

MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION
MEETING
NOVEMBER 7, 2019
10:00 A.M.

CONFIDENTIAL
ROUGHLY EDITED REALTIME FILE

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

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Good morning. Thank you. Already my day is off to a better start. We are calling to order Commission meeting number 281 of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission on Thursday, November 7th, at 10:00 a.m. here in the beautiful Plainville Town Hall at 19 South Street here in Plainville.

Before we get started, I do want to let those who are viewing today that we will not be able to provide closed caption, mainly just because of a technical capacity issue. Once we're back in Boston, we'll be able to renew that service. So we will begin with item number 2. Commissioner Stebbins, please.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you. Good morning, Madam Chair. In your packet, you have the meeting minutes from the October 24th, 2019, Gaming Commission Meeting. I'd move approval of the minutes, again, as always subject to correction for any typographical errors or any other nonmaterial matters.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Any discussion or suggested edits? Barring none, do I have those in favor?

[Vote taken]

Opposed? 5-0. Thank you, Catherine.

Moving on to our administrative update. Executive Director Bedrosian.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: Good morning, members of the Commission. I want to update you on a few items, personal matters, some of the items personnel are working on and outline today's meeting. So on personnel matters, we have had some additions to our IT operations. Tamran O'Connor has joined us as IT coordinator, Ann Bishop as our service desk specialist, and Aman, I hope I pronounced his last name correctly has joined us as a senior systems engineer. Also in HR Natasha Martin is back from leave, and she will be based in Springfield and focused on some of the HR issues with our remote employees. We have Boston employees, we have remote employees, all valued the same, but she'll be helping with those issues.

On some of the issues that the folks are working on just highlight, everyone's doing great work, our HR staff is working on an annual review of our employee handbook. So that is something that we will bring to the Commission. Finance is

actually, as Lance can probably tell us, is spending some time at PPC working on our annual statutory audit. Mr. Ziembra, who I have excused for today, and I will play the role of Mr. Ziembra a little later in the agenda, is working on, in addition to always working on community mitigation, he's preparing for the Gaming Policy Advisory Committee meeting which is scheduled Tuesday at 2:00 P.M. So he's working on helping to staff that.

In terms of today's meeting, first I would like to thank people from our staff, Mary Ann Dooley, Austin Bumpus and Jamie Ennis. We've traveled down to a remote location with all of our materials, making sure streaming is prepared, and all of the logistics that go along with it. It may seem easy but it's not and those people deserve a lot of thanks and credit from us.

Then about today's meeting, you'll see it is broken up maybe into two sections along with the quarterly report from our licensee at PPC. We have a number of racing items in the morning and regulations and research of responsible gaming in the afternoon. We intentionally put racing in the morning so they could actually go and conduct racing in the afternoon, which they have, and I think -- is it a 1:00 start? It's a 1:00 start. So we're going to just be cautious of that. I anticipate potentially for those watching that the Commission may take a break for lunch after item 5. So that would then put us on items 6, 7, 8 and 9 for the afternoon. So that is my administrative update.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Any questions for Ed? Thank you.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: Thank you. Now playing the role as John Ziembra. It is our quarterly responsibility to get a report from our licensees. Today Lance George, General Manager at Plainridge Park Casino will introduce his team for his quarterly report. Lance.

>> MR. GEORGE: Thank you. Great to be here. We have Dana Fortney, our Vice President of finance, and Mike Mueller, Vice President of operations. We will jump right in.

Oh, perfect. We'll start with revenue and taxes paid. Several comparisons here and some a look at the preceding seven quarters. For Q3 of 2019, revenues eclipsing \$36 million and total taxes paid approaching \$18 million. Year over year comparison for the third quarter shows a decline of approximately \$8.7 million in revenue, driven primarily by the opening of Encore Boston Harbor. To date the impact of Encore has been more significant than anticipated. However, even with that solid performance with the win per unit of \$314. And we also recognized that Q3 represents only the first three months for our new competition. As we've discussed in previous presentations, the property has always anticipated this opening, and the greater than expected impact to revenues does not materially change our operation.

Next slide is lottery sales. Again, a lot of numbers here. However, I'll draw your attention to just a few. Consistent with property revenues, lottery sales saw a decline. Sales down approximately 80,000 or 8.65%. Q3 2019 total sales of over \$850,000. And not surprisingly, we anticipate going forward that these numbers will roughly flow with gaming revenues, solid numbers, encouraging results.

[No audio]

With that I'll turn it over to Dana.

>> MS. FORTNEY: Thank you. Good morning, Madam Chair, Commissioners. I'll

start with our Q3 spend by state. For the third quarter, in-state spend was \$873,000 or 56% of qualified spend, which is a 3% improvement from second quarter's 53%. The remaining spend is split among the states on the right. The overall qualified spend from the second quarter of \$132,000 is applicable to the timing of payment of our larger capital-related projects.

Moving on to local spend. In-state versus post and surrounding community qualified spend shows a slight increase in community spend, quarter over quarter. The second quarter came in at \$77,000 versus the third quarter of \$103,000. The increase in local spend came from Mansfield from a vendor named Matt Graphics. They completed the banners and indoor signage around the property when we transitioned our loyalty program to My Choice over the summer. In-state spend has maintained similar levels to previous quarters in the year.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I just want to thank you. I know after getting your second quarter report, I had raised some concerns about differences with your track record in terms of Massachusetts spend, but I do want to thank you. We had a meeting down with Lance and his team. We talked about kind of one of the key drivers to that differential was, certainly understand, but certainly remain convinced that you are constantly on the lookout for vendor opportunities and sharings, and we talked about what some of those additional opportunities were and trying to find a mass source for those. So just a follow-up on kind of the post-second quarter report that we had talked about.

>> MS. FORTNEY: Thank you. We do continue to focus on that procurement team has taken some of the recommendations that Jill had, and we'll continue to look for more.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Great. Thank you.

>> MS. FORTNEY: For vendor diversity, we continue to be pleased, like I said, with the efforts made by our procurement team on the diversity goals. Year over year diverse spend came in at 30% overall on a goal of 21% and a prior year of 27%. You'll note a large jump in spend for the quarter driven primarily on our spend with an IT equipment supplier, monument information technology. We continue with the success story looking at diverse spend from second quarter to third quarter. The decline in spend is 63,000 due to the property's transition from liberty creative solutions. They're a marketing direct mail company to a company called maple direct. Although it's impacting our numbers, we're optimistic in recovering the spend as maple direct. We're just awaiting their certification before we include them in our report.

On to employment. At the end of September, we had 454 employees with 301 or 66% of them being full time. 143 or 32% being part-time and 10 being seasonal. Our seasonal employment is related to our racing operation. On our diversity goals, we see continued success in our diversity and veteran employment figures while we keep focused on our in-state and local hiring.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Just a note about employment because I always like to, when I see your employment report, then go to your website for your job postings, you have about 20 to 25 job postings available, at least as of last night. That might have changed. But I'm going to have a conversation with Director Griffin and I think your team because I think where a new opportunity might exist is now that commuter rail service is extended down to Foxboro, you might have the availability to

actually attract potential job candidates from up the commuter line down to Foxboro. So I think it would be a good conversation to have to see how we could work with some of our sister agencies to get the word out about job opportunities that folks closer to Boston may not have been thinking about prior to that commuter rail service.

>> MS. FORTNEY: Definitely. On to compliance. In Q3 our security team just shy of 17,000 IDs and turned away a total of 446 individuals of which 45 were minors, 96 were underage, and 305 in expired, invalid or no ID. We did have two incidents regarding underage for the quarter. Both gained access to the gaming floor, one of which they gamed. However, he only inserted a total of \$10 into slot machines before he was identified by security and promptly removed from the gaming floor. The other was identified by player services before gaming and was escorted from the floor. Neither individual consumed alcohol.

Lastly, for compliance, the MassDOT's traffic monitoring program was released on September 26th, 2019. The study's conclusion is that the measured impact on trip patterns, motor vehicle crash trends and traffic operations has been relatively minor with operating conditions at the monitored intersections found to be similar to the conditions that were documented in the 2015 baseline study.

>> MR. GEORGE: I'll take a moment to jump in here for public transportation and a GATRA update that we committed to providing each quarter. Continue to meet, the last meeting we had was on 10/28. So a week and a half ago or so. As far as current steps or current status, next steps, they will be revising and providing a new route for review and consideration for a myriad of reasons, the route that was provided previously didn't work necessarily for us or for them. And so we look forward to receiving a revised or their ideas on what a new route could potentially look like. No major hurdles or stumbling blocks, just agreeing on what the route will be. We should have that revision this week or next week. It shouldn't be that long.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And remind me, Lance, it's the route to extend the bus service that goes to Patriot Place?

>> MR. GEORGE: So I think there are a variety of different ideas that could be implemented. I don't know that that's where they are right now. It's kind of in their court to come back to us. But the last one we saw was more of a route between Attleboro all the way up to us. It did not involve Patriot Place at that time.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Oh, okay. Now, was that the only to-do, if you will, relative to the study that you just mentioned?

>> MR. GEORGE: It is, yes. Yeah, as we think about relicensing too quickly from now, what, eight months from now, certainly we're moving furiously. We want to get this accomplished. We'd love to have it implemented or agreed to by the end of this year. But as I think about June of next year, that's something we want implemented prior to that.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay.

>> MS. FORTNEY: Moving to an update on our women leading at Penn program. Over the summer we read the book you are a badass by Jen Sincere. It identifies common problems that people encounter in giving you away to face that problem head on. I really enjoy the excerpt on the book that's on the slide especially the part about the more you push yourself to do the things you're scared to do, the stronger your confidence will be in the future. In our next meeting in the fourth quarter we'll be

recapping the book with our group and our additional topic is navigating the workforce which is a module that will focus on gender bias in the workplace and how to work through those hurdles.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Quick question about this program. So you had success last year, the first year of the program, and I saw the numbers, 8 of the 16, so half of those women were promoted, which is tremendous. Is that word getting out that, hey, this is a great program, it could help you? I mean, are women interested in this program?

>> MS. FORTNEY: They are. We try to keep it at a relatively manageable size. And then as they get promoted, we're replacing them, and there is questions that I get usually every month or so about is there another opening?

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Oh, good.

>> MS. FORTNEY: Are we able to join?

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Great. Thanks.

>> MS. FORTNEY: With that, though, another success story of the group from 2018, we had another promotion in the third quarter. Chelsea Marinucci, the property's revenue audit manager, accepted a position at a larger property with a broader set of responsibilities. She was one of my direct reports.

So I'm very proud of her and her development. She started as revenue auditor at opening and then received multiple promotions through her time there. So I'm really genuinely excited to see what she does, what her future looks like, and how she grows her career. The only downside I've heard from her is that it's already been snowing in Colorado. That wasn't exactly exciting for her, but we are very, very happy for her.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Great. And are the women -- they understand this is a real opportunity even though they may have to move, that's not any kind of a barrier?

>> MS. FORTNEY: I would say for some, they prefer to stay, and that's okay. For others, we have the conversation where if this is what you'd like to do with your future and your career, moving may be a real reality for them in the future. And we just talk about it. A handful of us have moved multiple times and so can lend guidance on that.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So you're being a good mentor, it sounds like.

>> MS. FORTNEY: Doing our best.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Great. Thank you.

>> MS. FORTNEY: Moving on to Mike.

>> MR. MUELLER: Good morning, Madam Chair, Commissioners. In looking at the marketing section, Plainridge Park continues to be valued partner with our local host communities. As we supported many local events this year. We were a top donator for the American Cancer Society's Relay For Life where we had many employees participate. Two employee events we conducted this year to raise money were \$5 jeans day where he could donate \$5 and wear jeans on Friday. And we all had several cookoff contests throughout the year where everybody would bring in their food and then you would pay a small fee to get a ticket to eat some of the food there and then judge and we'd have winners. So that raised a lot of money for us.

We also had great guest participation through our donation boxes located on the floor. This allowed our guests to donate their low-value TITO tickets to the cause as they exited the casino.

Year to date 2019, we've raised a total of \$24,900. That included \$6300 from our employee events and another \$5300 from the drop boxes from the guests.

Another great event we did supported the friends Of North Attleborough Animal Shelter. This event used guests and employee donations to help stop shelves at animal local shelters and we also made donations to entertainment and to the Plainville Permanent Firefighters local 4415 here.

Finally as you can see on this page, we do continue to support local community initiatives by donating to and participating in The Taste of Tri-town. This is a local food festival through the chamber of commerce that benefits local food pantries in Foxboro, Mansfield and Norton.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Mike, I want to point out that this is an important slide. When we think about the contributions that our licensees make as corporate citizens, we recognize that in so many ways in terms of the broad impacts that the PPC provides for Plainville here, but the fact that your employees are also giving back on an individual basis is significant. It shows that they understand in so many ways the opportunities that PPC is providing and that they are invested in helping. So really a credit to each of the employees who participated in this effort. Thank you.

>> MR. MUELLER: Thank you. Moving on to the next page. Looking at some of our larger sponsorships for the year. We continued our partnership with the Wrentham outlet malls, TPC and the Fenway concert series. We've also worked with Beasley Media Group to successfully complement an outdoor concert series that utilizes our racetrack to hold concerts in the summer. It's been a good success and we're looking forward to more of that next year.

The next tab, looking at some of our recent marketing highlights. It includes a mycash to free slotplay version, mychoice mysummer and our Mercedes-Benz giveaway. We gave away choice of a new Mercedes-Benz SLC300 or \$30,000 in cash. Also we had responsible gaming education week where we offered numerous on-property events that included contests and quizzes for our employees that not only educated them but offered them prizes as well for being responsible gaming.

Finally during the week we partnered with GameSense to give -- to have a watch giveaway where we first 100 guests all five days of the event that visited the booth all received a watch that's pictured on the right.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Mike, can you expand a little bit more on the mycash and the mychoice programs?

>> MR. MUELLER: Sure. What we did is we had a -- when we paired with Pinnacle, there was two card programs, two marketing loyalty programs. And we combined them into one, which is the mycash -- the mychoice card. So the mycash free slotplay conversion essentially allows them to take all of their points that they've earned and give them yet another option as to how they want to spend it. And this allows them to take their comp points and turn it into free slotplay. So now it's just another option. They could go comp at a restaurant, at the gift shop, or they can turn it into free slotplay.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So did you find -- you know, to the extent that you can answer this question, that people had points in the two different loyalty programs and decide to combine them?

>> MR. MUELLER: Yeah, yeah. Absolutely. And they do enjoy the ability to have

the one card now at all of our properties across the country. It allows you to play here and earn your points. You can go to Colorado, earn your points. You can go up to Maine, earn your points, and it all stays in the one bucket.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Great.

>> MR. MUELLER: In conclusion, we want to spotlight one of our local community business partners, Camelot Enterprises. Camelot is a veteran business enterprise located in Stoughton, Mass, that opened in 1987. We've been working with them for almost two years as our local provider for many items like you see pictured here. Our team especially loves the work they do with their specialty embroidered items that we often use for employee gifts and incentive giveaways. They do amazing work for us and we continue to look forward to a long future with them. And here actually today is a couple of representatives from Camelot that are going to speak. We have Pam Glatter, our sales rep, and Elliot Kaplan, the owner. I'd like to introduce them now.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Excellent. Welcome.

>> MR. KAPLAN: Thank you. Thank you for having us.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you for coming.

>> MR. KAPLAN: Good morning. Elliot Kaplan, obviously. Camelot was started by me as a veteran-owned business in 1987. I served in the military during the '60s, both in country and in Germany. I don't have a lot more to say about that. We started the business in '87. It was a single printing machine. Expanded by moving to Stoughton in 1993 to a large facility with automatic equipment, both screen printing, embroidery, engraving. We also offer thousands literally of promotional products. We've been working with Ely at Plainridge Park and Pam. Excuse me?

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Can you describe how having PPC as a client for your business?

>> MR. KAPLAN: It's been excellent. Pam can speak more to it. She's worked with Ely and has expanded the whole situation with GameSense.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Please use the microphone.

>> MS. GLATTER: Sure. Yes. Hi. I met Ely at a South Shore Chamber of Commerce event. And he suggested I apply for the Mass. Gaming. So we sent the application in and got approved, and it's been a great relationship. We started off doing small things like water bottles and marketing promos, and we work with the human resource department to do employee incentives as well and then we worked with dining with chef codes and work with the loft. And that expanded now to Encore and to other casinos as well as GameSense. And I really enjoyed the GameSense portion. Really understand now the importance of promoting that. So that's been a nice relationship. And I recently met with someone on the Mass. Gaming who does the marketing as well. So it's been a great relationship.

>> MR. KAPLAN: I just want to say one other thing.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Close to the microphone, sir.

>> MR. KAPLAN: Monday is Veterans Day, and I think it would be nice if we can recognize the day here today for both veterans and those currently serving.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Well, sir, first, we thank you for your service. And I think that that is an important point particularly while we are in this facility to acknowledge how much we, as a Commission and agency appreciate all those who have served, and we will be remembering that service on Monday. My fellow Commissioners, did you

want to add?

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Just a quick question about, sir, did you realize that as a veteran-owned business, there were these kinds of opportunities, or was that new to you?

>> MR. KAPLAN: It's new to me.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay. Yeah.

>> MR. KAPLAN: We've looked into -- we got the license from Mass. Gaming, and since then we've been looking into other avenues as far as veteran-owned situations are concerned, yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I ask about that licensing process? We have heard anecdotally that it could be a bit of a barrier for some businesses to go through the licensing process. What's your perspective? Obviously, you went through it and now described --

>> MR. KAPLAN: We've had no problems. We thought it was straightforward, provided the information as a veteran provided my papers and all of that. I found no problem with the process. I thought the process was very smooth, actually.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Glad to hear that.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yeah. I would just add thank you for your service as well. And, again, I think you're a great example of what the statute envisioned that even though a lot of the gaming employee opportunities were going to be closer to where the casino was located, I think you're, you know, a great example of where spending dollars are having an economic impact beyond the region of where a casino might be located. So congratulations.

>> MR. KAPLAN: Thank you.

>> MS. GLATTER: Thank you.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: Can I ask a question about the name?

>> MR. KAPLAN: Well, being brought up in the '50s and '60s, JFK was obviously a meaningful representative, coming from this area, the whole thing. So we picked that name.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: Great. Thank you.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Can I ask another question, please? When you did go through the registration process to become a VBE, did you go through the state office, or did you go through a veterans --

>> MR. KAPLAN: State office.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: OSD. That's excellent. I know that they've been working hard to streamline that process. So anything that we can do to debunk the idea that it's difficult, you know, that's an important message for us to send. And I suspect that they could use the advocacy of veterans like yourself who have had that.

>> MR. KAPLAN: If anybody is interested, any veteran wants information, they're more than free to call me. I'd be happy to talk to them about it.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Excellent. Thank you so much. Any further questions? And that was a good question, Ed.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No, the golf shirts look very sharp.

[Laughter]

>> MR. KAPLAN: Thank you.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you so much. Lance? Does this conclude your

presentation?

>> MR. GEORGE: It does. I apologize. Yes, ma'am. We're good.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you. Any questions for Lance?

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I had a quick question. Have a seat, sir. You mentioned at the beginning the impact that competition was having.

>> MR. GEORGE: Certainly.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Is your experience -- and then you mentioned but it's only been the first quarter.

>> MR. GEORGE: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Do you anticipate or do you have experience from other properties where competition came close to your resort? Do you have a strategy? Are you doing a few things differently? Do you expect some of those customers who may have gone off the first quarter and tried their hand elsewhere that you may be able to bring some of those folks back?

>> MR. GEORGE: Sure. So I think parsed out two questions there. One is do I think that some of our customers will return? Certainly. I think at least I can only speak for our openings as a company. We have 41 properties. Certainly in your first year, your goal and your job is to drive trial, drive awareness, build the database. And at that point revenues become more important, and they supersede your bottom line, your EBITDA number. And so at some point -- and we did the same thing -- you begin to pull back on some of your marketing efforts. You try to streamline and make your operation more efficient. And so, yes. I do think at some point Encore, Wynn, MGM, Penn, everybody tries the same thing. And that is the focus out of the gate is to ensure that people are visiting your facility. And then at some point gradually you will pull back. And so I do expect at some point the level of marketing that is occurring now for Encore probably is dialed back a bit. And as far as people rejoining us or coming back to the property, yeah. Normally you see a spike if you're the opening property. If you're the existing property, you see a decline. But as time goes on, we will see some of our customers return. I would point out, however, what is likely to occur is that maybe they're not just our customers going forward, however. It's likely that we'll see a split. So sometimes they'll visit Encore. Sometimes they'll visit us. It sort of depends on the day of the week. And so while it's not necessarily a loss of customers. It becomes more a loss of trips.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I see. Thank you.

