

MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION
MEETING
FEBRUARY 14, 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. I call to order meeting number 261 of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission on February 14th, 2019, in our offices at 101 Federal Street here in Boston. Before I turn to our agenda, I wish to introduce myself. I'm Cathy Judd-Stein, recently appointed Chair to the Commission. I wish to thank Commissioner Gayle Cameron for her immediate past service as our interim Chair, and I wish to thank all of my fellow Commissioners, Executive Director Bedrosian, and the entire team here at the Gaming Commission for your warm welcome.

First on the agenda is the approval of the minutes. Commissioner Stebbins.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Sure. Thank you, Madam Chair, and welcome aboard. In your packet, you have the meeting minutes from the January 24th meeting of the Commission. I would move their approval except for any material changes or grammatical corrections. I would like to add, under the 10-08-2017 Suffolk Downs unpaid winnings that we mentioned that senior finance analyst Chad Bourque was on hand to assist Dr. Lightbown in reporting the financial numbers to the Commission. But other than that, I feel the minutes are ready for our approval.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Any further discussion? So there's a motion with the amendment. All those in favor.

[Vote taken]

Opposed? I'll be abstaining, so 4-1. Chair abstains.

As to February 1st, Commissioner Stebbins?

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Sure, Madam Chair. In the packet you have the meeting minutes from the very brief public session that was conducted on February 1st, 2019. I'd move the minutes be approved, again, subject to any immaterial changes or grammatical corrections.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Do we have a second?

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.

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

[Vote taken]

Again, I'll be abstaining. So the vote is 4-1 with the Chair abstaining.

Next on the agenda, item 3. Executive Director Bedrosian, do you have an administrative update?

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: I do. Good morning and welcome, Chair, new Chair. And, of course, Happy Valentine's Day to the Commission. I'll have two updates. One is an update on staff. I want to introduce a couple new staff members. We have new financial investigators who are here with us today, David McKay. Dave comes to us from a public accounting firm where he was a senior assurance associate, and he graduated with a B.S. from Bryant University, an M.S. in accounting, a taxation from the University of Hartford and was the college roommate of one of our previous financial investigators. And I'll leave that as just sort of a tease for you to figure out later on.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: We'll figure that out by the end of the day.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: Yeah. So -- and Fay Zhu -- and I'm probably mispronouncing your last name, Fay, and I apologize for that -- comes to us. And she's worked in diverse backgrounds in the fields of finance and accounting. She was with both State Street Bank and Santander and worked as a fund administrator, financial analyst, and regulatory reporting compliance. And she has a degree in both finance and MBA from Bentley University, and they've actually -- they're not new new. They've been here for a little while, but they've been -- they went out to UNLV to get some training. So they missed a meeting. So we're a little late in introducing them, but we want to welcome them and know they'll do a great job.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Welcome aboard.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Welcome.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Welcome. And I see you already got on board. You were up at the Valentine's Day brunch earlier. You're assimilating. Good work.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: The second part of my administrative update is just to give you an update on a couple agenda items for today. Item number 6, the licensing division, I'm going to ask that that matter actually be pushed off to the next meeting which we at this point anticipate will be February 28th. And that reason is it might work with an MGM quarterly update. We can address everything in total.

So the last update I have for you is you'll notice, again, item number 10, there's an executive session listed on the agenda. And as an update since our last public meeting, as anticipated, the judge in Las Vegas has issued the preliminary injunction which prohibits the IEB from using certain materials in its report until the matter can be more fully litigated. I note that the preliminary injunction can be found on the Clark County website. The IEB at this point are reviewing the preliminary injunction and its impact on the report. Our outside counsel are reviewing our legal options including some complex jurisdictional issues. These are issues I anticipate you will hear about in today's executive session. We've listed a vote after the executive session in the event there's any Commission action that needs to be taken because of your discussions, but there's no -- no necessity or assurance on that. So those are the updates on the agenda, and that is my administrative update.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Whether we have a vote or not after the executive session, we'll figure that out during the executive session, or is it fair to say that we will not be having one at that point?

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: I think that's something you'd want to reserve the right to discuss during the executive session.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: So in that, you'd probably report that you will come back after the executive session.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yep.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: And you may come back just to say we came back, and that's it.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Fair enough.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: So anything else? Great. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you. Item number 4, Ombudsman Ziemba, please.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: Good morning, Commissioners.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good morning.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good morning.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: Today I provide a brief status of the 2019 community mitigation fund applications. I'm joined here by Joe Delaney, Construction Project Oversight Manager, and fairly soon Mary Thurlow. My purpose here today is to just give you a brief overview of the process that we plan to take to review these applications. I'm not planning to get into any detail regarding any one of the applications. And indeed the review team has not even met yet, but I just wanted to remind the Commissioners and remind those in the audience of the process of how we're going to take a look at these applications.

Before I begin, I just wanted to note that in your packet, there is a memo that describes all of the applications that we received since that memo was written, we have determined that there is one additional application that was submitted. We're checking to make sure that it was timely submitted. We have every belief that it was timely submitted from the City of Springfield regarding the focus -- the previous focus application, MGM Springfield's location in the facility, focus cable access provider right at the corner of State and Main. So that application which we understand was submitted was for approximately \$555,000. It is not reflected in the memo before you. We will try to get that updated before the end of the meeting, and we'll post the correct memo. We apologize for that error.

So in total, with the new focus application, the Commission received 24 applications worth approximately \$5.6 million. Of that \$5.6 million, \$200,000 was previously awarded to the Southeastern Regional Planning and Development District, so only \$4.9 million -- excuse me, so only \$5.4 million represents new funding.

Our targeted spending for this year is approximately \$6.7 million. We have approximately \$5.2 million left in the fund that has not been awarded or otherwise allocated. This is the first year that the mitigation fund has begun to receive 6.5% of the revenues from the tax on gross gaming revenue from the Region B category 1 licensee, MGM Springfield. Over \$1.5 million of revenue was placed into the mitigation fund from MGM Springfield by December 31st of last year. So thereby -- thus, we have -- this is the first year that the Commission plans to split the fund by region based on our guidelines whereby the funds generated in each region are targeted to stay in that region after we account for all grants that we make for category 2 licensees. So let me just give you an example to make that a little bit more clear.

So if the Commission awards a total of approximately \$200,000 in grants relative to the category 2 licensee, we would have approximately \$5 million left out of the

original funds to be split between the Region A and Region B regions, so we would have \$2.5 million for the west, \$2.5 million for the east. However, as I just stated, we have approximately \$1.5 million from MGM Springfield revenues. So based on the allocation that we made in the guidelines, there would be \$4 million available in the western region and the Region B region and \$2.5 million for the region A region for this year.

So as you'll see in the packet, we have a memo that summarizes the funding amounts and gives you a little detail regarding the applications we received. It matches up the applications we received versus the spending targets that we established in those guidelines. So I just want to work a little bit backwards from when we plan to issue these awards. We're hoping to have determinations made well by -- well before the beginning of the new fiscal year. So we aim to do our awards by June of this year, similar to what we did last year. However, there is a potential that we may come to the Commission with some recommendations before that June date. Last year we came to you with some public safety recommendations and some workforce recommendations before that June date because of the need to move forward with applications earlier to prepare for upcoming potential impacts.

So the review team that we have is comprised of myself, Commissioner Stebbins is joining us this year, Catherine Blue, Derek Lennon, Jill Griffin, Joe Delaney, Crystal Howard and Mary Thurlow and the assistance of the IEB for public safety-related items. So for the next steps we will reach out to our licensees, as the Commission knows, we asked the licensees their opinion on the applications. We post these online. We ask the regional planning agencies their opinions. And then we will also get a memo from the Massachusetts Department of Transportation regarding transportation items. And then we will meet with all of the applicants in short form to go over any concerns we have with their applications and give them the opportunity to answer any questions.

Before we have that meeting, we welcome any questions from the Commissioners that we could raise to those applicants. And after that we will come back to the Commission for a recommendation, like I said, hopefully no later than the beginning of June.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you. John, remind me, in the past we talked about -- now that we're going -- we're thinking and considering this split of the regions, we've talked about instances in which maybe money is beginning to build in one region relative to the other or are committed and not used. Do you want to talk a little bit about what we're anticipating in that regard?

