		Page	1
1	THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS		
2	MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION		
3			
4	PUBLIC MEETING #55		
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	March 12, 2013, 8:30 a.m.		
18	OFFICE OF THE DIVISION OF INSURANCE		
19	First Floor, Hearing Room E		
20	1000 Washington Street		
21	Boston, Massachusetts		
22			
23			
24			

PROCEEDINGS:

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I am pleased to call to order the 55th public meeting of the Mass.

Gaming Commission on March 12, 2013.

Unfortunately, our live streaming is not starting yet but it will soon. There will be tremendous high demand for Tom Glynn's notes because we're not on streaming, but we'll get them.

We are now very deep in the process of talking about the evaluation criteria that we're going to use to select the licensees for expanded gaming in Massachusetts.

We have invited three guests today because of two particular questions, although we are interested in anything they have to say about anything. But in particular, we are interested in suggestions on what we can do to incent and support our licensees in their attempt to attract out-of-state visitors. Those are the visitors that are the most significant for the Commonwealth, the most economic impact (A). And (B) suggestions on what we can do to enhance,

support, augment the existing tourism business by leveraging investments of our licensees.

Those are kind of the special focus that we had in mind today for these guests. But as I said, we are game for wide-ranging comments on anything.

We have three guests. Tom Glynn who is the CEO and I guess Executive Director, right, of Mass. Port. Jim Rooney who is the Executive Director of the Mass. Convention Center Authority. And Betsy Wall whom we are getting to know well who is the Executive Director of the Mass. Office of Travel and Tourism.

Tom Glynn has to move on. So, we've asked him to go first. Welcome, nice to see you again. Fire away.

MR. GLYNN: Thank you and good morning, everyone.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Good morning.

MR. GLYNN: I'd like to thank the

Commission for giving me and the others an

opportunity to offer a few comments this morning.

I will try to address the issues that the Chairman

1 laid out.

I think this is an important economic opportunity for the Commonwealth. And I appreciate the transparency in the process that the Commission has adopted to try to make this as successful as it can be for all of the citizens of the Commonwealth.

International tourism is an important part of the Mass. Port mission, and certainly the Logan and the Cruise Port mission. So, last year at Logan Airport, we had about 29 million visitors. And we estimate that probably around six million of those were international.

But international means both people from Massachusetts going overseas as well as people coming back. So, if you say what percentage of the six million were people who were international visitors, it was probably a little bit more than half. So that's important component of the Logan story, about 10 percent of all of our passengers at the moment.

At the Cruise Port, we served about 380,000 passengers last year. Those are both people who left from Boston and came back. And

also, ships that stopped in Boston as part of their cruise around a number of destinations. So, we have a pretty healthy commitment to an investment in the international market.

The Governor and the Board have asked us to do a strategic plan. And one of the top priorities of the Governor and the Board is the question of trying to strengthen our relationship with more nonstop flights to international markets, primarily to serve the global economy and to serve the important institutions in Massachusetts that rely on us in order to stay current in their fields.

So, the four areas that we've been focusing on, the first one is Japan. Some of you may remember a year ago we started direct flights — nonstop flights from Boston to Japan with Japan Airlines. That's been a very, very successful flight that is run seven days a week. Roughly, I would say 400,000 passengers a year. And the flights tend to be very, very full when they take off and land. So, that's been a good indicator of an opportunity that's out there.

The second priority has been Latin

America. We announced in January that Copa
Airlines which is a very well known airlines in
Latin America is going to start direct flights from
Boston to Panama City on July 11. And Panama City
is kind of the gateway to the rest of Latin America.
So, that's going to be a very important opportunity
for people from New England and Boston to have a
better access.

The third priority is to have nonstop flights with Israel. We've had a number of discussions with El Al Airlines. They're very interested. We're competing in that instance with Miami and Chicago. They currently fly to New York, to Newark and to LA. So, another U.S. city would be a big step for them.

They recently took on a minority investor. So, things are a little bit on hold while they sort out kind of what their corporate strategy is going forward.

And a fourth area that we've targeted is China. And we have some significant relationships with China in terms of the container port that we run. And we are developing stronger relationships in China to open up the opportunity

to have nonstop flights to China.

The big constraint there as it is with some of these others is just the availability of aircraft. Because once an airline acquires an airplane, they put it into service right away. So, when you're kind of thinking what you might do, it takes usually take a year to a year and a half for them to acquire the aircraft to run the service. So, there's interest on the part of China in having us have some flights. But that's a little bit further down the road.

So, obviously, those four things feed very directly into the notion of the destination resort approach that the Commission and the administration have adopted. And we look forward to kind of working with and enhancing the attractiveness of this as a place.

So, that when the airlines look at the market in Boston, one of the disadvantages that we have on a population basis is we are smaller than Chicago or Miami. But if we can convince them that because of the important businesses and institutions, the hospitals and universities that there's a big population of travelers, even though

the overall population may not be quite as significant. Then that will help us, I think, attract these airlines that we're interested in having serve the Logan customers.

So obviously, the existence of a destination resort is going to make a big difference in terms of their thinking about possible passengers that can help fill up the plates that they are committed to.

So, I think there's a lot of potential synergies in what you're trying to do and what I'm trying to do with the Governor and the administration and the Board to try to strengthen our international component at Logan, which as I say has been successful over last few years. But we need to keep pushing forward and finding more ways for more people travel in and out of Logan with an international agenda.

I guess I would just say quickly I would be remiss in this opportunity not to mention a few of the sensitivities that we see down the road, which I think can be worked out.

If you take a step back and look at the big projects that have been done in our broader

community over the years, whether it's Jim
Rooney's BCEC or when John Drew developed Great
Woods or the football stadium in Foxboro, we've
been able to work out accommodations and things
like that. So that the communities end up, I
think, being more comfortable with the change that
a big organizational development is going to bring
to their community.

Having said that the relationship that Logan has with East Boston is very intimate. On a daily basis probably between 90- and 100,000 people go through Logan. So, that's a lot of folks. And in addition to that about 17,000 people work at Logan.

So, you put those two numbers together, it's a pretty active place. It's almost a small enterprise unto itself.

We dispatch on an average day about 6000 cabs. So, there's just a lot of activity that's already kind coursing through that part of the city. And ironically one of our biggest challenges at the moment is parking, because we don't have enough parking spaces even though we have a lot of parking spaces. We have almost

2.1

18,000 parking spaces.

But we are now in a situation we're on 40 days out of the 250 workdays, we have to valet people cars because we just don't have enough spaces, even though we have the highest use of high-occupancy vehicles in the country at about 40 percent. So, we are doing very well between the Blue Line and the Silver Line, but we are still kind of facing a crunch. So, that' something that we want work through, depending on which of these potential bidders might be selected. We look forward to having some kind of win-win solution to that problem.

Finally, I guess I would say in at least one instance and may be in two, there may be some concerns that we have to work out with the FAA about flight paths and the height of buildings. And that's a constraint we face at the airport and obviously anything that's in the adjacent area what we may have to face.

And finally, the other issue that we'd want to work through is the labor market. A lot of the folks who work at the airport live in East Boston. And if there's a new major employer in the

immediate area that might create the need to do more training or more preparation.

Obviously, we don't want to stand in the way of people getting higher paying jobs. At the same time, we want to make sure we have a pipeline of people that are feeding the new development as well as the existing 17,000 jobs that are already there.

So, I think overall, we are very optimistic about the opportunity that this presents. But being a good neighbor in East Boston, we want to try to make sure that those issues are on the table as well. As I know they are from reading some of your previous meetings and materials. So, let me stop and see if I can take any questions.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Go ahead, anybody.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: What can the

Commission do to stimulate the desirability of

whatever casino materializes in this area or

farther West in any of the regions as a draw for

foreign travelers? Is that something that is best

left to you who are out there trying to sell airline

gate space? Is it best left to the developer and

operator of the facilities? Is it best left to the tourism board?

MR. GLYNN: It begins with the tourism board. They're the experts in this regard.

They're looking at the whole tourist experience.

We're looking at getting them here and getting them home, which is a small subset of their overall experience.

So, I think Betsy's probably in a better position to give you a more thoughtful answer. But I think, as we all know in this community, partnerships usually work. And things that don't have partnerships often don't work.

So, I suspect at the end of the day between Betsy's organization and whatever developer and ourselves, we'd have to work out some kind of a plan so that people would have a positive experience. Because we have some constraints in our current footprint that we operate on. And we would want to try to figure out how to make sure that that was not -- people wouldn't have a negative experience.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: But to get back to the Chairman's opening remarks, we are in the

process now of trying to create evaluation criteria. These are the things we are going to look for from applicants. You are simultaneously out there trying to sell routes here.

This is a slightly different question, is there a way that we can coordinate with you?

You have an idea of how to pitch your sales. And is there some way we can coordinate with you to add things to your pitch that would be useful based on the criteria we are looking for a development?

MR. GLYNN: That's a great question.

I think the extent to which the target markets of the developer would overlap with the four target markets that I identified that would from our point of view be helpful. You'd have to figure out how important you want to make that.

But I think that growing these new markets in these new areas is very, very important to the economy that we have these kinds of relationships.

I was able to go with the Governor on his trade mission to Columbia. The Columbia GVP is growing at seven percent a year. And there's a lot of things that I saw and reports that I think

2.1

were very, very impressive.

So, we need to be more part of the global economy. So, we need to not just focus on the existing routes, but also these new routes to these new markets.

So, to the extent to which the marketing strategy of the developer would overlap with these four that would probably be something that would be helpful. But again, Betsy would be in a better position to give you a kind of overview of how all of the markets currently function. But we are focusing on these four.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Question. I know from the Atlantic City experience, small private planes and helicopter were far more frequent as ways to get to the casinos. Your capacity to handle those smaller private jets and helicopters, is that something anyone's approached you about or any thought been given to that?

MR. GLYNN: No. It's come up. I guess I would say we have tried historically to move most of that traffic to Hanscom. We've been

1 pretty successful.

2.1

There are under the FAA guidelines pilots of private aircrafts have certain rights.

We were very famous on the day after the election, Paul Krugman mentioned there were a large number of private aircrafts that landed at Logan.

We've had to accommodate them, but it's not really the way the master plan for Logan was designed. It's really how many commercial aircraft. And the strategy was to have the private aircrafts land at Hanscom. And that's basically the way it's worked. So, that would be a big question of how to accommodate that. I don't think -- We have not figured out a good answer to that question.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I have a question perhaps that Commissioner McHugh was already alluding to. But let me see if I can raise it with a different aspect.

What kind of incentives can some of these operators have, if you will, towards enhancing tourism on the point that you mentioned? And I understand that there's differences in the location. And you alluded to some of those.

But from a general standpoint, we're trying to think of incentives via our regulation criteria to have some of these operators enhance or mitigate the travel experience here. We'd love your thoughts about that either now or at some other point.

MR. GLYNN: I think that as I understand it, you have kind of put on the table the need for the developers to think about mitigation. I think in our instance, again, depending on who was selected, in one instance we're an abutter practically in terms of the location. In another instance, we're down the road pretty close.

So, there is traffic mitigation, which is very significant. There's parking mitigation. There's the question of the Blue Line and whether that could play a bigger role in the mitigation. There's the taxicab question because we're a pretty big user of cabs. It gets down to looking at day-by-day and hour-by-hour, kind of what the use is. Because conceivably a developer might argue well, their use is going to be off-peak compared to our use. So, that I think would have

1 to be looked at.

There's some probably discussion will take place about water shuttles and whether that's a piece of the mitigation. And then there's the training mitigation. And there's the FAA question.

So, I think there are a lot of things that can be looked at in terms of how you want to create the incentives for people to address these issues, particularly in a high-density urban area. Maybe less different issues in a different location. But certainly, in a high-density urban area, these issues need to be sorted out and mitigated to the extent possible. So, that people in the adjacent communities feel like this was a success for them in terms of their quality of life and their economic opportunities.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Can I try and pick up on that theme, unless somebody else has a question. Mass. Port has been through periods when the relationship with the neighbors was uneasy.

MR. GLYNN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: It is now from

all I read a good relationship, one that I'm sure you've worked very hard at and continue to work very hard at. Are there any overall strategies for that that you could share with us for things that are sort of the keys to success in maintaining a good neighbor relationship?

There's obviously a lot of concern, understandable concern in communities where one of these casinos may go about the impact and the negative impacts. And we do and are talking about and in the criteria we will ask for mitigation plans. But beyond that, are there approaches that you found to be successful in your relationship with the neighbors?

MR. GLYNN: Well, I would just say I've been at Mass. Port a pretty short amount of time. But I agree that in the last say six or seven years, certainly when Tom Kinton was running Mass. Port, things seemed to be much more positive compared to some of the issues when Steve and I were involved in state government in the 70s and into the 80s.

I would just say about the communities that we work with, the so-called impacted communities, the community groups are very, very

sophisticated. A lot of them have been around for a long time and have a lot of experience in raising issues. Many of them have access to very highly skilled professional experts in these areas.

There are people in East Boston who know the FAA rules and regulations as well as many people who work at Mass. Port.

So, I think you have to be very respectful. And you also have to recognize there's a diversity of groups in East Boston.

There are many, many groups in East Boston. So, it's not the case that you can just say well we meet with X. So, you have to be respectful of the diversity of opinions in East Boston.

The same thing is true in South Boston, which is an impacted community for us and for Revere and Chelsea. I'm not as familiar with Everett. So, it's a big component of working out these successful partnerships.

These are very sophisticated groups, as they should be. And they have a track record of making sure big institutions are responsive to their agenda. And it isn't just a case of mitigation. They want to be part of the planning

1 and part of the solution.

2.1

So, I think the recent past, one of the reasons Mass. Port has been a little bit more successful and has been a little bit more respectful and not just kind of a trade. You agree to this if we do this, but trying to approach things a little bit more and include people a little bit more in the planning and on the ground floor.

I think that would be the thing that I would say is true of our recent experience, which again it mirrors what other people have done. I'm sure if you ask Jim Rooney, he has the same experience in South Boston.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And our legislation happens to be quite aggressive on those points.

The Legislature got this one right, I think, from that standpoint.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: A question on the workforce, the 17,000 people you have over there. The forecast speculate as to if a destination resort comes to the greater Boston area, kind of what classifications of jobs employees you might be at risk of losing? I think

I look at it as it's sad to lose an employee who's pursuing a different career pathway but it creates an opportunity to give somebody else a chance to kind of backfill that spot. Do you speculate or forecast a number or types of people that you might lose should a casino come to the area?

MR. GLYNN: The one think I should make clear is roughly 1000 people work for Mass. Port, but 17,000 work for the airport, because TSA, FBI, State Police, American Airlines, JetBlue. So, it's a kind of diverse group of employers when you aggregate it up.

I think that as we thought this through in preliminary stages, I think that the two groups that probably would most be recruited in a kind of early phases would be people who have experience in the hospitality component. So, we have two hotels on the Logan campus, a Hyatt and a Hilton.

And then second, there are a lot of subcontractors to the airlines who are responsible for cleaning the aircraft, helping people who need wheelchair assistance and make roughly around minimum wage.

