COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION
PUBLIC MEETING NO. 245

## CHAIRMAN:

Stephen P. Crosby

COMMISSIONERS:
Eileen O'Brien

Gayle Cameron
Bruce W. Stebbins

Enrique Zuniga

June 21, 2017 10:04 a.m.
MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION
101 Federal Street, 12th Floor
Boston, Massachusetts 02110

Darlene M. Coppola, RPR, RMR, CRR

## CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good

morning. We are calling to order Public Meeting No. 245, on Thursday, June 21, 2018 at our offices on Federal Street.

The first item, as always, the minutes.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Sure, Mr. Chairman. When the agenda was posted, we thought we'd have the meeting minutes ready. But as you can see from looking through the packet, we are still working on those June 7 th meeting minutes. We'll have them at the next Commission meeting.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: At our next -- the next Commission meeting, which will be in Plainville on Tuesday, at 5:30, I think, where we're both going to have the Plainville report from Plainridge Park Casino, as well as a presentation of the research data that we've collected.

Now we've had two full
years -- we've had three full years of the
operation of the Plainville Ridge Park Casino, and we've done very, very extensive research on the social and economic impacts of that casino on Plainville and its surrounding communities in the first two years. And we decided it would be a good idea to go back to Plainville and the surrounding communities where we had several meetings before the casino and report back to the people from Plainville and surrounding communities on precisely what the social and economic impacts have been.

So we're going to have a special meeting next Tuesday night, in Plainville, at 5:30.

It will also be streamed live on the web.

Where's the meeting at? Is it at town hall?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No, it's at the senior center.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The senior
center in Plainville, Tuesday at 5:30.

Great. And we will have the minutes then.
Next up, Executive Director
Bedrosian.
MR. BEDROSIAN: Good
morning, Commissioners.
Just a couple of updates before I get to the MGM opening update, a couple of legal issues.

You might have seen a letter sent to us by legal representative of Mass Gaming \& Entertainment, which was the entity that an employed for the Brockton license in Region C.

They have asked the Commission to specifically reconsider the Brockton license.

The staff is working -- and that, obviously, implicates --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The
Brockton application?
MR. BEDROSIAN: Yes, the Brockton application. Yes, thank you, the Brockton application for the regency license.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
MR. BEDROSIAN: That,
obviously, implicates a lot of sort of regency issues.

I've been working with the legal department staff. I would anticipate that we would come back in front of the Commission at our next meeting or sometime in July and have a proposed response, a process for the Commission on that date for public discussion.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: July 19th?
MR. BEDROSIAN: At this
point, it looks like it will be July 19th, subject to potential movement.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
MR. BEDROSIAN: The --
another update is you might have seen that
one of principals of $F B T$ has filed a lawsuit regarding the 2013 land transaction in Everett.

Just as a reminder, this is the third lawsuit from either FBT or the principals of FBT.

The first one was against their
former lawyers. The second one was against us. The third one now is against Wynn.

We will, obviously, conduct the appropriate review of that matter and continue to monitor the litigation, but you probably have seen it. So --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Let's be
clear. The suit is by one of the land owners against Wynn, not involving us.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Correct.
Yes. The first one was against former lawyers. The second one was against us. This now third one is against Wynn, correct.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Correct.
MR. BEDROSIAN: On to the
MGM opening update.
I'm happy to tell you that things
are going along at a very expeditious
pace. The construction is going along both incredibly fast, and it's amazing to think every everything they will still
need to get done.
We were out there on Friday with our meeting, which will start to pick up in tempo with the MGM folks. We took a tour of the property.

We also have our gaming preparation school for new gaming agents and members of our gaming enforcement unit. It's been happening.

They spent the last two days here with a prominent teacher of table game cheating, giving them two days of both demonstrations and videos of various ways in which people have cheated and probably will attempt to continue the cheat in the future.

So it was both very entertaining and informative, and a little daunting to think of all the ways that people have come up with trying to cheat.
So --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But
cheaters should be aware that we know about them and all these things because we
have cameras everywhere. It's a bad place to cheat.

MR. BEDROSIAN: And that
was, I think, one of the take-aways is they just had all these video of all these things that --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
MR. BEDROSIAN: -- that
happen.
So I will tell you, also, some of these cameras were historic can views from years and years ago. And I've seen the cameras that are going into MGM Springfield. It will be night and day in terms of the quality and clarity of the cameras.

So even more of a warning.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
MR. BEDROSIAN: In terms of
our slot machine preparations: 2,500 slot
machines on premise, 2,300 -- just over 2300 are in place. The rest are probably
waiting, you know, some minor final
construction in areas before they can be
secured and put in place. 348 are actually verified. This was as of a couple of days ago.

But I know that our folks are picking up in speed and tempo. The more they do, the better they get.

So we would anticipate that we, hopefully, will have all the machines in place, verified with the state seal by approximately the third week of July.

So that is --
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I do think
it's appropriate to add a little humor here, that all of these 2,500 slot machines have been manufactured somewhere and shipped into Springfield, where upon the techs from MGM and from the Gaming Commission open them up to set them up.

One of those 2,500 new slot machines had inside it a baby possum. Where did it come from? Not a mouse. A baby possum. You will be pleased to know that it was fed and released.

Sorry. Go ahead.

MR. BEDROSIAN: I was told
to expect the unexpected in this job. So, certainly, that fulfills that.

As far as hiring goes, a report from MGM Springfield yesterday that they currently have 328 employees.

Approximately 29 percent of those are Springfield residents, but they expect that number to go up as the mass hiring starts.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: What
was the number again?
MR. BEDROSIAN: Right now,
they have 328 on board in employees. 29 percent are Springfield residents. This is probably more upper management. I think they would expect Springfield residents to help fill in some of the service employees and gaming jobs. So they expect that number to go up.

2,200 job offers made, and just under 800 left to make. And they have a -- a hiring event this week on the 18th and 19th.

They made 520 offers, and 53
percent of those were Springfield residents.