>> MR. GEORGE: Yep.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: So you focus primarily on the competition being within the Commonwealth as opposed to from neighboring states? That's your data is revealing that?

>> MR. GEORGE: As far as who our primary competition is?

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Yes. Right now in terms of that loss you focused on within the Commonwealth versus from other jurisdictions.

>> MR. GEORGE: Tough to tell. So I would argue that our biggest competition is Rhode Island given the proximity. About 25 minutes to Twin River from our facility. The challenge is to try to quantify they were already open when we opened so we didn't see a loss of revenue, per se. But I would argue that our primary competitor is Twin River. However, we wouldn't have seen a loss in revenue because they were already

there, already in a existing facility. So we're only experiencing that with Encore. But if the question is who is our competition, it's the closest competitor.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: And I think our early research revealed that PPC repatriated \$100 million from other jurisdictions which, of course, was a goal.

>> MR. GEORGE: Right.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Of the Expanded Gaming Act. So I wondered if you have -- if you had felt that in any way the other jurisdictions were taking any of those repatriated dollars back.

>> MR. GEORGE: It's interesting for us. What we have seen is that, as we just mentioned, Encore has been very aggressive out of the gate. And Twin River has reacted a little bit. I think a second question you had was are we going to do things different? We're not. We're not going to get into an arms race or a spending war. That's not who we are based on our size. We're a \$260 million facility compared to a \$2.6 million facility. Very different facility, different operation, different marketing spend. And so our approach is to let that work itself out. It will come back in line. We're not going to change dramatically the way we do things.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Along some of those lines, you know, a lot of what could happen in terms of this competition which was predicted, perhaps falls into two categories. Competing for an existing customer and then growing the market. So how would you -- can you comment relative to the growing the market piece which would be something that we, for one, would be interested in, you know, learning?

>> MR. GEORGE: Yeah. So these are all public numbers. And so we're studying feverishly in preparation for our budget meeting in a couple weeks. And so one of the things that we have found public numbers, if you include Connecticut, Rhode Island and all of Massachusetts, even with the addition of Encore, I believe the market growth was 3.8%, which speaks to me at least that it's a redistribution of the existing pie. More so than it is growing the market. Now, those are slot numbers only because table games numbers are not released for the state of Connecticut. So I can only speak to those slot revenues. But I guess I'm a little surprised at how small that number is. I think it's certainly easier for everybody when the market is growing. This appears at 3.8% to be more a redistribution.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Lance, a quick question relative to the lottery. I know some of the numbers year over year are down. I'm assuming some of that is just based on a corresponding dip in visitation. But have you needed to have or thought about having any conversations with our colleagues at the lottery in terms of new product mix or more machines or whatever a solution might be to drive some of those numbers up?

>> MR. GEORGE: Happy to do so. I think our revenues, public numbers are down about 18 to 19%. Lottery revenues were only down about 8.65%. So they are outperforming, if you will. But certainly happy to reconnect with the lottery. It has been a while.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Lance, one question on that. I think I saw the slide, and it addressed the ticket sales in the player-activated terminals. Do you have Keno as well?

>> MR. GEORGE: We do.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: And did I miss that in terms of the numbers? That's all

included?

>> MR. GEORGE: It is included, yes.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you.

>> MR. GEORGE: We have Keno. We offer Keno.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

>> MR. GEORGE: That concludes. Okay.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you. Yes. Thank you. Ed, moving on to item number 5 on our agenda. Dr. Lightbown, please, on the Director of Our Racing Division. Good morning, Chad.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Good morning, Commissioners. Our first item on the racing agenda is the racing update. And I'm just going to do a quick one. I know we have a lot of different items on the agenda today. Earlier this summer at Plainridge, they held the Spirit of Mass trot for \$250,000. And they added a new race this year, the Clara Barton Pace. This was another great way to showcase Plainridge and get some national attention. And it had the benefit -- there were some people that had Massachusetts ties that actually their horse finished second in the race, in the Massachusetts Spirit of Mass race. And then in the Clara Barton, some Massachusetts natives won with their horse. So that was kind of a highlight to not only have a big race like that but also have New England connections and Massachusetts connections do well through the day.

On the screen is a picture of Commissioner Cameron with the winner's trophy.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Dr. Lightbown, I think there were many, many people in that picture.

[Laughter]

You included.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Maybe a few of them. They had a nice day of different people come out for it. One of the people in there is the Massachusetts House of Representative Elizabeth Piorier and I apologize if I pronounced her name wrong. Sportscaster Bob Neumeier, harness driver John Campbell was there and local Plainridge people, Nancy, Melissa are in the picture. And then board of selectmen from Plainridge and the Patriots Minute Men. It was quite a day.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: It was.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: And do you know the overall attendance?

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: They don't keep attendance figures there because there is no charge of admission.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Right. I think we heard that it was certainly up over the --

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Yes, they had a nice turnout. It was on a weekend day, so they could do that.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: There were a lot of people there.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Bringing good business to Plainville.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Absolutely. We're excited about the local ties winning races.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Alex, a quick question. And maybe you know this. How did Clara Barton get a race named after her?

[Laughter]

I don't equate her with racing as much as the Red Cross.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: I think they were trying to come up with names for, you know, related to Massachusetts.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: And that's how they came up with that one. Steve O'Toole apologizes for not being able to be here today. He had a prior engagement. The next time he's at a meeting, he may be able to elaborate on his decision to name it that.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: All right.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: The other exciting thing at Plainridge which we just finished up was the sire stakes were the Massachusetts bred, standardbreds. That program has expanded greatly. They had three legs, three different weekends, where they held trials to qualify for the finals. The finals themselves, they gave out \$800,000 in purses that day. And the overall was \$1.8 million for that series. So it was definitely worth it. I looked back to 2013 which was before any of the gaming money came in, before Penn came. And that year the total sire stakes purses was \$253,000. So that's obviously a huge increase.

And another exciting thing was the 2-year-old pacing colts and geldings division actually had to be split into two different races because they had enough horses for that. So that program's expanding.

Suffolk Downs completed their final racing this summer. And I was going to go through and bring up statistics and all that, but, you know, those numbers end up in our annual report and all and people can see those. The final day, they did have 12,000 -- over 12,000 people come for attendance. The handle's always been good. They had a T-shirt that you could buy and the proceeds went to thoroughbred after-care. And I just -- rather than go through different numbers and all, I wanted to read a quote from Susanne Walsh, our chief steward, who's been at Suffolk since she was a hot Walker there, which is basically starting at the very bottom level, and then she worked her way up as a groom, became an owner, trainer, eventually she became our chief steward.

So to quote Susan, horse racing is in the end so much more than a list of winners or statistics on attendance. It's a crazy quilt of memories that can never be erased from those who have spent the best part of their lives here. I thought that was an appropriate sendoff for Suffolk.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: And Alex, I know it's meaningful to you, too.

>> JULIE: It is, thank you.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Do you want to share a favorite story?

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Oh, let's see. I actually had a baby shower. It was given to me in the what's called the trainers' viewing room. It's right on the turn of the track. So the trainers can stand there and watch their horses work in the morning. And they did it as a surprise. The way they got me there was they had the chief steward at the time tell me that there was somebody coming from out of town to do an inspection on the test barn. And so I needed to be down there. And I drove our people crazy beforehand saying, you know, make sure everything's -- they were all in on the joke.

[Laughter]

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Oh, they were. Wow!

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: That's a personal one. The other things are obviously the

horses and the people there. It was incredible, very much like a family, and generations of people through their families would work there, yeah. Very exciting times.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: And you saw famous horses.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Yes, yep. They had several horses of the year that attended the Mass Cap, a Kentucky Derby that was in it. Cigar was treated as a celebrity. He was banned from New York and had a state police escort the whole way. The horse. So those were definitely some exciting days.

So our next item is the 2020 racing applications, and I'll ask the Plainridge folks to come up.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Good morning.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: So today we have Lenny Calderone, the announcer, and racing services manager, and Jason Savastano, neutral manager here in place of Steve O'Toole to answer questions you may have. You all have had a chance to have the public hearing for comments. You've seen the application. They've basically asked for a harness racing dates April 6 through November 27. It's a very similar calendar to this year, with the one change is that they've added a couple days. This year they'll do 108. Next year they'll do 110 through an agreement with the Harness Horsemen's Association. And they're going to add two Sundays that they're going to add.

I won't read the requirements. Those are in the memo and come straight from the statute. The number of days that they're going to race will also make them in compliance for the ability to simulcast. That legislation's still in there for at least 100 days in which they'll have 110.

The one thing that we have done for the last four years is ask that they have an independent review of the track surface done. The first year in 2016, Ed Ryan did it. He's been associated with freehold, Yonkers, and has consulted on different training centers, building tracks and things like that. The last three years Dan Herbst has done it with the Maryland Jockey Club. So this year we're just asking that they have somebody new come in to do their review. And again, this is kind of basically a standard operating procedure that we've done now for four years. This is going to be the fifth year. Does the Commission have any questions on the application?

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Do you have any -- are you going to approve or comment on who they select in terms of the qualifications of who's looking at it? Just please don't use somebody you've used in the past?

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: They usually bring a name to me with their qualifications.

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Okay. So that will happen before they --

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: It will be informal, yes. Right.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So Dr. Lightbown, obviously from the hearing, this application has very strong community support.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Which is always a positive thing when we look at licenses every year. So that I look at as a positive thing. Again, I mentioned at the hearing, and I'll mention it again, we really do appreciate the association working with Penn National in order to jointly come together with racing days, which is great. I know there's a long-term contract in place. So we really do appreciate and think that's best when there is that collaboration to do things the right way. And I know the track has

been the safety, and we take that very seriously. In fact, I don't think there are too many standard-bred tracks around the country that really require the safety check. I think it's a really important piece, and to have someone different, I think, it makes sense, too, because we want people to feel -- we want it to be safe.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And I know you feel strongly about that.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Definitely.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: You've always had the best interest of the participants, whether they be drivers or horses, their safety. So I commend you for always having that first before anything else, that safety issue. So I think those are very good, strong pieces in support of this application.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Yeah. It is a strong application. I agree.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Commissioner Zuniga?

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. Just to clarify your point to the prior comments, the Harness Horsemen Association highlights in their comments the need for some replenishment of the track. Does anybody, Jason or Lenny, want to talk a little bit about that, or are we to take the inspection to be the one to really tell us whether there is indeed some need for replenishment of the surface?

>> I'm sorry, you said about the replenishment?

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. In the back, there's a letter from the horsemen's group saying that the track cover material needs replenishment.

>> Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Is that something you agree with or disagree with or it's going to be left for the inspection?

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: I guess maybe before you answer, have you had an opportunity to actually take a look at --

>> I have not.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: If you're not prepared to answer that, that's okay.

>> Steve O'Toole is looking into that.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, let me put the question to Alex. What do you see happening relative to this topic? We'll wait for the inspection?

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Steve O'Toole has offered to meet with the Harness Horsemen, and that's where we've left it is that they should get together. Track maintenance is an ongoing issue. It's something that happens every day.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Microphone.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Track maintenance is something that happens every day. They have their machines out on the track and all that. And comments from drivers on a daily basis can be made to management if they notice something, either sometimes the track is too deep. Sometimes it's too hard. Those types of things can be taken care of immediately. And I don't know if -- I'm not sure on the level right now. I was up there on the sire stakes day watching, and we could see -- with Steve O'Toole, we could see the machines going around, and you could see that it was digging down into -- there was stone dust there, and it was, you know, it looked like it was deep enough. I'm not an expert on tracks. But, again, we have told the Harness Horsemen that they need to sit and meet with Steve O'Toole on those concerns. And that's something that doesn't need to come to the Commission. They can say we noticed that there needs to be

some stone dust in this area. And Steve can take care of that immediately.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Dr. Lightbown, you are an expert, though, on the safety of horses and what it takes to maintain that. And have you seen evidence of breakdowns with horses which would be an indication that maybe there's an issue with the track?

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Yeah. We haven't seen them -- that. We did have one that had a fracture that needed to be euthanized. On the standardbred side, we don't see the number of incidents that they do on the thoroughbred side. And it's not unusual, looking back at our statistics. Some years we go without any incidents there. Other times there may be one or two. And we haven't finished doing a complete review on that particular incident yet. It may or may not have been due to the track surface.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So every time there is an issue with a horse, you do look into the matter and see if you can identify if there is a safety concern?

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Yes. Any time there's a horse that dies at the track, regardless of what the reason is, we have an autopsy done on it, full autopsy by an accredited lab, you know, laboratory that does this. And they give us that information back. We also get a blood sample from that horse and send it to our lab for drug testing. And those have always come back negative.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: What time of year did that happen? Do you know approximately when that happened?

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: It happened maybe about a month ago.

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: About a month ago. Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: And at our public hearing, the issue around safety was discussed as well when Mr. O'Toole was here to address the application.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Yes.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: So thank you for filling in the details today. Any further questions about the application? I think when you look at the requirements, the public hearing was very helpful because we did hear from so many of the stakeholders, including the community members who -- and including our public safety officials, the Chief of Police and the chief of the fire department were able to address issues around the racing, and they really acknowledge that there have been really minimal issues around community public safety. And in terms of the horse racing, I think what I see here is a request for a vote conditioned on, again, what has been the practice in any case of --

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Yes.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: -- certifying as to the quality of the track. This year you just want to make sure to be completely transparent with all stakeholders that it would be a new -- a new entity that would do the review.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Yes. And that doesn't in no way puts a negative comment on the people who have done it in the past. They were all well qualified.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Excellent. Any further questions? So do you want to, for the record, state your recommendation, Dr. Lightbown?

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: My recommendation is that Plainridge will have an independent -- let me start over again. The racing division recommends that the

Commission approve the application of Plainridge Gaming and Development LLC, Plainridge racecourse for live harness racing in 2020 with the following condition: Plainridge will have an independent expert that hasn't previously reviewed the track surface, review the track surface prior to racing. The Massachusetts Gaming Commission reserves the right to ask for further reviews during the racing season.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I would move that the Commission approve the application of harness horse racing license filed by Plainville Gaming and Redevelopment LLC also known as Plainridge Park Racecourse for the calendar year 2020 subject to the conditions outlined in the memo from Dr. Lightbown included in the Commission's packet and any other conditions discussed at the meeting today. Which I believe there were no other conditions that we discussed. So the ones that Dr. Lightbown has included in the packet.

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Second.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Any further discussion? Any additional condition? Those in favor?

[Vote taken]

Opposed? 5-0, please, Catherine. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. Good luck with the racing season.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you Lenny. Thank you, Jason. Thank you so much.

>> If I may say one thing.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Yes.

>> Mr. Stebbins, you asked about the Clara Barton, how we chose that name. A little bit of an insight into that. My understanding is that Paul Verette, our racing secretary, was going through the historical records, somebody that was a native of Massachusetts, and I guess he looked through the books there and he came up with Clara Barton because she was a volunteer nurse, a native of Massachusetts, and she was a volunteer for the Red Cross. So that's how the name came to be.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Any thoughts on, you know, Jeff Kinney ceremonial race?

>> I'm sorry, what?

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: A Jeff Kinney race? Thank you for clarifying.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you. Dr. Lightbown, moving on to item 5c.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Our next item is the racing annual report for the year of 2018. You have it in front of you and it's in the packet. So we're not going to read it word for word. Just go over some highlights. Suffolk Downs raced eight days. And in that year, Plainridge Park raced 110 days. The number of drug positives that we had went down a little bit in 2018. We always strive to do as much education as possible. We have a trainer's manual that is posted on the website. We leave a copy in our -- there's an office hallway that we share with the racing office that the horsemen have access to. We leave a copy there. And try to get the word out. We have a whole list of medications on a controlled therapeutics schedule that have thresholds and how to avoid getting over the threshold level. So we did see the levels go down a little bit at Plainridge, which was great.

At Suffolk, it did go up a little bit. That might have just been with Suffolk Downs, the type of racing there, you're getting so many people coming all at once from out of state that may have been in jurisdictions that may have had slightly different regulations. I'm trying to think if there's --

The rulings state fairly similar levels between that and 2017, between the judges at Plainridge and then the stewards at Suffolk Downs. At Suffolk Downs, there was a claiming issue that the stewards very diligently worked on and did a lot of research on as well as with folks from Suffolk Downs. And I discovered this false claim that involved maybe ten different people. So all of those people got rulings against them, and that's one of the reasons why the rulings at Suffolk Downs that year were increased. It's not necessarily that all of a sudden there were a lot of issues. It was that one particular incident that happened to involve a lot of people.

I'll turn it over to Chad now, if he wants to go over maybe some of the financial highlights.

>> MR. BOURQUE: Good morning, Commissioners. So after going through all the financials in the report, you did a bit of attribution analysis, and overall we saw an increase in the revenue categories across all line items except for the association licensing fee which was down roughly 3%. And as Alex had noted, on the compliance side, the fines penalties on a monetary value were down slightly. But everything else was up. So overall that was good on the revenue side. I think, you know, one of the biggest attribution for that was -- there was a 7% uptick in simulcast. Suffolk Downs alone was up \$10 million in that. So that's -- that's been happening over the past three or four years, these simulcasts have really been increasing year over year. And then also there was an increase of 13% in licensing fees.

So overall there was a lot of positive items on that, and I just wanted to put out if there was any questions out there that you had.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Dr. Lightbown, you mentioned, when you talked about medication overages and what the statistics were, that you actually spent some time with -- educating people, right? How to avoid an overage.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So that was of interest to me. So you're actually trying to be proactive here in assisting individuals on how to be smart about, you know, substances that are allowed but certainly at only a percentage, right? Only a level?

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Right. They realized that there's a subset of drugs that are used by even maybe your pet veterinarian uses every day, drugs used with animals to help them heal or get over a cold, an infection, different things. And so obviously we want to be able to treat the racehorses with those therapeutic medications. A lot of those also would not be appropriate to find in a horse that's actively racing. If it's a pain reliever, you know, certainly appropriate if the horse just got injured, but you don't want to do it after racing. Probably seven or eight years ago, RCI came up with a list of therapeutic medications, and they've added a few over the years. I think it was around 20 to begin with and now it's up to around 30 of drugs that you can legitimately use, and it just gives guidelines on when to stop using them, how much you can give, you know, to stay under the threshold limits. It's not necessarily an exact science because there's different things that can affect how a horse metabolizes drugs, but it is a help to trainers and veterinarians.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Great. Well, I think it's important that you saw fit to emphasize and try to assist with knowledge, right, how to do this better.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Rather than say, we've got you on the back end. You're trying to be proactive on the front end so that people don't run into a problem with medication.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Yes. We'd prefer not to have any positives.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: That would be -- that's easier for everybody. And we want fair racing. We want fair for everybody and everybody to be following the same guidelines.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So it's a great report, of course, because of timing, you know, we're looking at calendar year end of 2018.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Right.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: We can probably expect something really similar in terms of numbers for 2019 because racing and simulcasting was probably on the same levels. But it is for 2020 that we might see a change. Of course we'll have to see what is depending on what happens with the legislation given that now we don't have an application from Suffolk Downs, and we won't -- there's still a question as to whether and how long they'll be able to simulcast in the next calendar year.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Correct.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So I just wanted to point that out for the record.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Yes.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: I have one quick question. Mary, can you go to slide 34, please? It's a photo of the last page. So I just noticed, Commissioner Stebbins is holding a bucket. I didn't know if you were doing double duty that day?

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I'm not a licensed test barn official, but I think it was more of a prop. The bucket was empty.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: For the record, that's a water bucket.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I go back to the fact that I was unlicensed, I didn't know the difference.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Did you know the difference? Exactly.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thankfully, no.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: A great team down there at the test barn, absolutely.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: I thought the report was particularly helpful for me as I continue to learn more about the horse racing industry, particularly the racing terminology. Thank you very much on that.

I have a question. Forgive me for not knowing the answer. With respect to simulcasting, those revenues are treated in the -- how are they treated for the purpose of state benefits in terms of local aid and taxes? There's no tax rate on simulcasting, correct? If you could walk me through just how they're treated, that would be great.

>> MR. BOURQUE: So the simulcasting is for local aid purposes is lumped in under the handle.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Under the handle. There's no different. So the \$10

million that was extra that came through Suffolk would be subject to the same division as all the rest of the handle?

>> MR. BOURQUE: Correct.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Okay. Confirming what I understood. Thank you so much.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Excellent report. Thank you. And thanks for such a successful season and very ethical, you know, the proactive piece of what you do, it's much appreciated.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Thank you. So item b is racing legislation update. And Catherine Blue, our Chief Legal Counsel, did the memo for it. You both have been following the different bills and are waiting to see what happens with them.

