

MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION
MEETING
OCTOBER 25, 2018
10:00 A.M.

CONFIDENTIAL
ROUGHLY EDITED REALTIME FILE

This file was created in real time by a Certified Realtime Captioner / CART Provider, for the purpose of communication access. It is not a certified legal transcript and may not be entirely verbatim. It is intended for use by the recipient only, as notes of the proceedings.

HRI CART
Communication Access Realtime Translation
813.404.2488 (cell/text) www.HRICART.com

P R O C E E D I N G S

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning. I call to order the public meeting number 254. First we have the approval of the minutes. Commissioner Stebbins.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I move to approve the minutes -- whoops -- I move to approve the minutes of the October 11th, 2018, regular Commission meeting as included in the packet, subject to any immaterial corrections or grammatical changes.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I second that.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Discussion? All in favor?

[Vote taken]

4-0.

Next we'll move on to our administrative update. Executive Director Bedrosian.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: Good morning, Commissioners.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: Just by way of procedural, we have a substitute person doing our streaming today, Jon is here in place of Mike who's out today, and just for the speakers, not the Commissioners, if we could just reintroduce ourselves, it helps Jon, so for the record, I'm Ed Bedrosian, Executive Director. I have a couple of items. One, I have a general update, and the second, we have a budget closeout that Commissioner Zuniga is going to substitute for our CFAO who is out today. But by way of a general update, I did want to give you an update on our Wynn suitability review investigation and where we stand.

The Investigations and Enforcement Bureau is completing its report. Once the report is complete, there are a few more procedural steps before an actual hearing in the report can be made public. I want to outline those steps for you. First, the Commissioners individually will be provided a copy of the report along with the exhibits. We anticipate that will consist of hundreds of pages of documents. As a licensee, Wynn LLC representatives will also be entitled to a copy of the report and exhibits. Simultaneously, the IEB and Wynn will prepare their presentations for hearing in front of

the Commission. The legal division also will review the report for any redactions in conformance with the public records law. And this is consistent with the Commission's previous practices.

Once all this pre-hearing preparation is done and you as Commissioners have had time to hear and decide any pretrial motions and time individually to read the reports and necessary exhibits and the parties are adequately prepared for their presentations, the legal division, headed by General Counsel Blue, will work to schedule the actual hearing. It would be at the beginning of the actual hearing that the report with any redactions would be made public.

With all that in mind, I anticipate and hope that we can have any pre-hearing motions, again, if any, heard sometime in November with the actual hearing happening sometime the first two weeks of December. So that is -- that's my update. Okay.

Absent any questions of which I would probably be vague and refer you back to my update, I will turn the fiscal update over to Commissioner Zuniga.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I believe this is the exact same way we've held adjudicatory hearings in the past. This is the process.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: Yeah. Well, that I can confirm, yes. That I can confirm, yes. We are being consistent with our adjudicatory hearing process in the past.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And there were some motions that had to be dealt with ahead of time. General Counsel, you were here for all of them?

>> MS. BLUE: There are from time to time. It's not guaranteed that there will need to be any motions to be heard, but we will make sure we allow time for that if they're filed and you do need to consider them.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: All right. Thank you. Commissioner.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Now over to me, I suppose. Good morning. I'm just going to be giving the update on behalf of our Director, our CFO, Derek Lennon, who is not here today because of a disability, really. But with me are going to be Agnes Boglio and Doc Adono who can help me either answer questions or clarify anything that I cannot.

Included in the packet is a memo from Director Lennon. In a format that we've seen in the past, summarizing the results of the fiscal year 2018 that ended in June 30th of 2018. Through -- just as a brief reminder, through the first three quarters of fiscal year '18, this Commission approved a budget of \$30,960,000 for the Gaming Control Fund and projected a revenue of \$30,360,000. Based on the recommendations of the finance office, the budget at the time of the third quarter was relying on at least \$600,000 in reversions to bridge the gap between the budget and anticipated revenues.

The Gaming Control Fund is composed of various spending categories, and I'll remind us and the public that some of them are both regulatory and statutory in nature. We don't control all of the costs. There's funding for the Attorney General's office. There's indirect costs related to some of our expenditures, and there is ABCC costs that the Gaming Control also funds. Similarly, our costs -- our overall costs include all those efforts of the research and responsible gaming arena.

So the chart on page 2 of the memorandum shows the spending in variance in each of the categories. The Gaming Control Fund underspent its budget by \$1,360,000. At the same time, there were revenues that exceeded projections in terms

of I believe some additional vendor licensing that we anticipated to the tune of \$174,000. And when we couple these two figures with the net of the \$600,000 built-in deficit that we had anticipated as of the third quarter, this all results in a \$947,000 overage that we can revert back to the licensees for the overall -- for the year.

So there is a couple of reasons these figures came in that way. I'll just remind my Commissioners -- my fellow Commissioners that there is costs that came in greater than we initially anticipated, mostly in the legal arena. And we've talked about that, of course, plenty in the past. There were a number of costs that were going to be unique in the -- on the eve of the opening of MGM. And some of those costs came in as lower than we anticipated. We made these revisions along the way in the year, and those costs did not -- some of them those costs did not come to fruition.

So our regulations describe how the Commission assesses its operational costs including any -- any increases or decreases at the end of the year. That would be 205 CMR 121.05 which is also part of the memorandum. And therefore the FY18 surplus funds will be credited against FY19 assessments, some of which we started to do on the licensees in the same way that they were in the separate portion that they were assessed in fiscal year '18. The chart that explains that detail is included in the memo. That's up to the \$947,361, and the proration among the licensees.

So I want to stop there and let you ask any questions or have my colleagues expound on anything that you think I missed.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Questions? Questions? I had one. ABCC had some additional costs this year. I'm trying to recall. The top of page 2 on the memo.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. Yeah, I'll -- let me -- let me answer that. And if I'm mistaken, please expound, Agnes. Like many other costs related to the opening of MGM, we initially were conservative at the beginning of the year and decided to make this additional revisions along the way during the year. How that translates -- how that translated may be the difference that we are seeing here.

>> Right. Previously, there was only one employee, and they I believe they added an additional employee. With that the fringe and indirect costs that go with it inflated exponentially as well. And I believe there was also another vehicle involved for their travel back and forth between the facilities.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So were there additional responsibilities with the opening of MGM?

>> Right.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Plus the additional --

>> Mm-hmm.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Is it fair to say that this was a one-time --

>> Yeah. I believe so, yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Charge? We might go back to the level funding in the coming months.

>> Correct.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: I would point out they were very instrumental partners at the opening. They were present on weekends, and really helped us complete both our missions.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Right. I remember you talking about the partnerships up there during the opening, the rush to get ready. That makes sense.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And you know what? Let me also mention, we had early, early discussions with them -- this was with our prior Executive Director Day relative to the overall funding for them on an ongoing basis, and that was at a level that we've maintained, the one employee over at PPC. But given the opening and everything that was described, there's a recognition that there need to be -- there needed to be additional resources that, again, we'll smooth that out over time to the same level.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Other questions to emphasize? I mentioned the legal fees increases that was offset in many ways by some of the expenditures, not at the level anticipated. Mostly along the lines of Attorney General and state police, but those have been themselves revisions that we had increased. So in an interesting way, we ended up spending at those levels, as originally anticipated.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Do we have a motion?

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Madam chair, I move that the Commission approve the fiscal '18 budget closeout report as included in the packet.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Further discussion? All in favor?

[Vote taken]

Passes 4-0.

Next we move on to research and responsible gaming, Director Vander Linden.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good job.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Good morning, Commissioners.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Why don't we just go, for the record, go down the line and just introduce ourselves. Mark Vander Linden, director of research and responsible gaming.

>> MR. BRUCE: Christopher Bruce, crime analysis consultant to the Commission.

>> Brian Konis, Gaming Enforcement, State Police.

>> Lieutenant Tim Babin, GEU Springfield.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Great, thank you. So Christopher Bruce today will present to you the baseline study assessing the impact of gambling and safety in Massachusetts towns and cities. It's a baseline analysis of crimes, calls for service and collision data in the communities near MGM Springfield.

In 2014, the MGC began working with Mr. Bruce to design a process to assess changes in crimes, calls for service and collisions in communities likely to be affected by the opening of Massachusetts new casinos. Work began in 2015 with a baseline analysis of the Plainville area where Plainridge Park Casino opened in June of 2015. We had subsequent reports at six months, at one year and at two year post-opening that measured changes against that baseline.

Our attention now turns to the Springfield area where MGM opened in August. As he'll describe in much greater detail, Mr. Bruce worked with local law enforcement in the Springfield and designated surrounding communities to build a baseline of existing crimes, calls for service and collisions. I would be remiss without noting that this report

and any of this work would not be possible had we not the cooperation, collaboration and really overall enthusiasm of the Springfield Police Department and the surrounding police departments to pull together this data and report it out as it's being presented to you today. So a sincere and heartfelt thank you to those agencies.

On a final note, and before I turn it over to Christopher, many studies have attempted to study the effects of gambling on overall serious crime rates. Hardly any have attempted to analyze more specific and minute changes including following the opening of casinos including variations by hour, by month and by season, changes in patterns of hotspots and noncrime activity such as collisions and calls for service. But these were the questions that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission was asking. And it's with those questions and with the expertise that we have at the table and in the communities that we're working that we can answer those questions.

We're analyzing public safety at a level of detail that will actually help police agencies anticipate and respond to emerging changes and pat determines. So with that, I'll turn it over to Mr. Bruce.

>> MR. BRUCE: Thank you. It's good to be here again. I want to emphasize that this is the baseline report, so there's no real conclusions to draw yet as to the impact of MGM Springfield just yet. But I'll report on the methodology I used to collect the data and what at least the baseline data can tell us about what's going on in the MGM Springfield area. In the Plainville project, there were six participating communities. This one involves 11 participating communities in the surrounding area. And as you can see them all on the map here. Thus the scope of the project has been quite a bit larger than the previous efforts and has required a lot more work with data collection and the compilation of the statistics and so forth.

As Mark indicated, in the Plainville project, we're following the same basic template that we used with Plainville starting with the baseline report and then moving on to considerations of what's happened after a three-month, six-month, maybe a nine-month fending on if after the six-month period we see a lot of changes. And then a one-year period and then we'll make a decision, I suppose, after that as to how often to keep evaluating.

Just like in Plainville, I visited each of the participating agencies, and I established a connection to their records management and CAD systems with their permission, introduced a data extraction tool and downloaded key data that allowed me to identify -- to map hotspots and identify the basic characteristics of crime, collisions and calls for service in the agencies going back seven years, which is two more years than we were able to do for Plainville. So we were able to calculate a smoother average, I suppose, in the Springfield area.

No personal identifying information or narrative information was collected from any of the agencies, which limits some analysis possibilities but obviously makes everybody more comfortable with the collection of the dataset. The data from the individual agencies was fused into a master database from which I then calculated these statistics and did the analysis. Making things a little bit easier than the Plainville project, every single one of the agencies in the Springfield area is on the same records management and CAD vendor. CAD being the location where the calls for service are stored, and the records management system where the crime reports are stored. But they all use the same vendor, so there was no issue translating different conventions

from different systems. But obviously, the overall volume of agencies plus some quirks for this particular vendor did introduce some difficulties that I had to overcome, but everything ended up fine in the end. We got all the data into a centralized database, screenshot here shows an extraction from the main incident table for the combined agencies, and from there, I was able to calculate the various figures that appear in the report.

Some broad figures, again, 11 participating agencies representing a total population of just over 400,000 residents based on 2016 census figures. The total area of just over 250 square miles. Together, over the seven-year period that makes up the baseline period, these agencies made over 100,000 arrests, 103,822 arrests. They had over 350,000 nonarrest crime incidents, more than 3 million calls for service, and 89,000 traffic collisions. There were 187,000, just over 187,000 unique addresses at which crimes occurred in this area of which I was able to achieve so far a geocoding rate, meaning I was able to actually plot on the map 90% of those addresses which is a reasonably high percentage of a dataset like this. There's always going to be some junk addresses in any crime and call for service dataset.

