
P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. We are calling to order Public Meeting No. 229 on November 21, 10:00, at the Gaming Commission Office on Federal Street.

We will start out, as always, with the minutes.

Mr. Macdonald.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD:
Yes, I move that we approve the minutes of the November 9, 2017 public meeting, subject to corrections for typographical errors and for other nonmaterial matters.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
Second.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any
discussion?
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes,
Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that around the 11:47 -- well, maybe the

11:12 mark in the minutes, it's one of those things that I think the minutes really sort of summarize what took place when. And it's one of those things that, in my opinion, the vote doesn't quite capture the conclusion that we arrived at during that time. And that is that MGC had, indeed, the authority to -- the authority to set the race days -- the number of race days, which was different from what Mr. McHugh was arguing, and that we also concluded that the three statutory race dates had -- years had been met, none of which is in the summary or the vote.

We effectively -- the vote
reflects what the vote -- the minutes
reflect what the vote did, in my opinion. But there are these two other conclusions that are not reflected.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's in
the -- it's sort of in the sentence under the 12:00, where it says -- after Catherine Blue says the legislature understands there may be a need to adjust
the number of race days. It's kind of implied, but it's not clear.

So it would be easy, maybe, Sharon, to make that a little clearer in the redraft.

MS. BLUE: We can beef, you
know, up the minutes on that section.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'm
sure two sentences can deal with the point.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But there
was the point that it was -- the thought that carried that there was a compromise between the two proposal, and that's not mentioned there either.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It's ultimately reflected in the vote.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But not in the discussion.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: On
that point, that -- I should have picked
this up because I think I was the one who pressed Dr. Lightbaum on the point, is that her recommendation was 110 days, so that --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That was a fairly similar point. That's a good point, yes.

MS. BLUE: We can add both of those.

> CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Any
other thoughts?
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: So
amended.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in
favor of the motion as amended?
All opposed?
(Vote taken.)
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes
have it. Four to zero. Commissioner
Cameron is not in attendance.
Okay. We are then on to the -Mr. Bedrosian, I believe.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Good
morning, Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good
morning.
MR. BEDROSIAN: So I have
two items today.
The second item is CFAO Lennon has come out of a sick bed to give the interim --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, great.

MR. BEDROSIAN: -- budget.
Yes. We've kept him separated. We're trying to isolate him also from staff. But he -- he's feeling better and he managed to come in today. So we appreciate that.

Before we get to Mr. Lennon, I did
want to tell you that this was -- today or this week is the last week of racing at Plainridge Park Casino. The last day of the season will be Friday for 125 days.

Our HR staff is actually down at PPC today doing exit interviews with the seasonal staff, which we find valuable in preparing for next season. So, thank you
to Director Lightbaum, the leadership. We got 125 days in. And we will be looking forward to, as you discussed, about the 110 days next season. So congratulations to that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.
MR. BEDROSIAN: So with
that, I will turn it over to XX CFAO Lennon for the report of the midyear budget.

MR. LENNON: Thank you, Executive Director Bedrosian. And good morning, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good morning.

MR. LENNON: I would like to endorse DayQuil and NightQuil. They're a great product. I don't know if you need them.

But I we're here to present to you the anticipated FY '18 budget increase to support the operational costs of opening the MGM facility in Springfield.

Just for a little background,

Massachusetts Gaming Commission approved the FY '18 budget for the gaming control fund of 29.15 million. It required an assessment of 24.45 million on the licensees. A balance forward of FY '17 revenue of first quarter activity has resulted in the FY '18 budget decreasing by 24,600 , and the assessment on licensees decreasing by 872,000, from 24.45 million to 23.58 million.

When the Commission approved the FY '18 initial budget, it was with the initial knowledge that MGC operational costs associated with the startup of MGM in Springfield were not included.

We explained in the June 2017
public meetings the reason for not including this start-up cost was due to the fact that it was still at least 16 months from the opening of the facility, and the timetable was approximate, and delays could result in the MGC budgeting and assessing for costs not associated with FY '18.

At this point, MGM continues to believe that they will meet its opening date. Therefore, as promised in June, we're presenting to you our additional anticipated needs in FY '18. We are ready to open the MGM facility in September of 2018.

The same information was presented to our licensees and discussed at a meeting on November 15 in our office.

The chart on Page 2 of the memorandum greatly anticipated 570,000 in additional costs $X X$ out by object class and codes. The memo breaks it out further by division.

The majority of the costs are for
14 FTs; one each in human resources and finance and administration; 11 in the IEB, all gaming agent or supervising gaming agents, and one additional license coordinator.

The next biggest area is contracted employees, in which we are asking for four: three civilian
contracted investigators to supplement the MSP efforts, and one licensing representative in Springfield, which I have -- in the memo I have listed as starting in March of 2017 , which someone pointed out to me is incorrect and should read March of 2018.

There are another 64,000 of costs for GameSense, responsible gaming outreach efforts prior to the opening, and then some additional operational costs of circuits and temp help.

Page 3 of the memo lays out the regulatory authority the Commission has to increase its budget during the fiscal year, as well as what the increase would look like to licensees if this were ultimately approved in regard to our assessment.

We're asking to have this plan posted for public comment and bring this back to you for further discussion or a vote at the first public meeting in December.

If you have any questions on any of the information in the memo, we're open to field them now.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Comments?
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yes.
Thank you. I'm glad you're feeling a little bit better.

A couple of quick questions.
You break out contract employees versus temporary help. Why not just push those together, or are there different responsibilities of the two groups that --

MR. LENNON: So contract employees function more like a regular employee, but they have a time-specific start and end date. It's a whole separate procurement and posting process. Temp help, we go to a temp help agency, which there are three on the statewide contract, and ask for the specific people. Where with the contracted employee, you actually hire, like it's a person, it just has a start and end time on it. It's not a regular $F T$ that continues until we break
service with them.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Different responsibilities for both groups?

MR. LENNON: There are
different responsibilities for both groups on the licensing side.

If you recall, during the first opening where we were flooded with Plainville, the temp people came in and literally just sifted through the paperwork and helped out, in a capacity that didn't need a lot of hands-on work, and they're more just clerical-type help.

Where with the contracted employee, the person out in Springfield that we're looking at, they would be the face of the MGC. They would be a higher position. They would have to do some of the filtering through paperwork.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Okay. When you get down to the schedule for IEB team and hires, and maybe, Bruce,
you can help answer this question, too,
you're going to have four experienced agents, hopefully, we bring in February 2018, and then you talk about seven supervisor gaming agents. So I'm assuming those would be gaming agents that --

MR. BAND: Yes, and backfill
for people that have moved to other positions.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Okay.
MR. BAND: But for the four
experienced, we're down two people now, one with Ryan leaving our agency and Miss Storrow being promoted, it leaves us two short.

Soon we will have to send some people out in MVM to start doing some inspections.

So I need to backfill with some people that we don't necessarily have to give extensive training to --

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Right.
MR. BAND: -- but in order
to staff it. And we'll be starting training of the new agents about mid-May, and that will take some more of our staff as trainers to do that.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So is
that four, backfilled two and add two, or add four?

MR. BAND: Well, we're -- we just want to bring it back up to, like, twelve, and to have that staffed and that way we would have a full complement. And we're actually kind of getting beaten up a little bit now, which we're trying to avoid.

Our staff is -- we've frozen
vacation for July, August and the beginning of September. And so people are trying to take their time now, which, you know, compounds the issue.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But it's an increment of four?

MR. LENNON: It's an
increment of four.
So if you look at it, even with
the backfills, that one way we're talking about, those are already budgeted.

So we're down right now, which is
why Bruce alluded to the fact that we're using some overtime, but these would be four additional positions. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I did have a question on the timing on that. And it sounds, in my view, which is great, there's some work to do up front, and including some of these backfilling that you talked about.

There's a January start for the field manager, and then four senior supervisor agents in February.

Why do we feel the need to start -MR. BAND: They will start -COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- A
few months --
MR. BAND: They will
actually be out at MGM in mid-January. They'll be working with MGM staff on their
submissions starting March 1st.
The cameras start going online and the slots going on the floor.

The way we're planning to do the slots is that we will accompany MGM. So when they do their inspection, we'll do our inspection to save time, but that's going to make me have somebody there with them through the whole day that they work. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And we also anticipate having some of the other senior supervisors there?

MR. BAND: Yes, yes.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So are we really thinking about six or seven people, you know, in Springfield since February?

MR. BAND: It will be needed to get them open in a timely fashion and to work with property on any questions.

We've already started doing some inspections, like the walls, the cage, the money areas and those kinds of inspections have already started. So...

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do you
want to add to that?
MR. LENNON: Yes. That timetable is consistent with, what our CMS team, as well as our IT team is looking at to get out there and start doing some of the turnover of the floor and the inspections.

So we've already been trained. I know the IT team has, as well as the CMS team, on OSHA requirements to be out on the property starting in January.

So that's -- that's not unreasonable to ask, I think, what Bruce is looking for.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: So
Bruce, the slots are -- actually, the machines are going to be installed as early -- beginning to be installed as early as March?

MR. BAND: Beginning new zones in March. There's a lot of wiring that's involved with that. HYou've got to test the machine to make sure it's
communicating with everything. So it's a timely process to get the floor all laid out.

Once you lay it out, certain machines don't look as good in certain spots. So it means relocating it and just keeping up with all that. COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: And your people, at that time in the process, do what? They actually test the machines? MR. BAND: They will be working in conjunction with the XX NOC to verify that the chips and the new-built test on the machine, you know, that aspect of it.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: One, just a quick question.

I'm glad to see that we're responding to the availability and somebody who wants to register for the voluntary self-exclusion list.

You know, the GameSense person coming on in January, are they going to -I mean, they're going to be in our space,
but is that space because of ongoing construction going to be readily accessible by a patron or a person who wants to walk up, or are we thinking about --

MR. BAND: I don't know
how -- in the building itself, they would not be allowed to go in because it's still under construction.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Right. I mean, we still have rent on UMass space. I mean, it may make sense -MR. LENNON: We could always use that spot. Yeah, that spot is highly underutilized at this point. So we would work out whatever they...

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Some of these -- all of these items, in general, strike me as a little conservative, which is fine for budgeting purposes.

But I know that as we post for positions and we have -- some of them are promotions and fit very easy to transfer
or transition. Others are new hires, and that could take more than sometimes anticipated in terms of background checks and all that.

So I'm generally okay with some of these for budgetary purposes. I do think that we may be, in general, conservative on the start dates. But I know these -- this changes as you need to.

MR. BEDROSIAN: I agree with
Commissioner. The best laid plans aren't always what actually happens in terms of the hiring process.

But, obviously, we need to post this, get comments, and come back to the Commission for final thoughts or approval. But we will be conservative with the thought process.

And operationally, what often
happens is we say January. That ends up being February or even in March or something like that.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Or you
intend bring four and end up bringing three because somebody falls off and a person later --

MR. BEDROSIAN: Exactly.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- AND
you have to manage all of that.
I do think, maybe because I'm a
little bit more familiar with that, but the information technology and finance administration, and human resources, some of these we're already seeing that need. And there's a brand new process in all table game revenue, and we had identified that, I believe, earlier as something that we need to reinforce.

