



Massachusetts Gaming Commission Meeting Minutes

Date/Time: August 14, 2025, 10:00 a.m.

Place: Massachusetts Gaming Commission

VIA CONFERENCE CALL NUMBER: 1-646-741-5292

PARTICIPANT CODE: 111 919 2761

The Commission conducted this public meeting remotely utilizing collaboration technology. Use of this technology was intended to ensure an adequate, alternative means of public access to the Commission's deliberations for any interested member of the public.

Commissioners Present:

Chair Jordan Maynard

Commissioner Eileen O'Brien

Commissioner Bradford Hill

Commissioner Nakisha Skinner

Commissioner Paul Brodeur

1. [Call to Order](#) (00:00) - 1004

Chair Maynard called to order the 561st Public Meeting of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission ("Commission"). Roll call attendance was conducted, and all five commissioners were present for the meeting.

2. [Meeting Minutes](#) (00:32)

Minutes for the February 22, 2024, April 3, 2024, October 24, 2024, and July 1, 2025 public meetings were included in the Commissioners' Packet on pages 5 through 30.

Commissioner Brodeur moved that the Commission approve the minutes from the following public meetings, as included in the Commissioners' packet, subject to any necessary corrections for typographical errors or other non-material matters: February 22, 2024 and April 3, 2024. Commissioner Skinner seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner O'Brien: Aye.
Commissioner Hill: Aye.
Commissioner Skinner: Aye.
Commissioner Brodeur: Abstain.
Chair Maynard: Aye.

The motion passed unanimously, 4-0 with one abstention.

Commissioner Brodeur moved that the Commission approve the minutes from the following public meeting, as included in the Commissioners' packet, subject to any necessary corrections for typographical errors or other non-material matters: October 24, 2024. Commissioner O'Brien seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:
Commissioner O'Brien: Aye.
Commissioner Hill: Aye.
Commissioner Skinner: Abstain.
Commissioner Brodeur: Abstain.
Chair Maynard: Aye.

The motion passed unanimously, 3-0 with two abstentions.

Commissioner Brodeur moved that the Commission approve the minutes from the following public meeting, as included in the Commissioners' packet, subject to any necessary corrections for typographical errors or other non-material matters: July 1, 2025. Commissioner O'Brien seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:
Commissioner O'Brien: Aye.
Commissioner Hill: Aye.
Commissioner Skinner: Aye.
Commissioner Brodeur: Aye.
Chair Maynard: Aye.

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

2. Research and Responsible Gaming (03:38)

a. Presentation of report, "The Impact of Legalized Gambling on Recovery Communities: A Community-Based Participatory Research Study"

Mark Vander Linden, Director of Research and Responsible Gaming, explained that G.L. c. 23K and G.L. c. 23N required the Commission to carry out research on populations disproportionately impacted by gambling in the Commonwealth. He stated that the Commission approved a research grant to Texas Tech University to explore the impact of gambling on recovery communities in partnership with the Massachusetts Council on Gaming and Health ("MACGH"). He stated that the research explored several questions regarding recovery and sought to determine what indicators affected recovery.

Dr. Devin Mills, Assistant Professor with the Department of Community, Family, and Addiction Sciences from Texas Tech University introduced Travis Spencer, Graduate Research Assistant at Texas Tech University. Dr. Mills and Mr. Spencer presented a report titled “The Impact of Legalized Gambling on Recovery Communities: A Community-Based Participatory Research Study”. Topics in the report included the following: objectives, the current gambling landscape, understanding recovery, risk factors, support systems, impact of legalized gambling on recovery communities, and recommendations. *The report and presentation were included in the Commissioners’ Packet on pages 31 through 111.*

Commissioner O’Brien asked if the focus group participants suggested any wording changes to the phrase “responsible gaming”. Dr. Mills stated that the focus groups discussed safer gambling practices but that there were different interpretations of what “safer” meant among the participants. He stated that a community-based study with players might be able to look into what language was best. He stated that the research did not result in recommendations regarding what terms to use. Mr. Spencer stated that there was a conversation in a breakout group regarding the term “accountable gaming” but expressed that this term might not fully capture the intent of responsible gaming advocates.