>> MS. BLUE: So in the Commission packet today, there is a memo regarding the legislation that is before the legislature. The Commission's -- the racing statutes, chapter 128a and 128c were scheduled to sunset last July. At that point the legislature passed an extension until January 15 of 2020. So at the moment the legislature has a choice. They need to act before January 15, 2020, or racing in the Commonwealth will no longer be allowed. They can either pass another extension, which would look very much like attachment A to this memo, or they can pass another racing bill. And what you have in the packet are three bills that address racing. The first one is HB13. That is the Commission bill. It is broad, and it gives the Commission a great deal of flexibility to address the issues that impact racing through the regulatory process.

SB101 a similar kind of bill. It has some slightly different terms, and it is a little more specific in terms of what's statutory versus what's regulatory. And there are some points in SB101 that would be worth considering by the Commission if they were to create regulations around racing. HB322 is another bill. It's set up in a way that it doesn't seem to either extend 128a or 128c. And I think it would have some difficulty standing alone, but it also tracks very much what SB101 does and HB13.

And then finally, just because it's been out in public, there is HB4070. It's a gaming bill. The reason it's in this memo is because the proponent for that bill has talked about a racing component to any gaming application they would file. So there's been a lot of attention paid to that bill as well. Alex and I can answer any questions. We've been watching these as they've gone through. Again, the date to take some sort of action is coming up.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: First of all, General Counsel, I appreciated this memo. I thought it was very well put together, gave an excellent snapshot of each of the pieces of legislation that we've been hearing about and that are out there. You know, once again, we're faced with another pending deadline of where, you know, the can kind of keeps getting kicked down the road a little bit. You know, I think this is -- it seems unusual and not commonplace in the Commonwealth for regs of an existing business to keep getting sunsetted. I think it creates some level of uncertainty for operators. Certainly some uncertainty for potential operators. And at a time when we know one segment of this industry is doing really well, which is with respect to harness racing by evidence of an extended purse agreement, I think I saw in the packet that we have an increasing membership in the Harness Horsemen's Association, all good signs that are pointing to success in that industry. And, you know, it seems to me that the regs are not keeping up with, you know, the state of the industry as it is right now in

Massachusetts.

You know, one suggestion I would, you know, we can certainly consider is I would like to see this Commission renew emphasis for the bill that we've had up on Beacon Hill for a number of years, whether that be at this meeting or our next meeting, give the Commission a chance to revote our support for the bill or whether we would, you know, allow our Chair to put a new cover letter together with our existing bill and send it off to legislative leadership, I think that would be helpful. You know, again, we're looking at some just, you know, January deadline that, you know, we usually wait up until the 23rd hour to figure out whether, you know, Plainridge or, you know, the folks at Suffolk can accept bets or simulcast or anything. And again, I think we're at the right time and the right moment to give some more emphasis to our bill which, you know, kind of creates an open and transparent process going forward as to how we work with the horse racing industry.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: I think, Commissioner Stebbins, you're referring to the January 15th deadline.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yes.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: For 2020.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You know, I agree with everything that you say conceptually. I would add a couple of things. You know, just a very fine point, you referred to regs that keep getting extended. It's really the legislation. It's the statute. I wouldn't want to confuse it with the authority that we do have when it comes to promulgating regs. And the one that we don't have which is the legislative action. I do think that and agree that the memo lays out really the key summary or the key aspects and the differences of the bills. But I think it really perhaps this is what you were alluding to, Commissioner. It really might be helpful to revisit the reasons of some of the recommendations when it came to what we drafted. The history and evolution of racing in this state but in many other states as well is one that has resulted in a lot of different numbers and premiums and takeouts. And for one, what we feel that are the legislation that we were requiring and met the requirement to submit to the legislature. One of the things that they would accomplish we thought at this time and I think it's still valid now is streamline significantly the ability to regulate racing. Not just give the industry and the stakeholders certainty, which is critical, but then whatever cannot be determined, have the Commission, this body, to have flexibility and to be deliberative, analytical and ultimately come that a resolution either via regulation or anything else or votes.

So I have to imagine that just given very recent history at the legislature, you know, because they extend at the 11th hour, they may not really appreciate, you know, the thought that went into what we put together. I think it's -- to the extent that we can, we should remind that or make it or send a memo like this with additional -- some of the additional -- some of the research that I know we did at the time when we compared, you know, the takeouts and premiums in other states what other states, for example, have done to try to streamline and update their own legislation.

So I think that's some of the things that we could highlight. I'm not optimistic that there's a lot of time to do that between now and January 15. It's something that we've talked about at some point. But I think, again, this memo begins to really articulate the key differences. And one of simply to me is that with our legislation, we think we

have -- we would have the ability to, among other things, help the industry as it was intended in the Gaming Act. Their racehorse development fund that was put together with its moving pieces, the split and whatnot, is and was always meant to be an important piece to aid the industry and our ability to do that, especially in the thoroughbred side, has been constrained by the recent short-term extensions. So. . .

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: I just want to clarify the process first. I think I've given my thanks to you, Catherine, on the memo is very, very helpful. So thank you. There was a filing deadline, am I right, Counsellor Blue, for refiling SB13?

>> MS. BLUE: Yes, and we met that deadline last fall.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: It was last fall, not in this current year? Did you file something again this --

>> MS. BLUE: Because we are a state agency, we filed the November prior to the beginning. And that's when we refiled.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: And that was filed under your name, Executive Director Bedrosian? Is that how it worked?

>> MS. BLUE: It was filed under the Commission's name.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: So there was some discussion last fall as to the support. So what I'm hearing from my fellow Commissioners is that while it was filed properly through the channels, it might be helpful to, in an informal, less formal communication, reiterate the Commission's position on this particular filing. I don't think today we're prepared -- I wouldn't be prepared to necessarily say we endorse this particular exact submission without further clarification. With that said, I do think we could have time to get together some, you know, a letter, correspondence, on filing. Certainly there is a process that the legislature expects. And I'm not sure if we could -- this is a question if we could actually amend it at this time or not. But we could certainly communicate whether we would suggest in the sausage making, an amendment should be made of sorts.

So perhaps we can think about it for a future meeting with some work done by Executive Bedrosian and Catherine and her team.

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: I would make the same comment. The draft that's been resubmitted is something that happened -- the meat of it happened before I arrived and before you arrived. And so there's been some discussion but there hasn't been a deep dive. I trust and assume with the expertise in the office that any necessary changes would have been made. But I do think having had this experience in other offices, it's always good to take a fresh set of eyes and look at it again. I do think this is a good opportunity, however, to maybe remind the legislature of our submission and the fact that I agree with you. I remember conversations you and I specifically had disagreeing over an approach having to do with certain monies connected to racing and the frustration and the only the sunseting rather than taking a sort of good look at it. Given the closing of Suffolk, I think this is a very different landscape. So I think that's an even more pressing reason to sort of go back to the legislature, remind them of the submission because I do think it is something that needs to be addressed.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I would agree. I think it never hurts to, in an appropriate way, push something forth again that we think makes sense.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Further communication is always helpful. I just want to

make sure that we all know on the record the process was followed appropriately. There's only a certain window to file. So thank you for that. And we can put it on our agenda setting?

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: If you want, Commissioners, we can think about drafting a -- some type of communication that talks about the history of the bill, where the Commission is now, and recognizes the potential for modifications, and as you appropriately called, the sausage-making process. And also, I think that we'd want to just remind folks. I think everyone here knows it and people in the industry know it. But the connection between the racing bill and simulcasting. It's not just about racing.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: That's right.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: It is did simulcasting. When you hear those figures, that's important. So just to remind folks that there are different components of this.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Right. And again, the Commission really hasn't, as a whole, voted on this, but in terms of even if we know we have a consensus, so it would be a draft that could help guide our discussion. I think that would be excellent. I think there's also the component that because we always think about the impact of what the Commission regulates, looking through a wide lens, there are issues around jobs attached to both the racing and simulcasting and the revenue numbers are important too. So we should think with the wider lens as well as the statutory submission. Any further discussion on that? Excellent, excellent job on the memo. Thank you. Any -- Catherine, did you want to add, now that we've chatted? Anything further insights based on what we just talked about?

>> MS. BLUE: No.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Okay. You're all set? Excellent. So does that conclude the racing legislative update? Any further questions on that?

Then we go into the split, discussion 5e for purposes of our agenda.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: General Counsel Blue has a memo regarding that (away from mic) Commissioner Cameron sits on that committee. So she can also (away from mic).

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: And if you could remind us of the makeup of that committee. I know it's chaired by gubernatorial appointee, and Gayle is our representative here.

>> MS. BLUE: The horse racing committee consists of five members. The chair is Brian Fitzgerald. He's appointed by the Governor. There is an appointee from the treasurer, Emily -- I can't pronounce her last name, I'm sorry, Kotunsky. There is a representative from the standardbred, which is Peter Goldberg, a representative from the thoroughbred, which is Joe Savage, and then Commissioner Cameron is our representative from the Commission.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So as you can see as outlined in the memo, the newly constituted committee did meet this fall, met a couple of times, had submissions from both breeds regarding what they thought was appropriate for a split. The committee, many years ago, the original committee, decided it would be appropriate to meet every year because racing was changing pretty considerable changes, especially on both -- with both breeds, right? Penn National, with the Racehorse Development Fund, and increased monies, increased interest, increased race days. And the thoroughbreds obviously the opposite is true. Very few opportunities to race. So I

think the committee takes all of that into consideration. Race days is one of many, many factors. Really thoughtful review of all of the submissions. As well, Dr. Lightbown and her team is very good at providing the committee with real numbers, hard numbers, not only on participants, licensees, monies generated, but all of the ancillary pieces that everyone doesn't typically think about, meaning farms, how many horses, how many new horses for both breeds each year, all of the employees, which is a critical piece. So all of those factors are taken into consideration, and it's a difficult job for the committee because both breeds are very, very passionate about racing and having thoroughbred be successful, harness bred, you know, harness racing be successful. So there are spirited discussions. I believe the committee -- I was one of the four that voted in favor of this split. It really turned out 5% more went to the standardbred this year because of all the additional generations, the folks involved, the race days, all of the relevant factors that were really -- the committee was very thoughtful about taking a look at. So the recommendation is for 5% more to go to the standardbred side. And what we did not do this year as a committee was get involved in any of the retroactive pieces, and I think that was a good decision as well. There were many unintended consequences around that that we worked hard to avoid. So as a member of that committee, I think this is a sound recommendation and one that our Commission should approve.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Any questions for Commissioner Cameron or for Dr. Lightbown on the split?

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I would just add, I was very happy to see the retroactive piece included this year. I think that was a fairway to treat both groups.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: And with types of factors, as I understand it, the committee considers is not only the number of race days but open space, the breeders, impact on breeders, the ancillary services, correct, goes beyond the number of race days.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: It does.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: And that's where the 5% increase.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes. Because of the additional -- you know, the additional -- the entire -- the entire focus of racing, the entire -- when you look at all of the other factors that you just mentioned, the committee really did believe an additional 5% of standardbred was appropriate. Of course, the one vote here would be the representative from the thoroughbred industry. And, of course, they're very hopeful that there could be another track here in the Commonwealth, and there would be some monies there to assist with that endeavor. So that's obviously a very -- we understood completely their point of view and came to this decision, realizing all of those factors in considering them all.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: And like this committee, it's a public meeting.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Oh, it is. And there's always an interested group of individuals, passionate folks when it comes to racing with both breeds, and many of them were represented at our meetings this year.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Any further questions? Do I have a motion?

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. I would move that the Commission approve the split of the racehorse development fund recommended by the horse racing committee fully described in the memorandum from General Counsel Blue and Dr. Lightbown, Director of Racing in the November 7th, 2019, Commission's packet.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Further questions? Discussion? All those in favor?

[Vote taken]

Opposed? 5-0. Thank you.

Now back to Chad. This is item 5f, the quarterly local aid report. Thank you, Chad.

>> MR. BOURQUE: Thank you. Each quarter in accordance with Section 18D of Chapter 58, local aid is payable to each city and town where racing activities are conducted. The amounts are calculated at .35 times the handle for the quarter ending six months prior to payment. The local aid payment for the quarter ending in September 30th, 2019, is in the amount of \$168,536.99. This amount reflects the total handle from racing that took place in January, February and March of 2019 and on the second page you will see a breakdown of the handle as well as the distributions that are payable to each city and town. And this item does require a vote. Thank you.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Questions for Chad?

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Looks pretty straightforward. All of the numbers are in order, and I'm sure have been checked and rechecked, and they're accurate. That's what we come to expect from this team. So that's always appreciated. And if there's no further questions, I would move that the Commission approve the local aid -- quarterly local aid payments as described in the memo from Chad Bourque, Financial Analyst, dated November 7th, 2019, included in the Commission's packet.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Any questions? All those in favor?

[Vote taken]

Opposed? 5-0. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Now moving on to 5g. Dr. Lightbown? Thank you.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: So today I have Alice Szpila with the Harness Horsemen's Association, she's the treasurer. And what's your other title?

>> MS. SZPILA: Managing director.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Managing director of HHANE to talk about their pension plans and different things they're doing, benefits for their members.

>> MS. SZPILA: Good morning, Commissioners.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Good morning.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Use the microphone.

>> MS. SZPILA: Good morning, Commissioners, and thank you for having me. Welcome to Plainville. This is my town. I live here. My husband and I have had a farm since the end of '79 and went on to sell the first farm and buy another 60-acre farm. And he being Local 4 by trade built a training track, USTA regulation trading track in which another stable shares use of that track with all of us. So I'm very comfortable here. More so than Boston. And I just wanted to meet with you to kind of bring you up to date. Throughout the year I've been trying to do that. I wanted you to see our first year. This is our first year -- actually, our second year but our first year of really promoting it and getting people going on that RSP. You can see we increased our participants from 112 to 141. It has been a big, big hit amongst the trainers and drivers. So much so that it's probably part of the fabric that's making racing work over

at Plainridge. The criteria, the adjustment we made in the criteria because of the less racing days has worked really well and it's allowed them to participate the way it was intended. And our membership has, over the past three years, also increased from when I came on board, there was 256. We're now at 333 members. So we're really growing strong. And the Harness Horsemen's Association had an election in which all the same people were re-elected and the president. The membership felt strongly that they were being well represented.

And I just wanted to let you know what some of that money's doing beside the pension. We also have what we offered this year first time was a company. We teamed up with a company called 2020. And we did a vision program for them. And they brought a bus over. I'm sorry, I'm not following your order, maybe. They brought a bus to the facility. And the people were able to come in and have eye exams. And the health and welfare fund was able to help offset that cost. So people who would not normally be able to go get an exam or afford the glasses maybe wouldn't even -- didn't have the time, we made it really easy for them. So we had sent out a bulletin letting them know we were going to do that. And I believe you received a copy of a kind of frequently asked question page we put together for them. And it was a big hit. Everybody seemed very satisfied. So that's the kind of things we're trying to do. Vision, maybe get into some wellness checks, flus, things like that. We've got some big ideas that we want to work with the members and use that money for.

And also, not that it's part of the health and welfare, but just we wanted to give a little shout-out to the fact that we were able to get Tufts to offer our members a discount up there if they need any services. And that's the summary.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: That's exciting stuff. Again, what I referred to earlier is just growth and success on the harness racing side of the business. It's really encouraging.

>> MS. SZPILA: And all because of the legislation with the health and welfare fund that this is possible. And there's just endless possibilities we're trying to put together for them. And we appreciate that.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I agree with Commissioner Stebbins that this is a fabulous program. I see how hard you work every year to improve it. This is an excellent -- I love the frequently asked questions.

>> MS. SZPILA: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: That's really helpful to people, you know. Also, why are our -- in looking at those numbers of other states and our state, our numbers are so much higher, right? That first chart we showed. Is that just -- do you think it is the -- is it the pension plan that people really gravitate around becoming members, or is it just the increase in racing?

>> MS. SZPILA: It definitely was the pension plan that brought members aboard.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: It was. Wow!

>> MS. SZPILA: And people that -- I would approach people and I'd say, you know we have a pension plan? I heard about it. What does it involve? And when I'd tell them, "sign me up." I just -- I can't say enough about it. I mean, but I do have -- the other side is, people are asking me, what do I need to do? Have I met my quota? I want to, you know, move on, maybe get out early, go to Florida. I said, well that was the idea if you started early in April, you put your six out of eight months in, and you

needed to leave to head out, fine. If on the other toss of the coin, some people would not be here early but will stay now. They come up to me all the time. "I need to stay in November to get my points, right?"

Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay, great.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: That's great.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Alice, so you were here earlier discussing, you know, the uncertainty that comes on January 15, mostly around the thoroughbred racing but, of course, you know, it affects the standardbred if should something not be renewed, for example. So to the extent that you are not already doing that, doing the following, or your membership is not doing this, do you talk to your representatives or people at the legislature who might at least you might want to inform about the success story on this side?

>> MS. SZPILA: That's our focus, yes. Very big focus. I have to say I have a brother-in-law who is in thoroughbreds just passed. I'm passionate about thoroughbreds because I actually started as a groom in thoroughbreds, so I'm passionate about them. I'd love to be able to have them here too. But we are at our legislative level asking for whatever information they need, whatever numbers we can give to them to keep us going because of a program like this, it's so important.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.

>> MS. SZPILA: And that was it.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: I just wanted to reiterate how happy we are to get thorough reports from you, and we also really want to send our appreciation for close relationships that we work together with Dr. Lightbown. It's so important for us to keep those communications really strong so that we can make sure to meet your needs and we can help in our regulatory process. So Dr. Lightbown, your leadership here is so important. And this is all reflective here to these increasing numbers. So thank you and thank you.

>> MS. SZPILA: I've got to tell you, originally I started just to do this plan. That's all I came on board to do was do the plan and get out. And somehow I became a voice for the membership. And it's been a learning curve for me because I never had taken that role on. I've always been the trainer, the owner of the standardbreds. That was originally why we bought the farm, to do our business. So I was just part of the masses. Now I've become the voice of the masses. And I have a learning curve. And I'm looking forward to working together. I'm trying to see that we can find that common ground and find the avenues that you take to get there.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Well, it's very important, so thank you so much.

>> MS. SZPILA: Thank you very much.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: We are now moving on to 5h, correct, Alex?

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Yes. This is a request from Plainridge for a substitute judge for Plainville. His name is -- let's see here. I've got to get myself going here. James Traister. He is credited with the racing officials accreditation program as a thoroughbred steward. We've talked to the Harness Association, the USCA, about

what he needs to do to get accredited through them. And they have given him a provisional judge's license with the understanding that at the next time they offer the course, that he will take the course and take the exam. So he will be certified through them. And that also makes him eligible to get the rope accreditation for dual breeds. Once you've taken the full course for the rope on one side, then you just need to take the breed-specific sections to get accredited for the other side through the racing officials accreditation program.

So my recommendation is that the Commission approve the request of Plainridge Park Casino to approve James Traister as the fill-in judge and racing official.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Dr. Lightbown, although this candidate does not have the official -- he has a temporary accreditation?

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Right, a provisional.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: But you've reviewed his qualifications, and you're making assurances that he is qualified even though the official certification is in waiting?

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Right. And what we've done is he's shadowed the current judges in the judges' stand so he could start learning on that aspect of it. And then he will be -- any time he's on, he would on with our two judges as well. So it would be our two judges and him for whatever races he was needed to fill in.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So you are satisfied that the appropriate knowledge and qualifications are in place to approve this application?

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Yes. Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Alex, I mean, we have a short amount of time for the racing season left. Is there appropriate time that he would be able to complete certification before the start of next year's race?

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: I believe they're not giving it till sometime in the spring, and I don't know if they -- if that will be before it begins or not. They may not need him as a fill-in at the beginning of the season. This is specifically for circumstances right now for this, you know, for the last months, six weeks of the harness meet.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: I understand that you do need a vote for this. Are there any further questions for Alex? Commissioner Cameron.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So I move that the Commission approve the appointment of James Traister as a fill-in judge by Steve O'Toole at Plainridge Park dated November 1st, 2019, included in the Commission packet.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Hearing no further discussion, all those in favor?

[Vote taken]

Opposed? 5-0. Thank you, Catherine.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: I had a request, if we have enough time, to go out of order a little bit. Jason Savastano would like to get back to the track. If we could bring him in on racing regulation now, and if the submission --

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: We do have 15 minutes, and Executive Director Bedrosian, I'm not sure if we have more time to even go further.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: I think that's up to the Commission.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: (Away from mic).

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: I am told the most important thing that lunch is not here yet.

So we can give you the high sign. And if you want to go until lunch gets here.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Could we take a five-minute break?

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Five-minute break? For the record, this is exciting. We are ahead of schedule. So we duly note that.