>> MR. ZIEMBA: We determine if there are any unused funds for any one year, we would keep those funds in that region for up to three years. And then after that third year, then they could flow back into the general fund and be available for all regions.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. So we're planning on starting that this year?

>> MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah. That's right.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That practice.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: And again, these are guidelines we review every year, so if there are circumstances that become difficult, we can review them again next year. But that's the plan. We work that out after a lot of comments from our regional partners and from our local partners on how they'd like to see that split.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. So we have just a general number of \$4

million for Region B, 2.5 and the 1.5 that's projected to flow for the current fiscal year.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: That's right.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: How many -- what's the number that came from that region relative to that \$4 million?

>> MR. ZIEMBA: Okay. So we have --

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I didn't quite total them.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: No, no, no, it's right at the bottom of the memo. So we have -- from Region A, we had approximately \$3.187 million in funding requests.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: And then in Region B, we had approximately \$2.2 million.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: With the addition of the \$555,000 application for Springfield.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: All right. But this, of course, are preliminary numbers. They'll get reviewed by the review team.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: That's right.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Like the way you've done in the past and we'll get a much better sense of those numbers as the process continues.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: That's right.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Ombudsman Ziemba I had a similar related questions, knowing that the numbers are larger this year with the opening of a category 1 casino, the review team will be utilizing similar criteria, though, meaning the nexus has to be there for an impact from the casino.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: That's right.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No matter what the dollars are.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: Right.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: They really still have to meet our guidelines, correct?

>> MR. ZIEMBA: We really believe that we have to be responsible stewards of these dollars. And the statutory purpose for these dollars is to make sure that we offset costs related to the construction or operation of gaming facilities. We get a lot of very worthwhile projects every single year, but the difficult job is for us to make sure that it is really directly connected to the casinos. So even though we have a number of applications, generally the recommendation from the review team is that we would fund -- that we recommend funding less than those applications. For example, last year we had approximately -- approximately \$8 million worth of applications, and the review team recommended about five.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So those same guidelines will be implemented even though the dollars are larger.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: That's exactly right.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And one thing that I think perhaps goes without saying, but it's important for just for the record, my estimation here is that there's substantial requests now coming from host communities, specifically I'm thinking of Springfield. And the statute also anticipated, and there's a lot of monies that come to the city from the casino as part of the host community agreement. So as a review team reviews those requests, an important thing to consider is whether anything has already

been anticipated as part of the host community and is either not addressed or addressed partially or addressed totally in order for us to make the funding approval accordingly.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: That's exactly right. That's one of the other tough questions that we ask during these sessions of what are the anticipated purposes of these funds, the host community funds, and the surrounding community funds every year, and we include all of that information in the packet that we provide to the Commission at the end of the year. But indeed, in past years, we have rejected applications because it was covered by a host community provision.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I think there's another -- we're getting to this phase where we're also going to be able to rely on a lot of the research that's being done that, you know, Mark and his team are doing around community impacts as well. So we have our own base of information to make some of these decisions as well. John, just real quick, we do face a statutory deadline for communities to apply. That's kind of hard and fast. Did you anticipate some applications that didn't come in because people -- communities not able to hit that February 1st deadline, or is it becoming kind of process now that they know when it's going to be in?

>> MR. ZIEMBA: Well, the big omission was the Springfield application where we were very surprised that I didn't seem to have that application.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Right.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: And the background behind that is there was an application made this past year for that. And then the City withdrew that application because there was very little time left before this current deadline and this current program. So we anticipated that they were going to withdraw last year's application, submit this year's application, and indeed it looks like they did. But in a larger sense, I think you're right, we have only -- we're only six months into the operations of MGM Springfield. And it takes quite a bit of time before communities can really understand the true impacts. So we'll see. We'll see over time what other additional applications we will get. And I imagine all of our review teams and our local committees will explore what the range of impacts that we would need to build into future year programs.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: But everybody is -- familiarity with that February 1st statutory deadline.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: That's when it's got to be in, and it's kind of accepted business practice at this point.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: We send out numerous reminders, and it's on the combine system. You know, sometimes that gets a little glitchy, and we're working to improve all of that.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. Thank you.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: Thank you.

>> Commissioner: Any other questions? Thank you, Ombudsman Ziemba.

>> MR. ZIEMBA: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Next on the agenda, item 5, Director Griffin, you'll be reporting on Workforce, Supplier and Diversity Development. Good morning, Director. Happy Valentine's Day.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good morning.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Thank you very much. Happy Valentine's Day to you. Jill Griffin. I think we're supposed to still do that. So today I'm here to give you an update on some of the major projects that Workforce, Supplier and Diversity Development Department -- or team is working on. And the first I'd like to update you on is a request for responses, an RFR, that we posted on February 1st called Built to Last which will be a summary of the best practices for diversity in construction and the lessons learned. And we really seek to capture both lessons learned and the best practices regarding the construction of all three of our licensees' projects.

We envision the end product to be a lasting legacy based on interviews of project stakeholders, many of whom are regular members of the Access and Opportunity Committee meeting and have invested significant time in monitoring the projects, including our licensees, their general contractors, subcontractors, union leaders, and community members. The bid is posted in COMMBUYS like I mentioned. Responses are due March 1st and must be submitted directly into COMMBUYS. The post was sent to about 900 individuals and businesses, and we have received a lot of interest in terms -- in the form of questions, but we look forward to reading full proposals. Any questions?

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Jill, I was looking at the packet, and I noticed there is, in what must have been posted as part of this, that the contract was to be fully executed by June 30th of 2019. But that doesn't mean that has to be the performance of the contract has to be done by then, correct?

>> MS. GRIFFIN: That's right. We intend to spend the money from the budget from this year, but certainly the work could be extended. And we realize that was kind of an ambitious time line. We actually extended the time line so that we could get the, you know, a large number of really great responses.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. But I also notice that there's a four-month duration, I guess, from the contract execution? Or what is the four-month duration?

>> MS. GRIFFIN: A four-month duration. So we hope to execute the contract in March.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yep.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: And the selected bidder would have time to interview and gather information for the report. And we're expecting really to receive a draft first. And I think maybe that's what you're talking about. But those are just draft time lines. We plan to work with the selected bidder to establish, you know, a firm and realistic time line.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. Because I was going to suggest that you may want to have a renewal option or some kind of, you know, flexibility relative to the time line, especially to make sure that you don't straddle fiscal years.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And find yourself sort of in a constrained, if you will.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: That's a really good suggestion.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Slip a little bit.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: So include that in the contracts.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: When it comes to that.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Good suggestion. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Jill, great project. I even like the title. I know you came up with that. We're going to provide the list of folks to be interviewed, and a lot of those are folks that we've had regular contact with. But when I look at the project, some of the contractors, subcontractors that we may not have as much familiarity with, how do you hope to develop that list of folks?

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Well, I'd like to really pull from our licensees, you know, especially the category 1. They both had award programs. As well as using the stick, they use the carrot, right? And so they recognized, you know, the top performers. And I would like to select from that -- from those lists. And perhaps maybe even pull from the corrective action meetings and see what some of the challenges were there. Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: That's a great idea. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Director Griffin, you said you received a lot of interest. But obviously this is a new project. So that must mean are they emailing, calling. And so are you providing technical assistance since it is new to kind of give them assistance on how to be best prepared to compete?

>> MS. GRIFFIN: So everything is going through COMMBUYS, but we've received, I want to say, more than 20 questions.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: That we will also post today, actually this morning as we speak, it's likely being posted to COMMBUYS. So each of the interested parties is asking questions about, you know, further defining what the work product would look like and how many interviews, and do the interviews need to take place in person or remotely, those types of clarifying questions.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay. Great. Thanks.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I noticed a typo in the solicitation. It's page number 4. I think it says the budget is \$15,000, I believe.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: What paragraph?