Commissioner Hill noted that the research indicated that the legalization of sports betting had increased harms without an increase of treatment options. He noted that GameSense, the Department of Public Health, and the Massachusetts Council on Gaming and Health had information regarding treatment options available to the public. Dr. Mills explained that the report was qualitative based upon responses received and that there may be a gap in awareness between what is available and what is known. He stated that the claims that there was no increase in treatment options were based upon the perceptions of those interviewed and may not necessarily be true.

Commissioner Hill noted that the opiate issue in Massachusetts was addressed by adopting legislation to educate the public that there was help for those who were addicted. He stated that it would take time to educate the public but that harm could be reduced significantly if the Commission adopted a similar approach. Dr. Mills stated that there would not be an immediate effect based on this work as it would take time to reach the masses and develop trust with the public. He stated that resources were available in Massachusetts, but the individuals interviewed did not feel like there were enough.

Chair Maynard noted that the research was centered on a focus group and not a wide-reaching poll. He stated that the results were what the focus group qualitatively thought. Commissioner Brodeur stated that part of the legislative mandate related to sports wagering was to create opportunities for growth and minimize harm. He noted that there were individuals facing addiction challenges that were presumably not in the focus group, such as incarcerated individuals. He asked if there would be value in a pilot program offering problem gambling resources for incarcerated individuals. Dr. Mills stated there would be value in that program, but it was not considered in this research sample. Chair Maynard stated that there was the opportunity for additional research there.

Dr. Mills noted that New Jersey was piloting a gambling court for those convicted of a crime with a gambling-related component. He stated that research was supportive of treatment courts in general in addition to some programing in the justice system.

Director Vander Linden thanked the presenters. He stated that they asked difficult questions and did a great job of engaging the recovery community. He stated that this type of research was intended to be a deep dive into specific communities and to add color to quantitative data. He stated that another community-engaged research project would be presented to the Commission in a couple of weeks.

3. [Community Affairs Division](#) (49:04)

a. Encore Boston Harbor Quarterly Report

Encore Boston Harbor's ("EBH") Executive Director of Legal Juliana Catanzariti and EBH's Executive Director of Security and Investigations Tom Coffey presented EBH's quarterly report with topics including the following: taxes, lottery sales, workforce diversity, vendor diversity, compliance, HR initiatives, and community outreach. *EBH's quarterly report presentation was included in the Commissioners' Packet on pages 112 through 137.*

Commissioner O'Brien inquired about the minor who was on the gaming floor for four hours and thirty-five minutes as reported. Mr. Coffey stated that there was an identification swap and that the minor had used a valid identification from another individual. He stated that the minor entered the gaming floor several times over a two-week period. He stated that security staff were going through remedial training on identification swaps.

Commissioner Hill noted that EBH's veteran employment numbers were stagnant and asked if EBH was doing outreach to the veteran community. Ms. Catanzariti stated that EBH partnered with veteran groups. She noted that some veterans chose not to disclose that they were veterans. She noted that she believed EBH had more veterans than reported. She stated that EBH worked with community partners and did open postings for job listings.

Commissioner Hill inquired about the decrease in lottery revenues at EBH. Ms. Catanzariti stated that EBH upgraded to new lottery machines, but the decline was due to a reorganization of cross-promotions with the lottery. She stated that a lottery promotion was pushed into the next quarter on the promotional schedule.

Commissioner Brodeur asked about the scope of EBH's college care package promotion. Ms. Catanzariti explained that EBH partnered with an organization called Bottom Line to provide care packages to college students during finals. She stated that EBH purchased supplies, and staff compiled the care packages before sending them to Bottom Line. She noted that she could send the Commission more information.

b. [MGM Springfield Quarterly Report](#) (1:02:14)

MGM Springfield's ("MGM") Vice President & Legal Counsel Gus Kim, MGM's Vice President of Finance Arlen Carballo, and MGM's Director of Public Affairs Beth Ward

presented MGM's quarterly report with topics including the following: taxes, lottery sales, workforce diversity, vendor diversity, compliance, community outreach, and entertainment. *MGM's quarterly report presentation was included in the Commissioners' Packet on pages 138 through 163.*

c. Discussion of FY2027 Community Mitigation Fund Grant Cycle (1:18:02)