So, I suspect that people in that group

which is a significant number of the 17,000 would be interested. Again, I haven't seen what kind of salary scales the developers would be considering. But to the extent that they would be looking at something that would be north of these roughly minimum-wage jobs that exist now, then we'll foresee.

Now a number of these communities in what I would kind of describe as kind of the North Suffolk area of East Boston, Chelsea, Revere, Winthrop, they have been gateway communities.

So, in the sense that's what you're saying. This could be a good thing in the sense of a next generation has a chance as these folks move up, members of the group that comes in behind them.

But I just don't think we should leave it to chance. And the free market is good up to a point. So, I just think we have a kind of obligation to make sure that we've kind of thought that through.

When the Big Dig was being contemplated, there was a lot of discussions about what was going to happen with the labor force. And I think the labor force adjusted to a certain

extent. We didn't have some of the shortages that we had anticipated. So, you don't want to overreact. But it does seem, just looking at the numbers that it's something that would be -- needs to be on the agenda.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Another quick question I guess relative -- related to infrastructure. I don't travel in and out of Logan as frequently as some.

MR. GLYNN: We could change that if you'd like.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I'm happy to find a way. But trying to get in and out of Logan in late 80s compared to now, obviously, is a huge difference. Do you forecast any other major improvement transportation mitigation projects either on the drawing boards or in the coming years?

MR. GLYNN: That's a great question.

We are making some improvements. We're building a consolidated rental car facility. Currently, each rental car agency has its own lot and its office space. And we're putting them all together. This is one of the things that has been

encouraged by EPA. And you say well, why does EPA care? Well, at the moment on an average hour, about 120 buses circle the airport. When we're done, 30 buses will circle the airport. So, that's a big impact on air quality. So, that's a project.

We're also connecting the two parts of terminal B. Because at the moment, if you fly in on American and you want to fly out on US Air, you have to go through security a second time, which is not people's favorite activity. So, most airports now are trying to do the same thing and make it so you connect post security parts of the airport.

So, we have those projects which are underway. So, I think that there are some things that we want to still try to do.

Interestingly enough as you point out, and this is why we are concerned -- I'm trying to be appropriate and not overly concerned about some of the traffic and parking. Because in the 80s and early 90s as you said, people had a hard time getting to the airport, both because of the original design and then because of the

1 | construction around the Big Dig.

So, during that period both Providence and Manchester saw significant increases in their traffic, passenger traffic. And since the Big Dig has been finished and the system is so easy to get in and out now of Logan, we've seen an increase at Logan and a decrease from Providence and Manchester.

So, people's access to Logan matters in terms of their decision-making in terms of whether they're going to come to Logan or not. So, that's something we need to be mindful of when we talk about some of these other issues because it can have an impact on people's decision-making.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: How are we on time, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Are you all right with the time?

MR. GLYNN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: One question that I'd like to pick up on that you mentioned, which was partnership not just with you but the likes of others, which is the whole point of today, I suspect.

If I could characterize our process, the process of the Commission in the next two phases. One in which will be evaluation. And then after that really overseeing and making sure details come to fruition on what promises are made, etc.

What do you see -- How do you see those partnerships in those next two phases where the focus ought to be more prior to the selection of an operator, but also perhaps during the project coming to fruition? Do you have any thoughts around whether that's a distinction that we need to think about, especially as we talk about partnerships?

MR. GLYNN: Yes. I think that probably the of level discussion might be different with different partners during the two different phases. But I think it's a pretty high bar on having the partnerships be part of the equation.

And I think when the Governor asked

Steve to be the Chairman, he recognized the
importance of partnerships and recognized Steve's
knowledge of the public policy landscape in

Massachusetts, and his ability to kind of understand the different organizations. So, I think that's going to be very important.

But I think it will change to a certain extent. But you're going to end up with a pretty significant set of issues around that in both phases. Fortunately, I think you have under Steve's leadership somebody who understands from all of his work in government and with a lot of these different groups kind of how to have productive partnerships. Because it's not an easy task. There's going to be a lot of expectation as you see and as you experience around this stuff. But I think it will sort itself out.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The point that I was going to make, and this is obvious but our point of maximum leverage is between now and the time we make the license awards. And we want to use that to the maximum extent possible short of prejudicing people's ability to do their business well.

So, post award, there'll be plenty of time to work out working relationships, and with good faith and experience and so forth. Now is the

2.1

time when we can get people to really stretch and really think creatively.

So, from the way you've talked, it doesn't seem like there is or are, but if there are, if there become and there are ideas about specific things -- if you had a China marketing initiative that you were desperate to do but didn't have the extra million bucks, that could be something that maybe some of the bidders would want to do, because they're interested in marketing to China.

It's a huge market potentially for us.

And maybe somebody would put that on the table. Or if you had a parking facility that you couldn't afford to buy the land but it could be a joint something or other. So, if there are any specific things, commitments to marketing plans, anything like that --

MR. GLYNN: That's a great offer.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: -- we could lay out there that they might or might not pick up that's what we're looking for.

MR. GLYNN: I predict you might be in receipt of a letter in the near future along those lines. I think that is the right way to think

about this. And it's the right timing.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Just to pick up on that point, is there somebody at Mass. Port if an applicant was looking to incorporate information about your initiatives into their business strategies, who would be that person that they could reach out to?

MR. GLYNN: So, Jim Doolin, who is sitting there, he's been kind of the point person. He's in charge of our real estate and economic development portfolio at Mass. Port. And what's your phone number?

MR. DOOLIN: 617-568-3102.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: One thing that occurs to me out of this already is that on our checklist of mitigation efforts, one of the things we ought to have is at least the Eastern license is a coordinated conversation with Mass. Port in terms of traffic, parking and labor force. That hadn't really occurred to me before but that's the connection that bidders probably ought have present to us that they've done a good job and touching base with you all. And are as coordinatord we can be on those three variables.

2.1

MR. GLYNN: I know at least one bidder has met with us for a number of times. In fairness, that bidder --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: A very close bidder.

That was the second thing I was going to ask you.

Obviously, you're a neighbor to Suffolk Downs, but

Everett is a stone's throw from that.

MR. GLYNN: Right. We're nextdoor neighbor to Suffolk Downs but we're a neighbor of Everett.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Is it materially different? In terms you talked about if it were Suffolk Downs license that that would impact you in a material way. The way you spoke, it sounded as if you thought that would really be significantly different from the way it would impact you if, for example, it were in Everett.

MR. GLYNN: I didn't mean to make that distinction. I'm not disagreeing that I probably made it, but I didn't intend to make it. I think the Everett location is pretty close as well in terms of Route 1A and the whole traffic system.

Many of the issues, I think, would be very, very similar in a sense.

But Suffolk Downs folks have a disadvantage. They're a little further down the road, so there's more specifics on the table to kind of react to. But I don't think we should view it in any way that the materially different. The specifics may be different, but I agree. I'm glad you clarified that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Anything else? This is great. Every time I read something about a marketing effort and a new airline and so forth, a new daily route, I keep thinking there's just got be something that we can ask folks to do to work with it. So, if there's any ideas you got, would be much appreciated.

MR. GLYNN: We're getting ready to do a big launch with Copa, the Latin American airline. So, that's an example of something that would be before you folks and make some decisions.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. Thank you very much. We appreciate you coming.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We might get -- Is it Jim? -- your card or something, because we have

ongoing task groups that are there are talking about a lot about these issues.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I have his card.

I'd be happy to share it with everybody.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We had Jim Rooney and Betsy Wall in that sequence. Were you going to come up together? Or Betsy were you going to come first? Either way, however you want to do it.

We're going to take a short break.

(A recess was taken)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Let's reconvene the 55th meeting. Let's welcome Director Betsy Wall from the Mass. Office of Travel and Tourism.

We're welcoming her for I think the third time, something like that to us. Thank you. Our apologies that we can't make this work, but we've all see your proposal and have it in hardcopy, your presentation. So, why don't you fire away.

MS. WALL: First of all, I have something in my eye. So, if I start crying, don't take it personally. I just want to highlight a couple of facts about Massachusetts tourism for

your consideration. One is that tourists in Massachusetts currently spend almost \$17 billion here a year. That number went up almost nine percent last year.

Tourism is considered globally to be growing. And the United States to be outpacing other industries, like ours in Massachusetts.

Also many of the jobs of which there are now about 125,000 in Massachusetts in the tourism sector are entry-level positions. They offer great opportunity for people who may not have graduate degrees even college degrees.

There are 21.3 million people who came to Massachusetts last year. When our numbers differ from Mass. Port's, the reason is because they are referring to inbound travelers whose ultimate destination might be Vermont or upstate New York or somewhere else.

We're referring to people who arrive here and are here for the purposes of leisure travel. The industry definition of tourism is an individual who travels over 50 miles from home and/or spends the night. So, it's not someone who comes from the suburbs into Boston for an evening

2.1

of entertainment. That is not -- It's great economic activity, and it's important. But in terms of the statistics that we follow under the guidance of the US Department of Commerce that is not considered tourism.

We do measure all of these things. I always point this out, because not every state pays as much attention as we do to measuring the economic impact of tourism. We work with the US Department of Commerce. We work with several private companies to provide travel stats. We get information drilled down to the county level from the Department of Revenue monthly, in some cases weekly. In Boston, we can get it weekly. And we get stuff from the to the US Travel (INAUDIBLE).

Massachusetts is now considering the small size of the state, I think it's a remarkable accomplishment that among all of 50 United States we rank sixth in international visitation. That includes the Hawaiian islands which has an obvious advantage as regard to Asia and also other places.

We take international visitation -Tom Glynn referred to that. One reason that we're
all after the international visitor is because

they spend three times more per visit than

Americans do. Canadians spend about one and a
half times per visit more than Americans.

But the international visitor is highly sought after. And as Tom mentioned, there are some emerging markets. On the tourism side, the President of the United States has already designated and we completely concur that the emerging markets on the international side are India, Brazil and China.

In Massachusetts, we have unique opportunities in all three of those markets because of our international students. We have just over 41,000 international students in Massachusetts right now. And those numbers are going up every year.

The estimate, and I would not want to testify to this in a court of law, but the estimate is that every international student brings a family member to Massachusetts for 47 nights through a calendar year. So, there's significant visitation.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Wow.

MS. WALL: They come and they tour the

2.1

colleges. They revisit the colleges or prep schools in some cases. They come back and stay.

And if you have come as far as China to deliver your child, you're not just dropping them at the curb and going. Sometimes the parents will stay.

They can tell you Metro West hotels and Boston hotels have a lot of experience with the families who are coming from these large, what they call, long-haul travel.

In terms of domestic visitors to

Massachusetts in terms of numbers that's the

majority of our visitors. It's about 19 million.

Thirty-three percent originate in state. That

seems to be me very relevant for the consideration

that you have as far as repatriating dollars and

figuring out what's going to move the needle

economically.

This 33 percent that originates in Massachusetts does not refer to that overblown word staycation. It does not mean people who are not going anywhere.

That means people who live in Metro

Boston and decide to go to the Berkshires. Or they

live in the Worcester area and they go to the Cape.

So, they're traveling over 50 miles and/or staying overnight. Thirty-three percent of our visitors live in Massachusetts. That's a large percentage for any state to claim.

It directly affects our marketing. We make sure that we have one message for people who are in state and other messages for people who are out-of-state, have to travel some distance.

Domestic visitors, 76 percent of them arrive here by car. So, they're not experiencing Logan

Airport or other mass transit. So, much the typical length of stay is about three days.

The gravy train for Massachusetts is

New York. Those are the visitors who spend the

most here and who spend the most number of people.

It's also the most expensive media market in the

country. So, it poses some challenges for us.

We have an extensive social and digital media campaign, which we initiated a few of years ago for a variety of reasons including measurability and economy. One of the things we've done that you'll see in your packets is gone through to the exercise of creating what's called a Geo Heat Map where we can see on a map of the

United States where the visitors to our social platforms are coming from. So, you can see that the opportunities for us -- This is not actual travelers. These are people who are traveling to our website.

So, we have some interesting opportunities in areas that we're not currently marketing, in particular the western/southwestern United States.

As I said we have an aggressive social media campaign. We communicate with about two million domestic visitors every year.

Internationally we have campaigns ongoing everyday campaigns in seven markets. We have websites in four languages plus English. Around the world, we have representatives who work for us in those markets.

Our top international markets are

Canada, United Kingdom, Germany, France and Japan.

And the top reason they give for visiting

Massachusetts is leisure travel. The

international visitor, as you may know, books

travel very differently from the way Americans do.

Forty-two percent of them use a travel agent. And

2.1

fewer than one-third, quite a bit fewer than one-third, I would say about one-third of them to their original research on the computer, but they don't book on computer for a variety of reasons including the fact that they come for a longer trip and they are more likely to want to purchase trip insurance and all that stuff.

The other advantage of international, or the other characteristic of international visitors that's important to notices is that they are not affected by weather. People who live in New England, when they hear there's rain coming to the Cape, they might cancel. But people who live in Germany do not cancel. So, they're weatherproof and they're much more likely to come year-round. International visitors make up a big portion --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Might now come next year.

MS. WALL: That's right. That's up to our the hospitality industry to bring them back.

And as Tom mentioned, we have launched -- when Mass. Port launched air service to Japan, we relaunched our marketing campaigns in Mass.

Port. The partnerships that he referred to, we are much more integrated with Mass. Port than we have ever been in terms of their route development efforts and their marketing initiatives. Since there's been some changes at Mass. Port, it's made a huge difference in the way that Massachusetts is integrating all of their the resources.

That's important on the international side. I can tell you that we have about \$4.5 million invested in our international markets.

No other New England state has as much as \$200,000. Most of them are at \$100,000. So, we have a campaign internationally that far exceeds what our New England neighbors.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: How is that use? Is that individuals who are there to talk to travel agents or is it advertising? How do you spend that money?

MS. WALL: We have fully integrated campaigns that include some consumer advertising. We particularly work with the travel trade. Those are tour operators, the tour operators who build the packages overseas, work with receptive operators here in Massachusetts who then receive

2.1

the visitors and have their itineraries planned for them.

Some of them travel in groups. Some of them travel individually. But a travel trade is very, very important to us. And working with the international travel press to make sure that we host them for visits to Massachusetts so they write about what they're experiencing. We host TV shows from overseas that come here, all kinds of documentary filmmakers, all of that stuff so that we will get broadcast and coverage.

We do less consumer although we are about to launch TV ads in Canada for the first time. We'll be doing two flights, one in the spring and one in the early fall. Massachusetts has not done TV ads in Canada before. But there's a new first ever United States marketing campaign called Brand USA which is overseen by the US Department of Commerce. And we've entered into a partnership with them.

So, the issues that we see when I talk to the tourism people about the prospects of gaming here are few. One is the repatriation. The loyalty systems that exist whether or not any of

the -- I don't know whether any of the bidders have a vested interest in any gaming outside of Massachusetts. But if they do, we want -- the Massachusetts industry is obviously hopeful that they will figure out a way to bring people back to Massachusetts so they're spending money here.

They all have these loyalty systems and others that may encourage people to stay there.

People are very interested in branding. And whether gaming offers the opportunity for enhancing our brand or diluting our brand. Many casinos around the country do not attach the name of a state or even any particular geographic information.

