

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We're calling to order Public Meeting Number 236 of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission on February 22 nd at our offices in Boston. First item on the agenda as usual is the minutes. Commissioner Macdonald.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move that we approve the minutes of our meeting on January 31, 2018 as they appear in the packet subject to correction for typographical errors and other nonmaterial matters.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do I have a second?

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any discussion?
All in favor?
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.
COMMISSONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes
have it unanimously.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: And I
further move that we approve the minutes of the meeting of February 7th of 2018 also subject to correction for typographical errors and other nonmaterial matters.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
COMMISSONER CAMERON: Second.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second.
Just a note on the top of page two where we reference our CFAO and Agnes, I know we talked about this a couple of times making sure that we try to be consistent and professional and keep a person's job title kind of in front of their name as we consistently do in other cases of -- in other parts of other meeting minutes.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: So we'd want that for both of those individuals.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yes.
MS. BLUE: We'll make that correction.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else?
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: So amended.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: As amended all in favor? Aye.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously. Next up is the Investigations and Enforcement Bureau represented today by Loretta Lillios, the deputy director of the IEB and enforcement counsel, chief enforcement counsel.

MS. LILLIOS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good afternoon.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Good afternoon.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Good afternoon.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good afternoon.

MS. LILLIOS: The first item we have
is the suitability of an MGM qualifier for
your consideration this afternoon, and that individual is Mr. Scott Howard. He's the senior vice president and security information officer for MGM Resorts International. You've already seen the investigative report, and I'll give a brief summary now.

Mr. Howard joined MGM in 2015. It's his first position in the gaming industry. The IEB designated him as a qualifier in May of 2017. In the period between him joining the company in 2015 and his designation as a qualifier in 2017, MGM was in the process of putting its shared services model into place.

During this period Mr. Syed Espihani, MGM's chief information officer who was qualified in June of 2014, oversaw the IT security function. Later the positions were split, and Mr. Howard now reports to the chief operating officer Corey Sanders, who is also a qualifier.

Mr. Howard submitted all of the required forms and requests for additional
and updated information. He was interviewed by videoconference by the investigators, Sergeant Michael Banks from the state police and financial investigator Susan LaRosa. He cooperated and was forthcoming in all respects.

As with the other suitability investigations the IEB conducts, we verified his identity, confirmed his financial stability and integrity, reviewed litigation history and searced for criminal records.

Mr. Howard is responsible at the executive level for personnel and operations of the information services, the information security, security information, security policy and awareness departments.

He supervises teams that monitor security tools, conduct analysis of security information threats and conducts Cyber security investigations. He also supervises the team which oversees the architecture of new gaming and solutions to ensure that they are secure.

He is a graduate from the University of Texas with a degree in physics. He worked for several small companies as a systems engineer and then as a chief information officer at Benefit Mall in Dallas, Texas before joining MGM.

In addition to Massachusetts, he submitted gaming applications in Maryland, New Jersey and Nevada. The Nevada Gaming Control Board and the Maryland Lottery and Gaming Control Commission reported that his licenses are active and in good standing with no derogatory information. He is still pending in -- by the New Jersey Casino Control Commission.

Mr. Howard is active in two professional associations. He's a member of the Board of Directors of the Retail Cyber Intelligence Sharing Center, a group for Cyber security professionals to share knowledge in the Cyber security field. He does not receive compensation for that role. He's also a commissioner on the Nevada commission on Homeland Security

Cyber Security Committee where he also serves as a volunteer in this committee, which is made up of both public and private sector stakeholders as well as the college and university community makes recommendations to the Nevada Homeland Security Commission on Cyber security issues.

Mr. Howard has demonstrated to the IEB by clear and convincing evidence that he is suitable, and the IEB recommends that the Commission vote to find him suitable as a qualifier for MGM Springfield.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Comments?
COMMISSONER CAMERON: Well, I think it's -- first of all, it's a very clean report and so I agree with the recommendation. But, secondly, it's a really important position. I found it interesting that they do a public/private partnership in Nevada, frankly, because that's not something that I'm well aware of those two groups sharing information to have the best possible outcome from the
state. So that's just an aside when I read that.

But, again, very clean
investigation, no issues whatsoever, and I would move that we approve Mr . Howard the senior vice president of security
information officer for MGM.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any other
discussion, any other comments? All in favor? Aye.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously.

MS. LILLIOS: Thank you. So the next item on the agenda is listed as a Wynn update, and I'd like to give an update on the status of the investigation into Wynn's ongoing suitability, and that status is that the IEB's investigation is underway.

arbiter on matters affecting the gaming license. The five of you are the decision-makers regarding the gaming license. When the IEB concludes the investigation, which $I$ can assure you is a priority, you can expect that the IEB will present the evidence and any recommendations to you.

To maintain the integrity of the investigation, it's crucial that the IEB conduct it independently. The Commission will need to wait until the investigation is completed, and the evidence is presented so that all five of you are working from the same set of evidence.

An independent investigation will ensure that the Commission can maintain its impartiality so that you can carry out your decision-making function at the appropriate time in a fair and unbias manner.

It's understandable that you may be interested in detailed updates of activity or progress, but we all need to keep our eye on the greatest interest here, which is
the public interest and the integrity of the process. And I know that we're all committed to conducting the investigation in a way that ensures public confidence and the integrity of the process.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any thoughts on that?

COMMISSONER CAMERON: I thought your first point was where you say "it's best practice," it's really best practice not to update publically because it would -- it really would affect the outcome in the investigation. It will reveal what your investigative strategies and methods are, frankly, they would be much less effective. So I think that's just important to note. And, certainly, I understand and agree with that, with what you're doing.

So we will -- we certainly trust the team and know that you'll present us with a final product when you are completed with the investigation. So I just wanted to make note that that's why it's the best practice. It's really a very important
reason for that.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And just to
elaborate on that point, you made a point. Commissioner Cameron is a very experienced law enforcement official and a very experienced investigator. And when this began back, I think, at the end of last month, you made a point of talking about there needs to be the time to do this methodically and thoroughly. There was obviously tremendous interest. We have tremendous interest, the public has tremendous interest, and there is a legitimate purpose to do this as quickly as we can.

But, I think, part of our job here is to give you the space and the time to do this right. The stakes are very big. The issues are very big, a lot of people are involved. And we need to make sure that when we finally come to a decision-making process or processes, that you have had the time and space to do this absolutely right. So we encourage you to do it as quickly as
you can, and you will. But we will support you in your need to take the time to do it right. Anybody else?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, maybe
just to agree but also there is another side of this, which is as part of this process, the applicant or in this case the licensee with applicants, will have the ability to respond or clarify or whatnot as part of the process. And that's also very important for us to remain in the position that we are and let the investigative team continue with their process. Because the licensee will be afforded the opportunity to respond however they see fit if we ever get to an adjudicatory hearing or something similar. So, I think, it's also very important in terms of respecting the rights of the license holders as well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else? Okay.

MS. LILLIOS: So moving on, there is another matter involving a contribution in the amount of 2 million-dollars that was
made to the Republican Governors Association in October of 2014 by Wynn Resorts Limited. Recently, this office received a letter from three democratic candidates for Massachusetts governor inquiring about Wynn's contribution to the RGA that was made back in 2014.