Chief of the Community Affairs Division Joe Delaney explained that the Community Affairs Division was seeking guidance from the Commission regarding the Community Mitigation Fund grant program. He noted that the Community Mitigation Fund had approximately \$5.9 million available for the FY2027 fiscal year. He stated that this amount is approximately 30% of what was distributed in prior years and that there would be significant reductions in grants. *A memorandum regarding FY 2027 Community Mitigation Fund Policy Questions was included in the Commissioners' Packet on Pages 164 through 171.*

Chief Delaney stated that he wanted Commission input on four issues. The first issue was how funds should be split among the regions. He explained that the second issue was how much funding should be utilized for communities and how much funding should be provided to regional agencies. He asked if the Commission would want to make changes to the eligibility of municipalities. He explained that the last issue was whether the Commission wanted to make changes to the eligibility of regional agencies.

Chief Delaney noted that the Local Casino Mitigation Advisory Committees ("LCMAC") from both regions reached a consensus that the main focus of funds should be spent on municipalities with less funds being sent to regional agencies. He stated that both regions supported funding the workforce grants.

Chief Delaney noted that for the past two years, 66% of funds went to Region A, 30% of funds went to Region B, and 4% of funds went to Category 2 communities. Commissioner Hill expressed that he was comfortable with maintaining the block grant structure as it was in previous years as the block grant formula worked well. He stated that the structure should not be changed just because there were less funds available.

Commissioner Skinner stated that she agreed with Commissioner Hill. She stated that maintaining the existing block grant structure was the path of least resistance. She expressed that she did not want to have to determine which projects submitted would be more worthy of funding.

Chair Maynard stated that every application would have to be judged on its merit. Commissioner Brodeur stated that it was the Commission's job to make hard choices. He expressed concern that maintaining the status quo would result in some communities receiving de minimis amounts. Chair Maynard stated that he wanted the funds to go to the projects that presented the highest and best use for the funds. He noted that funding for the Community Mitigation Fund had been swept by the Legislature for two years now, but there was a possibility of funding being restored in the future.

Chief Delaney stated that the block grant formula could be applied to the reduced funds but that it was difficult to determine what amount of funds were going to be requested by regional agencies. He noted that District Attorneys' Offices ("DAs") were limited to \$100,000 in funding but that it was not clear how many DAs were going to apply.

Commissioner Skinner asked what factors would be considered to help the Commission evaluate what projects would result in the highest and best use for communities. She stated that if there was a significant project, the Commission would not want to be in the position of denying full funding due to adhering to the block grant guidelines. She expressed interest in identifying which factors would be considered a "higher use" of grant funding. Chair Maynard agreed.

Commissioner Hill stated that it was a subjective opinion and that each Commissioner would value different factors. He noted that the Commission moved to the block grant structure to remove subjectivity from the equation. He stated that it is not about the quality of the project but whether the project qualifies for funds. Commissioner Brodeur stated that the Commission would also have to develop guardrails regarding the funding giving the Community Mitigation Fund's new fiscal reality.

Chair Maynard stated that he would not judge painting the sidewalk and a public safety project the same. He stated that he wanted the Commission to have flexibility to say that one project is a better use of funds by comparison. He stated that ground rules would be important but that the Commission should have flexibility.

Chief Delaney stated that he planned to add this topic to the agenda for the September 11, 2025 public meeting at which point he would need a firm decision in order for his team to craft the Community Mitigation Fund guidelines. He noted that reducing the workforce grants from \$750,000 to \$250,000 would be a huge reduction that would lower the number of cohorts. He stated that if the Commission chose to have the flexibility to increase the workforce grants while reducing other grants, it may make sense. He stated that sticking to the block grant structure would also be easy to do.

4. Racing (1:59:27)

- a. Plainridge Park request to Reschedule the Cancelled Racing Day of June 23, 2025, to September 1, 2025

Director of Racing and Chief Veterinarian Dr. Alexandra Lightbown presented Plainridge Park Casino's ("PPC") request to reschedule the cancelled racing day of June 23, 2025. *PPC's request to reschedule the cancelled racing day was included in the Commissioner's Packet on pages 172 through 173.*

Commissioner Skinner noted that there were multiple dates listed in the memorandum and sought clarification regarding which racing day was cancelled. PPC's Director of Racing Steve O'Toole clarified that June 23, 2025 was the cancelled racing day.