It's like if you see an ad in the Sunday New York Times for some very glamorous apartment building on the water, you have to read really the fine print to figure out it's in Alabama or something.

A lot of the gaming facilities do not stress where they are located. And Massachusetts tourism industry takes our brand very seriously. This is a place that is known around the world. International travelers choose to come to

Massachusetts. In some markets, New England might be the better known brand, but Boston is universally known. It's a first top-tier destination for Europeans. It's on everybody's list of places they want to come. And there's a lot of concern about that.

Tourism industry loves the idea of any enhanced assets. Whenever anything new comes, it could be Cape Cod rail service this summer.

That's a great thing, because it's a new thing.

It's something we can talk about and make visitors understand that there's some new way to see things.

So, a new asset is a good thing if it doesn't crowd out the smaller businesses that have been here for many years and that really define the Massachusetts tourism experience.

I know you know about there's a lot interest in an open-wall design idea where some existing facilities would be considered part of a casino. So, that some of the businesses that already exist could be integrated into these plans.

There's also concern in the tourism industry about the lodging revenue. The lodging

term is 80, our average daily rate. Boston does very, very well and has worked very, very hard since the recession to get the average daily rate up for hoteliers. And they are concerned -- I don't want to put words in anybody's mouth. -- but there are some concerns that casinos would offer discounted rooms which would compete unfavorably with existing property. I'm happy to take any questions.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Can you talk a little bit more about degradation of the brand, the concerns about degradation of the brand? Is it the absence of a location in the advertising, those kinds of things or is it something deeper than that?

MS. WALL: I'll give you an example, a few years ago before I started in this job, my office ran a TV ad that showed a very complicated amusement park, a fun ride. And when my office tested that ad, people outside of Massachusetts thought that looked fun. It looked like a nice place to go. People inside Massachusetts thought what are you talking about. That's not what Massachusetts is all about.

We're about beaches, small towns,
white picket fences, art galleries and much
smaller scale. So, there's a lot of pride in the
tourism industry. Many of these business are
family-owned. They're small businesses. Many
of them have existed for a very, very long time
through generations. You just think about
Massachusetts and think about almost any other
state, there are certain unique qualities that
come to mind.

So, I think they are concerned about -I know there has been some discussion just from
what I read in the paper about the architectural
design of casinos and so on. There's a lot of
concern about whether or not these large
destinations will add to, just be another
wonderful asset or whether they will crowd out the
-- Brand is such an overused word. -- the
definition, the perception that people have of
Massachusetts as a unique, interesting,
innovative, spirited, historic place.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I've heard that before. I've read that before. To put it most bluntly, casino is not consistent with Paul

Revere. How does one mitigate that? Or look for an evaluation criteria, measures casino operators will take to harmonize what they're doing and their marketing efforts with the existing attributes of Massachusetts that have proven to be the effective sales lures in the past? Awkward question.

MS. WALL: I don't think that by the way -- Paul Revere was great. Don't get me wrong, but we try to move past Paul Revere, because been there, done that. So, Massachusetts tourism assets that are innovative that offer green technology that have some sense of newness and the spirit of innovation that Massachusetts has exemplified are good things.

When Massachusetts passed same-sex marriage, that became from my perspective a great advantage to Massachusetts. Because whether you come here for gender equality or not it helped the brand. That this is a place where there's innovative thinking. It's welcoming.

So, I don't think it has to yield the church tower, but for example the Convention

Center is I think a great asset to the Boston brand.

The fact that it's modern architecture, that it's

full of light, that it's got views that people don't have the opportunity to see, that it's got green technology. That's great.

It doesn't have to be all gingham curtains and all that stuff. But I think that what people are wary of is that big-box. I could be in New Jersey. I could be in Las Vegas. What is it that feels Massachusettsy about the place?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: In the sense of excitement, innovation green, those kinds of qualities that you're talking about.

MS. WALL: And I would argue there is sort of a dignity to the Massachusetts tourism experience. Most people don't come here just in order to get painfully drunk and get tattoos.

People come here for the immersion in art and architect. They come here for boating. They come here for fishing. They come here for the great outdoors. They come here for cultural things. There seems to be some purpose to the reasons that people come here.

We test visitors and ask them the number one reason why domestic visitors go anywhere is to visit friends and family. But

after that when we ask people why they come here, there's no one thing. Just think of yourself or your own family or friends, people like to do different things even within a small group.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Right. I saw one of your slides, 27 percent are visiting art museums, art galleries and the like. That obviously is an important part.

MS. WALL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's huge.

MS. WALL: That's not just the Museum of Fine Arts, but that's places all over the state. It's smaller galleries. It's lots of innovative interesting places. And there are things popping up all the time now. You can go into the South End and take glass blowing classes and stuff like that.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: To some degree,

I believe that the architects speak a lot about
that point on their community linkages point. The
AIA has given us this great White Paper that
creates this process for evaluating those
community linkages.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: There are examples where casinos, resorts have really

enhanced the tourism too. Is that something you've taken a look at as well to see what's worked effectively in other locations?

MS. WALL: I wouldn't say I have any great expertise on that, no. Sort of waiting to see you all come up with and then we'll deal with it.

Our job is to market Massachusetts tourism assets. And I've got opinions on almost everything, but my actual job is to promote what is here, not what I think should be here. But I do think that the Massachusetts tourism industry does have some just great qualities.

There are people who work -- I can tell you we hosted of the National Governor's Association here a few years ago. And for security reasons the State Police and the Secret Service had to go through the staff who would be dealing with the governors and cabinet secretaries who were attending, hundreds of employees. Not one of whom had been employed by the Sheraton Boston for less than 20 years, not one. That's the back of the house. That's the front of the house.

These are people who are committed to

an industry that is providing really important service. They do a wonderful job on behalf of the visiting public. They work very hard. And even if they're in a big organization like the Sheraton, they make a huge difference in the experience that people come here.

It's a wonderful asset in

Massachusetts. And we have so many workers who

are international who speak various language and

can welcome visitors. There are also businesses

all over the state that have been in the same

family. And they wake up in the morning thinking

about how they're going to do it better. They have

tremendous pride and they do a very important job.

They're bringing about \$17 billion worth of

revenue to Massachusetts every year with very

little support.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Betsy, you've been great in the time that I've been on the Commission in sharing information with us, relaying a number of the concerns that your network of convention and visitors bureaus has.

I'll ask one of the same questions well, one of the same questions I asked Tom. Who

on your staff is somebody that an applicant can get to to talk about not only maybe buttressing their application with facts and figures but tying into the promotional efforts that you have so that hopefully --

MS. WALL: They should come to me.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Oh, they should go directly to you.

MS. WALL: We do have a full-time research person. I know you've seen some of his work. We do have a lot of great assets in the office but it's just -- Just start with me and I'll take it from there.

think I was blown away by the emerging market out of China, which has grown over 120 percent I guess since the previous year. A lot of that can be attributed to not only foreign visitors, but foreign students coming here with parents. I probably, like everybody else, am blown away by the 47 nights that they generate per school year. My parents were prompt to just drop me off at the curb and head back home.

MS. WALL: Maybe if you had gone to

school in China, they would have spent a little more time.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: They might have stuck around for a couple of extra days. Tell me a little bit about, if you can delve into a little more detail, because obviously China is an expanding gaming market, what your plans are there. What you plan to invest in. How you plan to, I guess, promote Massachusetts through your efforts in China.

MS. WALL: Well, we're in the process of developing that plan with Brand USA, which I mentioned is the first US international tourism marketing program, which was created by the passage of the Travel Promotion Act, which was sponsored by Massachusetts Congressman Bill Delahunt.

And Brand USA is an entity that does not use any public money, but is overseen by the Commerce Department. It raises money from departure fees on international flights for international visitors and through partnerships with states like Massachusetts.

I believe that we're in a partnership

with them at a level that is only a couple of other states, I'm sure, only a couple of other states are in there. So, we are working out what that program will be.

For starters, it is completely unlikely that we'll be doing any big consumer advertising in China because the numbers are way too high. And there are obstacles with online communications and others.

So, we start by working with the colleges and the tour companies that bring college students and their families here. And then with the tour companies in Massachusetts and elsewhere in the United States, particularly New York that are accustomed to dealing with the Chinese market and working with them to build itineraries.

We hosted some Chinese journalists who were here doing sort of a travel show on US destinations. And they were very interested.

They say that when you survey prospective Chinese visitors, the one thing they can tell you about New England can be summed up in one word and that's Harvard.

So, we have a head start. And there

are tours of Harvard you can take even if you're not looking to go to college there. That's our entrée really.

But we're still building up the program. It will be through tour operators and through the business and student market. The business market is a big part of this, because people come here for a conference at the BCEC or they come here for a program at MIT or something, if we can convince them to bring their families, stay for a few days, see other things that's a big part of it. I would say that's still in the works.

OMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Whereas Tom obviously has better knowledge of the Boston market and the potential licensee here in the Boston market, you have the virtue of seeing the whole state. Focus a little bit, if you will, on the Western Mass. market.

How do you see a license applicant being able to buttress tourism activities in both regions?

MS. WALL: Again, I have no unique expertise in the gaming stuff but --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But you have

1 opinions.

MS. WALL: I have opinions. We've established that. A couple of things, first of all as you well know Western Mass., particularly the Pioneer Valley, the sliver where all the colleges are is already a fairly international part of the world with faculty and students from all over the place, and just by definition a transient population, people coming and going. So, there's a lot going on there already.

There's a sense that in that part of the state the casinos would be more of a destination.

Not in the middle of a town that's already got a look and feel that they've been selling for some time.

So, I think there's also, as you know, in much of Western Mass. some pretty significant economic issues, which people are hopeful that the casinos will address in terms of employment.

Parts of Western Mass. have very few opportunities for young people who want to stay there. So, I think there is enthusiasm in that regard, but tempered with the concern about what happens to the existing.

Some of Western Mass. tourism destinations, one of the biggest ones is Yankee Candle. That's a very sophisticated business. It's a charming place that people come from all over the world to visit. And it is a mom and pop operation, as you know. But it's very sophisticated, very international. They're very

involved with international marketing. And they

understand their importance.

So, there's plenty of sophistication out there. In the Berkshires, the cultural organizations market aggressively in New York where they are competing for the visitation from people who make very sophisticated choices about where they're going and spend a lot of money but their numbers are pretty small.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I can give you a couple of examples of the casino industry increasing tourism.

I was involved in New Jersey in hosting or our organization hosting national conferences. And if we held them in Atlantic City, we would triple our enrollment. It could be the most -- a subject that I wouldn't find all that exciting,

hazardous-waste for example. If we held the conference in Atlantic City, we would triple our enrollment.

One of the other things I did recently is I served as a commissioner with law-enforcement accreditation. And these agencies from all around the world have three times during the year — their accreditation is up. They have to go. And we hold them regionally three times a year because we're worried about people's travel costs.

Two years ago we held it in Las Vegas.

We had the majority of the agencies from around the world who wanted to be accredited that third. So, we really scrambled to offer incentives in the other two locations around the country. It really does make it more attractive for people when they're traveling and when they're attending a conference to do it in a location where there are casinos.

MS. WALL: Well, Jim Rooney can speak to this better than I can, but I can tell you that when conferences in a variety of places and Boston is one of them, Boston gets more people already. When we've had any number of tourism conferences

including the National Governors Association, the attendance is higher when it's in Boston.

So, Boston already has that draw. And I'm sure Jim sees this all of the time with conferences that are held in different places.

And I'm sure that's right. The concern that people have is is a casino going to be a cruise ship that people get on and they don't get off until they leave.

So, they want to figure out a way that people can enjoy the gaming experience and all of the entertainment and dining and all that but also see what else there is out there.

There are very sophisticated dining opportunities all around Massachusetts, not just in Boston. So, they want to make sure that they're not just kept out of it.

That's the challenge facing you to make it, as you say, a great asset and a lure but also getting people out into the world.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I would say the same thing that I said to Tom that this is the time when we can get people to stretch. And if you have -- Again, I think we should probably have on our

evaluation criteria that each of our bidders should have touched base with your office. And we should be assured that you think that they have talked in the kind of language about coordination that makes sense. That's one item that I think come out of this.

But specifically, you've got this marketing to China program you said you were just starting to work on. We're talking about the margins here, but significant margins. Our destination resorts are going to have an interest in that market as well.

And maybe there is some relationship that you could suggest now people step up and talk about. Do you want our bidders to participate in some way or other, commit to marketing with you, dollars, coordination, whatever towards that evolving program or any other specific ideas? If you have specific ideas that would be enhancements of your work and your objectives that we could throw out there for bidders to step up to that would be great. And the more specific the better.

When the licenses are awarded, we will become like you. We'll become a proponent.

We'll be pushing, we'll be coordinating. As well as regulating, we'll also be advocates for this industry and for Massachusetts.

But right now is where we have the maximum leverage. So, any specifics that you can put out there that would enhance your work that our bidders might be interested in participating in, please let us know.

MS. WALL: They certainly work with the travel trade. Just here in Massachusetts, Sunshine Travel, for example, that runs all of the tour buses multiple times a day from Boston and other areas outside in Metro Boston, Malden, Everett, some other places down to Foxwoods or Mohegan Sun, whatever. The casinos are going to have relationships with those tour operators already do that business. That's just domestic. But they particularly cater to the Chinese-American market. They have people on the buses that speak Chinese. So, that's one thing.

Of the top of my head, I'd say another thing is Massachusetts should be mentioned, prominent in their marketing stuff. We see this with the movies. We have the Massachusetts film

1 markets that's in my portfolio. And

Massachusetts was a little late to the game. So, we had not previously required that the studios put in the credits made in Massachusetts. In some states, the film tax credit is tied to -- in Georgia, they have to put the peach, the artwork.

So, there probably are some what would fall literally under branding that could be thought through.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any thoughts you have about that, further thoughts would be great.

You've talked about this and this is again, I know we're playing on the margins here, but they're important margins. We are having a meeting next week with the president of Mass. Hospital Association and a consulting team that's coming up from New Jersey to talk to us about the medical tourism industry. It's enough of an industry that it's an industry.

And when I talked to her, she was very interested in trying to figure out what we could do to coordinate that. Similarly, as you mentioned, I talked to the Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid at Harvard. And he said without

question, having the right kind of a destination resort casino here would help us compete against Yale and Princeton for some of the top students. It differentiates us just a little bit more. And it would help us particularly in some of the international markets.

So, there's a role that we can play in collaboration with those two key industries of ours in reinforcing and enhancing their market.

And again, we're looking for as many particulars. I know you're interested in and have a program in the student market, in the student family market. So, if there's anything in particular there that we could put out on the table to encourage people to do, we would love to hear about it.

MS. WALL: The top five markets, international markets send students to

Massachusetts, awkwardly phrased. But of the five countries that send international students to Massachusetts, top four out of five are Asia. So, it's definitely --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's huge. It's right where the sweet spot is for the big money in gambling. The whole idea of promoting -- These

developers, casino operators are so far beyond anything I can imagine in terms of the sophistication of their marketing, but they do have these as you said these loyalty programs and these relationship programs. And so do you.

You've got lists. You've got social media relationships. If there's ways to create synergies with their social media and our social media or ways to require synergies between their marketing, our marketing, some kind of access to or cross-marketing with their marketing lists, whatever, all of that kind of stuff.

