clearly though everyone will know
that what is unacceptable is to continue on in
that reporting relationship with the
subordinate.

MR. DAY: That seems to be the problem that might be unclear, because the last sentence does take care of that. If a reasonable solution cannot be agreed upon by HR and the manager or the director and so forth, may elect to transfer or terminate the manager or employee solely depending on the business needs of MGC.

That basically puts that decision in the hands of the agency saying it's just not going to work. You need to make these changes. I think the problem is it doesn't really firmly say that the practice itself is not acceptable or however we want to say it.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I don't know that we want to say that because then we're encouraging people to hide and not report. In fact, what I would hope to happen is if something like that starts to happen, okay, we

1 know the rules. We can't be in this. I can't 2 continue to be your boss kind of a thing. 3 everybody knows that. And right away that 4 issue gets handled. If you say it's 5 prohibited, I think you force that underground. 6 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I agree. It's 7 not prohibited. It just is going to result in 8 a change, and everybody needs to know that a 9 change is going to occur. And that needs to be 10 said straightforwardly so that conversation can 11 occur. 12 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes. 13 MR. BURKE: Okay. 14 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Between the 15 pair. 16 MS. KUHN: I will give it a new 17 rewrite. 18 MR. BURKE: Good. 19 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Next. 20 MR. BURKE: The last one is weapons 21 free workplace. Again, this deals with 22 bringing weapons into any MGC facility. 23 lays out exceptions to that rule, which would 24 be law enforcement, others who are licensed and

Page 43 1 approved by MGC to carry firearms. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Great. Do 3 we need to vote? COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think we 4 5 have in the past. 6 MR. DAY: Yes, we have. 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Commissioner 8 Cameron? 9 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I move that 10 we accept all of the 11 workplace policies just detailed. 11 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: As detailed. 13 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: As detailed, 14 yes. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? 16 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: As amended. 17 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Correct with 18 the amendments. 19 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? 20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Sure, second. 21 And may I say that some of these although we 22 are adopting them as new policies they were 23 statements in the prior employee manual. What 24 we've done in a couple of policies here is

```
1
     really codified and structured them. Some are
 2
     entirely new as discussed here. But others
 3
     were statements that we already had in place
 4
     like the expectation of privacy for example or
5
     the no expectation of privacy.
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any further
 6
 7
     discussion? All in favor, aye.
8
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH:
                                      Aye.
9
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
                                       Aye.
10
                COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
                                      Aye.
                COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
11
                                        Aye.
12
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes
13
    have it unanimously. Thank you, very much.
    Director Day?
14
15
                MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman that gets us
16
     to CFAO Derek Lennon and the financial policy
17
     reports.
18
                MR. LENNON:
                             Good morning, Mr.
19
     Chairman and Commissioners.
20
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good morning.
21
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning.
22
                MR. LENNON: Good to see you again.
23
     The pleasure today of being joined by members
24
     of the MGC finance and administration office as
```

well as two gentlemen from the Kahn, Litwin and Renza, KLR, public accounting and auditing firm. I'd like to do formal introductions.

We have the bios of the KLR team up on the screen. Henry Silva is the director of KLR's emerging business group who is directly to my right. And then we have Michael Medeiros who is an audit supervisor and basically headed up this engagement. He was in with us quite frequently on MGC property going through our records, going through our policies.

And then from MGC we have Trupti
Banda, our HR Director, Dean Ventola our HR
Business Manager, Maria Bottari, our Revenue
Manager, Agnes Beaulieu out Budget and accounts
Payable Manager and JoAnn Shea, our Finance
Specialist.

The KLR and MGC members here put in a great deal of time to review our current processes as well as provide information to the team to develop this work product.

And I also wanted to take this opportunity to reintroduce you or to recognize the MGC A and F team. They are the group that

1 keeps our day-to-day operations, our back-2 office running. You hardly ever see them 3 unless there is a problem. I just wanted to 4 recognize them and let you see the team again. 5 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And that's why 6 we almost never see them. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Because we never 8 have problems, right. 9 Just quickly, and I'll MR. LENNON: 10 turn it over to the KLR team, you asked us to 11 do an independent review of our finance 12 processes, see how we're doing, our policies. 13 We identified early on that while we have years 14 of finance experience, being thrown into the 15 mix so quickly, our group a lot of it wasn't written down and documented. 16 17 So, what we did was we went out and 18 solicited quotes from a statewide contract. 19 The contract number is PRF56. It's a contract 20 for security compliance and audits as well as 21 PCIR that's payment card industry standard 22 auditing. 23 We were looking for a firm to review

the current finance internal systems and

operations, policies and processes. And we were looking for compliance with the state comptroller's financial and security policies as well as state finance law. The areas we asked to be looked at were contracting and contract processing, revenue receipt and reconciliations, invoice receipt and payments, budgetary controls, payroll and personnel processing, securing personal data and compliance with PCI standards since we're going to have a licensing system that will be accepting credit card payments.

We're looking for the successful bidder to draft our policies and processes where they weren't written down. And make recommendations for improvements to our current processes where they saw risks.

Compass ITC was the firm selected. They're on the statewide contract. And they brought in KLR, a public accounting firm, as a subcontractor to look at the five areas that are going to be in front of you today, the security standards and securing personal data will come back with our CIO John Glennon at a

2.1

1 | later date.

Today, they're going to go over our contracting, our revenue, our invoice, our budgeting and our payroll processes. So, with that I'll turn it over to Henry Silva.

MR. SILVA: Good morning, Chairman Crosby and fellow Commissioners. Thank you very much for the opportunity to present to you this morning.

Just by way of background, I'm a shareholder at the firm of Kahn, Litwin, Renza. It's a 200 plus person firm based in Providence, Rhode Island with offices in Boston, Waltham, Cambridge and also Newport, Rhode Island. We have extensive experience with gaming having done significant work with establishments in Rhode Island and in Connecticut.

I've been with the firm for a number of years, and I have 25 plus years of experience in the area of internal control, systems development, design and evaluation.

Our firm was retained to perform a review of the current finance, internal systems

and operations for compliance with the Office
of the State Comptroller financial and security
policies as well as a review of the MGC's
financial policies and processes for
conformance with the annual internal control
questionnaire issued by the Office of the State
Comptroller.

We performed this assessment of the current policy, systems and processes in use and then made certain recommendations to the MGC team for stronger policies and systems where we felt were warranted.

Following this assessment, we recommended additional systems and helped them develop policies and processes working with the financial staff at MGC to mitigate any weaknesses or vulnerabilities that we identified during our assessment.

These policies, processes and systems were developed and recommended were based on best practices and industry standards. I believe you all have a copy of our report and were able to review that in advance of this meeting.

At this point, I'm going to turn it over to Mike Medeiros who is a supervisor at the firm who headlined the project under my direct supervision and direction.

MR. MEDEIROS: Good morning,

Commissioners. I guess I'll just give a brief

overview of what we did and the processes and

procedures.

As Derek alluded to there were five main areas we focused on as recommended by MGC. So, one, area one was contracting and contract processing. Area number two was revenue receipt and reconciliations. Area number three was invoice receipt and payments. Area number four budgetary controls, and area number five payroll and personnel.

So, with those five areas listed, we performed basically six procedures on each area. For each area we first, procedure number one, discussed the appropriate MGC personnel, the current process in place as the date of our work performed. Procedure number two, we performed a walk-through of the process to gain a further understanding.

Procedure number three we wrote a 1 2 detailed narrative of the current process and 3 internal controls. Procedure number four, we 4 provided a draft of the detailed narrative to MGC for review and comments. 5 Procedure number 6 five, we compared the current policies with the requirements of the Comptroller of the 8 Commonwealth. And procedure number six, we 9 informed MGC of any items that do not meet the 10 requirements of the Comptroller of the 11 Commonwealth and any other internal controls 12 identified that should be improved. 13

So, I'm going I guess a little more in-depth through the six procedures. The first one we discussed with the appropriate personnel, the current process in place as the date of field work. So, how we basically started is we actually had, I guess, a kickoff meeting you could say, going over the overall accounting system and kind of a high-level approach of the people involved, the processes in place. And that was performed with the CFAO himself and the finance managers.

Then once we had that meeting, we

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

came back to our office. We went through, compiled the policies that we did have from the state and had a better understanding of where to attack. Then we came back and we actually met separately with members of each area to develop an understanding.

So, for each area, the people we spoke with most, keep in mind that we spoke with a variety of people, but these were leads on certain areas. For the first area contracting and contract processing we met primarily with Agnes, the financial manager on the AP side, Derek, the CFAO and Maria, the finance manager on the receivable side.

For the revenue receipt and reconciliation process, we met primarily with the finance manager on the receivable side and members of the licensing department. And that was the licensing supervisor and the licensing specialist.

As far as invoice receipt and payments, the two people we spoke with most there were the finance manager on the AP side and the CFAO as well. Then as far as budgetary

controls, it was primarily the CFAO and the finance manager on the AP side again. And last but not lease, our fifth area was payroll and personnel. And that was primarily with the HR Manager.

So, our second step once we actually understood the document, the controls and discussed with them, we performed a walk-through of the process to gain a further understanding.

So, what a walk-through is in nonaccounting terms is it's if someone says doing
good control, we actually go through and follow
the control through their paperwork or their
steps or signatures or whatever is needed to
make sure what is being said is actually being
done. So, we did that for most of the key
controls throughout the process.

So, third step, the third procedure we performed once we discussed with them, went did our walk-throughs and then had ongoing conversations with them, we ended putting together a detailed narrative of the current process and internal controls.

Once we had that compiled, we gave our first draft to MGC for review and comments. We met with the staff. We went over it. We had another meeting of many to go over any differences we might have had and any recommendations and from there.

After that they gave us back the draft. We went back and forth a couple of times. Then we had a final draft to work with.

And this brings us to our fifth procedure, which is compare the current policies with the requirements of the Comptroller of the Commonwealth. So, we went through and found every resource we could basically find.

I'll give you the most ones we used most frequently. The majority of which are off mass.gov website or the Mass. Gaming's website.

So, some of the policies we looked at are the Office of the Comptroller Internal Control Guide, which is available on the mass.gov website, the annual internal control questionnaire from the State Comptroller, the most recent policies issued by the Office of

1 the Comptroller.

And those are all online on the mass.gov website in the guidance section. And then one of the those policies, some of the most important ones we looked at were expenditure classification handbook. There was as well the state finance law and general requirements, which is issued by the Comptroller's Office and the OSD, Operational Services Division.

Then you had a number of policies, the acquisition policy, (INAUDIBLE) policy, cash reconciliation policy and so on.

Obviously, we used the Mass. Gaming Commission website.

And then another useful tool we found was the National Association of State Comptroller's, NASC, internal control self-assessment tools. So, this is a number of checklists which are basically used to assist in determining whether the proper controls are in place for various business processes which should be evaluated for application under unique circumstances.

This was very important because this kind of had a checklist of what we were looking for. Keep in mind this was made for organizations of varying sizes. Obviously, MGC is a growing organization so we kind of looked at it at the high-level approach.

And also compared with clients that Henry alluded that we have seen before. Of course, typical from our experience we used industry standard and best practices of what could be implemented or recommended.

As far as the five areas, as you can see on the slide here, we did put together for each area we had our own little narrative like this. Overall, throughout the whole process MGC was well aware, understood the weaknesses that we discussed.

And also they're well aware of the need to improve. And obviously, it's a growing organization and there is increased activity happening over time. Even throughout this process that we went through, there were moving pieces. As you can see earlier, the payroll side everything is a work in process. So, we

1 | did keep that in mind.

and things pile up.

A big thing in accounting were the

segregation of duties. And that can always be

improved. And that basically is having

different people involved in the process to

kind of spread the risk, you could say.

Initially, it wasn't limited but the plan is to

grow into it and improve controls over time and

of course through resources and as activities

As far as each area, I guess, I could go through it briefly some of the high-level recommendations we had which are primarily based off of the NASC internal control checklist they had.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Excuse me. We've all read it. So, the things that any of you think were really, really significant that need to be brought out in a public meeting like this that's what you should focus on just to make sure we keep moving.

MR. MEDEIROS: I'll give an example, just to keep it moving as a recommendation.

Obviously, feel free to ask questions.

Basically, they're all surrounded around segregation of duties.

The first one I can look at right here was responsibility for services and fees should be segregated from those from collections and accounting. Currently, the receivables manager was overseeing all of this.

Of course, we sat down and they had an appropriate response. So, for each recommendation we had, we discussed a response and a way to strengthen it with the team. His response in this case was the area manager will generate the invoices and the CFAO will electronically approve the invoices in MMARS on a weekly basis.

On a monthly basis the receivables manager will generate an accounts receivable report for all activity that occurred in the prior month. That will be signed off by both the CFO and the Commission Treasurer.

So, I guess the point I'm trying to get at is that we had the recommendations and there was a process in place and responses to go through.

mentioned that most of the issues were in the area of segregating functions. Where you identified issues, which I gather you did and you worked them out, was it typically just because this is a very small new organization and you don't have enough people to segregate or was there anything chronic or systematic in misthinking it? Or was it merely being a small new organization?

MR. SILVA: Let me just address that. Absolutely. Given the fact that the organization is new with limited number of resources in terms of personnel, you're going to typically have situations where there are appropriate segregation of duties that we would like in the accounting world. And given that we worked very closely with the team to develop procedures that would mitigate that risk given the size of the organization.

So, we were very, very comfortable at the meeting with them and the proposed corrections to those issues, very comfortable with that.