Commissioner Skinner moved that the Commission approve Plainridge Park Casino's request to reschedule the race day previously scheduled for June 23, 2025 to September 1, 2025. Commissioner Hill seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner O'Brien: Aye.

Commissioner Hill: Aye.

Commissioner Skinner: Aye.

Commissioner Brodeur: Aye.

Chair Maynard: Aye.

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

b. Massasoit Greyhound Association, Inc. request to approve Churchill Downs Technology Initiatives Company platforms Twin Spires and DK Horse as Advance Deposit Wagering Providers in accordance with 205 CMR 6.20 (2:02:14)

Interim General Counsel Justin Stempeck explained that Massasoit Greyhound Association, Inc. d/b/a Raynham Park ("Raynham") had requested to use Churchill Downs Technologies ("Churchill Downs") as an Account Deposit Wagering ("ADW") provider. He stated that there was a robust discussion of this topic during the July 1, 2025 public meeting and that he had since sought further commentary from relevant stakeholders. *Materials regarding MGA's request to approve Churchill Down Technologies as an ADW provider were included in the Commissioners' Packet on pages 174 through 201.*

Counsel Stempeck stated that he spoke with the Racing Division and outside counsel and concluded that the limitations in the simulcast statute, G.L. c. 128C, § 2, were incorporated into the ADW statute in G.L. c. 128A, § 5(c). He stated that this was a consistent reading of the two statutes together. Commissioner Hill expressed appreciation for all of the input received from relevant stakeholders.

Attorney Michael Morizio, Counsel for Raynham, stated that he disagreed with Counsel Stempeck's summation. He stated that Section 92 of Chapter 194 of the Acts of 2011 superseded G.L. c. 128C, § 2. He stated that the simulcast statute set up minimum rights but that the Commission had authority under G.L. c. 128 C, § 8 to expand upon those rights, which included the authority to grant more simulcasting rights. He requested that the Commission approve Churchill Downs as an ADW provider for Raynham.

Chair Maynard thanked Attorney Morizio for his input and noted that the Commission received a copy of Raynham's argument in the submitted letter. Counsel Stempeck noted that G.L. c. 128A, § 5(c) referenced G.L. c. 128C and stated that the ADW statute specifically incorporated the simulcast statute. He stated that it was difficult to read the ADW statute in a way that would not incorporate the limitations of the simulcast statute.

Attorney Morizio stated that G.L. c. 128A, § 5(c) was intended to allow operators to conduct ADW in conjunction with simulcasting without violating laws regarding off-track betting. He

stated that there was nothing in the regulations that would require an examination of the simulcast schedule before the Commission approved an ADW service provider.

Commissioner Hill stated that he was considering granting Raynham's request without the simulcast restrictions. He stated that the topic needed further discussion and that the Commission had previously allowed Raynham to have ADW signals. He reiterated that he would allow Raynham's request without restrictions.

Attorney Bruce Barnett, representing Sterling Suffolk Racecourse, LLC d/b/a Suffolk Downs ("Suffolk Downs"), stated that Attorney Morizio's explanation did not capture the significant restrictions on all simulcast licensees located in G.L. c. 128C, § 2. He noted that G.L. c. 128A, § 5(c) did not only give the Commission a role in approving ADW providers, it also authorized ADW. He stated that Section 92 of the Expanded Gaming Act authorized Raynham and Wonderland to continue holding a racing meeting license and that the rights were not expanded beyond what it had previously. He stated that Raynham was bound by the restrictions in G.L. c. 128A and G.L. c. 128C.

Commissioner Skinner asked what the advantages and disadvantages would be for enforcing these restrictions on ADW. Dr. Lightbown stated that the licensees see which tracks are racing and pick the signals that would be most economically favorable. She stated that the restrictions would limit the number of signals on certain days. She stated that the restrictions would have an effect on how the licensee chooses which signals to receive. She noted that the Commission approved all potential signals the licensee may want to use but that the licensee was not obligated to use every requested signal. She stated that the licensee would request more signals than it may use so that it would not have to request a modification.