MR. LENNON: Okay.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'm glad that's all...

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes, I
think Commissioner Zuniga's instinct to want to scrub the numbers and look really hard at them is a really good instinct, and we'll continue -- we need to continue to do that.

But also, I think that the notion of at the launch, $X X$ erring on the side of timing is extra time is perfectly appropriate, and I think you've concluded the same thing.

You can cover up a lot of problems, but not having people there yet is an issue.

So I think it makes sense, for sure, because things never go like they want.

So I both agree with the need to really keep a sharp eye out, but also agree it has to be cautious.

Any other comments on the budget?
So the process now?
MR. BEDROSIAN: Would be that we would post it for comment.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
MR. BEDROSIAN: And then
come back to the Commission.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So it will
be available for public comment for the next couple of weeks. And we'll bring it
up again in two weeks at our next meeting. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'll
make one final comment, which I think is really a great way to go, which Commissioner Stebbins was also asking about our mix of civil, temporary and contract work force to deal with the traffic, with the peek, I guess, with the workload that's going to come for some period of time. I think it's very appropriate. So that's a great...

MR. BEDROSIAN: Okay. Thank
you, Mr. Lennon. You are excused.
MR. LENNON: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you
folks. Jump back in bed.
MR. BEDROSIAN: Thank you,
Commissioners. That is all I have.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.
Next up is Item No. 4.
General Counsel Blue.
MS. BLUE: So Commissioners,
we have for you today a number of
regulations, all of which, except for B,
you've seen before, and B is fairly simple. So we'll go one by one.

The first item 4A, what you have before you is only the small business impact statement. We've brought to you the 205 CMR 138.33 before. That's on the unsecured $X X$ wagers. Today we're just asking for your approval of the small business impact statement so we can start the formal process and then take this through the promulgation.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Comments?
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Mr. Chairman, I move the Commission
approve this small business impact statement amendments to 205 CMR 137.02 as included in the packet, and authorize the staff to take the steps necessary to begin the regulation promulgation process.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
discussion?

All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes have it unanimously.

MS. BLUE: Thank you.
Item 4B arose out of some questions that we got, and it's an attempt to clarify our regulation.

When certain people at the gaming school looked at our regulation, they were concerned that you had to take responsible gaming training for 90 minutes with each separate course you took on gaming, which means you could take it up to six times. We realize that was not our intent.

So this is a clarification of that regulation that, basically, says you only have to take the one 90 -minute course, no matter how many courses you take in the gaming school.

So we want to just get this through so the gaming school will have it and they ask adjust their curriculum
appropriately.
So today we have before you the small business impact statement and the amended regulation, and we're asking for your approval to start the promulgation process for that.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yes, this came out of some of the community colleges were putting estimates together. It was a rather surprising amount of money to complete this training when we went back.

It's helpful to kind of make this distinction, not only for, you know, the community colleges but some private operator who decides to come along to get licensed will understand the requirements.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I think it's great to clarify whenever we a need to.

I don't know how anybody read -the way that it previously read, how anybody read that it applied to every single time, unless it was self-serving,
of course.
But I'm all for it, this
clarification.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I
move that the Commission approve this small business impact statement for the amendments to 2005 CMR 138, 128, 138.33, 138.68 and 140.02 , as included in the packet, and authorize the staff to take the necessary -- the steps necessary to begin the regulation promulgation process.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY:
Discussion?
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Should we have our motions --
MS. BLUE: I think you --
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I
think my motion was for this one. I
didn't know it was laid out as 4A.
I think the motion Commissioner
MacDonald gave us was for --
MS. BLUE: For 4A?
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: --
for 4A.

I mean, we're taking care of it, but maybe we're doing it in a different order.

MS. BLUE: I agree with you, Commissioner Stebbins, you are correct.

So, why don't -- 4A, I think on your documents is really what's supposed to be 4B.

So why don't we do 4B at the moment, and then we can go back and do 4A appropriately.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: 4B, yes.

MS. BLUE: If you would use the motion for 4B, Commissioner MacDonald, I think that would work for 137.02 .

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Which is 4A?
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: As
to 137.02.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Which is the 4A page.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD:
That's the language that Commissioner

Stebbins --
MS. BLUE: No. What I have
on 4A is for small business impact statement and amendments to 205 CRM 137.02. That's for the Responsible Gaming Regulation.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I
see. Okay.
Accordingly, I move that the
Commission approve the small business impact statement amendments to 205 CMR 137.02, as included in the packet, and authorize the staff to take the steps necessary to begin the regulation promulgation process.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes have it
unanimously.
MS. BLUE: Commissioner
Stebbins, if you would move 4A now.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This will
be a revision of the first motion --
MS. BLUE: Revision of the
first motion.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I
move that the Commission approve the small
business impact statement for the
amendments to 2005 CMR 138.28, 138.33,
138.68, and 140.02, as included in the packet, and authorize the staff to take the steps necessary to begin the regulation promulgation process.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes have it
unanimously.
MS. BLUE: And then,
finally, 4C. These are the racing
medication regulations.
You first saw them probably about six months ago. We passed them on an emergency basis.

They have gone through the promulgation process. They have been with the legislature for the required 60 days that they have to be there.

So now we're just asking you to approve that draft and approve the amended small business impact statement, and we'll finalize these regulations.

The racing has operated under these for this entire season. They seem to have worked well. We haven't seen any particular uptick in hearings.

I can't speak for the judge's rulings, but in terms of appeals, we haven't seen any more than the normal number of appeals.

So these are the RCI regulations,
so we're coming into conformance with the national standards.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I --
it's been chatted about, with Counsel Blue and Deputy General Counsel Grossman, earlier, we have -- we've kind of followed the ARCI standards. I think it helps provide some uniformity for the industry across jurisdictions.

I shared with them what kind of jumped out at me in the small business impact statement was a reduction in the these multiple medication violations.

To me, it seems kind of
counterintuitive, but if it's consistent with the ARCI model for that other jurisdiction through adopting, I'm willing to -- I'M willing to approve it, but I want to gain some experience under this and see how we do.

Again, reducing penalties for being caught the second, third or fourth time just seems a little counterintuitive, but I'm willing to work with the staff and
kind of watch it and see how penalties are imposed when we find violations in Massachusetts.

MS. BLUE: I think if it's helpful, Commissioner, I think Dr. Lightbaum had a chance to talk with Commissioner Stebbins, and I asked her to send me an e-mail so I could understand what the reason was for the change. And as she described to me, the decision to lower the point was made because they could add up quicker than people had anticipated and it put trainers with a large number of horses at a disadvantage.

And that, to some degree, makes sense to me. The more horses you have, the more potential you have for a violation.

And that the people at RCI, the trainers and the judges, in fact, our own judges are comfortable with this.

But I also agree with Commissioner Stebbins that we need to take a look at it and see how it works in our jurisdiction,
and we always have the ability to differ from the RCI regulations if we think that's appropriate.

So we'll keep an eye on it. We'll look at it from this season. We'll look at it again for the next meet and see how it works.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I think we should keep an eye on it. But, you know, I think that repeat offenses on banned substances would certainly be counterintuitive. But these substances are therapeutic and it's about dosages, which is why in conjunction with the number of horses, the point that you make is, my suspicion, why the $R C I$ is going in the direction they're going, but let's keep an eye on it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Let's make a note somewhere, Commissioner Stebbins, because probably it would be after next year's meet, we would then have the data to go back and take a hard look.

Would that be compatible with
your --
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Sure. I mean, there's also a little bit more discretion built for -- just to kind of follow the progress and how we're implementing it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We have a
lot going on, and I don't want to for get --

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: No, no, no.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: -- A year
from now. So let'sd put in the record, and Alex puts it on her calendar, you put on your calendar, at this time next year we do some formal analysis which will be really interesting.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Absolutely.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.
Further discussion?
Do we have a motion?
MS. BLUE: We need a motion,
the item 4C on your papers.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I
move that the Commission approve the amended small business impact statement in its final version of 205 CMR 3.00, racing medication regulations, and the amended small business impact statement and final version 205 CMR 4.00, racing medication regulations, as included in the packet, and authorize the staff to take all steps necessary to file the regulation with the Secretary of the Commonwealth and complete the regulation promulgation process.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Second.

> CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote-taken.)
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes have it unanimously.

MS. BLEW: Thank you.
That's all we have.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. And
we are open to Director Vander Linden, et al.

Do you want to take a few minuets?
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Do you
need time to set up?
MR. VANDER LINDEN: Either
way.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Let's take a quick five. We'll come back.
(Recess taken from 10:28 a.m. to 10:33 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are reconvening Public Meeting 229 at about 10:35.

We are going to Director Vander Linden.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Good
morning, Commissioners.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good
morning.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD:
Good morning.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: I'm going to go down the line here, and I'm going to introduce our research team from the Cambridge Health Alliance.

To my immediate right we have Dr. Debi LaPlante. She's the director of research and academic affairs at the Cambridge Health Alliance, as well as assistant professor of psychiatry at Harvard Medical School.

Next to Debi we have Dr. Matt Tom, who is a research data analyst with the Cambridge Health Alliance.

And then Pradeep Singh.
Dr. Pradeep Singh, also a data analyst
with the Cambridge Health Alliance.
And Dr. Tim Edson, data analyst with Cambridge Health Alliance.

Thank you all for joining us here today.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We never had so many Ph.D.s in this building.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: I wanted
to just give you a little taste of
background about where we were and where things stand before $I$ turn it over to the -- to Debi and Matt to go over the evaluation.

So a key educational objective of
the Massachusetts Gaming Commission responsible gaming framework is to provide accurate and balanced information to enable informed choices to be made about gambling activities.

To support this objective, Strategy 2 of the framework identifies measures, including the development and implementation of play management tools. Such tools are incorporated into electronic game machines, slot machines, to enable players to more easily track their play, manage their gaming decisions and to obtain real-time individualized feedback.

In December of 2014, the
Commission voted to adopt a play management system, what we call now PlayMyWay, in cooperation with Plainridge

Park Casino.
Because the body of research supporting the effectiveness of these tools was limited and even inconclusive, the Commission specified the implementation would be on a test basis and that a determination of whether this program continues, and extended Category 1 casinos would be informed in part by the findings of an evaluation.

So following 18 months of development with Scientific Games in Plainridge Park Casino on June 9, 2016, PlayMyWay was launched at Plainridge Park Casino as a benefit to PlayMyWay card members. Patrons have the opportunity to enroll in the program at any slot machine, GameSense kiosk or GameSense advisor at the information center inside of the casino.

PlayMyWay prompts cardholders to voluntarily choose daily, weekly and/or monthly budget to track their spending at Plainridge Park Casino. Once enrolled
patrons receive automatic notifications as they approach 50 and 75 percent of their spent budget. Players also receive notifications when they reach 100 percent of their budget. And then if they choose to continue to play, they'll receive notifications at 25 percent intervals.

The program is strictly voluntary and players can unenroll, adjust their budgets or un -- or adjust their budgets or enroll at any time from any slot machine or electronic gaming device or at the kiosk or at the GameSense information center.