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The fiscal terms. There's a fourth zero. I hope it doesn't get confused with \$150,000. I think the comma is in the right place.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: So we will certainly talk to our finance team about clarifying that in COMMBUYS.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Great.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: But, in fact, the budget is \$15,000.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: \$15,000, that's correct. Let's correct the record.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, I think this is a great effort. I hope that many other organizations will benefit from this. We'll first have to, you know, have it done, and then we'll see what the response is. Given my familiarity with BAOC and all the efforts that you help us lead very well, this would be a very good effort.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Thank you. We've had a lot of interest and inquiries about the work of the access and opportunity committee and kind of asking for advice. And in talking with Commissioner Stebbins, we decided that not only to put together a report, but we're in the beginning process of organizing an event in western Mass to really highlight some of this work as well. So that will likely happen in the springtime. So thank you.

So this is really fun, but some of my role -- much of my role focuses on compliance. And as required by Chapter 23K, Section 12, and license condition 11,

each licensee is required to submit an affirmative marketing program to enable minority women and veteran-owned vendors to participate in the provision of goods and services to each construction project as well as a plan to identify local businesses.

Commissioners at the October 26th meeting, you approved Encore Boston Harbor diversity and business plan. Provided that the licensee provide additional information. You asked for an overview of the gift card program, more information about how they plan to mentor some of the local businesses, and if they planned to, could they provide information about feedback that they would give to firms, minority women and veteran-owned firms specifically who were not awarded the license. And the procurement director has submitted the final plan with these changes. And the legal team has determined that no additional approvals are necessary as the changes are nonmaterial. So the final copy has been posted on the website, but I just wanted to close the loop there. I know you updated many of you one on one, so...

Additionally to follow up on this plan, on January 29th, I convened what we call our vendor advisory team. In this room we had 25 to 30 chambers of commerce, state entities that focus on business, community groups, city officials to get more information on procurement needs and opportunities. And we plan to convene this monthly.

Also in the packet is a flier from Encore Boston Harbor regarding hiring. There we go. One of their first hiring -- or one of the first big hiring fairs is taking place on February 24th to 25th at the Hynes Convention Center. As we did with MGM, we update the Commission and the public on the goings on. They are providing exclusive access to the host and surrounding community residents from 7:00 to 9:00 a.m. on those days. And if you could flip to the next page, they're specifically focusing on those particular positions and very broadly in many different categories across the organization. So from food and beverage to gaming.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: When is this hiring event again? February 24th?

>> MS. GRIFFIN: February 24th and 25th. So it's a -- I believe it's a Sunday/Monday. So, yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Will you be attending? Have you attended prior events like this?

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Yes. This will be the -- I think the largest, but I do plan to be there. And this -- this notice did go out broadly to community centers -- not community centers -- I'm sorry, career centers and community groups that are meeting regularly with the licensee.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Mm-hmm.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Director Griffin, I just want to thank you for the work that you've done. It's very innovative in the best practices arena. I suspect that that will benefit this Commission in our mission but also the Commonwealth widely, so thank you.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Oh, thank you. Thank you.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: If I could just point one thing out that I thought was interesting, there was an op-ed today in "The Globe," and I apologize, but it does talk about Boston -- I shouldn't say following -- they don't necessarily mention the casino construction diversity, but they talk about the same model, and they point next door to the construction next door that's being done by the same general contractor. So certainly we hope -- we hope -- the lessons that that contractor learned working with us

in Everett has made its way into the city. So I thought that was a great -- indirectly, not directly -- but at least indirectly a great nod to the advances that Director Griffin and her folks have really helped in the casino construction industry. So we'll get that out to all of you and get that clip out to all of you.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Thank you.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Thank you, Director.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Jill, just one quick question. I notice a number of the jobs are interviewing for -- will require some licensing. Do you plan to have your colleagues in licensing attending or participating or at least providing information?

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Well, Bill Curtis and I are attending together, but there is -- they have had the licensing presence at the career center along with fingerprinting and all of that. So the integration is taking place.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Great. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Director Griffin, I see there posting here which is very well done. It says, please apply online prior to arrival. I know that was challenging for some of the folks in Springfield, applying online. Is there thought given to assisting those who may not have easy access to a computer?

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Yeah. I think applying online is encouraged but not required.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I see.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: And I know that many of our -- the entities funded through the Community Mitigation Funds are assisting in those efforts.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So at some of those locations, they'd be able to apply online.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Right, right.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good. And help them maybe print a resume, prepare a resume?

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Right. And we funded also workforce readiness efforts.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Right. Mm-hmm.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: That assist in those efforts as well.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Mm-hmm. Great. Thank you. Well done.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: So I wanted to also update you on our efforts to improve licensee oversight functions. We're in the process of performing a diversity audit. We've developed a process to perform periodic evaluations of our licensees' compliance with their established diversity goals. And as we did with our other licensee, MGM Springfield, we're performing an audit on the diversity information that they submit monthly to our access and opportunity committee meeting. So we met recently with Suffolk Construction and Encore Boston Harbor's construction diversity team. And the intent of this visit was to develop a real comprehensive understanding of the processes and systems in place for the compiling of data that they report each month to us. So Construction Oversight Manager Joe Delaney, Program Coordinator Crystal Howard and I are in the process of reviewing this information, relative to both workforce diversity and supplier and vendor diversity. We're conducting spot checks on supporting documentation of several subcontractors that we chose, looking at the March meeting including we're looking at weekly certified payroll reports, subcontractor certification documents, email correspondence, and corrective action logs. And we really -- the

intent is to verify the processing and reporting of the diversity data and to evaluate the adequacy of the management controls. So we are in the process of the reviewing of stacks of information, but we plan on submitting a summary memo to the Commission's Compliance Committee at the end of March.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Now, Jill, remind us, we did a similar effort for MGM.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: That's right.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And at the time that we did that effort, it was a two-tier just like you described. First ascertaining the -- how they capture information, how they get some of the reports themselves, and how they then report to us.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And then followed, you know, by the audit, if you will, the spot check that you described.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: My understanding was that we had already ascertained a system, in other words, the tier 1 of Encore as well at that time.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Is that the case?

>> MS. GRIFFIN: That was the case. We had, some time ago, met with Encore and their J.C. We had a little refresher because that was some time ago.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: And then last -- maybe it was Monday. No, Tuesday, actually, we received the documentation that we intend to review for the actual audit.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Mm-hmm. Great. We look forward to the end result, first of the compliance group, but I'll just mention for the record for you, for your benefit, Madam Chair, that based -- this process was really thought through based on feedback from the state auditor when they first did the audit going on almost three years ago. And I think it's really solid, and I'm glad that we're seeing it to fruition.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Yes. And we are encouraged by what we see so far, but we look forward to digging into the information. So thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That's great.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: And last but certainly not least, we have some regulations. And I think I'm going to -- I'll provide a brief intro and then turn it over to our Deputy General Counsel.

So currently we have some diversity definitions that talk about what is a minority-owned business, an MBE, a VBE or a WBE. And we allow certain certifications in those regulations. However, those regulations pertain right now specifically to construction. So what we're intending to do is apply and create regulations that apply to the operations period as well. We're not making substantive changes to the definitions, but this is the introductory period. So I'll turn it over to Todd Grossman.

>> MR GROSSMAN: Thank you, Jill, and good morning, Commissioners. As Jill described the proposal before you, it would simply add definitions for MBE, VBE and WBE that would be a broad application. So they would apply to the ongoing reporting obligations of the casinos as opposed to just the construction obligations. They are essentially the same exact definitions that apply in the construction section of the regulations. You'll see some highlighting in the draft before you. Those reflect some

updates since the initial version that you may have seen in the packet. They are largely administrative -- as you can see, there's some capitalization and things of that nature. Ultimately, as it pertains to the VBE definition, the point here was to take ourselves more out of the certification process and defer to the OSD process just to pick up on part of the conversation from before. When we first started doing this, there was no process essentially for the certification of veteran business enterprises. So we had to create our own. Now OSD actually has one. So we're migrating over to their way of doing it. So that's what this definition reflects in part as well.

So this is the first time you've seen this. We would ask you just to have a look, obviously offer any comments. We will come back before you at an upcoming meeting and ask that we start moving it through the process. We'll circulate this to the licensees and other stakeholders to see if they have any comments before we engage in the formal process.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Todd or Jill, we don't anticipate that this definition, clarification would in any way change the numbers that have either already been reported to us by licensees or will continue to be reported. This really just adds clarification to the certification part?