MS. WALL: When you keep in mind that Massachusetts' core domestic market is New York, that provides some guidance in terms of any casino or company that also draws on New York.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

MS. WALL: There's intention there.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: But a more mundane level, it would be really helpful if you had the time when we finish our draft of the evaluation criteria to take a look at it and see if there's any obvious things that we have missed

2.1

or that would not from your standpoint be attractive marketing tools.

We'll have that done in draft form fairly soon and would welcome any input you have on the criteria we are using for our evaluation.

MS. WALL: Great.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else?

Thank you very much Betsy for your several visits.

All right to go ahead? Does anybody need a break?

All right. Director Rooney, welcome

Jim Rooney, Executive Director of the

Massachusetts whatever it is, MC, Massachusetts

Convention and everything big in the world

authority.

MR. ROONEY: I'll take another stab at that. Good morning, I'm Jim Rooney. I'm the Executive Director of the Massachusetts
Convention Center Authority. We own and operate four assets, facilities in Massachusetts. What is not so new anymore the Boston Convention and Exhibition Center, which will celebrate its 10th year in operation next year actually. The Hines Convention Center in Boston's Back Bay, in Boston the Boston Common Parking Garage and in

Springfield, Massachusetts, the MassMutual Center formerly the Springfield Civic Center.

We're in the business of attracting meetings and conventions primarily to

Massachusetts. In Boston, we hold about 250 or so meetings each year. About 50 of those would be classified as major conventions. By that I mean conventions by our standard would produce more than 1000 hotel room nights on its peak night.

We in total generate about 700- to 800,000 visitors to Massachusetts each year producing over 600,000 hotel room nights. And in 2012 about \$560 million in economic impact.

To generate all of that, the taxpayers in Massachusetts has made about a billion dollars in investments. In particularly in the BCEC in Boston and in Springfield and upgrades to the Hines over the past decade.

So, given all of that and our relationship to the travel in bringing visitors to here, I want to thank you for this opportunity to speak to you today. And I applaud as Tom did the integrity and the transparency with which you are doing this. And I also applaud the signal you're

2.1

sending that you're seeking compatibility and synergy in ways to leverage the introduction of casinos into Massachusetts to the better of all of us for what we're doing. That's clearly what we do.

Some random thoughts based on what I heard Tom and Betsy say before me, one about brand. When we think about the way that we market and brand Massachusetts and Boston in the convention and meetings industry, it's a little different than many of my colleagues in the industry in that we try to be true to who we are.

In fact, most recently Boston was featured on a cover of an industry magazine and labeled as an intellectual destination. So, we don't think of ourselves or market ourselves the same way that Las Vegas or Atlantic City or Orlando or New Orleans would in terms of what we bring to the table, because that's not who we are.

And it is reflected in the types of meetings we hold. Most of our meetings are in knowledge-based industries, 35 to 40 percent in medical/life sciences. And that's our biggest segment. A significant number of academic,

2.1

1 financial, high-tech meetings come here.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thirty to 40 percent is life-science?

MR. ROONEY: Life sciences, medical combined. That's our sweet spot. We're generally a high-priced city and we acknowledge that. So, we are not able to offer \$99 hotel room nights. So, we cannot market in price-sensitive segments of the market.

So, government types of events or fraternal types of events, Kiwanis that sort of thing where people are generally looking for paying out of their own pockets generally and looking for opportunities to pay less than perhaps someone who is able to use a corporate credit card to stay.

Our formulas worked. Boston had never been among the leaders in conventions and meetings before we opened the BCEC. Since 2006 in terms of market share, while Las Vegas, Chicago and Orlando are far above everybody else, Boston regularly has ranked since 2006 in the six, seven, eight slot in terms of its market share.

Last year we had about 20 events that

broke records for attendance. In those segments, people like coming here. People like what we have to offer in terms of medical institutions, the biotechnology industry, the academic industry, the high-tech industry and so forth. So, there's a great deal of synergy between what we're trying to accomplish in terms of bringing meetings to Boston along with what the brand has to offer.

We have a marketing and sales force that is broken up into several segments. We, of course, have a local sales force that does social ballroom events and small meetings and so forth. We have a national organized, geographically organized sales force where people are assigned to Washington, DC, Chicago, the West Coast and so forth. And we have an international salesperson who works in partnership with Betsy's organization and with the CBB when we get into seeking international events.

We are very successful and I think something that will surprise or does surprise most people, there's an organization, an international organization that ranks cities and countries across the world in terms of international

2.1

meetings and how many are hosted in a destination.

The United States by far is the largest hosting

country of international meetings.

But when you go city by city, many of the European cities, Vienna and Paris are number one on those lists. But in the last three years, Boston has been the highest ranked international meetings destination in terms of number of true international meetings held.

Washington, DC is another one that does very well. But I think people are often very surprised to learn of the attractiveness of Boston as an international, truly international meetings destination.

But overall that puts us in about 46th to 47th place on the world cities scale. So, there's plenty of room to grow terms of international meetings. Another phenomenon we are seeing with respect to international is the degree of international participation in meetings.

As I said, most of our meetings are medical, life-sciences driven by associations. There's an association for everything in this

2.1

country. And their business strategy is to grow membership outside of the United States.

If you as a medical association about their saturation rate within an industry, they'll tell you that 90 to 95 percent of the medical professionals in their field are already members. So, growing more membership, which is what they're about, they've pretty much captured the American market. So, the phenomenon like in every industry is for them to grow into the European and Asian marketplace.

We're seeing that reflected in international attendance at conferences that are held in the United States and here in Boston. We do very well when international is a component.

As we are sitting here today, the International Seafood Show is at the BCEC with over 20,000 people, 65 countries and about 40 percent of the attendance being international. While we do primarily concentrate on knowledge-based industry, I would be remiss in the prime month of St. Patrick's Day not to mention that we also are hosting the World Irish Step-Dancing Championships at the end of March, which will

attract 20,000 people from across the world.

I also want to mention and I'll get into this is a little more deeply, Springfield. We operate the MassMutual Center, of course. The MassMutual Center is a little bit different in that it is a combination small convention and meetings facility along with an arena that has about 6500 seats.

In that arena we have a professional hockey team, a professional basketball team. We host family events, Disney on Ice, those types of things, concerts and the like. And in the convention center half of the building, we do regional types of small events that might be interested in that really third tier market in our industry.

In Springfield, it is sometimes a difficult market because we are competing with, if you think about the sort of geography of Worcester on one side, Albany on the other, Hartford, Connecticut to the south. And particularly challenging for us as it relates to the entertaining component, because we are competing with casinos in Connecticut. There are certain

2.1

non-compete issues, difficulties that we have attracting major acts into the Springfield marketplace because of the dominance, if you will, of the casino entertainment that takes place just 30 minutes south of us. And I'll come back to that as well.

As we think about the impacts, we think that the introduction of casinos, both into the Boston area and into the Springfield area. Our view is that they could be positive or negative.

And as I mentioned, we have these facilities that represents substantial taxpayer investments.

They were built for the purposes of hosting conventions, meetings and in Springfield entertainment and the like.

So, when you think about it, a facility in the Western region that might be built to host entertainment or sporting events or anything like that would have a significant impact on what we're doing and what we're built to do out in Springfield.

So, our view is that anything that is built should not compete with facilities that have already been built. And in terms of being able to

host major conventions, I know that when one thinks of a destination resort casino and you think of some of the international models or the Las Vegas models, some of them contain major physical components that will directly compete with convention space, entertainment space that sort of thing.

So, rather than think about that, we've thought about as is the tone of this conversation, seeking compatibility, seeking synergy, seeking to leverage the opportunities. And frankly, we see the greatest opportunity in the Western region and hope that whatever is decided out in the Western region will be one that we will have the ability to have a coordinated effort in terms of bringing people to use the MassMutual Center in downtown Springfield.

Naturally we look at geographic proximity to our facility as key. So, without tipping my hand too much about our preferences out there, facilities that are built miles away from downtown Springfield that have the potential to be drawing events away from the MassMutual Center doesn't seem to make a whole lot of sense to me.

2.1

On the broader issue of sort of what these facilities offer and can offer to the industries like the tourism industry and the components of it, hotels, what we do and others, I've thought of this phrase destination resort casino and what they are. And I'm not sure that there is any single definition other than, at least my perception and I think a general public perception, is that they're somewhat built with a business model to think inwardly, to bring people, capture them. And in the most extreme cases, hold meetings and conventions, feed them, entertain them, house them and then they don't create the synergy that we hope for. Certainly, I don't think any of us want to see that.

So, I sort of played with the words and thought that perhaps from a criteria standpoint it should be flipped to resort casino in a destination. And to emphasize the fact that the objective here is to enhance economic value to the entire destination and what is already there.

So, instead of this model that thinks inwardly, perhaps there's a model that thinks outwardly and is designed to deliberately

integrate into the features that are already there.

And as I said specifically as it relates to Springfield, if the thought process in selecting an operator for Springfield was filtered in that way, who is best proposing to leverage tourism and hospitality features that exist already in Springfield as opposed to thinking inwardly, I think that that would be an interesting criteria to think about.

A couple of other issues, notes I made as others were speaking that I would underscore. Transportation both in Boston and in Springfield will be a huge issue.

I actually sat on a panel yesterday at the of Mayor Sarno in Springfield. They had a public forum yesterday afternoon in which the present proponents talked about transportation and entertainment and hospitality and what they were going to offer. And they talked about where people come from and how they were going to get there and so forth.

It's a huge issue. There's already the economic systems that exist. And I think that

the proponents need to be ready and should be ready through the criteria to demonstrate that the impact of what they're going to do is somehow thought of in their plan.

Now as someone who listens to the morning news reports on traffic and hears that there's traffic associated with a big event at one of my facilities, I view that as good news.

But I understand that economic activity is going to generate traffic, whether it's at a stadium, an arena, a convention center, a casino, there's going to be some traffic. But it needs to be managed. And I would think that one of the criteria is that a proponent would need to think about what the impacts are going to be and how that should be managed in both regions.

Workforce development, I'm glad Tom brought that up. It is a big issue in our industry. And I'll give you a little anecdote. We opened the Westin Hotel adjacent to the BCEC in 2006. We had job fairs, 550 jobs. Two things happened that I think sort of are noteworthy. One is that about half of those jobs were filled by drawing people from other places.

2.1

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Places meaning?

MR. ROONEY: Other hotels, other hotels in the local market. People just sort of jumped at a better opportunity, which is good except that then those hotels had to back fill.

The other half had absolutely no experience in the hospitality industry. They were just people looking for jobs and needed to be hired. And I think in hindsight, we wouldn't say this at the time, it showed. It showed we were running a four-star hotel with people who had not worked in hospitality before. And we spend a lot of time in our facilities training people in hospitality culture and what it means to be in our industry.

I don't know what the current projections of sort of workforce and jobs is as it relates to the casino developments, but I would submit that for their benefit and for the broader sort of hospitality, tourism industry, the issue of workforce development and labor supply is something that ought to be thought about.

There is not a cohesive workforce development strategy. I think we're all kind f

2.1

doing our own thing right now. So, this may be an opportunity to leverage that.

By way of expectations, I think that as people have suggested to me or asked me what will it mean particularly in Boston, which is I think probably where more people are focused due to the size of our facilities, what will it mean to us? I've talked about the potential downside if there is something that is built to compete with me. And it's been suggested to me that there is or could be indeed an upside.

And to be honest I think that it will be on the margins. I don't think given where we go in terms of what we seek to attract in terms of conventions, I don't think there's a medical meeting planner that's holding back bringing their event to Boston until we get casinos here.

We had a focus group about two years ago of about 18 major meeting planners that do business in Boston. We asked them these questions. Their preference was that there be some geographic distance between the convention center and the casino so as not to draw people away for the business of the convention either the tradeshow

floor or the meeting.

So, while they thought of it as I think about it as a nice additional amenity, it will not change our marketing as an intellectual place that has leadership in medical, life-sciences and knowledge-based industries.

We just started using the tagline, borrowing from our friends in Las Vegas that says what happens in Boston changes the world. So, that's kind of thematically who we think we are and how we intend to market.

On the other hand, in Springfield and in the Western region, there is substantial opportunity, I think, for an uplifting synergy between our facilities and what might be built out in Springfield if there is a relationship that can be established between our asset and the potential casino development.

The last thing I'd sort of mention is we've been on the sort of the choosing side of proposed developments, hotels and other venues for a long time. And as we sit through and listen to presentations like I did yesterday in Springfield, the two proposals have great visions and

aspirations and all wonderful things that they're going to do, and we just went through a major hotel RFP process, we think about, I guess three categories in terms of trying to understand and evaluate how to think about the proposals.

One is the capacity of the entity to do what they're doing. And I know what they're proposing to do. And I know that you're thinking about that. So, that's important.

The other is the degree to which what they promise, propose to do, hold out as a vision is intended to be a secondary amenity, a gesture of goodwill, a component of mitigation or something that sort of they feel they need to do to win. Versus a key element of their business success factor. If they need to do it to be successful, the chances of it happening are greater than if it is just something they feel they need to do to win the bid. So, that's one thing that we look for.

The last is the reality and enforceability of making sure that what gets said gets delivered. And nothing speaks louder in that regard than money. So, we have for example in our

current hotel, there's a performance deposit that needs to be made of \$10 million that is nonrefundable if their performance doesn't work. We did the same thing with the Westin Hotel. And as things got hairy and things were going in the wrong direction, in that particular case I think it was \$30 million that was sitting in an account that was going to be forfeited if they didn't perform.

So, I think that's an example. But nothing speaks louder than some mechanisms for making sure whatever commitments are made either with respect to the hotel development -- the casino development itself or to some of the commitments that are made along the way with either local host communities or with respect to transportation and so forth. How those things are actually going to be enforced is important.

So, those are my thoughts and I'd be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: As usual, Jim, really helpful. Thank you. Commissioner McHugh?

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: We've got a

2.1

statute that says we have to have destination resorts. That's what these three things are.

We've got an environment in the Boston metropolitan area for convention goers that you described.

If you were in charge of creating the criteria for an award of one of these casinos in any region, what would be the top two factors you would be looking for?

MR. ROONEY: Well, I guess one if I could write it, I would limit the amount of certain space that people could build.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I'm sorry. You would limit --

MR. ROONEY: -- the amount of space that would compete with others including my facilities. So, for example, I wouldn't want to see anything that is defined as exhibit space in one of these things. I wouldn't mind seeing space that is associated with a normal major hotel type business of doing social events, business meetings, but not trade shows and exhibit types of things.

So, my personal preference would be

that they couldn't compete with me or other venues like the World Trade Center that has 120 -- it's a small venue 120,000 square feet of exhibit space. That wouldn't be just sort of taking an event that would be in Boston anyway and putting it in a different location. So, that would be sort of one of thing I'd look to define.

I'd look to express that an objective is to leverage this opportunity and enhance the economic vitality of industries like conventions, hotels, restaurants and others in the destination. And that's what I meant about flipping the words. And I wouldn't necessarily be prescriptive about how one would do that. I would look at how the proponent offered to do that.