So, obviously, that's a reflection of where they think the numbers will come from.

So that is --
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: One other
gratuitous comment.
We're all, I think, being careful
to try to keep our expectations down and not count our chickens until they hatch.

But I must say that when Governor Baker went out and took the tour, Governor Baker has never been a fan of casino gambling, he was laudatory about the project and really expressed enthusiasm and excitement about what you all are trying to do or we all are trying to do, but particularly, you all.

So it's a credit. That was impressive for him to put his almost emotions on the line like he did, talking about it.

So...
We're all excited.
MR. BEDROSIAN: With that,
that is the end of my MGM update
presentation.
So I think that is it for me. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.

Next up, Mr. Connelly.
MR. CONNELLY: I think we
have a full team from MGM coming up to join me.

So two items on the agenda today.
The first is exemption requests.
Employee exemption requests.
There are 20 positions that are being put forward to you today for exemption requests.

The packet, you'll see there's 22, but two -- based on subsequent conversations we've had and a more detailed understanding of those facilities' positions and their work on the gaming floor, we're pulling those out for consideration.

So it's just the two barber and master barber MGM positions and the vendor positions that are being -- that we're recommending be considered today.

Of note, there's a number of vendor positions. So there's 18 positions for vendor employees.

What they -- what that means is there are those 18 positions for in the entertainment block really, between the movie theater Kringle Candle and Hannoush Jewelers employees that will be working within the boundaries of the gaming establishment but are working for a third-party vendor.

We're requesting that those be exempted.

But importantly, several of those positions deal with the service of alcohol particularly in the theater, and as well it's to a much more limited degree in Kringle Candle.

Now, this is an important issue and the way $I$ framed it and, frankly,
agreed with MGM, and, again, MGM is doing this really on behalf of the vendors. If the -- if the casino were operational, frankly, we would have the vendors here themselves doing it. But it's, obviously, at a point in time at which it's much easier to have MGM kind of do that up front representation in this process for the vendors.

But I am recommending that they am forwarding these to you for your consideration for the recommendation that they be exempted.

The issue as I see it, and as I thought about it, and as we discussed it collectively, is there's really two ways to look at it.

The argument many against exempting them is that these individuals will fall under the alcohol or the gaming beverage license that is still to be issued, that we administer. And so we take that very seriously, obviously.

And we would -- we don't exempt
bartenders in the casino or on the floor or in the restaurants at the casino proper. Why should we exempt these? That's an argument against.

The argument for is that, as has been mentioned numerous times, the Springfield casino is really a different kind of endeavor. And the statute probably did not contemplate the type of casino that is being put in place in Springfield, with movie theaters, with bowling alleys, with this level of additional entertainment and retail.

The statute probably didn't even contemplate pulling individuals like this into the licensing scheme.

So we should, maybe, view it that way, and that kind of weighed heavily on my thought.

As well, if there were any issues with either of these vendors or individual employees and their practices and how they dealt with alcohol service and controls, first and foremost, we would caulk to MGM,
and we would tell them that we're seeing problems or we're perceiving problems with the activities of their vendors and ask that they be corrected.

If problems persisted, you know, it could put their license in jeopardy or condition their license.

If, theoretically, one of those areas had a lot of alcohol violations, the Commission could always condition it and remove that licensed area from the license, thereby removing the ability to serve alcohol.

And, thirdly, each of these vendors is a -- is registered with us as a nongaming vendor, and that would put their registration in jeopardy if they continued to violate it.

So I say that to express that, as we thought about the issue, my concerns about licensing these individuals, given their unique roles, is much lessened because we still have a number of ways that we could exert influence and
regulatory authority over the employers, particularly, if not those specific employees through their registration.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Questions
or comments?
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes.
In having this conversation with Director Connelly, I, too, obviously had concerns. But my experience with this is is individuals that are near the floor.

This is quite removed.
Secondly, your thoughts and comments about the levers that we still have, not that we expect to have to use them, because I do expect MGM to properly supervise and take care of situations.

They're experienced. They don't want these issues it's. Not in their best interest to have any kind of issues that would come to our attention.

So I was persuaded that this is -this is proper, and the risk is very minimal here.

> CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody
else?
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes,
I'm persuaded as well.
I think, you know, the only
difference here, on many of the exceptions that we did for the entertainment block is that they're a vendor employee, as opposed to an MGM employee. And I see that distinction really of no consequence for the purpose of this discussion, especially when you point out that there's these controls and mechanisms that we have, if any of these turn out to be an issue.

I happen to think that a
background is not a predictor,
necessarily, of any of those issues that we talked about in terms of potential concerns.

But I agree with the recommendation. I think it's -- it's a sensible request.

## CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody

 else?I guess we need a motion, right?

MR. CONNELLY: Again, the packet contains 22 positions. At this point, we're only asking collectively that you consider 20 of those to exclude you two facilities positions.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The first two?

MR. CONNELLY: The first two, we're asking that you do not consider those for exemption at this time.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Because they do have a presence from time to time on the floor?

MR. CONNELLY: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Mr. Chairman, I move that this Commission approve the gaming service employee exemptions for the MGM Springfield positions, as included in the packet, as well as the vendor employee positions, as provided for in the packet.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: As amended by Director Connelly?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: With
the exclusion?
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: With
the exclusion of the facilities and video staff positions.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN:
Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
discussion?
All in favor?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes have it unanimously.

MR. CONNELLY: Great. So next up is the application for the gaming beverage license for MGM Springfield.

You'll note that we were here previously on -- in late May to introduce the alcoholic beverage license application, really for the casino itself, as well as, importantly, the 2:00 a.m. to

4:00 a.m., and there was a lot of discussion about that.

What was outstanding at that time
was the plan for the outdoor plaza area, and we had promised that we would come back at a later date to discuss that in more detail, and today is that date.

The hope is that today we could have a vote on the alcohol beverage license, the gaming beverage license in its entirety.

And, again, I'll remind the Commission, you don't need to be reminded, but just to say it again, you can condition the license in any way you want.