1 MR. MEDEIROS: Going further with 2 that, inherent in the state department there 3 are a lot of checks and balance in place 4 already with the accounting system and the 5 contract procurement system. Even though there 6 were limited staff as we said in the beginning, 7 it's growing. There were checks and balances 8 throughout inherent in the system they used. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Okay, 10 good. I don't think we need to go through each 11 one of those. The way you've characterized 12 that I think it's perfectly understandable and 13 we're totally comfortable with that. Anything 14 else that was significant in any way, 15 recurring? 16 MR. SILVA: I would say nothing 17 other than the segregation of duties that you 18 just referred to, Chairman. 19 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay, great. 20 MR. LENNON: And just to expand on 21 that the main area was in the accounts 22 receivable. So, on the revenues side we have 23 Maria and we have Maria. 24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Maria and Maria,

1 that's great.

MR. LENNON: So, that is one of the areas. The only hire I think we have scheduled for this year in the finance unit coming in January is another revenue accountant in anticipation of slots revenue coming in -- revenue coming in from the slots parlor.

But that still doesn't segregate all of the issues. In a good practice, but we should have someone separate taking in the cash, filling out the deposit slip, actually making the deposit and then someone reconciling it. Now you're going to grow my team by four or five to do that.

So, we've had to come up with some workarounds. We've actually put some recommendations in there where Enrique would sign off. We put some recommendations in there where there would be a separate report that I could run that would take those so I'm not relying on the staff's information.

So, it was creative. I want to thank the team. They worked with us rather just saying no, you have to do it this way.

They came up with some creative solutions that would mitigate these risks.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I say something to that effect because this overall effort actually has been on my mind since I first had to answer the internal control questionnaire for the Office of the Comptroller.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Because then it wasn't just Maria and Maria, it was Enrique and Enrique.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: In that questionnaire, by the way, every time you answered no, there's about 100 or so questions. There's a big area of opportunity for the finance department, I may say.

And we had a bunch of no's back then. We would still have a few of those but they have been really addressed over the course of these two year short evolution that we've had.

Also, some of the policies that were mentioned here or some of the points that were

part of the report, which I think is great by
the way and I want to thank you, there also had
to be a critical mass in the operations to
merit some of the dual controls or segregation
of duties for example.

We are only beginning to really collect licensing fees in terms of from individuals and vendors. And there's a ramp-up period. We will ramp up significantly where a lot of these risks and controls are that more important.

So, I think I'm very glad with the balance we've struck in terms of doing an effort like this one at this point that not only checks and looks at what we've done, but also sets us up in a good framework to move forward.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. Anybody else? Thank you very much. It was great.

Let me just talk about the schedule here a little bit. We are as usual are running a little bit behind. And we have a lot of stuff to talk about in the Racing Division, and we have a lot of stuff to talk about in the

problem gambling. I don't want to rush either of those.

But we also have some guests who have an airplane to make. So, can we finish up your items, you've got two more. Then move the Ombudsman's report to the next topic so that we'll do the MGM? And we can do that before lunch. Does that work?

MR. ZIEMBA: Do you want to have the thoroughbred discussion prior to the MGM report? I think there might be a little bit of flexibility.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It would have to be after lunch then. We could do race horse next. That was the idea, doing Racing Division next but then we would probably take a lunch break and have MGM after that.

MS. REILLY: That's okay. There was an adjustment in flights.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, all right.

21 | Fine. I didn't know that.

MR. DAY: And Mr. Chairman, the two

23 | items left here should be --

24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes, I know. So,

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- 1 | we'll finish up administration. And then we'll
- 2 go to Racing Division and then we'll take a
- 3 | lunch break. Then we'll do Ombudsman Ziemba.
- 4 | Great.
- 5 MR. DAY: I think we're ready. Mike
- 6 | and Elaine? Our next item is to talk about the
- 7 links to the job information on our website.
- 8 | Here's Elaine and Mike.
- 9 MS. DRISCOLL: Hello Commissioners.
- 10 We'll be very brief. This is quick.
- 11 Essentially, we've been asked to make sure that
- 12 the Mass. Gaming website is appropriately
- 13 | evolving with the process itself.
- 14 So in other words, just making sure
- 15 that all of the links and also the homepage is
- 16 keeping up with where we are in terms of the
- 17 priorities in terms of what the current status
- 18 is.
- 19 So, basically what we're doing right
- 20 | now is we're in the process of slightly
- 21 reorganizing the homepage to include what our
- 22 priorities are right now, which would be
- 23 | highlighting the casino jobs that are already
- 24 coming online, which you'll hear about more

from Jill in a little bit, but in terms of what's currently available with Plainridge.

And then also highlighting in a very prominent place where we will have the ability soon for those that are seeking an employment license to conveniently apply for that online. The idea being that when individuals go to the Mass. Gaming website, they're not going to have to search for where in fact they can look to do that.

We just want to make sure that those two issues are getting prominent real estate on the homepage so that it's really easy for people that are looking to either (1) find out what's currently available for casino jobs and/or (2) be able to soon apply for licenses online.

So, I actually have our web developer just working on some markup designs for that which I'll probably have next week. But that's a really easy fix actually. And in the meantime, Mike has created a page that will easily again take individuals to that information. So, he's just going to show you

where those links currently are. Like I said,
we'll just be very brief.

MR. SANGALANG: Sure.

Commissioners, good morning. You have in your packet and up on the screen here a draft page that we hope to launch very soon, which is intended to be one-stop shopping for anyone looking for either employment or a vendor opportunity in the new expanded gaming industry.

We start off with three bullet points detailing the major bullet points that you need to know if this pertains to you. One comes from our mission statement. The Massachusetts Gaming Commission is committed to providing the greatest possible economic development benefits and revenues to the people of the Commonwealth. To that end, Mass. Gaming will provide information relative to employment and vendor opportunities at our licensees.

The second bullet point details the emphasis of the Expanded Gaming Act on economic development and job creation. And the third bullet point is a reminder to anyone coming to

this page that they need to be either registered or licensed.

And we will have a link to the licensing management system once that is up and running through mass.gaming.gov. And what we can get on the page as soon as it launches are the new opportunities at Plainridge Park Casino that have now been posted. Amy, if you could just scroll down a little bit.

They have set up a new careers page through their career center. That's for people seeking employment. We are also linking to their existing vendor opportunities page. And I believe Jill was going to walk us through the new Plainridge career center page.

MS. GRIFFIN: So, currently we do have a link to the Plainridge Park Casino careers page. It exists under the Workforce, Supplier and Diversity Development page that we have. But the changes that Elaine and Mike outlined are great, because it will make it far easier for folks to access these opportunities.

So, it's really exciting I think because these are the first opportunities for

1 expanded gaming. And Penn National has listed 2 most of the jobs up there. As you know, there 3 will be 500 new permanent employees. And if 4 you click from accounting, finance, IT and then if you click on another link to food and 6 beverage that's a really big area, marketing.

What's really exciting is that coinciding, these are the actual job descriptions, but coinciding with this website launch they also launched a new career center in Plainville on Monday. They've had great outreach to the local community. This morning I learned from Penn National that they have 755 applications for these jobs submitted already. So, this is the first week. There is a great interest in these jobs.

page come from the homepage? That page you just showed us what is the homepage link? That is what our MR. SANGALANG: web developer is working on now. It's going to be I believe a button at the bottom of the page.

> Not necessarily at MS. DRISCOLL:

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Where does our

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the bottom. So, essentially right now you can get to it through a jobs page and also the Work Development page, which I think we just tried to put it anywhere where people's commonsense would likely take them to look for it.

So, those will remain. Then we also have that I want to button on the homepage.

So, we'll be sure that it's there. We'll be sure that you can get to it through FAQs. So, everywhere that people would logically think to look for it, you'll be able to get to it.

However, like I said once the web designers are in the process of just creating the graphics and whatnot and just moving some real estate around on the front page, so that within the next week and a half or so when you go to massgaming.com you will very prominently be able to just click on a button that will take you right to this page.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. That's what I was getting at. That's great. This is wonderful. This is exactly what I think we had in mind, but getting to it is crucial. So, as long as it's prominent on the homepage that's

Page 71 1 great. 2 MS. DRISCOLL: It will be. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great, thank you. 4 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Looks good. 5 Thank you. 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: How's the kid? 7 MS. DRISCOLL: Good. 8 MS. GRIFFIN: Commissioners, I am 9 joined by Lance George, the PE and general 10 manager of Plainridge Park Casino. John Rauen, 11 Vice President of Development at Penn National, 12 and Emil Giordano, project executive from Turner Construction. Allison Stanton of Turner 13 14 Construction is also here. And I'd like to 15 welcome her back from her maternity leave. 16 MS. RAUEN: So would we, Jill. 17 Definitely an improvement to Emil. 18 MS. GRIFFIN: As a requirement of 19 their Category 2 gaming license, Penn National 20 and their general contractor Turner 21 Construction worked together to submit 22 diversity plans for the design and construction 23 phase of their casino. 24 And as required, they set up some

diversity goals for the construction workforce and for supplier diversity. And you had asked recently for an update regarding their progress.

So, this slide that's up here now -Actually, I think there should be one that's
before this. That's right workforce diversity.
If you look at this slide, this references the
construction workforce.

And it gives you monthly picture of the diversity and their goals for minority, women and veterans. On the right-hand side, you notice that their minority workforce goal is 16 percent. Their women's goal is seven percent and the veteran's goal they did not set a numeric goal but said that they would work hard on hiring veterans.

So, you'll see that the numbers month-to-month they make significant progress. The cumulative numbers on the right-hand side of the bar on the far right are the most interesting to look at. 15.81 percent as of August 31, so they're so close to meeting their minority workforce goal, 4.16 percent women and

1 5.89 percent veterans even with no goal. So, that's the workforce. 2

And Penn National actually requested to come here because they have some good news even after this slide, but I'll let them share their good news after we go through some of these.

So, the next slide, please. this slide refers to the supplier diversity during design and construction. The light blue refers to their minority business enterprise. So, 20 percent of the contracts went to MBEs that's \$7.4 million. And six percent of the contracts went to women business enterprises for \$2.1 million.

And try as they might, the veterans business enterprise was the real challenge here. So, the total construction contracts equaled \$37.4 million. Next slide.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's the total that were awarded through August 31? MS. GRIFFIN: Yes. And we know there's much more to go. I think they're halfway through their construction cycle.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So,

the next slide also looks at their design and construction supplier diversity but just in a different way.

The goal for each of the targeted areas is represented by the dark blue. So, their MBE goal was four percent. And their actual contracts awarded to MBEs was 20 percent of the contracts. And the WBE goal was seven percent. And they actually awarded six percent of the contracts. So, that lone bar represents their three percent VBE goal.

So, before I invite you to ask questions, I might ask them to update us on some their newer figures.

MR. GEORGE: Good morning,

Commissioners. I've been working with Jill

over the past few days. And it became fairly

apparent that we had some very good news that

occurred outside of Jill's reporting window,

some good news that occurred in the month of

September.

So, with me to discuss what has happened in the month of September are the people responsible for this good news, people

you guys are familiar with. I've got Jack
Rauen, my coworker as well as Allison Stanton
with Turner. Jack?

MS. RAUEN: Thanks Lance. Good morning. From the Penn side, clearly we are pleased with our supplier diversity results through the end of August. As we mentioned in the past, on the construction side we're doing well, on the design side not so much. But that's the factors that we inherited when we took over the project.

But on the construction side very happy. We thank Turner for their efforts and their knowledge of the market that have brought these diverse contractors forward to participate in our job. So far, we are happy with them, the quality of the work they are doing. And all is well.

Since the end of August, we've actually had the occasion to issue three very large contracts, all three to Massachusetts-based subcontractors. That's for HVAC, plumbing and electrical work all within the casino and the racing buildings. And in our

developments, they're typically three of the largest contracts we issue.

In this case, all three went to Massachusetts contractors. The mechanical contract actually went to a prime VBE. We actually found one. So, about an \$8 million contract was issued to a veterans business enterprise which now puts us on the board for VBE and gives us about 14 percent overall of the contracts issued so far.

We issued about an \$8 million contract to a Massachusetts-based electrical contractor that is WBE. And we had struggled with getting WBE where we ideally wanted it. And this puts a significant improvement on WBEs. So, we're now up to 17 percent against the goal of seven.

And on the MBE side, we had a little additional participation from lower-tiered subs on the plumbing side, which again just continues to add to our MBE results.

But I think most pleasant to us about this these particular awards is that the two large ones went to prime contractors, not

1 multiple lower tiers. And these VBEs and WBEs 2 distinguished themselves and flat out outright 3 won the bids. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's great. 5 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That is good. 6 MS. RAUEN: There is a second side 7 which tells you where we are at this point. 8 \$55 million worth of direct construction 9 subcontracts, we are now at 13 percent MBE 10 versus a goal of four, 17 percent WBE against a 11 goal of seven, and 14 percent VBE against a 12 goal of three. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And what will the 13 14 total direct subcontract be? It's 55 million 15 now. 16 MS. RAUEN: We're at 55 million now. 17 We're about two-thirds of the way done now, Mr. 18 Chairman. I would say our direct subcontracts 19 will be somewhere between \$80- and \$85 million. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. 21 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: This is great. MR. RAUEN: We are thrilled with 22 23 these results.

MS. STANTON: And we're not done.

MR. RAUEN: And the quality of the 1 2 people we're bringing on board. And you're 3 right Allison. Thank you for that. 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: While you're here, 5 and I just hadn't thought about this before and 6 probably you all have Commissioner Stebbins or Mr. George or Director Griffin, is there any 8 communication with the Suffolk Downs folks 9 and/or the thoroughbred horsemen folks, our 10 related employees about employment 11 opportunities? Obviously, I'm sure they're 12 thinking about it obviously. 13 Has there been any link between the 14 job opportunities at your shop and the people 15 who are looking for work from the East 16 Boston/Revere project? 17 MR. GEORGE: Yes, there sure has. Ι 18 know that our Corporate Director of Racing 19 Chris McErlean goes way back with Chip Tuttle. 20 My apologies if he's here. I don't know Chip. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: He is here, yes. I believe he has 22 MR. GEORGE: informed him of job opportunities around the 23 24 country for Penn National. Anything locally, I

think the short story for us is we're open to any sort of conversation at this point, but I do know that Chris has reached out directly to Chip. And I also believe that Steve O'Toole who is also here and our Racing GM and Chip have spoken as well. So, there certainly has been some communication back and forth.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. I know there's been a lot of other activities that people have undertaken as well. That's a natural fit. So, I'm glad that connection is being made.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Just a quick question. This is great news with respect to the VBEs and the WBE as well. Do you expect that will have an impact on your construction workforce numbers in terms of those categories as well, women and veterans in the workforce?