Today our research team from the Cambridge Health Alliance Division on addiction will present findings from a preliminary study of patrons' use of PlayMyWay during the period of June 2016 to January 2017.

Before I turn it over to Debi and Matt, I would just really want to call out a few people here.

Plainridge Park Casino has been an
incredible partner in launching this program. This is a new program. It hasn't been done in the United States. And Plainridge Park Casino and National Gaming were willing partners to introduce this type of responsible gaming tool to their floor. They were instrumental in the development. They were instrumental in the launch and in the ongoing operation of this program.

I'd like to call out Scientific Games as well. They are the developers of this specific tool. It runs on the casino management system of Plainridge Park Casino.

It's a rather complex explanation, but Scientific Games has been key in the development, ongoing upgrades and updates to the system.

The Cambridge Health Alliance, in all the twists and turns of developing this program, they've been responsive in dealing with data issues, changes in the scope of what we were doing to have a
report today in the ongoing evaluation.
Then, finally, and certainly not least of all, is our GameSense advisors, the GameSense program in the Mass Council on Compulsive Gambling, they, I think -- I don't believe it's accurately reflected in here that we can possibly quite capture it, but the importance of the GameSense program overall in how PlayMyWay fits within that overall strategy is key.

I think it's -- we have a lot to thank them for, their support and their enthusiasm about this specific program.
So --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Mark, before you go on, I would like to just expand on that a little bit, because I think it's an important message.

One of the principal -- the primary principals of the so-called Reno model, which is kind of the basic framework that people have used as an underpinning of the conceptual framework of responsible gaming strategies is that
collaboration among all the industry partners is required to be constructive in going forward.

That's easier said than done.
And in this instance, this thing
we call PlayMyWay, we call it a play management system, is also referred to in -- previously referred to as precommitment system.

Precommitment, having either requiring or offering the opportunity of players to limit their play is -- has been a tremendously controversial strategy within the industry, where all of the -all of our licensees were initially highly predisposed against trying it any further.

Even Cambridge Health Alliance's principals have been pretty strong critics of previous precommitted strategies.

But everybody -- we have the authority to make this be a trial if we want it to, but we didn't want to just go out and order it. We wanted to do it in collaboration with our licensees, if that
were possible.
And to their great credit, they all suspended disbelief, said, Yeah, let's give it a shot. And as you said, Pen National, who is our test site, has been an extraordinary collaborative partner, and our other licensees have been supportive as well, to the point where some of them are considering the possibility of adopting some such system themselves.

And Cambridge Health Alliance put their shoulder to the wheel and helped us design it and now help us evaluate it.

As you say, this couldn't have happened as successfully without everybody's support.

But it is a -- it's a very
powerful reinforcement of the fact that trying to figure out how to get collaboration, if you can get collaboration, it makes life much easier. In this case, it required some serious suspension of disbelief or suspension of
skepticism on the part of the number one partners to go forward.

So it's a credit to you because you kinds of led this fight, but it's also a really a tremendous credit to them. And I think the licensees, in particular, deserve real serious recognition for being willing to participate in this with us.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Debi, I
think if you want to lead the presentation.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good
morning.
MS. LA PLANTE: Good
morning. Thank you, Mark, and thank you, Commissioners, for having us here today.

As Mark said, my name is Debi LaPlante. I'll be sharing and overview of our study of PlayMyWay.

My colleagues, Matt, Tom, Pradeep Singh and Tim Edson are here with me today and available to help answer any in-depth questions that you might have about these findings.

So for the purposes of full disclosure, I want to recognize that the Massachusetts Gaming Commission provided the funding for this study. And I also want to recognize the other current sponsors of the Division's research.

I also want to acknowledge the Division on Addiction, who supported this work and other related work. We're grateful for their support.

And I will start today by providing a little bit of background information for this study.

So, now, although all of you are well-versed about the gambling-related changes that have happened in Massachusetts, for new listeners, I'll do a quick recap.

During 2011, Massachusetts legalized gambling expansion. Active licenses included Plainridge Park Casino, Wynn Boston Harbour, MGM Springfield, though other developments are possible.

> Part of this legislation included
public health and responsible gambling requirements. To start the Gaming Commission fulfilling those requirements with three programs, the GameSense program, voluntary self-exclusion, and PlayMyWay.

The 2011 legislation also required some annual research program to monitor gambling in Massachusetts. Some projects under this requirement include the Seigma and Magic study; research around special populations, such as veterans and ethnic minorities; public safety research; and evaluation studies of the responsible gambling programs and activities.

This presentation concerns the evaluation of PlayMyWay at Plainridge Park Casino, which is a precommitment of play management budget system.

Some people not might not be familiar with the term "precommitment." Simply put, precommitment refers to a system that enables gamblers to set money and time limits expenditure prior to the
commencement of a session of play. There are a number of varieties of such systems that might include stop-losses, or stop-wins, or focus on time limits.

Systems can take a hard-stop approach, which means that the system itself prevents a user from further gambling once a limit is reached; or a soft-stop approach, which means that the system leaves the final decision about whether to keep gambling or not to the gambler.

Scientific Games, as Mark
mentioned, developed the system that is in use in Plainridge Park Casino. They've used a variation of this system in other jurisdictions, including Australia. When PlayMyWay launched at Plainridge Park Casino, Derek Mooberry, the executive vice president and chief executive of gaming at Scientific Games said, "Using our systems to help players play responsibly and within their budgets is a great step forward."

A goal of evaluative research such as this is to provide information to the Gaming Commission for understanding whether or not this is the case.

To that end, there are several purposes to this study.

First, we sought to complete the first phase of the planned multiyear research and development agenda.

This study and these results that we'll discuss today are not the end of the story.

Second, we wanted to describe the initial use patterns of PlayMyWay.

Third, we hope to study a sample of PlayMyWay users and provide a first look at how the use of PlayMyWay might relate to gambling activity.

And fourth, we aim to lay the foundation for future evaluative work and the development of data-informed goals for the system.

What do I mean by that?
Well, we see this study and the
development of PlayMyWay as part of an iterative feedback loop and reporting loop. It starts with an initial program development and moves to monitoring and assessment, and in particular, safety, effectiveness, and impact.

After such assessment, the loop
includes a summarization of findings, which are contained in the comprehensive report that will be available on the Gaming Commission's website and on the Division's website. This includes the identification of areas in need of improvement.

The final phase of the loop includes revising the program to achieve the improvements according to the desired goals.

So I'll segue now to how we actually went about all of this.

The PlayMyWay software system is available to marquee rewards cardholders.

It's a voluntary system, and users can designate any combination of daily,
weekly or monthly loss budgets.
The system provides its users with notifications when they approach, reach and exceed their self-determined budgets. Users have the option to play beyond their budgets. This is a soft-stop approach.

At EGM, electronic gaming machines or GameSense kiosks, people can enroll, unenroll, set budgets, change budgets, and check their actual gambling spending.

I'll briefly describe the setting for PlayMyWay.

Plainridge Park Casino is a slot parlor with about 1,365 gaming stations, places where people can actually place a bet. The most common betting unit that we observed was one cent, and almost all game stations on the casino floor during our study period have betting limits of one dollar or less.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD:
Excuse me, Debi. Repeat that again. I was struck by that.

The most common betting unit is
one penny?
MS. LA PLANTE: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD:
What does that mean? People bet with just a penny?

MS. LA PLANTE: Yes. Yes,
penny slots.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That
don't mean every time they spin, it's worth one penny. The maximum bet on the penny combinations could be as much as five dollars on one spin.

MS. LA PLANTE: One of the unique things about the study is the data that we used.

Many program evaluations rely on survey research, which can suffer from limitations, like poor response rates or self-report biases, such as faulty memory, self-preservation of facts, or just miscomprehension of what you're asking.

This study used actual gambling and PlayMyWay system records. Therefore, it didn't struggle with these issues.

There were other issues that we did struggle with, but I'll get to those later in this presentation.

We had two primary sources of data for this study period of June 8, 2016 to January 31, 2017.

The first source is the ACSC server data. From this server, we were provided with data tables that included machines that they had, user demographics, cards and cash activity, and gambling activity with and without PlayMyWay active.

The second is the PlayMyWay server. From this server, we had data that included things like enrollment and unenrollment records, budgets and budget sizes, and notifications.

In an ideal world, these two sources of records would be linked for this research; that is, we would be able to tie the records for an individual from one server to their records on the other server. This would allow us to answer
interesting questions like, Does gambling behavior change once people enroll in PlayMyWay? Or does gambling behavior change once people receive a budget notification?

However, the link there was not available to us at the time of this study, and we couldn't answer questions like these in this report.

As I'll discuss in more detail at the end of this presentation, we're working with Frameworks for Casino, the Gaming Commission and Scientific Games to secure usable linked records for future research.

So what data do we actually get from these servers?

The ACSC server included records from about 101,000 marquee key rewards cardholders, of which nearly 60 percent were women and three-quarters were from Massachusetts. Most individuals were in their late fifties.

The PlayMyWay server and data
included records from about 7,500 program enrollees.

Now describing every single result that was in our report is beyond the scope of this presentation and probably your desire for how long we would like to speak.

Today, our general focus areas include cash activity, such as bill insertion, gambling activity such wagering behavior, and PlayMyWay activities, such as enrollment.

One point of clarification, under "Gambling Activity," by PPC visitations, we refer to the days that a person goes to Plainridge Park Casino and places at least one bet or pays for at least one handle pull.

Now, usually a recap of study limitations waits until the very end of a presentation. However, because of the uniqueness of this approach and the available data that we had, I thought it was important to state some of the
limitations prior to reporting on the results. I'll reiterate them again later.

First, none of the results provide causal evidence related to PlayMyWay. That is, it's not possible at this time to say whether PlayMyWay caused one outcome or another.

Second, although some analyses reflect general precommitment goals, these aren't the only goals that are possible and are not informed by the current analyses.

There's little available publicly -- there's little publicly available research that looks at precommitment by using actual gambling records. This means that determining the evaluative benchmarks in advance for this project would have been difficult.

Without the information provided by this study -- with the information provided with this study, the Gaming Commission will be able to make data-informed decisions about how they
would like PlayMyWay to operate moving forward, and subsequently, more specific evaluative approaches can emerge.

Finally, there are some important known data limitations. These include, for instance, unexplained gaps in gambling records for PlayMyWay users, our inability to link the PlayMyWay records and the ACSC records that $I$ described before, and data idiosyncrasies that led to data loss, depending on the date of PlayMyWay enrollment.

That said, what do we know about PlayMyWay?

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Can
I stop you there? What's the order or magnitude of these unexplained gaps in the data loss that you refer to here?

MS. LA PLANTE: What is the most severe data limitation? Is that what you're asking?

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: NO, just the -- you described here unexplained gaps in the gambling records and data
loss, data pole, et cetera.
My question is sort of, the phrase
I used was an order of magnitude. Is there any way of sort of generalizing as to how serious the gaps were, for example, what the data loss was?

MS. LA PLANTE: We observed data loss for a few weekends. Some of them were might be just -- might be key weekends, for example, over the 4 th of July holiday.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: So two weekends out of a six-month period?