So the application is the application, but you can decide on specific areas and condition it how you see fit.

There is, of note, and I, actually, have the wrong memo in front of me, so I apologize if $I$ don't have it off the top of my head. But there's a few things that we know that are outstanding
that would be a condition of the license that we'd want to follow up on, which is there are a number of those tenants, for example, the theater and Kringle, that we don't have the jointly responsible parties named as of yet.

And, also, there is an additional
retail outlet to be named.
So because of where they are in their development process, they just don't have the names yet. We expect those once those are available, and those would be added to the license as a supplement.

So I just want to make sure that that's clear that I'll been monitoring to make sure that information is submitted.

But, again, there's the kind of, what $I$ think of as the standard gaming beverage license application for the casino and all of the adjoining areas, including the entertainment block. That was discussed at a previous meeting.

There's the 2:00 to 4:00 a.m., as you separate the issues, which is,
obviously, of great significance. There's a specific plan about how to shrink the area and deal with that drink or alcohol service in that specific time frame.

And the outdoor plaza, again, the outdoor plaza is one that we touched on briefly, but MGM has worked to provide a lot more detail you see in the appendix to the application.

So we've been working with MGM for quite a while on this, about how they would secure the area, how they would define the area.

Because, again, with outdoor, the
concerns would be that if it was too porous that people would take their drinks off-site and kind of wander off into the local community, which wouldn't be desirable, intentionally or unintentionally.

And, also, we wanted to make sure that for normal -- the normal course of events as well as special events, that security planning and surveillance was
sufficient to make sure that incidents were not only spotted and potentially warded off, but also that a robust response would be imminent.

MGM provided with us a lot of that detail, obviously, and it's in the packet, and it was -- I do want to say, it was a lot of good collaborative work back and forth between the MGM folks and the Commission.

And, so, all that being said, we deemed the application substantially complete with those few items still to be filled in.

And we feel that they've been responsive to the questions that we've posed to them.

So I am forwarding, at this point, the gaming beverage license to the Commission with a recommendation that it be approved, subject to any conditions that you see fit.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Can we
take this in two steps?

MR. CONNELLY: The way I see
it, I think there's three areas, kind of the general license, the 2:00 to 4:00 a.m., and the outdoor.

The outdoor kind of falls in with the general, so to speak, because it would be a lot of the same hours. That has nothing to do with the 2:00 to 4:00.

But I do, I think, as a licensed area, it deserves specific discussion.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So let's take the outdoor area first and confine our comments to that, unless somehow they overlap, and then we can move on to the 2:00 to 4:00.

Reactions to that plan as laid out in our books?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I
thought we were going to have MGM speak to us about their specific plans for the outdoor area.

I think probably now would be the appropriate time.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Sure.

MR. STRATTON: Before I do that, if $I$ could, we've heard, $I$ think, in two contexts so far today the exemptions and the exceptions for the license application vendors that we have yet to identify, one of them being the movie theater.

> I'm going to pass it off to Mike

Mathis for a minute, because we have identified that operator and are officially papered.

And so I would like Mike to be able to make that announcement and explain to you who's going to be operating our movie theater.

MR. CONNELLY: Can I just get some credit for not getting it slip?

MR. STRATTON:
MR. CONNELLY: Good job.
Thanks.
MR. MATHIS: Thank you, Paul and Ed. You guys have been great working through this process. Paul, in particular, not just because you're giving
us a couple of good recommendations.
You've kept -- your staff has kept the pace, heavy work flow, especially on the on-boarding side. So I just wanted to recognize that ongoing effort, which has been incredibly important.

I am -- I'm happy to announce our movie theater operator. I always usually get the benefit of giving the good news, but in this particular case, I've spent two long days in Knoxville, Tennessee, making sure we got this final agreement over the line. So I've got a lot of sweat and tears in this.

But we are partnering with Regal Cinemas to do a luxury, seven-screen movie complex. It's going to be a great entertainment space, large bar space, great open space, right on the retail plaza, and couldn't be more excited.

This is their first venture into this part of the state. I think you've got a couple of Regals on the eastern part of Massachusetts, but I think, as we
predicted, we would make the kind of investment we make and we bring the kind of other quality co-tenants to a complex like MGM Springfield, and we'll attract national brands, brands that haven't entered the market previously.

So I think this is a great partnership that's going to really create that mixed use family experience that we've talked about, along with our bowling, and I couldn't be more excited to have them as partners.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: When you
say luxury, does that mean only the reserved seats in the big reclining seats and everything? Or will some of that -what do you mean by luxury?

MR. MATHIS: That's exactly right.

This is their full
leather -- what we call full recline and all -- in all, $I$ think it's about 650 seats or so.

And there will be service in
the -- premium service in the lobby, for instance, alcohol, that then you're allowed to bring into the theater.

And having been through a couple of these experiences, a movie is much better when you've got a beer or two, is my experience.

So --
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What isn't?

MR. MATHIS: That's right.
So we're really excited about it.
And, yeah, it will be -- there's a couple of smaller theaters within the seven that I think will give them the flexibility to do different types of movies in addition to the first-run.
So they are -- Regal's in
the movie business what we are in the gaming business, which is really forward thinking. I believe they're the number two operator in the world.

They've just partnered with a large parent company out of Europe. And
some of the stuff they're doing is really
cutting edge, including some of that
innovative, $I$ think they call it 4DX,
which is something we're going to look at
in the future, which is that full
immersive experience where the seats move.
They throw mist at you and scents at you.
So this is a really
forward-thinking company. We're excited to be partners with them.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.
Congratulations.
MR. MATHIS: Thank you.
MR. STRATTON: So I'll jump
into the -- I'm going to do a quick
overview of the outdoor plaza proposal.
And is this -- can $I$ flip using this? Great.

What I wanted to start off with is, I'm going to forward this, is why we're looking to do this.
Springfield is really trying to develop a walkable entertainment district and activate downtown urban areas within
the city. And we think this is a really critical part of it.