[Audio glitch]

What I'm hearing from our fellow Commissioners is that we would like a five-minute break, and then we could have -- move forward on these regulations.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: Sure.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you so much.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Thank you.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Before we start, I realized that I had not been properly recording, so we had taken a brief recess. I had noted, for the record, that we were ahead of schedule, which is exciting. But we're ahead of schedule enough so that we can accommodate some of our guests and move ahead to item number 6. So this is now we're reconvening officially. So starting with item 6, Dr. Lightbown and General Counsel Blue.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: This is just bringing back the pick in that Plainridge had asked for in the spring and it's gone through the promulgation process and is now ready for the commission to do the final vote on.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Okay. Moving ahead, then, with the pick (n) pools. I understand General Counsel Blue, that you're going to have Jason, correct?

>> MR. SAVASTANO: Right.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Speak on this. And Jason is with the combination of you and Dr. Lightbown will be presenting on it? Okay.

>> MR. SAVASTANO: Yes.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Well, you're very helpful at the public meeting last week explaining it to me, so thank you for being here today.

>> MR. SAVASTANO: Thank you very much.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: The main feature of the bet is that it will stimulate a pool of money, and it will grow. It's hard to hit it. Getting the full pool with being the unique ticket that would have it. So if you're not the unique ticket, then you get a portion of the pool. And Jason can expand on that.

>> MR. SAVASTANO: Just like we adopted the Penn effect that we have in effect now, which is the --

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Use the mic.

>> MR. SAVASTANO: Just like we adopted the pen effect which we have now which is wicked high 5 pool. And it's a jackpot carryover. It's the highest this year it's gone with 55 -- \$55,000. It generates a lot of interest. We did have a pick 5 at Plainridge at one point. We dropped it for not having enough interest in that pick 5 pool due to the lack of not having a jackpot go along with it. The majority, if not all, of the other harness tracks have a jackpot associated with that particular bet. So we weren't really getting much handled, and people are not going to really bet into a race that has \$800 in the pool, then minus the takeout, and there's not really much back to go around.

This now would allow us that single unique ticket where half the money bet into the pool on that day goes back out to the public if the single unique ticket is not hit. And then the rest of it will carry over and build the jackpot at that point. So it will

generate -- in the beginning it starts off slow. And then as time goes, as no one hits, you know, five consecutive winners in a row, the pool builds, and all of a sudden you're up to a 30, 40, \$50,000 pool. Now you have a lot of interest, a lot, a lot of interest of the public having a chance to win some halfway decent money out there. It's something that I really think that we should, you know, that we should add.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: And it's my understanding that this language, because it's complex, is actually lifted from the rules of the Association of Racing Commissioners International, the exact language?

>> MR. SAVASTANO: Correct. The current CMR has language up to, I believe, Section F that's currently already in place. We needed to get to move forward with this from Section G on.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: And all of those adage which are marked in red in our materials are actually exactly incorporated by that association?

>> MR. SAVASTANO: Correct.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: The same language, no difference.

>> MR. SAVASTANO: Correct.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Very helpful. Thank you. Any questions for Jason?

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No, but I do like that we're following RCI, you know, I -- knowing the organization, knowing how much time and effort is spent on thoughtful discussion about how this should be carried out is important, I think, and I do appreciate that we are doing that.

>> MR. SAVASTANO: Excellent. We just try to -- we want to -- we want to stay with the times, if not try to get ahead of them.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And the consistency, because these folks move from jurisdiction to jurisdiction understanding, you know, what those rules are on a larger level. So they don't have to go from here to Maine and follow a different scheme of things, right?

>> MR. SAVASTANO: Correct.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So I think that's important, too, for the public, for the industry. And so I do appreciate that.

>> MR. SAVASTANO: Excellent. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I would just, you know, for the record that in a prior conversation this morning, we were talking about Chapter 128d which we have submitted. Some of the flexibility that's embedded in that legislation would be really helpful on instances like this. The request for this bet, for example, came in March, went through the whole promulgation process we're finding ourselves now approving this. It would be, I would submit, a real parallel to what we have done in gaming, have a regulation that's flexible enough and points to rules of the game that can change as the market changes. Even -- and, you know, I would guess to venture that we will follow a similar deliberative process in terms of hearing the benefits, the tradeoffs, what others are doing, how the market is doing. But under that regulatory scheme, I would say we would have a lot more flexibility to react to things like this.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: That would be very valuable to have that.

>> MR. SAVASTANO: Absolutely. RCI, they do change the rules on a -- I wouldn't say fairly regular basis, but as new bets come and new bets are in place and they want to change things and add things, it would be nice for us to be able to just pick those up

right away instead of having to go through the whole --

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Through the process. It's a competitive issue, in my opinion. If you are --

>> MR. SAVASTANO: Agreed.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The betting public is really looking at signals from all other different states. And if you're not able to, you know, incorporate them here, people are used to others, they simply will not -- it would result in what you just said to us. You know, you eventually have to drop perhaps a bet because the interest is elsewhere. It has nothing to do with your operational ability, but rather the environment that you are operating within.

>> MR. SAVASTANO: Exactly.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Any further questions? So two-part process. Do we have a motion regarding the small business impact?

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Madam Chair, I move the Commission approve the amended small business impact statement for 205 CMR 6.35 pick (n) pools included in the packet.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Any discussion in questions? All those in favor?

[Vote taken]

Opposed? 5-0. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Madam --

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: I'm sorry. Oh, so sorry.

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Madam Chair, I further move that the Commission approve the version of 205 CMR 6.35 pick (n) pools as included in the packet and authorize staff to take all steps necessary to finalize the regulation promulgation process.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Any questions? Any questions? All those in favor?

[Vote taken]

Opposed? 5-0. Just, again, I failed to activate my microphone. The earlier vote was also 5-0. Thank you.

Moving on, then. Thank you, Jason.

>> MR. SAVASTANO: Madam Chair, thank you very much. Commissioners, thank you very much for your time. We really appreciate it.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: We appreciate your expertise. Thank you.

So moving on now, I think we have time to go through all of the regulations.

[No audio]

["Live video interrupted. The broadcast has been paused. It should resume shortly"]

>> MR. STEMPECK: Just in case we were cut off, the last regulation I had mentioned was 205 CMR 3.29. This formalizes an existing practice concerning the quarantine -- the option of a quarantine for horses that test positive for total carbon dioxide in blood. Again, this was an existing practice and puts it formally into the regulations. And then I believe the last in Section 3 is 205 CMR 3.35. This is a new section under Section 3, but the language was preexisting. And what this does is it moves the existing language concerning our adoption of the United States Trotting Association rules from the foreword of Section 3 into its on section just so that it's easier

to find and easier for those who might be looking for a particular rule to understand that, yes, the Massachusetts Gaming Commission does adopt the United States Trotting Association rules which often concern a lot of the granular details of what takes place during a race and what's permissible and that sort of thing. So that pulls that out into a separate section so that anybody who's looking can find it more easily.

And with that being said, those are all the changes in the regulations under 205 CMR Section 3. I'm happy to answer any questions about those regulations at this time.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I have a comment, which is I'm happy to see a formal process here for an official recusing and an alternate judge stepping in. I think it's really important that people recognize that we take conflicts of interest seriously, and we encourage that reporting as well as the ability to bring another official in in cases where there's a conflict or a perceived conflict.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: And that might be worth going through the process with just a little bit more detail so that when a conflict arises, can you just go through the resolution process, Justin?

>> MR. STEMPECK: Sure.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thanks.

>> MR. STEMPECK: So what this regulation does is it sets forth parameters that would establish when a conflict of interest does exist between a racing judge and, say, someone who's -- someone who's racing in the race. So if there's a family relationship or another significant relationship, it sets forth the four corners of when a conflict of interest exists. And then that -- then it also establishes a procedure by which that person can recuse themselves and also a procedure by which the recusal or the conflict of interest could be waived. If it's disclosed to the director of racing, Director Lightbown, and she examines it and says, okay, we're okay here, and also establishes the procedure by which typically we have three racing judges. If one of them has a conflict, that person can approach the other two racing judges to resolve the conflict to essentially query whether those two are -- if they would be amenable to going forward without that third judge which does occasionally occur. And we don't like it to be the normal practice. But if it does occur, we now have a procedure whereby it can be documented and set forth so that we know ahead and we can formally -- we can formally have on the record that there was an acceptance of that and it moves along.

And there's also the potential for selection of an alternate racing judge. Because typically it's incumbent upon the person who has the conflict to find an alternate. If they're unable to find an alternate, you can go to the two-judge system. The selection of an alternate judge does then have to be approved by our director of racing, which I think is an important step, so that it can't just be anyone. It has to be someone we think meets the credentials of being an appropriately educated and experiencing racing judge.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And I know you spend time every year with training for all of our folks, whether it be our regulatory staff, judges, stewards, folks at the track. So I think this certainly would be appropriate to train so that they understand clearly where it is a new regulation, how to report, what it's all about, the kinds of things that are may be perceived as a conflict.

>> MR. STEMPECK: Yeah, we made it an ongoing channel of practice to have

ongoing communication with judges at PPC. And at the beginning of every racing season, I make it a point to go down and meet with them at the racing offices and do an initial training about the things that can arise to become problems so hopefully that they don't become problems during that particular season and also just to give them any updates on any changes. And this would absolutely be one of those that we would go over in detail.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Great. Thank you.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Very helpful, Justin. Any other questions for Justin or Dr. Lightbown on any of the particular regulations? Because I understand we're going to vote on a whole for 3.00. With that said, we could carve out anything, correct? So if there's any questions you have on any of the regs. Okay.

I think that you were about to ask the question -- maybe it was answered -- is the beginning the process, as I understand it, correct?

>> MR. STEMPECK: That's correct.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: All right. With that said, do we have a motion?

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Madam Chair, I move that the Commission approve the small business impact statement for the amendments to 205 CMR 3.0 specifically 3.01, 3.03, 3.12, 3.18, 3.29 and 3.35, harness course racing as included in the packet.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Any questions? Discussion? All those in favor?

[Vote taken]

Opposed? Opposed? 5-0. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Madam Chair, I further move the Commission approve the version of the amendments to the same subsections just referenced, 205 CMR 3.0, harness horse racing references and annotations as included in the packet and authorized staff to take all steps necessary to begin the regulation promulgation process.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Any questions? All those in favor?

[Vote taken]

Opposed? 5-0. Thank you. Excellent work. We'll move on to the next grouping, 4.0.

>> The next grouping of regulations deal with 205 CMR 4.0 which relates to thoroughbred racing. The first in these three is 205 CMR 4.01. This proposed regulation change would strike duplicative language referencing the procedure directing the reader to our proper section, 205 CMR 1.02. So it's really just reactions. The next in this regulation is 205 CMR 4.03. Again, this proposal strikes duplicative language regarding appeals, again, directing the reader to the proper appeals section. And then the final one in 205 CMR 4 is 205 CMR 4.3. This proposal adds a procedure concerning recusal of stewards for events over which they may have a conflict of interest, so it's a parallel version of what you saw in the standardbred we just discussed. This would deal with thoroughbred if a conflict were to arise in the context of a thoroughbred race.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Any questions for Justin with respect to this particular reg? Any suggested changes? Again, we're just starting the promulgation process. Okay.

Do I have a motion?

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Madam Chair, I move that the Commission approve the small business impact statement for the amendments to 205 CMR 4.00, specifically 4.01, 4.03 and 4.30, rules of horse racing references and annotations as included in the packet.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Questions? Discussion? All those in favor?

[Vote taken]

Opposed? 5-0.

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Madam Chair, I further move the Commission approve 4.00, the specific references earlier made, rules of horse racing, references and annotations as included in the packet and authorize staff to take all steps necessary to begin the regulation promulgation process.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Discussion? All those in favor?

[Vote taken]

Opposed? 5-0.

>> The final regulation I have before you today is in 205 CMR 101.02 which deals with appeals section to the Commission. What this regulation does is it clarifies some of the language concerning the timing of racing appeals. This timely information previously existed in the now-redacted sections of the past regulations, just making sure everyone goes to this section for any and all information on appeals. What this regulation also changes is it streamlines some of the discovery procedures with cases of medication, overages or violations in the racing context to make it more uniform and standardized so that the process can resolve more smoothly for the hearing officers and everyone involved in the hearing process.

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: And to be clear, my understanding is that some of the requests that have been coming in were voluminous, taking a lot of time and were, in fact, slowing down the process and that this will keep it to relevant and material information necessary and move the hearing process forward.

>> That is accurate, yes.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: That's correct. Any questions for Justin on this? So there's a housekeeping component and more of a substantive component on this one. Any questions? Do I have a motion?

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Madam Chair, I move that the Commission approve the small business impact statement for the amendments to 205 CMR 101.02, review of orders of civil administrative penalties, forfeitures issued by the bureau, Commission staff of the racing division as included in the packet.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Questions? All those in favor?

[Vote taken]

Opposed? 5-0.

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Madam Chair, I further move the Commission approve the version of the amendments to 205 CMR 101.02, review of orders specifically administrative penalties forfeitures, Commission staff of the racing division as included in the packet and authorize staff to take all steps necessary to begin the

regulation promulgation process.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Questions? All in favor?

[Vote taken]

Opposed? 5-0. Excellent work. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Commissioners.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Does that conclude your presentation today, Dr.

Lightbown?

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Yes, it does. Thank you.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Well, thank you for your expertise, and we love being here in Plainville to do horse racing, so thank you so much.

>> DR. LIGHTBOWN: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: We'll break now for lunch. We are going to be reconvening -- I beg your pardon -- at 1:00. Will our guests be here?

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: We have Christopher Bruce is here.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you. My apologies. At 1:00 we'll reconvene.

Thank you.

[A lunch break was taken at 12:25 P.M.]

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: We're reconvening gaming Commission meeting number 281 here in Plainville Town Hall. We are now on our agenda, and I'm delighted to say a little bit ahead of schedule. So we have now Mark Vander Linden, our Director on responsible -- our research on responsible gaming director, thank you.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Thank you, Chairwoman Judd-Stein and Commissioners. And good afternoon. So this afternoon we are turning our attention to the research agenda, Section 71 of the Expanded Gaming Act. Put a heavy emphasis on trying to understand what the social and economic impacts of casino gambling are in the state of Massachusetts. Specifically what happens when you open -- in this case what happens when you open up a casino in Plainville, Massachusetts. What the benefits to the community? What are the potential harms that we would see in Plainville and the surrounding communities?

This is really what we're trying to answer here today through two different reports -- or two different reports that we have, really three different reports. One is the social and economic impacts of Plainridge Park Casino and the new employee report. Dr. Rachel Volberg from UMass Amherst and Dr. Mark Melnik from the Donahue Institute will provide an overview of those two reports for you. And then second, we have an examination of four years of operation of Plainridge Park Casino. So it seems like yesterday that it opened. We're four years into it, or greater than four years. And Thomas Peake will lead a discussion on the four years -- first four years of operation of this casino.

The afternoon we will turn our attention to what are the public safety impacts of casinos in Massachusetts, and Christopher Bruce will take a look at three different studies focusing on three different regions of the state where we have casinos, all in very different stages, as you very well know. Understanding what crime impacts casinos bring to Massachusetts was also an important piece of Section 71. Do you see an increase in specific crimes related to casino gambling? Or as Christopher Bruce

says, perhaps we will see decreases in specific areas given a change in the dynamic within each of these communities. Christopher will describe to you what his findings are after four years for Plainridge Park Casino, eight months for MGM, and he will describe to you the study for Everett and the surrounding communities.

So to kick this off, I will turn it over to Doctors Volberg and Melnik.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: You just have to speak really closely.

>> DR. VOLBERG: Just speak really closely, okay. In contrast to the instructions right here in front of me. Good afternoon, Madam Chair and Commissioners. It's a pleasure to be meeting with you in Plainville as opposed to Boston, and definitely a pleasure to see this building which I've heard a lot about but have not actually been in before.

So let's see. The presentation that Mark and I are going to be doing is a bit of a hybrid. So we had a very large summary -- inaugural summary report that we presented to the Commission I believe about a year ago, maybe a little less than a year ago which looked at impacts at both the state level and at the regional level. And in thinking about that presentation and that report subsequently, we realized that there was probably some value in extracting from that report all of the regional impacts since most of them were specific to Plainville and Plainridge Park Casino. And to basically just have a report that's focused on this area and the slot parlor.

So I'm going to be presenting on the social and health impacts that we identified regionally. And then Mark is going to present on the economic and fiscal side but with a focus on an updated section that deals with employment at the slot parlor. And then we're going to turn it over to Tom who is going to present to you on a new report that we will be publishing shortly on the operational impacts of four years of Plainridge Park Casino.

So to begin with, I'm going to go very, very quickly through some introductory slides. Some of you will have seen these multiple times. They're just to sort of provide some background about the Expanded Gaming Act and why we have casinos where we have in the different parts of the state. A quick slide, just to remind you of the importance of Section 71 in authorizing the kind of work that my team and I have been up to for the last six years. And just a quick overview of the essential elements of the research agenda and the parts that we have been responsible for which are the baseline study of problem gambling and existing programs as well as a much larger study to understand the social and economic effects of expanded gambling as those roll out over time.

Again, a reminder of where in the state the casinos are located and the officially designated host and surrounding communities. Just for people who might be watching on the livestream or who haven't seen us present before, this is often a useful map for people to see.

This next slide is a synopsis of the characteristics of Plainridge Park Casino. It is a slot parlor rather than a full-service casino with table games. The next two columns are the host and surrounding communities, gives you some information about the availability of gambling at the slot parlor and then also some notes about the fact that Plainridge Park Casino was previously a racetrack. The cost of the casino expansion, the size of the operation, and the amenities and ownership.

And then final sort of quick background slide. We were very fortunate when we

started this project to have as one of the members of our team, Rob Williams, who just prior to our project starting had produced a very large systematic review of all of the studies of the social and economic impacts of gambling that had been done internationally from the mid-'70s all the way through to 2010 that he and his colleagues identified 492 studies which they reviewed. They documented all of the findings of the approximately 200 studies that were actually based on empirical research rather than sort of more theoretical issues and identified actually, amazingly enough, only 7 of those studies out of the 200 were deemed to have what's known -- what they called an excellent methodology which was based on specific criteria that they developed.

Based on that review, they proposed a methodological approach to conducting social and economic impact studies of gambling that made theoretical sense, that enshrined economic principles and social impact considerations and was simple to use, or at least that's what they said. I'm going to say, as the first person to have led a team to roll out this simple-to-use methodology, that it is not as simple as you would think. It's actually quite a complex enterprise and involves a lot of different sort of hands on the wheel. But it's been my privilege to head this project up for six years, and I'm very proud of the work that we've done.

So just to review some of those methodological principles that we are employing, we like to call what we're measuring impacts rather than costs and benefits. Because the term "impact" indicates that a change has occurred without necessarily having to characterize it as positive or negative. There's a lot of disagreement, actually, between whether an impact is positive or negative depending on where you stand. So we just use that term impact.

While many of the impacts of gambling are clearly negative such as problem gambling or positive such as employment, the nature of other impacts or changes is less clear and somewhat subjective. And so that is the main reason why we use this term "impact."

The traditional approach is to use money to measure and quantify all impacts. It's appropriate, certainly, for capturing most economic impacts or changes, but it's actually rather inadequate for capturing many of the social impacts since social impacts often have no obvious monetary consequences, and many social impacts are best captured or described or best captured in a descriptive way, a percentage of change rather than trying to assign a monetary value to everything.

So one of the biggest challenges in conducting impact studies is that the ability to attribute changes to a specific form of gambling can be quite tenuous. When there's a change in the expected direction that's temporarily associated with the introduction of casino gambling, really all that we can say is that the change is consistent with a potential impact. The likelihood that something is actually attributable to casino gambling becomes stronger when we triangulate with analogous changes in variables theoretically related to gambling and when other sources of information pertaining to the same variable allow more direct attributions. For example, self-reports of gamblers in the population surveys or key informants who tell us that they see certain things as being the result of the casino, we take that as part of the evidence base that we're building as well.

So just to turn to the basics of the study overall, this is a graphic that most of you have seen several times. Across the top are the various activities that our team is

engaged in. The rows are time lines. And basically you can see that in 2020, we're quite busy because there's activity in each of the areas where we are collecting data. So we're clearly past the baseline phase. We are still slightly in the construction phase in terms of getting ready to report on the construction impacts of Encore. But other than that one last report, we will be fully into the operational phase once that report is published.

So I'm going to turn now to the presentation itself. This is a top-level summary, very top level, very summary of a much more detailed 80-plus report that will be available probably once I finish talking to you this afternoon on our website so that people in the audience or just the general public can access that report along with all of our other publications.

So let's begin with the social and health impacts. The social and health impacts part of the project focuses on impacts that are primarily nonmonetary in nature. We rely on many different sources of data to assess these impacts. Primary data includes the baseline general population survey, the baseline and follow-up targeted surveys in the host and surrounding communities, key informant interviews, some of the patron survey data also feeds into our side of the project.