Now, there are a lot of statistics in the report. Every agency is broken down individually with its crime and calls for service and traffic collisions statistics. I obviously have not -- I'm not going to present all of those here to you today. They're in the written report for everybody to take a look at. But some notes on just the general statistics that you'll see in the report, and this is just a sample extraction on the screen here of what I did was look at the last couple of years' worth of data and then calculate an average for the past seven years. I also calculated the standard deviation of the average which is basically -- it tells us, on average, how much from year to year does the -- does this crime or this category deviate from its average. The coefficient to variation which you see in the fourth -- or fifth column there tells us how much over the seven-year period this crime typically varies on roughly a scale of 0 to 1. So 0 would indicate a very predictable, unvarying set of statistics for a particular crime and a score of close to 1 would indicate it's all over the place from year to year, and that's very difficult to predict. So basically, the smaller that number, the easier it is to identify when something changes, when an external element is introduced and causes the crime or the call for service to increase or decrease below the threshold that we would expect for that. So that's all presented in there.

There's a final figure that I'm introducing in this report for the first time, the slope as a percentage of the mean. This is basically -- it gives you a sense of how the crimes or the category has been trending over the seven-year period that we have the data for. This is important because in the Plainville area, things had been very static for the previous five years. Most of the crimes and the calls for service we looked at, they fluctuated from year to year, but they weren't going anywhere before the introduction of Plainridge Park.

In this case, many of the crime categories and the call for service categories in the Springfield area had been trending downward in the seven-year period leading up to the introduction of MGM Springfield. With the exception of traffic collisions which had been generally increasing in the area. So for those reasons, we have to analyze any changes on the basis of what the trend looked like prior to the introduction of MGM and not just the overall average of the statistics, if that makes sense. So when that SPM is

high, it indicates that category had been trending significantly upward or downward. And as an example, here's some -- what a trend line looks like for slope as a percentage of the mean of plus 5% and negative 15% over that period. You can say negative 15%, that's a pretty strong slope that we have to consider. So even if crime were to even out at that point, it might be considered a change rather than simply a manifestation of a previous average.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Christopher, can I go back, please, just for a clarifying a couple of slides ago?

>> MR. BRUCE: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The figures are an aggregate of all of the 11 communities?

>> MR. BRUCE: Yes, yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Over the seven years.

>> MR. BRUCE: Over the seven years, yes. But within the report, they're broken down into the individual communities as well. Here are the overall violent property crime and total crime and crash averages per year among the participating communities. And as you can see, Springfield itself being the urban core of this area with the largest population of the communities really dominates the statistics. It accounts for well over half of the numbers during this period. At least for crime, violent crime, property crime accounts for about 40%, and total crime, about half, and for crashes, about one-third of the total crashes that we see in this area. So Springfield itself really is going to lead any major statistical increases we see here, which is why, of course, it's important to break it down by the individual communities and individual areas separately. There are changes if they have any don't get lost in the overall totals that Springfield reports.

Obviously, there's a number of state-patrolled highways and roads that intersect this area. Many of which will serve as carriers to and from MGM Springfield and thus might see increased traffic, and thus might see increased traffic issues and traffic collisions. So state police data is equally important to this effort. The local communities tend to take most of the crime reports in the area. But for commissions and other calls for service, the state police dataset is extremely important. And as you can see from these figures, on all of the roads, almost all of the roads, over the reporting period, the collision total has been increasing throughout the area, which could be signs of any number of -- it's been increasing, really, throughout Massachusetts during this period. There are many causes for that, lower gasoline prices, greater driving behavior, continued economic development of the area, bringing more cars into the area and so forth. So MGM Springfield might be a participant in that overall increase that we've been seeing over the last seven years, bringing more cars to the area. That doesn't mean the rate is higher. That doesn't mean the risk of collisions is higher necessarily. But, you know, hopefully we'll be able to get some figures to help temper this analysis with calculations of rates.

Now, one of the things --

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Christopher, a quick question on this slide. I'm assuming -- so when you're talking about crashes along I-91 it's literally I-91 from the tip of Northampton?

>> MR. BRUCE: Yeah, these are within the 11 communities.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Is it possible to extract out of that, like, how much is happening, say, on I-91 through each of those communities? We have a couple issues that we're dealing with? It would be interesting to see, are they predominantly in Holyoke, Springfield or Northampton?

>> MR. BRUCE: Yes. The state police data not only identifies the community in which the crash occurred but also the specific location. So we'll be able to identify increases by actual section of road.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.

>> MR. BRUCE: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I also ask, so the slope in this chart, they're all positive, and that's an indication of increases just like you said. Are there -- are they large enough? You mentioned the 15% in a prior slide. That was definitely a trend. Just help me understand order of magnitude here.

>> MR. BRUCE: They're -- they're a modest increase over the seven-year period. Not so much that it's a really stark trend. A single recent year, for instance, 2016, I think -- 2016-'17 together were the highest years in the dataset for the past seven years. 2016 on some sections of road and 2017 on others. The slope is small enough that a single -- a single year could have influenced, you know, the overall direction of the slope. So, yeah. I did emphasize that it's been increasing in the area, but I wouldn't say that it's a stark increase. I'd have to actually calculate the P-value. It's not an increase -- an overwhelming increase until we get to a slope -- an SPM of around 10%. Yeah.

Now, one of the things I'm interested in looking at in the surrounding area is what happens at places where people are likely to get on and off the highways on the way to and from MGM Springfield. And this map here shows the exits and the radiuses around the exits in which we find hotels, restaurants and gasoline stations to and from -- on major travel routes to and from MGM Springfield. You can also see the travel routes themselves plotted on the map. I took -- I seeded the area as far away as 100 miles with a bunch of different starting points and then saw what Google Maps recommended as travel routes. Not everybody uses that, but I used it as sort of a proxy as what people would be using as a decision-making tool for how they travel to and from the casino. And then identified the places within those travel routes that might likely see increased traffic, again, to and from MGM Springfield. So we'll be looking at specifically things that are used by travelers, gas stations, convenience stores, hotels and restaurants within those exit radiuses to see if we see any increases in activity there.

This map here indicates what was happening in Springfield among certain crimes for different crimes, just in the last three months of 2017. And you can see the dots are so numerous, you can't even really pick out individual, you know, crimes, which is sort of the overall purpose of this map. This is to emphasize that, you know, in the radius around where MGM Springfield is located, you know, because of economics and geography and a number of other issues, Springfield has had some challenges. Dealing with crime in that area. It's gotten better over the seven-year period that I analyzed. But obviously, we can see that the area is something of a hotspot. Now, it's possible that the presence of the casino and the legitimate activity that it draws as well as the extra law enforcement presence in the area serves as a suppressive effect to

much of the activity that we see here on this map and other types of crimes as well. It's also possible that all the extra people in the area, you know, may cause certain crimes to increase, just as -- on the basis of the number of potential targets alone. And so, you know, we have to be prepared to analyze either possibility. There are mechanisms by which crime could increase. There are mechanisms by which it could decrease, and some individual crimes might increase, and some might decrease. So it's important in the immediate area and the neighborhoods surrounding the casino to take a really close look at what happens and what we can both credit and not to the presence of MGM Springfield.

Based on my work with other analysts around the country, when I asked them for examples of the types of crimes that had increased in their areas after the introduction of casinos, you know, they offered some feedback to me about what types of specific locations we should look at, and they mentioned things like hotels, restaurants, gas stations, convenience stores, pawn shops and social service facilities within the immediate area of the casinos. And so I also mapped those. And I identified certain areas -- certain businesses and business types around the MGM Springfield area that, again, it would be important to measure specifically what happens after the three-month and so forth post-casino period.

And so that brings me to the specific evaluation plan. In December, shortly after the -- well, the three-month period is up at the end of November around Thanksgiving. So about mid-December after the agencies have had enough time to properly code the incidents that have been reported during that period, I'll revisit them and collect the data for that three-month period and then issue a report, obviously, about what changes we've seen in the Springfield area since then. It's important to note, of course, that regardless of the presence of a new facility like a casino, some crimes will increase. Some crimes will decrease in any dataset that you take from a police agency for a three-month period. And so those -- any increases or decreases we see by themselves won't necessarily indicate a causal relationship to MGM Springfield. That's why it will be very important to do a much further analysis of those increases to see if we see any evidence that ties it into the casino specifically, and obviously we've had some experience doing that because of the Plainville project. So hopefully we'll be able to determine on any increases that we see, what the cause is and whether we can attribute it to MGM Springfield or not.

And then we'll be looking, obviously, as Mark said, not just for, you know, broad statistical changes, but what we see down to the micro level hotspot with a particular focus on the access and the particular business types around the casino that we might hypothesize an increase at. We'll be -- I'll be working very closely, of course, with the Gaming Enforcement Unit which has been fantastic about providing data in the past. And with the agencies in the area and particularly the crime analysis unit at the Springfield Police Department. If there's one major difference in this project versus the Plainville project, it's that the central agency here has a very robust and well-trained and well-staffed crime analysis unit led by Bill Schwartz who is in the room here. I'm not just saying this because he's in the room. They really have done a fantastic job, Bill has in particular, getting that agency up to speed with modern crime analysis. And I have every confidence that any trends that we do see after the introduction of the casino will be able to fully analyze with the support of that unit, and I really look forward

to working with him closely on the upcoming project. That is my report, unless there are any additional questions.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I had just a couple of quick questions, Christopher, and thank you for this. I think it is, as you reminded us, it's important to understand this is a baseline. This is everything assessed before MGM opened. A quick question on your kind of property map where you listed hotels, gas stations, pawn shops, social services. Obviously there's a gas station right across the street from MGM. Didn't want to take that one into consideration because of its proximity?

>> MR. BRUCE: Oh, my apologies. If one didn't appear on the map, I might have -- something might have gone wrong in my data file and I didn't geocode it.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.

>> MR. BRUCE: I don't know why it wouldn't have appeared there. I'll have to go back to my dataset and make sure that I've captured them all.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. I'm sure the people at pride wanted to have some sense.

>> MR. BRUCE: Thank you for that. I don't know why that wouldn't have been there.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Two quick questions going into your -- the full report, page 3, the executive summary down on the bottom, you talked about possible statistics collected that the report does not cover. I was wondering if you could just kind of shed some light on maybe what the statistics are or what you didn't fold into --

>> MR. BRUCE: One of the things I tried to emphasize in the report is that the most important thing about this project -- or this part of the project is that I have a baseline dataset. It's not necessarily the statistics themselves that can be calculated from the dataset because I could have sliced the data 100 different ways. But the fact that the data exists, and so once we have the post-casino data, I'll be able to compare changes and categories that I didn't necessarily include in this report just on the interest of space. I mean, I could have made this report 1,000 pages with all of the different categories. So some of the things that aren't in there, I didn't do much on the baseline dataset when it comes to demographic information about offenders and victims. I didn't go into a lot of detail about origin points for offenders in the area, but these are things that I'll be analyzing after we have the post-casino dataset. So, for instance, if we identify an increase in crime and it turns out that most of the offenders or a significantly higher percentage of offenders for that crime are coming to the area from outside the 11 communities, that might be an indication of a casino-related involvement. But I didn't -- again, for interest of space, I just didn't bother to do a baseline analysis of those origin points.

Property types, stolen property types, I didn't really include in here. The data isn't great in that particular category, although it might be good enough to identify major changes in it, but I didn't think it was worth, you know, creating a section of the report for it. So those types of things. I guess maybe in this report I don't have an exhaustive list of the fields that I collected. But most of the statistics that I did provide in here are from the offense tables alone, which includes the offense type, the time and the location, and the -- I was going to say -- I thought -- I had another field there, but I forgot what it is. But I didn't include a lot of statistics on the other data tables. Again, that includes people, property and vehicles that are involved in crimes.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So let me just -- on that, so even though you did not do it for this report, you'll have the data capability.