Commissioner Skinner asked why one licensee might take issue with the signals another licensee was receiving. Mr. O'Toole stated that when the legislation was adopted, restrictions were put in place to protect a delicate balance between the racing licensees. He stated that if PPC was offering signals Raynham could not offer, it would attract additional customers. He stated that the restrictions gave each licensee a competitive angle and that each licensee agreed to that provision.

Mr. O'Toole stated that the balance had shifted due to the limited costs for licensees that had ceased racing. He stated that PPC complied with the restrictions and that he wanted to ensure that restrictions remained while PPC was the only licensee offering live racing.

Attorney Morizio stated that there was no valid reason for any licensee to object to simulcasting by another licensee. He stated that the only reason to do so would be to try to monopolize the industry to the detriment of the public. He stated that the industry is better when businesses grow cooperatively. He stated that it was in the public interest and the industry's interest to allow Raynham's application.

Attorney Barnett stated that the intent was not to hurt other tracks. He explained that it was a matter of statutory interpretation and that the words in G.L. c. 128A, § 5(c) should have meaning. He explained that the Legislature had every opportunity to revise the restrictions set

forth in G.L. c. 128A, § 5(c) and free up ADW from the restrictions cross-referenced in G.L. c. 128C, § 2, but the Legislature had not done so.

Senior Counsel at Churchill Downs Andrew Silver stated that by statute, simulcast referred to the way in which races were broadcast, but they did not speak to how wagers were placed. He stated that the simulcast restrictions did not encompass ADW. He expressed support for Commissioner Hill's approach. He stated that Churchill Downs did not enter an agreement with Raynham contemplating that there would be limited or conditional approval. He stated that there could be operational consequences to conditioning the approval of the ADW provider. Chair Maynard stated that he spoke with Director Lightbown and that there might be implementation challenges with regard to imposing the restrictions.

Commissioner Brodeur expressed that it was his understanding that Churchill Downs took the position that no approval was necessary for ADW signals at the state level due to federal pre-emption. Attorney Silver stated that Churchill Downs put forward that position in a court case in Michigan but that Churchill Downs worked to comply with state law in a reasonable fashion when possible. He stated that Churchill Downs followed state law when there was a reasonable path to do so.

Commissioner Brodeur noted that the restrictions were in place by statute and that the Commission did not have the authority to vary or depart from the statutory scheme. He stated that prior approval of ADW signals that was done at odds with the statute were not a good place of reliance. He asked how the stakeholders could reconcile that they are asking the Commission to vary from what the statute says depending on interpretation.

Attorney Silver stated that the ADW statute provided the statutory floor of what is required at a minimum and that approval of additional tracks was consistent with the statute. Mr. O'Toole stated that when scheduling a daily menu of races, the track takes into consideration the statutory restrictions for that given day. He stated that signals could be added or removed to be compliant with the statute.

Attorney Morizio stated that the statutory scheme is confusing and that the restrictions applied to the minimum right each licensee has but did not limit the Commission's authority under G.L. c. 128C, § 8. He stated that the Commission had the authority to grant rights beyond the minimum set forth. He reiterated that Section 92 eliminated the restrictions set forth in G.L. c. 128C, § 2.

Attorney Barnett stated that the Legislature had made changes over the course of 15 years. He stated that Raynham was relieved of the obligation to pay simulcasting premiums to Suffolk Downs due to changes in the industry. He stated that the Legislature did not adjust the simulcast restrictions and that the Commission did not have the authority to disregard legislative directive.

Mr. O'Toole stated that the restrictions were implemented to protect live racing and create a delicate balance between the racing licensees. He stated that the statutorily required restrictions were still in place.