Some of the questions that we had previously received from the Commission as well, is this -- where has this been done before? Is it done successfully? Have there been issues?

And we looked right in our own backyard in Springfield.

There are several outdoor events that happen from time to time in the downtown corridor that are very successful that involve entertainment and alcohol consumption outside in public areas. And those are generally run by the Springfield Business Improvement District.

We have joining us today Chris Russell, who's the executive director of the Springfield bid, who runs these events, including White Line Wednesdays, Cruise Nights, et cetera.

So I've invited him here to just briefly address for the Commission why -what the experience has been with
customers and patrons, appreciating this opportunity and doing it responsibly, as well as what it means for continuing to develop downtown Springfield and activating the downtown area.

So if you could, Chris, just briefly address that for us, we would appreciate it.

MR. RUSSEll: Sure. Good morning.

I was asked to come just to speak about our experience of outdoor programming. We redesigned and spent a lot of time and money in producing and promoting these outdoor events. Very successfully, they were designed originally to draw people out of the office or to keep people in the downtown after-work hours.

They've been -- they've quickly taken off, very successful, and are now not only keeping the work force in the downtown for a bit after work, but it's attracting people from the greater region
around Springfield.
So the biggest value to these events that we see is, one, we've had zero incidents, that's absolutely zero.

They're mobile. So we're able to move them throughout different areas of the downtown that we need to see attention or there's a new retail experience that we want to highlight. So we move them around the downtown.

And they change the dialogue about the city center and its popularity, and changing the public perception about safety.

So if you have any questions about these events, we've been doing these new events for about four years. They happen weekly. We have three regularly scheduled events, two of which serve alcohol today, and that's White Line Wednesday and our cruise Night.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I
would love to hear details about exactly what you do and how you keep it safe and
secure.
MR. RUSSELL: Sure. Part of
that is in tight management. We have in place controls, both public and private security, that monitor the area.

We don't have an extensive
camera system for surveillance. But
everybody that works for the event has been informed up front that this has to be a zero tolerance of any type of issue that may pop up, arise.

So we have private staff that is hired for these events, as well as public police that are hired for these events to monitor what's going on in the event.

Controls in place are making sure that anybody that's consuming alcohol is, of course of age. They're TIP-certified pourers that we use for all these events. We work with very closely with all the city departments.

Some of the events happen on public spaces, in our parks. Some of them happen in private spaces, and that would
be plazas from some of our downtown towers. And they're all monitored.

And we have -- we have a zone that we allow the alcohol consumption to take place. Beyond that is no-go as far as all the staff is concerned.

We communicate that through signage, orally, and just how we market the events.

We're bringing young professionals. They're very, very successful. They include not only alcoholic, they include nonalcoholic beverages, food, music, culture. And they're really designed as social networking events, and they've been tremendously successful.

MR. STRATTON: And if I
Could, because Chris and I spoke about this very issue in advance.

Our proposal, as you see, is going to have -- will be much more secure from the standpoint of surveillance, active security, barriers. Due to the size and
the scope and the rotating location and their track record, they work very closely with the city to ensure that a lot of your controls are generally through education to patrons and folks having clearly delineated space and understanding the rules, and it's been very successful with zero incidents.

So we believe that we can do the same thing and then layer on top of that park barriers, fixed security posts, surveillance, a law enforcement presence on-site, regularly that will go above and beyond what has been a very successful model, working closely with the city incidents rate.

MR. RUSSELL: I will add one of the reasons when $I$ was asked to comment and speak to you that $I$ felt very strongly about MGM having the ability to provide these type of events is because what we've done on a very small scale has changed the perception and the street activity of what were used to five years ago in downtown

Springfield.
So we now have young professionals, really in highly visible areas, mingling, enjoying themselves, having a good time. Again, a track record of over four years of zero incidents in any way, shape or form.

And I just think this will further our mission where we've spent a lot -we're funded by the property owners in downtown to challenge us in new ways of creating a better environment downtown and having them weave into the fabric of downtown, as opposed to keeping folks just internal, $I$ think is very, very important to the city.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The City of Boston does it very successfully as well.

I have a question relative to what you alluded to.

There's what you communicate by signage and orally. Is there -- in the events that you talk about where there is
alcohol, how do you manage or how do you -- is there a demarcation understood that people are not supposed to go beyond for the consumption of alcohol?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, exactly.
All of our events, we have a site map in advance that, whether it's A public or private entity that's hosting the event or is the host site, we go over with their management, their security, where the confines of the area to serve alcohol, the very soft borders. We don't want to make it seem like the O.K. Corral with a very hard presence around the event. But they're very soft, but they're clearly defined, and whether they be plaza areas that have landscaping and boundaries around them, street corners, and we monitor those perimeters very carefully. MR. MATHIS: If I can just add. I've attended a number of these events. And to Chris's point, I think it really does highlight the best of downtown Springfield in terms of we always talk
about as one of most walkable cities in the Commonwealth and has beautiful back-drops between Court Square and some of the historic buildings.

And every time I've been to the event, I've seen different people that you don't see in Springfield. And I think it exposes them to really all of the wonderful things that are going on downtown, including the young professionals in the community that we're building, which includes some of our employees.

I think I've talked to you in the past, we've got a number of our young professionals that are make continuing choice to live in the apartments across the street from the project, and they love it that they can walk to work, and that they can, as a community, go to the local bars and restaurants together.

MassLive does a -- always does a review after the fact of sort of a photo gallery of candid shots of people
participating in the events. And I'm always struck by the diversity of folks. You have people from Worcester, Ludlow, the Berkshires, Somers, Connecticut.

I think these type of outdoor events really speaks to the millennials and is something that's going to draw a different group of people to downtown and really expose them to the transformation that we're all doing down there.

And I command the bid and members of the bid and we're going to continue to support these type of events including, hopefully, in our plaza.

MR. STRATTON: Great.
Thanks, Mike. I'm glad you raised the MassLive as Chris spoke to.