That letter, which we received earlier this month, suggested that the Wynn donation may have improperly funneled campaign contributions to then
gubernatorial candidate Baker and now Governor Baker in violation of Massachusetts law.

In light of that letter that we received this month, Chairman Crosby and the Executive Director asked me to report on was the IEB aware of the contribution to the RGA at the time in 2014, whether we reviewed it and what were our conclusions.

The short answer is: Yes, the IEB did look contemporaneously in 2014 at the 2 million-dollar contribution to the RGA. We did look at whether it was a prohibited
political contribution. We worked in conjunction with our legal division, Catherine and Todd. We discussed this with our gaming consultants, Michael and Carol. We were in contact with the Massachusetts Office of Campaign and Political Finance, and we communicated with general counsel for the Republican Governors Association.

Ultimately, we concluded that based on the evidence that we reviewed, the contribution did not run a fowl of Massachusetts law. I'd like to briefly set out a time line for you to review of what we looked at in 2014.

On September 17th of 2014, the Commission made the determination to award the Region A gaming license to Wynn Mass., LLC. Two weeks later on October 1st of 2014, Wynn made the 2 million-dollar contribution to the RGA. This contribution was a matter of public record, and I should be clear that on this matter there were no efforts by Wynn to conceal the contribution.

That same day, October 1st 2014, the RGA made a 1.1 million-dollar contribution to the Commonwealth Future Independent Expenditure Political Action Committee. And on October 10th 2014, the RGA made another 1.1 million-dollar contribution to the Commonwealth Future PAC. This PAC paid for ads supporting then Republican candidate Baker. The current concern in the letter is that, in essence, the Wynn donation to the RGA funded the Baker campaign. Our review did not find evidence to support this.

There are two statutes at issue that we reviewed in our analysis, and there is a memo in your packet that follows these two provisions. The first is Chapter 23k Section 46, which is part of the gaming law. That section prohibits applicants for gaming licenses from making certain political contributions.

The rational for that provision, I think, is pretty obvious. It's that no company or person while the application
process for a casino license is pending should be permitted to influence or potentially influence the award of the license by making any political contribution, and the Commission enforces that provision in the gaming law.

As I stated earlier, the contribution to the RGA was not made until after the Commission determined to award the license to Wynn, thus Wynn was no longer an applicant on October 1st 2014. The determination had been made by the Commission, and the Commission had had its final vote. So this restriction on political contributions by gaming applicants was no longer in effect with respect to Wynn.

The second provision of law that is applicable here is Chapter 55 Section 7AC. This provision is part of the Commonwealth's campaign finance law. It applies to gaming licensees, and it prohibits gaming licensees from making political contributions in an aggregate
amount over $\$ 200$ to any one candidate or a candidate's committee or any other political committee that is subject to Massachusetts law. And that provision in Chapter 55 is enforced by the Office of Campaign and Political Finance.

Under this law Wynn, as a gaming licensee, would have been prohibited from contributing to the Baker campaign or contributing to the Commonwealth Future PAC. The evidence that we reviewed did not show that Wynn's contribution to the RGA did either of these things. The RGA is clearly not a candidate or candidate's committee under Section 7A. And, also, the RGA is not a political committee subject to Massachusetts law under this statutory scheme.

We learned that the RGA is a nonprofit organization organized under Section 527 of the Internal Revenue Code of federal code. 527s, as they are known as, generally work to actively influence elections and policy debates but do not
generally advocate directly for the election or defeat of specific candidates.

We learned from our independent research and from our gaming consultants that it is not unusual for gaming companies to make contributions to national party committees, both the RGA and the DGA, for example, and that these organizations are sophisticated multistate organizations.

It is true that the RGA made 2.2 million-dollars in donations to the Commonwealth Future PAC within ten days of the 2 million donation from Wynn to the RGA. So it is understandable that someone might speculate that the money was funneled from Wynn to the RGA to the Commonwealth Future PAC. And I put funneled in quotes. However, the public record of contributions shows that in the six and a half month period between May 28, 2014 and December 19, 2014, the RGA made 11 separate contributions to the Commonwealth Future PAC totaling over 10 million-dollars. Six of them came before October 1, and four of
them came after October 1.
Also, general counsel for the RGA informed us that the Wynn donation was placed in an account that the RGA used for general expenses, that the contribution was not used for political candidates, and that no funds from the Wynn contribution to the RGA were distributed to the Commonwealth Future PAC or to Governor Baker's campaign. We credited these statements. The information from the general counsel of the RGA was consistent with our own research and with the information provided to us by our consultants.

The evidence of the substantial sums that the RGA contributed to the Commonwealth Future PAC in this time frame, which were well in excess of Wynn's donation to the RGA, taken in conjunction with the common practices of the RGA with respect to gaming funds and the representations of the general counsel for the RGA persuaded the IEB that the Wynn donation to the RGA did not amount to a
prohibited contribution under Chapter 55.
I also note, as I noted in the memo, that the IEB was in contact with the Office of Campaign and Political Finance back in 2014 about this matter and that the OCPF, which enforces Chapter 55, has not initiated any adverse action against Wynn under Section 7A of its statute.

So to be clear, during the period when Wynn was an applicant, the IEB confirmed that it made no prohibited contributions under the gaming law. And so that goes back to the period when it was an applicant. We look during the application period at what, if any, contributions are made during the applicant period, and that information is part of the Wynn suitability report. So there were no prohibited contributions during the period when Wynn was an applicant.

And based on the information that we reviewed back in 2014, I'm satisfied that there was no contravention of Massachusetts law and no lack of compliance based on the
information that we reviewed at that time. Of course I understand that monitoring political contributions by our licensees is important, and it's especially important as we enter a new election season.

And with that said, as we have said many times before, suitability is ongoing. And if additional details, additional facts, additional evidence come to our attention, we will pursue them aggressively. Essentially, that is my report to compliment the memo in your packet about what we did back in 2014.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Comments?
COMMISSONER CAMERON: So the work was done at the time that all of these contributions were made, because you wanted to make sure; is that correct?

MS. LILLIOS: That's correct.
COMMISSONER CAMERON: Wanted to make sure that everything was legal. And this new letter came to light, and what you did now was review the work that was done then and in doing that review, conducting that
review, nothing has changed, correct?
MS. LILLIOS: Based on the review of the evidence as it stood then, we continue to be satisfied with the conclusions that we made.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: And you just said, which $I$ think is important, if you received credible information that you did not have in the past about an allegation of distributed funds that may or may not have been illegal, you would take a second look. MS. LILLIOS: Absolutely, of course. COMMISSONER CAMERON: Thank you. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else? COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Just to follow-up from what Commissioner Cameron said, perhaps stating it slightly a different way, has anything come to the IEB's attention since the initial investigation was done in 2014 which in any way affects the conclusions which the IEB came to in 2014 in regards to this?

MS. LILLIOS: There has been no additional information that has come to our
attention. But should any additional information come to our attention, we would pursue it.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: And in the course of your investigation, did you determine whether the RGA has any particular policies with regard to earmarking of contributions from individuals or entities and subsequent contributions to political action committees?