MS. LA PLANTE: It was more
than two weekends. It was closer to three- or four-day gap instances.

MR. TOM: There are a few of
those. There are a few evenings, consecutive evenings that were lost or that we didn't have data for.

So it's hard to say whether you
could interpret from other data or we could -- it's not something that you can -- I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: You
want to get the mic closer to you.
MR. TOM: I don't -- I can't
really draw any immediate conclusions as far as whether it's possible to recover that data or anything else, do any similar processes.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD:
We're talking A relatively small number of weekends out of the period?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It's an eight-month period. It's about eight months.

I remember, actually, July 4th, it was something related to the CMS, that there was some loss of data.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: In terms of a period of time in comparison to the overall period, it's actually very small, the percentage of time where the -- where there are those types of gaps for whatever reason.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD:
Thank you.

MS. LA PLANTE: So I'll start
right now with some basic enrollment and unenrollment information that we observed using the PlayMyWay server data.

We noted that PlayMyWay breaks down into three primary types of enrollments: Stable enrollees who enrolled in PlayMyWay and then remained enrolled in PlayMyWay throughout our study, about 85 percent of people were stable.

Erratic enrollees, who enrolled, then unenrolled, and then re-enrolled by the end of the study period.

Then drop-outs who enrolled and unenrolled by the end of the study period, so a minority, about 14 percent.

Gross enrollment, the red line on top, during our study period increased steadily over time, as did gross unenrollment, the green line, be it at a much lower rate.

The ACSC server data contains evidence that over 8,800 people enrolled
in PlayMyWay.
However, the data we received from the PlayMyWay server only had enrollments for roughly 7,500 cardholders. This suggested that some information might have been lost from the PlayMyWay server. We don't have an explanation beyond that.

As you might expect, enrollment rates by date were higher after the program launched when there was an intense introductory promotional period, and decreased over time and seemed to flatten and stabilize by the end of the study period.

Now, recall that 85 percent of people were stably enrolled in PlayMyWay. Among the 15 percent of others who were erratic or remained unenrolled, this graph shows that unenrollment happened fairly quickly, within the first day.

It's difficult to tell what actually happened during that first day from this graph. So in the next, we'll take a closer look.

Here you can see what actually happened during that first day. Using arbitrary time units we observed specifically that about 5 percent of all unenrollments occurred within the first minute after enrollment. About one-third of unenrollments occurred within the first hour, and half occurred by the end of the first day of enrollment.

So among minority who unenrolled, it happened quickly for about half of them. Among the rest of the minority who unenrolled, it speaks low, about three-quarters unenrolled after a month. The final unenrollment in our sample occurred 232 days after enrollment.

To sum up, enrollment appeared to be mostly stable during our study period, but daily enrollments in the program decreased over time before stabilizing.

A minority of people actually unenrolled in the program, but when they did, it tended to happen quickly as soon as the first day.

I'd like to turn now to some
observations that we made about individuals' use of PlayMyWay and their cash and gambling activity. These observations utilized data from the ACSC server. And then we compare nonusers, that is people who have never had a record of using PlayMyWay, with PlayMyWay users, that is people who ever had a record of using PlayMyWay.

Please note that ever having a record of using PlayMyWay does not imply that those people always used PlayMyWay. It just refers to the fact that they have an enrollment record. Their cash and gambling activity records include a mixture of play that is and is not associated with PlayMyWay.

The group designates people who are willing to sign up for the program.

One of first things we examined was Plainridge Park Casino visitation trends by PlayMyWay use. We call it PPC visitation trends refer to records that
indicate that an individual gambled at Plainridge Park Casino on a particular day.

If someone visited without gambling, they would not be counted. If someone gambled without use of their marquee rewards cards, they wouldn't be counted.

On the left you can see a cumulative number of visits per day for nonusers, and on the right, you see a cumulative number of visits per day for PlayMyWay users.

For nonusers in the red, we see a marginal increase in a cumulative number of nonuser visitors during the summer months, relative to winter months, and a cumulative number of PlayMyWay visitors per day increased initially, that's in the blue, and the months of December and January we see a drop in PlayMyWay using visitors to Plainridge Park Casino.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Does
this -- sorry, does this say if you
overlay those two, it looks like, in general, particularly after the first few months or first maybe month, that the PlayMyWay users are more intense standards. At any given point in time there are more, a higher percentage of users gambling than there are nonusers.

Am I interpreting that right?
MS. LA PLANTE: I think that
what may appear that -- it might appear that way because the scales are different on these.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, the scales are different.

MS. LA PLANTE: Yes. Yes, and that's so you can see what's happening within the group.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: In terms of the number of visits, they are roughly the same?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: They are.
MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. Do
you do that, you don't really profile
them. You can pull out certain profile points, but you don't really profile them side by side.

I mean, you do talk about men versus women, you do talk about age, but frequency of visit and out of play, you don't really profile them.

It could be something interesting to see at some point would be to, as many variables as you can think of, what are the profiles of nonusers and what are the profiles of users.

MS. LA PLANTE: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Can
I ask you a question that I look at these graphs beforehand and I wrote myself a note as to what I thought that it represented, and I'm just -- I'll just read you my note and you tell me if I'm wrong.

Overall, a generally similar pattern, but PlayMyWay users increased visitation later in the year in the September to November period, while
nonusers peeked in July and August.
Is that right?
MS. LA PLANTE: That -- that
would sum up those graphs, correct.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Oh, okay.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good job.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: So
I get an A.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Due to
chance, there's no -- right?
MS. LA PLANTE: We don't
know right now, this could be a
characteristic of the time period that we looked at. We don't know whether it's just an idiosyncratic aspect of this particular snapshot.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay.
MS. LA PLANTE: Or something more characteristic.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: And to
add on to that, the sample of PlayMyWay users is a much, much smaller sample than the overall visitors, nonPlayMyWay
visitors to Plainridge Park Casino. So there may be some differences in there, but it could have something to do with just the sample size for PlayMyWay users.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
PlayMyWay users are not necessarily a representative sample of the overall population.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Right.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
Just --
MR. VANDER LINDEN:
Commissioner Macdonald, you can see the graph on the right, you can see the gaps where there wasn't data.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD:
Right.
MR. VANDER LINDEN: Doesn't give specifics, but you can see in terms of a relative -- relatively how big of an issue that was.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD:
Going back to my earlier question, you
mean, where you're saying there are gaps here in this graph, that actually reflects the gaps that were earlier referenced.

MS. LA PLANTE: Gaps in
data.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD:
Gaps in data.
MS. LA PLANTE: Yes.
Any further questions?
So the next question we wanted to
look at was, did PlayMyWay users and nonusers do different things when they actually visited Plainridge Park Casino. And we found that PlayMyWay users were more likely to use the electronic table games, but similar to others in their use of slot machines and video poker terminals.

Interestingly, PlayMyWay users inserted more cash into electronic gaming machines, but they also withdrew more cash from the machines and they redeemed more vouchers from the machines.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I
ask about that. I know you mentioned up front that there's no evidence of
causality. I just find it very interesting that they kind of like work in the opposite direction. Some inserting more cash, but playing less as opposed to the nonusers.

Is there anything there for us to think about, to follow up?

MS. LA PLANTE: I think it's
definitely worth looking at this again with new data. And $I$ think that as far as them having kind of a bigger bank in play, we don't really know much about PlayMyWay users beyond the fact that they enrolled in PlayMyWay, and we know a little bit about gender, we know a little bit about age.

We don't know anything about their means, so we don't know if they're from distinctly different socioeconomic class or anything like that, and there are any number of variables like that that could play a role in some of these differences.

bet, so --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So does
that count the turn, in other words, if you put in $\$ 100$ and then you win 100 , so now you have 200 in credit, you play against that 200, you -- you've wagered 200, even though actually cash out of your pocket is 100?

MS. LA PLANTE: Yes.
MR. VANDER LINDEN: Well, I --

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Well, it measures cash activity, so it would measure cash in and it would measure cash out.

MR. TOM: Right.
MR. VANDER LINDEN: What
happens in between there, there's bound to be ups and downs.

MR. TOM: Right.
MR. VANDER LINDEN: You're saying it measures all of those ups and downs.

MR. TOM: Well, amount wagered is strict -- it's all -- I won't
say it's independent, but it's different from amount won or lost.

Let's go back to, you asked about penny slots. So let's say I'm playing penny slots, but it's 50 lines, so that's 50 cents per time I hit the spin button. Let's say I do that 10 times. So 1 penny, 50 lines, 50 cents bet, do that 10 times, 50 cents, 10 times, $\$ 5$ that's going to be $\$ 5$ total wager regardless of how many lines $I$ win on, how much $I$ win on those lines, whatever.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But it's the number of spins?

MR. TOM: Yes.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The
value of the total number of spins?
MR. TOM: Right.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: In order
to -- I should know this, but in order to play a penny slot and on 50 lines, you have to have put in at least 50 cents, right, you have to have -- you have to have enough money in the bank to cover it.

You can't just put in a penny, right?
MS. LA PLANTE: That's
right.
MR. TOM: Correct. Right.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So in that
scenario, if you put in 50 cents and you
then have the multiple plays you're talking about.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Just
spin once.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, you
spin once, okay, you've wagered 50 cents or \$5?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 50
cents.
MR. TOM: One spin. You
said 50 cents -- you said one spin.
COMMISSIONER CROSBY: One spin, correct.

MR. TOM: You said a total
of 50 cents wagered.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But if
you spin ten times.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If you
spin ten times, you then -- you have wagered \$5.

MR. TOM: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And, if
you, for the sake of discussion, if you've lost, you walk away thinking, well, I lost my 50 cents because you only put 50 cents in.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Or you have to have more in.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No.
You paid a minimum -- you played a minimum of $\$ 5$. You could have gone up and gone down and gone up, but you've lost --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Your cash
in, you had to have $\$ 5$ in there in order to play ten times.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
Right.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If you
only put in $\$ 2$, you couldn't keep clicking.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, it all depends on happens on every spin.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But
adding the number of spins times the value of the spin, gives you the total wager.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But --
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
Whatever you put --
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm going
to take one shot at this, and I'm going to drop it if it isn't helpful. I put in 50 cents and I spin once.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: What happens?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You win a lot.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay.
Good.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Then you keep pumping and, say, your wins have gone up to \$5, so you can play against your \$5. You keep playing, then you lose everything, and you go home. Out of your
pocket has been 50 cents. But in the process of playing, you had more money, which you eventually lost, that person would be deemed to have wagered how much?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Total
number of spins --
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: No, I'm
asking them --
MR. TOM: It would depend on
how much you won. You would have a net loss of 50 cents. Your --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That
wouldn't be called -- but you wouldn't have just wagered 50 cents, you would have wagered --

MR. TOM: Correct.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: -- however
much you won and lost again.
MR. TOM: Correct. If you think about it, you could have won and then -- and lost some of it and won more and lost more, and it could go up and down, up and down, and then eventually bottom out at a -- at a net loss of 50
cents, but how you got there would determine what your total amount wagered was.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: So
the wager figure is a cumulative figure.
MS. LA PLANTE: Yes.
MR. VANDER LINDEN: And I
think this explains the difference between the net winnings on this slide and the much, much higher amount wagered, correct?