>> MS. GRIFFIN: It does. I don't envision any changes. You know, I think we've been having discussions with licensees regarding this. So I don't anticipate any huge issues. It may encourage businesses to get certified by our state supplier diversity office or by other entities. But I don't envision any impact in terms of the numbers.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Great.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Didn't our licensees find that they had more, in particular, veterans, but they did not really understand a way to register? So this may improve numbers, correct?

>> MS. GRIFFIN: The veteran issue -- some veterans don't wish to call attention to their veteran status.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Oh, I see.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: But we are -- others are just unaware. So this -- you're right, there are some who may, in hearing this, they may decide to get certified.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I see. Was there any resolution -- remember last year we dealt with the change with the Portuguese population? Is that still --

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Portuguese-owned businesses are not considered minority-owned businesses.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Right. Right.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: There was some resolution.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That was a change a little while ago.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Right.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: So our licensees are not reporting PBEs as minority-owned businesses. Effective the date that that was determined.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And by the way, if I could go back to my prior comment, if there's any way in which this changes anything, I would want it to be just prospectively. No need to kind of try to go back and draw up anything that has been reported to us in the past. You know, I think that would be a useless effort, just in case.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Okay. I think the -- this refers to operations, and I don't anticipate

Plainridge Park Casino having any issues. And I think MGM is -- you know, their procurement program is in its infancy, right? They just opened, so I don't anticipate any issues.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Director, in terms of this notice today, this is the beginning of the rule-making process, so we will invite public comment at this point in time.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Right. Yeah, we would like to hear if there are any potential impacts.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I -- go ahead.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But usually -- this is the initial draft. The way we normally bring a regulation is to have this kind of discussion, brainstorming and questions. If there's any edits, we send it back to staff, come back to the Commission, and then that begins the promulgation process. So we would not be -- if I understand this correctly, we would not be putting anything at this time to be in the promulgation process.

>> MS. BLUE: That's right. That's why it's not scheduled for a vote. Our custom has been to have you take a look at it first, put it out, see what we get, incorporate the comments, and then come back to you with a formal vote to start the promulgation process. It will go out for comments again during that process. So if we get any more comments, that's fine. And then we'll make final revisions before we come back to you for a final vote on the promulgation.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Thank you for that clarification, commissioner and General Counsel.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yeah, just to complement Jill and Todd, because you've been working on this for a while. We all knew kind of the problem that was in front of us was no existing process especially in the area of veterans certification. And I think you guys in working with licensing came up with a process that was a stopgap. I'm glad to see SDO came up with their own process, and we'd certainly push people to that. We've met with the folks at SDO to make sure the process was easy, convenient and expedient, and they can pretty much -- you provide all the paperwork, they can usually turn around a certification in less than 30 days or about 30 days. So it's a quick process.

I did have a question under -- and again, something for you to think about or a comment -- under the Women in Business Enterprise. You talk about the SDO certification and the Women's Business Enterprise National Council. That's the certification that our local friends at the Center For Women and Enterprise give out. Should we add the CWE name or mention it just so it kind of clarifies for anybody who has the we bank certification, they may think of it well, I've got the CWE certification, but just kind of maybe clarify that by either adding their name or referencing that folks might have gone through that process as well just so they're not -- somebody reading this doesn't think oh, my gosh, I've got to run out and get another certification.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: We could certainly clarify that. They are the local entity that provides the national certification, but we could certainly clarify that.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Oh, the CWE is the local chapter of the --

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Of the we bank. So just avoid any confusion over what I actually have is certification. Again, I haven't seen the document, so it may say the We Bank name on it.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: It does.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: We also know CWE is a big player in this effort.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Good suggestion.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Any further questions? Thank you very much.

>> MS. GRIFFIN: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: As to item 6, Executive Director Bedrosian noted that matter was moved. So next on our agenda is item 7, research and responsible gaming, Director Vander Linden, thank you for your update.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Good morning. Good morning, Chair Judd-Stein and Commissioners. So I'm providing to you a periodic update on what's happening with the research agenda both in terms of deliverables that were recently released, projects or deliverables that are upcoming. There's a few other activities that I think are certainly worth noting. And at the back of the memo that I gave to you, it's just a list of -- an extensive list of the different reports and publications that have been created as part of MGC's research agenda.

So I think the last time I provided a report to you was around October. So I wanted to just kind of cover for you some of the reports and provide a summary for reports that have been released since that time. We have two reports, actually, that were just released that relate to trying to better understand at-risk and problem gambling among veterans. The first is -- it was actually just published on January 18th in the Journal of Gambling Studies and it was led by Dr. Volberg and our SEIGMA team. This study utilized the baseline general population survey that was fielded in Massachusetts back in 2013, 2014. Of that sample of 9,578 participants, we identified 129 problem gamblers. Interestingly, of those 129 problem gamblers that were identified, 20% were identified as veterans.

In order to make this a larger, a more robust sample size, that smaller sample of problem gambler -- veteran problem gamblers was combined with veterans that were also identified as at risk so that we could take a look specifically at their gambling behavior and maybe conditions that surrounded that. The results were interesting. The team identified that having friends and family members that engaged in gambling as well as engaging in more than one gambling format, meaning they go to casinos, they play the lottery, they do sports betting, was highly associated with being a problem or at-risk gambler.

Interestingly, they found that participating in raffles in the past year was associated with lower odds of being a problem or at-risk gambler. And when I spoke with them at greater detail about that, they said, you know, a lot of times raffles are primarily used as fund-raisers and not necessarily considered as gambling by the veterans. So there was some explanation to try to back that finding up.

It's always good to understand what the implications for this -- for our research are. And I think it's something I want to highlight for you in just a few minutes. But the implications for this -- the team identified that this type of information, understanding that problem and at-risk gamblers are engaged in more than one format of gambling,

understanding that they gamble socially or they gamble with friends and family around them. These are important pieces. They're nuggets of information to have as we think about constructing both intervention programs and prevention programs.

The second veteran study that was conducted was actually part of a larger push by the Commission to examine gambling behaviors, attitudes among groups that would be considered at risk. We funded three of those studies. And the next two studies that I wanted to highlight for you actually came from that line of funding. The first was funding that we provided to the Bedford V.A. Research Corporation. They set out in their study to evaluate the reliability and validity of the BBGS or the brief biosocial screening that they would use for among all V.A. patients coming in to primary care behavioral health clinics in Bedford. They also wanted to try to better understand or evaluate the prevalence of problem gambling among veterans and its co-occurrence with other medical and mental health conditions.

So the results here, I think, are a bit mixed, but I think that there's a lot of directions that this study has gone and will continue to go. Of the veterans that gambled, 5.9% endorsed at least one item out of the three items that are on this BBGS or the brief biopsychosocial screen. Of those that gambled, that would be of those individuals that had gambled in the last 12 months. Of the sample as a whole, it was 1.9%. So that would include gamblers that hadn't gambled in the past 12 months. This was very much in line with actually some of the findings that we had in our general population baseline study. But the sample size and the number of veterans that endorsed even one BBGS item was so small that it would be difficult to make a conclusion about the overall prevalence rate of problem gambling or even at-risk gambling among veterans.

So to that end, we perhaps missed the mark on what the overall objectives of that study were, but I think it's really -- what has happened since is I think incredibly encouraging. Without a doubt, veterans are considered at greater risk of developing gambling-related harm. That came true to us in our own Massachusetts-based research, but it's also borne out in other studies that have happened around the country. And so it doesn't -- we want to continue to try to focus on this specific group and to better understand how we can be of service.

So Dr. Shane Kraus who was the principal investigator on this study is using this study as a launching pad to provide additional training to the clinical staff at the Bedford V.A. Medical Center. Dr. Shane Kraus has really launched a career into this area in this line of research and is quite brilliant. And he's used this study -- he's also been involved in a national study of over 1,000 veterans that was recently completed. And it's this study can continue to try to help and inform the much broader study. And still even with some of its limitations, I think, adds to that larger body of evidence that continues to grow.