We employ a lot of secondary data. Much of this data comes from government agencies in Massachusetts as well as federal agencies. And then we rely on the work that Christopher Bruce does to be able to say something about the crime impacts that we also keep on the social and health side but that obviously have economic impacts as well.

So to dig down into the specifics of the kinds of impacts that we have seen in Plainville and surrounding communities. Somewhat to our surprise, we did not identify a significant change in problem gambling or related indices that is likely to have occurred as a result of the introduction of the slot parlor in this region. There was no significant change in the rate of problem gambling or at-risk gambling in the targeted population surveys between 2014, the one we did -- baseline in 2014, and the follow-up survey in 2016. Nor was there significant change between those two surveys in the percentage of problem gamblers wanting or seeking help.

There were no significant changes between the two surveys in the percent of regular gamblers reporting negative impacts due to gambling. No change in personal bankruptcy filings in the county that were different from previous years. And there were no changes in divorce filings, restraining orders, or number of cases of child welfare involvement at the county level. With these secondary data, sometimes it's not possible to drill down to the local municipalities, so that's why we're reporting county-level data here.

And this is a couple of quotes from two of our key informants that we interviewed in 2018 indicating that there did not seem to be any impacts on the health and well-being of the people of Plainville and that residents have not come forward with concerns about an increase in problem gambling. So that was another sort of triangulating effort to make sure that what we were seeing in the survey data was supported by folks who actually live and work here in Plainville.

Turning to attitudes. There was evidence of a significant change of attitudes toward gambling between the Baseline Targeted Survey and the follow-up targeted survey. There was a decrease in the percentage of people who indicated that

gambling was not available enough and a corresponding increase in the percentage of people who felt that the current gambling availability was just fine. So they seemed to be pleased with what they have, but they're fine with what they've got.

There was also evidence of a significant change of attitudes towards gambling in terms of, in the same two surveys, in terms of the state impact. There was a decrease in the percentage of people who felt that casinos would be beneficial to Massachusetts. And a corresponding increase in the percentage of people who felt quite neutral, neither beneficial, nor harmful. And then also a change in perceptions of the impact of the casino on the community of Plainville, an increase in the percentage of people who felt that the new casino in their community would be neither beneficial nor harmful, a reduction in the number of people -- or percentage of people who felt that the casino would be beneficial.

Finally, in terms of population health, there was no evidence of any change in the health of the population in the wake of the opening of Plainridge Park Casino. No change in the reports of levels of health, happiness or levels of stress, and no significant change in the percentage of people who reported seeking help for their use of alcohol or drugs or who reported a behavioral addiction.

So we're going to come back to the implications of the social and health impacts at the end of this presentation, but I'm going to turn it over now to Dr. Mark Melnik to talk about the economic and fiscal impacts.

>> MR. MELNIK: Good afternoon, Madam Chairperson and Commissioners. It's good to be in front of you guys again today, and thanks to Mark and Rachel for the introduction. I'm Mark Melnik, I direct the Economic and Public Policy Research group at the Donahue Institute, and we are partners with the School of Public Health at UMass Amherst to lead the economic and fiscal side of the work that we're doing as part of the SEIGMA project.

Let me echo what Rachel had been saying a little bit about before about the pride that we have in the work that we've been able to do over the last six years in this project. You know, I think I say this every time I'm in front of you guys, but it's such a unique opportunity when you're analyzing an industry when it comes into a marketplace that it wasn't there before. There's very few things that ever exist in such a way that you can say, well, we didn't have this industry, and now we do. And to -- for the state legislature to have the foresight to say let's try to analyze all the different elements of impact that might be a part of this, it's a very unique opportunity for us as researchers. And while we get to sit here and be the ones that present that to you, there's a big group of folks who support us in the background and on the economic side alone, there's seven different staff members with areas of expertise.

What I'm going to talk about today will be a high-level overview of some of the impacts we've seen in Plainridge. Tom's going to step in after and do the preliminary operations report of what we've seen over the last four years. Tom reminds me all the time about what innovative methodology and how unique this type of work is because of our ability to leverage data directly from the operators so that we can tell a very complete and full story of what economic impacts look like now and what they would look like going forward.

So the big story, though, when we talk about economic and fiscal impacts in Plainridge -- in Plainville and how it relates back to Plainridge Park, is one that's

generally a very positive story. What we've seen and what I'll highlight in the data for us is that what we've seen is a unique job growth in the city that outstrips what we've been seeing in terms of job growth statewide or in the county. Not terribly surprising when you put a very large employer in a very small place. But still one that highlights the fact of job growth. Another element of positive that we've seen in the city and region is the -- what I'll highlight in the new employee survey in the latest new employee data that we have is that a large number of folks who are employed by Plainridge Park are folks who were either unemployed or underemployed and these are generally folks with much more limited educational attainment than the typical labor force in Massachusetts.

What does that mean? Well, it highlights the fact that these are accessible jobs for folks. Again, another positive element of the story in terms of economic development and economic activity. And the third part I'm going to highlight is talking a little bit about government and fiscal and what the infusion of cash for local governments we've seen and we're setting an example of that because of the resources that were leveraged by Plainville are part of what built this Town Hall.

So first, I'm going to talk a little bit about our analytical framework as we do the economic research. There's a number of different ways that we can think about theoretically or logically how we put our work together. We generally group them into three main buckets. I think about it in terms of economic and community impacts which are more macro-level types of things about how a community changes over time. And one of the unique elements of having a baseline analysis but then continuing to track how things are operating. So this could be simple things as demographic changes, population growth, employment growth, other socioeconomic characteristics. These are not things that would change specifically because of a casino or because of any one employer, but are the characteristics of community that may shift and have other elements that are related to it so it tells a story of community.

The second element of work that we do is around casino impacts that are much more direct. And those are leveraging a lot of cases directly that we're receiving from the casinos. So this talks about direct employment, some of the spin-off economic effects that are associated with that direct activity in the casino. So that talks about, you know, both direct spending, business-to-business spending, and the consumer spending that's leveraged through dollars in people's pockets.

But then other elements of the casino like what are the characteristics of the workforce? What types of folks are coming through here? What can we say about patrons who go to the casino and so on? This third element that we refer to as special topics is something we haven't really delved into yet because we've been doing a lot of descriptive work about the impacts of the casinos directly. But we've seen a lot of questions raised over time as a part of our work on boy, wouldn't it be interesting to understand a little bit more about what the casinos are meaning in terms of impact on travel and tourism in a community? And I think as we get into a fully operational phase in the casinos, our intention is on all elements of the project, particularly on economic and fiscal, is to roll up our sleeves more and try to understand these more direct economic effects that are happening in communities and related industries.

So a couple things I'm going to highlight in this conversation first is around employment. I already teased a few moments ago that what we've been observing in

Plainridge to date is pretty robust job growth in the town over the last several years. Between 2014 and 2016, we've seen an increase of about 300 jobs in Plainridge -- Plainville, excuse me. A little over 4600 jobs. That's an increase of 17.3%. Comparatively the state's grown about 4% over that time period. Norfolk County and Bristol County have grown about 3.2%. A good amount of this job growth as we've been able to observe it is tied directly to employment that we see in Plainridge Park. There are some limitations to what we can say with secondary data with this because of suppression issues and how state data are reported back. So they suppress when there's one major employer and one mix code. But the aggregate numbers show this growth, and a lot of it, again, tied to what we would expect to see with a large employer moving into town. So we've seen robust job growth in town.

A couple of things that we've seen through our mixed methods approach. So we analyzed second data, data we get directly from the operators but another way that we've supplemented our work over time is talking with local experts to understand how impacts are being felt by folks on the ground especially where we may see data lags. Employment data always has like, a year lag to it. What are people saying in realtime about some of the things that we may be observing through secondary data? And so a few things that have come out through talking with different local officials, here is the quote from Jennifer Thompson, town administrator in Plainville. One of the things the casino promised to do was to reach out to Plainville folks first which they did. They kept their word. It's definitely have an impact. Lou LeBlanc noting that employment has been a positive impact so far for the community.

The next thing I'm going to talk about is our new employee survey. So what we do is interview folks as they are employed by the casinos and ask some very basic demographic questions about first their characteristics such as what they've been doing previously for work, what industries they've worked and where do they live, why do they want to work here? There's a report that we've been doing this data ongoing throughout the entire time Plainridge Park has been open. The data I'm going to highlight for you is for fiscal year '18.

Over time we've added new questions because either we're, like, oh, that would be a great thing to add additionally or through feedback from folks like yourself. But for us, it's trying to understand the characteristics of the folks who got jobs here, what their -- what experiences they are having, and our goal is over the long term is to continue to track, you know, how -- what's turnover look like in these kinds of things as they relate to new employment.

The most notable part, which I highlighted at the beginning, was the level of accessibility of jobs for folks getting employed at Plainridge Park. Here what I have on this graphic demonstrates that of folks who were employed during fiscal year '18, what was their previous employment status? What we find is that 51% were previously employed full time. While 46% were either unemployed or part-time employed. In fact, so what we're seeing here is that this has been a great element of job creation for folks who may have been lightly attached or unconnected from the labor market. Other parts of this that are positive stories.

Of the folks that were previously unemployed, 72% of those went from unemployed to having a full-time job. And of the ones who were -- who were part-time employed, 42% transitioned into a full-time job. Though it's a positive story in terms of

economic development and access into the labor market. These data points are very consistent with previous data that we've been presenting to you in the past. The original new employee survey that we had done which was, I believe, at the one-year mark showed about 50% of folks were previously unemployed or underemployed. So this does seem to be a trend that we're -- but would be something we would continue to track over time.

We asked what industry folks used to work in. Unsurprisingly, the concentration of -- the vast majority of folks were coming from a combination of food services, retail. What's interesting about this, though, is that some of the industries that are strongest here, a combination of food services, retail, we see some transportation and warehousing, a little bit of manufacturing there. But some of these were industries that were very heavily hit after the recession or during the recession and maybe didn't recover jobs as quickly in some instances. So it does tell a story, too, as well of folks who may have been disconnected from the labor market because of economic downturn and now finding that opportunities in a new industry.

A couple slides that we had to drop because we were too long in the original slide deck. A lot of the reasons why folks were interested in working in the casino dealt with career opportunity and increased wages. So the first two that we're seeing here, a combination of food and retail are traditionally low-wage industries, and one of the interest in coming to the casino was an opportunity to make more money.

Next slide here is a map that just highlights local employment and where people are coming from during fiscal '18. Not surprisingly, the majority of the workers in Plainridge Park are coming from Plainville or other parts of the host and surrounding communities, particularly North Attleborough and Attleboro. But as you can see, you know, the kind of employment trend really runs along 495 and some of the major highways. And the accessibility that Plainridge Park has for people in the broader community. About 62% of the folks that were hired in fiscal '18 were Massachusetts residents. 68, excuse me, 32% coming from other states, Rhode Island and Connecticut.

I already highlighted a little bit earlier that casino employment is creating opportunities for folks with limited educational attainment. About 22% of the individuals who were hired during fiscal '18 had a college degree. Comparatively, over 40% of Massachusetts mass a college degree. This highlights people with limited educational attainment.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Could you please say that -- the comparison again one more time?

>> MR. MELNIK: Right. So the percent of the Massachusetts population with a college degree is about 40%. Workforce is a little over 40%, approaching 46%. So comparatively, you know, obviously there's quite a bit of difference here between the folks who are being employed at the casino. So jobs that are accessible for folks with limited educational attainment.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you.

>> MR. MELNIK: On the government and fiscal side. In terms of impacts. What we're seeing is there are some natural increases that are taking place in terms of government spending. Some of this, you know, services that need to increase police hours, fire hours, these kinds of things as well as extra stress on the roads. These are

elements of our work that we'll continue to deconstruct deeper over time. But the highlight from the impact report was that revenues from local aid in surrounding community agreements have more than covered for those kinds of costs that we would see in communities.

This next graphic here talks a bit about gross gaming revenue for each individual year, fiscal '16, '17 and '18. And what that translates back to in terms of local aid. So just focusing on fiscal '18 right now, gross gaming revenue was around \$170 million. New state revenue from GGR equaled out to \$83.3 million, which led to \$68 million in local aid distributed around the state. And the map here kind of shows that distribution of local aid, which generally is formula based and goes to communities with different types of socioeconomic challenges. But we've seen an increase in local aid across cities and towns.

And then when we talk specifically about Plainville, the host and community agreements, we've seen \$1.5 million in property taxes annually, \$100,000 in community fees impact annually and then other employments of additional annual revenues that come into the town. And then here Jennifer Thompson's quote, it's the only town hall and public safety building in Massachusetts where not a penny of tax dollars had to be used, which is amazing. The residents were thrilled. The host community agreement, we have only used -- is only used for capital projects. We used it twice. Once to buy an open space parcel. So it has preserved 103 acres of open space. And the second one is for the town hall and public safety building where we are today.

And then I'll turn the rest of the show over to Rachel.

>> DR. VOLBERG: To one of the things that we've tried to do increasingly is to figure out ways to quickly and easily share information about the impacts that we are seeing. And so we have -- on the two columns initially, we have the various areas where we are looking at impacts. And then we have the specific impacts that we're looking at. And then we have change from baseline to follow-up. And where you see a level arrow is an area where we haven't identified an impact or a change. Or where we see increases or decreases, we have either arrows pointing up or pointing down. So we checked this with quite a few people, and it's a nice way to sort of summarize the data.

So what this slide shows you is that there were sort of changes in attitudes towards gambling that went both ways, both positive and negative. And there were some environmental impacts that we identified mostly relating to the increase in traffic. But apart from those two areas, we did not detect any significant changes in the indicators that we've been monitoring over time related to social and health impacts in Plainville and surrounding communities.

And then on the economic and fiscal side, it's the same idea of how we're showing this graphically. You can see that most of the arrows are pointing up. There's one that we are still working to be determined, which is gambling participation in relation to income and one where we did not identify any changes that could be attributed to the opening of Plainridge Park Casino which relates to changes in real estate and housing.

And I'm just going to finish up our part of the presentation by mentioning that we have two new fact sheets that are now posted on our website and will be available for people to download and print. And I have copies for one of -- this fact sheet relates to

changes in social and health impacts of Plainridge Park Casino in Plainville. The majority of the focus is on changes in attitudes, but you can see that graphic there that we also included. And the second one relates to the impact of Plainridge Park on traffic issues in Plainville. And that's a picture of our team. You can see how many people there are.

And now I think it's time to turn it over to Tom.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Before we just shift to Tom, should we just do a check-in to see if there's any particular questions right now?

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Rachel, remind me how many reports like this for Plainridge have we done?

>> DR. VOLBERG: How many reports for Plainville?

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. Well, let me back up a little bit.

>> DR. VOLBERG: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You're right that some of us have seen some of these slides before, and that's totally fine. Good context. I have also, you know, you have presented at times before GRAC, the Gaming Research Advisory Committee, and I have attended your public meetings. But I'm interested in just how many times have we -- have you presented before to this Commission on Plainridge?

>> DR. VOLBERG: I'm not sure I can answer that immediately, Commissioner. I would have to go back and dig through my records. I'm going to say it's more than five but less than ten.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I guess what I'm getting at is there are a lot of data here that is -- does not appear to be changing, which is perhaps a lot of good news. The way I'm thinking about it is how much do we need to keep measuring some of the indicators that may not be changing?

>> DR. VOLBERG: So I think what is important to understand is that the first either two or three years that Plainridge Park Casino was open, there were no other casinos operating in Massachusetts. And we now have MGM Springfield that's been operating for a little over a year and Encore Boston Harbor which has now been operating for almost six months. And I have to say that although we have not identified changes to date in what we are looking at in Plainville and surrounding communities, it's quite possible that certainly gambling behavior and some of the social impacts and possibly some of the economic impacts will be affected in terms of their trends by people changing their behavior with the change in the gambling landscape in Massachusetts. And it's -- I think what one of the most unique features of the study as a whole is that we're looking at both the state level and at the regional levels. And so we're going to be, I think, able to say something over the next few years about what is the impact of a large integrated resort style casino opening in Boston, for example, on the behavior and economics of a small slot parlor in Plainridge. I'm sorry, Plainville. 30 miles away. I think it's a question that hasn't been -- we haven't been able to answer it yet, but we are well positioned to be able to say something over the next few years in terms of the impact of these regional casinos on one another.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. The other -- and I know the answer to this, but maybe we should just state a little bit for the record. Some of the data that you present here is from 2016. Some of the quotes are from 2018. And one of the things that I'm interested in, as we go forward, is having more timely reporting on, you know,

on the research that we do conduct. We have a big role in it. We put you through a research review committee which takes time. And I know there's a lot of data collection that goes and quality assurance goes before you can report it. But as we move forward, one of the things that I'm most interested in is being as timely as possible with the information that we're getting so that we are, if anything, able to try to react policywise or otherwise to the findings that we may have.

>> DR. VOLBERG: Yeah. It's a challenge that we have faced all along in terms of timely reporting. You know, research takes a while to do. It's certainly the review process that the Gaming Commission has established has been very rigorous but also somewhat time consuming. And I've thought about this quite a lot in terms of, you know, are there ways that maybe we -- I mean, what we have to do is we have to come up with ways as a research team to perhaps, you know, raise a hand before we actually have final results that are ready for public consumption.

>> MR. MELNIK: If I could comment.

>> DR. VOLBERG: Yeah.

>> MR. MELNIK: Part of what we are intending as part -- especially on the economic and fiscal side of the shop going forward is now that the model has been created and now that there are templates of reports that exist, to kind of get away from the full report and rather do kind of quick hitters on updates of various elements. So whether they function as a fact sheet or, you know, smaller kind of reports, but there's no reason, after a certain point, that an operations report needs to continue to be lengthy. Because we can always reference the older report and say, well, the newest year is this, and there's a couple of data points there. And so I think that those are going to be ways in which we'll be able to shave a lot of time off. Because one of the things that makes the report long is when there's a lot of pages, and then people need to read it, and then there's that whole process. So what we've proposed and, you know, this is separate from what this presentation is but I think gets at the heart of your question is next-level research is to selectively have longer reports when they make sense. Like if we were going to do a comparison of operations impacts across the three casinos. Well, that should be a full report. And, you know, year six of Plainville, all right, let's do that as a fact sheet. And I think those are instances where we could be faster, and your review process can be faster because it's not the same kind of thing that people are going to be reading through.

We've been sensitive to that, not just on the review side of it, but it's also in terms of the human consumption side of it, right? Because attention spans are what they are. And so to have -- we want our impact -- our research to have the greatest impact on the most people. It is intended for a policy audience. It's also intended for general public. And the general public is more likely to consume a fact sheet, right? So these are things that we've been wrestling with internally, and as you know, we've been having conversations about this on and off for a long time. Some of it has been the production of a product line that has been set in motion a while back. And then so part of our thinking is, okay, well, when we're fully on operation phase, what does that look like? And so that's some of the thinking in trying to make that more efficient.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. We're all ears. And I should say -- actually, I should reiterate, we have a big role in that.

>> MR. MELNIK: Right.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You know, through the quality assurance and the review process. But I'm -- this is a good opportunity, you know, now that we are into the -- going into the operational phase, to think and rethink those assumptions made early on.

>> MR. MELNIK: Right.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: About the cadence, the format. Because -- I suspect because you already also alluded to early on -- there will be other research priorities that emerge, and we need to be able to respond to those. We've had those questions, you know, to you before. You know, maybe a perspective from the city relative to tourism, et cetera. So it's really important for us to continue to think about --

>> MR. MELNIK: Yeah. And for me --

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- what does that mean.

>> MR. MELNIK: -- those exact questions in that we've created a tracking study that tells stories around employment, characteristics of workers, real estate, lottery sales, all those different things. You don't want to lose that, right? But at the same time, it's like you don't want to keep recreating the exact same things over and over again because what are you learning, right? We've been having you guys ask really interesting and important questions about what other industries are impacted, other elements of job quality and so on. So how do you answer those questions while keep the tracking going, right? So that for us has been how do you repackage different product lines so that you can still do A in a different way so that you can go and do B. And so -- and, again, conversations we've had in different ways over time.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: It sounds as though this is something we can continue to explore because it's important to keep that relevancy and to achieve efficiencies, but I'm with Mark, you would hate to lose the tracking.

>> MR. MELNIK: Right.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: That would come -- what I'm hearing you say, that's probably not the most -- that's not the part of the research and deliverable that's taking up more time. It's the full reporting.

>> MR. MELNIK: Correct. Especially when the systems are in place, right?

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: That's right.

>> MR. MELNIK: It's the buildup of system and then moving it forward.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Because that data collection, it would be too bad to lose that right now on year four. Five, right?