MS. LILLIOS: It is our understanding based on our research that there is no earmarking to particular candidates.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: When you
say "there is no earmarking," you understand that they have a policy that forbids that?

MS. LILLIOS: That's my understanding, correct.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else?
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And one of the things that $I$ just picked up as part of
this is that the contribution came from Wynn Resorts, not from Mr. Wynn himself; is that --

MS. LILLIOS: It came from Wynn Resorts, which is a qualifying entity for the Wynn Mass. license. And with that designation, Wynn Resorts would still be subject to the two statutes in question.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Am I
remembering correctly that when you did the initial work, and I think part of your finding was over many, many years they've made many contributions to both republican and democratic organizations.

MS. LILLIOS: That is my
recollection as well.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is sort of a technicality, but it's clear that Wynn was not an applicant when the contribution was made. And for our purposes, that's by far the biggest issue, that we were in that sort of funny period between the time we decided to make the award and the referendum and maybe you could argue
whether they were a licensee or not, even though they clearly were not an applicant, what's your thinking on that; how did you address that kind of --

MS. LILLIOS: You're correct --
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Just for the record, if they weren't a licensee, they could do whatever they wanted. So this is not a potential negative. It's just a peculiarity in the fact.

MS. LILLIOS: And you're pointing to the award, the agreement to award the license which was made in that time frame where there was a valid question looming within, $I$ think, 60 to 90 days from the agreement to award the license. So your award was done in the form of an agreement to award. And as I recall, it was because, otherwise, Wynn would be required to submit a nonrefundable 85 million-dollar fee potentially 90 days later to have gaming, you know, not allowable in the Commonwealth.

So for purposes of the analysis
under Section 46 of the Gaming Law, I did look at it as a binary. Your Section 46 talks about being an applicant. It doesn't talk about being an applicant or a licensee. It talks about no applicant shall do this. So it was under the analysis for 46 a binary concept. And when --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Binary meaning applicant or not.

MS. LILLIOS: Applicant or not. So given what the award of the license said and given the final vote of the Commission, it was viewed -- we viewed it as Wynn was no longer an applicant certainly for purposes of 46 .

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. My recollection is that they were licensees. They were just a conditional licensee on that fee, under consideration of the fee because --

MS. BLUE: Our regulations provide that your decision is made when the vote is taken. So once you voted to award them a
licensee, they became a licensee.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, they were. So even by our own regs. they were a licensee.

MS. BLUE: Your decision is it's when you take the vote, the decision becomes effective.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. That answers that question. Okay, good. Anybody else questions on this issue or anything else for Counselor Lillios?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No. Thanks for your memo. It's pretty well articulated.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, it's always refreshing to have something come up and say I'm going to look back and see how we handled that and look back and see how we handled it the way we would have liked to have handled it, so good job. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I think it would also be helpful, obviously there's an ongoing restriction on donations of employees of our licensees going forward. We don't track that. CPF does that. It
may make sense to, as we approach another election cycle that, you know, a reminder be sent to our licensee to that piece of the statute, not the applicant piece but the licensee piece.

MS. LILLIOS: That's correct. And we are implementing a protocol now to do those routine checks, even though it's a statute that we do not enforce and it's those communications with those CPF about this arrangement. But like we did in the first round for initial suitability, we made those inquiries of both CPF. It's pretty easy to do and it's public information, so we have incorporated that as part of our ongoing reviews of suitability.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else?
Okay. We are going to take a break before we get on with the rest of the meeting. We will reconvene in just a few minutes.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Thank you.
Well done.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Thank you.
(A recess was taken)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are ready to reconvene Public Meeting Number 236 at about 1:35 or 40 , and we are onto Item No. 4, Mr. Connelly, director of our licensing bureau and associates.

MR. CONNELLY: So yet again, I think I've cleared a room with my topics. Good afternoon.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You've got others that clear them faster than you do. We have a bunch of them. Wait until we get to the regs.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: This is exciting stuff.

MR. CONNELLY: Exactly. So here today with Pat Madamba and Marikate Murren from MGM to present on this topic, because we wanted to reflect that this really was a collaborative effort between us and MGM to work through this exemption issue, and I
wanted to upfront thank them for all their help in this process.

So we're here today to present
recommendations to the Commission to exempt certain gaming service employee positions from the registration requirement. I wanted to speak a little bit about the process as to how we got here.

So at the outset when the law was changed and passed to allow the Commission to exempt certain employees, we went through, frankly, all of the SER positions and went through them, you know, internally and also with MGM to gain a deeper understanding as to the specific job functions of each of these positions as well as where they sat in the hierarchy overall so that we'd have a better understanding when we might eventually approach making those recommendations.

At the January 18th meeting, Director Wells was here and spoke to you about the process in general as well as putting forward some criteria for
consideration, so criteria that we might use when we evaluate positions to make recommendations.

At that time, the Commission
provided feedback and further guidance on those conditions, and we used those to produce a form that we distributed to MGM to provide us additional information on each of these positions. It was actually called the identification of potential positions for exemption from the registration requirement by the MGC. We call it the PPE form. That's right out of federal bureaucracy there. That's why the room was cleared, exactly, as Pat notes.

So this form was important, though, because what it did was it provided us a consistent manner to gather information about each position that we might consider providing a recommendation on. It provides the Commission a consistent set of facts when you are looking at and evaluating the recommendations from licensing and IEB.

And, finally, it will provide the
records. So as we go forward, this is not obviously the last time I may or someone else may be in front of you with potential exemption recommendations, and it will give us a good record to look at to see how we made evaluations in the past.

It contained, importantly, those eight factors that were discussed at the January 18th meeting, which included whether or not a position involved work on the gaming floor, whether there were managerial responsibilities in any department, supervisory responsibilities in human resource or sales and marketing, access to secure casino back-of-the-house areas, including executive offices without security escort, responsibilities for accounting or finance relating to the gaming establishment, right access, meaning the ability to change data in a gaming-related casino database. And, finally, responsibilities that potentially impact the integrity of gaming operations, including access to confidential or
sensitive information.
So for each position, and it's all
in the packet, MGM provided feedback on all those factors for each position or consideration. So once we received that set of PPE forms, we did a further analysis and, again, worked very closely with MGM to make final recommendations, which encompassed 127 jobs with an asterisk there, and we'll get to that in a second, encompassing 870 employees. And just to note, that is nearly 60 percent, there's my Boston accent, 60 percent, 60 percent of the eligible SER positions that could have been put forward for exemption.

This is not, as I mentioned a moment ago, the end of the process. This is really the middle. I fully expect again to be in front of you with further recommendations to include some of the entertainment block employees which, I believe, and MGM can answer better than $I$, but I believe will largely be vender employees. So some of the facilities that
are part of the entertainment block be run by venders. Those employees by our reg. would be considered gaming service employees and fully expect that we'll go through the analysis of potential exempting them.

And, also, there may be additional positions as you have done your analysis that you ask us to consider that we haven't already considered. One position -actually, two positions but two different flavors that I want to point out is the position of porter, so utility and casino porters, essentially those folks that clean.