MR. TOM: Yes.
MR. VANDER LINDEN: That's the amount that was wagered, the person just walking away with negative $\$ 89$.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Because
not very many people -- is there -- this is cumulative over the eight months, right?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Some of them are per day, some are per month.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But this
one.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: No,
it's per day, per week, per month.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, I see.
Sorry.
MS. LA PLANTE: Those are
the different outcomes in the columns.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
Right. Okay. Thank you.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: One
thing is consistent here is that everybody loses.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
Right.
MS. LA PLANTE: PlayMyWay
users seem somewhat more conservative from
the start, and, over time, this figure displays the average amount lost per day, and PlayMyWay -- by PlayMyWay use status.

You can see that among nonusers amount lost per day increased slightly over the study period, whereas amount lost per day was lower and more variable for PlayMyWay users. Some of this difference in the variable pattern might relate to the data issues that $I$ described earlier.

Finally, in some of the -COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Can

I ask you a question, just on this because this is potentially a significant graph and also it seems like there may be some risk of this being misinterpreted.

The caution that you made before about the limitations in the data being ones that prevents you from being able to establish a causal connection.

Is it fair to say that in looking at this -- looking at the delta between the red and the blue, that you would be hesitant to say that it's because of PlayMyWay?

MS. LA PLANTE: Yes. It's
still -- we're still just looking at association between whether or not you have ever enrolled in PlayMyWay and these various outcomes. So the association is there, but it's not sufficient to say that PlayMyWay did this.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'd
like to think about it like in the analogy
to the Fitbit.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: To
the Fitbit?
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: To the
Fitbit, which is it strikes me like there's a case to be made that Fitbit users are more likely exercisers, you know, regardless, whether they have a Fitbit or not. Makes intuitive sense. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Just because all Fitbit users take more steps doesn't necessarily mean that they did it because of Fitbit.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
Precisely, which is part of causality, but Fitbit users might actually -- the Fitbit might actually help them continue exercising or exercising how they intended, or -- right.

MS. LA PLANTE: Yes, I like that analogy.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right.
MR. VANDER LINDEN: The goal
of the program is to provide people with
information to support their decisions, whether it be a Fitbit informing them of the number of steps that you want to take, or a tool like PlayMyWay to establish how much you're willing to budget or spend, both are about informing user choice.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right.
But just maybe a Fitbit, if I give somebody a Fitbit they say, well, I'll try it. They might turn out to become more exercisers than they otherwise, which is the thing that we need to think about.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Or you
may use it sometimes and not others.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
Sometimes and not others, yes.
MR. VANDER LINDEN: Good
point.
MS. LA PLANTE: All right.
Finally, in some other ways, PlayMyWay users and nonusers were similar. Here's an example: To gain an understanding of the betting typhologist as of two groups who perform a cluster analysis on total
amount wagered, net winnings, and number of visits.

For both users and nonusers, we observed two natural betting groups that we call typical and atypical.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Before
we go further, actually, $I$ want to make sure you -- I don't want to disrupt too much the flow, can you help me understand how you define typical and atypical for both sets of players.

MS. LA PLANTE: So this was defined statistically through the cluster analysis using the variables total amounts wagered, net winnings, and number of visits.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: 91, 95, or 99 percent, what's the cutoff? How did you cut off deviation?

MS. LA PLANTE: It's not really a percentage cutoff like that through -- do you want to talk about cluster analysis?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Just
in laymen's terms, what makes somebody atypical.

MR. TOM: So, essentially,
what happens -- what we do in a cluster analysis is we -- say, suppose there are two centers or two locations that all of one group sort of resolve around, all of the other group revolve around. So there's no actual hard percentage, oh it's got to be 95, it has to be 90 percent.

It's just what sort of centers as far as average amount bet, and the other variables, what centers make sense and sort of what people or what data points belong in what group.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Before
we get into the groups, though, I realize that you did it for the groups. Just help me understand what makes atypical player. Is that the point at the very top over there or does that include five others and where was the cutoff.
How do you -- how do you define
typical versus atypical?

MR. TOM: So the
definitions -- so the definitions for the -- not definition, but classifications were based on the data themselves. And it was -- it was done with software we used, just -- as you can see in the picture, just sort of separates those two groups.

There's no -- there is a rule, but we can go back and reconstruct the rule itself, but it was -- I think the more important point is that when you look at the scattered blocks, that you can see distinct groups of players.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I don't know that I understand. I look forward to the rule, if you need to come back, but I'm asking a straightforward question, I think. How do you define atypical player?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: How
different did you have to be from the -to be called atypical?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: What
makes me atypical regardless of what group

I'm in from the scattered shot one or the other or both combined. What makes me atypical?

MR. TOM: I think the --
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The
amount wagered, how different I wager.
How much -- how many times I go.
MR. TIM: So the three
variables that we use to define it were amount wagered, net loss, number of visits. If you were higher than the general mean of the rest of the players on any one of those variables. You could have been gone one and not the other.

If you were higher than the other, you would probably get into an atypical group.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: How
high is the group?
MR. TIM: It depends on the
means of everybody, based all on the means.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: So
it depends on --

MR. TIM: It is easily
explained.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay.
I look forward to --
MR. TIM: That is similar
explanation we can kind of give to you.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Did
you say it depends on the means of the players?

MR. TIM: Of the whole group of players.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The mean
not the means, the mean. Okay.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But
maybe there's a way to average, sort of formula, a complicated formula --

MR. TIM: It's a complicated
formula. I just can't --
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'm
very interested in at least conceptually understanding a little bit more what that is, if you can get back to me on that.

MR. TIM: Of course.
MS. LA PLANTE: I mean, to a
certain extent it's statistically determined. We're not going in and saying, we are not going in and saying, if it hit this level, that puts them in this group and that puts them in this group. We're letting the software do some of the exploration of the data, asking it, you know, does the data naturally fall into two groups? Does it naturally fall into three groups? Does it naturally fall into four groups? What's the best fit for this data?

And the statistical analysis that we did suggested that the best fit for this data, naturally grouped into two separate groups; one, that consisted of most players, and one that consisted of the out liars. We considered those out liars to be the atypical groups.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But
I'm not far off at least conceptually thinking that this is not a normal distribution, $I$ give you that, that in that with that mindset the people who are
really at the tail end of some distribution, with all these factors that you have, you have a combined -- somebody, whatever variation metric, maybe it's not the standard deviation, but some variability after some variability, they're really -- because you have means and you have aggregated them and whatnot.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Is
it fair to say that in looking at these two graphs, that the out liars are these little dots that are outside of the monogrammatic clusters?

MS. LA PLANTE: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Is
that what that is?
MS. LA PLANTE: Yes. So,
one of the things that $I$ wanted to point out for this, again, is that just to note that the scales on these graphs are different, and this is so that you can actually see what's happening among the PlayMyWay user group.
What I think is important to
observe about these figures is that for both the users and the nonusers, the bulk of gamblers represented by the black circles were what we called typical.

And the atypical users represented by the colored circles were mainly the out liars. Those out liars for both the PlayMyWay users and nonusers wager more money, made more visits, and lost more money compared to the typical players.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The
nonuser, is it fair to say -- I mean, I know this is very -- just visualizing here, the nonusers seem clustered, more clustered together, obviously, right? Is there any --

MS. LA PLANTE: Part of that is the scale, I think.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Oh,
okay. Can you put them at the same scale, would that make any difference visually at least, or --

MS. LA PLANTE: I'm not
sure. Everything in the PlayMyWay user
group will be much more scrunched together.

MR. TOM: Also, it will be tough to see because I think there's a ten to one ratio that there are more nonusers than users. So when you try to differentiate the two in a single scattered line, it could get messy.

MS. LA PLANTE: So the PlayMyWay user group on the right is kind of like a zoomed in line, so you can actually see the difference between the groups.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: So you
broke it into the two groups, typical and atypical users and nonusers. But you're -- I was thinking that, is there something, a purpose to that to begin talking about what atypical users play versus typical user, each of the groups, and possibly, what one is saying compared typical to atypical users and nonusers and --

MS. LA PLANTE: Yes, I mean,
we can't -- this is one of the things that we can't draw direct comparisons across these groups because of the -- some of the data idiosyncrasies that we already talked about.

These groups that cut offs that were used to create the separation between typical and atypical for the nonusers was different among users. So it wouldn't be appropriate to do a cross comparison at this point.

I think in the future when we have the improved data with fewer gaps and a better understanding of the linkage between the PlayMyWay and the gambling cash activity, then hopefully some of the data qualities, idiosyncrasies resolved, that would allow us to do a more direct comparison I think you're looking for. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I was
really intrigued when $I$ first read the graph of the report, not the presentation, about these, which is why I was asking about the atypical players here and how
they were defined, that there's really something for us to think about.

I really am wondering whether atypical players, however we define them, have higher rates of adoption of PlayMyWay, first and foremost.

Then, of course when you get that, which is if PlayMyWay is affecting behavior, which we need all this data, linkage and things like that, that's obviously the next phase, but simply just the rate of adoption, I'm really -- at a first pass, I only added a net -- and I didn't understand that there's all these multi-factors in the statistical world that are making them atypical.

But at a first pass, it looked to me that maybe there is atypical players have a higher rate of adoption compared to the rest of the population, and if so, I think that would be a fantastic finding. I'm not saying that we have it.

MS. LA PLANTE: I think it's
a really interesting question.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And to
expand on that, which relates to something that Commission Zuniga has brought up previously, it would be interesting to know the adoption rates within every cross section of intensity, you know, as a practical matter, speaking layman's language.

If you're what we refer to as a casual gambler, that is less than 11 times a year, we don't really care very much whether you adopt PlayMyWay or not. It's kind of interesting, interesting to look at, but it's people who are in the heavier groups.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
Intense gamblers.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Abstract
definition that we are more concerned about, because the next group, people who gamble, say, between 12 and 36 times a year, are the people who are more likely to be at risk of drifting into the problem gambling.

So are the adoption rates by
segment, however you define those segments, by intensity segment, similar or not, that would be incredibly interesting variables we can all argue.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, there's three variables that you're using, net loss, frequency of visits -- and what was the third one?

MS. LA PLANTE: Total
wagered.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Total
wagered. Different aspects of precommitment tool will work better for you, right? If you are having a hesitation, maybe the monthly is something that might be a lot more effective. If you are heavy gambler, the budget figure may be more -- could cause somebody to consider whether they're better off offering more or incentivizing it.

MS. LA PLANTE: All right. To sum up our observations related to the cash and gambling activity, we found that

PlayMyWay users and nonusers had some similarities, such as their typical number of visits and the natural groups that comprise them.

There also were some differences cash and gambling activities suggested that PlayMyWay might be associated with more conservative behaviors for these factors.

And finally, just to reiterate all
comps, we can't make a causal attribution to the PlayMyWay for these findings, but the associations are suggestive, I think, and worthy of continued investigation.

I'll turn now to some observations
that we made from the PlayMyWay server data related to PlayMyWay budgets and notification activity.