Commissioner O'Brien asked Counsel Stempeck if there was anything in his memorandum that needed further explanation or amendment. Counsel Stempeck noted that Churchill Downs' initial letter was in the meeting packet for the July 1, 2025 public meeting but was not included in this meeting's materials. He stated that G.L. c. 128C, § 2 is still good law. He stated that G.L. c. 128C, § 8 only gave the Commission the power to promulgate regulations, not the authority to promulgate regulations which run counter to a statutory provision. He stated that there was a balancing act between the licensees that was considered when the Legislature enacted the simulcast restrictions and that he would hypothesize that G.L. c. 128A, § 5(c) was included to carry over that balancing act to the ADW provisions. He reiterated his opinion that the restrictions remained in place and stated that it was difficult to ignore black letter law.

Commissioner O'Brien stated that if she were to vote consistent with Counsel Stempeck's statutory interpretation, she would want to know the practical implications and timelines for vendors to be in compliance. She stated that she was not in alignment with Commissioner Hill's suggestion that the Commission move forward and circle back to this discussion at a later point.

Chair Maynard asked if it was possible to give the licensees a runway for compliance. Counsel Stempeck stated that the Commission would have to build in time for licensees to come into compliance as this would be a change of interpretation that affects work with licensees. He stated that staff would speak to the licensees about an implementation timeline and get feedback regarding the impact this will have. Chair Maynard stated that the licensees should be given time to comply with the restrictions as there was a reliance on the Commission approving ADW signals in the past. Commissioner Brodeur stated that the Commission was bound by the statutory restrictions in deciding how to move forward.

Commissioner Hill moved that the Commission approve Massasoit Greyhound Association's request for approval for Churchill Downs Technology Initiatives Company, and its platform known as TwinSpires and DK Horse, as an advance deposit wagering provider. The motion was not seconded.

Commissioner O'Brien requested that the Commission staff meet with Raynham's staff to follow up on this discussion. Commissioner Skinner stated that the Commission staff would need to engage with the licensees to determine what the consequences would be in upsetting the status quo.

Attorney Silver stated that Churchill Downs had an agreement with Suffolk Downs and was operating in Massachusetts and stated that the request was to transition to Raynham as a partner. He noted that this matter had already been before the Commission twice and that Churchill Downs was not seeking a limited approval. Chair Maynard requested that the Commission staff return to this discussion with more information regarding implementation at the September 4, 2025 public meeting.

5. [Legal](#) (3:25:44)

a. Litigation Update

Executive Director Dean Serpa explained that the Commission had a human resources issue related to a complaint filed with the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination (“MCAD”). He stated that based on subject matter, it was appropriate for discussion in an executive session.

Chair Maynard stated that the Commission anticipated that it would convene in an Executive Session pursuant to G.L. c. 30A, § 21(a)(3) in conjunction with its review of litigation strategy with respect to an MCAD complaint, as discussion at an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the litigation position of the Commission.

Commissioner Brodeur moved that the Commission enter an executive session on the matter and for the reasons just stated by the Chair. Commissioner O’Brien seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner O’Brien: Aye.

Commissioner Hill: Aye.

Commissioner Skinner: Aye.

Commissioner Brodeur: Aye.

Chair Maynard: Aye.

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

b. Executive Session Minutes (3:27:36)

Chair Maynard stated that the Commission anticipated that it would meet in executive session to review minutes from previous executive sessions as their discussion at an open meeting may frustrate the intended purpose for which the executive session was convened, pursuant to G.L. c. 30A, § 21(a)(7) and c. 23N, § 6(i): May 23, 2023; G.L. c. 30A, § 21(a)(2): December 20, 2023; G.L. c. 30A, § 21(a)(7) and c. 4, § 7(26)(n): June 17, 2025 at 2:07 P.M.; and G.L. c. 30A, § 21(a)(3) and (7) and c. 4, § 7(26)(n): June 17, 2025 at 2:21 P.M.

Commissioner Brodeur moved that the Commission enter an executive session on the matter and for the reasons just stated by the Chair. Commissioner O’Brien seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner O’Brien: Aye.

Commissioner Hill: Aye.

Commissioner Skinner: Aye.

Commissioner Brodeur: Aye.

Chair Maynard: Aye.

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

Transcriber’s Note: The Commission entered an executive session at 3:29:36 in the meeting video and returned to the public meeting session at 4:35:18 in the meeting video.