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: I think I agree with that statement. And if, you know, by doing -- using the same data and tracking data over time, we have to -- we also have to balance it with what are -- what are other issues that are coming up where we want to direct our resources towards? And if I could just add one other point about the time line. We have one review. So round of review with our research review committee takes about six weeks. It would take -- it takes three weeks for our review committee to have it, to digest it, to provide the feedback to our research teams and then they have three weeks to generate a new -- a following draft. And if there's multiple iterations, if we go into round -- it's not three weeks each time, but you can begin to see how long it takes for us to do this type of thorough research review. I don't want to compromise on any part of our research review. We perhaps should take a look at the time line between reviewing drafts and getting it back out. The problem is we have a research

review committee that that's not what they do full time, and they're incredibly good, but we need to respect their time and what they can give to us.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. I agree, they're really good, they're really responsive. But to the extent that, you know, it's something we've done before and everybody agrees that the methodology is sound or the format is what it is, at least in theory, you would think there would be opportunities there for that research for you as well.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: I agree.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Perhaps one or less, one or more less turnarounds, maybe only one. I'm familiar with, you know, how rigorous that can be and, you know, and comments, et cetera, and that's -- there should always be allowance for that.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: (Away from mic).

>> DR. VOLBERG: I just want to add one more thing to the review process issue, which is that in addition to the review committee, quite a few of our reports need to be vetted by the operators because they're giving us their data, but we need to give them the opportunity to review what we are seeing through our analysis. And that is sort of, you know, also built into the review process and adds another sort of layer of complicated interaction sometimes.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Well I just want to make sure that we're not adding a layer of negativity here because this is wonderful research and reporting. But I am also aware that there's always opportunity to review and where there can be efficiencies achieved and the methodologies that are agreed upon maybe somehow conveyed in an efficient fashion so you're not repeating and reviewing what's already been approved. That would work out. Do you have any further comments?

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No. Just that it is, you know, good news here is that the impacts are not severe. In many cases there aren't negative impacts to what happened here with the Plainridge experience over four years. So just a comment that that is -- that is good news and I think partly attributed to the work everybody is doing to minimize those impacts.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: In terms of mitigation.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: And innovation. The one that stood out to me was on environmental. Can you elaborate on that in terms of whether they're significant or?

>> DR. VOLBERG: So in terms of the traffic --

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: I think it was traffic and noise.

>> DR. VOLBERG: Yeah. So the reason that we reported that there seemed to be an impact in terms of noise was actually a specific comment that was made by Lou LeBlanc who is one of our key informant interviews. At the time we interviewed him, he was the head of the Board of Health. And he mentioned that there were a number of noise complaints related or during the construction phase of the slot parlor. But that there had not been any noise complaints since the construction ended. So -- but we felt it was important to document that. And then also through the use of -- or through an analysis of data from task cameras around the main intersections in Plainville. We identified, I believe it was about a 14% increase in the amount of traffic that was going in and out of the casino. Not a surprise, certainly, given that you have a lot more people coming to the facility. But we, again, felt it was important to document that as

an impact that could be attributed to the slot parlor.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So that was an independent look at traffic and not related to Christopher Bruce's work, correct?

>> DR. VOLBERG: So in the full report, we look at the traffic data and we looked at Christopher Bruce's traffic collision data as well.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Interesting that when we have our meetings with the Chief of Police of the host and surrounding communities, there was a strong feeling that a lot of the additional traffic was based on ways, you know, taking them off of 495 and putting them on back roads. They did not think it was related to the casino, interestingly enough, and that was an interesting piece in talking to all of the chiefs. So I didn't know if you knew that we had discussed that at length, the traffic issue. That's sometimes where the research and those who are directly responsible having those conversations are very helpful.

>> DR. VOLBERG: Yeah, absolutely. Thank you for that.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you. Sorry to disrupt the chaos.

>> MR. MELNIK: Not at all.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you for that.

>> THOMAS PEAKE: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Commissioners. I'm Tom Peaks, senior researcher over at the Donahue Institute. A big thing that I've been working on for the last four or five years is sort of developing systems to track the economic impact of the casinos. And what I want to talk about specifically today -- how do I get it to my thing?

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah, you have to go through it to get -- it's in order.

>> THOMAS PEAKE: Okay. This might take a second. Oh, yeah. I can just start -- yeah. What I really want to talk about is sort of what we're calling the direct impact of the casinos. So what are direct impacts? It might be easier to back up and talk about when we do economic impact modeling. What we're really trying to capture is everything that's changed in the economy as a result of some sort of policy decision or event. When we're talking about direct impacts, we're talking about the sort of primary economic activities that are occurring at the casino. So what does that include? It includes operating employment so people who are hired at the casino and working there, the expenses that the casino is paying out to vendors and government entities and charities and whatnot. It's the revenues that the casino is bringing in and then some large portion of that is then paid to, you know, the state government. And those sort of direct trackable things.

What this is not covering is a lot of the sort of ripple effects that you see in a community like this when there is sort of a big economic event like the opening of a casino. So, you know, we're measuring the compensation that the casino is paying out to its employees. Well, those employees were then going out into their communities where they live, and they're spending that money. We have a bigger economic modeling process that's capturing this ripple effect. It's also capturing when they buy a lot of stuff from vendors. That might cause those vendors to invest, to hire more people or to purchase capital goods. Maybe the biggest thing is when we have -- you know, a thing like a casino, a private source of revenue is patrons that are sort of local to the community coming in. It's not like it's a software company that's producing goods for people all over the world. The consumer base is local, and those people are

probably spending their money in other places before the casino. Maybe they were spending their money out of state gambling. Maybe they were spending it, you know, at local bars and restaurants. And a lot of these questions about these things outside of the casino are some of the sort of hottest public policy conversations that surround these things.

We have a really great methodology for capturing all of that stuff. But to really get it working out, we need to do these patron surveys that we do. And we at this point are not doing one of those at every casino every year. We still think it's important to report to the Commission on the things that we can get data on every single year, and that's the very rich dataset that the folks at Plainridge Park Casino have been very helpful in sharing with us.

So let's talk for a moment about data collection.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Tom?

>> THOMAS PEAKE: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Maybe you can get to this later. Why is it important every single year?

>> THOMAS PEAKE: For me it's a matter of we want to establish time series data. We want to see how things are changing over time. And we want to see how other events that are happening in state and out of state, whether that's a regulatory event, whether that's a change in the market, how those are coming. In my personal philosophy on data is that you collect a lot of it, and you then look at it and you see what's going on. But you don't always know what you're looking for until you can take a look at it. And there's actually some really interesting examples in here. I'll touch on a couple of them here, and then when this actual full report is published in the next few months, you'll hopefully be able to see a few more of them. There were things that we saw that we maybe didn't set out to look for. And it was, like, wait. This is going up. This is going down. That's kind of interesting. And it sort of sheds light on things that we maybe weren't even -- we hadn't even thought of yet as sort of the unknown unknowns or whatever you want to call them.

So for us it's important that we just continue to track these things so that we can sort of establish a time series of how these institutions are responding to, you know, the world, if that makes sense.

So, you know, in order to do that, we've actually got this really great dataset. So that includes payroll employment and compensation at the casino. It includes spending to outside entities, so all of the vendors, government entities, third parties. We've got data on visitation to a casino. We've got obviously the MGC makes available information about gross gaming revenue. Taxes and assessments. All of this stuff. And when we look at these things and we compare them to each other and relate them to each other, we're often able to find out just really interesting things and help folks, you know, such as the Commission to actually answer some interesting questions.

So, for example, here's a time series we have of payroll employment at every pay period since the start of fiscal year 2016. So about two weeks after PPC opened initially. When we say payroll employment, what we're talking about is employees who received a paycheck during that period. It might not perfectly line up with the number of people there because some people may have left and they were receiving their last paycheck. Some people might have started a few days earlier that haven't received

their first paycheck. But it's a really rich dataset because for each of these employees that's receiving a paycheck, we know from that all sorts of things about them, about what they were paid, what sort of position they were working in, demographic information about them, benefits, compensation. And because we have this sort of as a time series we're actually able to track a lot of interesting stuff about how people's careers, you know, change over time and the tenure that people work there, you know, how their status might change. There's a lot of stuff there.

But to give you an example, this is a graph that shows something about payroll employment. Well, it makes it look like so it was high. It sort of reached its peak towards the end of calendar year 2015. And then it fell, and it's leveled out a little bit. And that's true. But it's also true that if you look at -- a different perspective, actually, the hours worked at Plainridge Park has -- it's actually higher in fiscal year 2019 than it was in fiscal year 2016. So that suggests that they might be moving towards having more full-time and less part-time people and that there might be less turnover. So that's just one example of why we want to collect these things sort of as a time series. But, yeah, for the last few years, it's really been fairly level. The payroll employment with, on average, about 450 people working -- employed at the casino at any given time.

And in terms of where those employees are located, they're fairly tightly clustered around the casino. When we talked about the new employees survey, you saw that with the new hires, but it's true for a lot of the long-standing people as well. Actually over half of the folks working at the casino are coming from ten communities. And those ten communities include Plainville plus all of the surrounding communities except for Wrentham which is not contributing a lot of employees. But the biggest are North Attleborough and Attleboro. On average, North Attleborough has about 51, 52 people working at the casino at any given time. And Attleborough has about 43. Plainville, on average, has 24, 25 people who are employed at the casino. There's also a pretty good number of people in the communities right over the Rhode Island border who are employed and come over here.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thomas, on this, how do you define metro Boston and southeast?

>> THOMAS PEAKE: Oh, sure. So when we're doing our economic modeling exercises, we have -- it's a county-based model. So metro Boston would be North County, Middlesex, Essex and Sussex, a very large region while southeast would be Bristol and Plymouth County.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Can you tell me -- I may have missed it, Tom. 453 jobs now. Do we know the FTE part-time breakdown?

>> THOMAS PEAKE: It's not in this presentation, but I could easily -- it is in the full report. I could get that.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: You don't know off the top of your head?

>> THOMAS PEAKE: Off the top of my head, I'm not sure.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: But you said it's an increase for full time.

>> THOMAS PEAKE: Yeah, I believe the number of full-time has gone up and I do believe that the majority of employees at Plainridge Park at this point are full time. I think that's always been the case, but it's gone up.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: And you may not have this, but I know that one of the goals for taking a job at the casino was increased salary.

>> THOMAS PEAKE: Mm-hmm.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: I think we saw around 50% have gone from underemployed to earning a living wage. Do you know if their wages -- for those who are full time, in fact, if their wages were higher?

>> THOMAS PEAKE: We haven't done this yet, but one thing that I'd be really interested in doing at some point is actually relating the new employee data to the operating data and sort of tie those together. We actually -- we've been working really closely with Plainridge Park Casino, and we now have a much richer dataset than we've worked with in previous years that would allow us to maybe do some more interesting work like that. But that's -- it's not something that we've done to this point.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Yeah. I didn't think you had access to that. Thank you. I'm probably asking a question I've been asking in the past.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: And just to acknowledge Lisa McKinney for her immense help in collecting this data and validating the data and working through some of the data problems that we had at different points of time but to assure that what we have is what the condition is. So thank you, Lisa.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: And we did have the data -- thank you. I knew I had seen it but I couldn't remember. So the breakdown is 301 full time, 141 part time, does that sound right?

>> THOMAS PEAKE: Yeah, that sounds about right. One other thing we're hoping to do at some point is develop a methodology for estimating income from tips so we know what the casino is playing but obviously for some of the employees, they might be making even more than that an hour from tips. So that's an area where I'm really interested in looking for that, especially when we start doing -- when we start running these things through our economic models because if they're getting that tip money and spending it in the communities, that leads to an even bigger sort of ripple effect.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you.

>> THOMAS PEAKE: In terms of -- sorry. Expenditure. The casino -- we would talk a lot about jobs at the casino. But in terms of the actual money, which is finding its way into the Commonwealth, sort of the spending on employee wages is actually a relatively small fraction of what's going on. Obviously, the biggest share of money that's finding its way to the Commonwealth is the tax paid on gross gaming revenue, which is very considerable and which has actually grown over the years. Spending on private sector vendors as well as spending to local, state and federal governments, whether that's various fees or taxes or host and surrounding community agreements, that's also sort of spending to outside entities has remained relatively stable but, again, is higher share of spending than employee wages.

In total, so obviously 100% of the GGR tax goes to the state. And then some share of the spending, you know, vendor spending and employee spending goes to individuals or entities within the Commonwealth. But some of the employees and some of the vendors aren't here. When you calculate it all up in fiscal year 2019, we're talking about \$135.2 million in spending and 83 -- or 86.3% of that is actually going to either the Commonwealth of Massachusetts itself or entities or individuals within the Commonwealth. And that share has remained over 85% consistently throughout the four years of operation.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: It's interesting to note spending on employee

wages has climbed even though employment has kind of leveled off.

>> THOMAS PEAKE: Spending on employee wages as well as hours worked. And there's -- yeah, we have a little bit -- we have some ideas about that might be sort of settling into a more incumbent workforce where you have people who have been there longer, sort of where people are trusted. Either there's people who are being promoted or people who started part time who are now working full time. So we're -- yeah. That's what we are seeing. Actually, really specifically in FY19, hours worked and compensation have both increased.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you.

>> THOMAS PEAKE: Talking about vendor spending. It's a pretty diverse field of industries that are receiving some amount of vendor spending. The largest of those industries is wholesale trade. Obviously there's a lot of wholesale supplies coming through the casino, particularly related to sort of the restaurant and bar side of things. But really most of the operating expenses are going to industries that aren't in our top ten. So we're talking about a very diverse field.

And when you break that down by in-state versus out-of-state, you'll see that the -- this is where the amount of money coming into Massachusetts has declined a little bit. The share of money -- or the share of vendor spending, which is going to vendors within the Commonwealth, has dropped off a little bit in the last fiscal year, while the amount out of state started very high, dropped off, and has crept up a little. A lot of that really high initial spending had to do with the miscellaneous manufacturing industry. And in fact, it still is. One of the things in the miscellaneous manufacturing industry is gaming equipment manufacturing, which is largely done in a couple large cities, mainly Las Vegas. That's where a lot of that is.

But it still remains fairly high.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Can I interrupt?

>> THOMAS PEAKE: Yeah.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: I believe we saw a slide earlier today that indicated good part of the out-of-state spend goes to New Hampshire? Do you remember that slide? Did you -- did you detect that in your research where -- because I understood if it's gaming manufacturing where we would have a hard time competing with those other states.

>> THOMAS PEAKE: Mm-hmm.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Do you have a sense as to anything that's not related to gaming where Massachusetts is losing out on opportunities because either lack of supply or being too costly? Is there any trend that you were able to detect on that?

>> THOMAS PEAKE: I'm not sure about a specific trend, and I'm not sure about New Hampshire specifically as a state. I haven't -- I have done sort of state-by-state analyses in the past, but in this year, that wasn't something that I really sat down and looked on. I do know that, you know, when you have casino operators who are national or multinational, in some cases entities, they sometimes have preferred vendors for certain things like financial services who they're already working with with some of their other properties. But I'm not positive what is specifically related to New Hampshire.

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: If I can help, and correct me if I'm wrong, some of the vendors, it was a food vendor and they shifted from -- is it Sysco to someone in New

Hampshire which accounted for the swing.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Was that a good portion?

>> (Away from mic).

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: That accounted for the New Hampshire.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you for reminding me. With respect the one vendor.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: We should point out that some of the data has not been captured because you're reporting on fiscal '19. And from Plainridge, we get the most up to date.

>> (Away from mic).

>> MR. MELNIK: In the past we've demonstrated to showing where different things are. (Away from mic) this is a good reason to track this on an annual basis, too, or at least on a regular -- on a pretty regular basis because it can tell you a little bit about -- like different points in time when it is really going down. Are we missing something competitively or is there some other story to tell about, you know, somebody used to be in Mass (away from mic) or something?

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right.

>> THOMAS PEAKE: In terms of revenues, I think you all are probably very familiar with all of this since you publish it. You know, the revenues have continued to be fairly strong. It almost looks to me like there was a little jump where the first two years were very similar to each other, and then it hopped up a little in terms of sort of the annual totals for fiscal year. But overall we are not seeing, even with the -- one thing we were really interested in this year was how the introduction of MGM Springfield was going to affect the gross gaming revenue numbers at PPC, and obviously we haven't seen a significant effect yet.

But we actually -- one thing that we kind of did, we looked at revenue numbers and employment which I showed you earlier, and this is where I think we add a little value. Not value.

[Laughter]

I specifically --

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Good pivot.

>> THOMAS PEAKE: This is one thing that we can do which I think is kind of cool is that we can actually look at these things and say that, you know, sort of monthly employment at the casino has, over time, fallen to some extent, but we also see at the same time that gross gaming revenue has, on average, risen, which suggests to us that we're talking about a more productive workforce where individual employees -- like per employee, they're bringing in more revenue than they previously had, which I think you could sort of expect for a new entrant into a market, you know, the first year or two, you're going to have to do a lot of sort of building, sort of industry-specific skills. And then over time, you're going to see individual employees being able to bring in more revenue per employee. And that's what we've seen here. So it's not exactly shocking, but it's really interesting, and it's the sort of thing where this data is really valuable because most just standard economic models would assume sort of a fixed ratio between productivity -- between, like, output and employment. So you'd say, oh, if the employment isn't what it was the first year, then that must mean that the output isn't. And that's not what we've observed here. So these sort of data allow us to sort of

model things in a much more comprehensive way.

>> MR. MELNIK: One thing if I could add too that I think will be interesting over time is to see how that industry looks with the other casinos. Because one of the things that we're seeing is a maturing casino (away from mic), right? So will we see a trend that looks like this or will it look more consistent out of the gate? Especially as we see some level of flexibility between the casinos with you know, staff working in one and (away from mic) working at the other. Will that translate to some level of consistency out of the gates or not?

>> THOMAS PEAKE: And sort of on the flipside of that, if we track operating revenues against visitation, we see the same thing where visitation at PPC has declined a little bit over the four years. But, again, on average, the operating revenues have climbed. And this is one of the reasons we're really interested to continue to monitor patron behavior is, you know, one thing that this could be an indication of is that we're seeing the population who is going to the casino shifting to people who are less -- coming in just because they're curious and folks who are spending a little bit more money per visit because you've got less folks but more money.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: How much does inflation factor in here? I know it's only a couple of years.

>> THOMAS PEAKE: You know, I don't think it probably --

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Or lower minimums? You know the business model, higher minimums?

>> THOMAS PEAKE: I guess that's a possible -- like, yeah. If minimums have gone up, that could definitely also play a role for sure.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Or slot hold, for example.

>> THOMAS PEAKE: Yeah. Yeah. I mean, there's definitely things internally in terms of how the casino sets its own rules. That could lead to this as well. But these are the sort of things where I think it's really interesting to sort of continue to monitor these things because this is a trend that we didn't even think to check. We just looked at these numbers and these trends independently, and you pointed out, says this is interesting these are going in different directions. It's not what you necessarily would expect. So it's something that we intend to keep an eye on.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: But I think these last couple of slides kind of point to what we begin to learn about the gaming industry which is after three, four years, you hit this steady state of operations, right? Employment starts to level out. Revenues start to level out. Licensees get to know their customer and get to know other operations and operate more efficiently.

>> THOMAS PEAKE: Absolutely, yeah.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: That begs the question, that's why we do need to continue to be consistent so we can really see that it's not just a four-year steady but a longer -- what would be the number of years to really know? Is it a ten-year trend that it becomes clear?

>> THOMAS PEAKE: That's a really great question.

>> MR. MELNIK: It would be nice if there was an easy answer to that. I think one of the things that's unique about Massachusetts, the strength and weaknesses come together is there was all this spacing of when the casinos actually opened. So should we expect this level of consistency -- so for us from a research perspective, we are able

to disentangle it neatly and develop our methods very cleanly, the negative in terms of so when's the equilibrium hit or when's the stability hit? Well, the elements of where stability hits is when other major casinos also (away from mic). You know, so it's a little hard to say, well, once we hit year ten, this thing should be very predictable. It might be. But I hesitate to say that knowing that, well, we just opened a massive casino just up the road. So, like, what is that going to mean and that kind of stuff?

>> THOMAS PEAKE: Or there's other things. How is online gaming going to affect? Demographic change. How's that going to change? We don't always even know what we need to be looking out for until we see the changes and then you start looking into them and saying what's this all about? What's the story here? And, I mean, that's the sort of stuff I really love to do.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: That's great.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I would add -- I don't want to -- and I know I've brought this up to Mark and Rachel and with Mark Vander Linden, again, going back and revisiting the possibility of looking at some engrained data sources, and we've talked about this, you know, a lot of it is locally based, meals tax, hotel tax, stuff that's collected locally because, you know, as we saw in Western Mass, Northampton was very concerned about what the opening of MGM would have on their kind of restaurant and hospitality scene. And it would be a great picture, a great story to tell if we could say the introduction of gaming has actually not impacted or perhaps boosted some of those local numbers because that would get to, you know, certainly interest on behalf of, you know, the communities or designated surrounding communities, but it would also tell a bigger story about people are coming. People have really changed maybe their spending habits. Maybe there's more people coming to the region. And that's data that's pretty readily accessible but would certainly help us maybe calm some fears of some of the local communities to have that data analyzed and looked at.