It really helps with the image of people, seeing people in downtown Springfield having fun.

The risk is that you're in photos. And I told my wife last week that I was working late, and the next day $I$ was in the front page in a White Line Wednesday
photo. She said, Oh, really? You were working late?

So there's a little risk when all the photos are online.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What are
the hours of your activities?
MR. RUSSELL: The hours vary
on the event. Most of the events, the afternoon to the evening events start at 4:00 p.m. And some go from 4:00 to dusk, which would be Cruise Night. White Line Wednesday may go a little bit later into the evening, about 9:00 p.m.

And then we host different
music events. We have a JamFest, that we actually raise awareness and funds for NAMI, which is the National Alliance for Mental illness. That is an all-day, all-night event, and that goes from 10:00 a.m. until 12:30 p.m.

So depending on the event and how it's advertised and how it's structured, the hours do vary. But most of them do start early afternoon and go --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And the
alcohol is served until 12:30?
MR. RUSSELL: No. We
actually shut alcohol, for the later event we shut that an hour before the event closes.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 11:30?
MR. RUSSELL: Yes.
MR. STRATTON: Great. Thank
you, Chris.
So I'll proceed. I want to
highlight, really, what are the elements that we've worked through very carefully with staff to ensure that we have a safe and responsible experience in our plaza and at a high level.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Excuse me, Seth.

I just got a text message a couple of minutes ago saying our meetings would be a lot better with a couple of beers, too.

MR. STRATTON: So we will -we proposal limiting the hours of
operation for -- of the plaza for consumption of alcohol to midnight.

We propose $24 / 7,365$ days of surveillance coverage of the entire plaza.

We will ensure that alcohol is only consumed from plastic containers, and when -- when outside of licensed areas. And so that's a -- there will be a few patios that are licensed areas themselves where, for instance, Tapias, you'll be able to sit outside and have a glass of beer. But if you were to leave that licensed area into the plaza, then you would have to convert to plastic.

We'll have robust protocols, including signage, which you all see an example of in a moment.

Fixed security posts, which is one of the items we worked through with staff. We had originally intended to have full-time fixed position, but agreed that it made sense to control one of larger areas, which we'll show to you.

Some additional bollards to
add perimeter delineation, perimeter fencing, and roving security.

We also have
industry-leading alcohol beverage training, responsible alcohol service training for all of our employees.

And we will have an incentive program for employees to report any minors found consuming alcohol or any violations of the law or our rules.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What do
you mean, an incentive program?
MR. STRATTON: So you
actually you get gift certificates, for instance, for reporting -- successfully reporting a violation, once we have internal incentive programs to incentivize self-reporting internally.

So, again, we propose a combination of signage, security posts, and surveillance and perimeter delineation.

Here, you'll see on this slide is what our signage would look like.

I'll show you in a minute where those would be posted.

We'll have a combination of fixed security and roving security. Roving security will generally be on bicycles.

We have high-definition PTZ, which Executive Director Bedrosian just learned last weeks means pan, tilt, zoom, monitoring the plaza. So we have full coverage by our surveillance team. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Seth, quick question.

Typically surveillance, the responsibility is not to -- is not to monitor everything -- monitor everything, but not specifically to be part of your alcohol consumption, you know.

I mean, so are you going to train security in other words, rather, surveillance folks to really look at that plaza and look for violations?

Is that part of the
training? Because that's typically not their role.

MR. STRATTON: That's a fair
question, and we don't have our surveillance executive here.

But I think, generally, the answer is no, it won't be active -- we won't be actively looking for underage drinkers through surveillance. But it will allow us to do is to really evaluate what's going on in the plaza, see when maybe there's an issue developing or retrospectively figure out where the problems are, where -- if we're finding that people are getting in or there is an issue with -- we hope there won't be, but if there is a issue with folks being able to, say, find a corner where they can hand off a beverage to an underage, we'll be able to have that ability to analyze what's going on and make adjustments in our program based on it being fully surveilled.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: That was my next question.

The biggest problem that I'm aware
of with outdoor drinking facilities is the ability for a person over 21 to then hand an alcoholic beverage to someone in the crowd who is under age.

So how will you be -- how many -first of all, how many drinks will you allow one person to come up and buy and take back out into the plaza?

MR. STRATTON: This is where I'm going to invite the other two folks we have with us, the head of food and beverage and head of security to join us, maybe if you could switch out, because I think they'll be able to help answer those questions.

MR. RUCKER: Good morning.
Jason Rucker, director of security for MGM.

So, the first thing $I$ want to talk about real quick is the difference between surveillance and security.

So we have two separate monitoring rooms where surveillance is going to focus on the floor gaming, where my team is more
focused on the perimeter and the nongaming aspects.

So it is a completely different set of eyes looking for different items.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay.
My question was about specifically one individual buying drinks and then taking it back out to the plaza.

MR. CARATOZZOLO: Yes. It
would be one drink per guest. You walk
up -- you're not allowed to buy -- we
would follow the normal laws of the
Commonwealth where, no, we are not going to serve pitchers of beer. It's going to be one beer for one --

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: It's usually two in lots of locations. You can buy two drinks take it out.

So you're only allowing one drink?
So an individual comes out --
MR. CARATOZZOLO: Yes, correct. This is just for the outdoor plaza. We would just allow one.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: If
you're inside a bar in Massachusetts, you can get two, or Fenway Park, you can get two.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes.
That's my point.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The
whole area is licensed as a bar. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes.

So one drink?
MR. CARATOZZOLO: One drink.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: That
should help with that issue, then.
Thank you.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And
there's no pitcher-serving in
Massachusetts, either.
MR. CARATOZZOLO: Correct.
MR. STRATTON: So we've
broken this down, or plan to basically, our standard operations and special event. And I'll go through these and we're happy to answer any questions.

So during our standard operations, which I'll actually flip to the map, I
think it's easier to look at here.
But what we've done is we've identified what we propose to be the area of permitted alcohol consumption within Armory Square in the plaza.

