



Region B - Local Community Mitigation Advisory Committee Minutes

Date/Time: November 20, 2017 – 2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Place: UMass Springfield, One Monarch Square, Springfield, MA

Members Present:	Jill Payne, Chair Stephen Foley Marc Strange Rick Sullivan Ellen Patashnick Kate Kane	Greg Chiecko Timothy Brennan Andrew Smith Judith Theocles Sean Powers Mike Vedovelli	Attendees: Chris Cignoli Phil Dromey Seth Stratton Lloyd Macdonald Bruce Stebbins John Ziemba Joseph Delaney Mary Thurlow
Members Absent:	Carmina Fernandes		

Call to Order

Jill McCarthy Payne, the Chair, called the meeting to order once quorum was reached and introduced herself. She introduced Chris Cignoli and Phil Dromey from the City of Springfield. The Chair then requested approval of minutes from the October 16, 2017 meeting. With corrections noted, the minutes were unanimously approved. The Chair then turned the meeting to John Ziemba.

Mr. Ziemba summarized the Community Mitigation Fund (“CMF”) of having approximately \$10 million through 2019. Thereafter new funds will be going into the fund once the casinos are operational. It is anticipated that after a full year of operations the fund will have approximately \$6.5 million from MGM Springfield during the first couple of years. At present the Commission has not set a limit on the CMF spending. The priorities for overall amounts were discussed concerning the type of grants, grants per community, and multiple uses of grants. The question was posed whether the Specific Impact grants be limited to one grant per community with the ability to apply for waiver. He discussed how a community must demonstrate what impacts are anticipated and the importance of separating out casino related vs. general needs. He discussed the expansion of the Workforce Development Pilot Programs between now, opening and during the first 6 months of operation. He asked if the funding was sufficient based on the fact that there is a lot of turnover in employees during the first six months. Mr. Stratton noted that there was a fifty percent turnover in Maryland with 4000 employees; Mr. Ziemba noted that the Workforce Pilot Programs will be considered in the context of the Host Community Agreements.

Mr. Ziemba noted that from comments received, the transportation amounts were not enough for significant projects. The Tribal application will need to be re-applied for annually and continued as there is no sign of a resolution regarding the gaming development. Those funds would only be expended if something occurs. It was discussed that the Non-Transportation Planning Grants are for those communities with no further funding available for other planning needs once reserves are fully used. The Non-Transportation Planning Grants would only be allocated to the communities who have already been allocated the use of their reserve by the Commission.

Mr. Stratton asked whether this fund was only for the surrounding communities. Mr. Ziemba explained that the first year of the reserve was for surrounding communities. However, in 2016 it was expanded to host communities, those who had petitioned to be a surrounding community, and those who had missed the deadline or had not applied in 2015 but had the designation of being a surrounding community. Mr. Ziemba noted that planning dollars were well worth the money. Communities reach out to the regional planning agencies for coordination and fellow communities in the region.

Mr. Ziemba then described a proposed additional funding incentive award for multiple community applications for major transportation projects, such as a corridor that passes between 2 communities. Mr. Smith noted Greenfield and Holyoke. Mr. Ziemba noted that the nexus to the casino must be established and must be for impacts that have occurred or are occurring. The Commission as a general rule does prefer to prevent or minimize the impacts rather than mitigate at a later date.

The next topic concerned public safety training and the state police class for upcoming casino needs. It was noted that these classes are not a regular occurrence. The casinos are policed by the state police. It is hoped a MOU will be signed between the state police and the local police. Mr. Ziemba then explained how the state police get funding for its training. The State Police get an appropriation from the state, and the state police go to the agencies that use the state police for funding. It is anticipated that the state police will need approximately 35-40 troopers for the casinos. Is the CMF the way to pay for this training similar to the way it funded the Workforce Development Pilot Programs? The current language in the Guidelines prohibits paying for the police training. Mr. Delaney noted that the training would essentially be for backfilling the positions needed it is not a direct hire.

Mr. Sullivan asked whether the state police have funding for classes. Mr. Ziemba mentioned that the Commission is currently paying for Plainridge and those servicing the facility. Mr. Sullivan asked if the licensees were funding and if there was a way to fund. Mr. Stratton noted that he was in favor the concept of using the Community Mitigation Fund. The question was asked if there should be an application for police funding as a joint application with law enforcement and the communities?

Mr. Brennan asked whether this would be a once time kind of expenditure or a repeat whenever there is a new class? Mr. Ziemba noted that once the troopers are up and running that there should be no further need for training expenditures. Ms. Payne asked what would prevent the local police from requesting training. The local police may reach out for their fair share. She asked who has jurisdiction over the budget.

Mr. Ziemba noted that the training was for 24 weeks at which time the troopers would be shadowing for a total of 6 months. Mr. Sullivan asked whether the police would work under the Commission separate from the Attorney General's office.

Ms. Payne was concerned that the police would continue to come back and request more money for training. Ms. Kane asked about an expansion on the topic such as how many people for each region? Mr. Ziemba responded that approximately 19 State Troopers as the casinos are 24 hour facilities. Mr. Brennan noted replacement based on body count.

Ms. Kane noted that this new training funding proposal is way above other mitigation amounts. Mr. Stratton noted that it was in the regulations that public safety be covered. Ms. Kane recommended a public safety grant process and was in favor of articulation for public safety. Mr. Smith asked whether there would be any match requirement. There is no match requirement. Ms. Kane suggested that workforce pilot programs should be increased for EMS, fire and law enforcement. She asked if we have to rebalance funding. The Host Community Agreement provides significant funding. However, the City may not put it towards public safety. Mr. Sullivan noted that it was a large amount of money to be asking. Ms. Payne asked about what percentage and would this end up training a lot of police. Mr. Ziemba noted that the training school session is for 240 State Police.

Mr. Stratton noted the importance of allocating funding. Mr. Foley noted that public safety funding is bigger than just state troopers, and it is not just law enforcement.

Ms. Kane asked for a breakdown in allocations of the Fund. Mr. Ziemba noted a proposed spending amount of \$3.4M in Community Mitigation Funding with \$2.5 M for state police, totaling \$6M in spending. That would leave approximately \$4M for 2019 plus the approximate \$1.5M to \$2M in additional funds from MGM, once it is operational.

Commissioner Macdonald noted his concern about this and thought it would be helpful to have comments from communities; Mr. Ziemba reminded the members that this is open for public comment.

Mr. Ziemba turned attention to page 6 question #12 on the topic of regional funding. Mr. Ziemba asked members to discuss unused funding accumulating in one region, and what kinds of spending system should be in place for splitting the funds. Mr. Sullivan asked about sweeping funds from one region to another for a long term or large project; Mr. Ziemba noted that both Wynn and MGM pay into the fund but Region C does not have a license fee and the tribe would have a reduced tax rate for Region C and there are no Surrounding Community Agreements in the tribal compact.

Mr. Ziemba asked members to discuss joint applications. He noted that the fund was not yet ready to be used to build transportation projects. He mentioned that there is a project coming up in Region A for a pedestrian bridge. He asked how would the fund pay for projects in general. Lastly, he mentioned private entity requirements and the prohibitions in the Massachusetts Constitution.

At 3:30 the meeting was adjourned.

/s/ Mary S. Thurlow
Mary S. Thurlow, Secretary

List of Documents and Other Items Used on November 20, 2017

1. Notice of Meeting and Agenda
2. Draft minutes from the October 16, 2017 meeting
3. 2018 Memorandum on Policy Questions
4. 2018 Community Mitigation Fund Guidelines