MS. RAUEN: I think while the ownership of the entities is veteran and women, I think the workforce composition will probably continue in line with what we've experienced so far.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I am sure I

speak -- I speak for myself. I think we need to really celebrate this. We put a lot of energy into job owning you at the beginning.

And you've really come through here.

This is setting the goals and then exceeding them by this much with these major contracts really reflects a go-get'em attitude. And that's exactly what we were hoping for. I think you are to be congratulated.

MS. RAUEN: We took a cautious approach to some of the bigger contracts and assumed that we would have a pro rata participation between M and WBE. We were not sure that there was a quality player, VBE player like we had found. But it worked out. These two organizations came out, learned the job and just through the bid process distinguished themselves. And they are great choices for us.

MS. STANTON: And I think one of the things with VBEs, it's not always something that a person advertises about their company. So, that was part of the challenge as well was to find a company that was in fact saying, oh,

1 yes, I am a veteran business. Because unless 2 they are really federal contractors, it's 3 challenging to find that. 4 Overall also within their 5 percentages we awarded 14 of MBE contracts, 18 6 WBE contracts and then as Jack said two VBE. 7 So, it's just good to look at those numbers too 8 to just see that it is spread out. 9 MR. RAUEN: It's not just dollars, 10 it's multiple contracts. We're pleased. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's great. Ι 12 echo Commissioner McHugh's appreciation. 13 you. 14 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: And this 15 goes back to another issue. I know we talked 16 about it with MGM who at the time we designated them for a license didn't have I believe a 17 18 general contractor. And this demonstrates the 19 importance of the general contractor also 20 understanding the obligations and the goals of 21 the MBE, WBE and VBE participation. So, kudos 22 to Turner. Welcome back, Allison. 23 MS. STANTON: Thank you. 24 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Let me add to

1 that because the three contracts referenced 2 here are really mission critical from a 3 construction standpoint, HVAC, plumbing and 4 electrical. 5 So, the fact that they went to 6 minority firms is great. It's really a great news because had they not that would have made 8 the task that much more challenging because these contracts are going to be for the balance 9 10 of the work. And they're large contracts. 11 congratulations and thank you. 12 MS. GRIFFIN: Commissioners, if I 13 could add what a pleasure it has been to work 14 with both Penn National and Turner 15 Construction. You can see by the numbers they 16 took this very seriously. But even behind the 17 scenes they've been working really hard at 18 So, I would like to commend and 19 congratulate them as well. 20 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's great. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great, keep it up. 22 Thank you. 23 All right. I think we are to item 24 Do we need a quick break? Yes, why four.

don't we take as quick a break as we can. And then we'll get on with the Racing Division matters in about five or six or eight minutes, maybe 10.

(A recess was taken)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are reconvening meeting 135. And we will go directly to Director Durenberger of our Racing Division.

I had a request from the audience for the speakers to keep the mics close to their mouths. We can be heard pretty well.

We're more used to it, but if you all would make a point. Director Durenberger

DR. DURENBERGER: Thank you, Mr. Chair and Commissioners, good afternoon. Good to be before you again.

The first item is going to be a voting item. This involves is a schedule change for both of our operators. We had some new legislation that took effect on September 9 of this year, an act relative to racing days. It's Chapter 311 of the Acts of 2014.

What it does is it reduces the number of racing performances and live races required to be conducted in order for the licensee to offer simulcast wagering. That requirement appears in Chapter 128C.

The requirement for Plainridge
Racecourse has been reduced from 100
performances and 900 races to 80 performances
and 720 races in 2014. The requirement for the
Suffolk Downs operator is reduced from 100
performances and 900 races to 65 performances
and 500 races in 2014 and 2015. There's a memo
in your packet in which we revisit the issue of
that led the stakeholders to pursue this
legislation.

And we've got voting items on page two there. One would be we recommend that the Commission approve the request of Plainridge Racecourse to conclude its 2014 live race meet on the October 22 card. And Suffolk Downs, we recommend that the Commission approve the request to conclude its 2014 live race meet with the October 4 card.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any discussion?

1 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: You mentioned 2 the stakeholders. There are many stakeholders. 3 Are they all in agreement with this? 4 DR. DURENBERGER: There are many stakeholders. So, in order to conduct live 5 6 racing, there are purse agreements negotiated between the operator and the representative 8 horseman's group. So, in your packet you'll 9 also find not just the request of the racetrack 10 but letters of support from the respective 11 horseman's organizations. 12 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Oh, yes. 13 forgot about that, sorry. 14 DR. DURENBERGER: No problem. 15 There's only 173 pages in your packet. 16 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: But I did read 17 that. Okay, thank you. 18 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Remind us 19 Director, when did this chapter pass? 20 DR. DURENBERGER: September 9. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: For Suffolk Downs 22 it would be October 4. What day of the week is 23 that? 24 DR. DURENBERGER: Saturday, October

1 4.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

17

19

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Any other discussion? We do need a vote, Commissioner

4 Cameron.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes. So, this is in keeping with other similar requests in past years. So, I move that we approve the Plainridge Racecourse request to conclude their 2014 live race meet on October 22. As well as we approve Suffolk Downs' request to conclude their live race meet on October 4.

12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any further

15 | discussion? All in favor, aye.

16 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

18 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes

21 | have it unanimously.

DR. DURENBERGER: Okay. We're going

23 to roll agenda items (b) and (c) together.

24 This is going to be a staff effort. We are

going to rely a little bit on General Counsel Blue and on Director Griffin to help us out with some of the things we're going to talk about.

The first one is I'd like to update you on the business outreach efforts to our stakeholders and to potentially displaced employees. It's our understanding, and actually we received a letter this morning that Labor and Workforce Development's Rapid Response team is coordinating with Suffolk operations to provide support and services to potentially displaced employees.

I understand that that there was a meeting yesterday afternoon. Ken Messina who is the director of that group is working closely with the team. I believe they have a session set up on the 29th where they will meet with members of the Suffolk Downs workforce.

I think Director Griffin maybe is better able to speak to some of the services that this group provides. We did have a meeting last year when we were looking at the potential of this happening in Plainville as

well. So, we've had some face-to-face meetings in the agency between Director Griffin and myself as well. So, we'll let her talk a little bit more about that.

MS. GRIFFIN: The Rapid Response team is the Massachusetts Department of Career Services statewide early intervention team that responds to plant closings and makes sure that the workers know what their resources are and potential retraining for other opportunities.

So, the Rapid Response team gathers information about the employees' needs, organizes services to help them get back to work. They explain the unemployment insurance benefits. They give information and referrals to area career centers. They give job-search assistance, resume preparation assistance, interview skills workshops and information about educational and training opportunities. They also give up-to-date information about the current labor market.

DR. DURENBERGER: In addition, the Suffolk team is compiling for us a list of employees so that the Commission can maintain

2.1

that for employee hiring preferences with the
new Region A gaming licensee. And that's
employees of Suffolk Downs. We've also got, of
course, our occupational licensees that we have

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Excuse me,
Director. I just wanted to point out and I
think I mentioned this yesterday that for the
most part the big jobs at the Wynn Everett are
going to be down the road a piece. But there
are jobs starting now.

And they are looking for space.

They will be hiring for their preparatory work.

So, I'm not sure whether they in their minds

have made the link. They're sort of thinking

when we do that those big numbers those 3000,

4000 jobs. But we want to make sure that

they're attentive to even if they've got five

or 10 that's a start. Thanks.

DR. DURENBERGER: Thank you for reminding us of that. We've also got our occupational licensees. That's the group that represents owners and trainers primarily as the Horseman's Benevolent and Protective

concerns about.

Association. That's a New England chapter of a national organization.

I do believe the Rapid Response team has spoken with them, but we've also with Commissioner Stebbins help had the Massachusetts Small Business Development Center get in contact with them. We have about 1100 occupational licensees that could be immediately affected by the shutdown.

So, we've got them in touch with each other. I know there's a lot of conversation. We've also been aware of some conversation with the national chapter as well. And we've got a number of requests from that organization to look at what we can do from the Commission's standpoint. They're standing to lose quite a bit of their funding mechanisms for their insurance and other benefits that they provide to their members.

The Massachusetts Thoroughbred

Breeders Association is similarly situated,

although the majority of its statutory funding
is used for purses for state bred race horses.

But they're in a similar situation here losing

2.1

a source of funding.

So, we're going to ask General
Counsel Blue to speak a little bit about the
provisions in the Race Horse Development Fund.
I'm going to remind everybody that this is
established by section 60 of Chapter 23K. And
it is a distribution of monies from the gaming
licensing fund and from gross gaming revenue.

That money gets distributed 80 percent to our live racing licensees' purse accounts, 16 percent to the representative breeder's organizations and four percent to the representative horseman's organizations for benevolency purposes.

So, some of those monies we understand may be available from the licensing fund in perhaps December. So, we've got a couple of questions.

I know that the Commission on advice with the Horse Racing Committee has determined we are going to be writing some regulations that will enable monies if there is no live racing licensee to be escrowed. But the question presented before us is whether that

four percent for benevolency funds and possibly the 16 percent to breeders if those payments can continue to be made in the absence of a live racing licensee.

MS. BLUE: So, we know that we were requested by the Racing Advisory Committee to look at escrowing the funds. And we are in fact working on regulations as they requested to escrow the funds for between two and three years to have them available in the event that one of the breed's racing facility went dark for a period of time.

We are also looking at the statute that governs the Race Horse Development Fund. As we know, that's a new provision with the Gaming Act. We do not have regulations under that provision yet. But we are now looking at regulations that would potentially allow us if we can by statute to make the four percent payments while a facility is dark and perhaps the 16 percent of that's under that statute as well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Explain exactly so everybody in the room knows. What would that

1 mean exactly? Four and 16 would go to where? 2 MS. BLUE: The Race Horse 3 Development Fund as the committee required 75 4 percent went to thoroughbred racing, 25 percent went to the harness. So, it would be 80 5 6 percent of that 75 percent would be to purses then 16 percent of that 75 percent would be to 8 breeders, four percent of that --9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Go to breeders 10 for? 11 MS. BLUE: For their breeding 12 programs. 13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: For their 14 discretionary use as they see fit? 15 DR. DURENBERGER: The majority of it 16 goes to purses for state bred race horses. 17 They have some other administrative costs. 18 MS. BLUE: And then the four percent 19 is their health and welfare funds that they 20 So, what we're looking at is whether we have. 21 can craft regulations that will allow some of 22 those payments to continue even if a facility 23 is dark. 24 And we're trying to determine under

the statue how much of that has to be tied to the existence of a license facility or can we do some other things with that.

So, it is our expectation that probably by the next Commission meeting we will have a first draft of something for the Commission to look at.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So, with the four percent I know that those benefits run out by the end of the year. Would it be possible if you deem legally we can do this to use the emergency regulation mechanism in order to move that along so that maybe there wouldn't be a break for those benefits?

MS. BLUE: Yes. We could use that like we do and have done for other regulations for the Commission. Yes, we could do that if the Commission would like.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think that would be important to provide those monies as soon as possible.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Absolutely. Okay, great.

24 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Have we given

1 any thought to going to the Legislature to make 2 some short-term adjustment to the 80 percent? 3 80 percent goes into purse accounts now, but if 4 there's no thoroughbred racing and our idea is 5 to try and escrow it for three years, but has 6 any thought been given to going to the Legislature and seeing if we couldn't get some 8 of the 80 percent to add onto the 16 percent to create a fund that would be available now in 9 10 the sort of interregnum period. 11 Come October 1, we're going to have a better idea of what's available for next 12 13 year, right? So, conceivably this would be 14 That would be the best outcome. 15 DR. DURENBERGER: That would be the 16 best outcome, yes. 17 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: But 18 realistically, or at least contingently 19 planning, have we given any thought to that? 20 DR. DURENBERGER: Commissioner, we 21 That's a great question. So, there's have. 22 lots of thinking going on right now both in-23 house with staff and of course with our 24 stakeholders and with the private parties that

1 | are involved.

The timeline on this is the New England HBPA is going through their elections this week as we speak. I think that they count ballots Friday, if I'm not mistaken.

So, we the staff and the agency have been trying to give them the space. And then next week we're going to begin some substantive conversations. We've received some communications from their attorney. We have received some communication from their executive director about ideas they have, particularly about capturing some additional monies as well and where those could be repurposed.

So, those conversations are in the planning stages. And then I think we're going to be rolling up our sleeves over the next couple of weeks and coming back to you to have a conversation in this forum.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. It seems to me that if that's a viable and not DOA kind of idea, it seems to me that the sooner we coalesce around some plan to execute it, the

better because these things take a little lead time up on the hill.

But it seems to me that that's a source of money that otherwise isn't going to go anyplace for a couple of years perhaps and could be directed to sustaining the breeders right away.

Others that are available. That one will probably a pretty controversial one, and would also have to go back to the Race Horse Advisory Committee or whatever it's called because they're the ones that figure out the split.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: No, I'm not talking about readjusting the split.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm sorry. Got you. I understand, excuse me. That's a good idea. That's one of several buckets of money that we have identified that might be available for any a number of purposes, whether it's somehow or other trying to support an operator, whether it's trying to support the breeders, whether it's trying to add further to purses, whatever.