>> MR. BRUCE: Yeah, exactly.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So that in the future, if we hypothesize or if you hypothesize that there is this outside flow of people, you could go back and corroborate whether that was also existing in the past or not.

>> MR. BRUCE: Precisely, yeah. Prince, in the Plainville area when we saw an increase in credit card fraud, it became really important to look at the origin points of offenders and the specific types of properties that were being purchased with stolen credit cards. Ahead of time, you know, if I had offered the types of properties being stolen for every type of crime, it would have just ballooned the report into thousands of pages. You know, once we know that there's something to look at, the data is there to do that additional analysis.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That's important, yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I would also just add, you know, kudos to you and Mark and Brian and Tim and to you, Commissioner Cameron, this is a big effort to get all the hosts of surrounding communities, law enforcement agencies to work together. It's great that they're all on the same vendor, I guess the data collection piece simple, but kudos for getting that kind of cooperation up front.

>> MR. BRUCE: No the surrounding agencies have all been fantastic. They asked the questions that they should ask, but, you know, once they were satisfied with the security and confidentiality of the data processes, they were overly cooperative. I have good people at each one of the 11 agencies that I can rely on when I have a question or when I need to look at a particular category further, they can do more analysis with their own dataset than I can with what I've collected, and it's nice to have that kind of relationship with all of the agencies involved.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah, I would just love to expound upon that because it really is interesting and unique. You know, I've presented at conferences, as you have, on this topic. And one of the things I'm asked is, how did you get the police departments to participate? They all tell us they're so busy. They don't have time. And because without a baseline, it's very hard to then determine what has changed. And as we all know from our hearings, this was one of the major concerns, right? Citizens, we're worried about crime. If a casino were to come. So, you know, when we started this project, I think the research team probably didn't have the right folks to move forward on this. I said, well, let's just start with all the police chiefs. Let's just ask for their help. Which is what we did. We went down and invited all the police chiefs down in Plainridge. And they were just excellent. First of all, it's nice when you ask and don't say, we need you to do X, Y and Z. But one of the chiefs recommended Christopher Bruce for this project. And he has been invaluable. First of all, he had worked at many of the police departments in Massachusetts. So he had a working relationship, trusted relationship, not easy for police departments, state police and all of these surrounding communities, around Springfield and Plainridge to turn over their data to someone. That is a big ask. And making sure it's secure and used properly. As you pointed out, you can cut data in a lot of ways and make it say different things. So that relationship was critical, and I just want to thank all of the police departments. And to watch the level of engagement to me has been just satisfying. I mean, they

have -- all of them in a room talking about the issues, what do we anticipate, and the idea -- one of the things that I find most interesting about this project is realtime information. So every three months we know exactly what's happening, brainstorming by the chiefs, by the other police executives, and really the ability to change a strategy and not wait till something becomes a bigger issue than it has to be. So that part has been terrific, and I just can't thank all the agencies enough for their participation and their enthusiasm about this project. They see the value and not just because it's written on a piece of paper for research, but the ability to share data, information and solve problems, which is, you know, what people are looking for. So thank you and thanks to everyone else that has participated in this project. It really is gratifying.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Thank you, Commissioner. .

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah, if there's a hotspot that we can identify early on and, you know, have the rest of the GEU look into it, leverage existing police efforts locally.

>> MR. BRUCE: Obviously, I can't be faster than the crime analysis unit at the Springfield Police Department itself and that's, again, the great part about this project. They've got a unit there that can be literally tracking realtime changes in a way that I can't. So I think it's important to keep that in mind. They're constantly responding well in between the datasets that I'm able to collect.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And I think we have some representatives here from Springfield. I'd love to give them an opportunity to talk about the collaboration and some of the efforts that are being made. The other thing I've been really impressed with are the efforts with all of the agencies involved. Springfield State Police working together to really keep Springfield and the whole metro district safe. So if you're here, you drove all the way down from Springfield, I'd love you to take a minute and talk about that.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Grab a microphone.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Have a seat.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Just introduce yourself for the record.

>> Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Brian Walsh, I'm the civilian public information officer for the Springfield Police Department. I'm here with our director of crime analysis, Bill Schwartz, Commissioner Barberi sends his regrets for not being able to attend. He's in Plymouth today. One of our officers is receiving the medal of valor from the Massachusetts Police Association which he really wanted to attend. So thanks for having us here.

Yes, speaking about the Gaming Enforcement Unit, one thing our officers tell us all the time across the state, the relationship between the local police department and the state police may not be that wonderful. In Springfield for years, it's been completely the opposite. The working relationship there with our C3 programs across the city, utilizing resources together, whether it's canines or just working together in the CPAC unit in the district attorney's office. The relationship was there beforehand, and everything I've heard from Lieutenant Akers from our police department is that they don't consider themselves state police and Springfield police there. They are the Gaming Enforcement Unit and work together as one team and it's going extremely well so far.

What the Commissioner has done leading up to when the casino was opening is

look at our metro unit and start to expand. There was a C3 south end unit before of about ten officers. Knowing that we were going to see 100,000-plus visitors to the city, he expanded that into the metro unit with 40 officers and supervisors. He added kiosks, which is based on if you see them down in New York City in Times Square, at far ends of the metro unit, which are staffed by officers at peak hours, and they are doing walking posts as well. We added a metro substation right across from the mass mutual center. So the officers will go directly to that substation as opposed to Springfield Police headquarters. And many of them are out on foot, most of their time when they're working. The commissioner's approach is high visibility and high approachability for our officers in the metro unit. And even this morning as we're here at this meeting, they're announcing a regional visitors center right at the corner of Court Street and Bruce Landon Way where there will be a police presence at peak hours and high events right a block away from where MGM Springfield begins.

So far it's working extremely well. Obviously, there were some things that they anticipated in the metro unit, whether it's amusement parks, NFL games. When you add 100,000 people down there at all times a day 24/7, there are many things you anticipate, but many have been planned and pre-planned for. Our metro unit so far is just doing an outstanding job. We also have cameras, external cameras, on all of MGM's buildings, our realtime analysis center is able to monitor those at any time as well as at our kiosks and all throughout downtown. So if you come to a realtime analysis center, they can pop up the cameras outside MGM. If there's any sort of incident, issue, whatever there may be, they're able to alert the officers, both our metro unit and the Gaming Enforcement Unit, to be able to separate from a potential bad guy and a civilian so that the officers come prepared with that information when they arrive or possibly a route of travel, whatever it may be. Commissioners Stebbins spoke about pride a minute ago. We're currently working on a volunteer pilot with Pride where our realtime cameras will be able to be utilized at all of their gas stations externally and internally which would be a big assistance as one of the highest foot traffic Prides is the one right next to the casino there.

But Springfield as a whole, the commissioner has been there since June of 2014, and crime continues -- continues to drop. It's just spectacular. It's dropped by about one-third of part one overall crime since the Commissioners took over. And we continue to see some of that data continuously going down. Springfield's 33 square miles. Where in my backyard, you see a mountain, deer, frogs, whatever it may be, so it's a unique city. But we've seen nothing but positives downtown in our metro unit. Before MGM opened, the workers, anyone else couldn't wait to get out of town. You could see tumbleweed, and now the casino's really reenergized the city, reenergized the downtown, you know, the foot traffic, the people down there on weeknights, weekdays, weekends, it's really been exciting.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. That's important information. And again, I've been impressed with the coordination. That's what's really important to me, to see how well these PDs work together. And Lieutenant Babin is here with us. We're fortunate because Lieutenant Babin headed up the Gaming Enforcement Unit at Plainridge, so there were a lot of lessons learned. And then he has now taken over as the commanding officer up in Springfield with those lessons learned, although in a much different environment. Lieutenant, if you don't mind just quickly just sharing some of

the work that the gaming enforcement, working with Springfield PD and the state police is doing.

>> To echo upon what Ryan said, it's the cooperative work between the Springfield PD and the Gaming Enforcement Unit. The metro unit on the perimeter but within the gaming establishment, it is says the Gaming Enforcement Unit. It's made up of both state police and local police. It's a 24/7 operation. We have plainclothes officers inside, we have undercover officers inside, ensuring that it's going to be a well-policed environment, a safe environment. We have experienced, like any small town, all the crime issues including narcotics issues, intoxication issues, minor issues, things that were very concerning to the Commission. We've tried to keep a tight handle on that. We've had great cooperation with MGM along those lines. I know DLT Connors put together a short list of some of the items to touch on directly that we have been handling out there. I'm glad to answer any specific questions about any type of crime that we've had, in general. It's been a little bit of everything. The unit has done a terrific job with the resources provided by the surveillance and security at MGM, dovetailing with the surveillance provided by the city, and the metro unit. And it has been -- it's a busy, lively assignment. There's a lot going on there, late nights and weekends, in particular. It's a safe environment and it's going well.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. Commissioner?

>> Good morning, Commissioners. To echo what Ryan said, and it's tough to follow, very polished and speaks very well. But again, we have had a very good relationship with Springfield police obviously prior to the casino coming. But this has gone extremely well. I believe I speak for everybody involved from the get-go. Just by way of background, the relationship began very strongly in May when we brought in the team. We identified both state police and Springfield Police who would be part of this Gaming Enforcement Unit specific to Springfield to the casino there. So since May, they have been training, obviously gaming is new in Massachusetts. Everybody needs to get up to speed as to certain areas to cover, the Mass General Laws, MGC rules and regulations. We had a mini-academy, if you will, state police and Springfield police, so it was a great opportunity for the troopers and the detectives and the Springfield group led by Lieutenant Akers to get to know each other, to be in a classroom setting for a period of time, and that just dovetailed right into the opening of MGM Springfield in August.

And since then, the unit has been doing tremendous work. I'm extremely proud of the work that they've done. And it really is a partnership. And the group there has really gelled very nicely. And they take it very seriously. They're active, they're proactive. They have a vested interest in seeing this work for MGM for the Gaming Commission and for the City of Springfield. I can't say enough about the work that they've done.

We have a number of stakeholders. As you mentioned, as far as Lieutenant Babin coming to us from Plainridge and taking on the role of leading MGM Springfield, he knew the partnerships that we had to make and immediately turned to getting those partnerships in place, specifically with the Springfield's metro unit. Their invaluable service to us. And there are times when things get busy there, and we need some extra assistance, or even just some logistical assistance, the metro unit is right there. And that relationship appears to be working extremely well, as well on an operational

basis. We also have the Springfield Barracks that is within a mile or so away from the facility. They've been on site assisting in whatever possible times that we need as well. As Lieutenant Babin mentioned, the relationship with MGM Security, their surveillance and their management is critical to the successful operation that we have here, and we worked hand in hand with them. They've done a very good job in the two months. And that is a daily evaluation and process that we're evaluating the relationship and how best do we serve each entity on site there.

Some of the other stakeholders that we've talked about are the ABCC. Lieutenant Babin has also been attending meetings with the U.S. Attorney's office, liaison with the secret service. We do deal with counterfeit money fairly consistently. We liaison directly with the secret service and conduct further investigations on any confidential -- counterfeit money that's been seized. ATF, other federal agencies that we do liaison with on a continuous basis. So it is a robust program, and Lieutenant Babin is leading sort of the boots on the ground experience out there for us. And as Lieutenant Babin said, it has been a very busy two months for us in the Gaming Enforcement Unit. It has gone extremely well. It's great that the facility is packed. The attendance is up. And we have a particular role that we have to fill on a daily basis. And I think the team has done a phenomenal job. Again, it's a daily evaluation process, whether it's for staffing protocols, how do we handle certain situations, that is an ongoing piece. Although we come with the experience from Plainridge, this clearly is a different facility, specifically with table games, and it's a major city. So those challenges are something that we've taken. We've taken willingly and gladly, and we'll see it through. We'll continue to foster those relationships and I think with Springfield Police, it will only get stronger.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thanks. And I know our gaming agents play a role as well, right? There's a good relationship there. They went through the academy with you, those folks.