And I would judge the degree to which they were, as I said, inward looking or outward looking. And if their business model -- And you can tell, whether they tell you directly or whether you infer from what they say, I think you can tell what their success, business success factors are. And if it is keeping people at the casino, then it really doesn't do too much for the rest of us. So, I would look within their presentations to

determine whether they're uplifting to the destination or whether their business strategy is much more inward looking.

And I think again, I'm probably being repetitive, but I think that particularly in the Western region and particularly in Springfield, you all, we all have a tremendous opportunity for something that can be transformative to the region, not just to the City of Springfield.

Because if we can at this point force the hand of the proponents to think that way, how are you going to be uplifting to the economy of that region? And how are you going to integrate what you do into the existing assets, facilities and needs of that region? I think we can achieve something great out there.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Our statute of course calls for us to have a regional focus as well as a host and surrounding community focus in siting these casinos and the like. Do you have in your marketing efforts, do you have a regional focus as well? In other words, are you looking for people to come to the convention and then stay or come early?

MR. ROONEY: We do that primarily through the partnerships with Massachusetts
Office of Travel and Tourism and with the Greater
Boston Convention and Visitors Bureau and the
Eastern and the Greater Springfield Convention
Bureau in the Western part of the state. We think about it, although there's some overlap as to we're the inside game and they're the outside game. And what I mean by that is that when we work with bringing a major event to the city, we are focused primarily on the execution and the needs of their event inside the building.

Our partners at the Bureau will then market, and they're all regional as you know, market the destination attributes, the historic sites and sort of what exists within this region. As part of that, and this is what I mean by there is some overlap, we in all of our facilities have information and staffing available to help people understand what they can do while they're here. For many of the events that seek to do companion or spouse things or come early, stay late, we'll help connect them in the ways that they need to be connected.

It's not our core objective. Our core objective is to get the 20,000 people here that are here today. And then allow for others who seek to benefit from the fact that they're here to do that.

And we work the same way, for example, with the biotech industry. When we bring the bio convention here, we will work with the people who want to do business with them, but it's not sort of what we wake up in the morning thinking about.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Are there circumstances under which you would use the existence of a casino in a region where you have a location as part of your marketing efforts?

MR. ROONEY: Absolutely. Once the casinos are in, they will be in our marketing materials. Yes. As is Fenway Park, the Kennedy Library, the Museum of Fine Arts. We market on two levels. We market the destination attributes and what your attendees are going to be able to while you're here.

And then we market the specifics. A meeting planner wants to know how many meeting rooms I have. How big are they? How many chairs do you own, the kitchen. So, they have very

specific things. So, our marketing efforts exists on two levels. To the 3000 people who choose where meetings go, it's very specific and oriented to the ability of the destination to host that meeting. But for a lot of the attractiveness of the destination, sure, we'll be including all of that.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I'm not as familiar with the Boston market. The potential addition of hotel rooms either in Western

Massachusetts or the Boston region, does that help position you better for any exhibitions or conventions that maybe you can't get now because of that lack of hotel room space?

MR. ROONEY: Yes. One of the big issues -- We're on a campaign now. We call it Top Five. As I mentioned, we starting in 2006 elevated Boston into the top 10, and each year since. I think we're eighth this year. But we're stuck there. And when you think about it, my primary product is future time and space. Space in a convention center and space in hotels.

The biggest limiting factor that we have is hotel availability. There's about 20,000

hotel rooms in Boston proper, about 30,000 in greater Boston. Occupancy last year was 79 percent, which is virtually full. Anyone who has tried to get a hotel room in certain parts of the year know you either can't or you're going to pay \$700 a night if you choose to. So, it is. And we do an analysis on every piece of business we lose. And hotel room inventory is a major factor, particularly proximate to the Convention Center.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Which means what as a practical matter?

MR. ROONEY: Half a mile, walking distance. That's what we need, We need more in the South Boston waterfront and we need more in the market, both in South Boston waterfront but in the broader geographic market more price diversity.

If you look at the hotel inventory that's developed in Boston in the last 15 years, it's primarily four-, five-star hotels. It's the Intercontinental, it's the Mandarin Oriental, it's the Ritz. And that's all driven by hotel economics that we could spend all day on.

But generally speaking, we need more overall. We need more in the South Boston

waterfront. And we need more at a midprice, a lower-priced level than currently exists in the city.

So, if one of the Eastern, I guess, or Boston region hotels was to produce a hotel inventory, I'm sure that we'd use it to the extent that they would be willing to play. That's an issue in every city, the degree to which the hotel strategy is compatible with the convention and meeting strategy. There's a couple of examples, New York, Philly, Washington where they the convention market as kind of a secondary market. So, they're not as willing to give up rooms to attract conventions because they have higher priced business travelers and leisure travelers that they can get as opposed to these discounted rate conventioneers.

So, to the extent that the developer saw it in their best interest to provide a block of rooms. The way that I do business is I will go to a hotel for convention that is not going to be here until 2017, 18, 19. And I will say that I would like 400, 600 of your rooms. And I'll block them so that they can't can sell them. Some hotels

don't want to do that.

2.1

They want to wait for the business traveler, the leisure traveler to come in. And I'll negotiate the rate down for my convention. So, some of them don't want to do that.

The short answer is yes. More hotel inventory helps. But where the rubber meets the road is on the business behavior once they get here.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: There's a conundrum. One of the interesting things you said was the criteria that you would use. This reminds me, Commissioner McHugh was leading the process for, among other things, looking at the process, functional process of evaluating these big proposals. And Jim knows as much about this kind of stuff as a lot of people and might be a conversation worth having as another conversation to pick his brain about how we do that.

But one of the criteria you mentioned, the second one was make sure that the cool vision stuff that they present to you is actually central to their success and not just fill-ups that they're doing to try to win the business.

We have made a big point about talking about we don't want just a big box with everybody inside. That's been one of our probably strongest messages. As you know, the casino industry is changing anyway a little bit from that kind of model. Partly because the casino market is getting saturated and they need revenue from other things, shopping and so forth and so on. But as a practical matter, it's clearly in their business interest to keep the people inside the building.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: On the seat.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: On the seat most of all. But if they're going to get up out of the seat, they want them to go to your shops, your restaurants, your hotel rooms, your spa.

So, if you were a casino operator, how do you make your interest as the casino operator compatible with that vision? As opposed to just doing the least you can get away with to convince the Commission that you're going to at least go through the motions of trying to coordinate with the region and the community and the tourism around you?

MR. ROONEY: Well, I think that what is

proposed to be built sends a strong signal in that regard. So, I am aware of generally speaking of proposals both in the Boston region and the Springfield region. And as I understand it, for the most part, there isn't any real remarkable amounts of exhibit space, for example.

So, they're kind of sending a pretty strong signal that their business strategy isn't to sort of host major conventions and events ala the Sands or Singapore or other places that have twice as much exhibit space, frankly, as I have. So there's that.

So, what's in there? That will tell you what their business strategy is once they tell you what's in there.

The second is the degree to which as they are proposing and developing their relationships even today, they are intending to rely on something that already exists.

So, I'll give you two examples. Out in Springfield I heard yesterday one of the proponents that is developing a relationship with an existing entertainment venue. They're not going to build one. They're going to use one

2.1

that's there. There's another proposal that proposes to link directly and build a bridge into our building. They're not going to build anything. They're going to use what's there.

So, I agree Steve that the purest of business models is keep them there and sort of meet all of their needs. But you can I think look at what they're physically proposing to do along with sort of some of the strategic components of what they're intending to do as a way to kind of get at that.

I wouldn't say -- I believe in the capitalist system. So, I'm not begrudging them making money and trying to sort of do those things. But how they strategically and cleverly think through achieving both, I think, is what might be interesting to ask for.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We have this clause

I'm sure you're aware of that the bidders have to

sign agreements with live entertainment venues in

their area. Is your facility in Springfield

covered by that? Is that a live entertainment

venue?

MR. ROONEY: I'd like to think so.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: It may be a matter of debate?

MR. ROONEY: Yes, I think it would be.

If I remember right, we took a look at it. And I think there's some specific language in there that would make it a debate related to private facilities that we're not. So, that being said that doesn't mean we don't try to leverage our presence.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Anybody else? Thank you very much, Jim. It's really helpful stuff. Thanks a lot.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I wonder before you leave, I'd like to as you the same question I asked Betsy when she was here. That is when we come up with the draft evaluation criteria, things that we're going to be using to evaluate bidders, which we will do hopefully in the next few days, if you or somebody on your staff has time to take a look at that and give us your feedback that would be enormously helpful.

MR. ROONEY: That would be -- actually enjoy the opportunity. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you very much.

Appreciate it. We'll take a brief break.

(A recess was taken)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We will reconvene and welcome John and Julie. You want to introduce yourselves and take over? Thank you.

MR. NUNNARI: For the record, my name is John Nunnari. And I am the Executive Director of AIA in Massachusetts.

MS. TAYLOR: I am to tell Julie Taylor.

I'm a lawyer with the law firm of Noble and

Wickersham in Cambridge and work with John and a

team of other people to prepare the White Paper on

casino design standards.

MR. NUNNARI: So, our thought here was to just sort of touch on some of the highlights of the forum itself. And use those highlights to sort of talk about what we put into the White Paper in terms of the recommendations or how those highlights helped us get to some of those recommendations. Talk a little briefly about what the recommendations are. And then hopefully have some questions and answers about potential

1 next steps.

2.1

So, in terms of the forum itself, we had a number of speakers, seven speakers in total.

Vernon Woodworth who is our president did an introduction and overview. Laura Wernick discussed some concepts of design excellence.

Julie Taylor talked about the gaming statute and in design sustainability. Mark Walsh-Cooke talked about sustainability features of high-performance buildings.

Anne-Marie Lubeneau spoke from the perspective of being involved with the Pittsburgh casinos and talked little bit about what worked and what didn't work in that process. Alicia McDevitt spoke about the Clean Energy Center and the programs that that center can offer to prospective casino developers. And lastly, Easley Hammer spoke from his personal experience on designing casinos in Singapore and Las Vegas.

After hitting those topics, we had our discussion back and forth between the Commission members and our members. And what we heard was really a need for some help in two big areas.

One putting some design standards in

place about what these casinos might be in terms of physically what they may look like and how they might be built. And secondly, a design review process to help you figure out once you take these 11 applicants, how you actually review them to determine -- to bring them down to the three that you actually want to grant licenses to.

And then how you follow that through after you've granted the license, how you follow the project through to ensure that they're actually complying with everything they said they were going to do.

So with that, Julie's going to talk a little bit about the recommendations that we made on the design standards. And then I'll talk a little bit about the design review process that we propose.

MS. TAYLOR: So, the White Paper was the result of a lot of collaboration among a lot of people who have a lot of experience with design criteria. And we reviewed the gaming statute and the criteria that were explicit in there as well as the authority that provided you to do things beyond what was specifically listed there.

2.1

We came up with a list of 20 specific criteria that we call the design, sustainability and community linkages standards. I would suggest to you that you adopt these or use a similar framework.

And the criteria were grouped into eight categories. The first being overall design, design quality, design excellence including integration into the surroundings and tourism appeal, linking to the communities in which they are going to be situated.

The second grouping of criteria was LEED, the energy and efficiency and design and materials.

Third area for criteria was in energy including renewables and equipment, monitoring of energy and increasing energy efficiency.

The next set of criteria had to do with operations, which I'd really like to stress. That in terms of post-occupancy, people tend to think of design criteria as something that you start with. But for purposes of meeting the statutory goals as well as sort of sustainability and quality design in general, you really want to be having

standards that require ongoing operations to be monitored and tweaked to the standards that they were designed to. And the statute also requires improvement.

So, energy efficiency in year one, in year seven you want make sure that you're not just going back to what is now old hat, but that you're continuing to require high standards.

Next set of criteria had to do with community impacts from a couple of perspectives including the sort of lighting and noise impacts on communities from the casino operations, as well as a robust inventory of community resources and linkages to those community resources.

Following up on sort of your last Q & A about how do you have it be outward looking. And I think having a requirement for robust design review process that John will talk about a little bit more would help the developer fulfill the requirement to have the casino be linked to the community.

Next criteria category had to do with water and water conservation.

Another category had to do with climate

2.1

and climate resiliency. In light of Super Storm Sandy, we learned the importance of that.

And then the final was traffic and access, both the function and appearance of how people come and go from the casino area.

So, I will just briefly touch on the project has overall design and concept excellence, both the entire project as well as each element. You wouldn't want one beautiful building and everything else to look like Soviet bunkers. That the project is integrated into its surroundings in terms streetscape and scale.

And one of the things I'd really like to emphasize is that because these resorts are not just going to be one function, create in effect a small village that you could have a casino, you could have a hotel, you could have entertainment facility. You could have sort of pathways where people walk through and that those pathways could be linked to the community. So, it doesn't need to be one model as its structure. And that's a way to have it be integrated into the surroundings.

And the project has tourism appeal.

That's one of the things that in terms of having

the success for the casino developer and operator be tied into its own self-interest is that the more tourism appeal, the more successful the casino resort is going to be. And that tourism appeal can link into the surrounding communities.

Some of the most significant projects around the world are ones that draw huge amounts of tourists because of high-quality design, because of linking to the site. Whether it's the Bilbao Museum in Spain or other places where the tourism appeal is a big part of the successful factor.

LEED and materials, we recommended that the projects and their elements be certified as platinum under new construction and major renovations. This is the sort of leveling of the playing field that both renovation of existing facilities as well as new construction can be eligible through LEED and LEED platinum under LEED-NC.

But also to take into account the community impacts in terms of LEED for neighborhood development and that be a LEED gold standard. And to prohibit certain materials on

the red list.

2.1

On energy, have each building in the project exceed the stretch energy code. Several of the communities are green communities and already require the stretch energy code. And the existing stretch energy code is easy for any developer to meet now. You should set the bar not so high that they can't meet it, but high enough to set a new standard.

The project should generate onsite at least 25 percent of its annual electricity for renewable sources, which all of the engineers will tell you is pretty easy to meet. And that it procures offsite the rest of it from renewables. And given that there are renewable energy credits in Massachusetts again, that's easy to do and relatively short money as one engineer said to me.

The project would submeter and monitor all of the major sources of energy consumption, part of the statutory requirement. Annually maintain and biannually improve energy efficiency, again, this sort of continuous improvement. Demonstrate that gaming equipment is energy-efficient and other equipment as Energy

Star labeled.

2.1

That it incorporates district heating and cooling technologies. This can be a fabulous way where these huge resorts to have cogeneration of combined heat and power to be a demonstration model and also to save money for the casino operator in the long run.

Have at least one key building aimed for net zero energy and within three years actually operate at net zero energy. So that the onsite generation of energy equals or exceeds the energy consumed onsite. That's feasible these days.

There initial commissioning. There's annual reports that would be submitted. The project after opening would be certified under the LEED for existing buildings. There's a LEED criteria that looks to operations and maintenance.

So again, it's important to not just sort of have your plan and put it on the shelf and be done with it when the building opens, but make sure that it continues to operate.

Community impacts that there can be benefits and amenities for schools, for children, for elders, for local organizations, whether it's

community theater or whether it's making the space available, providing discounted benefits and tickets.