There are a number of buckets we've already identified that would probably take legislative action probably are not something that we can change ourselves.

The issue here, and I don't know whether you're getting to this or not, but as quickly as possible we need to get all of the stakeholders in the room. And one of the critical stakeholders is in a gestation process for its leadership team right this minute. But as soon as we can get all of the stakeholders in the room where issues like that and these other buckets and other ideas can be worked out, we're anxious to do that.

And that's one of our highest priorities is to try to figure out a medium for essentially a strategic planning meeting for the thoroughbred racing industry with all of the stakeholders at hand and all of these buckets and ideas that everybody's kicking around. And this is one of them.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right, right.

I agree. It's really important to get
everybody to agree, get everybody on the same

2.1

1 page as quickly as possible, come up with a 2 plan and execute it, put our shoulder behind the wheel. 3 4 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. 5 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. 6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: There's 7 another alternative there, which I don't know, 8 you might get to this. But we have a statutory 9 deadline on the racing application coming that you alluded to Commissioner, October 1. So, 10 11 it's really a week from today. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We talked about 13 that one also. You planning on discussing 14 that? 15 DR. DURENBERGER: I am. 16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Go ahead. 17 DR. DURENBERGER: We'll seque into 18 Actually, before I get into this we are 19 going to remind everybody of what that process is, how you become a live racing licensee. And 20 21 then we're going to talk about exactly what 22 Commissioner Zuniga was getting at. And we'll 23 have some more conversations about 24 possibilities there.

I just want to remind everybody as you've come to realize that racing is a nimble, flexible and adaptive industry. And the other thing you're coming to learn about race trackers, if you haven't learned it already, is we don't have a lot of quit in us. We keep going.

So, from day one I think our message to you and your message to the Legislature has been consistently that the existing pari-mutuel and simulcasting statutes could benefit from some revision or updating to align the governing law and realities of the current leasing business model.

So, we anticipated being able to participate in a near-term dialogue about how to improve that model. But instead we find ourselves today asking the question what are the immediate barriers to entry that would discourage someone from filing a live racing application for racing dates in 2015.

The process itself, as Commissioner Zuniga was starting to point out, could be a real obstacle this year. So, the statutory

1 requirements is that there is a timeline for 2 filing that application. MGL Chapter 128A 3 section 2 imposes a statutory deadline of 4 October 1 on all applications to hold or conduct live racing meetings in the 5 6 Commonwealth. That's next Wednesday. Following receipt of applications, 8 we schedule public hearings -- Those would be in late October. - in the proposed host 9 10 communities. And we solicit public comments. 11 The Racing Division then reports the 12 summary of the hearings and the public comments 13 to the Commission. This year that is 14 anticipated to be on November 6. Then the 15 Commission as required by statute grant or 16 dismiss such applications not later than 17 November 15. 18 So, the first barrier that we note 19 is the almost immediate application deadline. 20 Under the circumstances, interested and 21 affected parties in the thoroughbred industry, 22 which our statute refers to as the running

horse industry have not yet had the opportunity

to crystallize a business plan of the

23

complexity required to operate live racing, at least not to the degree required to file an application.

Our live racing application is pretty lengthy and involved. And I will tell you that the two messages we've been hearing from our stakeholders consistently and unanimously throughout the last seven days is that we need more time.

The other is that for a number of reasons the interests of the thoroughbred racing and particularly the breeding industry and all of its attendant agri-business extensions would be best served by conducting that live race meet at the Suffolk Downs facility, if at all possible. There are a number of productive discussions occurring and the parties whose livelihoods are at risk are looking to you for guidance.

So, section 2 of Chapter 128A does provide a mechanism whereby an applicant who has timely filed an application could then file a later supplemental application regarding the same premises for your consideration.

The Commission would then have 30 days to grant or dismiss that supplemental application. And in this situation, I guess, I respectfully suggest that neither the public interest nor the stakeholder interest are necessarily best served by this mechanism under the circumstances. We can talk about that a little bit, but maybe easier thing to do is to just point out that this is a statutory deadline that we've got in front of us.

So, the agency may have significant administrative flexibility and we've certainly noticed that you've demonstrated that throughout the gaming licensing application process. The clearest route to an extension of this date and the receipt of meaningful applications seems to me to be emergency legislation amending that statutory deadline.

But absent that possibility, I've requested Counsel to assist our stakeholders by providing clear guidance as to what form these placeholder applications should take in order to be able to preserve that we can consider them.

1 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: We had 2 placeholder applications last year for two 3 applicants. Did those applications comply in 4 all respects but for the one day only racing 5 date, comply in all respects with the other 6 requirements of the statute? DR. DURENBERGER: They did not. 8 of the applications was missing a significant amount of information that we would have needed 9 10 to make a determination. So, we welcomed that 11 if and when they submitted a supplemental 12 application. 13 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So, how did we 14 handle that last year? We granted at least one 15 one-day license. 16 We did. And there were MS. BLUE: 17 contingencies in the license. I believe we 18 granted it with the proviso that they would 19 come back with the additional information 20 should those contingencies become effective and 2.1 the license therefore become effective. 22 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Would that solve the problem now, a similar kind of thing? 23 24 Give us an application, give us your general

plan, give us a plan that looks realistic and we'll work on that subject to a concrete plan ASAP.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think even more than that I'm going to use colloquial language because I don't know the formal language here, what some of us have considered in discussion with the staff, on the emergency legislation there were two problems. One is trying to get emergency legislation in five days was a longshot at best, number one. And number two, we did not have an argument for extending the deadline to what. We didn't know what we would extend it to. So, I think that route is not a very viable route.

But what we have talked about is we do have a fair amount of flexibility in our administration of this October 1 deadline. And what we would like to have the Commission consider is being as flexible as we can possibly be in saying to the industry and saying to the folks who are trying to get their act together but can't possibly do it in the next five days, but get something in there.

1 Get a placeholder in there.

We will be as flexible as we can be within appropriate standards on not asking you to give us more than you can possibly give us.

We will be flexible when you can come back at a later date and amend that placeholder.

And we're again keeping an eye out on what's fair and appropriate. If new things materialize two or three months down the road, we will be as flexible as we can in permitting new ideas that might contribute to the discussion about salvaging thoroughbred horse racing. We will be as flexible on those we can as well. So, it's sort of taking your point to its ultimate extension.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I think that would be a terrific idea. Give us a concept plan and get it in by the first and then we'll figure out what to do with it. And that ties in, if we take that approach that ties in with the stakeholders, the Association getting its elections finished, the possibility of getting everybody in the room knowing who the leaders are. I think we ought to do it.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You mentioned 2 in your remarks that the feedback was 3 essentially we need more time. Is that for 4 even the concept plan? 5 DR. DURENBERGER: It really is. 6 really is. We've heard that unanimously, and reiterated again this morning with some level 8 of desperation. 9 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: But a concept 10 plan can be we would like to have -- I'm not 11 trying to draft the plan now. But we are very 12 interested under the right conditions in 13 running a racing meet. We would like to do it 14 in such and such a place, but if we can't do it 15 in such a place, we would like to explore the 16 possibility of doing it elsewhere. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: For some number of 18 days. 19 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: For some 20 number of days. And we would very much like 21 you to take this as an application and we'll 22 get back to later as details materialize. 23 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think what 24 Commissioner McHugh is suggesting is concept is

not a limiter. A concept is an opener. So,
don't let the word concept in this construct be
considered a constraint.

We're trying to create a situation that will be as flexible as reasonably possible to accommodate this peculiar situation we're in. So, give us something, give us a placeholder and we will work with you to try to let legitimate opportunities flower as it becomes plausible.

DR. DURENBERGER: I think that the clearest guidance that we can provide as to what the sufficiency of that placeholder is is important. I certainly think I'm going to get that question this afternoon.

So, to the extent that we can have that conversation, and maybe it's something that Counsel and I talk about later. But I think what will satisfy the requirements and the needs to reserve that place?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Suppose we said the presumption is that a sincere description of interest will be the default for a sufficient placeholder?

MS. BLUE: I think the key is that we have an application. It is somewhat detailed. I think to the extent that someone fills that out to the best of their ability and explains to us where the gaps are and why, then that should be reasonably sufficient for the Commission to start looking at it.

I personally have thought about the situation where someone may want to apply but they don't know where their facility is, for example. I think if they explain to us what that might be or potentially where they might partner for a facility that is something the Commission can start to look at.

And I do believe the Commission could issue a license with conditions as they do on the gaming side or they could ask for a supplemental filing.

So, my sense would be that you take the current application and fill it as much as you can, explain where the gaps are. And the Commission can start reviewing it to see what's there and what might be needed.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I guess I'm

trying to envision a situation where there's
somebody out there, and I may be just dreaming,
who's got a real interest who's got some money,
so, this is not a pie-in-the-sky, but doesn't
know anything about a place. And really wants
to jump in and look around and find a place or
do a deal with an existing place as quickly as
possible.

But at this moment doesn't have a clue as to where that place or who that might be or who that person might be.

And I would like to construct a situation where under these circumstances he, she or it could file a document that we would treat as a sufficient placeholder. I don't know if we're saying different things.

MS. BLUE: I think we're saying the same thing. That's a situation I was thinking of. I would suggest that they use the application form but they explain precisely that.

And the Commission could look at it and say within so many days of some date there needs to be a supplemental filing that they can

explain. Because I think that is the
situation. There's also potential situations
where people may decide they want to partner.
And it may be a partner who can understand the
racing side, but it's someone else who has a
potential space for a facility.

There may be a license that could be granted conditionally with some transfer in the future. Those are some of the things that we are looking at, my group is looking at for regulations as well. Also, looking at potential regulations for accepting applications outside of that period if it's a totally new person in the Commonwealth that wanted to come forward that had never been part of the racing industry before.

But I do think the Commission has the flexibility to take an application like the one we've been describing, look at it, review it, hold the necessary public hearings and then perhaps condition it.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: This is after all a public solicitation. And the statute contemplated a steady-state. And this is

unusual. This is certainly an unusualsituation from a statutory perspective.

What, if anything, under the statute could be contemplated relative to getting no applications for racing? Getting a rebid, if you will, scenario?

MS. BLUE: That's what we're looking at for regulations. Because the statute is very much set up as though there is a steady-state and has been one for a long time. And I think it's in the best interest of the Commonwealth if somebody comes forward outside of the application period for the Commonwealth to be able to consider another application, because that obviously brings jobs and revenue to the Commonwealth.

So, we were looking at drafting regulations that would allow under certain circumstances the Commission to accept an application outside of the period. The question is how you would define that so you're not in violation of the statute.

But maybe in a situation where there is either a new entity or there is a new

facility or someone who arrives on the scene
after the fact would like to submit an
application, if we can create a way by
regulation for the Commission to take that
through the normal process, I think that would
be beneficial. So, that's something we're
looking at in terms of regulations if we can do
that.

also thinking of the notion, documents aside, I was thinking if we were to get a statement of interest or something to that effect, a statement of intention in whatever format that may come prior to October 1, it is conceivable that that could be viewed later on via regulation or otherwise or by this body as complying with the statutory deadline, details to follow, whether that's a new entity or an existing group or what have you.

MS. BLUE: I think as long as something gets on file by October 1, I think the Commission has flexibility to address it. I think the cleanest route is to try use the application we have because it at least lets

you know what the Commission is going to be looking at in the long run on how we evaluate it. But I think the best you can do is good to get the process started.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Getting back to Director Durenberger's concern about people being deterred by the formality of the application, it gets down to a clear message that if you take the application, put down on the application as much as you can, and leave out what you don't know and get it in by October 1, the Commission will consider it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: When Commissioner Cameron and I talked with staff about this, we raised the issue what are the impediments to letting people get in, get something in, get a placeholder in, and we talked about the bonding. There is a bond issue.

And we suggested the idea of even having Catherine look at a workaround like we've done on the 85 million.

If the bond is material money, and I don't really know what the actual money turns into, but if the bond is an impediment then

maybe it could be constructed the bond isn't called upon until some other date.

So, we're trying to -- You have the spirit exactly right. We're trying to work our way around every impediment that might get in the way of a reasonable good-faith effort to keep the door open to a possibility.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yes. And I guess the only gloss I'm trying to put on it, and maybe I don't need to is that the ultimate result needs to be in a clear set of declarative sentences put out to everybody so that we don't have anybody thinking I can't get in because I don't have X, Y or Z. And do that quickly so that they can make October 1 deadline.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Do you feel like you have the tools you need to convey, you Jennifer, to the people you say you're going to get questions this afternoon?

DR. DURENBERGER: I will. I'll

probably get with Counsel Blue and put some language together and we'll maybe put something on the web.

1 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is there clarity 2 on the spirit of what we're trying to do here? 3 DR. DURENBERGER: Absolutely. Yes, I don't think there's been any question about 4 5 that throughout the process, yes. 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, it's 7 implementing the spirit in whatever the 8 appropriate language is. But I think 9 Commissioner McHugh immediately picked up on 10 exactly the thrust, the direction we were 11 trying to go. 12 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Being as 13 flexible as we can with whatever comes through the door on October 1, are these kind of 14 15 follow-up benchmarks hold us, the Commission, 16 to its level of participation until the end of 17 November or the middle November by which we 18 have to act? 19 Can we structure the post-October 1 20 deadline to a process that speeds along 21 discussion with applicants? Maybe puts 22 potential applicants in a room to, I think the 23 point or the scenario you raised was maybe two 24 entities out there that didn't know the other

one was applying decide they can sit in a room and maybe figure something out?

Is there a way for us post-October 1 to finesse a process with the Commission involved so that we're not waiting around until the November deadline to be helpful or encourage participation?

I hate to say you have a meet and greet among the applicants and we hope with our declaration right now that we're encouraging people to put in something that we can kind of finesse around our regular process, if that makes sense.