6. Sports Wagering Division (4:35:52)

a. House Rules Update

I. DraftKings

Sports Wagering Compliance and Operations Manager Andrew Steffen presented a proposed House Rules update from DraftKings. He noted that the structure of the house rules was rewritten but that the rules largely remained the same. *The proposed changes to DraftKings' House Rules were included in the Commissioners' Packet on pages 202 through 455.*

Commissioner Hill moved that the Commission approve the updates to DraftKings' House Rules as included in the Commissioners' Packet and discussed here today. Commissioner Brodeur seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner O'Brien: Aye.

Commissioner Hill: Aye.

Commissioner Skinner: Aye.

Commissioner Brodeur: Aye.

Chair Maynard: Aye.

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

II. [BetMGM](#) (4:39:10)

Sports Wagering Compliance and Operations Manager Tom Lam presented proposed changes to BetMGM's house rules. *The proposed changes to BetMGM's House Rules were included in the Commissioners' Packet on pages 456 through 457.*

Commissioner Hill moved that the Commission approve the updates to BetMGM's House Rules as included in the Commissioners' Packet and discussed here today. Commissioner Skinner seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner O'Brien: Aye.

Commissioner Hill: Aye.

Commissioner Skinner: Aye.

Commissioner Brodeur: Aye.

Chair Maynard: Aye.

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

III. [MGM Springfield](#) (4:41:13)

Mr. Lam presented proposed changes to MGM Springfield's house rules. *The proposed changes to MGM Springfield's House Rules were included in the Commissioners' Packet on pages 458 through 459.*

Commissioner Skinner moved that the Commission approve the updates to MGM Springfield's House Rules as included in the Commissioners' Packet and discussed here today. Commissioner Brodeur seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner O'Brien: Aye.

Commissioner Hill: Aye.

Commissioner Skinner: Aye.

Commissioner Brodeur: Aye.

Chair Maynard: Aye.

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

IV. [FanDuel](#) (4:43:26)

Mr. Lam presented proposed changes to FanDuel's House Rules. *The proposed changes to FanDuel's House Rules were included in the Commissioners' Packet on pages 460 through 465.*

Commissioner Hill moved that the Commission approve the updates to FanDuel's House Rules as included in the Commissioners' Packet and discussed here today. Commissioner O'Brien seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner O'Brien: Aye.

Commissioner Hill: Aye.

Commissioner Skinner: Aye.

Commissioner Brodeur: Aye.

Chair Maynard: Aye.

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

7. [Investigations and Enforcement Bureau](#) (4:50:22)

- a. Briefing on noncompliance matter related to Temporary Category 3 Sports Wagering Operator Betfair Interactive LLC, d/b/a FanDuel and discussion regarding next steps. Alleged noncompliance relates to offering wagering on an unapproved event in violation of 205 CMR 247.01(1), 205 CMR 247.01(2)(i), and the Massachusetts Sports Wagering Catalog

Enforcement Counsel Diandra Franks explained that there was an alleged noncompliance incident involving FanDuel offering events that were not included in the Massachusetts Sports Wagering Catalog. She stated that wagers were offered on the Maharlika Pilipinas Basketball League ("MPBL") from June 4, 2024 through April 2, 2025. She stated that 62,851 wagers were placed in the amount of \$3,250,840. She stated that FanDuel self-reported this incident after a re-evaluation of the league's permissibility. She stated that FanDuel had relied upon their belief that the MPBL was a part of the FIBA member leagues, which are approved. *Materials regarding this noncompliance matter were included in the Commissioners' Packet on page 466.* She stated that a similar matter was presented to the Commission at the July 15, 2025 public meeting and that the matter was referred back to the Investigations and Enforcement Bureau ("IEB") for review.