And you'll notice we've carved out a few areas from an overall parameter, because it's allowed us to more narrowly control the access points.

So what you'll see grayed-out areas 1 through 6 are what we've identified as the only access points to the plaza.

Certainly, the largest one is Area 1, which looks like an upside-down question mark. That is the rotary on Howard Street.

And, so, talking about that one first, because that is really the largest area.

We have a combination of bollards around the cul-de-sac itself to delineate that you're stepping off of property. We'll use signage, that signage we showed
you earlier, to indicate that alcohol is not allowed beyond that point.

But then as you go up the street, the bollards trail off and there is some open access.

And so in working with staff we said, well, what we could propose to really ensure that that area is protected is that we have a fixed security posts there.

And you'll see that indicated -there's a small dot, it's hard to read, from a distance, but you'll seed the red line of sight from that security post showing where that security post would be able to monitor, covering that entire area, will be able to detect and intervene to the extent that individuals were either purposefully or inadvertently stepping off the property with an alcoholic beverage.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Is
that what's demarcated here as Area 1, Seth?

MR. STRATTON: Correct.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That's
the point THAT you can look in both directions?

MR. STRATTON: Yes.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That's
the demarcation?
MR. STRATTON: Yes. So we
worked with Jason and his team, and he will have a physical post -- well, physical is not fair. He will have a -there won't be -- an officer posted. So that will be the permanent post.

They switch out in three-hour shifts? Three-hour shifts, AND that will rotate so that there will be someone there full-time monitoring, and likely to be more of a customer service and reminding people, just a reminder, you can't step off the property, if someone looks like they're going to do that.

And I think through constant vigilance and communication, people will get the message very quickly, and we'll be able to monitor and ensure that we don't
have any issues.
Moving on, Areas 2, 3, 4, and 5 are very similar.

They're very narrow areas. Breaks in fencing that someone could pass through off-site. And we're proposing that a combination of signage and clear demarcation through borders adjacent to those areas, as well as roving security would be sufficient to protect against, really, any issues where you have any material issue with folks coming and going from the property with alcoholic beverages. And those are, really, when you see the property on-site, those feel like the back of the property, and they're -- we really don't anticipate high volume, but we feel confident that because they are narrow and through signage and roving security, we could easily protect those.

The final one is Area 6, which is a slightly larger area going on to Union Street.

We've proposed adding additional bollards that didn't previously exist to assist with the demarcation of that as a property border, along with signage. And you'll see that there's a surveillance camera -- surveillance cameras are indicated in yellow dots -- right at that spot that can help us when roving security isn't present to have the ability to monitor that area.

So we feel comfortable that in a steady state, again, this will be a nonspecial event -- so we don't anticipate really high volume -- those protections will be sufficient to ensure a safe and responsible experience outside.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can
you go back for a minute.
So you are proposing that there will not be any consumption on the park?

MR. STRATTON: Correct. The park -- although, we will -- we will basically run and maintain the park under
our license agreement with the city. That is a city property. It's not part of the Gaming establishment. So it would not fall under our gaming license.

We do anticipate, however, from time to time we may work with the city to put an event on there. And at that time, we would do a special event license through the city, similar to what Chris -COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:

Precisely what you were talking about?
MR. STRATTON: Yes.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay.
And just so I get that clear, the line between the park and what's the back of the Armory, is there going to be fencing?

Did you talk about earlier about fencing?

MR. STRATTON: So all along
the parameter of the park, there is fencing. That area, actually, and it's hard at this distance, but that area is open not directly into the park, but you can take a left and get over to the Howard

Street cul-de-sac.
So you could -- Area 2, you
could come out -- you could pass through there, not get into the park because that's fenced, but walk -- there's a little corridor on the back side of the Armory that could bring you out to the Howard Street cul-de-sac, and then could you get on the street.

So there's some bike racks back there. That's somewhat of a back alley. It will be a pretty back alley, but a back alley nonetheless. So we don't anticipate high volumes there at all.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So is
it fair to say, then, that most circulation is going to be on the other side of the Armory closer to the entertainment?

MR. STRATTON: Absolutely.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Just given the sort of barriers that there are?

MR. STRATTON: Yes. We
anticipate virtually all circulation
between what we're calling Armory Square, which is the piece on the left, and the plaza, will be between the Armory and the entertainment building.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Seth, Area 6, you're talking about roving security personnel.

What's the time frame or schedule when folks are out there?

MR. STRATTON: Jason, if you
could speak to how you do that.
MR. RUCKER: So in the plaza
area, there will be three security $24 / 7$, basically. So it will be one fixed post at the top of Area 1 that we spoke about and then two patrols that are just constantly going around the plaza. If there's an issue, they respond to it and then go back around through patrols.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: It
would just seem to me, I mean, you benefit, I think, in some respects from having kind of choke points, narrow points.

But, obviously, the cul-de-sac and that exit at the end on the Union Street seem a little more wide open, where you might be more prone to find somebody trying to walk off property with a beverage.

MR. RUCKER: The Area 1 is going to be a much higher traffic area just because Main Street is right there.

If you come outside of Area
6 on Union Street, there's not a whole lot going on to go to. So it's going to be a lot lower traffic volume. So that's why we thought the roving controls would be better than posting somebody there, that's really not doing a whole lot.

MR. STRATTON: We feel that to the extent there are issues on Union Street that that -- the issue on Howard is more -- could be inadvertent, and that's why we're really making an intense effort to make clear the delineation and have a fixed security post, so people don't wander.

On the Union Street side, it would really be more intentional because there's really nowhere to go, if you're going out that side.

So we think because it's really a low volume issue, we can control it through the roving security and surveillance.

The busier map, which I brought up, is what we are proposing.

Now, this isn't a specific event. This is a sample event, but how we would deal with higher-volume events, ticketed events, concerts, activations of the plaza where it's not just your day-to-day folks from inside the casino deciding to walk out and have a smoke in the smoking area or watch something on the screen while finishing their drink, or walk across the top.