We found that most users, 57 percent, set only a daily budget, which you can see in the large yellow circle on the bottom. About 9 percent set only a weekly budget, which is represented by the blue circle on the upper right. And about

19 percent set only a monthly budget, which is apparent in the red circle on the upper left.

The rest of PlayMyWay users set some combination of budgets. 15 percent set a combination of two budgets, and 12 percent set a combination of all three budgets.

If someone set more than one budget, they were most likely to set all three.

About 78 percent of people who set more than one budget set all three types. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So that's the 892 grid plan, correct?

MS. LA PLANTE: Correct.
The gray.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So they
set all three budgets.
MS. LA PLANTE: Correct.
The gray.
Budget set at enrollment indicated that most set a daily budget of around $\$ 75$, a weekly budget of around $\$ 200$, and a
monthly budget of around $\$ 300$.
The figure on the right shows that the budgets in our sample were skewed. We observed high standard deviations around the mean budgets.

Budgets at enrollment had a maximum of $\$ 25,000$ for daily, 50,000 for weekly, and 100,000 for monthly.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Could
I ask a question on this? Just a little bit of a thought. Could something like this maximums based on some of the other medians, could that explain perhaps somebody desiring to use this tool as simply as a way to check their total play not caring about notifications, for example?

MS. LA PLANTE: That's
possible. Yes.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Or the
\$5 incentive.
MS. LA PLANTE: That too.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
There's always that one.

MS. LA PLANTE: Either is possible. Or, I'll get to the point when I get to that in a minute.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Debra, on this median daily budget is for those people who enrolled with $\$ 75$. Back on the slide we were talking about earlier, the gaming gambling activity by PlayMyWay use, has the total amount wagered per day. Is -- and the median for PlayMyWay users is 285, almost four times the median -- the average or median budget -median. Are those numbers counted the same way? You set a budget for $\$ 75$, is that calculated the same way as wagers?

MS. LA PLANTE: Well, these are separate systems, so the wagers that are in the ACSC server system and these budget numbers are from a PlayMyWay server system. These are simply the things that are input, the information that's input by all the players who are enrolled in PlayMyWay and were calculated those averages and medians from the PlayMyWay
server.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But you
then have to calculate -- you then have to -- the machine has -- you set a budget for 75 .

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I
think that's the number. The number -the number to compare the 75 is the 89 lost.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So they
aren't --
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The
budget is about the losing.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So when
you calculate your -- when the machine calculates your budget, does it go through -- you budget 75, you then win a thousand, you then lose the thousand, that -- then you lose 925, that doesn't tell you you've hit your cap, right?

MR. VANDER LINDEN: No, I
like to describe it as it measures the actual money that you take out of your
pocket and put into the machine. So
that's the net winnings and the net losses.

> So I think you're looking for how do you square the $\$ 75$ average with what an actual -- what was actual, and I wouldn't look at the total amount wagered, I would look at the net winnings, the bottom line, the negative.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Which is what Commissioner Stebbins is saying. Right. But this -- yes, okay. We're good on that, yeah.

MS. LA PLANTE: As I recall
that the budgets that people set indicate the point at which they might receive notifications about whether they're approaching their budget, have reached their budget, or have exceeded their budget.

You can see here that just over 40 percent of people did not ever approach their budget. This means that they never received a notification from the system related to their budget.

Nearly 60 percent of people who
set a budget received at least one notification that they were approaching their budget. Among those who received such a notification, three-quarters received a notification that they reached their budget.

So that means among those who actually approached, 75 percent of those people went on and reached their budget.

Among those who received notification that they reached their budget, 85 percent of those people received at least one notification that they exceeded their budget. In all, about 37 percent of all users exceeded their budget.

Now, we were curious about the distribution of whether the distribution of budgets might play a role in whether or not people receive notifications.

So this gets to your question, Commissioner Zuniga, about whether or not they are using it for some other purpose,
or maybe they are using it for a gift card, or something like that.

So we looked at the budget sizes that people set for daily, weekly, and monthly budgets. And we also looked at whether there was evidence that budgets were so high that they were unlikely to represent their actual play.

Although for daily budgets, we did observe some budgets that were so high that no one ever received a notification relative to that amount.

For weekly and monthly budget sizes, we observed that the budgets were aligned with notifications indicating that people might be selecting budgets that represented their likely play.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: On a monthly basis for --

MS. LA PLANTE: For weekly and monthly.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right.
MS. LA PLANTE: Now people could respond to notifications in a
variety of different ways. And in this initial report we examined three primary outcomes related to this. We wanted to look at how people might have responded with budget changes, with system unenrollment, and with budget compliance. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'm sorry, can $I$ go back a little bit to the prior slide. Could something like this, if we -- in the GameSense advisor was to ask how much of a player are you, are you an intense -- sounds sort of intuitive, what I'm saying, if you are an intensive gambler, you're better off thinking in terms of a monthly budget. I recommend you try it that way, as opposed to a daily budget.

MS. LA PLANTE: Maybe. I
think that that's one strategy. It depends on what you want them to use the system to do. If you want them to use the system to provide more immediate notifications of what they're doing on a particular day, then you would still
recommend that they use the daily -- if you want them to have a more global notification, then maybe you would recommend the monthly.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But is
it fair to say that given this graph, the people who acted on a monthly budget, were more likely to approximate compared to people who were, say, daily budgets?

MS. LA PLANTE: There were just a few extremely high daily budgets, which you can see in the column that's to the furthest left. We don't really know why they're as high as they are, so I'm not sure how far I would want to take that as far as the psychology behind the setting of the budget, which is, I think, what you're getting at.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes.
MS. LA PLANTE: I don't know
how far $I$ would take that at this point.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Does this say that some people set a daily budget of \$25,000?

MR. TOM: Yes.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
Doesn't mean they reached it, though.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: No, I
know. And the mean was $\$ 75$, right? But the first number you even have on the graph is 5,000.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Each
one of these points, these little dots here.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yeah, but the way these dots reads, it looks like an awful lot of people set their budget higher than $\$ 5,000$.

MS. LA PLANTE: No, the --
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Those
are nonusers, right? Are these graphs for all users -- I'm sorry, for only PlayMyWay users?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes.
Because it's just invoices right.
MS. LA PLANTE: Right.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So the
left-hand column is the daily budget that
you set, correct?
MS. LA PLANTE: Yes -- no, I'm sorry. Yes, yes. No notification.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
So --
MS. LA PLANTE: And in the column on the right for each are people -budgets that were set and people actually received a notification for budget of that size.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
But I'm just looking at the colored in
dots, and it looks like from this chart that an awful lot of users set their budgets higher than $\$ 5,000$, which doesn't make sense to me, is that right?

MS. LA PLANTE: Sure.
MR. SINGH: Yeah, I think
also --
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is there an
extra zero -- an extra zero here
somewhere?
MR. SINGH: I think the
colors because they're so many
observations that can be a little bit deceiving, so the first one it has a median of actually 100, and the second one with --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm sorry,
what -- what has a median of 100?
MR. SINGH: So no
notification, but it looks like there's an awful lot of people in the 5,000 range, which is true, but it doesn't portray that the median is actually on the 100. And the second one people who receive notifications, the median is 32.

So it can be a little bit confusing because of the distribution is so wide.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Could
you put this in a histogram by the way, to break out -- to break out the horizontal --

MR. SINGH: One of the challenges is the distribution tends to be so wide, some people have all the way up to 25,000 , and the median is only 100. So
we have the challenge of trying to show the variation --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The variations?

MR. SINGH: Yeah, in some cases we just want to focus on what is the signal.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: In this particular -- in this particular column, if the median is 75 , 75, you can barely even -- your eyeball can barely even find it on this chart. It's so close to the zero. So that must mean that there's thousands of people lumped under that very bottom of that blue column. Okay. Well, I'd be interested to know, I guess, what you asked --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: A
histogram that breaks it down.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Forget the
guys putting 25,000, they're playing
games, but that -- what's bunched into
that lower end of the scale.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'm
actually more interested in this graph.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Both
sides. Both sides.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: In
this graph on the upper end, how many people are above 5,000 and are reaching their notification so they're -- again, gambling intensively.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
Right.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
Setting a budget of 5,000 or more and reaching invoices.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.
MS. LA PLANTE: We found that users who approach their budgets were more likely to change their budgets than those who never approach their budgets.

Only 1.6 percent of those who never approached -- change their budgets, whereas 9 and a half percent of those who approached their budget changed their budgets.

Also, users who reached their
budgets were more likely than those who just approached their budgets to change. 13 percent of those who reached their budgets, changed their budgets, whereas 9 and a half percent of those who approached their budgets, changed their budget.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Does
that tell us anything about notifications, for example, amount of notifications?

MS. LA PLANTE: Not yet.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You're
hoping it will.
MS. LA PLANTE: Not yet.
MR. VANDER LINDEN: So,
Commissioner, do you mean the number of notifications that are delivered --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes.
MR. VANDER LINDEN: -- to
patrons.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes.
MS. LA PLANTE: Not yet.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'm
very interested in that. I think I mentioned this before, we started with an
assumption about those notifications. I remember, well, you and all your colleagues said, let's set it at 50, 75, 100, just seemed, you know, more intuitive, $I$ guess, but I'm really interested in the effect of those notifications, whether they're turning people off or really -- or some people really affecting what they do.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: To
expand on that, I'm curious as to whether people who set daily, weekly, and monthly, would, more likely, receive more notifications because they would be receiving notifications based on three different gambling types, intuitively, where $I$ think it's worth investigating further is if you set all three types, are you more likely to change your budget than if you enroll in just one type.

MS. LA PLANTE: I think
that's an interesting question to be looking at.

MR. TOM: Uh-huh.

MS. LA PLANTE: However, we also observed that users who exceeded their budgets, were similar to, but less likely than those who approached their budgets to change.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Can
I ask on this one, just the bottom line, people who exceeded their budget, going over the column users who did not change a budget.

> So the number of people who exceeded their budget was 2,480 , and the percentages as 87.7 percent. So that that reflects that 2,480 people exceeded their budget and did not change their budget.

MS. LA PLANTE: That's
correct.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Let me just be happily reminded every now and then.

MS. LA PLANTE: Here are the types of changes that users made. You can see that moving left to right for daily, weekly, and monthly budget changes, most
changes were upward revisions.
The median daily budget changed from 75 to $\$ 350$. The median weekly budget changed from 200 to $\$ 900$, and the median monthly budget changed from 300 to $\$ 1,000$.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Is the blocks represent some kind of spread?

MS. LA PLANTE: Yes.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: What's the spread?

MS. LA PLANTE: What is that spread?

MR. SINGH: It's the middle line is the median and the bottom of the box is 25 percentile, and the top of box is 75th percentile.

MS. LA PLANTE: Next we looked at whether notifications seem to be associated with unenrollment from PlayMyWay.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Sorry, just one -- the access is the same for daily, weekly, and monthly. It only goes up to 4,000. How does that compare to the
numbers on the budget sizes and notifications' chart?

MS. LA PLANTE: Those are budget changes.

MR. SINGH: Also, in this
one, we, like Commission Zuniga was saying, if we looked at the entire spectrum, we would miss the signals. So we did not include the observations that were like 25,000 , or things like that. So we focused on the distributions we were interested in.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It's truncated.