MS. BLUE: Well, one of the things that we did last year, which may be more helpful this year is once we reviewed the applications we put them on our web so that people could see them and look at them.

So, if we do that promptly then people will see who applied. If there's partnership opportunities there, they'll see through the applicants. But they may also other people who didn't apply may see people who are looking for partners or what they have

planned.

So, we could work to get those posted more quickly then perhaps we did last season. We can time -- The only end time is that the Commission has to make a decision by November 15. So, within that October 1 to November 15 timeframe, we can time our public hearings. Or if we should do them sooner perhaps rather than later we can do that if that helps create discussion. We have some flexibility in the process during that period.

DR. DURENBERGER: The grant or dismiss is on that original application. The Commission can consider the supplemental application at any time up until December 31 of next year. It doesn't give you a lot of time to run a race meet next year, but at any time. And then you have another 30 days to consider the supplemental application and take action on it.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I'm just looking for any opportunities for us. This is a different year, obviously. And trying to find a way to finesse a solution after we hit

1 some level of interest by October 1 I think is in our best interest. 2 3 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: We certainly 4 have broad discretion in interpreting statutes within our domain. 5 6 MS. BLUE: We do. 7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And we've got 8 great interpreters. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else? 10 DR. DURENBERGER: So, impediment 11 number two actually you brought up which is the 12 bond issue. So, we are looking at that. 13 chapter requires a bond in the amount of 14 \$125,000 in the case of a regular live racing 15 applicant and a \$25,000 bond in the case of a 16 fair racing applicant. So, we touched on that 17 briefly. And we're looking at what 18 administrative flexibility we have there. 19 The third obstacle --20 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Just a moment. 21 Does that have to accompany the application? 22 DR. DURENBERGER: That's the 23 question. 24 MS. BLUE: It doesn't appear to by

1 statute. It says upon the award. So, another 2 regulation that we are looking as it defining 3 what that means. So perhaps we can stretch it 4 out so that it's maybe some time before the 5 meet starts as opposed to -- That's what we're 6 looking at to see how we can address that. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Okay. 8 they don't have to put that down until next 9 Wednesday. 10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Routinely they 11 That's been the custom. have. But the 12 language permits us it looks like to do a 13 workaround. 14 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: From my 15 perspective, I think this is something that we 16 really have a lot of flexibility as far as I'm 17 concerned from a risk perspective, the 18 situation that the bond is trying to prevent is 19 one that would put some of the stakeholders in 20 jeopardy. 21 And this situation being as unusual 22 as it is is something that I think does not 23 need to be addressed with the bond up front. 24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY:

Okay.

DR. DURENBERGER: And then the third impediment and it's significant of course is just the cost of operating live racing. A lot of those costs can be contracted around between the parties in terms of their various profitsharing agreements, especially if you have a situation where you're simulcasting for 365 days.

I think those conversations are happening as we speak. So, that's out there. And then beyond that again the legislative changes. It's a challenging environment here for our operators. We've got the current takeout structure, the inability to offer rebates to customers, restriction on the number of simulcast signals offered and of course the state withholding tax issue that we've all talked so much about.

These are serious issues that we've recommended and you've all agreed need to be addressed going forward. And you've signaled that to the Legislature. And we continue to stand ready to help advocate for those.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody?

1 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Yes. Those 2 we're in active pursuit of corrections for. 3 So, the other ones, it seems to me, are within 4 our control. We don't have any control over 5 So, we've got to try to get people in 6 with the understanding that we are actively working on them and will continue to do so. 8 That's about the best we can do on those, 9 right? 10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes. 11 DR. DURENBERGER: I just wanted to 12 remind in case there were any operators who 13 hadn't been following the story thus far that 14 those are things that the Commission has been 15 looking at the recommendations about. 16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But they're a good reminder if there is, I don't know what 17 18 the likelihood or appetite over in the 19 Legislature to address some of these will be in 20 terms of timing as well. That's their 21 prerogative. 22 But the context in which all of this 23 operates I think is important. And we've said 24 it before and now becomes even more critical to 1 | remind those who would listen.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: It's a fight to take up next year.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Does the idea of maybe as soon after the elections are completed as possible, of trying to figure out a process by which everybody can get in the room? Does that make sense?

DR. DURENBERGER: Absolutely. We're talking with stakeholders daily.

are. But getting all of this together in some kind of an organized -- because the kinds of things that Commissioner McHugh talked about which there are near-term legislative intervention that could be helpful above and beyond the big reform stuff we've been talking about.

So, if you think that's a good idea then I think you remain our point to try to pull that together with everybody. To try to figure out a format, a structure, what's a productive way of get the appropriate people in the room to figure out a strategy here? And I

- leave it to you to try to help us figure out how to do that.
- 3 DR. DURENBERGER: And we're
- penciling in the week of October 6. So, we're
 looking at two weeks.
- 6 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: So, the 7 elections you were talking about are the
- 8 horsemen's elections?
- 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes, thank you,
- 10 the horsemen's elections, right. Okay,
- 11 anything else folks?
- DR. DURENBERGER: That's the update
- 13 that I have for you unless Counsel has
- 14 anything else.
- MS. BLUE: I thought we wanted
- 16 discuss today some of the requests we've had
- 17 from our employees to attend, to go to the
- 18 track. We have received a number of requests
- 19 from our employees to go to the track. And
- 20 pursuant to our enhanced ethics code, the track
- 21 is treated the same as a casino.
- They're not allowed to go unless
- 23 they are there on business or they can go as
- 24 part of a social family event if they check in

with the State Police, they advised the 1 2 Executive Director, and that they understand 3 they cannot wager. 4 So, we're going to ask the Commission to consider whether they be 5 6 comfortable with treating this situation as per that section of the enhanced ethics code in 8 that if an employee did want to go on their own 9 time, they could go but they would have to 10 follow those rules where they didn't wager, 11 they notified Executive Director Day and they 12 checked in with the State Police when they were at the track. This is limited to Suffolk 13 14 because we know this is an unusual situation. 15 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: To Suffolk for the remainder of this meet? 16 17 MS. BLUE: Yes, that's right. 18 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think the 19 requests are along the lines from other 20 employees who have never seen Suffolk and would 21 like to take the opportunity to be able to see

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I think

I have no problem with handling it in that

22

23

24

it.

manner.

Page 126 that's fine. 1 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I totally agree. 3 Do we need any more formal action on that? 4 MS. BLUE: No, I don't think so. 5 will work with Executive Director Day. And we 6 will let the employees that have inquired know 7 and set up the process for doing that. 8 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. 9 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: It's a good 10 idea. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else on 12 this item? 13 DR. DURENBERGER: Thank you, Mr. 14 Chair. 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you very 16 much. 17 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Thank you. 18 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. 19 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Now, if I 20 understood you correct, we're okay to take a 21 lunch break. And then we'll come back with you 22 and with MGM; is that correct, Ombudsman 23 Ziemba?

MR. ZIEMBA:

Yes.

```
1
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is everybody ready
 2
     for a break? Do you think we can do it for an
3
    half-hour?
 4
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Too close,
     think we need 45 minutes.
5
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right, 45
6
 7
    minutes we will reconvene at 1:45.
8
9
                (A recess was taken)
10
11
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are ready to
12
     reconvene at about 1:45 the 135th meeting,
13
     Ombudsman Ziemba is next on the agenda.
14
                MR. ZIEMBA: Good afternoon,
15
     Chairman, Commissioners. We are joined by MGM
16
     Springfield to give us their monthly report. I
17
    will ask Mike Mathis, President MGM Springfield
18
     to introduces his team and to give us his
19
    monthly report. Thank you.
20
                MR. MATHIS: Thank you, John. Good
21
     afternoon, Commissioners. It's nice to be back
22
     in front of you.
23
                Very pleased to provide our monthly
24
     update for some of our project development
```

1 activities. In putting it together realized 2 how busy the last 30 days have been. But very 3 happy about all of the outreach and the 4 progress on various entitlements and really in 5 our view, the real work that needs to take 6 place so that we're ready to go come November 4, which I know was an important message that 8 you gave us when you provided us your 9 provisional licensing. And we took it to 10 heart. And we very much want to be ready to 11 go. 12 So with that, I'll let my colleagues 13 introduce themselves. And then we'll kick off 14 with the initial presentation. 15 MR. IRVING: I'm Chuck Irving. I'm 16 with Davenport Properties in Boston. 17 MR. CIGNOLI: Chris Cignoli, DPW 18 Director for the city of Springfield. 19 MR. MATHIS: So, what you have up on 20 that screen is our, we view it as our four-21 month look ahead. We wanted to show you the 22 type of activities that we were going to be 23 engaged in over the four months between the

initial provisional licensing and the November

1 vote.

Happy to report that there continues to be much progress among many of these line items. Chuck and Chris can help tag team some of our descriptions. And I won't walk through. I think as has been the case in our prior presentations, we won't walk through each of the line items in detail. If you see anything of interest that we can update you on, we're happy to that.

But there's a couple of items that are certainly we believe critical path and are things that we have been more proactive about. One of those for example is coordination with the viaduct project.

That is an important regional project in terms repairing the infrastructure to that span of the 91 which largely fronts our project. And we think there is an opportunity, because both projects have a very similar construction timeline.

So, to the extent that there is going to be disruption in the area, and there certainly will be, I think we can take

1 advantage of overlapping activities to make 2 sure that we don't for example close an exit 3 ramp unnecessarily long while we're doing off-4 site improvements. We're going to coordinate and make sure that those activities happen at 5 6 the same time. Chuck is that something you want to talk to a little bit about? 8 MR. IRVING: Yes. First of all, the 9 team that the state has put on the viaduct 10 project is fantastic. And we have full 11 confidence that they're going to be on 12 schedule. 13 The bid package went out this past 14 I think Michael Audette is going to 15 deliver this on time. One of the big factors 16 that concerns the state on this is the impact 17 on parking in the nearby area, especially 18 relative to the courthouse. So, Chris Cignoli 19 and I met with state, courthouse officials last 20 month. And maybe you can describe where we 21 ended up with that. 22 A couple of MR. CIGNOLI: Sure. Number one, with regard to the 23 things.

viaduct, as Chuck was mentioning, the project

1 is out to bid. It was out to bid September 20.

The city of Springfield has received a copy of the PS&E, the final plans that the contractors

4 are looking at.

We've had final coordination
meetings within the last month with MassDOT and
all of the utility companies out there. So,
everybody is on board with the processes the
way that it's moving forward here. Everybody
who has a voice at the table or should have a
voice at the table has had one throughout this
entire process.

On the 15th of this month, a week and a half ago, we met with the court people and discussed the issues related to parking and access to their facility, both for the viaduct project and with regard to the casino project as well. I'll talk about the meeting in a second.

But following the meeting, one of the things that we did is we met with the Springfield parking authority. And the Springfield parking authority has extremely good records as to the monthly parkers that

park in their facilities, how many of them work for the court systems.

So, what we're going to be able to do is basically identify the exact volume of people that are going to be displaced by the casino project.

One of the other things that they were voicing their concerns about was if there were trolley systems example that were going to be ferrying people throughout the city of Springfield, concerns about defendants and complainants being on the same bus and issues like that.

Basically, right now people find a parking space whether on one side of a case or the other. They go to the facility. And we think with the identification of the parking in the city, both public and private, we're going to be able to continue the process. We're going to be reporting back to them probably within the next month once we get all of the information from the parking authority on there.

So, as I mentioned at the last

meeting, we've identified over 1000 parking spaces within a quarter mile of the project that we'll be able to service both the displaced parkers overall at the casino site but as well as the displaced people from the courthouse themselves.

One other thing that I just wanted to mention as a monthly side from the city standpoint is that we are holding monthly meetings with utility companies to discuss other projects in the city, but primarily the viaduct project and the casino project so that we are all on the same page with regard to schedule, how we're going to be handling reviews, etc., so that it's not all of a sudden surprises that are coming in on any side of the table, either from the design team or from the city.

We are all basically getting into the same boat, identifying what our concerns will be. We always try to avoid telling somebody to move the building three feet to the right and the other one is telling it to move it three feet to left. So that we all know

exactly what we are dealing with.

So, from the city standpoint within the past month and a half, two months, we've seen some very big steps. The viaduct getting out to bid, extremely important to us as the city and to this project as well.

MR. IRVING: Let me just add one thing there. So, MGM came into the courthouse discussion, as you know, offering to pay for shuttle service as well as parking off-site.

As Chris indicated, courthouse officials feel that would be a very dangerous idea putting litigants in a small van after a decision has been rendered. So, what they've asked us to do is find a surface lot, which is open and visible from everywhere that would be designated to the courthouse during this period where we absorb all of the parking.

We can do that. And I think at our next meeting we're going to come back to you and say here's where the lot is. And we can guarantee that the economics are not going to be different than what current courthouse constituents and officials are paying right

now.

MR. MATHIS: And I'll just add onto that. To the extent there is a delta there, we will subsidize that parking so that there is no impact to the individuals that otherwise were taking advantage of the surface spaces.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.

MR. MATHIS: So, unless you have any questions because the viaduct has been such an important issue. Just wanted you to know that we've been proactive about it. And I know you in particular, Commissioner McHugh, were concerned about the parties.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That sounds like a good plan.

MR. MATHIS: In terms of what you're going to see for the remainder of our presentation, and I know this is far too much detail to really pick out, so we're going to roll from this to an update about some of our community outreach, vendor activities, workforce development activities.

And then we're going to bring it back to a full development timeline, which I

think was one of the asks from the last presentation, which was to make sure you got some comfort that we were tracking multiple activities towards a finish line.

So, with that Amy can you bring up the presentation. Vendor outreach, workforce development and community engagement. We continue to be engaged with the community. I think it's very important given the pending vote and our commitment under the host community agreement to make sure that they understand that we are as committed today as we were back in July '13 when we received their approval.