>> They did, and it was a great opportunity for them to everybody to get to know each other. Obviously, we're physically located in the same space out in Springfield. We've pushed for that interaction back and forth. They're a major resource for us and vice versa. They come with an incredible amount of experience, wide-ranging experience in the gaming world, and we've said to our personnel, make sure you're picking their brain because they're a vital source and they're right there. And it's a very good team concept.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I mention something? This is all great, and I'm reminded of something that it's a bit of a flip side to all of this. A few months ago our partners at DPH who do a lot of work at the community level identified some concern from some community -- some in the community relative to the notion that additional police presence might bring in perhaps more attention or perhaps some more attention with some minority groups. You mentioned -- you did mention approachability in this aspect. Can you expound on that with that concern? I believe in some people's minds as to what, you know, additional police presence does?

>> Yeah. I mean, that's not something that's been brought to our attention in terms of the casino at all. It's -- the commissioner's belief is if you have presence and visibility out there -- and our police department is the largest -- or the most -- has the highest minority rate in the entire state. So you're not just seeing white officers out on

the corner. Our officers are about 30% Hispanic, about 10% black as well as white. So when you're talking about that in Springfield, I don't know if it necessarily plays the same role with the demographics. But the commissioner's vision is that police officers out there visible, approachable so that people are not only safe, but they can feel safe. And it's strategy that's worked elsewhere in places like New York City, in Times Square, where there's just a lot of foot traffic. So ultimately when people see officers, the commissioner's vision is that they will obviously be more specific but they will feel safe as well.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good question. Anything else?

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: I think I heard the coordination with the AG's office.

>> I just noticed in my notes that that is correct. And also, the Hampden County's District Attorney's office. We do work hand in hand with them on a daily basis and the gaming enforcement division of the Attorney General's office handling a majority of the investigation or the arrests and criminal prosecutions, although the Hampden County DA's office is very hands on, and those relationships have gone extremely well. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And these regional meetings, Christopher can attest to. You know, all of those folks are represented at the meetings. And it really is -- you know, it's my old line of work, so it's nice for me to be around these kinds of meetings but real brainstorming. You know, they talk about, okay, this is what we see happening. What are we going to do about this? And just strategies and certainly without our state and local partners, that wouldn't happen as effectively. So thank you to everyone who's participating. Anything else?

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thanks.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Next we have Director Griffin with Workforce, Supplier and Diversity Development. Before we do that, let's give them time to set up. We'll take a five-minute break. Thanks.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Great. We will resume our meeting at this time. Director Griffin.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Good morning.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: So I'm here to talk to you about the affirmative action program for equal opportunity for goods and services that is required to be submitted by each licensee. And this is for minority women and veteran business enterprises identified in Chapter 23K, Section 21, for the provision of goods and services procured by the gaming establishment. There are also several license conditions, but these requirements indicate that each licensee shall identify specific goals expressed as an overall program and a specific value of the contracts for minority business enterprises. Women business enterprises and veteran business enterprises.

Additionally, license condition 16 indicates that this licensee Encore Boston Harbor shall submit a plan to identify local vendors. So with these -- I requested this plan on June 22nd, within 90 days, as required by law. And Encore Boston Harbor responded appropriately and submitted this plan. And we're here to talk about this plan today. We posted the plan for public comment on October 4th. And until October

19th. And we received three letters within that time period. We received, in your packet, a letter from Mayor DeMaria from the City of Everett, supporting the plan. And we received a letter from the center for Women in Enterprise, also supportive of the plan, and further commenting that the goals set forth in the proposal are in keeping with other efforts within the state.

And we received a third letter from an individual who indicated that perhaps this increased scrutiny on Encore Boston Harbor is positive, and it seemed to me to be supportive of the plan. Additionally, we received another letter from the Hispanic American Institute after the deadline, so I did want to -- it is not in your packet because we were not able to post it in time. We will include it -- we'll revise the packet and include it later. And we'll talk a little bit about the letter, but first I would be remiss without introducing my guests here. So I have to my immediate right, David Granata, Director of Procurement for Encore Boston Harbor.

>> MR. GRANATA: Good morning.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: And Nadiuska Ballard, procurement manager, and Jacqui Krum whom you know very well. So I'll talk just a little bit about the -- well, no, I think I'll go into my comments about the plan. I actually found this plan to be very strong. I looked at the first version. You have the tracked changes version in front of you. And Encore increased their diversity goals when they heard that the state was prepared to increase their goals in FY19. So you'll see the increased goals. This plan includes detailed discretionary spend for the project. It includes target local spending amounts for the host and surrounding community. It also includes the timing of the procurement. You'll notice -- I think it's appendix A -- Exhibit A, rather. Exhibit A gives an itemized list of spend and the timing. And that is also posted on their website.

It also includes a community engagement strategy, utilizing local diverse business groups, the Commission's own vendor advisory group, which is also composed of various state and local business groups. And so I thought Encore did a great job in incorporating some changes. And I'm talking about outreach and the sharing of information about the RFP. Sometimes that is half the battle is knowing when the contracts are going out. So I will -- maybe before I open it up for questions, I wanted to go over this new letter from the Hispanic American Institute because I think there were some noteworthy things that we should discuss.

So the Hispanic American Institute indicates that they would support activating the Gaming Commission's vendor advisory team and suggest a little bit more information about its mission. You'll notice that the vendor advisory team is noted on page 6. I think perhaps we could maybe include a little bit more information about the makeup and the mission of the vendor advisory team, and I could certainly share that information. The Hispanic American Institute also indicates that they'd like some more information about the RFP process, more definition and transparency as to the source selection criteria. And I wanted to -- because I think this is important -- turn it over to David to respond to this. For this particular point.

>> MR. GRANATA: Yes. Good morning again, Commissioners.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good morning.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good morning.

>> MR. GRANATA: On Exhibit A, the Hispanic American Institute is looking for more granularity on the process. Exhibit A is illustrative. This is not the complete list. I

was really trying to keep it to one page, but there's actually 76 different discrete commodities that we list on our website, on the vendor opportunities website. And as you can see, it's very granular. We didn't just say food and beverage or we didn't say maintenance materials. We really got into the details. And looking left to right, we also spent some time talking about what our criteria might be. Some types of commodities, if we're looking to supplement our electricians and our plumbers, they need to be licensed, we indicate which ones would be on call or 24/7. To the right you can see that we talk about the actual timing of the opportunity. And then to address more specifically the Hispanic-American Institute's comment, if you note the three footnotes at the bottom, we took some time to add a little bit of color to what we were saying up in the table above.

So we do talk in footnote 2 about a lot of our criteria for our decision-making is obviously the quality of the product or service, the cost, which is always important, and for an operation like ours, like MGM's and operations of that scale, the scale of the supplier's operation, you know, the ability to deliver product in volumes and certain frequencies. So we think with Exhibit A, we're addressing some of the requests for granularity from the organization.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Okay.

>> MR. GRANATA: And we tried to cram a lot of information onto one sheet of paper, so it says a lot, hopefully.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Great. Another comment that I wanted to raise, they wonder if you will consider hosting bidders conferences where the upcoming RFPs are discussed and the requirements explained.

>> MR. GRANATA: We will. We refer to them as walk-throughs.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Okay.

>> MR. GRANATA: So it's a standard practice in procurement industry. Now, you don't necessarily do walk-throughs when you are RFPing a box of widgets. But certainly, as an example, when we start talking about pest control and we start talking about services across 3 million square feet, what we will typically do is we will, in advance or when the RFP is going out, we'll schedule a walk-through where all the bidders are there. They all get to walk the space, ask their questions, see the back of house hallways, and what's good about that process is everybody is getting the same information. Nadia and I have worked together for years. And we also have a practice where during the RFP process, if somebody asks us a question, hey, I don't understand requirement number 4. When we respond, we respond to all of the bidders because we want, again, really level playing field and everybody has access to the same information. So that's just an example.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Okay, great. Were there any other of the comments that you wanted to respond to?

>> MR. GRANATA: We do not intend to do a set-aside. We feel very strongly that there are very strong MBEs, WBEs, VBEs out there as well as businesses in our host and surrounding community that can win meaningful business from us because of the quality of their operation. And a set-aside is -- I don't think does anybody any good. What we want to do is we want to create access, access, as we'll describe in this plan, is really how we intend to drive business awards. And we'll talk a little bit later about that, but we really think, truly, that if we can cast our net wide enough and give that

access and those solicitations to dramatically higher vendor base, then we think very simply that will just exponentially increase the awards. So there's the human factor and the human bandwidth. And again, we'll talk about it a little bit later, that if we can overcome it with technology, which we can, because we're already starting to do it, I could -- I could RFP something to 1,000 vendors with not the concern that we would never be able to disseminate that information.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I build on that, Mr. Granata? Thank you for that explanation. At least anecdotally, I know that access notwithstanding, the requirements of an RFP, the connection may be one thing, and knowing that something is coming up is great, and minority and women businesses, it could be daunting to respond to, you know, a number of prerequisites, some of which come directly from the licensing process. So I recognize that, you know, part of it is systematic. But it could be daunting to respond to them and then maybe that person, the small businessperson says, well, I'm going to have to pass because I don't know about, you know, all these prerequisites just to be able to respond. What can you tell us that's alluded to or described in the plan relative to trying to overcome, if anything, that at least perception barrier, that somebody is just simply not able to scale up or spend a lot of time responding to many prerequisites, if you will, at the moment that it comes to that RFP?

>> MR. GRANATA: Well, I think there's two -- there's two ways to address it. One is -- and I know that MGM was actually successful in Springfield doing this. So we talk to a lot of the same vendors, Granger, WW Granger is a big company that sells everything. MGM -- Granger approached MGM months ago about their tier 2. So basically, what they're doing is Granger is sourcing from local and certified diverse firms. And MGM is benefiting from that because they're buying through those firms. Granger acts as -- I guess counsel, an inability to scale and protect the customer. So we do a lot of business with Granger as well. And we've had those same conversations even within, I think, the last week or two, we had them in our offices. So we think one way to approach it very simply is to -- for types of commodities where we need that scale, an alternative is to buy through a bigger partner who themselves have a very strong plan with certified firms.

The second thing we do is -- and we discuss that later in this plan -- is in our RFP process when we are awarding business to a big -- could be a Fortune 50 company, we have very specific utilization goals that we will typically ask for. So I believe it's Exhibit B is the writer to our RFP document. And this really is verbatim. When we RFP something, this Exhibit B is an attachment to every one of those solicitations. And as we did during our construction phase and our design phase, we pushed these firms. These are not check box items in a contract, that contract sign is filed. We drive them because our name is on this. We've made commitments and representations to our neighbors and the Commonwealth, and we intend to hit them. So nobody said it's easy. We can't say your utilization goal for MBEs is 15% and then we just sit back and watch them do it. Typically you have to chase, you have to drive, and it's why we're actively recruiting for a diversity manager right now because we're going to need a very aggressive pit bull to ensure that these things are actually done. And that's how we're going to succeed, hopefully.

>> And just to add to that, the other thing that's important is Dave and Nadia's group

has focused a lot on this recently, making sure that people are aware of what those prerequisites are from the get.

Go so they can prepare themselves for when we do go out to bid.

>> MR. GRANATA: Yes, the Exhibit A, we keep referring to it as the opportunity matrix, has really been well received. Because it's not -- it's not vague. It's specific. It's 76 commodities. There's requirements. There's timing. We hand them out at all of our vendor fairs. Nadia's going to talk in a minute about some of our outreach activities and also about our spend objectives. But we finished a fair yesterday down at the Royal Sonesta in Cambridge. We started assessing all of these events we've either hosted or attended. And in the last six months, we're approaching 1,300 individual businesses and/or business owners that we have met personally one-on-one meetings, eyeball to eyeball, talking about their firm's capabilities and how can we partner. It's really been -- and we intend to keep doing these. We're not doing it till opening. We're separately trying to build an organization. We're interviewing madly and hiring people. So the more folks we can add to our team, the deeper we can go out in these ongoing initiatives.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: So would you like to start generally talking about the plan?