>> THOMAS PEAKE: So this is -- that's my presentation. If there's any other questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Very, very helpful.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: And I echo Commissioner Stebbins' thoughts on the local taxes. I don't know, Mark, how we can get that information maybe sooner than later before too much time has passed, but certainly it would be interesting to see that trends associated with events that are coming into our destination casino licensees and see the local impact.

>> MR. MELNIK: And we are exploring different elements of that. There are some issues with -- to the question that Bruce is raising with -- I'm sorry, what's the office? The taxation office. DOR. Challenges in terms of how data are able to be disentangled at locations, but municipalities are a little bit different thing. So we are doing some exploration with it, but there are obviously (away from mic).

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Yeah. I think with respect to the municipality -- you're actually thinking how much hotel, food and beverage and hotel, tax. So there's no privacy issues there. Yeah. Certainly with respect to individuals, DOR -- that would be challenging.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: And again, this kind of is to a bigger conversation that we've had is how can we take the great research that's been done and share it out

with a broader group of stakeholders, so this information isn't just being exchanged between us, but it's helping educate the public, it's helping educate the local chamber of commerce about how much is being spent locally. It's understanding the local impacts, the local employment, you know, even when you go out and do your visitor patron surveys, that's great information to be shared back with the tribal bureau as to, hey, this is why I keep coming back to PPC or to Encore or to MGM. So I know Mark's thinking about that day and night, but. . .

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And by the way, I should note that there's a great estimate they do through the REMI modeling and other things relative to those multiplier effects and whatnot. What you allude to, which they also responded to, has other difficulties because of how data is aggregated at the municipal level. But to the extent that it can be continued to be estimated or at least, you know, put into the context with other data, that would be really helpful.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you so much. We appreciate it very much.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.

>> DR. VOLBERG: (Away from mic) for each of you.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Oh, thank you.

>> DR. VOLBERG: This is 10 and 11. Please enjoy.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: At this time I think we'll take a five-minute break before we start with Christopher Bruce. Thank you.

[A break was taken at 2:36 P.M.]

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: We're reconvening Commission meeting number 281, and we are now on our public safety reporting from Christopher Bruce. So thank you. Director Vander Linden, do you want to make the introduction?

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Sure. Just one comment. I introduced his work just before the SEIGMA team. And to Commissioner Stebbins' point of taking the wealth of information that we have through this research and assuring that it reaches the right stakeholders, knowledge translation is kind of how that's defined. And I think that the work that Christopher does and his close work with each of the local police departments is exactly that. It's intended to be this type of monitoring system where it's engaging didactic and reaches the right audience. And so for one, I think this is fantastic work. And I applaud Christopher's sort of due diligence of making sure it gets to the right people and working with the right people. So with that, I'll turn it over.

>> MR. BRUCE: All right. Thank you, Mark. I think this is the first time that I've been in front of you speaking about multiple studies at the same time. So I tried to condense them as much as possible so it wouldn't go on forever. And I think you're pretty familiar with my methodology by now in which I'm extracting the data directly from the record systems of the participating agencies so that we have not just summary data, accounts of crime, but actual information about each individual offense and call for service and person involved in crime so that we can check for changes in quite a few variables.

That process went very smoothly in Plainville and in the Springfield area. It ran into a few snags in the Encore area with one agency choosing not to participate at all and a couple of others having difficulty providing the data exactly how I was used to getting it. But I think it will be okay in the end. So we'll talk about some of those

issues when we get to the Encore study.

And I wanted to talk briefly about the statistical methods I've been using. I deliberately kept them somewhat simple because I wanted them to be understandable to the audience which, of course, to many he is principally the agencies that are involved. I think I've covered them before, but just to go over it again, what I'm trying to do really in all of the studies is to identify a window of numbers in which we would expect each crime or call for service to fall if nothing had changed in the community. And as you might imagine, some crimes fluctuate, you know -- every crime fluctuates a little bit from year to year. Some fluctuate a lot. Some fluctuate a little. And the amount of that fluctuation determines the width of that window, I suppose. So one method of creating that window is just to look, as this example shows you, in sort of the general central tendency of the crime over the previous period. In this case the crime hasn't been going anywhere, trending up or down, it's just fluctuating around that central line, basically. And we establish statistically standard deviations, a window on either side of that average where we would expect the activity to fall, again, if nothing had changed for the community. Other times you have a situation like this in which, you know, the numbers over the course of the previous period are trending downward clearly. So if I used the standard -- the central tendency method to establish a window, it would be predicting the past, essentially, not the future. And so we have different methods that are based on the trend line that can run through the data to create the window there. Regression analysis, basically.

Again, I've tried not to use statistics that are too complicated for this. Just to make it more understandable to the audience, although there's going to come a time in which once we have data from all three casinos, and we try to answer the macro question of what impact do casinos generically have on crime in public safety that it's going to involve -- have to involve a lot more sophisticated statistical modeling, I think, but we're not quite there yet.

So the important thing is to understand when you see a statistic in any of the reports that has, you know, a dash in between two numbers, that's the window that I predicted based on one of the two methods, depending on whether crime was trending or not, and then we compared, of course, to what happens -- really happened during that period to see if it's inside or outside that window.

So we'll start with Plainridge Park area here. And the major findings over the four-year period since Plainridge Park opened have been that violent crime has been trending upward but not in a way that I can tie specifically to the presence of the casino. It's mostly related to domestic violence, as we're going to see, that seems to have been going up for its own reasons. Incidents at the casino itself generally led to Plainville itself experiencing a 7% increase in property crime, a 9% increase in total crime and a trivial 1% increase in violent crime that I didn't even bother to put on the slide there. So that's at the casino. That's at 301 Washington Street. So if that facility had not existed, those crimes likely would not have existed. And therefore that's the specific impact on Plainville itself.

In the surrounding region, arrests have been way down for these six participating communities, mostly in the area of liquor-related offenses. That has a lot to do with changes in policies for protective custody, crimes that I think that might be related -- or incidents that I think might be related to the casino have to do with credit card fraud

during the first year but fell after the first year. Also during the first year a little bit of -- we're talking about single-digit numbers of disorderly conduct, liquor-related disorderly conduct across the street in Plainville Commons, traffic commissions on feeder roads coming into Plainridge Park, particularly Plainville and North Attleborough for those lots. And then a bunch of related stuff that is just related to volume in an area. So lost property, suspicious activity, people complaining about traffic, erratic driving, parked cars, things like that.

The more people you bring to a community, the more those types of calls for service tend to increase. Plainville was the only one that really had a consistent increase in all of those things over the four-year period.

Now, for the first time there's two things in this report that weren't in past reports. One has to do with drunk driving. And what I'm characterizing as a mild increase or at least a mild increase caused specifically by Plainridge Park. The fact is I can't separate exactly what's caused by the casino, what's caused by other economic growth in the area, and that's a theme that's going to run throughout this presentation. And it's going to continue getting hazier going forward, how much we can credit specifically to the casino and how much is related to the general economic growth of the area of which the casino's a part. But we're also seeing expansion of the outlets. We're also seeing expansion of Patriot Place, and the impact of those is tough to differentiate from the impact of Plainridge Park, if that makes sense. Go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Quick question?

>> MR. BRUCE: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: With the drunk driving.

>> MR. BRUCE: Yeah. I have some more stuff on that.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Oh, you do? I'll wait, then.

>> MR. BRUCE: Okay. Some things that are happening around here that I don't think are related to Plainridge Park but that we've talked about with the chiefs anyway, again, the increase in domestic violence. Mostly in area of simple assaults. So assault without a dangerous weapon or without significant injury and what we call family offenses which are generally restraining order violations or child neglect calls. Those have been trending upward in most of the communities around here. Mansfield, I think, being the exception. But every time you look for any casino relationship, we can't find anything. There's nothing in the narrative that indicates a gambling motivation, any kind of casino-related motivation, which, you know, I could imagine a scenario in which those were contributed factors that led to sort of a general increase in angst and frustration among a community that might then lead to violence, but I would expect it to show up once. I would expect to see gambling mentioned one time from a victim's narrative about why, you know, her husband had become violent or something like that. It's just not showing up at all. And the fact is, you wouldn't expect that type of trend to be so geographically localized anyway. So it just appears to be a more general increase in domestic violence, and Chief Alfred has talked about general economic or financial lows that might be causing that that don't necessarily directly have to do with the casino.

Also, the opioid epidemic as well. Excuse me. We've seen increases in fraud and identity theft. And the trend for the fraud incident seems to be a lot of telephone fraud. People getting calls from fraudsters claiming to be from the IRS or claiming to

have their family members wanting to extort ransom money. But these types of things are increasing all over the Commonwealth. And, again, it's not something you would expect to be geographically localized. Fraud out in the street, sure, but not when you're calling residents, there's no reason to not call anywhere in the U.S. if you were motivated for gambling funds. I don't think they have anything to do with the presence of Plainridge Park.

Just a few examples of some of the crimes and calls for service. The general story, I want to convey here is that the types of things that people generally fear might increase, from the kind of fascial direct causal hypothesis of somebody's motivated for gambling money so they go out to the area community and steal things in order to meet that need. Those are specifically the types of crimes we have not seen increase. Robbery, burglary, thefts from vehicles, auto theft, things like that have all been decreasing in the area. Burglary, enormously so. If I looked at that number and I hadn't collected the data specifically myself, I would seriously question that number. I would assume it was something else going on with reporting for that figure. But all across Massachusetts, burglary is decreasing, and it's quite a lot in this area.

We also haven't seen increases in -- the other hypothesis would be vice crimes would increase, drugs, liquor, things like that. But we haven't seen any evidence of that either. What we really have mostly seen the evidence of is crimes or calls for service that are related to the volume of activity in the community. And those are where we've seen the most increases like in traffic collisions, as you can see there.

Traffic collisions I have to mention were already on the increase before Plainridge Park opened. And they actually dipped a little bit in 2017, at least based on the CAD data from the agencies. No, that's based on -- I'm sorry, that's based on state crash data which they haven't closed the years after 2017 yet at the state level so I can't give 2017 just yet. So even if Plainridge Park contributed to the number of collisions, it was already an increasing trend. So their contribution was fairly mild. And that jibes with a couple of reports that have county out of a traffic engineering firm that the casino hired themselves that issued a couple of reports that have basically said that the contribution of the casino has been minor and in minor collisions, right. So mostly fender benders, rear-end collisions, and almost not even noticeable in sort of a -- in congestion, in day-to-day traffic volume. And I think that that's probably the case.

When you look at the police calls for service for traffic collisions, they're increasing more than reportable traffic collisions. Now, there's only reportable when it exceeds a certain dollar value or when injuries happen. So that suggests that most of the increase is in noninjury minor dollar value crashes that are contributing to the trend. So to get into the alcohol -- I'm sorry, I thought you signaled, Mark. To get into the alcohol thing -- I thought I saw your hand or something like you wanted to say something.

So the question of alcohol-related collisions, there's a few pieces of evidence that are showing up that I've collected in the last year that we hadn't had access to before. And the first is the last drink statistics from the alcohol beverage control Commission. This is collected during adjudication for drunk drivers. And they specify where they had their last drink. These are the figures for Plainridge Park, as you can see, it went from one to two to nine in 2017 and then back down to three in 2018. At the same time, I'm looking at collisions that have alcohol as a causal factor. Now, the specific fields where

you're supposed to collect that in the police systems are not filled out with enough Fidelity that I trust that data. But what I can do is look at calls for service for traffic collisions that then led to a charge for drunk driving. And that gives I think a pretty good proxy for the number of traffic collisions that were caused by drunk driving. And that's these statistics here.

Now, in the report --

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Can I ask you one question about that?

>> MR. BRUCE: Yes. Sure.

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Have you gotten the last call from the court system, or are you getting it from the ABCC?

>> MR. BRUCE: I'm getting it from the ABCC. Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Does the court system provide it discreetly that you can get it from the court system, or does that have to be -- do they forward it to the ABCC?

>> MR. BRUCE: They forward it to the ABCC. I'm not aware that I could get it directly from the court system. The ABCC is the one that always issues public reports about the data. That's who I went to. I didn't even try to go to the courts, to be honest.

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: And then your presumption is that it comes from the court or is it coming from the court?

>> MR. BRUCE: Well, according to the ABCC's definitions in their public released reports, that's where they're getting it from, yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Okay.

>> MR. BRUCE: It explicitly doesn't come from the police reports during arrest which might collect and it might not, so, yeah.

Anyway, you can see from these statistics, during the first three years, the numbers were a little bit inconsistent. So in 2016, Attleboro was well within the predicted window, Foxborough was below it, Mansfield was above it, Wrentham and the total was well below where we expected. 2017, it was still within the window but towards the higher end and a couple of the communities were above the predicted window. 2018, it went back down. 2019, it went back up again. So when I looked at it in 2018, I had two years in which it was lower than average. And only one that it was not even really above the window. So only in 2019 did a clearer trend come out of the data, I suppose. But then mixed with that, the ABCC data. I think the story is telling there is a subtle increase in drunk driving in the area that is leading to a few more crashes. Now, I don't want to attribute that to Plainridge Park exclusively because Patriot Place, the different bars and restaurants there, contribute over 100 last-drink locations in the same period that Plainridge Park had, it looks like, 15. So, you know, it's not -- it's not just PPC, and PPC, at best, is only responsible for 10, about 10% of last-drink locations between the two, at least, and so the story there is that throughout the region, we've seen a mild increase in drunk driving that's led to an inconsistent trend in crashes, but within the last year, at least, higher than normal drunk driving crashes of which PPC has probably a small percentage of, if that makes sense. It just might be worth reviewing the -- whatever policies are in place for drinking at the casino and ensuring that drunk drivers don't leave the location.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: This is more my own personal curiosity.

>> MR. BRUCE: Sure.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Does Plainville and the surrounding communities, do they -- do patrons rely on rideshares?

>> MR. BRUCE: Yeah. That one I can't answer you, unfortunately. I don't know if we have good data on that anywhere.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Of course, I'm looking right to the chief who's shaking his head yes, they do rely on rideshares, so it's consistent with the rest of the Commonwealth, right? Or probably the rest of the country.

>> MR. BRUCE: I have been waiting eagerly for a couple years for national studies to come out to evaluate the impact of rideshares on drunk driving because you would think it would have a fairly significant impact, but I'm not aware of any yet and I'm especially not aware of any localized to this region. Definitely -- I'll look for that in future reports.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you.

>> MR. BRUCE: Okay. Funny -- it's not funny, but it's kind of amusing statistically that in the midst of a time that we had a decrease -- such a decrease in burglaries in the area, we also had a burglary pattern. And the only one that I'm aware of in which the offender could clearly be shown to have a casino motivation. So it's a reminder that you can have these patterns even in the midst of big decreases in crime, and they might not therefore show up if we're just looking at the numbers. And as you can see from the table here, it doesn't really even involve, except for Wrentham, most of the surrounding communities. But this guy was arrested ultimately twice for this pattern. And you can see the first five or six of them, he didn't get anything -- he didn't steal anything. He tried to break into the house, but he got scared away, or the dog scared him away or something like that. And so finally in the one after he's been doing this a week in Wrentham on October 8th to 9th, he got \$250 from a wallet which he immediately took to Plainridge Park. He was identified as suspicious activity there. And identified as intoxicated, actually. He drove away and the state police ended up charging him for drunk driving. But then later on he got arrested for the burglaries as well, which he committed another one after leaving Plainridge Park on the 11th. Anyway, he specifically cited after his arrest that he was motivated to look for cash for gambling. So that's the one case that we're aware of, that I'm aware of, at least, in which that happened, the one case I've been told about in which that has been a clear motivation in the midst of a crime that has experienced 50% decreases in the region.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Christopher, I want to make sure I understand this slide. This is the same individual?

>> MR. BRUCE: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Out of all of these days and times?

>> MR. BRUCE: Yes. Well, as best as we can figure anyway from the modus operandi, the suspect description and what he admitted to after the crime was committed. I'd have to go back and look at my notes to see how sure I am about all of the individual ones, but, I'm 90% sure of the entire series.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So he attempted seven burglaries and he was successful --

>> MR. BRUCE: Five, at least. Before he was -- or a total, yeah, a total of seven in which he was only successful once.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah. So he's not the best burglar.

>> MR. BRUCE: No. He amassed enough charges to put himself away for about 20 years and got \$250 for it.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah.

>> MR. BRUCE: So the summary here is that we've had no increase, and, in fact, we've had significant decreases in the classic profit-motivated predatory crimes like robbery, burglary and auto theft. The violent crime doesn't seem to be related to Plainridge Park. Neither do the fraud and identity theft increases. We've seen a mild increase in visitor-driven crimes -- not crimes -- calls for service like lost property, suspicious activity and traffic complaints, a child increase in traffic collisions, and minor traffic collisions specifically. And as I said earlier, this is all part of a larger pattern of economic growth and traffic growth in the area from which Plainridge Park is going to be harder and harder to extract individually as the years go forward. Shall I take any questions on Plainridge Park before I move on to MGM?

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think your comment about the drunk driving charges as a result of a crash are interesting and probably something we do need to follow up on. We need to meet together and follow up on that. Because crash data is reliable because there's not -- it doesn't matter if there's a detail out there.

>> MR. BRUCE: Right.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: It's a crash.

>> MR. BRUCE: Right, exactly. It's not dependent on police activity.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Correct.

>> MR. BRUCE: And prior to -- so we encouraged agencies to adopt methods for recording what incidents they knew they were specifically related to Plainridge Park. Only Attleboro really instituted something that formalized within their records management system. And they don't have it anymore because they switched records systems last year. But during the period in which they had that, the only times that that box was checked was for a couple of drunk driving incidents in which the person said they were last leaving Plainridge Park. So we had that little bit of evidence prior to it, but we didn't really have better statistics until now. I'm going to try to collect that from the other agencies, though, going forward because the ABCC data has to wait for adjudication which takes a while. So I'm going to see if we can get data from the local agencies, too.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: If I could, just one last comment. So this report at this point is considered preliminary because we haven't -- the comment period hasn't closed yet? In order to move this forward as quickly as we possibly could, we were comfortable enough with the data even as is, that we felt it was appropriate to share it publicly, but the comment period, we'll give it a couple more weeks before it would be considered final.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: But we did have the premeeting with the chiefs.

>> MR. BRUCE: Correct. I didn't have all the numbers at the time.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: You didn't have everything, but you had the basic --

>> MR. BRUCE: Gist.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yeah. And just to acknowledge Chief Alfred from the Plainville Police Department. And we've been doing this for four or five years now, and

Chief Alfred has been there at every meeting and been a really welcome participant to this process and really helpful to this particular study. So thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Actually, Chief, I would jump on that bandwagon. Not only has he been an active participant, but because the chief was willing to go out on -- I won't say a limb, but he was willing to work collaboratively with the state police right out of the box which then made it possible and probable for the other chiefs in both Springfield and their surrounding communities in Everett in there, and I know how many calls you've gotten, hey, how's it working out? Because it's not something that's done readily. So I think that that's really been so helpful with the implementation of gaming, the fact that you were willing, Chief, to take that chance and say yes, I'll sign an MOU. Yes, I'll work together. And because that was a successful endeavor, the others were much more willing to come on board. So I do want to thank you for that as well.

>> MR. BRUCE: All right. So obviously, MGM opens in a very different geography from Plainridge Park. It opens in an area that has a lot higher population, of course, and historically much higher crime and call for service totals. So because of that, different analytical methods are really necessary to extract its influence from the surrounding area. In particular there's the issue of geography. You know, where MGM is right there on a street that you can walk right to the casino, you can park nearby and get to the casino. You can take a bus. You can ride up on Amtrak. It's a lot different from Plainridge Park which exists in a sort of isolated own space there. And things aren't spilling out of Plainridge Park to the surrounding communities the way they could theoretically at MGM.

So you're going to see in the future a lot more, I think finite geographic analysis of what's happening around MGM. I don't have a lot in this report just because it's only been eight months. So once we have a year's worth of data, I think I have enough to do more with. It's also notable that -- oh, I'll start with the major findings. So over the eight months after MGM opened, all crimes were well below average during -- across all of the communities that participated. They had been going down in the region anyway for about seven years. That wasn't terribly surprising. The casino, if we just take what happens there and assume that it wouldn't have happened without it, it led to a 2% increase in violent crime, 2% increase in property crime and a 2% in total crime, 1% increase in police calls, which isn't a terribly high series of numbers. Of course, Springfield's a big city. They've got a lot of other things going on. It was the top location for crime and calls for service during the region, but each percentage contribution wasn't all that high.