The casino porters, in particular, are focused on cleaning the gaming area, so around machines and table games. And the utility porters do, my understanding, more general cleaning but specifically if there is a bigger job, more complex job in the gaming area would come in and do that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Excuse me, is there a separate -- a different category
for people who clean elsewhere in the gaming establishment like at the movie theater or at the hotel or whatever?

MR. MADAMBA: There are several different categories of porters but the one I think Paul is specifically referencing, the utility porter, which is 16472. It's on the last page of Paul's very handy-dandy chart here. We're going to withdraw the request for an exemption for that. There was an inadvertent mistake in the information that was given to the Commission. We literally within a few minutes before the meeting we realized there was a mistake, and it's just going to be part of our continuing discussion. We want to pull 16472, which is utility porter.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So utility porters who are people that are called in apparently for big cleaning facility on the floor?

MR. MADAMBA: They are
essentially -- since it was actually my
first position in the casino industry in 1981 at Harrah's, Atlantic City.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Is that right?
MR. MADAMBA: I was a carpet cleaner at Harrah's end of my freshman year at college.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: I was a first year trooper. I didn't run into you, though.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That was probably a good sign.

MR. MADAMBA: That's probably a good thing though, right?

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Very good thing.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's why he's still here.

MR. MADAMBA: In any event, it's essentially the next step up from a porter, from an entry level porter that can clean a carpet and what have you. They used to be called heavy duty porters. Now they're utility porters, but they do have entry to the casino floor. We are continuing to
have the discussion with staff about the porters in general. So that particular porter, while it's not interchangeable with, it has some of the same duties as the casino porter position that's not on here. So that's about 46 positions. The other position is not in here. It's about 100 or so.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Between the two of you.

MR. MADAMBA: There's about 150 altogether that are up in the air. We want to continue that for discussion.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Porters that function in hotels, for example, they're on here already?

MR. MADAMBA: They are already on here as well as the ones in the restaurants, right.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So the only porters which we would think of as cleaning people are -- that have not yet been addressed are the utility porters and the regular porters who will be on the casino
floor or maybe on the casino floor.
MR. MADAMBA: They maybe on during the ordinary course of their duties --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And that's about 100 of the 625 exempt.

MR. CONNELLY: No. Of the 625, yes, it's a little over a hundred. It's a hundred and change. Again, because, as Pat pointed out, the utility porters are in there. MGM asked us to remove the exemptions and licensing agrees. And what we're doing is we're in the process of getting additional information on both of those positions, and we may come back with a further recommendation in the future.

But also to note, the compendium is really a living document. It changes on the margins right now, but there may be new positions that are created, and we may bring those forward. But there is obviously some opportunity to revisit this list, including -- and it's important to note that should you vote to exempt a position, any time the job description
changes for an exempted position or any position for that matter, the licensee must notify us of that change.

If it were a job change or changed to a job description for an exempted employee, we would review that specifically to see whether the change has any impact on our recommendation to the Commission for exemption; and if so, we'd bring it back perhaps for reconsideration to actually be classified again as a service employee registrant.

So this is not, you know, a terminal process in the sense it cannot be revisited. Any of these decisions obviously can be picked up and revisited at any time based on these circumstances.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody?
COMMISSONER CAMERON: Just listening
it sounds like it was a collaborative process. You worked well together to come up with this, and I think what's good about this from my standpoint is we have the comfort level, but we also have some things
where we have -- we have some time to assess our risk. And, I think, that's really important to a brand-new agency just so we have that level of comfort knowing what happens in other jurisdictions but $I$ think it's really important that our team have that ability and so that they, you know, they can see firsthand where the risk is and where it is not. So I appreciate the collaborative effort.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I also appreciate the collaborative work. This seems to have been done in a very expedient amount of time thinking of when the legislation passed all this work to, you know, compile all the information, take a look at some serious level of detail at each position, how it met our guidelines or didn't meet our guidelines. So, I thank you, Paul, and your team as well as the team from MGM.

I do think, you know, I'm encouraged by the numbers. I'm somewhat surprised and excited by the numbers of positions that
are now going to be available for folks who prior to the change, might have found themselves on the outside looking in in a career changing opportunity or life changing opportunities, so I think that, you know, the headcount that you've come to agreement on is encouraging. It's certainly going to get a lot of folks out there hopefully with action today to start, you know, going onto Skill Smart and putting their information in now knowing that they're eligible.

A couple of caveats to that is we obviously know that MGM, our licensee, also has your own background process that each employee is going to be required to go through for many of these positions. And, I think, as we think about a public education effort about what this change means and how it's going to impact the people out there looking for a career at MGM, that we need to be mindful of the public education effort as to what the change means but what it still entails.

I had two quick questions to our licensees. Your workforce development plan was great at pulling out a couple of different positions that showed kind of a career pathway up the ladder. A lot of what's contained in here, you're a great example, was an entry level position into the industry.

Does MGM see Career Pathways associated with any, all of these jobs as people think about getting into a position knowing that it has the opportunity to lead them somewhere?

MS. MURREN: For sure. And that has been the reason why we've had this conversation to begin with with staff is that if these are the positions that really are the gateway into the industry with us at MGM Resorts International, in general, but with Springfield specifically in mind and they are the gateway. These are the positions that once you are part of that family, there is tuition reimbursement. We will help people get their high school
diploma.
So that workforce once you're part of that family is critical, Commissioner, in each position. And, I think, knowing now that $P$ at was in that entry level, he might be his picture, just like so many on Facebook and Twitter, to really show that progression because that's what the company is about. We strive for that.

There is people around this table that have started off in different industries, started at lower positions, have moved their way up and we need to celebrate that success so people in Springfield can see that and see their lives are going to change and their family dynamics.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: There were -- as I read through all of these, and I saw Paul wince when $I$ told him I did that, but there were two positions I'd like to ask you about. One is job position 16703, the assistant manager of restaurant sommelier, if I've got that correct.

MS. MURREN: Sommelier.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Shows you how much I drink wine. And 10946, director of restaurants. These two positions look like they have responsibilities that tied into our guidelines. The assistant restaurant manager, how does that tie into the guideline around responsibility for alcohol, sales, distribution, service and storage?

And the director of restaurants look like it might bump up against our guideline around managerial responsibility, whether somebody was hiring, training, overseeing the operations, more of a senior level position than maybe I would have expected it. But if you can give me your thought process on this.

MS. MURREN: Sure. So from a director of restaurant's perspective, that position does report up directly to Anthony Carizola, who is our vice president of food and beverage. So we've got food and beverage, food on one side, beverage on the
other. So there will be a lead commissioner, and that is the director of restaurants.

It's more of the implementation
because that strategy does come from the vice president perspective. Though, you are correct. There are reporting structures up into that director, because they will come from the other outlets up into the director of restaurants. So that is more of the admin. side, and then we've got leads within the outlets themselves.

So if you can imagine very similar from a corporate perspective, you have the admin., the executives on one side and then you have people running the facilities, specifically like a Macmacs, right.

So there is managerial
responsibilities there. But from a
purchasing of alcohol perspective, that is driven by our director of beverage and that position is service.