>> MR. GRANATA: Certainly.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Thank you.

>> MR. GRANATA: Thank you. And I would like to thank Jill, by the way. Jill has really been invaluable. The difference between our first iteration and our second, we've gotten wonderful guidance. So I want to thank you for helping us navigate.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Thank you.

>> MR. GRANATA: Through this. So as I alluded to a little while ago, the emphasis for us is threefold. It's identifying those firms. It's soliciting those firms across a much wider base than a typical procurement organization might do so. And obviously, the real objective is to award meaningful and ongoing business. It's just an exercise, if that's not the end result. So we kind of worked backwards from -- if the goal is really awards, how do we increase awards? We feel we increase awards by increasing solicitation. How do we increase solicitation? We do that by going out and identifying all those firms. So that's why, for the last six months, we've really been holding these fairs and we've been attending G&E and SDC events. Nadia was in Framingham Friday -- yeah, 400 WBEs. We've presented to the North Shore Latino Business Community. So a lot of that was with an eye towards identifying those firms. So those are the three key objectives. We've worked very closely with John's SDO office. We've worked very closely with G&E and the CWE. And we have ongoing meetings with the Chambers of Commerce, too. We've invited the Chambers to all of our vendor fairs. They have attended pretty much all of them. And it's been very successful because we're hoping the chambers reach deeper into their communities. We have tables at each event for the MGC and for the CWE and all of the different diversity organizations with an eye towards using it as an opportunity to explain to people the benefits of certification that go far beyond doing business with Encore. It just opens up doors to state and federal spending that would otherwise not exist. And we encourage, at each of these events, right at the beginning, visit our partners. They're sitting back there in the corner and understand the value here.

So with that, those are the major objectives. Those are some of the high-level

outreach that we've done and the chambers that we're working with. And so with that, I will introduce Nadia Ballard.

>> NADIUSKA BALLARD: Morning.

>> MR. GRANATA: She'll talk about our spend objectives.

>> NADIUSKA BALLARD: So I'm going to talk about the spend objectives, and then Dave is going to explain how we plan on achieving them. We have established two types of commitments to create economic opportunity. The first one is diversity. We have committed to spending 8% of our discretionary spend with minority business enterprises, MBEs. 14% of our discretionary spend with women business enterprises, WBEs, and 3% of the discretionary spend with veteran business enterprises.

We utilized the Commonwealth of Massachusetts definitions of MBEs, WBEs and VBEs. And like David said, a more detailed description of that discretionary spend is on attachment -- or Exhibit A. Our host and surrounded commitments are \$10 million annually with Everett-based vendors. \$20 million annually with Boston-based vendors. \$10 million annually with Somerville's base vendors. \$10 million annually with Malden-based vendors. \$10 million annually with Medford-based vendors and \$2.5 million annually with Chelsea-based vendors.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Excuse me, I'm sorry. I had a quick question. I know that, you know, Everett through Medford came through as a result of the host and surrounding community agreements. But I couldn't go back and discern where the \$2.5 million commitment to Chelsea came from. I went through the kind of arbiter's agreement between Encore and Chelsea, but I'm trying to figure out where that commitment came from. I'm not saying it's a bad thing, but I'm just trying to figure out -- I know where the others came from. I'm trying to figure out where that one came from.

>> MS. KRUM: Right. And as you'll recall, it went through the arbitration process. I believe that was a commitment we made with them as a subsequent -- through subsequent discussions.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. Thank you.

>> MR. GRANATA: Back to me?

>> NADIUSKA BALLARD: Back to you.

>> MR. GRANATA: Okay. So I had given a few minutes ago the three main objectives at a high level. Really on page 2, the plan objectives is getting just a little bit more granular in some of the things that we're doing to identify those firms. We do have an Encore Boston Harbor website. As I mentioned, there's vendor opportunities within that -- so there's the ability there to register as somebody that's interested in doing business with Encore. So they can provide their vendor information. They can indicate whether they're a certified diverse firm, they have the ability to tell us what their general product or service offering is. So we have that website. Within that website is this opportunities matrix which is our attached exhibit.

We do meet with these groups on a regular basis. So the Hispanic American Institute, the Chambers. It was a very interesting meeting. Maybe about two months ago, we had all seven of the Chambers. We invited them there to really just have an open discussion about how we should approach our upcoming fairs, our vendor fairs. So it was very interesting to get all the Chambers because they didn't necessarily agree on everything. But we said hey, folks, we can do -- we can do fairs that are open to

everybody, all commodities, all categories, just big, really huge events, or we could tailor them specifically to categories and commodities that maybe are more prevalent in your community. And that's how we ended up dividing the affairs up into a food and beverage fair in this city and a maintenance materials fair in that city. So it was very interesting to sit down with all these chambers and ask them for meaningful input in how we should approach this thing. So these fairs were really a reflection of how we wanted to do it but also how each of the -- our hosts and surrounding communities preferred to do it as well.

We've had ongoing meetings with the Urban League for years? It's been going on for a while. Mostly focused on workforce development. But with us now hitting a point where we're really going to begin our true RFP process, as we approach 2019, we're going to expand that into -- these are going to be regularly scheduled -- is it monthly? Quarterly? Do you know, Nadia?

>> NADIUSKA BALLARD: So we're probably going to do them monthly.

>> MR. GRANATA: Okay.

>> NADIUSKA BALLARD: We're probably going to have our first one within the next month, depending on how many vendors we're able to capture. We'll decide whether we want to do them monthly or quarterly.

>> MR. GRANATA: Gotcha. Okay. So it will be our first one discussing vendors, but it will be one of many that have been going on on the workforce side.

Page 3. Northeastern's event. These were some of the events that we had attended and/or hosted as of when I had submitted the plan to Jill. And we then -- again, this was mid-September. We talked about our upcoming community outreach activities, most of which have already now occurred. So with that, I'll give the floor back to Nadia to describe a lot of the things that we've done since mid-September.

>> NADIUSKA BALLARD: Okay. So like David said, we have been meeting with vendors since March. Our very first vendor fair was March 17th. I could be wrong on the date. And we were able to capture about 350 vendors during that event, although it was a snow day, which was wonderful, that that many people actually showed up, and we were able to meet them. We learned a few things from that one. There was a lot of vendors that attended. And at the time, there was a small group of us. So we were not able to meet with 350 vendors, although we tried to. So we decided to split them into smaller vendor fairs commodity based and have the appropriate people attend each one of them, which is what we've done in the past few weeks.

In the past few weeks, I want to say we've been able to meet close to -- I think you have the number -- about 400 vendors. And we've been able to engage with them directly and also have the people there that are looking for certain types of services and products. So I think it's been beneficial for us and for them to actually have the face-to-face time with the end user and being able to present their products. We did allow them one-on-one meeting. They were pre-scheduled, so they were able to come in, bring their products, present to them and show them what they can do for us.

We haven't awarded any business yet. We're in the process of RFPing right now. So this is the perfect time to find these vendors, try to work with them and try to get them where they need to be where we can actually purchase from them. A lot of the vendors that have attended events are minority firms, women-owned firms and a few veteran-owned firms. So we're hoping that, you know, working with them, we

might be able to get them to, like Dave said, the point where we can actually purchase directly from them and not have to go through a bigger company so that they can be first-tier diversity versus second tier.

We have been able to put this together, by the way, with the help of a lot of our partners. I have to mention them. The GNSDC --

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Do you want to say the acronym? Not everyone knows.

>> NADIUSKA BALLARD: Sure. The greater New England Minority Diversity Council. The women --

>> MS. KRUM: Here we go.

>> NADIUSKA BALLARD: Thank you. The Center For Women in Enterprise, the Commonwealth Supplier Diversity Office, the Hispanic American Institute and the North Shore Latino Business Association.

>> MR. GRANATA: And the chambers.

>> NADIUSKA BALLARD: And the chambers. They have been great partners. They were able to get most of these vendors to our vendor fairs which is invaluable to us in trying to meet and achieve our goals. I think that is pretty much it on the vendor fairs.

>> MR. GRANATA: Back to me?

>> NADIUSKA BALLARD: Yes.

>> MR. GRANATA: The only thing I would add, it was kind of a speed dating approach. So people would come to the front desk, which we had staffed with folks, and we would award them -- not award them -- we would assign them a time slot. And they were seven-minute intervals. And we wanted them to be longer, but we wanted to be able to talk to folks. So the structure for all of these things was we would have somebody on the microphone calling out the times. So we would say one minute to go. And then the next minute we would say okay, the 10:22 a.m. meetings are now starting. Please approach your table. So it was very structured, but it was a way to really get folks to speak to those business -- at the event in Cambridge yesterday, we had limo companies talking to our director of transportation and our limousine manager, they were talking to the right folks. So that was one benefit to the format that we chose. Okay.

So with that -- these outreaches will continue. We've uncovered some wonderful relationships already. We don't want to name the vendor, but we have a certified WBE based in Massachusetts. I don't believe they're in a surrounding community, but they're Massachusetts-based certified where we've identified them for about \$600,000 or \$700,000 of spend in the next hopefully next two or three weeks. I think they're going through licensing right now. But it's somebody that we met at one of these events. And they said, here's what we do. And we said, wow! That's what we're looking for. And they scaled.

And it was interesting in that we had to -- we had to convince them that the opportunity was real. They were concerned that oh, Encore, they have relationships maybe out in Las Vegas. We would never have a shot at this. So Nadia and I spent a fair amount of time explaining, we're from Massachusetts. We're not here from Vegas. I've lived on the North Shore for 20 years. 90 some odd percent of our staff is born within probably 20 miles of where we're sitting right now.

We had to convince them that this was not an exercise, and just using them as

leverage. And we said, but you can't participate if you're not willing to go through the registration process and give us a meaningful bid, and they did it, and they won it. And that's just the first of many, hopefully. It's a big piece of business. So...

Solicitation is the second objective. I discussed a little while ago, when a buyer is overseeing an RFP, there are just these built-in limitations. How many bids can you give meaningful attention to? Maybe 10? Maybe 12? That's even high for some things depending on the complexity of it. So there's this built-in throttle coming right out of the gate where you're limiting who you're sending it to just because you have to. So working backwards, as I had mentioned before, where, okay, if the goal is awards, working backwards from that, how do we solicit more? And it's -- when I wrote this thing, Bob DeSalvio asked, is that a word? I refer it as templatized. I don't know, but I put it in quotes just in case it isn't. It's a templatized approach where when we send an RFP out, we say here's the widget that you're looking for. And you have to put your SKU number in this box, and you have to put your proposed unit price in that box and your unit of measurement in that box.

By taking that approach, which is really just here's the format of the RFP, please ensure that you respond and put the information in the right place. Now you can just step back and technology, and we're doing it. This is not speculative. Can just take all of that information and run it through this very simple tool that says this is the lowest proposal. This is the second one. This is the third one. This is the 82nd lowest proposal. We would -- that's what I would refer to, I guess, as the heavy lifting. So it still allows us to make the decision with the human element. But it allows us very quickly to broadcast this thing very widely and then say, okay, so which one of these are from our host or community? Which one's an MBE, VBE, a WBE. So we did this at the last place that we worked, and we actually have the tool -- is that the tiny URL that we keep hoping --

>> NADIUSKA BALLARD: Which I'm looking at tomorrow, yes.

>> MR. GRANATA: Good. So we had the tool when we worked previously. We have the tool today. We intend to use it. And we think we can really broadcast these things very widely. And I think I kind of morphed right into 3. I think I talked about how we overcome those limitations. I'm on page 7. Greater visibility leads to greater awards.