Having a community resource assessment process through the host community and potentially with neighboring communities. And have sustainability education programs for employees and visitors.

In terms of water, to conserve water so that each building would use 40 percent less water than the standard building of that type and size. And promote reuse and recharge of water. The Institute for Sustainable Infrastructure has a lot of techniques to impact -- minimize the impacts of storm water, which is not only from roads but from the buildings themselves, from the roofs and particularly garages.

And to aim for net zero storm water but given that that may be technically difficult to do, to provide some offsite water savings mitigation. And that could be an agricultural project if there's a project out in the Springfield area. Or in the Boston area there's a great need for storm water collection and recharge. And that would be

2.1

something that would be easy for a developer to come up with.

In terms of climate, there's a lot of dialogue these days among architects and engineers about climate adaptation and resiliency and how to think about extreme weather events and where you should place things and what the design should be.

And that would be particularly important for these landmark buildings that are going to be having thousands and thousands of people in them. People don't always pay attention to the weather when extreme weather events are coming.

The project can also be available as a community resource in extreme weather. So, that if people are flooded out or lose power that there would be the ability to use at least some of the buildings at the casino resort for sort of a safe haven and a coordination for first responders.

The traffic impacts of these projects are going to be immense. And that there is a requirement in the statute to mitigate vehicle trips and reduce impacts. And you will need to consult with a good traffic engineer about the best

practices and the ways that that can be done.

Even within the site, the parking and circulation, you don't want to neglect the fact that people are going to be walking from one location to another. And there are going to be of delivery trucks. And you need to provide for the safe function as well as the visibility of how those things are going to work.

And finally, that there would be at the time of the initial opening access to multimodal means of transportation so that there are functioning public transit options whether it's rail or subway or bus. And that there would be plans for linkage to -- in the urban areas, linkages to the existing public transit system. And in rural or suburban how it can be linked up to RTAs, the regional transit authorities.

Finally, we had noted that you could include whatever sort of rating system that you come up with for the 20 or other criteria that there be extra points. So, if a proposal suggested that it would work with a UMass Amherst or UMass Boston or Harvard and MIT to come up with an innovative demonstration project on renewable or energy

efficiency, sustainable education that that would get extra points. Or if there was a proposal to partner with the State Department of Energy Resources on a demonstration pilot on renewable enerby, anaerobic digestion from the restaurants and food waste, for example, that that could also get extra points.

So, I'm happy to answer questions.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you.

MR. NUNNARI: On the design review process, one of the things that we heard was you were struggling with trying to understand how you would take these applications and actually figure out on the building portion of it what is a good proposal, what's not.

And what we thought of was sort of two-step process. One that you would take the standards that Julie just spoke about, but in the first process, you would take those standards and you would use those standards literally to help you rank, if you will, the actual proposals per region.

The second portion of the process would be putting together design review boards. So, after you've ranked your proposals and decided on

who you want to award licenses to, you would create these design review boards to follow the process from -- literally from giving the license, to concept design all of the way through the end of construction and past.

The design review boards, what we thought of was or what we're suggesting is a three-representative design review board. One representative would be a direct representative of the Gaming Commission. A second member would be a member from the host community. And then the third member would be a member who is designated as the collective representative of the neighboring communities.

The representative from the Commission would be the official voice, call them the chair if you will, of the three. But it would be encouraged, obviously, that they should work -- whatever decisions they come up with should be done in the form of trying to reach a consensus.

But in situations where consensus can't be reached, it still would be on the chair or the Commission representative to actually be the voice of the Commission. This person,

2.1

obviously, wouldn't be speaking for the Commission without consulting with the board or this Commission but that would be that one particular person's role.

We're suggesting that the people that serve on this Commission should have at a minimum 10 years experience in design and construction, ideally architects. We suggest that you might want to consider, if you like the idea of design review boards, that you would actually establish design review boards for the three actual projects as opposed to one person who works for the Commission sitting on all three projects.

Our concern is these projects are big.

They're immense. They're long. And that's a lot of work for one person to try to do. So, you might consider either hiring staff or hiring a consultant to work in that regard.

But again, this design review board, they would be your eyes and ears. They would be the ones who look at the standards that you approved when you gave the license. And they would work with the developer and the communities from concept design all of the way through the end

2.1

of construction to ensure that everything that was said upfront actually occurs.

And these folks would actually have the power through you to essentially stop the project if they felt that the project was going off track. If at the beginning of the project, the development team offered X and nine months into it X sort of fell by the wayside, the design review board could bring this to your attention and would have the ability to tell them to stop, go back, solve this. And once you've solved it, we can move on.

That's one way to ensure that you're actually going to get the buildings that you want. And some of the issues that were raised earlier about making sure that the building process that we're talking about in terms of trying to link to communities that is one way to ensure that you are actually linking with the communities and that the community process doesn't fall to the wayside by being able to tell them no, stop. We're not happy with what you're doing. Go back, solve it and then you can move along.

Really that is essentially it in terms of the design review process. There's a little

more in the proposal here in terms of the details, but I don't particularly want to go through all that now unless you have specific questions about it.

What I think would be a little more useful is having a conversation with you in terms of what you feel was either good or bad in this proposal and how we might be able to work with you in terms of taking either the design standards and moving them forward into your regulatory process. So, that the idea would be that hopefully these standards in some way are given to the 11 developers that you've approved that have to then come back and answer these questions as to how they're going to meet these standards.

And also to work with you to figure out the suggestion that we've made for these design review boards, whether that's something you like or not like. And if there's other ways that we can do it, how can we work with you to do it. I guess I would ask are there questions from the Commission as to what we've proposed?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I have a comment. I wanted to be the first one to make

this. Because I really thank you and applaud what you've put forward in this White Paper.

I think your recommendations are very good, on point out of the statute but really fleshed out, and out of your collective experience as well in other jurisdictions. So, I think you've laid out really well holistically but also very nuanced when it comes to things like what the transportation may mean in an urban setting versus a suburban setting and many other examples like this.

So, I read and reread your paper because it requires sometimes rereading with interest. And I really thank you. I really think that we are -- we should be thinking about the next step that you allude to John, which is taking these into the regulatory process. When what is a smart regulation -- You speak to much of that here, what should be a standard versus a prerequisite.

And prior to this, I was personally thinking that there were going to be a lot more prerequisites. The theme does not appear to be on that side. My read is that you are more on the side of meeting standards or setting standards, setting

2.1

high aspirations and letting the proponents really create -- bring together the best proposals, if you will.

And I also want to comment a little bit on the whole design review process, because I think that is key. One idea that I hope to take to other aspects of the application, like the finance evaluation, you speak really well to the building, the site -- the building design, the site design and the community linkages, but it has a tremendous parallel to what we will hope to accomplish in my view relative to just the purely financial evaluation.

Some of these proposals will not come with 100 percent financing, for example. And having that kind of review along the way is going to be important. So, I wanted to mention that now. At least in my view, your recommendations are not just limited to the design element. I think they really transfer to other key aspects of the application. So, a big winded way of saying thank you very much for all of the work that you've done.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: You mean in terms of the ongoing evaluation.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Evaluation,

2 yes.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I thought that was quite -- I echo Commissioner Zuniga's thanks for the thought and care you've put into this.

These are, as he put it so well, nuanced and very aspirational criteria.

And the notion of an ongoing review process, a team assembled to ensure that the -- to monitor what's going on, is an excellent way to address this and I think other aspects of it as well. So, he said it more eloquently than I can, but I do echo the thanks for what you've done.

I was curious about the overall goal in light of what we've heard here today and something we've been thinking about, I think all of those, in various ways. That is this. That you, Julie, talked about this as a little island, a little community or something so we have pathways through it. That is certainly what destination resort seems to suggest. That's the statutory definition.

Yet we have heard from not only the people who spoke here today but from others along

the way about the need for interconnectedness with and an outward lookingness, if you will, to surrounding communities. So, there's the first kind of dichotomy that occurs to me.

The second is that the interconnectedness with the surrounding area is one thing in an urban setting where a casino is plunked in the middle of a vibrant or could be vibrant urban setting. And it's different, it seems to me, in a much more rural area. Not that the concepts aren't useful in both places, but they're different. And they're achieved, it seems to me, in different ways. Could you talk about both of those in whatever way you think would be helpful?

MR. NUNNARI: As Mr. Rooney was speaking, I was actually thinking about that question actually. And it seems to me there's two scenarios that came to my mind.

One was a casino that's totally inward looking. They know how to make their money.

They're going to make their money. They're going to build a building and that's I guess the Vegas model maybe or the now changing Vegas model.

2.1

There's an argument I think that could be made that says if presented in the right way, it is more beneficial to the developer to truly reach out to the community. If they truly become engaged with the community, in all its aspects, funding a Sunday parade, allowing the community theater twice a month to use their theater, sponsoring school sports, those sort of things, that it only works to their benefit. It only helps them, quite frankly, make more money if they are strengthening their tie to the community, because then the community will help, quite frankly, promote the casino because they will see a mutual benefit in their relationship. That's what I was thinking.

And in terms of how do you do that, I think you can sort of to a certain extent do it through physical built environment by making the two sit down and figure out literally what do these roads look like? Is it literally just a paved road that winds forever? Or are there things that occur along that road?

Could the casino developer be engaged with the community's planning department and be

part of the master planning exercise that looks at the growth of the community? And literally, how are they going to grow? Yes, maybe this casino in a rural area does sit way out, sort of the golden road to Oz.

But there's a community somewhere that you have to go through to get to that Oz. And one way might be literally to have them sit down with the zoning board and the planning board and talk about the overall master plan of the town. How do we want to build up development on that golden road that leads to your casino so that it works for both of us? What sort of businesses should be there?

Just what kind of businesses that could be there.

So, I think that there are ways to do
it. I don't think that there is any silver bullet
that I can offer you right now that answers that.
I think some of it will come out through the way
they respond to some of the questions that we've
phrased in the standards as to tell us what your
plan is for linking to the community.

If the developer responds by saying I'm going to make a \$500,000 donation, well, that tells you something. But if they say I'm going to make

a donation but I'm going to do this, this and this, that tells you something else. And I think that is a way to look at it. It may not be a perfect way, because I'm not sure there is, again, any real perfect answer to that question. But I think it's a start.

MS. TAYLOR: Just a couple of further comments I think. If you make clear in your design standards package that go out to the developers that interconnectedness is a key criteria for you, that they will find a way to try to convince you that they are going to being more interconnected than anybody else who's submitting an application.

And they will have creative planners and architects and designers on their staff, traffic engineers who will be thinking about these issues. So, whether it's promoting a new public square where there can be this sort of European public square activities and cafés around the edges, whether it's something like that.

Or whether it's in a more rural setting and thinking, as John said, sort of how is the experience of the space along the road going to be. How can it tie in to this sort of geologic and

historical factors in some of the other buildings?
How can it sort promote some of the regional
resources in the area?

If you make that a key criteria as I said in a presentation in the forum in December, if you require things of developers, they are extraordinarily good at convincing you that they know how to meet them. So, just put a lot of the aspirational, put a lot of the high standards in the application. And that will draw out from the developers.

The second comment I think is to also make clear that perhaps in one of the standards itself, and we didn't put it this way in the White Paper, but that one of the design standards is in the initial stages a very robust engagement with the community on the design review process on these issues of interconnectedness and the surroundings and sort of supporting the surroundings.

And if you have that part of the process, if you have that kind of process being part of the criteria, that will function to bring out the best possibilities for the different site specific locations.

MR. NUNNARI: To a certain extent,

that's what the design review boards that we're

talking about will do. So, when you ask for it in

the standard, when we say these design review

boards will then follow the project, they will be

there at all of the local zoning meetings and all

of the planning board meetings. They will be at

all of the community meetings that are going to

occur just about what the design is.

So, it's sort of at that level that as Julie said, these developers are going to be very good about telling you here's why I'm better.

Here's the way that I'm going to do it, which is better than this other person.

It's the design review board that you can use that they actually do do it and that they stay on track. It could be again, one of those things --

MS. TAYLOR: And to help them do it.

MR. NUNNARI: Yes. But if they're not doing it, then you have that authority to say wait a minute. You got off track here. And we can still pull back your license if you don't get back on track.

MS. TAYLOR: Just to give a pretty short example, when I lived in Vermont for several years I was General Counsel of a company that was based up there. And I sat on the Act 250 review panel, which is their state sort of major projects review panel.

And there was a major sort of warehousing type building that was going up in an area that was on an incredibly scenic highway.

One of the areas in Vermont where you just go, oh, isn't this beautiful.

The developer came in with sort of this is what he wanted to do. And we said no. That's going to be glaring and it's going to take away everybody's eyes from viewing the mountains and the lake views. And you need to make it recede. You need to use darker colors. And you need to do more landscaping to hide it.

And I remember meeting with that developer a few years later and he said thank you. You made our project a better project because of the back-and-forth that we required during these review hearings. That we wouldn't have thought about the colors receding and the landscaping and

placing it over there rather than placing it over there.

So, a good developer can find a good review process helpful.

And on including in the criteria on our proposed criteria number 15 under the community impacts, does talk about having a community resource assessment process. And you might look at sort of beefing that up as a key criteria.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I pick up those comments. This morning I'm not sure if you heard our three speakers. I know you at least Jim Rooney, the one before you.

One of the common themes, if I could summarize, was along the lines of branding. And that the tourist that comes to Massachusetts is perhaps or that Massachusetts as a tourist destination may be thought of as more intellectual or sophisticated. And there were a couple of comments along those lines.

I am wondering if you have some reaction to that or ideas? You talked to some degree relative to community linkages. And I think that's great in the context of the region.

But I would be interested in your thoughts now or later relative to branding.

I know that in the forum, the design forum that you hosted a few weeks ago, Mr. Woodward talked about perhaps branding from a sustainability perspective. That maybe casinos Massachusetts could be the ones that have net zero. If you could speak a little about that or any other comments in that venue.

MS. TAYLOR: I'll just very quickly say that I think that Massachusetts -- it's not that I think. Massachusetts is a leader in energy, energy efficiency and renewables and the research at the universities that relate to Harvard and MIT, the Lowell Institute. So, to be able to take that and sort of do fun stuff with it and have it be neat demonstration projects and things. And have it be family resorts, bringing more people in, not just sort of single gamblers who sit there and smoke all day or something.

You could broaden the appeal with a Massachusetts branding about sustainability and energy. And the other is -- two others. One is sort of the university and the fact that there is

such a wealth of resources here in terms of universities and linkages.

But the third is the Massachusetts
landscape. We have beautiful landscapes. We
have hills out in the Berkshires. We have coasts
on the North and South shore. We have Cape Cod.
We have water. We have lakes. We have hiking.
So, all of the sort of recreational, outdoor, New
Englandy kind of stuff. So, I think energy,
university and that sort of recreation and the
beautiful varied outdoors is a lot to go on there.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Betsy Wall from -- I think the point you're making is about the tourism industry is worried about branding the ideal of Massachusetts to international visitors, which is a subject of a lot of discussion, how we get them here.

Betsy was worried about the branding and talked about quaint little New England with picket fences. And all I could think of was we're going to build a 300,000 square-foot saltbox house to house one of these casinos.