So, here's a demonstration of a lot of activities along those three categories. A lot of them were planned before the SJC decision. And we believe that they are part of predevelopment activities in order to make sure that we've got the infrastructure to execute come November 4.

This is just an example of what we've done in the last 30 days. Stone Soul Music Festival, this is a civic organization

2.1

that we continue to support. The picture to
the right are African American gentlemen,
residents who do a reenactment of the AfricanAmerican soldiers from the Civil War. It's a
group that we've been supporting from the very
beginning and that we will continue to support

and celebrates music as well.

Central Mass. Business Expo, we've been very attentive to the Worcester area, because as you know being in Central Massachusetts they are on the periphery, I think, in a good way of two very large developments between ours and now the Wynn Resorts. So, we want to make sure that they understand that we want to tap into their businesses.

We're working with the local chamber, Tim Murray, former Lt. Governor we've got a great relationship with. And we send our groups out to make sure that we can fill our database with suppliers and vendors in the Worcester area.

East of the River, this is their chamber event. You'll recognize Kelly Tuckey

1 as well. We're reaching out to the chambers.

2 We've got a quarterly commitment to move around

3 the region. But we're really exceeding that.

4 If there's a request or there's an opportunity

5 for us to tap into a local chamber event, we do

6 so all of the time. Again, we're building our

database so when we go to let out our goods and

8 | services.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

United Way breakfast, they were kind enough to invite me to present at the United Way. United Way does great work in Springfield. You can see that it was a packed room. I think what we wanted to reinforce is our commitment in all of our properties whether it's Las Vegas or a regional property on giving back to the community.

Over half of our employees across the company contribute to our voluntary employee charitable foundation. And we would expect that be the case in Springfield if not exceed those levels. So, it was a great opportunity for us to start to talk about our philanthropy.

This is a Women Business Leader

event. The woman to the left in the yellow
jacket is Kenyata Lewis. She is based in Las
Vegas, but she's been out here quite a bit.
She runs our national diversity supplier

So, dedicated position to make sure not only that we procure locally but that we procure through diverse organizations, women, women-owned, minority-owned.

I was here earlier when the Penn National folks presented their statistics. They certainly set a very high bar. And we need women like Kenyata, Gerry Harris to the right, an African-American woman who is in charge of the construction specific pieces of this. But applaud the Penn National folks for what they're able to do. And we want to meet that bar.

This is a civic association

Commissioner Stebbins will recognize. That association, again just continuing our support, our local support. These are annual events that we've supported from the very beginning and will continue to.

program.

The Puerto Rican parade, you can see we've got activated residents who are focused on the vote. I know that's not your bailiwick, but certainly we are focused on having our supporters understand the question and what's at stake. We're happy to see a continuing great support there in Springfield.

This one I'm really excited about and I'm going to play a video in a short moment. But I want to spend a few moments about this event. The gentleman to the left in the chef's jacket is Anthony Amoroso. We call him Chef Anthony. He is the Executive Chef for Aria.

We brought him out last week along with his colleague Chef Edmund from the Bellagio to host a really wonderful event in Court Square. You all know Court Square from our tour. You're going to see it highlighted in just a few moments.

What we did is we had our chefs stop by the Putnam Vocational Academy in Springfield to teach juniors, I think they are juniors in that program, about culinary skills. Our chefs

are rock stars in the industry, and were able to sit down and tell them the practical day-to-day work that goes around being an executive chef. Really fantastic.

They were so happy with event that the instructor asked us if they could partake and help staff the event that the chefs came out for the following day. So, we had 12 of the kids at Court Square. Our chefs signed the jackets. They're going to put them up in the vocational school.

And one of the great things about Chef Anthony's story is he started in a vocational academy. So, we gave them some real context that they can achieve their dreams from relatively humble beginnings.

You'll recognize this scene. Since we came to Springfield, and it starts with Jim Murren, we've fallen in love with Court Square. Court Square I think topographically is the oldest existing site in Springfield since its founding in 1636.

You'll recognize those buildings from our tour. You've got the old First

Church, which is the white church in the background. The yellow beige building straight ahead is old Court Square Hotel, which is one of the leading hotels at the turn-of-the-century.

We are potentially going to invest with Peter Picknelly, one of the Picknellys on getting that hotel back open as a boutique hotel and as part of our program. We are not there yet, but we're trying to figure out how to preserve that building.

Across the street, the perspective where the phot was taken from is State Street which is where the courthouse is. This is the perspective from City Hall. Beautiful buildings in the area. And we wanted to highlight Court square.

So, I'm going to play for you in a moment a video from last Friday where we held an event. What you see are a bank of banquet tables that are right in front of old First Church. A little bit difficult to see.

The event what we put on was to bring 200 people down to Court Square, have

1 them fed by our executive chefs with the 2 assistance of the Putnam high school kids. And 3 we funded two charitable programs. 4 One is our MGM Springfield public 5 art program. You might recall that was an 6 aspect of our application where we were going to work with Professor Simpson, which is a 8 UMass professor and some local kids to do 9 murals, to do public art to bring art to public 10 schools. 11 So, proceeds from this event kicked 12 off that program. We also worked with the 13 Community School of Music. You'll see in a 14 moment, we had kids that were part of that 15 music school playing in the background of our 16 event. It was really fantastic. 17 18 (Video played) 19 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. 21 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Looks like 22 fun. 23 MR. MATHIS: Tremendously proud of 24 that event. And I think the star of that night

1 was Court Square and downtown Springfield. 2 We brought a couple of chefs. We 3 brought some banquet tables, but very 4 gratified. We heard some feedback from longtime residents who said I've been here 40, 5 6 50 years. I walk through Court Square to get to jury duty. I walk past Court Square to get 8 to the MassMutual from time to time, but I 9 never stopped and enjoyed Court Square. 10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Who were the invitees? 11 12 We did a combination of MR. MATHIS: 13 personal invitations to our supporters. 14 also did a public sale of tickets. So, \$125 15 per ticket and we sold half of the 200 seats to 16 the public at \$125, which was a great show of 17 support. And it benefited a good cause. 18 And that's what we're really good 19 at, frankly, is doing creative things with food 20 and entertainment. That's just an example. 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great, terrific. 22 MR. MATHIS: And that'll be the 23 first of many annual such downtown dinner 24 projects.

MR. IRVING: We've been doing this for a couple of years. And I told Mike that was the very best night we've ever had in Springfield. It really showcased what the city can look like some day. It was fantastic.

MR. MATHIS: With that I think we'll turn back to the monotony of permits. So, we just want to highlight a couple of things.

This is an \$800 million project, the largest project in Western Massachusetts.

And as a result I think there's a great amount of collaboration that needs to take place between the developer and between different agencies. We're aware of that. And I think Chuck has done a really good job with our development team breaking this up into different packages.

One of the things that we did yesterday is we met with Secretary Bialecki's office of housing and economic development and met with their permitting ombudsman to make sure that we're able to identify issues early. And he can help us work across different agencies.

It was one of those meetings where everybody was looking for a problem that didn't exist yet. And we said that's the way want to kick off the relationship is not in crisis mode, but to be proactive and make sure you understand what our work plan is.

That goes to the viaduct project for example. I think the biggest opportunity for us is on building infrastructure in terms of vendors and suppliers. And I think this touches a little bit on the work that Commissioner Stebbins is doing with his Vendor Advisory group.

They know what their database is out there. And what we've committed to do is to give them a gap analysis. Here are the types of goods and services we need. Here are the vendors that we've identified in the area.

It won't surprise you, we've plenty good on alcohol and spirits in Western Mass.

That we've got covered. Not so good on different professional services, for example, or some of the FF&E. So, we'll identify those early and start working with Commissioner

Stebbins or with Secretary Bialecki's office to try to bridge that gap. And a lot of that takes some lead time.

Chuck, maybe we can talk about where we are with MEPA, just again calling out a couple of the big items.

MR. IRVING: Last month, I think, we gave you a four-month schedule with 60 line items. This one has 92. So, we're going to just try to go through the treetops on these as quickly as possible.

In the MEPA process, we are working toward this with the intent that we're going to be successful in November. And we are planning to or hoping to submit our FEIR prior to the vote and just get that going.

We had a full team session last week. Things are moving along very quickly.

MGM is funding things as forcefully as they can. And we feel comfortable that we can probably get that submission done, which we are excited about to have completed.

MR. MATHIS: Just to put a finer point on it, we are spending hundreds of

thousands of dollars at risk to get the FEIR materials in a position that they can be submitted.

I think this schedule shows them going in a week or two before the vote. We are confident about the vote. And we want to be ready to execute on our plan and get open as quickly as we can ahead of Wynn Resorts. So, we are very focused on that. And I think the work plan demonstrates that and all of the activities we've been doing.

MR. IRVING: This chart is intensive, but Massachusetts is intensive. And what you're seeing here is the same chart that I would show you for development of any shopping center in Massachusetts but for the vendor licensing and things like that.

This chart is overwhelming, because it probably is the largest development project in the history of Western Massachusetts. So, with Chris's help and the city's help, as Mike said we are looking at trying to package this in bite-size pieces so we can go to agencies and say let's engage now.

Let's really work on a parking garage, work on this utility and process this as efficiently and gently as we can. Because candidly a lot of the resources are fairly strapped. And we can't just lay 1000 pages on somebody's desk and expect approval the next day.

MR. MATHIS: I was remiss about -I'm going to ask Amy to bring one slide up
because an event going on today that's really
important. An you'll be pleased as a
collaboration between two of your licensees,
ourselves and Penn National. We put this
together before the Boston selection. This has
been in the works for quite some time.

At this very moment, we've got a joint vendor information showcase going on at the DCU Center in Worcester. Again, very focused on Worcester because we think we're doing a good job in Western Mass. with our vendors. I know Penn National feels like they're doing a good job in their area.

And we really think that Worcester is such an important market that we're going to

1 force ourselves to host events in that area.

2 | So, I think as of -- I checked in at lunch. We

3 | had 115 registrants come through as a snapshot.

4 And they've been circulating throughout the

5 day. So, you've got our booths. You've got

6 the Penn National booths. And then you also

N have different workforce development partners,

8 vendor groups that also have booths there as

9 | well, different chambers for example.

So, when we kicked this all off, meaning start to develop the project, we don't believe we're just building infrastructure for our project, we believe we're building infrastructure for Western Mass. And as a result, it will attract new businesses because of the investment that we'll all be making.

We'll continue to do events like this but this is part of again building that database and that awareness to make sure that we've got good vendors in our system when we go to let all of these goods and services out.

MR. IRVING: So, let me just walk through the treetops here quickly. This chart can be a tool as a baseline for you to ask us

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

questions literally for the next year going forward. I promise you all of these this line items will change and move and it will be very organic but that's natural in any project.

Starting at the federal level, we are blessed by having very little federal approval process in this project. We are going to drain water, runoff water into the river. So, that's an approval that we have to get but we're not concerned about that.

At the state level, we have to get our MEPA permit. We have to get through the Historic Commission process, the Department of Housing and obviously we need the Gaming Commission's input on the plan and our design as we work through that process.

At the city level, we have an overlay district, which is still in the approval process. But we're comfortable that that's going to be finished up. Within that process, there is a site plan review, which is a normal process. But we're not worried about that because obviously our plan was an attachment to the agreement with the city. So

everybody knows what's coming forward from here.

We have to get demolition permits for all of the buildings. We have to do hazardous waste study on every single building before we can get those demo permits. Those permits come in one at a time. So, those will be the first lead item. If I say hey, I think they're going to something in December that means we think we're probably going to have those buildings coming down in that time.

We have to go into the streets and redesign the utility systems. Some we have to cap. Some we're going to have to redirect in other places. So, we're going to have to get approval from the city to go in and do that. And then once we figure it all out, we have to get approval from the city to have connection into those facilities.

And I'm just starting with the preconstruction approvals here. We have to get sewer and water permits. We need to get a highway access permit. We need a sewer connection permit. We have to work through

1 Chris and the DPW to redesign the streets.

Some streets we're abandoning. Some streets we're reconfiguring. And he's going to be really our guide as to how we do that most

5 efficiently.

We have to get curb cut permits, off-site roadwork permits. Within the building department, typical construction permits. As we've indicated, we hope to do that in a phased process coming out of the ground first with the parking garage so we can get the courthouse employees as well as our construction workers inside our garage as quickly as possible.

LEED certification is something that we've committed to on that project. So, that's a box we're going to check as well. We're still looking at all of the options as to how we're going to achieve that goal but we're comfortable that we're going to achieve everything we committed to.

Use and operation permits, vendor licensing, the daycare center that has state requirements that we have to live up to. The elevator permits, fuel storage, alcohol,

building department, we need to get

certificates of occupancy. Hunter sent us a

note saying don't commit to this thing on the

schedule. We just want you to know this is a

date that we think we're going to pull our

certificates of occupancy.

It could be pushed out a little bit. For example, if the viaduct is 30 days late we may stutter step and be 30 days late with them because we need to have those two projects lined up perfectly.

Fire department, health department, all of this is very standard. And what's great about Springfield is there really have been no surprises. We're not worried about this permitting process in any way at all in terms of achieving it and getting through it.

Do I have concerns about how quickly some departments can take this giant process and put it through their system and say go forward, yes, I do. So, that's something I would recommend as you look at this that would be a question I would ask. How long do you expect that sewer and water permit? Where are

you getting that highway access permit? What is the timing?

Every department in the state works differently. And I would expect different timelines on all of them. At the city level, I think Chris can speak to this better than I can, but I think the city is going to be our partner on this. And in any way your team is going to try to expedite this with thorough diligence. You're not going to give us a free pass.

MR. CIGNOLI: Not a free pass, but one of the things that we've really been happy about is that as Chuck has said there's been no surprises, from his side thinking about the city and from our side thinking about MGM.