One of the things that we've explored, and I don't know -- I hope we're going to be able to do it -- but we've explored linking networks. So I've spoken to John Fitzpatrick about the -- their database and some of the other diversity databases. And everybody's giving me notes here.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Sorry.

>> MR. GRANATA: See, if I didn't get notes, I'd be speaking faster. Okay. We're going to look at a bunch of technology potential solutions. Some of it may be linking networks, and some of it may very simply just be plugging a link to our site onto some of our partners' websites. And people can click and say, what's Encore bidding right now? Was that fast? Okay. And I'll hand it back over to Nadia now for organizational support.

>> NADIUSKA BALLARD: So the plan is currently being led by Dave, who's our Director of Procurement, myself, I'm a Procurement Manager, and then we also have the full support over senior leadership team, and that is comprised of President Bob

DeSalvio, General Counsel Jacqui Krum, executive vice president of operations, Brian Golbrans and Frank Kissella. The mandate of the steering committee is to ensure that the commitments we've made in this plan have the highest visibility within our organization and to take the necessary steps, as needed, to ensure that the plan's objectives are achieved.

We are about nine months away from opening, and like Dave said, we're still in the process of hiring and interviewing people. We're hoping that our team is going to be about 10 to 15. We're currently at 9. Hoping to get more in the next few weeks. By the end, hoping to be fully staffed by the end of the fourth quarter of 2018. And like Dave mentioned, we're also in the process of looking and interviewing -- hoping to find a procurement diversity manager to directly lead all aspects of this plan. With that, I'm going to turn it over to Dave again.

>> MR. GRANATA: And I'll go -- diversity development assistance over on page 8. I'll go through that quickly. Some of these items I think we've already discussed. We are -- we are having conversations with companies like Granger to partner at a tier 2 level. That's one example. We're pushing in our contracts for utilization goals which, again, we need to then sometimes chase folks, but that's the way, at the end of the day, that you do hit your numbers. And we've got good experience doing that in the previous phases. So we intend to do that as well operationally.

And we're also now thinking about mentoring programs. We're doing some things on the workforce development side to partner at Everett High School and other organizations. And we're now putting thought into how can we do that on the vendor side as well? If we are helping high school and college kids with their career paths and alternatives and et cetera, et cetera, we feel strongly we can do the same thing on the vendor side as well, which might be partnering with our executive chef, Joe Liebowitz, or our director of facilities, who has a very big building that he needs to keep heated and cooled and cleaned and et cetera. So we're looking now at doing things like that and modeling them after what we've done in other areas of our business. I guess that's it, really. I don't want to be repeating myself. But it's really about identifying them, soliciting them, awarding them, and giving advanced visibility through any number of means to either show them what we feel the criteria is, to show them when the opportunity timing is, to continue our meetings with the Hispanic American Institute and others and really just keep driving the program well beyond opening. And I'll open it up to questions, too, if the Commissioners have any.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Questions?

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you both for your presentation. I had a couple of questions and a few comments. You know, what's interesting is MGM, through all of its hosts and surrounding community agreements, paid -- put a tremendous focus and priority on hiring. Encore places a tremendous value on local business spend. And it's interesting because regional -- employment has kind of a regional focus, purchasing, small business relationships can actually impact all corners of the Commonwealth, which is kind of interesting even though obviously there's also very concentrated focus on the companies in the hosts and surrounding communities.

Just a couple of notes, you know, the vendor advisory task force which the Commission has worked with and organized, I'm glad to see them referenced in the plan. They can obviously be a great source of not only helping you find potential

vendors but also providing a lot of technical assistance in financial resources to -- I think to your point, to help a company get the contract, maintain the contract, and put their business at a capacity level to maintain the contract. I'm very interested and pleased to see the plan talking about mentoring. That's key. You know, you talk about it a lot, a meaningful and ongoing business relationship, and that doesn't stop after the bid is awarded.

Going through some of the other pieces, I went back and looked at the host and surrounding community agreements. You also made commitments to purchase local gift certificates from local businesses.

>> MR. GRANATA: We did, yes.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I think Malden, for example, was, like, \$25,000. I do look at that figure as being in addition to what you plan to spend.

>> MR. GRANATA: That is our intend, yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Separate items. But I'm wondering, as you're doing this whole procurement process and introducing yourself to the community, are you publicizing the fact or making the fact aware to a business that you get introduced to that has a salon, has any other type of business that may not have that direct biddable good relationship with you but saying you might be a great candidate for us to buy some gift certificates from. And I'm just trying to think of how you are kind of formalizing that process. I think it can contribute to your WBE and VBE spend. I think that's important. But that was kind of a piece in the plan. It's not significant dollars. It may mean significant dollars to a local company, but that's a piece of the plan that I'd love to have you kind of go back and just shore up because, again, it was laid out in your host and surrounding communities.

>> MR. GRANATA: Yes, it's definitely -- it's incremental to everything discussed here. And further support of that is I was not even aware of the gift certificates until about a week or two ago when somebody said oh, Dave, by the way. So it absolutely is incremental. And I think to your point, Commissioner, we can -- we can and should think carefully about how we buy them because it can contribute to the spirit of this, even though it's aside from the goals that we've already set. So it was a new revelation for me, but -- well, I'm actually working with Jacqui's team on that right now as far as how we're going to utilize them.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. Also, again, just referencing the host and surrounding community agreements, it may be old terminology, but there was talk of making sure that businesses are quote, unquote, Wynn certified.

>> MR. GRANATA: Mm-hmm.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I'm not quite sure what that meant, but is that helping with building the level of capacity, or is it just making sure that obviously the small businesses have a vendor capacity or performance level that you would expect?

>> MS. KRUM: I think when we're talking about Wynn certified, now Encore Boston Harbor certified, they go through the process and meet the requirements that we have internally for insurance and other things. So the key -- that's been one of the key messaging points during these vendor fairs is to let them know what we require in house as well as the Gaming Commission's requirements.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.

>> MR. GRANATA: So it's a two-step process. MGC registration followed by us.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I had one question. It seems like you've made a really strong, very strong effort on the front end to recruit and to encourage, make the contacts in the communities. But I'm wondering if you have a mechanism on the back end for those firms who may have been unsuccessful to receive some feedback. And, you know, you were really strong on ABC, but there are others that may have been stronger in D and E. And that does two things. It gives folks the opportunity to improve. And secondly, it keeps them engaged. You know, lots of times if someone's unsuccessful, they say that's it. I'm done. I'm never applying again. And if you had a mechanism like that, I think that could be helpful as well.

>> MR. GRANATA: Yeah, that's great, and full honesty, no, I had not put a lot of thought into that. We do have a requirement where we -- we will respond to every -- somebody that submitted a proposal, we will say sorry, we've chosen somebody else. So what we'll never do is not ever get back to them. But no, I had not put thought into that, and I think -- I think it's a good idea. I think that's something we can develop because it can tell these interested businesses where they need to shore things up. Or maybe partner with somebody else. So I think that's great feedback. We'll work that into it.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Anything else? I believe we have to vote on this plan.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Let me just make a comment along the lines of what you introduced, this overall plan, Director. And I think there's clearly been a lot of thought put into this. There's a lot of tactics that we've heard from all the work that you've done prior to this. You know, with the committee and others. I think this document reads well because it's straightforward, as is your approach. And I really look forward to a lot of this coming to fruition. I like the anecdote that you mentioned, which was perhaps a little bit of the question I had about this MBE that thought that -- or a WBE that thought that the opportunity was going to be for others and elsewhere. But to the extent that you can make those conversations that much more ubiquitous or more recurring theme, maybe that anecdote will become an occasion to be, you know, repeated and whatnot, and that's really where the opportunity comes up for all those businesses.

>> MR. GRANATA: I think that's a challenge for the whole diversity community. I've heard that from Peter and others. And that's part of our job is to say this is real and then demonstrate it by awarding that business.

>> NADIUSKA BALLARD: And we're definitely willing to work with them. It's definitely the perception of our smaller business that they're not going to be able to be up to the scale of what we're looking for, but we are working with them and encouraging them and explaining to them that they have a chance just like anyone else does.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Madam Chair, I would move that the Commission approve the supplier diversity and commitment plan as provided by Encore Boston Harbor as included in the packet with a couple of kind of follow-up items with respect to their plan, first that at such appropriate time that they share with us their plan or strategies to address this issue around the local purchasing of gift certificates. Secondly, to the degree that they want to report back to us, I think on your suggestion about working with vendors that might not be chosen, I think that's an interesting strategy to build upon. And thirdly, that, as you said you're in the process of hiring a

diversity manager, I would invite Director Griffin at some point to, one, give us an opportunity to meet that diversity manager hire, report at any point I think as you see fit to talk about that individual's work and how you're progressing on meeting some of the diversity inclusion goals.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. I second that.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Any further discussion? All in favor.

[Vote taken]

4-0. Thank you very much.

>> MR. GRANATA: Thank you for your time.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Thank you, Jill.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Director Griffin, do we have one more item there?

>> MS. GRIFFIN: One more item.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay.

>> Morning, Commissioners.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good morning.

>> Is it still morning? Good afternoon, 12:01. So actually I'm here, I just have a brief update for you.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Well, let's introduce Crystal, Crystal Howard, our manager of Workforce, Supplier and Diversity Development.

>> MS. HOWARD: Hello again. We're on the right foot now. I just wanted to give an update about an event we're going to be hosting here at the Commission on November 5th. It's -- it will support the efforts of all three licensees and their goals toward attaining their vendor contracts and procurements with veteran-owned businesses primarily. The bid is actually ideal because this occurs in tandem with national veterans small business work which actually runs the 5th to the 9th and this event's on the 5th, as I said.

We're purposing this event primarily as a catalyst to spark greater awareness among the entire veteran community, not just the small business owners who have been identified. So we're inviting all organizations and entities that deal with veterans as a whole at all. Just to make sure that they have the knowledge of what happens here, what the casino's goals are. And actually, OSD will be here to provide some information just in general about getting certified as a VBE. So it's an opportunity for them to work with the state contracts, in general, not just us. So that will actually take place from 1:30 to 5:00 on November 5th, right here in this room. There will also be -- each licensee will get a chance to present actually what we just heard is a really good example hopefully to just energize the room and tell them of some of these VBEs who are having really great opportunities, but also to give an awareness of their opportunities that are upcoming or some events, vendor fairs that they have, that they could engage some of their veteran contacts in.

And then there will be a resource fair portion of sorts where they can just network with other individuals in the room, see what they do for veterans, how they could communicate and contact on some of this initiative in the future. Yeah. So and actually, we've heard that the interest and the appreciation from the casinos themselves is pretty high in this event. They've determined that it's important to them and that it

will be a good resource for some of the issues that they've been having in that realm anyway. I think that's it. Do you have any questions?

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah, just curious, the flier doesn't identify an RSVP. But do you have a sense as to whether there's already some people who are interested?

>> MS. HOWARD: We sent an actual invitation out on Monday. This was really just an awareness piece for you guys. The invitation has -- you just contact me. So if you guys want a copy of that invitation, I can send it to you. We have it in flier form and digital form. But we had a pretty great list. Commissioner Stebbins was actually really helpful with convening partners. Jill obviously had a lot of contacts as well. And it's growing as we go through the week, we've seen more interest. We've gotten more names, and we just keep pushing it out. There will be a reminder invite as well. So if you think of anyone or you have a contact you think should be in that room I would be willing to get this out to them.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: To Commissioner Zuniga's point, what we can do is put the information out on the website again so that people who are listening know who to contact.

>> MS. HOWARD: Yeah, absolutely. And it is on social media, Mike got it up on Tuesday on all of our social media outlets as well.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I hope many people make it.

>> MS. HOWARD: Yeah. I think it will be great.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Great.

Sounds like an excellent idea.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Great work.