So there's also Dr. Kraus and his co-investigator, Dr. Shirk, used this study as the basis for funding -- a funding request with the National Center For Responsible Gaming. I didn't include this in here only because I found this out just a couple days ago, which is great, right? What we want is we have funding for research in this area, but what we really want is for this to be used more broadly. We want this to continue to grow, to fill in the gaps. If there isn't a group that we consider at greater risk, probably, most likely, and certainly with the case of veterans, we get part of the story. And the

research is probably okay, but there's certainly ways in which we can better understand what's happening and how we can be of better service. What types of intervention and what types of prevention programs can more appropriately respond to the needs. And so to that end, I feel like this -- the combination of these two studies and this one with the Bedford V.A. in particular I'm excited about and excited to see where this -- how this study can contribute and how Dr. Kraus and Dr. Shirk will continue to do their work and research with the V.A.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Mark, remind me, I thought Dr. Kraus approach included the DSM-5 screen.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes, it did -- if the veterans at intake responded positively to one of -- one or more of the three item BBGS, they went on to a full assessment that included all of the criteria of the DSM, the nine criteria.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. So it was a two-tier?

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Mark, so the numbers are the same. 1.9%. So the numbers are very similar to general population. But the doctor, you, you feel like you didn't -- folks weren't self-identifying, is that it? Is that what we're trying to find other ways to reach people? Is that --

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: You know, it's interesting that we found in the general population baseline survey --

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Right.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: -- a non-V.A.-based survey, a higher rate, compared to a survey that was administered under the umbrella of the V.A. This is simply my hypothesis. It may or may not be true, but that perhaps when entering into the V.A. system, individuals may be less forthcoming about what the presenting problems are. Maybe that would come out later on as a therapeutic relationship develops with whatever clinician they're working with. But perhaps there's some hesitancy to fully disclose that added mission.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You're more likely to, if you're a veteran, to answer an anonymous survey and less likely during the V.A. setting where you might feel that your employer might take some kind of action. I think there's also -- which was part of the limitations and assumptions in the study, if I remember correctly from Dr. Kraus. There's also -- and I really don't want to make too big of a deal on this, but there is different measuring. The screening tool. Dr. Kraus used the BBGS, which is a brief tool, just a few questions before going into a DSM, which is a therapeutical type of Q&A. Whereas our general population survey uses, by necessity, the PPGM -- or is it the CPTI?

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: PPGM and CPTI, problem and pathological gambling --

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The Canadian index. It's like 10 or 11 questions that get you to, you know, whether you're at risk or not or a problem gambler. They're all really good tools and used in -- you know, we're using the best tools available, but there could be at least, in addition to what you just mentioned, the notion that there is different tools being used to compare similar numbers.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: One other highlight that I think is evolving from this, we

had a very good meeting with Secretary Urena of the V.A., Chief of Staff. They're very interested in how we can partner -- we're very interested in partnering to be able to provide prevention services through GameSense to veterans in a variety of different settings, whether it's our GameSense advisers working directly within -- with veterans or whether it's us training the staff or veteran advisers. We're open to both.

There was also an interest in making sure that we make our voluntary self-exclusion program widely available across the state and certainly in advance of the opening of a Region A casino. So that's, again, either working through GameSense or us providing training to their social workers to be designated agents so that they can provide that enrollment into the program. I think there's great possibility for us to continue this partnership. And Commissioners Zuniga and Stebbins attended that meeting as well.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Director, I think that's an important point and I would like to be kept comprised. I'm sure your fellow Commissioners would like to be aware of your work with the secretary because we've heard some important findings and so the next steps are so important for implementing these findings for strategies to get the services they need and deserve. So thank you.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Sure.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Very important.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: I agree. The other study -- I'm kind of moving around. If you have any questions at all about any of the studies, I will do my very best to answer your questions, but there were just a few that I felt like I wanted to spotlight.

The next study that was released back in November was -- is highlighted on page 4 of your memo. And it's the casinos and gambling in Massachusetts African-American perspectives. African-Americans were identified as a group of specific interest because in our general population survey, they were identified as having a four times greater likelihood of experiencing gambling-related harm than other groups. While they gambled less, African-Americans gambled less, they're at greater risk of developing gambling-related harm. So we wanted to try to get a better understanding of this. Dr. Vega with JSI and his team wanted to do kind of a broader understanding of what's happening. I think it's a complex issue when we -- yes.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Do you mind just clarifying JSI?

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: It's a research group, company.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay. I wasn't -- I didn't know that acronym.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yeah, I'm sorry. And I couldn't tell you what JSI stands for. I don't know that. And so Dr. Vega wanted to do some qualitative research to supplement the quantitative research that was done by the SEIGMA team. So, again, this is kind of this effort to say we have this -- we're laying this amazing foundation of research through SEIGMA, but let's life perhaps where the gaps are and identify some alternative or creative research methods including this type of qualitative research to begin to fill in the gaps. So it did exactly this. It was a relatively small study of using 49 participants. So that's certainly something that is important to understand and interpret the -- any of the findings with some caution. But I think that it still pointed out some interesting findings.

Dr. Vega did five focus groups in Boston, Everett, and Springfield. That covers it. Where these 49 participants were included. So under the findings, participants

described their communities as being impoverished, lacking employment opportunities, and need of social services to address mental health and substance abuse problems. Their primary motivation to gamble included financial need as well as recreational thrill seeking. Participants for directory towards problem gambling was described as involving playing lottery games. They reported a host of negative consequences associated with problem gambling including obviously losing money intended to pay for living essentials such as food and rent but also losing key elements that helped them to gain their livelihood. Whether it be losing jobs or losing their transportation to get to and from jobs.

Participants overall were aware that casinos are purposely designed to entice people to gamble more. The negative aspects associated with the presence of a casino relate to concerns that already exist within the participants' communities, whether it be crime or drugs, gentrification or community ties. The positive views regarding casinos related to what their potential was to create new jobs and other types of economic benefits that would come directly to their communities.

So what are the recommendations from the group? Outreach and to educate and treat gambling problems should recognize that many believe that they must gamble out of need in order to escape poverty. That if you have limited resources, that perhaps those -- they can't cover all of the needed expenses, perhaps your one way out would be if you gamble and you would win enough to be able to get out of poverty. That has, I think, a lot of really important implications, both in the treatment realm as well as in the prevention realm.

We talk a lot kind of under the umbrella of GameSense of gambling within your means, that you have money that would be set aside that would be for entertainment. And when that money is gone, that that's when you would stop. This is something that is, I think, an extraordinary finding where specific messaging could be designed to address that specifically. Many African-Americans are family and community oriented, and therefore when we think about interventions or prevention, again, I think it's recognizing that this is a great strength, and that should be leveraged.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I mention one thing that actually -- I had the benefit of seeing Dr. Vega's presentation a couple times. So I remember one of his findings also, which is sort of captured indirectly here, but not specifically. Also had to do with how -- some of the participants saw the casino as really inviting, diverse, accessible and welcoming. Whereas as an African-American, you know, there's other places that are not quite like that. So there was this dichotomy in the casino, in addition to what you highlight here. And I think in addition to what you mentioned relative to GameSense, one of the things that we should also think about and are thinking about is how the amenities, that the welcoming can be there, encouraging breaks like we do to visit the amenities, not just the slot machines is at least another tactic to deal with this topic.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yeah. Great. Yes, exactly. Any of these reports, the summary that I provide certainly doesn't include the detail that the researchers found. After this presentation, these reports specifically will then be posted to the research page of our website. So viewers and people interested can read more about what was found.

So the final piece, in order to bring the greatest benefit, residents need to see the

added resources and opportunities that casinos are bringing to the community and how they can be accessed. Residents need to be reassured that the safety of the community will be guaranteed far beyond the geographical boundaries of what the casino is. You know, for each of these points, I feel like we have an idea. We have something that either is in motion or perhaps is within reach. And so this is really good information to have for us to have a broader understanding of perhaps what the needs are.

So that's a highlight of reports that were just recently released. There's a few more in there that actually I think were presented by the researchers to the Commission. So I won't spend time highlighting those. We have a few interesting ones that are coming our way. So starting on page 5, I have pending reports and studies. The first that I wanted to highlight is the follow-up analysis of crimes, calls for service and collision data in communities near MGM Springfield. We had Commissioner Cameron and I had a good meeting with our crime analyst, Christopher Bruce, yesterday to get an update on this. It's not going to be a three-month report. It's going to be a four-month report. He was calling us from Springfield where he was gathering -- finishing up his data collection in order to do the analysis. We hope to have the report in our hand for review by the end of the month so that it could be to the Commission near the end of March, perhaps the March 28th meeting as pending right now. So that will be interesting. That will be a follow-up from the baseline that was presented in October. I have a typo on here, but it was presented in October.