MR. CONNELLY: And that was, Commissioner Stebbins, that was one of the
perspectives we took when we looked at the positions as well is even in potential areas where, you know, it may seem farther away from gaming, we still wanted to make sure at a managerial level we were capturing someone so that from a compliance perspective we had someone who is responsible to the Commission from a licensing and registration perspective for a particular unit.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Do you want to talk about the other stuff, the assistant restaurant manager?

MR. MADAMBA: What we did capture was the person above, one above that person. The way that exemption worked was in the outlets, the person that is the head of or responsible for a particular outlet, there was no exemption for work. And then at the assistant level, we requested the exemption for that person. But we still had someone that was responsible to the Commission -- looking up responsible to the Commission and looking
into the outlet responsible for the overall activities of the outlet.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I actually
wanted to also mention that $I$ was very encouraged by the numbers and the process as others have mentioned. But also in this particular instance that there are some higher level positions that are exempted here, which I find very encouraging. Not only for -- I initially had the impression that the majority, and they have been, would be exempted at the bottom of the pyramid, if you will, but there is at least a semblance of a career track or the beginning of one in this exemptions, which I think is very positive, a couple of the ones mentioned before but, you know, some executive decisions because they happen to be in the food or the retail or the entertainment wing, so I think it's very positive.

MR. CONNELLY: That was the whole analysis was done based on the qualities of the job as opposed to who we might be able
to fill out that position.
COMMISSONER CAMERON: I just had a quick question about your internal background process. Do you outsource that or is that something you handle internally?

MS. MURREN: We do outsource it. It is a third-party vender called Hire Right, and they do our drug and background screening after job offer.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: National firm?
MS. MURREN: Yes.
COMMISSONER CAMERON: And you've had good success with them?

MS. MURREN: Yes, we have.
MR. MADAMBA: Hire Right does the background checks for all of our properties.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I just add my voice to all the others. I'm very, very impressed by the job that was done here not only by you, Paul, and you do have a future in Washington waiting for you from the skill with which you designed these forms
and Marikate and Pat as well. I really think this is an extraordinary job and the thought that 870 service employees are now free of that automatic exclusion on account of minor, potentially minor conviction in an early part of their career is really very important for our larger workforce development calls. I think it's a great job.

MR. CONNELLY: And I just want to point out, too, it wasn't -- the commission level wasn't just me but Director Wells and Attorney Lillios delved, as they often do very, deeply into the work here. There was a bunch of us on the team involved.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: My two cent's worth also, Paul, is just -- it's really all impressive and it did happen quickly and it's great. And if you think about where we were, it's almost 1,000 jobs that are going to be available to people, which is pretty good. Do I understand correctly this will become a reg., right, that we will make this is a reg. or how do we --

MS. BLUE: No. You can vote on this today as long as you're comfortable with it. It will not become a reg. The regs. allow you to take these kind of activities.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Have we got
feedback from some of the constituent groups that worked on this with us? There were a lot of groups that were involved, community groups who represented the folks who might have a chance to work in these jobs. Have we got feedback from those folks?

MR. CONNELLY: So I received feedback through Director Griffin.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Jill, do you want to come up?

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: No.
MS. GRIFFIN: Truthfully?
COMMISSONER CAMERON: Jill, you need a mic.

MS. GRIFFIN: Thank you. The community groups that you're referring to have been following this very closely. I'd be very surprised if they weren't watching
now, and I think they're very encouraged.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. I mean, they helped us get this law changed. I'm not sure we would had they not pitched in, and it's important to get their feedback. For the most part, it makes perfectly good sense to me. I think the standards that we came up with make good sense. This is a sensitive area. It was a learning curve as Commissioner Cameron talked about.

The only one that $I$ have an issue with in my mind is the bartenders and waitstaff who serve alcohol either in general or particularly those who are not on the casino floor. I think if you're going to do a registration of porters on the casino floor, you're clearly going to do people who serve alcohol on the casino floor. I'm fine with that.

But there will be some number of jobs, $I$ don't know, 10, 20,30 probably who will be off the casino floor like in the entertainment block and the Armory when it gets done who will be bartenders and
waitstaff that really are the kind of entry level jobs that we've been talking about, this same category of people.

And, personally, it doesn't feel to me inconsistent if we carve those folks out from our other criteria. In fact, it seems to be consistent with our criteria. But these are the criteria we came up and I'm just wondering what you all, and anybody else for that matter, think at this point would it be worth -- I know you're going to be rethinking all this all the time. You have other things you're considering. Would that be one to think about also?

COMMISSONER CAMERON: For me this comes back to the risk. These are our licenses to issue. This is our first time issuing licenses. And just from my past experience with risk in casinos that folks like the bartenders, they can present a risk in a number of areas, so...

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Who don't have contact with the casino floors.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Correct,
correct. So I just think it's important for us to start conservatively and issue these licenses with an understanding of the people that we're dealing with and, again, continue to assess the risk.

But, yes, I am familiar with a, just to set the tone, that those folks are -we've taken a look. And then if we don't have a problem down the road, that would be something to consider. But right now I'm comfortable with because of our license and because of my knowledge of things that have happened in the past that may have implicated bartenders or waitstaff, frankly, so I'm comfortable the way it is. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do you guys have any thoughts about that from your experience or anybody else?

MS. MURREN: We worked with Paul and his staff and we are very, very comfortable with the solution and what is put forth in front of you today. And as Paul said, we'll continue to have these conversations moving forward.

MR. MADAMBA: And we'll certainly have a continuing conversation as we develop the entertainment block as well. It might be appropriate there, but the process of the staff just has been an excellent process.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Because the entertainment block people, many of them will be third parties, right? They are not included in these.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No, they would be.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, they will be but they're not yet.

MR. MADAMBA: Their positions are not in there.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So if there were going to be 100 employees at a movie theater, those numbers aren't in here who will be exempt and who will not be exempt, which would be pretty much covered by the people I'm talking about, too, as a practical matter.

MR. MADAMBA: Essentially what's
left is some of the entertainment block, and there's still a question as to whether there will be some or all of them will be operated by third parties. So you have that pull of employees, and then you have the utility porter and the casino porter. They're the big chunks that are left. We already addressed the utility porter, casino porter. We still need to have a discussion about the entertainment block.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All of us have another bite at that apple. And I refer to the Armory. But at the moment, the Armory won't be programmed, right, so there won't be personnel assigned to the Armory other than to hopefully lease it out to people to pay you tons of money.

MR. MADAMBA: Correct. But we do believe in either March or April we will come back with some further suggestions when we fill out the program.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We will get to this. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I just wanted
to answer your --
MR. STRATTON: Could I just make one clarification?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Seth Stratton.
MR. STRATTON: Yes. We will be back here on the 15th, but $I$ just don't -- the comment that the Armory won't be programmed, $I$ think it will be programmed and we look forward to presenting to you on the 15th how it will be, just not in a traditional sense with staffing and the compendium of employees.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's what I meant. At the moment, there isn't a bunch of staff that we need to deal with.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You know, I have been as liberal as you have been, Mr. Chairman, on this topic in terms of exempting from the get-go. I think, as I mentioned before, this is a great result. The numbers are very encouraging. I would side with your comment, Commissioner Cameron, about starting now, wait and see.