We deal with developers all the time that we talk about preliminary plans and preliminary layouts. And kind of give them an idea that yes, this is the direction we want to go in. And then all of a sudden they show up with a plan and says we decided to move the building here and the entrance is going to be over here.

Their plan has stayed basically the way that it has been proposed from day one.

So, our review, nothing has changed. All we ever do really from a standpoint of working with MGM and with Chuck is confirming that it's still the way that it is and nothing has changed.

So, our approach to what we need to do and what we're expecting to see on plans really just gets into a little bit more detail every time. And we haven't had to go back and rethink anything about roads, about intersections, about access things like that.

So, as a city we're extremely comfortable with where it is right now. And as long as it keeps going on that path, I think the process is going to work very, very well in the city.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Great.

MR. MATHIS: I think just in closing, again, any questions you have. One of the commitments we made in the host community agreement with Mayor Sarno was to fund a dedicated position, essentially a city version

of an ombudsman to help shepherd some of these permits, because we recognize that staffing up for the type of permitting review that it will take to review our project isn't something that necessarily makes sense on a long-term bases.

You don't want to hire all of those positions because there's not another \$800 million project coming down the road. So, we've prepared for that, and we'll work with them to create some dedicated positions sort of as a one-off to help shepherd this process.

So, can't thank Chris enough for all of his support for schlepping out from Western Mass. to be here with us this morning. But it really speaks to the kind of collaboration we have with the city. They're our partners as is the Commonwealth once we get this open.

MR. IRVING: And one thing I'd like to really emphasize, and this is coming from a local developer perspective, the money MGM invested into the entitlement process starting two years ago is why we are in such a comfort zone right now.

They have allowed us to put together

1 a Massachusetts-based development team like Genslar and Tech and Brown Rudnick that are 2 3 here today. And I think it's the best team 4 I've ever seen working together in 5 Massachusetts. And through that process 6 there's not an agency in the state that we have to work with that isn't now familiar with this 8 team and is ready to engage right after November. 9 10 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That's great, sounds terrific. 11 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's all wonderful 13 to hear. Any other comments, questions? 14 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Just a quick 15 question, and Chris we need to better coordinate our travel schedules. I noticed 16 17 you're going back into some meetings with the 18 Springfield Historical Commission. Obviously, the fate of several of the historical 19 20 properties are key. 21 And on your schedule, you had a 22 meeting last week. Just quickly how did that 23 go? And obviously, it's an ongoing thing. 24 thoughts or comments from the meeting last

1 | week?

MR. IRVING: What we're doing in the historic meetings are taking one building at a time right now because we think they all deserve that level of attention.

So, last week's meeting was regarding how we move the church down the street and keep it in the condition that we want it to be in. So, there was really no new information. It was a collaborative process talking about the church, relocating down toward Union Street, and the timing and the execution, which in our past, our meeting with you last month we talked about and said, hey, this is going to be an interesting project to move this church.

MR. CIGNOLI: And just one thing I wanted to add on that, Bruce, our interaction with somebody like Bob McCarroll, etc. is has the plan changed any from the city's perspective, and as I just mentioned before, the answer is no. So, that on their side there continues to be no surprises.

They're obviously talking about the

1 historical standpoint. Is there anything else 2 in the plan that is changing that they need to 3 kind of be aware of as we're moving through, 4 the process. At this point nothing new needs to come to their attention from our side. 5 6 I'm assuming it's going to continue that way. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: That's 8 great. 9 MR. IRVING: So, every month I 10 expect that before we meet with you we're going 11 to have had another meeting with the Historic 12 Commission. And right now we're working on 13 which building we're going to discuss next 14 month. And we'll come in with a report on that 15 as well. 16 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: That's good. 17 MR. MATHIS: I think that's it for 18 I think the importance of the work our update. 19 we're doing, and I'll maybe close with this 20 interesting tidbit about the church. 21 dynamic with the First Spiritual Church is that it's in the center of our site. So, it needs 22 23 to be relocated.

We've talked to you about plans to

1 incorporate that into our childcare center.

2 But the interesting sequence issue is that in

3 order to create the foundation for its final

4 | home, which is a farther out need and a farther

5 | out timeline, what we're going to do is lift

6 the church, park it somewhere, which will be

7 incredible I think. I'm going to ask our guys

8 to make that a Discovery Channel special.

Park it somewhere temporally to get it off the site and then prep the pad for where it will land. And that's the level of detail that we're getting into now. You wouldn't want to discover that the day you start breaking ground that you have nowhere to park the

So, those are the kinds of things we're starting to work on. And it's the exciting part of development that we're happy to challenge with a really talented team. So, we'll continue to give you those types of updates.

But feel confident that we're on top of it and we're excited to get this project open.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

church.

1 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I want to see 2 the Discovery Channel film. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I want to go to 4 the next dinner. COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That too. 5 6 MR. MATHIS: That's why you were 7 asking about the invite. I'm sorry. I think I 8 snubbed the Commission on the invite. That 9 probably wasn't too smart. 10 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I don't want 11 to get into that. I am fascinated by this 12 church thing, by lots of pieces of this but 13 that's one of them. 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Let us know when 15 it's moving. 16 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: We'll bring our lawn chairs and sit and watch this. 17 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything we can do 19 on your behalf? 20 MR. MATHIS: As far as we're 21 concerned, John Ziemba and your staff have been 22 fantastic. In fact, we gave them a couple 23 issues to help us with just in terms of 24 communications. And we're working really well

- 1 | together. So, we'll let you know certainly,
- 2 but thank you for your support.
- MR. IRVING: We're meeting with Rick
- 4 and John very regularly and as Mike said,
- 5 | they've been incredibly proactive. So, we're
- 6 | very grateful for that.
- 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Terrific. Thank
- 8 | you very much.
- 9 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Thank you.
- 10 | COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It's always a
- 11 parking issue, huh, even for the church.
- 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do you have other
- 13 things, Ombudsman?
- 14 MR. ZIEMBA: That's the report
- 15 unless you have any questions.
- 16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: No, that's great.
- 17 | Thank you. Let's quickly move to legal. Item
- 18 | number seven, General Counsel Blue.
- 19 MS. BLUE: You have in your packet
- 20 today two amended small business impact
- 21 statements and the final versions of the vendor
- 22 secondary licensing and the gaming school
- 23 regulations.
- 24 We had our public hearing on the

1 regulations on September 4. And with your 2 approval of both the amended small business 3 impact statements and the final versions, we 4 will submit these for filing and they should be 5 through the process. 6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Are there any 7 questions about those? 8 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No questions. 9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do we want to go 10 straight to a motion? Who would that be, Commissioner Stebbins. 11 12 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. 13 Chairman, I move that the Commission approve 14 the small business impact statements, as soon 15 as I can find them, -- I'm not as good as the 16 Judge is on this. --17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Maybe Catherine 18 can just list the names. MS. BLUE: It is the 19 20 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Page 102, 21 Bruce. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: -- approve 22 23 the small impact business statement for 24 proposed amendments in 205 CMR 134 licensing,

Page 165 1 and the small business impact statement for new 2 regulations in 205 CMR 137 gaming schools and 3 the associated regulations. 4 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second. 5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any discussion? 6 All in favor, aye. 7 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye. 8 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 10 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 12 have it unanimously. 13 MS. BLUE: Thank you. 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Next? I thought 15 you had --16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: We covered the 17 regulations in the same motion. 18 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, we did them 19 all. Okay. I'm glad I voted for it. 20 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Catherine 21 didn't tell me I couldn't. 22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, are we onto 23 research and problem gambling? Okay, good. 24 This is the last item on our agenda, I believe,

1 today.

2.1

2 MR. VANDER LINDEN: I didn't expect 3 to go so soon.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Neither did I.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Good afternoon.

I am bringing back before you the responsible

gaming framework for your consideration.

Before I begin, just real quickly the purpose of the framework, the responsible gaming framework is intended to provide guidance for the Gaming Commission in terms of responsible gaming regulations that we will ultimately end up adopting. It's also intended to provide just a general orientation for the Commission as well as our licensees on responsible gaming practices.

The framework has been before you many times before and has gone through many different versions. I think I started -- It really began back in October of last year when we kicked it off with a forum on responsible gaming. From there, I worked closely with the Massachusetts Council on Compulsive Gaming -- I'm sorry Massachusetts Council on Compulsive

Gambling as well as Problem Gambling Solutions and the Massachusetts Department of Public Health.

That version, the first version came to you in March followed by a second version in May then July, and here we are today.

There's been many changes in this version in large part based on the feedback that you had provided in July. But it also took into consideration further support and information provided by the Department of Public Health, also the Massachusetts Public Health Association.

And I think that what you have before you is a much stronger document as a result. So, with that I don't know how you want to kick off this conversation. I'm open to any additional feedback you may have and any discussion you may have as well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: My suggestion would be that you just walk through the major issues. As you say, we've all been through it several times. So, we're pretty familiar with the evolving document. But where there are

major issues that you think ought to be
highlighted both for us and for the public
record, let's do that

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Okay. I would start off with the introduction on page three. Within the introduction, there was some question the last time that I presented it to you. What is the true intention? What is the purpose of the framework?

I felt like we addressed it, but it was further down in the document. So, I put it front and center. And you see the first two sentences under the introduction. It, I think, clearly describes what the purpose of the framework is.

I would also like to point out the definition of problem gambling. I put a slightly more general definition of problem gambling, whereas before we indicated or brought up time and money spent. Really, I think a broader definition is better where we state that problem gambling is characterized by gambling behavior which leads to a continuum of adverse consequences for the gambler, others

1 and the community.

2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: It's also important in that introduction, the second

5 paragraph is also important.

We're going to have regulations that will contain a list of do's and don'ts and must's and mustn'ts. But it's also important to understand overall that this is a policy that the Commission puts its full, a policy that the Commission puts its full weight behind. So, that there's ambiguities or intersections in the regulations that this kind of thing supplies the philosophy that the Commission has got its back behind.

And I think the second paragraph is a very useful one as well as the first. It's all useful, but I just wanted to give a shout out for the second paragraph.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Thank you. I think the intent of a framework to me is this is a really complex issue. And thoughtfully addressing this is what's going to make a true impact. And it doesn't come with just one

strategy. It doesn't come with just one measure. It comes with a framework.

And there are probably 50 plus different measures that we identify in here. And I think it's with that thoughtfulness that spans all of the way from primary prevention and basic education, all of the way through much more intensive types of intervention recommendations that provide that type of more of a public health safety net that we're looking for that I think fits within the mission of what the Commission is trying to do. And ultimately ends up meeting what the original intent of the authorizing legislation was. So, I agree, Commissioner.

I would like to move all of the way to strategy two. There are a couple of different things that I would like to point out in strategy two. First, under 2.1 informed decision-making.

During the last meeting there was question and concern expressed around looking at the different types of gamblers, the casual gambler, the frequent gambler and the intensive

gambler. And specifically assigning frequency or how often somebody would be gambling within this, when much like the definition of problem gambling, you can't necessarily tie it to a specific frequency or tie it to a specific amount spent.

So, to I think recognize that we just simply took out the frequency in there.

But I think the rest of the definition fit it quite well.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes. There's not a negative connotation here. It's all positive and constructive and tools. So, I think this reads really well and it's not assigning blame. It's really giving you tools to understand the issues and to address them as need be. So, I think this reads really well.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It's not a one-size-fits-all, which is part of -- or three size fits all, which is part of the point you're making, Mark, relative to how difficult it is to deal with a variety of individuals with many different circumstances and

backgrounds.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes. The 2.2 play information and management systems. This is the one piece that in my mind remains a controversial issue that many of our licensees have a problem with. And they have expressed some concern about.

Informed decision-making and management systems basically look at what types of tools can we give players to help them make more informed decisions about their play behavior. And it moves it from just simply providing some information about responsible gaming, for example, saying set a budget and stick with it to providing real-time tools for people who want to use those.

If you want to say I want to spend \$50, when you go into the casino, you've have the ability to set that to your player card. When \$50 is spent at a slot machine, then it provides notifications and reminders that you've spent \$50.

The concern I think from our licensees has been (1) how effective is this?

What does the evidence show that says that this is effective? (2) How much does it cost to implement such features at the casino? Third is what are the considerations in terms of implementing this of rolling this into their existing systems?

With that I want to take all of their questions, all of their concerns seriously. We decided to enlist the help of a consultant or consultant group take a look at all these concerns. Their process was to do a thorough literature review on what do we know about play management features or more specifically pre-commitment features that would be connected to player cards.

They also -- We took it a step further and have been in the process of interviewing in other jurisdictions, in fact nine other jurisdictions gaming regulators, gaming operators, machine manufacturers and other government officials about what their experience has been with these types of features. I think to provide me, to provide you all with a very solid understanding of what

are the advantages of this, but also and more importantly I think to answer some of the concerns about what are the problems with it.

I am sorry to say I don't have a final report for that to you right now. I can report that they are in the process of wrapping up their data collection. And their preliminary recommendation is for the Commission, for the Commissioners, for you all to adopt such features.

I think that how we implement that is probably as important as if we implement it. Because in their experience in talking with these individuals from nine other jurisdictions that have used these, how you do it is incredibly important.

I think that a lot of the concerns that have come up in other jurisdictions is what is the rate of uptake? How many people actually use this in order for it to be worth the cost of it? What is the cost-benefit ratio here?

So, I think that what we'll see in the final report is a number of recommendations

regarding how to encourage uptake of these tools.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: The final report from the consultants?

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Correct.

Another important key feature or factor that I think we'll end up seeing here and that they've let me know just in their preliminary findings is how do you implement it in a way to maximize the effectiveness of these tools. So, that it really is something if you have a lot of people using it, how do you make sure that it's being used appropriately and for the right reasons to help people set a budget of time and/or money and stick with that.