The next report that I wanted to highlight is the Massachusetts Gambling Impact Cohort. This is -- to date there have been four waves of data collection with a cohort of 3,139 adult Massachusetts residents. This cohort of roughly 3,100 people was drawn from a much broader sample of the general population baseline study. So out of the roughly 10,000, we have 3,100 that we continue to engage with through this cohort. There was an oversample of problem and at-risk gamblers. So even this 3,100 people, we have a very rich mix of individuals that are currently or at risk of experiencing gambling-related harm.

The wave 3 report is under review by our research review committee, and a finalized report is expected by the end of the month, maybe a little ambitious, but certainly end of March. There are a couple really interesting publications or work that is spinning off of this. One is a publication of low-risk gambling guidelines for Massachusetts residents. And another is a publication of a report on the etiological predictors between waves 1 and 3. So the first, I think this publication or a better understanding of low-risk gambling and how we can use that information through our GameSense program and through other types of prevention programs is really important. Dr. Volberg has partnered with other countries, other jurisdictions that are also sponsoring gaming cohort studies to try to bring together as much research power as we can to distill down and following cohorts over time to better understand what are the risk factors, what are the protective factors that would cause somebody to move from recreational gambler all the way to a gambling disorder or vice versa, individuals that have a gambling disorder, what are the factors, predictive factors, that would cause them either to stop gambling altogether or to move down that continuum into recreational gambling. If you take all of that data, you can begin to identify themes, or in other words, guidelines or behaviors that would be indicative of low-risk gambling.

The GameSense program is fantastic. And I think that we've developed a set of tools in our toolbox. And when I think about how do we use our research, how do we use science to advance that toolbox to refine it as best as we possibly can, understanding establishing these types of low-risk gambling guidelines is really important. The second is the etiological predictors of the transitions. And that is much like what I had just described. What are the causes that are causing people to move up and down the continuum of gambling behavior? And you can only get that type of information by doing a longitudinal cohort study. And so the efforts of this theme in order to keep as many people engaged in the study is really quite impressive. There's a tendency that you see attrition over time and that eventually you have such a small end number that you've been able to retain that, it loses the power. It loses the ability to do these types -- do these types of studies. Dr. Volberg, Dr. Rob Williams who is the co-principal investigator have done these types of studies before and certainly know some of the tricks to keep people engaged in a longitudinal study.

The next piece that I wanted to highlight is very close to being launched. And this is after more than a couple years of trying to get up and off the ground, which is the exportable database or database of the baseline general population survey and the baseline on panel. I won't go into great detail, but to say that we have limited capacity to do the types of analyses that we do with the enormous amount of data that we're collecting. It's incredibly costly to do the analyses that we do. So wouldn't it be great if we could make this data available to other researchers where there isn't a lot of data or a lot of datasets like this. So let's make it available to other researchers to do this type of analysis where, quite honestly, we don't have to pay for it, but we get the benefit of the analysis and the findings. So as we continue down this path with the research program, we have an incredibly valuable dataset that is being -- that is being developed. We, with some parameters around it, want to make it as widely available for research purposes as possible.

We're working closely with our partners at the Department of Public Health in order to make sure that this database is protected with all the appropriate securities and guidelines that health information should be protected with. And I'm working with Dr. Tom Land to build the access point and build the requirements around data access in Massachusetts. My hope is that we have this available within the next 30 days. And the application process will be built into our website and probably other locations as well. I hope that we have an application process that can be launched from the MGC website.

Actually, if you don't mind entertaining me a few more minutes. I get really excited about this. The third study we funded under this at-risk research is being conducted by the University of Massachusetts-Boston Institute For Asian-American Studies. They're developing a pilot for screening and conducting diagnostic interviews among Chinese immigrants living and working in Boston's Chinatown. Dr. -- the study is really quite impressive, and it's just taken much longer than we had anticipated. Dr. Wong who leads that is finishing it up, and we hope to have that hopefully for my next update for you within the next couple months.

A couple other activities that are under way, we provided a small grant to the Public Health Institute of Western Massachusetts. They are largely responsible for the administering the youth health survey as well as the youth risk behavior survey to

students in the Springfield Public School District. It's a standardized test, the YRBS, YAHHS, that is administered to, I think -- is it 7th, 10th and 12th graders. I may have that wrong, but it's administered standard across Massachusetts. The Public Health Institute of Western Massachusetts has taken on doing that, administering that, in partnership with the Springfield Public School District.

Our partnership and the funding that we provided allowed us to gather more information about youth gambling behavior and integrate a youth problem gambling screening instrument. I think it's incredibly timely that we were able to work with this group, with Springfield Public Schools as well as the Public Health Institute in order to build these questions in, and it would be my hope that we could use this almost as our baseline by which we can continue to track and monitor perhaps how opening up a casino in Springfield, Massachusetts, may or may not be affecting youth.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Director Vander Linden, this is the first time we've done anything with high school students, is that correct?

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: That we have, correct.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Is it prevalent -- I mean, are there any good studies out there with high school students?

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yeah. I would say that, you know, the research isn't great. But what research has been done would identify this also as a group that is at greater risk. Not gaining access into casinos, but of gambling on sports.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Gambling on games of skill, gambling on video games, that sort of thing.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well, that will be very interesting. You know, esports, also sports betting is of interest, and I'm hearing, you know, without a study, you don't know for sure about a lot of issues with online poker with teenagers and maybe even more with college students. So this will be an interesting study.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: I think it's great.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: I'm very excited about the possibility of seeing how we can -- what types of information we can gain and how this may inform prevention services in the schools.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Agreed.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You know, if I can mention, the general baseline population survey, really -- one of the big findings, of course, was that gambling affects different groups differently. And when there was not necessarily a lot of statistically significant information in that study for particular groups, what we did since then -- and this is really the three studies that you mentioned, two of which have been completed and the third one with Dr. Wong just about to be completed, in other words, Asians, African-Americans and veterans were identified -- were populations that were identified as having a greater risk compared to other populations, and that's the steps we took to learn more about them in the qualitative arena, and that's also the direction in which I see this research agenda expanding. There's the notion that in the statute we'll do another lookback on the general population survey, the before and after, and that will