The best piece of this process that

I didn't mention that, $I$ think, is very encouraging as well is that we have the ability to come and redo. You can put in somebody else, another job description, you can take them out and we could do this as a matter of course as we get more comfortable about some of the details and some of the how -- especially how some of the duties overlap, because not any one person operates an --

So, I think, that as we continue, we may learn and get a lot more comfortable in certain sort of key areas. But for now, I think this is a fantastic result in terms of the numbers. 60 percent is a big, great result. And, I think, another big positive is that it will allow us in terms of resources to really focus on the thing that we really want to and need to and those are other positions, which is to get those right because we know we have, you know, a job to do there.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right, great.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I also and,
once again, I'm impressed by the numbers. I think they exceeded what my expectations were going to be, which is great news, again, for anybody who may have felt themselves on the outside looking in. And I would ask that, you know, those positions that I highlighted, we kind of flag those and kind of continue to monitor those. Again, you know, we're being -- unlike my liberal colleague, I'm trying to be a little more conservative even though I sit to his left.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Like the workforce development one.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Well, I'm excited about this. I think this is actually -- you know, this is good news in terms -- because this is going to apply not only to MGM but is going to apply back to Plainridge Park, and right now it applies to our Region A licensee as well.

MR. CONNELLY: Correct, two points. One, I think it's important we will take a look at those positions you identified,
because the most important thing through this process is that it's consistent and rational. If it's not consistent, then it's not worth anything. And to that point, you know, we still have to talk through internally what our recommendation -- how to move this forward. But, I think, what makes the most sense based on some concerns, even regarding employment, is that this is now the model.

And what we'll do is we'll take this model, and we'll find the analogous positions that the other licensees and perform the same analysis. Frankly, without, you know, fortunately for them, without that level of collaboration, they won't have to talk to me so much. We will just tell them what the new schema looks like.

So, again, this is now depending on the vote and everything and any further guidance or further decisions this is we built the model that will be extrapolated to the other facilities.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: One thing that, you know, I want to raise and we look for MGM's help in trying to find a solution to this. When we did Plainridge, because everybody was licensed, everybody had to come in and be fingerprinted, everybody had to come in and be photographed, at that point our research team was providing questionnaire tablets to employees, help us understand where people were coming from, what their previous employment status was. We are kind of losing that, because now some of these people we won't see.

So, you know, I've had this conversation with Director Vander Linden. We need to think how we can do that in partnership with you to make sure that we're capturing all this good information, we're capturing all this good research so that when we go back to stakeholders, we can show them that the Expanded Gaming Statute kind of met the job hopefuls or the job prospects that the legislation intended, so we need to work on that piece
and hopefully do that with you.
MS. MURREN: And just a little update, Commissioner, we do have Mark and the team coming in, I think, the second week of March. And Paul and I and the team were on a call, $I$ think, three or four weeks ago discussing this very thing that they won't have access to some people coming through. So we're going to come up with a plan to make sure we can get the survey and results and working as a good partner with that side of the house also.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: That's great. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else?
Great, thank you very much. Great job. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'll make a motion.

MS. BLUE: I would say that the easiest way for you to make a motion is to move to accept what's in the packet minus position number 16472, because that has been withdrawn by MGM.

MR. CONNELLY: And just as a point
too, it's being withdrawn by us because we are -- the Commission is -- we would -staff puts forward the recommendations, so just to clarify. They were being nice enough to ask for it. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr. Chairman, I would move that the Commission approve the Gaming Service Employee Exemptions as provided in the packet with the exception of position 16472.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Second. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any discussion further? All in favor? Aye. COMMISSONER CAMERON: Aye. COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously. Thank you. Great job.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Thank you all. MR. CONNELLY: Thank you very much. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are onto No. 5,
legal division, General Counsel Blue. Now you're going to get an empty house. MS. BLUE: So in your packet today you have six regulations for your review and approval. The first one, the amendments to 205 CMR 138.10 was actually the change that was mentioned in the past by Director Connelly. This is the change that will require licensees to advise the IEB when they make changes in job description, file them so they can be reviewed.

We're asking on this change for you to approve it on an emergency basis. You approved the prior change to allow for the change in the law on an emergency basis so we could implement it. We're asking for you to do the same here.

We'll note that starting today what we would like you to do is take each regulation in two motions, one to approve either the small business or amended small business impact statement first, and then to approve the actual regulation or
amendments to the regulation. And I've drafted some suggested motions for you to try to make that simpler. So we're asking for your vote on the changes here to 138.10, Jobs Compendium Submission.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Make a motion?
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I will move
that the Commission approve the Small
Business Impact Statement for 205 CMR 138.10, Jobs Compendium Submission, as included in the packet.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Discussion? All
in favor? Aye.
COMMISSONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: And I
further move that the Commission approve the amendments to 205 CMR 138.10 as included in the packet and authorize the
staff to file the regulation on an emergency basis pursuant to Chapter 23K Section 5B, and further to take steps necessary to file the regulations with the Secretary of the Commonwealth and to proceed with the formal regulation promulgation process.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Discussion? All in favor? Aye.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously.

MS. BLUE: The next set of amendments we'd like you to consider is on the agenda it's listed as Item C. It's 205 CMR 133.04. This is where we took out the six-month period on the voluntary self-exclusion list. We would ask you to approve the amended small business impact statement in that final regulation
amendment for the final promulgation process.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I had a question or perhaps a potential edit. We did take out the six months exclusion list, which is great and I think there are other reasons as well, 133.04. But in the Subsection E, the lifetime remains and the language goes on to say that an individual may only select a lifetime registration after they had been on the self-exclusion list for at least six months. Should that read now at least one year, because there has only been -- my reading of the prior regulation was that you had to have served at least one --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: At least the short-term first.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: At least one of the terms without it now existing I submit to you that it should be at least one year, meaning that it really is one of the prior options, one of the other options, not lifetime.

MS. BLUE: So we did not have that conversation with the responsible gaming folks. We can certainly have that and come back to you with that change. If that's what they were thinking, they did not advise us that they were thinking along those lines. So I would suggest we approve this change, and then we'll go back and talk to our responsible gaming team and see what they think.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And I'm fine doing that. I just remember, as being one of the Commissioners involved in this, is that the notion was that somebody would go first through a self-exclusion, that would conclude. There will be an exit interview, which is important as part of the whole rehabilitation process, and then somebody might then decide to do a lifetime which was -- anyway, but if we could --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's a very good point. It makes no sense to have it in six months. It either should not be there at all, because now it's a full year or it
should say a full year, because that's the only other option, but that's a very good point.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Because there would be no exit interview in six months.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. That would imply that somebody could get in the list eventually directly just by going through any one of them, and then after six months getting into a lifetime without that exit interview.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I was starting to say could we adopt this amendment subject to General Counsel Blue working out the wording? But there are some issues in that actually whether we would extend it to a year. That makes -- a person comes in and says I want to go on a lifetime, we'd say, sorry, you have to wait a year before you can go on a lifetime. I'm not sure that's a good idea. I think that is something we need to think about.