But she flipped it and did talk about the energy piece and the efficiency piece. And

the pictures of buildings that you included from Massachusetts are certainly, I think, very well blend those two.

I had three areas, I guess. of concern and question. The first is you talked about the use of LEED for neighborhood development rating system. And reading through the criteria that the neighborhood development rating system uses, it worried me or concerned me a little bit that it may tend to focus or favor an urban facility than a rural facility.

Access to civic and public spaces, agricultural land conservation, housing and jobs proximity. Is there a way to still use that criteria but a way to blend it so it doesn't favor a rural location over and maybe an urban location?

MR. NUNNARI: I think so. We had a big debate about LEED, quite frankly. And it's in one of our notes about LEED. Because LEED was a smart enough organization to grab onto something that they saw happening years ago, which was this movement toward sustainability. And they jumped on and grabbed a hold of it. And now we all talk about LEED. The reality is it's a for-profit

2.1

organization that we all use.

2.1

So, we had some concerns about the idea of saying should you use LEED or not, which is why in this recommendation we said not becoming LEED certified but becoming LEED certifiable.

That being said, the sort of beauty of LEED at the moment is that it is a checklist. But the checklist is up to you to decide which requirements you want. So, if you are in a rural setting as opposed to an urban setting, you can check off the requirements that this is what I'm going to do. Or this is what I'm going to do.

As opposed to in the rural requirement there may not be as much of an ability to tie into a public sewer system, for instance. But in an urban setting, it's pretty much a foregone conclusion that you are going to tie into that system.

So, I think that there is some leeway within the LEED's checklist to allow for that.

The other thought that we had, which could be a requirement is something called the International Green Construction code. And it's a code that has not been fully adopted across the country yet.

It's still sort of going jurisdiction by jurisdiction.

But what it is is a code that uses the matrix of LEED in terms of the checklist but instead of it being a checklist from a third-party, a for-profit organization, it's actually a building code. And it operates the same way.

Whereas you have a certain amount of points on a base that you need to comply with. I think it was like 14 points. And then there was a whole set of electives. And you could go per your project and choose the electives that you want. And there were certain standards that you would want to get to on the electives. You might want to get to 10 to reach a certain level. Then if you want to go to the next level, then you want to get to 15 or 17 or something to that effect.

The problem with that is that

Massachusetts has not adopted the International

Green Construction code because of the issues

surrounding trying to resolve the jurisdictional

issues. Because that code actually gets into

issues of water use, which because it's a building

code and regulated by one state agency, water use

is regulated by a different state agency. And we haven't figured out how we're going to make that work yet. So, the state hasn't looked at it.

But that being said, there are -- it is a building code that could be use and could be referenced. And those standards that are in that code could be used by you or by those projects if you so choose.

So, they are building code language that hasn't been adopted. And it would be a process to work a little bit with the Building Board of Regulations and Standards to make sure that if you're going to use that for these projects that we're using it appropriately and not circumventing the building code in some way.

But it does allow for a process that is a little more geared, I'd say than LEED to looking at suburban versus urban. And it's a very -- I don't want say it's complicated, but I don't think anybody's done it yet. So, you would definitely be a trailblazer if you tried to do it.

MS. TAYLOR: I have a question that sort of relates to your question, which is are you going to be issuing draft regulations for public

2.1

comment or are you going to be sort or issuing regulations?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The former times two or three.

MS. TAYLOR: Because I think that you can -- any good set of government standards is always going to have some discretion built into it, and always some room for sort of exceptions at the discretion of the Commission.

And you can invite comments from more rural sites, proposals in more rural sites about how would they propose to meet the intent of LEED-ND in terms of maximizing the benefits for the community and minimizing the negative. How would they meet the intent of that requirement given that it's in a more isolated setting?

And the LEED-ND don't -- I didn't give all of the criteria in there, but you can sort of rank different points within them. And there are some more rural community set of standards. It's not all based on sort of density of urban neighborhoods if that's helpful.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: That's helpful. One of the big takeaways from the case

2.1

examples you presented at the forum was the experience in Pittsburgh where hey, that's not what we asked for. When you had the two-story building and a 15-story parking garage right behind it right on the riverfront. I do look at the design review board as a way of kind of protecting against that.

I think a lot of people out there have questions and concerns about especially in the host communities is what we're being proposed, how do we make sure that's what we get at the end of the day.

Can you give an example of where design review board has been used kind of in the similar manner in which you're suggesting on a project that we might be familiar with in Boston or nearby?

MR. NUNNARI: I think when we were first here, Mike Davis had made a presentation to you, who is the chair of the Boston Civic Design Commission.

I think anything, quite frankly, that goes to the Boston Civic Design Commission or just the BRA in general through their large project review, I can tell you I did -- My background in

school is I did a charter school up on Pope's Hill that I remember we did our initial design, submitted it to the BRA. Went through the large project review and came out with a much different looking building.

For good or bad, we built it. We liked it. We photographed it. We certainly marketed it. Some people liked it. Some people didn't. But the point was there was a process. It was a public process that engaged with the City of Boston in that instance.

And a building was built from it. The client was very happy. The neighborhood was very happy. And they were happy because they were involved in the process. So, I think that's the one that immediately jumps to my mind.

I think you could probably point to every community that each of you lives in through your planning board and zoning board or school boards when they go through the process of designing a building.

I right now work, am a member of my town's building committee. And we're doing a police master plan study, which also incorporates

a school that's across the street from the police/fire station. And tomorrow night, we're having actually our second public presentation on what it is we're thinking.

We actually just started. We just had our initial meeting where we talked to the public about what it is we were doing. Now the second meeting will be they've met the architect. Here's what we're thinking. And it's a range of ideas. We're literally opening it up to say tell us what you think. Do you like this option? Do you not like this option? Give us your feedback.

So, I think there's plenty of examples. It's hard to really narrow it down to one specific that you might know of. Here in Boston I think the BRA and the Civic Design Commission are certainly two examples that have a very direct impact on literally, physically what these buildings look like in this town, city.

MS. TAYLOR: I would also add that all proposals change from what they're first proposed, all. So, don't feel like you would be doing something either detrimental or unusual by having a process that would require changes. All

2.1

developers expect that reviews will result in changes.

MR. NUNNARI: One of my biggest issues with new technology these days is -- I'm sure you've seen them. We've all seen the pictures in the paper of going back months here was the casino proposal for XYZ site. And you already saw what the building looked like with lights going off and cars driving by. And it looks like a finished product.

The problem with that is people see that and think all right. It's done. That's what it's going to look like. And it's a struggle that I've had and others in my profession have had of trying to get people to understand that no, it does change. There's a process for this. It will change. It's literally just in keystrokes. And we'll make another rendering and it'll look just as finished as the last.

MS. TAYLOR: Even in the Globe, you saw Sasaki came up with a very different -- reducing a lot of storm water. Putting stuff underground. Okay. And you want something else? Okay, we'll do something else.

MR. NUNNARI: It is part of the process that it does change from concept design on through. It changes less and less obviously the further you get into the process. Just by virtue of building things and what things cost. And you don't want to be in the middle of your construction documents and decide to add 500,000 square feet to the building. That's not a particularly good idea. But things do change and you shouldn't be afraid of that.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I had a similar question I'm just going to ask. First, I want to thank you and your team for this thoughtful document as well.

With that three-person review process, are you familiar with any other jurisdictions who license casinos using a similar process? I know you had folks you met with with architects from Singapore and other jurisdictions. But are you familiar with another jurisdiction or did your research --

MR. NUNNARI: lead us to that?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes.

MS. TAYLOR: I would say that we did

2.1

not do an extensive search for what other casino review processes have been. But our comments both on the standards and on the design review process were very much informed by the casino experience in Pittsburgh and by the experience in Singapore and the standards that they used.

MR. NUNNARI: And the two folks,

Anne-Marie and Easley who respectively looked at
those, agreed this was a good first step.

We didn't obviously in this particular presentation we didn't detail it to the Nth degree as to how exactly this would work. But the overall concept of saying that you should get a group of people together that really should be charged with making sure that the project, whatever project that is approved initially, is the project that is built.

And those people, one person should be from this Commission. One person should be from the host community. And one person should be from the other surrounding host communities. And that they should be charged with ensuring back to you that this happens.

That that basic concept was a concept

2.1

1 that everybody wholeheartedly agreed with.

2 Because it does allow for communities to be heard.

It gives them a voice at the table, which is clearly

4 what the problem with Pittsburgh was was they

5 didn't have or at least they didn't feel as though

6 they had the voice at the table to advocate on their

7 behalf.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. TAYLOR: But I think it would be a wonderful step for the Commission and our staff to take.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I'd be curious. One of the jurisdictions I followed is Ohio, even though Ohio introduced gaming in particular communities, there is a blend of new construction as well as building renovation. And the investment size is somewhat on the same level and magnitude of what we're requiring in Massachusetts.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Ohio, the site and the operator was selected as part of the referendum. So, that's a key difference. But nonetheless.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: It moved their process little faster.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 1 A little 2 faster. If I read the design 3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 4 review process right, you're talking about having the DRB would start before the licensing decisions 5 6 are made; is that right? 7 MR. NUNNARI: Not necessarily. 8 could. 9 MS. TAYLOR: You would use the process 10 before the decisions are made. Whether you 11 formally constitute a DRB, not necessarily. 12 MR. NUNNARI: You could put them 13 together, quite frankly, and have them help you if you wanted with the actual first portion of it. 14 15 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I wasn't sure where 16 it started. So, if it started in advance of the 17 licensing decision, then I was going to ask, what 18 do you see as the role of the DRB in advance of a 19 licensing decision. 20 If you're not suggesting that it be 21 there in advance of a licensing decision, then I 22 won't ask the question. 23 MR. NUNNARI: To a certain extent, the 24 only way it can really happen in advance, in

fairness I think, is that you would appoint the three people that you want to be -- Let's assume you're going to get three licenses. And you want one person to follow each of the licenses. That you appoint those folks and that those folks help you in the step one portion of reviewing the applications.

I am not sure and you could probably make arguments both ways, but my initial thought is you wouldn't necessarily want to appoint the community representatives yet, because you haven't granted the license yet. So, they might be a little biased.

MS. TAYLOR: But you could appoint someone who is familiar with community processes in a whole variety of projects in a whole variety of locations. Not promoting Ann Ruade, but someone who has been through projects in urban areas and projects in suburban areas and projects in rural areas and has seen 15 different varieties of the community review process. That you retain two or three consultants to help you in the initial review packages.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think we will do

that but that's different -- that's not the design review board idea that you had. So, you're not specifically suggesting that the DRB would be in advance.

MR. NUNNARI: I don't think -- I think there are ways that you could do it. I could envision, quite frankly, a way where if you wanted, you could put together say a group of five we'll say architects, because we are architects. And you could charge them, quite frankly, with I think you have four basic criteria in the general sense of what you're looking at in the applications.

You could charge those five with saying look at this portion, the building portion. And I want you to break them up into the regions. And I want you to rank the proposals. And they give those rankings back to you. And you take those rankings and then look at them in relation to the other three areas that you're looking at in terms of the casino license.

The next step might be you take that five member group that you put together and pick three of them. And make those three the people who will now be the individual representatives of the

three design review boards. That's one option if you wanted to go that way.

Another might -- The other way is to just not bring them on until after you've made the selection of the three actual licenses that you're going to grant. Either one could work.

But I think when we were thinking of this, I don't think we were necessarily thinking that they were going to be part of helping you select the three applicants.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The other thing I was going to ask about that was the post-licensing work is a lot of work that you've suggested here.

In your mind's eye, would these folks be paid?

MR. NUNNARI: I would think that they would be because it is going to be quite a bit of work, which is why we were suggesting you might hire them as consultants. You might hire them as staff. Because the reality is and this goes back to one of an earlier meeting that I attended here, just because the building is done, doesn't mean the building is done. It's going to be there for a long time. It may have multiple operators. And it may have additions and renovations.

One of the comments that we were talking about earlier was LEED for new construction. The reality is the minute you get your certificate of occupancy, you're an existing building. And you're into a different part of the building code. And that's a different LEED standard now for your renovations. So, there is an argument that says these buildings are going to go through a lot of changes over the years. And it might behoove the Commission to have staff following that.

MS. TAYLOR: And I think it is extremely like that most of these are going to be phased. They're not going to build out everything -- they're not going to do it all at once.

They're going to build the casino and a hotel. And then they'll add a museum or they'll add some additional parking. Or they'll add some other restaurant or something. I would think that would be much more likely.

MR. NUNNARI: And it's a decision I think that the Commission would have to make in terms of it seems you have two options. You could either bring people on staff that work directly for

the Commission, which you might argue you have a little more control over, so to speak.

Or you're hiring consultants who are working for you and just have a contract with your for a defined amount of time who represent you but don't represent you probably in the same way as a staff person might. That would be decision that the Commission would want to make.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: There is perhaps a third category of people in my view which are those whose job it may be at the host and surrounding community to think about economic development for example or other impacts. People that -- Public works comes to mind in some cities or towns.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The RPAs.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: People at the RPAs. People at the BRA in the case of Boston. Still have to think about stipends and things like that, but there are people who could be part of this process.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Whose job it already

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right.

is.

commissioner Mchugh: But picking up on the theme that both you and the Chairman said a minute ago or maybe you answered it. One of the things we heard from Tom Glynn this morning which is proven, I think, by Mass. Port's experience is the feeling of community participation in these developments leads to a community enthusiasm.

One of the things about the design review board is it's got representatives from the community. Assuming that we didn't have a, couldn't have really the same kind of design review board in advance of a license award that you would have afterwards, what other mechanism is there for getting involvement of the host and surrounding communities in a design review process before the Commission makes the award?

You're going to have the host community agreement, if you think about the flow. So, that's going to be an abstract. You'll have then presentations. That's what you've just described a minute ago, Julie. That's somebody with three clicks on a computer and you've got a design.

Then we're going to get the applications. And the applications are going to

have people address with various schematics and other kinds of things and various responses to a lot of these criteria, if not all of them that you've said.

And somebody on behalf of the

Commission is going to have to rank them and

evaluate them in each of the regions. But is there

a role -- And that's probably one group that can

do evenhanded comparison. But is there a role at

that stage for some community involvement in

saying that this is a useful, this is a great design

or this is a great design but for this.

So, if the Commission wants to award this at least the community thinks that we ought to have more flowers, more daffodils or something.

Is there some way -- Have you thought about whether there'd be a way to do that?

MR. NUNNARI: The only thing that quite frankly comes to mind is almost an open public presentation by the Commission that says, here's everything we've received --

MS. TAYLOR: Otherwise known as the dog-and-pony show.

MR. NUNNARI: To a certain extent it is

that. Here's what we've received. You as the host community and surrounding communities, this is your day. Come tell us your comments.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: We are required to do that by statute.

MR. NUNNARI: Barring that I'm not sure what sort of formalized process you have.

MS. TAYLOR: But that could be facilitated by people who are used to productive and efficient community processes. As opposed to just sort of letting the public stand up and make some questions and comments.

MR. NUNNARI: There are facilitators that will help with that.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Surely, we can do that and we have to do that. And we will do that and do it enthusiastically.

But some of this stuff is technical.

And the average citizen isn't going to look at it.