come in due time. But much of what I think is -- the excitement that you talk about, Mark, is finding more nuances about how different groups are affected differently. And develop strategies accordingly. We cannot really have one strategy for all groups.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Right. Exactly. And I'll talk about the gaming research strategic plan as well.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Excellent.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Just before I move on to that, however, I just wanted to point out we are -- we have one final baseline report to build for our public safety research. Commissioner Cameron and I, again, met with our crime analyst, Christopher Bruce, yesterday. And we've been in the process for a while of planning our kickoff meeting in Everett and the surrounding communities. That is scheduled for February 27th. This kickoff meeting is basically we pull all of the police chiefs and as many of their analysts as we can together of the host and surrounding communities for Region A, and we begin defining what it is that we're setting out to do and try to gain as much input and buy-in and cooperation as we can. It's worked phenomenally well so far in Plainville and Springfield, and we have no reason to believe that that isn't going to be successful this time, too.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah. For the benefit of our new chair, this is an area -- how does -- what does a casino, entered into whatever community, how does that affect crime. And this is something with very little research in this area, partly because getting police agencies to participate in sharing their data is difficult. They protect their data because it could be used in ways that they would not be comfortable with. So we started this, and we just went out and asked for their help and said please help us. We have this piece to do, but we need your help. We didn't say we want you to do X, Y and Z. We said can you help us. And a brainstorming session came about. And one of the chiefs recommended our crime analyst that we've been using now for years. He's worked out -- he's terrific. He's very well respected throughout the world, actually. And he's really dug into this project. So once again, we were -- will the chiefs in the Boston area participate and you know, pleasantly surprised, as always, that after sending a letter, they are all participating. They will all be at the meeting. And, again, we will ask for their help. And it is a sharing of data and analysis that we go through, but it's really important, especially now with Springfield and now with Everett coming online. And one of the things I love about this project is it's realtime information. So if there is an issue, a strategy can be put in place. It's not just research driven. It is realtime data analysis and police chiefs putting their heads together saying, hey, this is what we see, and let's try this strategy to, in fact, try to combat whatever the issue may be. So, yeah, it's an interesting project, and we continue to be pleased with the participation here in the Commonwealth. I've spoken about this project at many conferences, and people have said to me, how the heck did you get the chiefs to participate? We said, we asked them nicely. And we value their input. They know more about their communities than we do. So we didn't -- and it just worked for us. So Mark, you're right about that. It really has been something that we're pleased at the participation and once again, all of the chiefs here, about ten of them, right? They're all be part of our meeting at the end of the month.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: It's great to have you help lead that. You have the credibility to bring everybody together and gain their buy-in.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well, thank you for that.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Finally, I just wanted to cover two initiatives that are under way right now. As Commissioner Zuniga mentioned, we're going through a gaming research strategic planning process. Chair Judd-Stein, you haven't been involved with this, but for the other four Commissioners, I'm working with Judith Glynn. She is the principal at a group called Strategic Science. So Judith and I have met with the four Commissioners to try to get a better understanding of what their needs are out of a research agenda. More broadly, we partner very closely with EOHHS and DPH. So to the extent possible, we also made sure that we interviewed as wide and far as we could to get a better understanding of what -- how this research agenda can help those agencies and inform their programs as possible. I've worked with Commissioner Stebbins to do some targeted outreach to stakeholders on the ground in Springfield, specifically that have an interest in some of the economic research that we're doing. It's not by any means an exhaustive list of people that we could do, but I think that it has certainly opened our eyes as to what we're doing well and how we can do a better job down the line. I've described the statute calls for a research agenda. And so that's how I've described it for most of the -- for the five, almost six years that I've been here, but I think it's time to start calling it a research program where you see each research deliverable, each product that comes out of the research agenda as cohesive and somehow informs the other pieces of it. So I'm calling it a research program now to kind of symbolize that we have an enormous gift to be able to do this type of research. Let's make sure that we use it to the maximum extent possible.

So what's kind of bubbling up? There's a couple of things that have really bubbled up through the strategic planning process. And let me say it's not done yet, but where I think I see this going. One is that we want to maximize our ability to collect data and have it used by other researchers. So developing a really sophisticated, very accessible database for other researchers. And it includes the research, the datasets that we have to the extent possible that we can share those. But it will also include player card data that's a requirement of the statute under Section 97. So all player card data needs to be made accessible for research purposes as well. So that will be included.

We wanted to do a better job of research translation. There's -- how do you take the research that we have and translate it into concrete policy and practice recommendations as quickly as possible as opposed to the ten years or so that it traditionally takes for research to be translated into something concrete. We want to streamline that as quickly as possible. And I think that there's almost a new field of research translation out there. I've had some conversations with individuals that this is what they do. This is their focus. So let's -- I think that the research strategic plan will recommend that we invest in doing some of this translation work as well.

And then finally, and it goes right along with my next -- the final thing that I wanted to mention is community engaged research. Community-based participatory research is a specific type of research that says we don't necessarily know what all of the right research questions are, but the community does know what those research questions are. They do know what the issues are. And so we're doing a great job of trying to get a picture of what's happening at a specific level across the state with the introduction of casinos. But we have, as I said repeatedly this morning, we have some

gaps in there.

And we have a lot of people that are probably saying that this research isn't speaking to me. It's not doing me any good. And community-engaged research, community-based participatory research is intended to address that specifically. It requires that there's community participation. It requires that there's a community process in order to develop, to define what the issue is, to define the question and to develop a research plan to answer the question and that then the findings of that research are used to inform policy and practice within the community, to empower the community to make those types of decisions.

We want it. We want the same high level of research that we have across the board. So there is a requirement that even with this type of research, that there is engagement with researchers. There's also a specific push to -- though not a hard requirement -- there's a push and high recommendation that it complements the existing research that we have under way and that it complements initiatives, prevention and intervention initiatives, surrounding problem gambling that are being launched now by the Department of Public Health. This I see as a specific arm of the research agenda that I would like to see and I hope that people agree that would be an enduring part of this research program.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yeah. Let me just emphasize, this is a very important next phase of the research agenda, and I think it's very apt that you call it a research program. Some of the things -- the strategic planning that we have conducted -- that we are conducting has taken a little bit more -- a little bit longer than we anticipated, but it was necessary. And the principles emerging out of that, as you mentioned, are also very important for us to begin to think about, and we have been thinking about at least a couple. The data storage, for example, as well as the knowledge translation for a while out of necessity. One of the ironies about how much research we're producing is that I felt at times that the next study comes in and drowns a little bit the prior one. And the insight, you know, and the policy next step, if you will, sometimes can get a little lost.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Not in this Commission, not with this staff, but some of the stakeholders that are critical to the process out of -- outside of these walls. So a real emphasis on this knowledge translation, I think, is going to be very important as we continue this program.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And as well the community engagement is almost like the third leg in that stool. The data sharing the knowledge translation, and the community engagement to further essentially the same goals.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yeah. Yeah. Make sure that the right research gets to the right people.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: And in a timely -- in a timely way.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mark, great update.

Just a couple of notes, especially as we look at what your -- the deliverables you've added in FY19, and we've talked about how some of this research can have some

overlay into John Ziemba's work, potentially into Jill's work. You know, a great example is looking at the first wave of the MGM Springfield patron survey and using that with local entities on the ground like a convention and visitors bureau to better understand why people are coming -- I mean, they're coming to Springfield to go to MGM, but where are they being drawn from.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Thank you for pointing that out. That's ready to launch at the end of -- I think next week we will have our first wave of data collection at MGM.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: With the SEIGMA group.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Let's think about those groups that would really like to do a deep dive into the data. The other one I'm looking for is obviously the MGM -- new MGM employee data survey. I know you and Teresa have been hard at work on that. It was a little bit of a different scenario that we were operating under as compared to the PPC survey. But when we get a time line for that, you know, that would be great information to have as well.

>> MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yeah.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Great work, Mark. Thank you.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Any other questions?

All set. Thank you very much. We'll move on to item 8. Commissioners Stebbins, we understand that you would like to present an item for the Commission's consideration.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Sure. Thank you, Madam Chair. Colleagues, as you'll see in our packet this week, there's an attached memo. We've been asked to sign a letter of support for MGM Springfield's application in the Mass Historical Commission for recognition of their historic adaptive reuse efforts during their development. You know, throughout the RFA-2 process and the construction period, this Commission has always taken the opportunity to offer our vocal support and plaudits for MGM's efforts. We've all understood the unique and open nature of the project. However, integrating renovated historic buildings, preservation of key architectural pieces I believe this is made this truly a unique integrated casino resort among its peer properties. I also believe the involvement of the community and the support of MGM's CEO helped create this one-of-a-kind facility.

I recognize as regulators, we always need to maintain our responsibility and point out where a licensee needs to take steps to remain in compliance with the law, but I believe we can also take a moment to highlight their successes. We were involved with MGM Springfield's nomination of MassEcon last year as an economic development impact project. Again, highlighting their project as the largest privately developed construction project in the history of the region. I also think recognizing their success can be rooted in the overall benefit gaming has to the Commonwealth.

I certainly welcome any edits or comments you might have in the draft language of the letter, but I'm hopeful we can approve the letter and allow all of us to sign it and provide it to MGM for inclusion in their nomination packet.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Is there a motion?

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: First, Commissioner Stebbins, I think -- I would agree that this is a good area for us to be involved. Those of us who have watched this

since the beginning, they have made tremendous efforts to really listen to the community and try to abide by making that -- they assimilated to the neighborhood. They really did. So many people have commented on that. Watching them move that church was amazing, right, and the look of that up there as part of that project, I think, is really very interesting. I note that a group of legislators were out last week for the first time and were so positively -- their comments were all very positive about the improvement to the neighborhood because of the casino, and I just know that's not the case everywhere around the country. So I agree that this is a good area for us to provide support. And I move that we do endorse this letter today.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I mention something, you know, in addition to -- just for your comments, and I will be, of course, very enthusiastically supporting this. I think an important part of this is that the process really worked. The Springfield Historical Commission, at a first level. And, again, as I look back to all those meetings that we had out there that were informed about that process, and then the Mass Historical Commission, there was a lot of back and forth between, you know, those two groups, other stakeholders and, of course, MGM. They did not get everything that they wanted initially, but they did recognize that this project was very important for the overall -- and they were very much in favor of the project altogether because it was going to do itself a lot of historical preservation, let alone all the economic development that they were also very much in favor. But there had to be a number of judgment calls and a little bit of a back and forth for all of that purpose ultimately of historical preservation.