MS. BLUE: I think there's a number of ways -- that's why I would like to talk
to the responsible gaming folks. There's a lot of ways that you could approach this. It wouldn't be necessary for someone to -if they picked a year, for example, on their first voluntary self-exclusion, if at the end of six months they wanted to extend it to a lifetime, I'm not sure you necessarily need an exit interview. You could have a conversation with the GameSense people, the voluntary self-exclusion folks and make that decision. So, I think, it is a little more complicated than just they were synched up to match, and I would like their input on that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think it would be better that we don't vote on that. Let's just wait, because it won't be this. It will be something different, and then maybe something we want to talk about. So why don't we see if we can get it on the agenda for the 1st.

MS. BLUE: What we need to
understand is we have taken this all the
way through the hearing process to make greater changes to this. We will start the process again. That will mean the six months is still available to people who want to select it. So we understand, it will be the same reg. in place for a little while longer without the changes we're suggesting.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'm sorry I didn't know this earlier, but that's a great clarification.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm with you. But the reason we're doing this is to adapt it to the regional, as you know, to the regional voluntary self-exclusion, which isn't in place yet. So I think another -extending it for another whatever isn't going to be a big problem. All right. So let's wait on this one. Thank you.

MS. BLUE: The next regulation is 205 CMR, and it's a couple of regulations that have amendments to address floor plan issues. And I'm going to let Deputy General Counsel Grossman describe this to
you.
MR. GROSSMAN: Good afternoon.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good afternoon.
COMMISSONER CAMERON: Good
afternoon.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good afternoon.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Good afternoon.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good afternoon.

MR. GROSSMAN: The regulation before you pertains to the gaming -- excuse me -to the floor plan that has to be submitted by gaming licensees to the Commission. By way of background, you'll recall that at present there is a requirement that a floor plan be submitted to the Commission.

What this proposal does is divorces that requirement from the operations certificate and puts it under the internal controls. That will be done in an effort to streamline the process and give both the licensees and the IEB more flexibility to
maneuver and to allow for amendments to floor plans and changes of that nature as opposed to tying it to the operation certificate, which requires a full
presentation to the Commission and what have you.

So that was the impedence for this change. And in the process of doing so, of course, we went through the existing floor plan requirements and streamlined some of those provisions and took out some things that we didn't think we really needed in there, and that's how we landed where we landed with this.

You'll see of course that we received some comments from Plainridge Park Casino on the proposal. Mr. Band and I have gone through all of the comments. We are content, as a general matter, that the proposal you have before you is still sound, and that it should generally remain as it is in that it's in existence at the moment. We really haven't changed much of anything at all.

We could certainly work with them to ensure that they understand the requirements. They have a floor plan at the moment that has been approved that meets these requirements. So with the exception of one area that I'll point out, we're not suggesting that any modifications be made to the existing draft.

So if approved, essentially this will just become part of the internal control procedure. It would have to be submitted by both MGM and Wynn in the future as part of the submission of their internal controls and could be amended in accordance with the terms here.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Todd, just getting clarification on your -- on the format here. In green we've got the PPC comments. Was any of the language -- is the language that is in red here, which is the proposed language, does that incorporate in any instance the comments that were made by PPC?

MR. GROSSMAN: No, it doesn't. The
red language is all the original language that was initially presented to the Commission and brought through the promulgation process through the public hearing. PPC simply inserted their comments in green in the draft as to highlight what they were. But we haven't --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And they are in red because when you highlighted this because we're essentially just taking them out of the operation certificate section and putting them in the internal controls. So there has be no change to the actual language that was there before. There has only been a -- or has there been?

MR. GROSSMAN: That's true as a general matter. We did certainly clarify some provisions. For example, when it comes to temporary amendments to the floor plan, that's on page two, towards the bottom, we clarified that process as it was my understanding that, you know, there was some uncertainty as to exactly how that
would work.
Now we set out a very specific
process for the temporary amendment of a floor plan, and we set out specific time frames for the allowance of a temporary amendment, at which point you'd have to apply for a permanent amendment if you wanted to and things of that nature.

So I wouldn't represent to you that this is identical to the previous version, but certainly the essence of it is the same. It's the same content. And a lot of the items that have to be reflected in the floor plan itself are essentially identical.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: But you've take into account what PPC had asked you to think about at least, and you're comfortable with the text that you are proposing here.

MR. GROSSMAN: We are comfortable.
There was one word that we would add in here to clarify one of the areas, which we thought could use some further
clarification. On page two in Provision $K$, which is up about a third of the way down, they asked whether essentially an automated coupon redemption machine is the same as $M$, which is a gaming voucher redemption machine.

We'll suggest that by adding the word "kiosk" into Provision K so it would read, "automatic coupon redemption machine or kiosk," that that will help clarify that we are referring to something other than the gaming voucher that may be on the floor.

But, otherwise, we're of the opinion that everything really stands on its own. We could certainly, as with any regulation, spend pages and pages explaining exactly what we mean by everything. But we think, you know, some things kind of stand on their own and we can work with.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We kind of like to have that authority ourselves anyway.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: And most of their comments are asking for more detail,
right?
MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
COMMISSONER CAMERON: That's the majority of their comments. So you provided some of that and other parts of this you feel like you could do with them independently with this document.

MR. GROSSMAN: I think the IEB can work with PPC to ensure that their floor plan is adequate and meets the requirements of the regulation as it's written without really any conflict or anything like that.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Is it a different person than the original --

MR. BAND: Yes.
COMMISSONER CAMERON: So you work with one person who did the original --

MR. BAND: Yes. And we'll work with this individual so they have a better understanding. Todd and I actually went over their floor plan today and everything that we need is in there and, you know, there wasn't any deficiency.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: The language
that kind of struck me that PPC had a question about is the kind of the opening section where it says, "gaming area depicted in the floor plan shall be arranged in such a manner as to provide optimum security for the gaming operations" and what's optimum security is kind of a subjective question. What is the necessity are you experiencing to drive that in? MR. BAND: Well, just for the table floor layout isn't subject to, you know, robberies, thefts, I mean, that kind of thing. So you'd want to look for the optimal security.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, it's those things I really wouldn't want us to go down the path of trying to define each and every one of those terms that have to be very case specific, especially in light of the fact that we already have a plan -from the people who commented that complies with everything that we've got we wanted. So where are we on this process; is there a
motion we need to move to --
MS. BLUE: There is a motion. This
is to take it through the final
promulgation process. We have an amended small business.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Mr. Chair, I
move that the Commission approve the Amended Small Business Impact Statement from 205 CMR 138.07, 138.66 and 151.01, floor plans, as included in the packet. COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Second. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Discussion? All in favor? Aye.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: I also move that the Commission approve the final version of the 205 CMR 138.07, 138.66 and 151.01 as included in the packet and authorize the staff to take all steps
necessary to file the regulation with the Secretary of the Commonwealth and to complete the regulation promulgation process.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Discussion? All in favor? Aye.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously.