Some of the LEED stuff, some of the aspirational stuff, some of the recirculation stuff, some of the things that might have been included but weren't along those lines are not going to be picked up unless there is a group charged with focusing on

it.

And maybe the group and certainly, the Commission's group will do that, whoever is advising the Commission. There may be some local flavor that needs a local board, a local group, a local something or other to focus on these things with the rigor and intensity that the general public won't and give the community's view. It's worth thinking about.

MS. TAYLOR: There are also professional organizations that could help you consider the review of the proposals in light of specific communities.

So, ACEC participated in our forum.

That's the group of engineers. There are the architects groups. There are planners groups.

There are the Mass. Municipal organizations.

They are a whole variety of people who are professionals who could help you sort of interpret properly the pros and cons or the strengths and weaknesses may be is a better way to put it.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: What I was thinking is, and I don't want to beat a dead horse here, I was thinking of the instrumental as well

as the intrinsic value of it. The fact that the community is somehow participating in the frontend in a rigorous review of this thing has its own value apart from the results it reaches.

MR. NUNNARI: What I sort of hear you saying almost is that the Commission would ask let's say in the 11 communities you are the host community. One of the requirements we might ask of you is to literally put a group of people together, internally do that and review this proposal and come back to us to sort of organize it a little bit.

Because it seems to me that that's what the issue is trying to organize the thoughts of lots of people into something coherent to make its way up to you so you can use those thoughts as part of your judgment process.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I would argue that that process is already taking place by virtue of the host community agreements and a separate one with the surrounding community agreements. And we decided that we would be removed from that process because we would later evaluate it.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I don't think it

is. I'm talking about something different. I am talking about after we get the application. The application -- We're not going to see the application at the time in all likelihood of the host community agreement.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think he's saying and I was having the same thought, and you're sort of dismissive of HCA stage. You said that's just going to be three clicks and they won't really -- I would hope that at the HCA stage, they would be doing precisely what you're talking about.

That they would do a really rigorous review of looking at the water, lots of community participation, culminating in a referendum.

COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I didn't want to be dismissive of that. So, if we could somehow without getting involved in the HCA processing encourage that. Because you're going to know, right, whether what's actually being proposed regardless of what the HCA says until you see the application.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I would argue that I tried to make that point unsuccessfully weeks ago --

1 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: I know and 2 you're still unsuccessful. 3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- relative to 4 dictating --5 MS. TAYLOR: Welcome to community 6 process. 7 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: That's exactly 8 right. 9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: We did discuss 10 the idea of dictating the type of advisors that 11 host communities should have. And we decided not 12 to weigh in on that. One we could have but we 13 didn't. I also remember specifically talking 14 about issuing guidelines, guidelines that as a 15 participatory agency we could put out and then 16 evaluate, which some agencies do all of the time. 17 And I think that to some degree I know 18 that process has already started without any 19 guidelines from the Commission, which is fine as 20 I just remind us of those times when we did well. 21 discuss these policy questions. 22 And I'd say Commissioner MS. TAYLOR: 23 McHugh, to follow up on my comment about these 24 review process always involve change.

developers expect change. The community process could start in a very robust way when the applications come in. And there could be a lot of changes. There could be a lot of feeling of engagement and ownership and relationship building between community voices after the applications come in.

It'd be great to have everything all along the way all at once, but I think it's hard to do that.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I have a question from the functional or operational standpoint from the Commission's perspective.

We've tackled or attempting to tackle, and maybe there's an appropriate role for the design review board in this, calculating an applicant's level of investment.

Eight-hundred million, is it really 800 million or construction guidelines, etc. dictate a lower or higher amount. Also, functionally an applicant will be required to set aside 10 percent of the investment cost. And at some point in the latter stages of construction and development, they come to us and say okay, we need

2.1

1 that 10 percent to finish.

And we've toyed with the question of what type of internal help do we need to help make that judgment as to are they really at that point where that money needs to be released.

Would you envision that the design review board could actually help us with those two functions of the evaluation process?

MR. NUNNARI: Yes. What I sort of hear in the second portion of your question is basically a retainage. The way I think of retainage is more concrete in terms of it's just a building.

At the beginning of the project, five percent of the project is held in retainage until the end. And that five percent is then released as the punch list is completed on the building.

But I think what you're talking about is something much larger than just the building itself. It's the overall project cost maybe.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: They can request to get the 10 percent when they can demonstrate the amount of money needed to finish the project is equal to or less than the 10 percent.

MR. NUNNARI: And I think if you were to follow the design -- the suggestions that we made with making sure that you're bringing on people with design and construction experience, architects, others, I think absolutely they can help you with that. Because that's what we do.

MS. TAYLOR: Cost estimating is a central factor for people who are involved in big projects. So, anybody who has 10 years experience with large projects is going to have some ability to gauge cost estimating.

This is going to be a different scale and a different nature of the beast, but you just need somebody who's could. You may want to consult with a really big cost estimating companies on a couple of key points and say do an integrity check here.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I agree. Just like technology can help us produce what could look like a very detailed cost estimate, it could just be couple of clicks.

MS. TAYLOR: And a cost estimate in year two is not a good predictor of a cost estimate in year six. The cost of steel at various points

1 has ricocheted all over the place.

MR. NUNNARI: Traditionally, with the projects I've been involved with, we generally do a cost estimate at the end of schematic, which is a little more than throwing a dart at the board. But it gives you at least an understanding.

We're talking about a building that's going to be X amount of square feet. We know it's this type of building. We know these type of buildings cost generally about this much per square foot. So, you can start to get your head around a project cost.

But then the estimates continue from
the end of schematic design, at 50 percent of
design development, at the end of design
development, construction documents, at 50
percent, 75 percent, sometimes 90 percent and then
100 percent. So, there's ample opportunities
through the construction project to make sure that
your numbers are --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: One thing that's interesting about what you just said is that by definition therefore, our bidders who are throwing these big numbers around really have no idea of

what kind of money they're really talking about.

MR. NUNNARI: At this point, I would honestly say, and I'm sure there will be knives thrown in my back from the development community for saying this, but it is not much more than well, I did it before. I built one of these buildings before. I know the rough square footages. I know roughly how much building I'm going to build --

MS. TAYLOR: I know what the labor costs are these days in Massachusetts construction.

MR. NUNNARI: -- the approximate cost will be X. The only thing, quite frankly, I think that's truly known at this point is the statutory requirement to spend at least \$500 million in actual capital construction. Besides that, it is good educated guesses, but educated guesses nonetheless

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So, to ensure that we are not just taking at face-value someone that says \$1.2 billion and someone else says \$800,000 and not be more impressed by the \$1.2 billion, we really need to get someone to evaluate.

2.1

MR. NUNNARI: I suspect that they are going to submit you a pro forma that shows why it is that way. But it's never a bad idea -- In my world we always have competing cost estimates that get reconciled.

The architect will generally do one and the contractor will do one. And they're never the same. And then you have to get together and talk about it. So, it is probably worth your effort just to talk to somebody to get this is the proforma they submitted. Does this seem to make sense? Are they playing with the numbers a little bit?

MS. TAYLOR: There's always going to be a value engineering process that goes on.

Developers by nature are people who, you know, are optimists and think that things are going to work out fine. And they're going to make tons of money.

And then they find out that to do this is going to cost a little bit more. So, maybe the skin of the building isn't going to look quite nice. And maybe they have to scale-back the size of this. That's where having the design review process and saying this is something that is

required for you to proceed. So, you're not going to take off the nicely patterned canopy and put up a piece of plastic.

MR. NUNNARI: You're not going to change it from Bilboa to the 500,000 square foot saltbox.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: One of our early policy discussions, and I remember because I prepared the recommendation, had the submittal of different stages of the design be always accompanied by the cost estimate and the schedule. Because those three tools will allow the Commission and/or any design review board to see the progression, to see the changes and cross-reference to what's now being drawn and estimated.

MS. TAYLOR: Just on that point, everybody wants the most beautiful building as soon as possible for the least amount of money. Those things don't go together. Something has to give.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think our legislation required that the buildings be LEED gold minimum.

1 MS. TAYLOR: Or higher. 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Can you 3 talk -- Is there any constructive way to talk about 4 the cost-benefit of a platinum? If we were to 5 require a higher standard, which we have the option 6 of doing, what are the implications to developers 7 of requiring higher standards? 8 Presumably it costs X amount more 9 But is it readily predicted that that is 10 recaptured under certain circumstances? Is there 11 any ball parking that you can give us on that? 12 MR. NUNNARI: It depends on who you 13 speak to. The upfront costs have been pegged 14 anywhere between seven and 15 percent for doing 15 more energy-efficiency, more things related to 16 LEED upfront. 17 Over gold say? CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 18 MR. NUNNARI: Just in general. 19 MS. TAYLOR: When he said about people differ --20 21 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Let him finish. 22 -- the figures that I MS. TAYLOR: 23 hear are more in the one to four percent margin. 24 MR. NUNNARI: It depends on who you

speak to. Like I said, the numbers vary. I think the argument has always been that even though the numbers may vary upfront and that the costs are a little more upfront, and you can argue about what that number is, the long-term benefit, the payback to the owner is worth it, because you are making that money back over a 10- or 15-year period.

I think what's good in this particular situation is the developer likely will be the owner of this building and operator of this building hopefully for quite some time. As opposed to a different development community that is literally just going to build the building to sell it.

So, they're not interested in paying those upfront costs. So, I think the reality of the standards of LEED is the higher you go you could argue you might be paying a little more of a premium upfront to go from gold to platinum. But the payback to the owner in terms of lower operating costs and lower maintenance costs will far outstrip those upfront costs that they may have.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Over some period of time.

MR. NUNNARI: Over some period of

1 time.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is that debatable?

Are there people who argue with that or is that pretty established?

MR. NUNNARI: That is pretty established.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You can argue the amount. You can argue how many years and so forth, but it's pretty established.

MR. NUNNARI: The basic concept of yes, the upfront costs will pay you back over time. That I think is pretty well established.

MS. TAYLOR: If you look, there is some materials that talk about the overall cost of operating a large project and personnel is the biggest bar. It costs the most to pay money over years to people to do what you're paying them to do.

Then there's some sort of building related costs and then the construction costs and then the design costs. So, the little marginal cost to move from gold to platinum I would argue might be almost nothing, because you're starting with a large-scale project.

And the difference between gold and platinum is not going to be very high. The design costs to go from gold to platinum, what you have to pay your architects and engineers will be miniscule.

The construction costs will be relatively small to go between gold and platinum if you're starting early and you're designing all of your mechanical systems to be smart.

Then you've got 15 to 25 years of operations. And if you're requiring the LEED in the operation and maintenance that has been unequivocally demonstrably proven to save building owners money by having LEED in the operations and maintenance. Because by keeping everything at peak efficiency, you keep your electricity and water and energy, heating and cooling bills far lower than if your systems aren't working at peak efficiency.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: What's the difference in costs if your facility or part of your facility includes existing buildings? So, now to meet that standard you'd have to take that existing facility and bring it up to the standards.

1 What kind of costs are we talking now?

2 MR. NUNNARI: That I don't feel 3 comfortable giving any particular number on.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But it sounds like it would be more.

MR. NUNNARI: It's more because you're dealing with an existing facility.

MS. TAYLOR: But it's also more just to bring it up the code, setting aside LEED and energy efficiency. It costs more to take the 100-year-old building and have it be access for disability.

MR. NUNNARI: It's a pretty standard thumb thing to say. The reality is renovation always costs more than brand-new construction.

So, if you just start from that premise you can sort of extrapolate from there.

The only thing I would say is Julie's comment was absolutely correct. The only thing I would actually differ or disagree with is on the designer cost. I would argue, quite frankly, there is no additional designer cost if the design team is told upfront that this is what you're doing. The fee is not going to change because it's

pen on paper. It's writing specifications. We do that anyway.

So, it's just a function of what the material costs are going to be for the system they design.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So, the debate here is between zero and miniscule.

MR. NUNNARI: On the design side.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I think at some point and I also don't want to beat a dead horse, it becomes a question of where the opportunity cost of the investment dollars for the developer. I think that a developer will assess the market and try to -- the market for gaming and say we could build something here for X and try to do that. And to the extent, and you made that point in your forum. To the extent that you're required to do something, they will factor that in. And they will do it. And that's not negotiable.

The contingencies will have to be -- if something goes wrong, if they find ledge or they find unsuitable materials, it'll have to come out of another area, another pocket.

If you're not required to do certain

things, then that gets into the mix of what could become a contingency or value engineered as you develop the project.

This is why I was earlier thinking that some of your recommendations would be along the lines of requirements or prerequisites. But I think you speak well relative to what's already existing in terms of these communities, the stretch code and the like. Because some of these already are required by the statute or other building codes we could just exceed in an aspirational capacity.

MS. TAYLOR: And there are developers including in sort of resort and entertainment like the office developers and residential developers who believe that it is a status, it is a brand, it is a positive thing to be able to say that they have a LEED platinum. MGM's doing that out in its City Center project in Las Vegas. It's doing a lot of marketing about its sustainability.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We're well past our end point. Anything else for our valued guests?

MS. TAYLOR: Do you have a timetable

for when you plan to issue standards or something

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

2.1

1 related to what we're talking about? 2 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You'll see a draft 3 an early draft of evaluation criteria within the 4 next few days or week. 5 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: It's plastic 6 and we'll look at your comments. 7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We're starting 8 possibly this afternoon but for sure on Wednesday, 9 tomorrow, for sure tomorrow afternoon to talk about the draft evaluation criteria. 10 11 Are they up on the Web or will they be? 12 They will be soon and we'll send them to you if you 13 want to ask for them. So, we would look forward 14 to comments any time. 15 Thank you very much as always. 16 guys are really helpful We really appreciate it. 17 Do we have a motion to adjourn the 18 55th --19 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So moved. 20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor, aye. 21 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. 22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. 23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. 24 COMMISSIONER MCHUGH: Aye.

```
Page 165
                   CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Meeting adjourned.
 1
 2
 3
                   (Meeting adjourned at 12:08 p.m.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

	Page 160
1	ATTACHMENTS:
2	
3	1. Massachusetts Gaming Commission March 12,
4	2013 Notice of Meeting and Agenda
5	
6	
7	
8	SPEAKERS:
9	
10	Thomas P. Glynn, CEO - Massachusetts Port Authority
11	James E. Rooney, Executive Director - Massachusetts
12	Convention Center Authority
13	Betsy Wall, Executive Director - Massachusetts
14	Office of Travel and Tourism
15	John Nunnari - American Institute of Architects,
16	Massachusetts Chapter/Boston Society of
17	Architects
18	Julie Taylor - American Institute of Architects,
19	Massachusetts Chapter/Boston Society of
20	Architects
21	
22	
23	
24	

CERTIFICATE

2

3

4

5

6

1

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

8

9

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

11

12

13

14

15

16

10

I, Laurie J. Jordan, further certify I neither am counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this hearing was taken and further that I am not financially nor otherwise interested in the outcome of this action. Proceedings recorded by Verbatim means, and

17 18

WITNESS MY HAND this 18th day of March

transcript produced from computer.

20

19

21

22

23

24

LAURIE J. JORDAN

Notary Public

My Commission expires:

May 11, 2018