And the only things I found in eight months, anyway, that I thought were likely related to MGM were, again, increases in collisions and traffic-related calls like disabled vehicles, like traffic complaints that mostly to the south and west of the casino in Agawam and West Springfield, service calls, things like escorts, lockouts, other kinds of public assist calls as well as lost property. Union Station in particular saw a big increase. I know it wasn't open for many years prior to this, but it saw an increase even above what was happening at the previous bus and train terminals that were being used in the city. And I think the extra volume coming to the casino might have a lot to do with that. And then just across the bridges in West Springfield, we saw some patterns of disorderly conduct and suspicious activity at a couple of the shopping strips over the bridge, some panhandling complaints in that same area. That was the only obvious

geographic impact. We'll talk about some other possibilities as I go forward here.

As you can see from this chart, property crime, violent crime and -- property crime and violent crime were already decreasing. Violent crime sort of bouncing around at an historic low just before the casino opened. Property crime still shooting downward. And traffic collisions were up in the area before the casino opened. When it opened, it really -- the impact was not detectible if you were looking at overall crime statistics for the region. You can see that dotted line represents what would have happened with crime -- all crimes, total crime. That dotted line represents what would have happened if MGM hadn't opened and the thick black line is what actually happened. They're virtually on top of each other and you really don't see much variance.

When we look at crashes, this is by street segment. I've got to get a better map of these street segments, too, so I can aggregate them better. But it still tells the story. Right around the casino, obviously was all the extra traffic, we saw an increase in crashes. As we get farther away from the casino, its specific contribution becomes less obvious. But if you look over in Agawam and West Springfield, you see some of the streets showing an increase are on feeder routes to the bridges heading over to the casino. I think obviously what's happening here is on the east side of the river and north of the casino, people are just coming in off the highway a lot more. So it's not affecting the local routes except exact -- specifically right around MGM where, you know, there's going to be a lot of congestion, naturally. But from the south and west, they're not necessarily taking highways up. And so we're seeing more local traffic through Agawam and West Springfield. That's my hypothesis at this point anyway. Obviously we'll have to wait for traffic studies to know what's happening there.

And here's the map of suspicious activity calls in West Springfield, as we can see. There's a shopping center. You guys can't see me pointing. There's a shopping center in that southern area in West Springfield. Its name escapes me. I had it wrong at the meeting, too, and they corrected me. Anyway, there's a lot of stores there, restaurants, a couple big-box stores.

>> Riverdale?

>> MR. BRUCE: Yes. No, that might be a different one. I keep getting two or three confused. It's possible you're right. Riverdale, this lower area here. I have it in the report itself, obviously. I didn't mark it on the map in text. In any event, there's a lot of stores in there.

We're seeing a lot more calls for people hanging out in front of the stores, suspicious activity, panhandling and so forth. Where it's so geographically close, I think it's at least worth considering it might be related, but we don't have direct evidence from the people themselves saying yeah, I'm only here because of the casino.

Now, this is an interesting story. I made the "discontinued" a little bit too big there.

[Laughter]

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: You've got your pointer.

>> MR. BRUCE: Yeah. But during the first four months, we saw an increase in thefts from vehicles and from residences like bicycles in the yard and so forth. Stretching south and east from MGM and into East Longmeadow and Longmeadow. And that went away during the second four-month period. Now, that type of pattern isn't terribly

uncommon for the region, but talking with the chiefs, they thought there was a reasonable chance that the casino was having something to do with the extra activity caused by the casino.

But what they did, they effectively responded to it. So the Longmeadow Police Department told us specifically that they established a DDAC zone in the zone, it stands for data-driven approaches to crime and traffic safety. It's a method of hotspot policing, another project I happen to be involved with. So it's kind of funny to see them come together at this place. But the Longmeadow Chief said he established a zone up there and put extra patrol officers in that region, and Springfield also said that they had reacted to this analysis by putting extra patrols at various times in that region to the south and east. I don't believe -- I'm not sure if East Longmeadow was at that meeting. I don't believe we heard anything specific from them about what they were doing. It's potentially a pretty good example of this report prompting some police strategy that ended the pattern that the report had identified. I'd like to think so anyway. We'd have to do more of a case study on it to prove that. That was the feedback we got from the meeting anyway.

And this was another pattern that was discontinued. We saw during the first four months after the casino an increase in purse thefts and purse snatching along this Riverdale Street section of West Springfield. But there were five of them -- only five -- and it didn't continue after the first four months. So we never really found out for sure what was motivating that particular trend.

As I said, geographically, I want to do a lot more analysis once we have a year's worth of data. For this report I did three geographies. One, the MGM block. So the literal block surrounding the casino. The metro center in general and then the surrounding neighborhoods of Springfield. And the only thing that it increases on the block right around the casino was disorderly conduct calls for service. In the metro center --

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Could I just ask this question?

>> MR. BRUCE: Yeah.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: I'm seeing references to drunken driving, and then I see something like disorderly conduct. But is there any connection to opioid abuse? That's not being --

>> MR. BRUCE: We haven't really seen anything involving an increase in drug activity.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Interesting.

>> MR. BRUCE: In any of the casino regions so far. Now, that's heavily dependent on police activity. And what they focus on and how many investigative resources they apply. So it's really tough to get data on actual usage without using -- say self-report surveys of people in the region. But so far, no, we haven't seen any evidence. Not even reflected in, say, crashes or reflected in causal factors of any crimes. That hasn't been a theme so far.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: I wonder if it's part of the health -- if there are calls for medical care not connected to crime.

>> MR. BRUCE: We do have from a certain number of agencies, they'll -- they code overdoses, at least.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Right.

>> MR. BRUCE: Which is what you're talking about, I think, medical calls related to those. A lot of them didn't start recording calls consistently until two or three years ago so we don't have much of a baseline to do the comparison to. But in the ones that had that historic baseline, we still haven't seen much of an increase. The opioid epidemic is always something that it started, you know, before this decade, right?

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: I'm sure.

>> MR. BRUCE: 2005, 2006, 2007. So in any of the period for which we have baseline statistics, we were already in the middle of it. It's not something that -- I don't think -- Chief Alfred might have a different opinion, so I'd like to get it, but I don't think it's gotten particularly worse in the last five years. Do you think, Chief?

>> No. We've seen a decrease (away from mic).

>> MR. BRUCE: And I don't know how well they've applied to the local area, but there have been some effective national strategies in dealing with opioid abuse. And a lot of law enforcement agencies, too, are starting to see more of a health issue rather than an enforcement issue. So that's changing the way that they respond and record numbers for those types of crimes, too. Yeah.

>> (Away from mic) necessarily when we're at the scene. (Away from mic). We are seeing some of those effects (away from mic).

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you, Chief. Very helpful, thank you.

>> MR. BRUCE: I noted on this map and in the report some statistics that had gone up and down in those three geographies. I don't want to make too much of any of them because none of them were during the summer. So this was the period that ended in April. Obviously before the height of what would be, say, pedestrian season in the area. So when I collect the one-year data, that's going to be much more meaningful in the analysis of what happened geographically around the casino.

At the same time, we'll also be analyzing what happened in the surrounding communities around their exit radiuses which I've already mapped. But I wanted to see if traffic to and from the casino caused an increase in, say, restaurants or gas stations, other places that people would use facilities in the immediate area. And so I've got those geographies mapped. They were just waiting for a big enough dataset to make enough sense to fuel it. So I'll have more on that next time. I don't want to make too much of it this time except to say a number of crimes have decreased in the metro center around the casino, and I think that there's a really good chance that long term all of the extra law enforcement presence as well as the legitimate traffic in the area will continue to drive down some crimes while maybe increasing some others. You know, you have competing things happening, basically. You have a much larger population of people in the area which, you know, classically might increase the number of victimizations. But you've -- it also creates a situation where people are acting as mutual guardians for each other and that drives down certain crimes.

Some other notes. I don't want anybody to get alarmed so many of the communities have seen increases in pornography. There's not much illegal except for child pornography. Most of what we're seeing in the region even though the numbers are going up is not classic predatory child pornography but teenagers taking images of each other and sharing them around and causing little mini-scandals at their schools and so forth, which I don't want to minimize that, but it's not anything that's related to MGM. It's definitely its own special thing. Just like Plainville, we're seeing an increase

in domestic violence and domestic disputes in the area in some communities. Only 3 of the 11. Again, that's not really enough to establish a huge trend. But we'll keep monitoring that. Overall arrests are within the expected range. And so far, I hadn't seen any changes at the types of locations that I thought might go up like gas stations, hotels and restaurants. The last drink data, you know, obviously isn't complete for the time period that it's been open, but we'll have it for future reports.

Amtrak, I'm curious what's happening on the lines going up to the union station. And if they're seeing an increase, they express willingness to participate, but otherwise haven't provided the data just yet. And I also want to get some more statistics on traffic volume. So I can better establish the relationship between certain traffic-related calls for service and, you know, whether or not it's truly related to the extra volume in the area. That's all coming soon. Any questions on that?

So finally, I'll just talk briefly about Encore. There's not really much to say since -- oh. I had a little slide. We talked about that. Encore there isn't much to say. There's just a baseline that we've done there. There's no changes to report just yet. Obviously, we've just passed the period in which I can now collect four-month data for Encore. I'll give the agencies a month or so to get their coding in order before I do it. But we'll see a report towards the end of the year, the beginning of next. These are the Encore participating agencies. And Cambridge is the one that just said no on providing the data. A little bit personally embarrassing since I was the crime analyst there for seven years. Things have --

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Maybe we can work on that.

>> MR. BRUCE: Things have changed politically. Going maybe we can ask, you know, kind of just find out what the issues are.

>> MR. BRUCE: It might be worth -- sure.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: A phone call.

>> MR. BRUCE: They're the only agency that has a legal adviser full time. And I find, you know, whenever that position exists, they tend to be a little bit more cautious about -- you can almost never go wrong by not providing data. But then when you do, you know, things appear in the newspaper and so forth.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: And how did you approach each participant? How did you get them to --

>> MR. BRUCE: Well, we started by having a regional meeting of all the local chiefs. I'd like to think I've been contacts in this area for my previous work, I also have been heavily involved in the crime analysis community in this area, unlike the previous one. Springfield has an excellent crime analysis unit but none of the surrounding agencies do. Here almost everybody does. Everett, Chelsea, Revere, Malden, Somerville, Cambridge, Medford, Lawson, Lynn does. It's been a lot -- it's also been easier to work with these communities because of that. But in this particular case. So we invited them -- we had a meeting. Everybody seemed to agree to participate at the meeting. But when it came to getting the specific dataset is when we -- now, I will say that Cambridge, credit, they offered to send me numbers. To an analyst, that's about as close as you can get to a middle finger, basically.

[Laughter]

So I don't want summary data. I need specific data. But anyway, Medford did not -- was not able to contribute data for this particular study. But they're willing to do

it. We just -- I don't know. We just had problems with the logistics. So that will come before the next report.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well, we were successful in getting Foxborough to get on board eventually, so maybe we can, you know, try that again for Cambridge as well.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: And Christopher, there was a discussion about including Saugus.

>> MR. BRUCE: Right.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: It's not a designated surrounding community but it's a hole in the map. And so that could be on our list of to-dos.

>> MR. BRUCE: Sure, we can give them a call. Boston was surprisingly easy to work with. I had a great experience with them. Although they didn't give me direct access to their database the way that other communities did, they provided what I needed. And just for the Charlestown neighborhood, I felt the entirety of Boston would be just too much data to -- it would overwhelm the region.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Right.

>> MR. BRUCE: And we wouldn't be able to identify subtrends. But they gave me Charlestown and they gave me selected reporting areas in the sea port area so that -- where there's water taxis that are going to the casinos so we can see if that has any increase as well.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Can we go back to the surrounding communities for a minute here?

>> MR. BRUCE: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: The conversation about Saugus, for example. So what we did when we started this project is initially surrounding communities really obviously easy ones were, you know, there's border. They border the host community city or town. Now, other communities applied, right? And said, look. I really believe I'll have impacts. And these are the reasons why. And we were able to designate them as surrounding communities. Saugus did not self-identify or apply to become a surrounding community, which is why they're not included. But for this purpose, that doesn't mean we can't go back to them and say, hey. We'd love to have you participate in this project.

>> MR. BRUCE: I think we should do that because they obviously with Route 1 cutting right through the middle of the town and so many restaurants and there's a mall there, obviously. So many facilities on that major travel route, I think that they'd be more likely than even say Revere which is geographically closer but has less of that key travel real estate to experience much activity. Okay. We'll definitely make that contact.

So -- and I believe they use the same records system as some of these other ones so it won't be that hard to get data if they agree to participate.

So the data I didn't collect was from eight agencies from January 1st, 2012, area of population of 430,000, and we had about 300,000 crimes and about 2.3 million calls for service among the data. You know, a huge part of doing the baseline part is just setting things up for further analysis. And a big part of that is the geography. How many dots -- what percentage of dots can I get on the map from the addresses that have been supplied? And I got almost 90%. And I could keep chipping away at that.

That was good. I was expecting it to be lower. And the mapping part to be much more annoying here.

Also, it's worth noting that the state police patrol much more territory in this region and many more of the local routes than they do in both the Plainville and the Springfield area. In Springfield, you know, I'll have state police statistics for the highways and that's about it. But around here, Memorial Drive, Soro Drive, Revere Beach Parkway, there's a lot of local routes that have a high state police presence and collect a lot of -- where the state police is the primary reporting agency for those crashes. You can see some of them on this chart here. So we'll be working a lot more with state police data in assessing the impacts here. Because naturally, Encore is just off of Route 16.

As for the immediate surrounding geography, it's interesting how different a challenge the three casinos have posed. Because Encore, although it is in terms of the city itself, is in the middle of a fairly busy area that has a lot of activity going on. The specific block on which the casino was built was just industrial area that had virtually no activity in the past. You can see here with just 2018, and just a selection of crimes, but, you know, there's some across the road that says mixed residential and commercial area on the other side of Route 99 that had a little bit of activity. And then on the other side of the casino to the west, there's a major shopping center that you can't easily get to from Encore. You've got to go back up to 16 and then over and then down. You know, a little bit of activity in both of those places. But generally speaking, that block, anyway, that series of blocks hasn't had much in the past. So it will be easier to detect new activity there. But then as far as going beyond that into the surrounding region, you're suddenly hitting an area that has -- that's just very dense, very dense urban concentration that's got a lot of existing activity and it's going to be harder to thread out the Encore-involved activity specifically from it. It's a challenge. I enjoy that. If that root ridge ever gets completed, of course, you've got the Assembly Square. I couldn't come up with the name, on the other side of the river there. That has gone through so much revitalization in the last few years and has a lot of things to attract casino visitor so we might see an increase in activity in that area as well. So each one has very different urban geography and is going to lead to different methods of analyzing what happens there.

I just threw in one map. There's, like, four or five in the actual report, in the presentation. I just put in this one map of thefts from vehicles just to show, you know, I did collect geographic data, was able to map it, was able to identify hotspots. You can see existing hotspots in Charlestown there, in downtown Chelsea, in downtown Lynn, a little bit in Everett, but the area where the casino is, you know, isn't a hotspot at all. Currently for almost any crime. We'll be able to see if that geography changes.

There's a lot of stats in the book that show the numbers that you would expect annually for each of the communities. Obviously, we'll be starting with the four-month period just like we did with Springfield, doing an eight-month to one year and then we'll see after that.

A few data collection issues. More state presence on local roads. Different geographic patterns. And there's much more in the way of transportation that we have to look at here. I'm trying to get MBTA to participate as well. Because they have their own police department, as you know, and the deals with stuff happening on the train in

the stations and in the lots. And so that's going to be important to analyze if they'll come aboard. There's a lot more ways to get to Encore than there is to the other casino so far. So we have to look at those transportation patterns and what happens around the depots for those -- that transportation. Any other questions for me?

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No. Excellent work. As always. And we'll keep the chiefs engaged and make sure we can make this -- continue to make this project worthwhile.

>> MR. BRUCE: Awesome.

Thank you very much.

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: The only question I had about the Boston data. Given -- I mean, it's not an easy walk, but in decent weather, if people were to go over the bridge through East Cambridge and dump themselves down at the FleetCenter, is there any thought to whether you think there's going to be an impact in that area in terms of getting specifics?

>> MR. BRUCE: Well, in talking with the Boston Police, they didn't seem to think so. But you're right. It might be worth taking a look at that. I'm sure the data extracts they're using to give me the data that I requested could just be expanded to pick up a few additional reporting areas. So, yeah, if that's a concern, I'll definitely ask them to do that. Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Okay.

>> MR. BRUCE: It would be quite a bit of a walk, but you never know. I mean, certainly we're looking at Lynn, which doesn't even -- isn't even on any major travel routes. So I'm making a note to myself. I'll get that additional data.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: This is great. I really look forward to, as we now have the three on the way, we're able to -- you were able to, you know, glean some of the differences or similarities, because, yes, they sit in different geographies, but we are, of course, interested in, you know, protecting all of them equally. So to the extent we can get some of those trends, that would be really helpful.

>> MR. BRUCE: There's obviously going to be a place in a couple of years for a macro-level report that asks some big questions about the impacts of casinos generically once we have multiple years of data from each casino. But, yeah, it's been interesting to see all the variances. And not just obviously in the geography but also in the type of facility too. And what they offer and how many patrons they get and so forth.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: One last question. I know it's late in the afternoon. Is there anything that you can identify through your work that we could be doing, should be doing that we're not right now?

>> MR. BRUCE: You're talking about as a Commission?

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No, no. For your work, and you have a contract to do X, Y and Z with us.

>> MR. BRUCE: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Is there anything, because you've been doing this now for a few years, is there anything you think we're missing or could add value to the work you do?

>> MR. BRUCE: Well, one big thing, I guess, is that I need to work to get better data

on what's happening at the casino specifically.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay.

>> MR. BRUCE: I'm mostly getting summary statistics from the Gaming Enforcement Unit which I can't analyze them in the same detail as I can analyze what I get from the police departments. Some of that data is duplicated by what's in the state police record system, RAMS, but enough isn't that I need to do a better job trying to figure out why and what the difference is between what's in RAMS and what's not in RAMS.

Now, I understand at least some of the casino -- I don't know if this is universally true at all of them -- I understand the GEU is using a different database than they did in the past. Detective Connors was telling me about it. I haven't had the chance to look at what that looks like and how I can get better data from it. But I was originally contracted just to analyze the surrounding area. I included some statistics from the casino, you know, just because to make a more complete picture. But since so many of the questions I get are about that specifically, I want to be able to answer them better. And that's also going to include collecting data from other casinos nationally so we can better sense of do any of ours have a unique problem with a particular crime, or is that just what we'd expect given that overall volume?

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Right. Well why don't we set up a call with Detective Lieutenant Connors just to talk about what's happening at the casinos and if there's a way we can improve the data that you're getting.

>> MR. BRUCE: We had talked early on about the possibility of tasking, maybe a fusion center analyst for the state police or something.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes, yes, yes.

>> MR. BRUCE: And if that's still on the table, I think we should have that conversation as well. And, of course, we've talked also about the whole issue of human trafficking and how hard it is to measure that with police statistics, but we're talking about setting up a meeting with some experts on that.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: We are. We are. We are. In fact, we're back on that now, and we'll be contacting you soon with a date to do that. And we'll also set up a separate call with Detective Lieutenant Connors just to talk about what we could do differently and a body at the fusion center. We'll figure that piece out. Thank you for that.

>> MR. BRUCE: That's the only thing I can think of. But if you had a specific thing in **mind**, obviously --

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No, you're doing the work and sometimes you see things that you didn't anticipate or we didn't anticipate.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: And just -- I recall back when we had the early hearings at the Commission and the three primary concerns that communities approached us with were traffic, crime, and problem gambling. And so there was that very explicit charge to take a look at what the crime impacts are or around the casino, not necessarily in, but it does seem like a natural sort of progression to begin looking at the whole picture, the whole picture including what's happening in the casino.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Great. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you. Thank you, Mark. Moving on to item 8, Commissioner updates. Do we have any updates?

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I have a quick one to get out just before we reach our allotted time. Our friends at the national center for tradeswomen -- or the Northeast Center For Tradewomen's Equity shared an email with me and others earlier this week, and it said that women in Massachusetts now represent 9.2% of apprenticeships in union programs. Which is interesting because that figure leads the country, and the national average still only remains around 2 to 3%. So kudos to our colleagues and the great work that they're doing and our team, Elaine and Jill and Crystal who have focused on the Build a Life Campaign, but that's a pretty impressive number.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Very impressive.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Any other updates? With that, do I have a motion to adjourn?

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So moved.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Those in favor?

[Vote taken]

Those opposed? 5-0. Thank you.