MS. BLUE: The next regulation on our list is 205 CMR 138.20, that's possession of firearms. You might remember from this regulation that we actually included the language in the reg. that has to appear in the sign, and we've promulgated the reg. We put in Plainridge Park's phone number. So, clearly, that's not the right phone number for everyone. So what we've done is change this reg. to leave the sign language with a blank so
that the appropriate facility's phone number can be included.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Discussion?
Questions? Motions?
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr. Chair, I
move that the Commission approve the
Amended Small Business Impact Statement for 205 CMR 138.20, possession of firearms, as included in the packet.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
COMMISSONER CAMERON: Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Discussion? All
in favor? Aye.
COMMISSONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I move that the Commission approve the final version of 205 CMR 138.20 as included in the packet and authorize the staff to take all steps necessary to file the regulation with the

Secretary of the Commonwealth and complete the regulation formulation process.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is . 2 not .02, okay. Any discussion? All in favor? Aye.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously.

MS. BLUE: The next regulation before you is a series of changes to a couple of regulations regarding unsecured funds and gaming day, and I'll leave that to Mr. Grossman. We've brought this before you before. We've made some changes as there has been an update as well.

MR. GROSSMAN: You'll recall that this was before you at the last meeting. There was a comment raised by MGM relative to our gaming day proposal. We have since reviewed this and they have reviewed this,
and they are now content with the proposal as written. So we are not recommending any further changes to that. And if you adopt it as it's written with a six a.m. to 5:59 gaming day. So that's the first piece of this proposal.

The second piece of the proposal deals with unsecured funds, which you'll recall are is essentially cash or whatnot that's located in the slot machine during a drop or collections that didn't make it into the drop-box and how that particular currency or tickets are handled. We set that forth here.

We also have provisions in here that deal with the event of any overage or underage during the count process and how that gets handled. So those are contained here, too. We do have one proposed change based on a comment we received from Plainridge Park Casino, and you'll see that reflected at the bottom of page one where we have crossed out some language and then included some new language in green on page
three.
Essentially what we were doing is saying that instead of counting an overage as unsecured funds, that essentially we sweep into our control, they will become part of the investigation that gets performed by the casino similar to that that would be done in the case of underage or lack of proper funds based upon the meter read. They'd investigate it and report back to us as to the source.

So that's the one change that we are recommending to you that came through as part of the comment period. Otherwise, we would recommend that the Commission approve these changes to be adopted.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do I have a discussion? Do I have a motion? The issue of gaming day that MGM raised, this didn't correspond with their gaming day, right? That was the problem.

MR. GROSSMAN: It was, but it was sorted out.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So they ended up
figuring that out, okay. Do I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Sure. I'll be happy to move that the Commission approve the Amended Small Business Impact Statement for 205 CMR 138.28, 138.33, 138.68 and 140.02, unsecured funds on gaming day, as included in the packet.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
discussion? All in favor? Aye.
COMMISSONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And I further move that the Commission approve the final version of 205 CMR 138.28, 138.33, 138.68 and 140.02 as included in the packet and authorize the staff to take all steps necessary to file the regulation with the Secretary of the Commonwealth and complete
the regulation promulgation process.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
discussion? All in favor? Aye.
COMMISSONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously.

MS. BLUE: And then the final regulation today before you is 205 CMR 141.06. This regulation there is a few technical amendments to this, but the biggest change is that it requires a licensee to notify the Commission prior to making any movement in terms of slot machines and table games.

Our original regulation said that we would get notification upon the movement, and obviously we would like to know beforehand. So we've taken this through the process, and this is the final step in promulgating these changes.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Why did we decide to do this; what difference does it make? MR. BAND: Well, every once in a while, the casino would relocate a camera we wouldn't know about it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: CCTV equipment.
MR. BAND: Yes. And, actually, the floor is set up with our approval on each one that we can adequately see each table. And if they just start to not notify us and move it around, we lose control of the floor and that sort of stuff.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I move that the Commission approve the Amended Small Business Impact Statement for 205 CMR 141.06, notice to the Commission of changes as included in the packet.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This is really
tiny, but you don't say the moving of CCTV equipment. You talk about replaced, including a change or an upgrade to system hardware. Are you talking about -- do you
mean to be talking about changing camera locations? Because it's not covered here. That isn't covered.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Any change, CCTV includes any change.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: To system hardware, change the system hardware. It's really detail.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But the hardware is the camera.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay, okay, that covers move. I think that covers move. Okay, fine. Told you it was tiny. Any further discussion? Any other useless points to make? All in favor? Aye.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All opposed? The ayes have it unanimously.

MS. BLUE: Did we have a motion on that?

COMMISSONER CAMERON: We did and I
second.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I seconded the motion.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: I moved, and I think Enrique seconded it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You need the second one.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: And, finally, thank you, I move that the Commission approve the final version of 205 CMR 141.06 as included in the packet and authorize the staff to take all steps necessary to file the regulation with the Secretary of the Commonwealth and complete the regulation promulgation process.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
discussion? All in favor?
COMMISSONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER MACDONALD: Aye.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously.

MS. BLUE: That's all we have. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you very much.

COMMISSONER CAMERON: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Counselors, is there any other business that was either unanticipated or do we have any Commissioner updates?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I actually have an update. I attended the New Horizons conference and GameSense summit in Vancouver this last week. This was my first time going. I had heard from Director Vander Linden and others that this was a great conference to attend to in the area of responsible gaming, and I was not disappointed by any means. It's a great conference and it was great to see the GameSense summit and others that are implementing GameSense around Canada and the United States in ways that we are.

I want to say something we've said before here that we continue to be
recognized as very progressive in this area by all the work that we've done. There was a delegation from Japan who was very interested in coming to visit PlayMyWay, to see PlayMyWay and as well as the GameSense face here and how that all might turn out to be with MGM. And it was very good to speak to them, and they were very impressed with some of -- some of our recent history which they draw a lot of parallels to what they are going to.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I have to say that MGM was really showcased there with their own efforts on implementing GameSense. There's a real sense of an expectation of how that is all going to work with an operator. Because up until then, it had only been bodies that -- in Canada there's PCL of course, but they have a different sort of framework for the oversight and regulation of that. And they really have what, I believe, to be a great story to tell and how quickly and
effectively they are deploying GameSense throughout all of --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: MGM.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: MGM.
Throughout all of their properties. So that's one area that $I$ think I'd be very curious to go see at some point when they deploy GameSense to some of the properties in the Northeast or Vegas because they are doing that, and they are seeing quite a bit of great feedback from both employees and customers.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I was going to comment on that, too. And incredibly valuable we are going to have research evaluation of the GameSense when it's administered by an operator, a regulator, sorry, like us versus and MGM, for example, in Maryland where they will have it just integrated only with their own M-Life program and will be able to do evaluations to see whether or not the effects and uptakes and so forth are more or less comparable, which will be great.

But I agree with you that it was appropriate to single out MGM, because they have gotten real credit, they deserve credit, on really taking a serious corporate lead on responsible gaming.

COMMISSIONER MACDONALD:
Commissioner Zuniga, at the conference, was there any discussion of the introduction and employment of the play management tools like PlayMyWay?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Absolutely.
Actually, Mark Vander Linden, Director Vander Linden presented in two panels. The one that I'm remembering most recently was specifically on PlayMyWay. He had really essentially the history that we are all familiar with.

Again, a lot of great questions relative to, from the audience, relative to the fact that we are the first ones to do that in the United States. There is a lot of people from Canada and elsewhere in that conference, but they recognized that our context is slightly different. And a lot
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