I myself was a little skeptical about some of the things that remained in the preservation. Of course, everybody recognized the armory and the church. But then now seeing -- you know, a few months ago, seeing the final product, I think it was tremendous. I think, again, the process which is a message that I think is the main message to be delivered to Secretary Calvin here in the letter is that it really worked. It wasn't without the back and forth that I'm describing, but it was well done by all the parties. And in that context, I think it's good that it comes from us with that message.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: You raised a great point. The cooperation and the partnership with the folks on the ground and the City of Springfield and the Springfield Historic Commission. I think back to the conversation around the Chandler Hotel.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: A couple presidents stayed overnight there.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: The historical significance. But in a lot of local advocates were fighting for protection of that building. And it wasn't till MGM and the local advocates had a chance to actually physically go through the building that they all realized that the building was somewhat beyond saving in its current state. You know, to your point, it was probably not the easiest path to get to where they wanted to be. But the fact that all parties, including our licensees, were willing to listen and willing to kind of fashion through some compromises, I think, is what really has made the project successful.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yep. And I remember at the time a lot of this has a translation in additional costs, additional time line which, you know, it's just the way it is

around here, you know. The licensees would say, well, it's a lot more expensive to build, and it's in Nevada, of course, but then the result is also really good to observe and appreciated.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: So we have a motion to approve this letter of support. Do we have a second?

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I second that.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Any further discussion? Okay. Those in favor?

[Vote taken]

Opposed? Hearing none? 5-0.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Great. Thank you for your leadership, Commissioner Stebbins.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you for your support.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Do we have any other business to discuss?

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I have just one other --

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Commissioner update?

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: -- update. Commissioner Cameron along with Director Driscoll and Crystal Howard had a chance to sit down with our stakeholders in the Build a Life Campaign and kind of review our progress. I think we realize -- and it was reinforced the program continues to assist with recruiting women in the construction trade, and interest always spikes when our campaign visibility is up. So we had some good conversation around funding the campaign as we look ahead. Interestingly enough, yesterday our partners at the policy group on tradeswomen issues showed us that in 2018, over 600 women enlisted in apprentice programs across the Commonwealth. This is a 25% increase from 2017. And look back in the data of 2012, the number was 173 in one year. So we congratulate our partners on their success.

A question was raised at the meeting about whether the Gaming Commission could require licensees to hire a certain percentage of women from their construction project into some of the key ongoing facility positions. I'm not sure that we had the authority to do that at this point. However, I think it's a suggestion our licensees should consider in their overall effort to achieve their goals for hiring minority women and veterans as part of their operational team. So it was a great meeting.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yeah, I agree. Those efforts are tremendous. I think we have to give credit to Director Driscoll on that as well. I mean, that's really a professionally done campaign. And I think the numbers are a direct result of the campaign itself. It's really -- those billboards, those signs are really effective. In fact, I stop and look every time I see one. There's one right next door, right, at this new project. So I know how hard Directors Griffin and Driscoll worked on that campaign. And I did not know there was a 25% increase. That's a tremendous number. Tremendous number.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Remind us, what is the goal that they speak about by 2020?

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Their goal is to have 20% of the construction workforce in Massachusetts be women by 2020.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: By 2020.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I think we all understood early on that was a very

aggressive goal, but I'm impressed with some of the statistics they shared yesterday that showed that there's a tremendous upswing, and women are really giving full consideration to a career in the trades as something that provides great benefits, great pay and some great opportunities.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: To hear some of those women who worked three jobs previously maybe in retail or some other position now with one good-paying job with benefits supporting families, it's really -- it's inspirational.

I have one more commissioner update, which is just, you know, this was brought up speaking about gaps in research. When we were updating over with our partners at the Department of Health, a mention to us would be is there any way you can look at trafficking in and around a casino? And --

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Human trafficking.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Human trafficking, yes. You know, I still make a distinction because I really do believe there is a distinction between prostitution and trafficking. But we are putting a meeting together with -- there's some real experts here in the Commonwealth that oversee human trafficking. So we are putting a meeting together with a representative from the Department of Health and these folks from law enforcement. And with Christopher Bruce, our crime analyst, to see if there's something -- a way to capture data, maybe do some training with our unit members. You know, I'm thinking, of course, Springfield and then Everett to make sure that they're observing everything they can about what's happening in the operations. We don't want to presume or say that there is anything going on now because we don't know. But I do think it was an interesting observation and look forward to putting -- pulling this group together to really brainstorm, is there a way to -- for us to, again, train our people so that they -- they are aware of telltale signs, and secondly, capture data if there is data to be captured. So that's -- we'll have that meeting later this month as well.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Great.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: I would be remiss not to note that the governor's Commission on domestic violence and sexual assault does address human trafficking issues. And given my most recent job, I'd be remiss not to direct you to some resources there.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay, great. Thank you for that.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: I do have one update, and it's sort of out of order. I apologize, but I think it's appropriate at this time. Yesterday Mike Sangalang walked into my office with an envelope. And I was cornered. Mike is moving on. He has a new position, and Director Driscoll and I just wanted to recognize, you know, his work with digital coordination and communications with all our folks, all our different directors and staff. Mike was really a utility player. And one of the jobs he did very well, obviously, was streaming these meetings, you know. I think the Commission has become one of the leaders in streaming, and that's in big part to Mike's efforts both here and then when we go out remotely in the field. I'd like to think our streaming quality is among the highest. But that's due to Mike's efforts, making sure the microphones work, the cameras are on the right people, you know. We do -- we are ADA compliant and all those things. So I think, unfortunately, Mike, is this the last meeting you will be -- and he's giving us the nod. So I just -- we want to recognize his work and say thank you and obviously best wishes.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Wow.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes, thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you, Michael.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you very much.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: You will be missed.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I think he also made us look good.

>> MR. BEDROSIAN: For some of you, that's impossible.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I just never look.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: And Mike, you can flip the camera one more time to you.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I always get nervous when someone says they handed me an envelope.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Is there any other business for the Commission? Okay. Item 10 is noticed for an executive session. The Commission will now go into executive session pursuant to Massachusetts General Law's chapter 30A Section 21A3 for the purpose of discussing litigation industry in the case of Stephen A. Wynn versus Karen Wells, the Massachusetts Gaming Commission, Wynn Resorts, et al. Given the posture of the case, it is clear that a discussion of the Commission's strategy in an open meeting public -- an open public meeting would have a detrimental effect on the litigation portion of the Commission. The Commission will reconvene in open session at the end of the executive session. Do I have a motion to go into executive session?

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: So moved.

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Second.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: We'll have a roll call vote of the Commission to go into executive session. I presume there's no further discussion? Okay. Commissioner Stebbins.

>> COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Commissioner Zuniga.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Commissioner O'Brien.

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Aye.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: Commissioner Cameron.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: And the chair votes yes. All members of the public and any staff members not involved in the matter to be discussed must leave the room. I'd ask that all live audio and video recording and the livestreaming be shut off and the doors to the room be closed. Thank you, Mike.

>> Thank you.

(The Commission went into executive session at 11:59 a.m.)

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: The Commission -- it's on. Thank you. The Commission received a briefing today on litigation strategy in the executive session. In compliance with the Open Meeting Law which requires that any vote be taken be listed on the meeting agenda, a vote was listed on the -- for the executive session. The vote was put on the agenda in the event that the Commission needed to take some action based upon the briefing. The Commission decided not to take any action at this time, so no vote is needed, and no vote will be taken. Do I have a motion to close the executive

session and reconvene? And open session. We did that. So, sorry. Do I have a motion to close this executive session -- this open session? My apologies.

>> COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So moved.

>> COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Second.

>> CHAIR JUDD-STEIN: And do I need a roll call for this? No. So all those in favor of a motion to adjourn.

[Vote taken]

Any opposed? Five ayes. Thank you.

>> COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.