This is where we'll really activating the plaza, potentially hundreds of people. You'll see a lot of enhancements here. Primarily, the
enhancements involve perimeter fencing for that event, as well as event security.

You'll see the stars, depending on
where the event's taking place, we would really surround the activation with a combination of perimeter delineation and security personnel to ensure that we don't have folks with that volume spreading out into public areas and that they're incident-free.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Would
that be like the velvet-type, or what do you mean by fencing?

MR. RUCKER: It really
depends on the kind of events. It could be the velvet ropes, or it could be the pedestrian barricade.

If it's a concert, it would most likely the pedestrian barricade. If it's more of watching the game, it's probably the velvet ropes.

MR. STRATTON: Could you
explain what a pedestrian barricade is?
MR. RUCKER: Sure.

Pedestrian barricades are the steel, kind of bike-rack looking barricades. They're like 8 feet in length and connect to each other.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: They
connect to each other?
MR. RUCKER: Correct.
MR. STRATTON: And just a
final piece is that we take training of our employees very seriously.

We have a very comprehensive program to ensure that not only are we properly carding people but that we're looking for signs of intoxication, and that's going to be whether it be in the plaza or in the building.

The culture that we set on property is one of responsible service and consumption of alcohol. And that culture will spread both indoors, outdoors.

And I think one comment, Anthony
Caratozollo is with us here today, I think, to Paul and Ed on some of our discussions around conditions and
monitoring, and he said, Don't worry, if there's issues, we're going to shut it down before you ever have to shut us down, because that's -- one, I think he mentioned that his name is on every -- as the manager on every licensed area. So he's a little bit concerned.

But the culture that our company sets around ensuring that we have a safe and responsible environment, we take it very seriously, and we're confident that we can do that, activate the plaza and activate downtown in a way that is responsible and creates a great experience. And if we have issues, we'll independently either pull back or change the approach before we ever have to have any enforcement issues.

With that, if there are any questions, any one of us are happy to address those.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: When
you mention plastic cups, are we talking disposable or the reusable?

MR. CARATOZZOLO: So it's a recyclable plastic cup that we're actually switching, when we do our cut-off period after 1:00 a.m., we switch to a plastic cup so we know at 2:00 a.m. when we stop our service, we know it's actually alcohol in the glass and not a nonalcoholic beverage.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So if
somebody were to leave the property, they would have a -- this is -- it would be quite obvious that this is a reusable, not a disposable, that they can't just throw it away. They could, but it's --

MR. CARATOZZOLO: It's not a souvenir-type glass at all. It's more of a -- there is a logo on it, but it's very -- it's not something you would reuse a couple of times.

If you probably washed it once, it wouldn't hold up in a dishwasher. MR. STRATTON: But it will be clear that it's an MGM Springfield cup. It will have a gold lion on it.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank
you.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I
have a question more directed to Director Bedrosian and/or Paul.

What understanding, all the specifics of the license, how they plan to treat outdoor events, how they plan to treat service during 2:00 to 4:00.

What type of training are we doing with our gaming agents or with the combined NSP, NSPD units so that they're aware of all of the issues and circumstances that might arise during the execution of some of these events?

MR. BEDROSIAN: I'm just
looking around to see if Director Ban was present, but I think -- he is. He is present. There He is in the back.

So we've had conversations about this.

Our gaming agents are sort of the front-line enforcement people for us and the ABCC at our locations.

So we will, depending upon the conditions on the license and the areas, then we will work with our gaming agents to figure out how to work on enforcement.

And they also do, in addition to underage drinking, they also have responsibilities at the particular designated beverage areas: are taps being secured at the appropriate times? How is liquor stored?

So they have a -- in addition to the gaming responsibilities that they have, they have a whole other set of beverage responsibilities. And I think -I remember, I think we had one or two issues early on at PPC of unsecured liquor. So that was an issue that was discovered by our gaming agents, our GEU folks, our gaming enforcement, our State Police and Springfield police, traditional law enforcement authority also.

So underage drinking, obviously, is a crime. Providing alcohol to a minor is a crime.

So those are things that could be investigated.

We have the regulatory component with our gaming agents. We have the criminal component with the GEU part.

So that would be the role which those two entities would play.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I just mention the ABCC agent, because you mentioned it as well.

So I'll remind everybody that we fund -- gaming monies fund one ABCC agent who has been stationed mostly at Plainridge for all those eventualities that you spoke about, and will probably go to MGM Springfield and, essentially, for the better part of the opening months, it's my guess, will eventually float between three properties.

But just for reference, there is ten agents at the ABCC for the state as a whole.

So the amount of alcohol
supervision that's dedicated for these
casinos is substantial, not just because it's leveraged with our gaming agents and the GEU people, of course, the security and surveillance on events and whatnot, but because there's a dedicated agent from the $A B C C$ as well.

MR. BEDROSIAN: That's
correct. Thank you for reminding me.
Commission, I just want to mention
one thing that came to mind when $I$ first walked the site with the MGM staff, which was I think $I$ was more familiar with outdoor events that had set perimeters, and usually quite smaller, obviously.

If you go down there, Trillium has a space, Trillium Brewing has a space. It has a set outdoor perimeter.

So we had that discussion about could you sort of harden this perimeter with some type of, whether it was the -it distinguish between the velvet rope or bike racks.

And, specifically, and I think they're right, there are a couple of
natural choke points that seem to sort of define the -- define the flow itself. But if you look at the bottom Howard Street, the cul-de-sac, there's sort of the big open area and might be the most -- that area -- Area 1 might be the most used area.

What I learned, and maybe the MGM
folks can comment on this, is from a sort of life and safety issue, having -- there are a set of major doors across the patio there to the casino area that having either things like velvet ropes or any type of barricades in an area where you might have to do a -- you could potentially have to do a mass evacuation of the building presents substantial challenges.

So I think what I heard from the folks is they're trying to blend that life and safety issue with the alcohol oversight issue. And that's where the bollards, the planting, and then eventually the permanent security officer
come in.
But I just want to make sure that was the issue I took away from those conversations.