>> MS. HOWARD: That's it.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you both.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Next we are moving on to Ombudsman Ziemba, and he's got a number of items. And a number of --

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Paper. A lot of paper.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: -- binders.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: He hasn't even gotten an application yet.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I was wondering when you were going to get cold.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: Thank you very much, Commissioners. Today first on the agenda that we're continuing our review of the 2019 Community Mitigation Fund guidelines for our next funding round which begins on February 1st of 2019. I'm joined here by Construction Project Oversight Manager Joe Delaney, staff attorney Carrie Turisi, director of workforce development Jill Griffin and Mary Thurlow, our program director. So full team here today.

So our review today is part of our effort to publish guidelines for the 2019 program by the first week of December. The Commission, as you know, met on September 13th to develop a list of questions to consider in reviewing the fund. Since that time we've met with the local community mitigation advisory committee in region B once. Unfortunately although our meetings have been scheduled with region A and the subcommittee on community mitigation, we've been unable to meet due to some

quorum issues. As you know, this is a really, really robust way of taking a look at the fund each year, but we find it very valuable. We get a lot of very good input from all of our local and state partners.

I'd like to thank all those members for a lot of the good advice that they have provided today. So what we're trying to do is we're not trying to finalize the guidelines. There's sort of many -- quite some ways to go before we finalize those in December. But what we're trying to do is get some consensus just on the discussion draft of the guidelines. That doesn't mean we're making any final determinations regarding what will be in the guidelines. But it's really just a draft to solicit more discussion of items that are outstanding. And indeed, just because we include something in the draft guidelines, that doesn't necessarily even mean that something will be funded in the end. As you know, it's a very exhaustive review process for all applications that we receive.

The process that we are engaged in is very similar to what we did last year. Last year we sent it out to the public to get comments, and then we reconvened to consider all the comments before we issued the guidelines. So if we can get approval for the discussion draft today, I'd recommend that the Commission put forward this draft for a comment period to end on Monday, November 19th. That's right before the Thanksgiving holiday.

So the goal would be to come back to the Commission at the December 6th meeting so the communities would have roughly about two months to put together their applications before the statutory February 1st application deadline. What we have today in the packet will most likely not be the final guidelines. We'll probably do some wordsmithing even without comments. What the draft is meant to do is provide you very significant detail regarding all the concepts that we're entertaining for the 2019 fund.

The first item that I'll just mention is that should we continue to have an overall limit for the fund, each year in order to be conservative, we take a look at available funding and what we should put out there for projected targeted spending. Even though we put out a projected targeted spending each year, in reality, we have awarded less than the targets each year. Last year we awarded pretty significantly less. As I just mentioned, it's pretty exhaustive process, but we have to make sure that we're fulfilling the statute and that all applications -- all the applications that we receive, they always look like very, very good projects, as you know. But the thing that we have to make certain is that the projects are directly connected to the casino for purposes related to that to fulfill the statute.

So currently there's approximately \$5.2 million that remains unallocated from previous years. In addition to that, we have -- we are estimating that approximately \$1.5 million will be generated by MGM Springfield this fall up until December 31st of this year. Again, we take the conservative approach when we're allocating funds for the upcoming year. We stop counting funds basically as of December 31st of the prior year just to make sure that we don't run over. The one thing that perhaps is maybe not as conservative as previous years, we held back amounts for future funding rounds in previous years. This year we're recommending that we can spend the full amount outstanding, or at least we could target that spending. With the anticipation that we will have further revenues generated as a result of the category 1 facilities.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: John, so in other words, that full amount would be

the 5.2 plus the 1.5?

>> MR. ZIEMBA: The 5.2 plus the 1.5.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So 6.7.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah, 6.7, but obviously MGM Springfield continues to create revenues so there will be more monies that go into the fund. But based on our conservative approach, we could spend that much, but in reality, we probably won't. So one thing I will mention, that \$5.2 million figure, there is an asterisk on that. We currently have one item that is on hold. We reviewed a Springfield application relative to the focus Springfield site, and we put that on hold. The Commission said basically at that time that we would award no more than \$300,000. But there were significant issues involving the anti-aid provision of the constitution that we had to take a look at. The status of that is that we have had discussions with the city of Springfield, and we're awaiting a further narrative for them on a different approach on how they would take a look at the impact that they believe is being caused in that corner of the MGM Springfield project. I don't have those documents today, but we're expecting them soon.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But they're still there, though, right?

>> MR. ZIEMBA: They're still there.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: In the location.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: They're still in that location to the best of my knowledge. I don't believe that there's been any action to move to -- to move them.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: To move them.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: As of now. So we just mentioned the total amount of funding, that 6.7, which is the 5.2 of old and 1.5 of new. Last year when we did the guidelines, the Commission included a statement of intent in its guidelines. And the statement basically said that in future years, we would consider breaking up the fund by region. As we will have new revenues in from MGM Springfield, new revenues that are anticipated from the Encore Boston Harbor facility. What we heard from our dialogue with our local partners is that both in Region A and Region B, there is an appetite for us to take a look at the fund, separate funds within the overall Community Mitigation Fund. So that, in essence, Western Mass money, MGM Springfield-generated money, could be allocated to the Western Mass region and then similarly, money in Eastern Mass would be dedicated to Eastern Mass purposes.

At the time we said that, well, this is a statewide program. We also have to account for the category 2 impacts because their method of payment, they don't pay into the mitigation fund on an ongoing basis. Category 2, as you know, goes for the horse race development fund and for local aid. So what we have in your program, in the draft program, would be the first year of that regional allocation. And so what we're recommending is that we split up the funding. So if we take -- it's easier to explain this by way of example. So if we have \$5.2 million and we anticipate that we spend about \$200,000 off of the top for the category 2 impacts, because our spending has roughly been about 170, on average, or around there. So if we allocate \$200,000 for category 2 impacts, that leaves you about \$5 million. And so if we split that up, that \$5 million of the existing funds, we would have \$2.5 million available to spend in the east and \$2.5 million to spend in the west. With the exception that we have 1.5 from new monies that we could then add to Western Mass. So with that region allocation, we could do 2.5 in

the east and 4.0 in the west. But that does take into account that because MGM Springfield is operational, it is generating new types of impacts. I don't know if you have any questions on that type of an allocation.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Just so I'm -- I've been privy to the conversations and the feedback, obviously, from the Western Mass group on this topic, I just want to be correct in assuming that if something happened in Region C, the \$85 million license fee, if it was awarded in Region C, part of that is allocated to Community Mitigation Fund, so your plan might be to take whatever Region C licensee contributes, that would be used to address community mitigation needs.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: That's exactly right. So we would take a look --

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: The initial funding so they're not, like, looking around for a pot.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: Correct. So the initial funding could come out of the licensing fees. And if we did have a Region C, the fund says that would be generated could be kept within the Region C area. One thing I will mention is just like last year, we allocated \$200,000 for technical assistance program in the event that the tribal facility moves forward. And that money's already been accounted for. So it's not new monies. But we recommend that we continue that program into next year. Those funds would not be eligible or available for technical assistance unless the Commission makes a separate vote to free those dollars up based on a determination that the construction of a facility may occur in the next fiscal year. So that also addresses that particular need.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I just mention, I was initially -- I'm going back years --

>> MR. ZIEMBA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Initially reluctant on the notion of splitting a fund like this, just from this whole theory that it diminishes flexibility for a state agency, and we are a state agency, to really look at, you know, statewide priorities. But fast forward to today and I think there's a lot of virtue, if you will, or a lot of business case to split it in some way that is equitable and rational and, you know, whatever -- really whatever money comes out of that region will go to mitigate the impacts from that region appears to be really what a lot of local partners see as equitable. There's a long history of the Western Mass region feeling like money from that region gets disproportionately spent elsewhere, notably in the east. And I understand that. They understand there will be different monies coming from each region, at least if the projection has been out like they're projected to be. So I think this is a really important year in which we would make that move. That as we are beginning the operational phase, it would be the time to entertain it and to do it. Something tells me that, you know, with this document, you will get that much more input in this regard. But I think that with a small caveat of at least a carving out a reasonable amount for the category 2, that the splitting up of the regions would ultimately make economic sense.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yeah, I would agree. I had some concerns about it at the outset, but I think through -- going through a few rounds of this, we've gained a level of experience of what expectations are, you know, revenue generated already kind of seeing what communities in the region are looking for and, again, have certain expectations about what the fund could be used for. So I think I'm a little more

comfortable with it again now kind of having a couple of years under our belt.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: One thing I will note is we included language to make sure that the Commission has the discretion, if it's necessary, to not -- very closely abide by those targeted spending. We very much view those allocations as targets. You know, it's quite clear that we have ongoing relationships with all of these communities. So if we don't adhere to those targets, we'll definitely hear about it in all of our local meetings. So if we -- if we don't adhere to those targets in any one year, there's language in this draft that says that we would try to then make it up in future years through some way, shape, form or manner. But we also have the ability to look back at this policy every single year, the guidelines are done every year, so we want to make sure that we are addressing the needs that we were told to address but try to do it fairly between the regions. And I think that this -- at least this draft, as of now, knowing what we know, goes a long way to on doing that.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And I suppose that at least in theory, we could be in a situation where, you know, in a steady state a few years from now, where we may be facing real pressure to fund a project in one region that might be in the overall less meritorious than a project in another region only because, well, the funding has been segregated. But I think, as Commissioner Stebbins was saying, with the experience that we have, the process that you've put together with all the team about, you know, being really diligent about matching an impact to the casino and whatnot, this effort is really -- this probability would be at least minimized. In terms of, you know, funding less meritorious projects.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I agree. I think it's in keeping with the legislation, which is one license to each region. So this really does follow that theory and make sense.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: Right. As for some of the other recommendations, you'll see that a number of the recommendations have not really changed since last year. There are a number of programs that we included in last year and previous years' grants, specific impact grants, transportation planning grants, nontransportation planning grants, and then reserves. Reserves that we awarded in our first year, we continue to allow those. We haven't made dramatic changes in those. We still have the specific impact grants. But the one thing I will note is that now that MGM Springfield is operational, we have now expanded the eligibility for the purposes of the specific impacts that cover both operational related and construction-related impacts. And this will be the last year where you have both because we have some construction impacts that have occurred that perhaps would be the subject of an application. In eastern Mass, we continue with the restriction that we only have construction-related impacts. Because obviously they're still in construction.

The one exception that I will state to that is that in Eastern Mass, similar to what we did in region B last year, we state that police training costs could be eligible now. Last year we funded a grant for the Springfield Police Department that enabled some of their members to fully participate in the Gaming Enforcement Unit and then other folks to get trained to then fill their spots in the Springfield PD. And basically what we are doing is an apples-to-apples comparison between that program in Western Mass and eligibility for Everett for this upcoming year. So that is one notable exception for the prohibition against doing operational-related impacts in Eastern Mass.

We still have workforce pilot programs at 300,000. I do note that this continues to be an area of great interest in all of the regions. There's a lot of support for workforce pilot programs. Undoubtedly, we'll get some comments to this during our reviews. The thought of keeping it at that same level is that hey, we will receive those comments as part of our reviews. But one of the other things that we have to think about is that there is a gaming economic development fund out there. And the gaming economic development fund lists a number of eligible purposes and job training is sort of squarely within the gaming economic development fund.

Also, both host communities have -- will have and have significant resources to bring to bear as a result of their agreements to potentially dedicate to workforce development. That doesn't say that we can't consider an increase to this amount come the December application, but at least as of now, that is some of the thought that went into that status quo operation. But I don't know if Jill, if you wanted to -- if the Commission would be interested in sort of a very brief summary of some of the successes to date, we know that we've had a lot of interactions with our grantees about this.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: We do have our Western Mass grantees coming in in November. So I'll give you highlights. In Western Mass, cumulatively, the program served 219 individuals in FY18. And we're starting to see some exciting results. Now that MGM is opening, you know, for example, the scholarship, 72 scholarships were awarded. The gaming school had an 86% completion rate. 81% were hired by MGM. And 86.7 of those individuals in the gaming school were new to gaming. So that was really exciting.