MR. SINGH: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's an important distinction that isn't explained here.

MR. SINGH: Yes.
MS. LA PLANTE: You recall
that unenrollment happened quickly for about half of those who unenrolled more gradually for others. Because of this, we looked at unenrollment patterns for those
who did it within one day, separately from others.

Among those who unenrolled within one day, those who never approached their budgets were most likely to unenroll. This was about 12 percent of those who never approached.

Among those who unenrolled after
one day, those who reached or exceeded their budgets were most likely to unenroll. This was about 12 percent and 15 percent, respectively.

This suggested even more research
to determine whether these reach and exceed notifications for those with longer enrollment with PlayMyWay, play a causal role in unenrollment, like you said. The number of unenrollments -- sorry, the number of notifications that people receive is that one of the things.

Finally, we looked at ongoing notification instances to gain insight into whether people stopped gambling after receiving notifications that they've
reached their budget. Just as a reminder, PlayMyWay is a soft stop system, which means that people can reach their budget and exceed their budget and keep going if they want. The system doesn't make a judgment about which decision is appropriate.

For this analysis, we looked at 2,271 steady users, or those who had instances of hitting their daily budgets, but also didn't change their budgets or unenroll that same day.

We found that nearly 9 percent of steady users who reached their budget, received at least one additional notification. This means that -- I'm sorry. We found that nearly 9 percent did not receive a notification again after they reached their budget. This indicates they might have stopped gambling.

It's also possible that they stopped using their marquee rewards card to gamble and were gambling incognito, so to speak.

About 91 percent --
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD:
Just to try to put it into words what you just said, this suggests that, approximately, 9 percent appeared to have stopped after receiving notification?

MS. LA PLANTE: Correct.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: After
being told they hit their limit?
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD:
Right.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Hit their budget, right.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes.
The additional notification here is after they've hit their budget.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So are
these -COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Say that again. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Am I here to correct when I say that when it says no additional notifications, it means they've hit their 100 percent budget and
they did not receive their next one, which would have been the 125 percent.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So it's no additional notifications after being told they've hit their budget?

MS. LA PLANTE: That's right.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. So you could have perhaps 9 percent stopped playing.

MS. LA PLANTE: Perhaps.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Perhaps.
Right. Is the same factor here, somebody's -- a bunch of people, a lot of people received 11 to 100 additional notifications, but it would be cumulative, if you were on a daily, weekly, and monthly budget that would be cumulative, right, for -- so that could be spread out across day, month, and week to receive all those invoices.

MS. LA PLANTE: Not this --
MR. TIM: This refers to
just daily budgets. We only limited this
to just daily budgets and daily budget notifications.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD:
This is just daily.
COMMISSIONER CROSBY: This
is over the course of the whole period?
MR. TIM: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So if you
did 100, it's doing -- you're saying no?
MS. LA PLANTE: Let me make sure I understand your question. First, go ahead.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I mean, it's concerning, just on the face of it, to say that 46 percent of the people who got notified that they hit their daily budget, got between 11 and 100 additional notices. And if you don't think about it very hard, you just look at it, that looks like, wow, that's a lot of people playing a lot of times past, but if that's cumulative over eight months, then that may or may not be as concerning as it looks on its face.

MS. LA PLANTE: This is per
a particular gambling event.
MR. TIM: No, this specific
one -- there is a table that looks just like this that we'll show you in the full report that shows all instances, which includes multiple people hitting their daily. This is taking all those people and adding all of their instances and all the additional notifications received in all instances.

So it could be someone at one instance they did, got one additional notification, another time they got more. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But let me make sure $I$ understand, so if I'm a player cardholder No. 1, I set my daily budget on the first day of the study, and I then hit it again 99 more times, post-budget notification, $I$ would be one of the people who had hit it 100 times, right, because it's cumulative?

MR. TIM: You already hit
once, then 99 times?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes.
MR. TIM: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So it's
not as scary as it looks like because this is a lot of -- a lot of notifications over an extended period of time.

MS. LA PLANTE: There are
some other factors that can change how you view this as well, so it might be that people are just regularly really going past their budget, but another characteristic of the PlayMyWay system is that when a gambler kind of hovers around their particular budget, they can be crossing above and below --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's a good point.

MS. LA PLANTE: -- that
threshold. And that can inflate the number of notifications as well.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: It looks
like to qualify it, could be the additional notification wasn't the notification exceeding 100 percent. It
could be a notification, you reset it, if you go past 100 percent, then you have a win, it brings you down below 50 percent, and then you reach 50 percent again, that's an additional notification that's factored in here.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's
interesting. Right. So that's important.
So if you hit your budget and then you win, play one more time, and you win, and then the system will recalculate that you're back down to whatever number you are, so you'll start getting notified again. It's that net winnings tracking mechanism, right.

MS. LA PLANTE: Yes. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's interesting. Now there's a ton to be learned here. MS. LA PLANTE: Right. So
to sum up what we learned about budgets and notifications, most users set daily budgets and most received at least an approach notification.

Receiving a notification was associated with progressing through the notification types, and notifications were associated with budget changes and unenrollment.

They did not seem to elicit a self-imposed hard stop among users. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'm sorry, say that one more time. MS. LA PLANTE: So people
didn't use it -- they weren't self-imposing a hard stop. So if they got a notification that they reached their budget, they weren't saying, oh, I need to stop and walk away, you know, at this point. They didn't put that on themselves. The system doesn't put it on themselves, but they didn't self-impose that.

## CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Because

 that's the 9 percent number. It's only 9 percent who got the notification, and to all outward appearances, stopped, right. So it's 91 percent that didn't do that.MS. LA PLANTE: Right.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can we
calculate of those people who received notifications, if they dropped off more frequently than those who didn't?

MR. VANDER LINDEN: So is
unenrollment associated with --
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
Notifications.
MR. VANDER LINDEN:
Notifications exceeding 100 percent?
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes.
MS. LA PLANTE: We could -we do chase that.

MR. SINGH: I think, not
with the current data we have, I think also the point Chairman Crosby made earlier about looking at enrollment across different spectrums of gambling, those are very interesting questions, but right now like Debbie mentioned, we couldn't link the enrollment data with the gambling activity data. We didn't have that link.

So we couldn't do some of those analysis and we looked forward to doing that once we have that link.

MS. LA PLANTE: The last
thing I would like to talk about today includes some age and gender observations.

You recall that our ACSC server data included about 8,800 PlayMyWay users and 92,000 nonusers.

About half of all users were
women. Enrollment rates among marquee rewards cardholders from various states were similar. Among those that we looked at all around 8 to 9 percent.

More specifically, the majority of PlayMyWay users were from Massachusetts, but 1 percent were from Connecticut, 9 percent from Rhode Island, and 5 percent of our sample were from New Hampshire. PlayMyWay users were slightly younger than nonusers. They both were in their 50 s per data the age $I$ see or to younger ages.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Look at
that, some number of players over 100 years old.

MS. LA PLANTE: That's what
they say.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's
pretty cool. That's what they say, yeah.
Right. Probably not that many people exaggerate that they're over 100.

MS. LA PLANTE: Women, as I
said, made up a larger proportion of PlayMyWay users. You can see that by the width of the bar in red there, but in contrast, they also accounted for a smaller percent of the total amount wagered by PlayMyWay users. And you can tell that from the height difference between the two bars.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Can
I just make a comment back on that last slide about the age of the -- the demographic here is really quite an old group. Although, these people are a lot younger than $I$ am, at the same time, these are -- PlayMyWay, they are 54 years old,
and nonusers it is 59 years old. This is not a millennial crowd.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's pretty close to the audience.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It does. I think it correlates very much to the actual people.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: TO
what?
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: To the actual patrons.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Oh,
yeah. I'm just making that point. It's an old demographic.

MS. LA PLANTE: Finally, the
largest age cohort of PlayMyWay users was between 50 and 69. These folks accounted for the largest percent of total amount wagered in our sample.

Summing up, PlayMyWay users tended to be female and middle aged. Women participated in PlayMyWay more, but wagered less. In contrast to individuals in their 50 s and 60 s participated in

PlayMyWay more, but also wagered more.
As with the other findings, just a
reminder that causal attributions aren't possible for these observations, just associations.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Would
you have, at least for Plainridge Park Casino, could actually have a profile of the users of the players, the overall players.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The cardholders.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
Cardholders, right, age, origin, right.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We must,
too, if we have a profile of users, we must have the nonusers.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Is it worthwhile to attempt to draw differences, for example, between the actual population? Is there any worthwhile --

MS. LA PLANTE: So we
recorded on age and gender from the ACSC server. This was from the PlayMyWay
server, $I$ believe. And without the link, that comparison wouldn't quite be right at this time, but $I$ think that once we can link, we can make more of a direct comparison about users and nonusers and what their gender distribution looks like, what the age distribution looks like for both of those cohorts.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I seem
to have been asking the same question in different ways all this time. But, yeah, that linkage is very important.

MS. LA PLANTE: So I will
wrap up by mentioning what $I$ think are our main take away points from this initial study, its limitations and some future directions that we're considering.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD:
Excuse me, Debi, can we just go back to that last slide before you get to the final points.

The last bullet point, "As with other comparisons, causal attributions are not possible for these observations."

What would be needed on a going forward basis for being able to have the capability to make the causal attributions that you're referencing?

MS. LA PLANTE: We would like to have information that would allow us to not just look at a single moment in time. Causal attributions also could involve randomization. So if we did some type of a study where we asked people if they would be willing to be randomized to engage in PlayMyWay or not engage in PlayMyWay, maybe they use their own budget system, then we could compare those two different groups.

We could look at whether their gambling behaviors differed over time. We could look at whether their visitations to Plainridge differed over time, their wage and earnings, all of those interesting comparisons from the ACSC server that we talked about earlier.

We could kind of look at those outcomes and see whether or not the people
who are randomized to a PlayMyWay group looked more conservative, if that's what you want them to look like or not.

So our take-away, we observed that enrollment is mainly stable during our study period, about 85 percent of enrollees remained enrolled. And PlayMyWay was associated with less cash activity and gambling activity, which potentially indicates a more conservative approach.

Notifications were associated with upward budget revisions and unenrollment. Those are worthy of additional research.

Finally, evidence of continued notifications after users reach their budgets suggest that people didn't self-impose a hard stop once they reached their budgets.

More generally, we think that the findings provide a good early look into how real gamblers actually interact with the PlayMyWay system, and that the findings can guide discussions like this
and other discussions of data informed goals and future research topics.

To reiterate some of the limitations, we can't assume that PlayMyWay caused any of these outcomes. Many data issues limited the areas of investigation that we wanted to pursue. It wasn't possible to tie the specific PlayMyWay action to specific gambling actions. And this included some of the most interesting research questions.

We can't determine the intent that some PlayMyWay users held, for example, how people intend to use their budgets or whether or not they intended to use them at all. Like Commissioner Zuniga said, they just wanted to enroll in the system so that they could track their spending, their actual spending over time.