So, at this point, what I have in the framework is a statement that the MGC will investigate the feasibility including costs, available technology and the effectiveness of incorporating play information and management systems into the development of regulations. I state what those features are, but I would say that at this point I would recommend that we keep that language in there. We are certainly

1 on track to gather that information. And I 2 should be able to provide that to you soon. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What is your 4 schedule for that? When do you expect to get 5 the report at a point where you will want to 6 distribute it? MR. VANDER LINDEN: I would give it 8 probably another 30 days before I would have 9 that final report. 10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thirty days, okay. 11 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: A key 12 provision of this is in the first sentence of 13 It seems to me this is voluntary. People 14 can be encouraged to do it but this is not 15 going to be something that's mandatory or 16 required. The approach is a voluntary --17 giving people the tools they want to use 18 voluntarily. 19 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Correct. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: There has been a 20 21 lot of misunderstanding about the word 22 voluntary. And yes, you're absolutely right. 23 And that's one of the places where there's been 24 a misunderstanding. But it would not be

1 voluntary for the licensees to offer it. 2 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I understand 3 What other misunderstanding about 4 voluntary has there been? CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, originally 5 6 there was a misunderstanding about whether 7 people would be required to participate, 8 people, individuals would be required to 9 participate in the program. 10 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: That doesn't 11 sound like voluntary to me. 12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm sorry, 13 misunderstanding of voluntary. No, there was a 14 misunderstanding that it was not voluntary. 15 Sorry. But there's two levels of voluntary. 16 17 One is the individual participating and the 18 other is the industry participating. 19 were to do this, we would mandate that the 20 industry offers it as a voluntary option. 21 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: As a voluntary 22 option, right. So, then the cost piece has a 23 -- I can understand the cost piece. I'd have 24 to be persuaded of what the other problems are.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I think 1 2 there's something we need to explore is the 3 role of the Commission offering certain of 4 these tools without necessarily the full 5 participation of the licensees. I have some 6 ideas but this goes back to the feasibility. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: T think 8 what's important is this language does not lock 9 us into anything. It's an exploration, 10 continue to evaluate and gather information. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think we call it 11 12 a placeholder. 13 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: We can call 14 it a placeholder. I think that language makes 15 it clear that there is no final decision here. 16 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: We have to and 17 are going to I know continue to work with the 18 licensees and get their thoughts about 19 feasibility, implementation, all of this other 20 stuff to make this work and to test it. 21 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes. Actually 22 that last point is very important. That we are 23 looking at pre-commitment tools on gaming 24 machines is not something that's been done in

1 | the US before.

It's been done in a number of other jurisdictions. We're certainly gathering all of the information about what worked and what didn't work and what the recommendations are, if we should adopt this of how we should proceed.

With that said, I think it's ultimately important that we have a rigorous evaluation process in place here. It fits with our overall orientation.

We want to adopt practices that are tested that are identified best practices in responsible gaming. The downfall of that is that there really aren't that many out there. So, with that in the absence of that sort of best practice approach, we're taking a precautionary approach.

And this would be an example of a precautionary approach where we say you know what, there is great potential in offering tools like this to help individuals gamble responsibly. But because it isn't some type of tried and true practice, we may choose to move

forward with this, but we're going to
rigorously evaluate the effectiveness and
decide whether we continue as is, whether we
change that and offer it in a slightly
different way or whether we abandon ship.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Another key feature within the framework, and this is actually was envisioned within the authorizing legislation, is under 2.3, the responsible gaming information centers.

I'm incredibly excited about what the potential of these on-site spaces are. I am incredibly encouraged also in talking more specifically and recently with Penn about what their vision is and where they had proposed that this space is placed within their facility, in an area where there is a high amount of traffic coming by to gain a lot of visibility. But at the same time that it's large enough that there would be private space that if there is a sensitive situation that needs to be dealt with that we can do that within that space.

So, I look forward to working with our licensees to further kind of iron out what this looks like and how it's used.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yesterday we actually toured the Penn site and saw right where the responsible gaming space will be right at the front door. It's great.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: It's in a space actually where they've said about two-thirds of the patrons coming through will walk by that space.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Great.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Moving to 3.6 under the strategy of providing protections within the physical environment, a number of recommendations come from Massachusetts Public Health Association.

One that that fit I felt like under the encouraging breaks in play which was to display clocks in prominent locations in the gaming area to help patrons track the passage of time.

This is something that has been tried in other jurisdictions. It's something

that hasn't gotten a lot of attention in terms
of how well it's been evaluated. I felt like
that it was a recommendation coming from the
Public Health Association. I think that it
fits well within a broader strategy of helping
encouraging breaks in play. So, I put that in
there.

Under strategy four there were four additional recommendations that I have for practices in casino gambling and advertising.

Under 4.2 generally the advertising does not encourage people to play beyond their means; imply the certainty of reward; exaggerate the chances of winning or encouraging excessive or irresponsible play.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Some of these may be hard to evaluate; is that right?

MR. VANDER LINDEN: That's correct. Evaluation is going to be key in many different measures. Some of them we will spend a lot more time and energy setting up a rigorous evaluation protocol than for others.

Some of them for example the four additional ones that I placed in there were

adopted from a jurisdiction in Australia that had those as advertising guidelines there.

Moving to strategy five, managing high-risk financial transactions, this while it hasn't changed since the last iteration, I would like to just highlight the fact that there was a lot of input from the licensees specifically through the Mass. Partnership for Responsible Gaming to come up with I think recommendations for house credit that have a lot of potential.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: And I think those -- This didn't change from the last iteration?

MR. VANDER LINDEN: No, it did not.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Well, it did change substantially from the first one. This is a much more functional, sensible and I think effective way of dealing with this. I think this is really good the way it is now.

It permits the extension of credit to people who really want a lot of credit, someplace to move money from one place to another and at the same time has safeguards

built in so that people aren't going beyond
their means. I think it's very well thought
out.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Thank you.

Moving to strategy six, there were a number of small changes to strategy six that came from recommendations from the Mass. Council on Compulsive Gambling as well as the Department of Public Health.

I think that they're all very good. Specifically Steve Keel and Marlene Warner from those two organizations are here to offer their support.

What I like about it is it remains relatively general but it also sets it up that it allows us to expand this over time. As we get more information about what are effective ways that we can encourage our operators to work within the community and engage within the community.

In general, what I would love to see is that they are members of their community.

And I've seen nothing to that contrary. MGM was a perfect example of how they are from the

onset engaging with the community. Their
presentation was fantastic. And I look to
continue that. And I think that strategy six
kind of sets that up.

That actually kind of covers the main substantial changes from the last version of this document.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any thoughts, others, questions?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: No. I think this is really good. It sets out a set of principles. It sets out a set of principles at a level of specificity that carries some focus forward, but at a level of generality that leaves us leeway to issue regulations without having to change this.

And also provides a framework for flexibility as we move downstream and begin to actually get data and see what's going on, and enlist the support of our licensees knowing what our target is and helping us achieve it, if whatever specific regulatory strategy we are using doesn't seem to be working quite the way we'd like.

1 So, I think it's really a good thing 2 And the way that it's been put to have. 3 together with engaging the license community, 4 the public health community, the compulsive gambling community, I think this is really a 5 6 great step forward and a really important one for us and for this new thing in Massachusetts. 7 8 So, it's great. 9 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I agree. 10 had a chance to visit with Mark earlier in the 11 week and talk through this. And my biggest 12 concern was that this is a living document that 13 we can kind of keep coming back to as 14 strategies change or strategies are proven not 15 to be as successful as we had hoped that it can be reflected ultimately here in and then 16 17 ultimately in regulations. I think it's well 18 done. 19 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Thank you. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 20 I echo that. 21 The adjustments, changes are right on and 22 really make it a workable, practical document. 23 Well done. 24 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Thank you.

just wanted to highlight one thing that I don't think I ever really stated but that I felt like was important in considering any of the strategies or measures in here is that we have this great potential to put and promote responsible gaming here.

That before somebody would cross that line to problem gambling, we can provide tools, information to encourage people to gamble responsibly that they wouldn't cross that line and experience the negative consequences, at times devastating consequences of what problem gambling does.

It doesn't say that we don't prioritize that. And it doesn't need to be specific and intentional strategies for that. But I think that what I really want in this document is that we can promote gambling or gaming in a way in which people can do it as it's intended, as a form of recreation, as entertainment and something that they can afford. It's really important.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I agree.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Just to say a

similar thing for the record that I think this effort has been really great.

Perhaps quite a few months in the making, but I think a great testament to what's really in our mission which is to be participatory, engage the licensees, other stakeholders like DPH and the Council. So, I think your approach -- You've led this approach of a lot of thoughtful research really understanding what's out there, available and what's not.

And a testament to that is also as Commissioner Stebbins is saying this will continue to be a living document, would evolve into regulation in some fashion, strategies will remain the same, some might evolve. But I just think overall it's a great product.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You mentioned 30 days before the report is ready. I know you're tracking this, but just to reiterate. If we did end up requiring that our first licensee, Penn National, did have to install some kind of a personal management module on their slot machines, they would need to know that when?

1 And are we on the track to hit that deadline? 2 MR. VANDER LINDEN: I will follow up 3 with Penn, obviously, since they're well in 4 advance of the other licensees. I will communicate directly with Penn and make sure 5 6 that we are meeting their earmarks as well. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. If we are 8 going to do this, and we don't know yet whether 9 we are or not, but we want to do it in as 10 timely a fashion as possible to get it into 11 their pipeline at the least expensive 12 inconvenience as possible. 13 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Correct. 14 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do we have 15 anything else? 16 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Are we going 17 to approve this? Is this on for a vote? 18 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes, it is. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm sorry. 19 Commissioner Zuniga, you've been pretty heavily 20 21 involved in this. 22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Sure. I would 23 move that this Commission approve the 24 responsible gaming framework as presented and

discussed here in its last iteration as labeled 1 2 here version one presented on September 23. 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? 4 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Second. 5 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any further 6 discussion? I would certainly add my appreciation to this. I know how hard you've 8 worked on this. And I know your style with 9 which -- you've gone out of your way to have 10 this be a process in which you really listen to 11 people. You think hard about your own 12 assumptions and their assumptions. So, I would 13 just echo what everybody else has said. 14 is a good document. And I'm proud to have it 15 be a part of our operation. 16 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Thank you. 17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor, aye. 18 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: 19 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 21 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes 22 23 have the responsible gaming frameworks

recommendations adopted in a unanimous vote.

```
1
                I have one other thing before we
 2
              I am alerted to the fact that we're
 3
     about to lose one of our team members, Tom from
 4
     Pyxis, who has been with us. Stand up, take a
5
     wave.
 6
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH:
                                      Tom, are you
 7
     going to take all of your machines with you
8
     too?
9
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Tom I'm told has
10
    been hired to go to work at Liberty Mutual from
11
     Pyxis. So, we hope you'll leave good folks
12
    behind but it's been a great operation. It's
13
     almost worked flawlessly. I know we've asked a
14
     lot of you folks and you've always really
15
     responded quick, quick, quick. So, it's been
16
     great.
17
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Really great,
18
     really great.
19
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good luck in your
20
    next phase. Do I have a motion to adjourn?
21
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH:
                                      So moved.
22
                CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor, aye.
23
                COMMISSIONER MCHUGH:
                                      Aye.
24
                COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
                                       Aye.
```

```
Page 192
 1
                 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
 2
                 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
 3
                 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you.
 4
                 (Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.)
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

1 ATTACHMENTS:

- Massachusetts Gaming Commission September
 25, 2014 Notice of Meeting and Agenda
- 4 2. Massachusetts Gaming Commission September 5 4, 2014 Meeting Minutes
- 6 3. Massachusetts Gaming Commission Employee
 7 Handbook Master List with Attachments
- 8 4. Biographies of KLR Consultants Henry Silva 9 and Michael Medeiros
- 5. Massachusetts Gaming Commission ControlNarratives for Budgetary Controls
- 12 6. Massachusetts Gaming Commission Control
 13 Narratives for Payroll and Personnel
- 7. Massachusetts Gaming Commission Control
 Narratives for Revenue Receipts and
 Reconciliation
- 17 8. Massachusetts Gaming Commission Control
 18 Narratives for Contracting and Contract
 19 Processing
- 9. Massachusetts Gaming Commission Control
 Narratives for Invoice Receipt and
 Payments
- 23 10. Massachusetts Gaming Commission screenshot 24 of webpage

Page 194 ATTACHMENTS (continued): 1 2 Penn National Gaming Diversity Graphs 11. 3 (Workforce, Design and Construction 4 Supplier Diversity) 5 12. Massachusetts Gaming Commission September 6 25, 2014 Memorandum Regarding Chapter 311 7 of the Acts of 2014 with attachments 8 13. Amended Small Business Impact Statements 9 14. 205 CMR 134 10 15. 205 CMR 137 11 16. Responsible Gaming Framework 12 17. MGM Project Overview spreadsheets 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

Page 195 1 **GUEST SPEAKERS:** 2 Ed Burke, North Passage Associates 3 Joan Kuhn, North Passage Associates 4 Henry Silva, KLR 5 Michael Medeiros, KLR 6 7 Lance George, Penn National 8 Jack Rauen, Turner Construction 9 Alison Stanton, Turner Construction 10 11 Michael Mathis, MGM 12 Chris Cignoli, DPW Springfield 13 Chuck Irving, Davenport Properties 14 15 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION STAFF: 16 Catherine Blue, General Counsel 17 Richard Day, Executive Director 18 Jennifer Durenberger, Director of Racing 19 Derek Lennon, CFAO 20 Jill Griffin, Director Workforce, Supplier and 21 Diversity Development Mark Vander Linden, Dir. Research and Problem 22 23 Gambling John Ziemba, Ombudsman 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 27th day of
21	September, 2014.
22	Sauri Jordan (1)
23	LAURIE J. JORDAN My Commission expires:
24	Notary Public May 11, 2018