Additionally, we have individuals who were part of the adult basic education program, both English language and high school equivalency. Over 100 individuals starting to see some gains there. We have accelerated high school equivalency. That's a smaller program. 32 individuals, 5 received their high sets, high school equivalency. And a pilot line cook training is starting -- or started, and they hope to actually expand that next fiscal year.

And then in Eastern Mass, their efforts have really focused on spreading the word. And they launched a new casino career advisers network, which is composed of career centers, community-based organizations, and metro north, Boston, workforce regions of -- Metro North and Boston workforce regions. They've met five times with Encore Boston Harbor. They're learning all about the jobs and requirements. They also have a pilot culinary program that has a high placement rate as well.

Additionally, they have outreached over 400 individuals have received in-depth service like career counseling or industry orientation, application assistance, that sort of thing. So those are just the highlights. And we'll certainly share more as the word comes in.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Just to interject, I think what's been interesting about the workforce development pilot money has been we've seen in the last two years how our funds are being leveraged by the applicants to, again, tap into other monies that might be existing. I know Mark Vander Linden and I are talking with -- in terms of looking ahead to the research agenda, trying to actually figure out what communities are experiencing in terms of the workforce impact and talking with both local and statewide stakeholders to figure out what data we can look at. So as it moves along,

it's obviously having some good results. But hopefully we'll get some data that we can go back and look at and see what direct impacts we're having as well. Good work.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: To continue on, next category, transportation planning. We're not recommending much change here. There was a question that we talked about in September, which is should we expand our transportation planning grants to include the construction costs of transportation projects for the first year. And I think at this point, our answer is no with a caveat -- and I'll talk about a new proposal for a new subset of a program. But I think our answer is no for the reason that there will be a lot of evaluation of the transportation system over the course of this next year. There are a number of different lookback requirements in all of the surrounding community agreements. In addition, our Section 61 findings, Mass Dot Section 61 findings, there is going to be a tremendous amount of review of how the transportation system is accommodating MGM Springfield-related traffic. So given those outstanding reviews, we thought it would probably be wise before we started jumping into paying for actual transportation basically roadway projects.

And similarly, out here in Region A, we're still in the process of constructing the facility, and we won't know the impacts of the mitigation that they've agreed to for quite some time. However, you know, we have always focused on what do we need to do to make sure that we are ready in the event that there are any impacts beyond what we've anticipated. And what we're doing with transportation planning is getting ready. And the new proposal that I'll talk about in a little bit is also something that could be put into that same category.

I mentioned the travel impact grants. No change there. We would continue with that \$200,000. Nontransportation planning grants. We recommend that we continue with that, that program. But with one minor change. Currently we allow funds to be used for nontransportation planning, and they're really useful when it comes to economic development planning. One thing that we would specify, or recommend specifying in the guidelines is that planning would also include activity such as providing technical assistance and promotion of groups of area businesses. Not singular businesses but groups of area businesses. And what that could do is that could help prevent issues or remedy any issues if there are any impacts from MGM Springfield facility or indeed the Encore facility, area businesses that we could try to do to promote those area businesses to make sure that they succeed and we know that MGM Springfield is doing a lot of that work as well. But the grants, what we're specifying is that they could be expanded for this purpose.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: So John, remind me, we need to put this out for comment?

>> MR. ZIEMBA: Correct.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: Okay. I wanted to make sure. And I don't know, Commissioners, if you've all had a chance to review this, if you have any additional questions for John.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I think this is a very good, you know, first draft to put together. It's an incremental effort like you've done in the past to build on essentially what we've done to this day. And we look forward to hearing from the local community mitigation committees and others.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: And then once we put it out for comment, we'd come back for a more in-depth discussion and a vote.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Makes sense. Good work.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: Great, great. And there's the transit projects of regional significance. There's some detail in the guidelines that describe that. But if anybody needs further input on that, I can certainly provide that.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Great work, as usual.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: All right, good.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So at this point we'll move on to the Region A local mitigation advisory committee appointments.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: Yes. So we continue to try to make sure that we get our local committees fully membered up, if that's a word. So just recently the Commission made some appointments. We had an Everett chamber of commerce representative, Colin Kelly, one of our recent appointments. Unfortunately due to some work constraints, he is due to move on. We really thank him very much for all of his assistance that he has provided. And then we are recommending one new member, which is the economic development spot, a regional economic development spot. We're asking the Commission to approve a person by the name of Mr. David Bancroft. David works currently in Mass Development. He is the senior vice president of community development for Mass Development. In this position he's worked in the Greater Boston Region. He's responsible for the agency's Brownfield's predevelopment co-working and transformative development initiatives. He joined Mass Development in 1999. I've been telling folks in the office that I've known David for about 20 years, but I guess upon reflection, I've known David for closer to 30 years. Since we both worked in housing at the beginning of our careers.

So anyway, we look forward to his expertise and also the expertise from Vincent Panzini who would be the new chamber of commerce representative from Everett. He was born and raised in Everett and graduated from Everett High School. He began working right out of high school in the banking and related technical areas and did so for 21 years. He was educated at Bentley University with a bachelor's degree in management. In 1987, Mr. Panzini opened up a financial advisory practice in Everett and began a 31-year career in that field.

He has been particularly active in the Everett Chamber of Commerce and this year he is the President. So we think that we would be well served by these new appointees.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Madam Chair, I'd move that the Commission approve the appointments of Mr. Panzini and Mr. Bancroft to the region A local mitigation advisory committee.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Any further discussion in all in favor?

[Vote taken]

4-0. Thank you.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: Great. Commissioners, my final item is -- relates to a filing deadline that is coming up. There is a deadline for filing of legislation by state agencies. That filing deadline is the first Wednesday in November, which this year would be November 7th. Included in your packet are two pieces of legislation that we had filed in previous years in acts relative to horse racing and wagering. And the

second piece of legislation is an act to enable municipal and regional planning agency employees to fully participate in Gaming Policy Advisory Committees. Let me just start with this later one. We worked with the State Ethics Commission to craft this language. And basically what it would do is it would enable a lot of our local partners to fully participate in our advisory committees. Right now there is a danger that if you are a municipal employee or a regional planning agency employee, that you could potentially be in violation of the conflict of interest law by participating and providing advice. And basically what it is is that when you participate on our advisory committees, you become a special state employee. And so there could be a potential conflict if your local area duties also involve gaming-related duties. The ethics Commission, I think they felt very comfortable with proposing legislation that would enable those local partners to fully advise the Commission as special state employees, but they would be able to do their local duties at the same time. One thing that we will want to do is we will want to continue to work with the ethics Commission on the language. We were unsuccessful at getting this thing through this past year. And perhaps one of the obstacles might be that we tried to amend MGL Chapter 23K, which is the gaming statute. There is a lot of hesitancy about opening up that statute. So potentially we could craft language to accomplish the same mission in another method.

In addition, I think we've had some conversations about expanding the reach of this legislation to maybe cover some of our other advisory committees, and I think that we could accomplish that same thing through conversations with the ethics Commission by the time we have hearings in the spring, March or April. But as of now, we still need to do those conversations.

The next piece of legislation I'll ask General Counsel Blue to help me with this one. This is our horse racing and wagering legislation. As you know, the situation with racing and simulcasting, every year there's an open question about what will happen as there are certain deadlines that are imposed by the legislature. We had an extension of the simulcasting law right at the deadline this past year. That has been extended till July 31st of next year, of 2019. So it might be a very important thing for us to seek out all of the members that will have a hand in looking at racing legislation as early as we possibly can given that deadline and that we can work with them as much as we possibly can. I'll let General Counsel Blue talk about more specifics of that legislation.

I also just wanted to put it in context. We have these two pieces of legislation, but there are other pieces of gaming-related legislation that are very likely in the next legislative session. And specifically, as you're aware, the Supreme Court earlier this year, they had a case that involved sports gambling. And as a result, there has been a lot of movement in other states to develop legislation authorizing sports betting. Since the Supreme Court decision, a number of other states such as Delaware, Mississippi, New Jersey, West Virginia and Rhode Island have acted to legalize sports betting.

At the close of formal legislative sessions here in Massachusetts in July, there was a lot of dialogue about what Massachusetts would do in the wake of that Supreme Court decision. Chairman Joseph Wagner of the joint committee on economic development and emerging technologies said at the time, quote, we will get about the work of this quickly so that when we do convene for the 2019/2020 session, we can be ready to go. As you're aware, the Commission issued its white paper on sports betting

in February of this year. Undoubtedly, we will continue the need to be continued to provide expertise and input as the legislature intensifies its review of the sports betting issue. Together with the July 31st, 2019, expiration of the racing statutes, the Commission may be quite busy early next year on the legislative front. And with that, I'll turn it to General Counsel Blue.

>> MS. BLUE: Good afternoon, Commissioners. The racing bill that is in your packet is essentially what we filed last year. We made a couple of minor tweaks to it. We changed a shall to a may to give the Commission more flexibility. But generally the basis of the bill is that there is not a lot of definition in it. It does require the Commission to draft a lot of regulations to determine how licenses are awarded, what has to be filed, whether the Commission wants to address issues like simulcasting and live racing separately. However the Commission wanted to do that. So it is essentially the same bill. I would imagine that we are going to get comments on it like we have in previous years and hopefully this year where racing, at least on the thoroughbred side, looks like it's starting to end. Perhaps we'll get more input from the stakeholders on thoroughbred racing and maybe get some support there. So it is essentially the same. But we're certainly open to discussing it and making changes in it where appropriate.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I -- I completely understand it's the same bill we have filed, and appreciate the tweaks to it, but again, as you pointed out, as we heard on Monday, there may be no thoroughbred racing in Massachusetts after June, I think, of 2019. So I'd love to find a way for us and the stakeholders to finally be able to have a singular voice in talking with the legislature and, you know, that might mean, I think -- and also to John's point of getting the stakeholders together so that we're going to the legislative leadership with one voice. How best we can do that, I don't know, but I think it's incumbent upon us to try.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You know, to that end, I don't think there's any changes that I can see in the proposed bill. I would emphasize -- and I know we've done it in the past -- it's just not very clear in the proposed letter that we have here. Sort of like the background, it doesn't have to be lengthy. What has brought us now to this place, this is really now the third time that we've done this filing, or it may even be the fourth. Because the Gaming Act requires us to look at the state of the simulcasting and racing statutes, which were set to expire by the Gaming Act originally in '14 or '15?

>> MS. BLUE: In 2014.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 2014. And prior to that expiration, we filed bills accordingly. And the legislature has instead extended simulcasting statute, the one set to expire, now for three times. And my guess is that, you know, they don't quite recognize -- and I wouldn't blame them for that -- that, you know, the levers of the racehorse development fund and the many other moving parts work together. And to the point that you've made earlier, there needs to be, you know, a number of things in place. And one of those is at least some business certainty into what a regulatory framework might look like. I feel that, you know, our bill is flexible enough to provide that. You know, there would still have to be a number of answers, a number of details to be filled in. But I really think that this year is important more than ever to make the context that a one-year extension is, in my opinion, simply not going to cut it. Because the very likelihood that there might not even be a track to conduct the two or four or six

racing days, you know, just to draw on some of the purses. I really hope that we don't find ourselves in a situation at the end of July or June or at the end of the legislative session where some people begin to pay attention to this. They have many other priorities. That's for sure. But I really think that the context of this expiring statutes that have only been extended is important to educate the people up there as to what needs to be done. I really think this needs attention.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And I think if there's a legitimate proposal which we hear about, but it has not happened yet, we'll hear about from a number of different sources if something like that comes to fruition, then there probably would be the, you know, more interest in taking this matter seriously.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: So I don't think this requires a vote, but you understand that this is the legislation, we'll refile, pursue and monitor on sports betting.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Mm-hmm. Okay. Anything else on that topic? Thank you both very much. We'll move on to commissioner updates. Any updates today? Hearing none, do we have a motion to adjourn?

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So moved.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: All in favor.

[Vote taken]

We're adjourned. Thank you.