Commissioner O'Brien noted that in the similar matter, the other operator had allowed wagers on the MPBL since launch. She stated that she had more questions regarding the timeframe of this incident as FanDuel did not offer the MPBL since launch, choosing to add it and then remove it. She stated that the time period that wagers were allowed, the number of wagers, and the number of wagers was striking. The Commission reached a consensus to refer this matter back to the IEB for a recommendation.

b. Briefing on noncompliance matter related to Category 3 Sports Wagering Operator Crown MA Gaming, LLC d/b/a DraftKings and discussion regarding next steps. Alleged noncompliance relates to offering wagering on an unapproved event in violation of 205 CMR 247.01(1), 205 CMR 247.01(2)(i), and the Massachusetts Sports Wagering Catalog. (4:53:59)

Counsel Franks explained that DraftKings had also offered wagering on the MPBL between March 14, 2023 and April 11, 2025. She stated that 151,508 wagers were accepted for a sum of \$7,493,177. She stated that this was discovered by the Sports Wagering Division when it came to their attention that the MPBL was not sanctioned by FIBA. Commissioner O'Brien stated that attention should be paid the length of time wagering was permitted and the amount of money wagered. The Commission reached a consensus to refer this matter back to the IEB for a recommendation.

c. Briefing on noncompliance matter related to Temporary Category 3 Sports Wagering Licensee Bally's Interactive LLC ("Bally's") and discussion regarding next steps. Alleged noncompliance relates to Bally's contacting individuals on Voluntary Self Exclusion List and in "cool-off" status in violation of 205 CMR 256.07 and 205 CMR 256.06 (4:55:55)

Enforcement Counsel Nathaniel Kennedy stated that the IEB was looking for guidance regarding an instance of noncompliance by Bally's. He explained that Bally's had sent promotional emails to an individual on the voluntary self-exclusion ("VSE") list and five promotional emails to a player who was on cool-off status. He stated that Bally's claimed the emails were sent due to a data processing error that did not treat the accounts as closed. *Materials regarding this noncompliance matter were included in the Commissioners' Packet on page 467.*

Commissioner O'Brien noted that it was interesting that the error only occurred twice. She expressed an interest in learning whether the investigation finds the issue to be more systemic. Counsel Kennedy stated that the IEB would look for more information when conducting the inquiry. The Commission reached a consensus to refer this matter back to the IEB for a recommendation.

d. Continued Discussion of Sports Wagering Noncompliance Matter Involving American Wagering, Inc., d/b/a Caesars Sportsbook a Category 3 Sports Wagering Operator. Alleged noncompliance relates to wagers offered on "Tournament Total Red Cards", an unauthorized event in violation of M.G.L. c. 23N, § 3 and 205 CMR 247.01(2)(e) (4:58:39)

Counsel Kennedy explained that on February 26, 2025, the IEB presented an issue of alleged noncompliance from Caesars Sportsbook (“Caesars”) regarding offering wagers on the total number of red cards in a tournament in contravention of G.L. c. 23N. He stated that six wagers were accepted totaling \$8,217 between June 27, 2024 and July 9, 2024.

Counsel Kennedy explained that the Commission elected to proceed with an adjudicatory hearing regarding a similar instance of noncompliance by BetMGM. He asked if the Commission wanted to proceed with an adjudicatory hearing or refer this matter back to the IEB for a recommendation.

Commissioner O’Brien asked if the reason for the error was the same as the previous hearing on red card wagers. Counsel Kennedy stated that it was unclear what the reason for the error was at this point as the IEB has only had preliminary conversations with Caesars. He noted that BetMGM’s volume of wagers on red cards was significantly higher than Caesars, accepting 2,564 wagers in the sum of \$42,690 over the course of a year.

Chair Maynard asked if the decision was released for the BetMGM incident. Counsel Kennedy stated that the decision had yet to be released. Chair Maynard stated that he was fine referring this matter back for an IEB recommendation but that he would want to review the decision on BetMGM’s noncompliance first. The Commission reached a consensus to refer this matter back to the IEB for a recommendation.

9. [Commissioner Updates](#) (5:02:35)

The Commissioner did not have any updates to provide.

10. [Other Business](#) (5:02:43)

Hearing no other business, Chair Maynard requested a motion to adjourn.

Commissioner Hill moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brodeur.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner O’Brien: Aye.

Commissioner Hill: Aye.

Commissioner Skinner: Aye.

Commissioner Brodeur: Aye.

Chair Maynard: Aye.

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

List of Documents and Other Items Used

1. [Notice of Meeting and Agenda dated August 12, 2025](#)
2. [Commissioner’s Packet from the August 14, 2025, meeting](#) (posted on massgaming.com)