And finally, player responses in the study might not be the same at other properties. At Wynn or MGM, the study is not directly generalizable to those properties which have very different game
characteristics.
In the future, we hope to obtain new data that links the PlayMyWay activity and cash and gambling records in doing so will allow us to examine differences between gambling behavior before and after enrollment, between gambling behavior before and after receiving notifications, and whether things like any gambling patterns or machine preferences are associated with PlayMyWay adoption.

We would also like to engage in survey research to gain some insight into players' objective experiences, so that we can gain an understanding of what PlayMyWay users like and dislike about the system, and what might be keeping nonusers from deciding to enroll.

Thank you very much for your attention and your questions. We can open for additional questions if you have them, and we also are prepared to talk about some of the more nitty-gritty details about the data limitations if you would
like as well.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well,
I --

## CHAIRMAN CROSBY:

Commissioner Zuniga, will get to that off-line.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes.
All about nitty-gritty, but at a later time.

What I think just that the slide of future work is very apropos of what I've been alluding to because I'm really intrigued by these atypical, that then translates into heavy gambler or at risk gambling in our responsible gambling framework discussion how those people are using the tool, what might they be finding helpful to keep them to what they intend to -- intended or intend to do, they revise it, et cetera.

That's something that I'm really
intrigued about. As Commissioner -- as
Chairman Crosby alluded to, if somebody
who's betting $\$ 20$ twice a year is using
the tool, that's great.
But some people here have medians very high, and I realize it's a very small percentage of the overall population, but if their behavior is being affected in some way or they're finding any characteristics, this tool is useful, I would love to know what those are or turn offs, the same way.

If there's any impediment barrier
for any of the nonusers who are also atypical players or heavy gamblers, that's also an insight that $I$ would like to learn, but $I$ realize all the limitations on the current.

I find fascinating this -- the
next phase here of trying to link that player card overall data to ascertain some kind of behavioral change.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's worth
pointing out that $I$ don't think anywhere, certainly in the United States that I'm aware of, any place in the world, but would you know whether that's accurate
has, ever had the opportunity to link actual player, hard data, but in the bricks and mortar casino world, has there ever been an opportunity before?

MS. LA PLANTE: To link play management data with cash activity data.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: With real player card.

MS. LA PLANTE: Nothing that's public.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm sure
operators, licensees have a pretty good idea, but just a measure of what an unusual research project this is. This has never been available before.

A reminder that I think you sort of alluded to this earlier in some of our discussions, Deb, that the -- it's time as this evolves, we can begin to think a little more clearly about what we're trying to get out of this. What is a net good. When we went into this, for example, early on it was easy to say, well, how many people would you like
enrolled?
Well, the experience of enrollment was so abysmal that we had no idea what to -- other than more than in the past, you know, we couldn't be very precise about what we would consider good, but I think what we're beginning to see of how this plays out.

In long run, the question is, does this accomplish our broad based objectives and what does it take, what metric, how many people affected in a positive way is enough to net a positive?

I think we're working our way
towards being able to articulate those kinds of objectives more clearly.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: The
survey was referenced in the final bullet point here is that going -- is that part of the research agenda going forward?

MR. VANDER LINDEN: It's in
the research plan for this fiscal year. So, ideally, it will be in the report that will come to us later, probably at the end
of the fiscal year.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD:
Thank you.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And --
MR. VANDER LINDEN: In
addition to a report that includes the linked player data, the data issues that Debi and Tom were talking about, we're collecting the data is quite complicated, but we have made significant strides and being able to create that dataset that links the ACSC player directly with the PlayMyWay player data. I believe that Mat is especially happy about that.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Debi and everybody, I've heard Dr. Shaffer talk about in the past context of a lot of other things, the notion of towards these kinds of activities, making sure there's no harm, that first there's no turn offs, there's maybe people affecting the behavior in a negative way.

Do you see any -- can you say
anything to that effect based on this
research?
MS. LA PLANTE: I think as
far as the data that we have available right now in the analyses that we did, we didn't observe anything that we would categorize as harm at this point.

Certainly someone else could look at it in a different way and come to a different conclusion, but from the analyses that we did right now, we didn't -- we didn't come to that conclusion.

## CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And I

think we have had to make a judgment for -- basically, we've had to make a go, no go decision of PlayMyWay at the other casino without data research still open, but I think we did look at two potential kinds of harm.

One, is harm to health and play, not necessarily harm is a hash word, but interference with healthy play. Is this program something that becomes an annoyance or significant distraction or
some other kind of negative to people whose play we would deem healthy play?

And two, does it screw up the operations of the casino by bringing in the casino floor down or portions of casino floor, whatever. And I think as best we've been able to look at and getting what I'm sure is pretty honest feedback from Plainridge, we have not had those two issues.

Certainly in the early days we had some bugs in the system, but I think their characterization now to the outside world, if I'm not mistaken, is that the imposition on the operations of the casino floor is in the nature of zero, although there's occasional problems in the PlayMyWay program, A.

And B, I think people on the floor and the management at Plainridge do not have any sense of negative feedback from their players, from people who are not interested in PlayMyWay saying PlayMyWay is a pain, it's an annoyance,

I'm going to go somewhere else.
We haven't picked up anything like that. I don't think we have.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: No.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: As best
we're able to tell, those two kinds of harm are -- have not been evidenced, which I think is why other of our licensees are going to think about they may want to do something similar.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Let me
clarify that quickly. There are individuals that have unenrolled and they unenrolled because you've heard that they didn't like receiving the notifications, they were an annoyance, but the key factor there is it's a voluntary system.

If you don't find the
notifications helpful, you don't find the tracking tool helpful, you have that option to unenroll. But has it interfered once they unenroll and enroll, I would say no.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD:

Apparently, it's very, very easy to unenroll. You have a large number of people unenrolling within the hour.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: A minute.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Within a minute.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: It is very easy and it was one key feature that was very important was the ability to unenroll from the --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It sounds like it's easier also to continue getting notifications just clicking another, would you like to continue, and it's yes or no.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Were
you --
MS. LA PLANTE: I was going
to say that once we're able to actually do the survey, we'll be able to look at other aspects of harm that might be interesting.

So just as one example, we could ask people whether or not having the
ability to check their actual spend over time, did that ever stimulate you to gamble when otherwise you might not have.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
MS. LA PLANTE: We could
find out whether or not it provokes things that maybe you don't want it to provoke spending beyond what people had planned, things like that. But that's going to take, you know, something like that is going to take actually talking to them through a survey and asking them about their subjective experiences and opinions about the system.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: How do we market PlayMyWay now to new card holders?

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Well,
PlayMyWay is still -- PlayMyWay is still talked about and it's a central tool of the GameSense program, so it certainly is marketed that way.

There continues to be signage through the property as far as I know. And any new player, the first time they
put their card into the machine and do the invitation to enroll, PlayMyWay pops up.

In addition, if a person says no, I don't want to enroll in PlayMyWay, take me to the game, they -- they would simply push a button, but that same invitation will pop up 30 days later.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And 30
days later, and 30 days later.
MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Two
thoughts, one is it might just be worth making a note when we're somewhere, is there more that we could do when enrollments are modest at the beginning and you get hundreds of thousands to enroll?

There's not much you can do in the retail and hand-holding marketing of this, but when you're in a steady state of operation and you're having incremental growth, there might be more that we could do to market this to people than what we're doing now.

So just make a note of that somewhere and we ought to think about that.

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes, I agree, there will be points when we want to reinvigorate the program much like any of the responsible gaming or GameSense tools or initiatives that we have.

This survey through January 31
represents 8,856 PlayMyWay users. Since that time, through the end of September, I don't have the exact numbers in front of me, but we're well over 15,000 people that have ever enrolled in PlayMyWay, and well over 12,000 people that are currently enrolled in PlayMyWay.

The program continues to grow.
The dataset that we can use for our evaluation continues to grow. And so I'm personally very excited about the program, but also about the evaluation efforts as we move forward.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: In
addition to marketing efforts, $I$ think,
you know, GameSense advisors are a great conduit for that effort. But we learn along the way, which some of the questions that we're posing is the number of notifications, is it a barrier, or just right, or the other way, you know.

I think those things could help a long way towards --

## CHAIRMAN CROSBY:

Absolutely. Right. The other thing that, in terms of harm, quote, "harm," I would think that maybe over a period of time, a regular player would get annoyed every month having to say, No, I don't want to play. I would think we hear that just anecdotally if not otherwise.

But it would be interesting to see when you talk to people, is there a point at which we would want to turn the system off? If you said no, for six months in a row, should we turn it off for a year or something like that?

MR. VANDER LINDEN: Or give
them the option not to receive any further
notifications, like many unsubscribed features on the Internet.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Asking about these again, a little check mark.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Get them off my case.

MS. LA PLANTE: It reminds me, I was annoyed yesterday by my car, which gives me an alert whenever it hits 37 degrees because it might be cold out, and it did it twice and $I$ was trying to figure out how to keep it from happening again.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Same here.
If you figure how to turn that off, would you please come to my house. Okay.

Anything else. Thank you very much. This is great.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This was
really a lot of work and we really
appreciate it.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD:

Very, very impressive.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Really
powerful stuff. Thanks a lot.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank
you.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Done. We are on to Item No. 6 Commissioner updates. Do we have anything of particular interest from any Commissioners? You've been doing a lot of work for us involving that stuff.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Trying to think of what we've been up to. Oh, yes. We were actually out at the opening of the MGM Career Center, which was now open and staffed by their $H R$ and talent acquisition team. So they're readily accessible location right adjacent to the property people can go in, they can populate, the skill smart account. They can talk with MGM HR and talent acquisition staff to learn more about individual jobs.

$$
\text { It's open from } 1 \text { to } 4 \text { every }
$$

weekday at this point after the -- after
the new year, those hours are changing and expanding. So it was a great opening. The folks that they invited were a lot of their community based stakeholders, again, trying to get the word out as to what the opportunities need and encourage people to come in and get subscribed to the system. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.

Anybody else? COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I can just report that I've attended the local mitigation committee meetings for region A and yesterday out in Springfield in region $B$.

One of the things that's striking by comparison to last year is that there is a sign that the -- there's indication that the members of those committees are becoming considerably more engaged as they've become knowledgeable about the fund and what the guidelines are and what they are at liberty to suggest for purposes of obtaining -- considerably, more engaged in conversation than it was
even a year ago.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: All
of that $I$ think is very positive.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Just
to add to that one of tidbits of information that we picked up yesterday was a report from the City of Springfield that most of that I-91 viaduct work is now all complete. So they're reopening exits and they have -- they're not completely completed the work, but they have heavy kind of traffic realignment and temporary exit work is just about done, which is great.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I
think it's only one, if I've got that right, all but one either exit or entry has been reopened.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I
remember when that date was a bit cause
for discussion and even the MGM opening.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Even
in April.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If I were
NASCAR I would want to strike this one as a big win. They took some.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Sure.
They did it at time.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Reminds me
that the governor has appointed a new chair of the gaming policy advisory committee, which a primary statutorily mandated advisory committee for us and it's a woman whose name I can't remember. She is a woman that runs the Merrimac Valley, I think Merrimac Valley Planning Association, and so we will be able again to start trying to convene.

We also have a number of more appointments so we have to be able to get a quorum and a chair, so now where's going to get a $G$ pack going again, which is good.
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