MR. STRATTON: That's right.
We explored, really, every option we could do try to add delineation on the perimeter. And when we explored trying to use -- to change other items on that Howard Street, we did run into the issue of, we have, $I$ think, building capacities generally in the 14 - to 15,000 persons range. And so from a life, safety evacuation standpoint, basically, Areas 1 and 6, if you had to flow out of the casino through those main doors, those would be the primary points of egress into safer areas. And adding restrictions around those could create significant issues with that line of flow. So we had to get creative around how would you really delineate that border but not negatively impact.

And, frankly, we would have
to restudy the entire life safety
evacuation program if we were to put barriers in those two areas, which, Jason, feel free to add anything I missed on that point.

MR. RUCKER: I think you hit it right on the head. Adding any kind of impediment to a mass egress when people are panicking to get out is not a good thing to do.

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Can I
ask, you talked about the plastic cups for the outside spaces.

Is that all the time, or just after a certain hour? How does that work?

MR. CARATOZZOLO: There's no glass allowed on the plaza area. It's always going to be plastic.

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: So if
I have a glass drink, I go to the bar inside and I want to go outside, walking through how --

MR. CARATOZZOLO: It will be switched out.

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: --
how does that happen?
MR. CARATOZZOLO: The two doors -- we do this in theaters, so it's a very similar process. We don't allow glass in any of our showrooms or theaters.

So, basically, when you're
walking out the doors, you're going to have -- you're going to be asked to switch it into a plastic cup. And then if we do any service out there, when we do our special events, if it's beer, it will be service in an aluminum can or an aluminum bottle. Any liquor will be in a plastic cup.

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: So is
the ID checked again at that transfer point or only the first time they get the drink?

MR. CARATOZZOLO: Usually
just at the first time.
COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Is
there -- there was some discussion, I think, in my head, too, about the use of
wrist bands, people who are going to be milling around the property, to make it easy to identify if somebody's passing on this plastic cup.

Can you address the
feasibility of that, particularly, if they're going to have to swap a glass cup out anyway?

MR. STRATTON: Well, it certainly -- so we talked about it in two aspects: one, special events, and we've indicated that that's something that we would employ in special events due to the high volume and what we showed on here to be really a controlled perimeter with security presence.

It would be really feasible and make sense, given the volume, to do that.

Once -- in kind of your steady-state, normal operations, it's -it would be much more challenging and impact our customer experience, for instance, to the extent that you have to -- anytime you want to walk outside to
go to Top Golf or, say, step out to have a smoke, find a way to get a wrist band on, and it could create, one, staffing issues for us, and also customer experience issues where it has -- it's one thing at a special event, but it has almost a little bit of an amusement park feel if you have to wear a fluorescent wrist band every time you go inside and outside.

So from a customer experience standpoint and logistically, we feel that it's not feasible or necessary to do that, given the other protections we have in place.

I don't know if there's anything that you want to add.

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: I mean, in terms of experience aside or THE ambience aside, if they have to swap the cup out anyway, if they're only needing a band to drink alcohol, how much more of an inconvenience is it?

You can step out and have a smoke and come back in without the band. It
would only be if you want to be able to drink alcohol outside.

MR. CARATOZZOLO: I think if
you have the drink in your hand when you're walking outside, you get it switched out if you're going to smoke. You would still have -- we're not going to know if they're going to smoke or if they're going to Top Golf. So we to have to, literally, ban everybody.

And I think from a staffing standpoint, positioning people at those doors, basically, from 10:00 a.m. until midnight, you would need at some point three to four employees just to manage the doors.

I don't know if it's a -- it would be very clunky because you're going to slow traffic down.

Then on top of it, you have your walkways that are designated. You're crossing that walkway and you're kind of bottlenecking traffic in.

MR. STRATTON: If I could, I
think -- so the bands go to, also, as I understand the concern, kind of identifying minors. Is that the primary concern?

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN:
That's part of it, yes.
MR. STRATTON: So keep in
mine it's less of an issue on the casino floor because it's controlled and there are no minors on the floor.

But throughout the remainder of the gaming establishment indoors, it is the same issue.

You can walk around freely with an alcoholic beverage with adults and minors interacting, and we believe that through education, through security, and monitoring that we're going to be able to create an environment where minors don't have access to alcohol.

So the plaza is really an extension of the remaining indoor areas of the facility off the gaming floor. We're going to have that combination of adults
and minors. And to require -- I guess the extension of that would be, then, really requiring wrist banding of anyone off of the gaming floor, which would create -which would, again, experience-wise, logistic-wise could create a significant issue.

So we feel that, based on our experience on other properties and the resources, that we could accomplish it without that.

And I think Paul spoke to it in the beginning. The Commission has the ability to condition and to relook at, to the extent that we're having issues, which we're, of course, self-reporting, we could revisit and look at a different procedure, if there are significant issues.

Again, we don't anticipate that there will be.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I
actually like and will favor the recommendation. I was going to say this later, but I'll say it now.

I think creating barriers -- the whole point of the design of these casinos is to try to activate the plaza, to not make it that fortress, that old-style casino where they just want you in and want to keep you in.

The idea of the Armory, the renovation -- the design concept of this is about having some activity.

And I think alcohol is one that will enhance it. If we were not to license this area, the alcohol, it would act as a barrier, I think for -- towards that activation.

It's not a dispositive. They will still be able to do programs there. It's just not going to be the same ability to do the programming that they've been talking about.

So, I generally -- I favor this.
I think there's a lot of systems and controls that we can put in place, like they have done successfully in the city, like they do it here in downtown Boston on
a number of different areas that we're very familiar with.

So I think this would be a good reason to see that activation, which is the whole intent of the design.

We can always come back and revisit this in terms of hours, in terms of controls, or barriers.

Actually, $I$ happen to think that some of the existing barriers are a little too restrictive. I want it to be more of a natural flow, but $I$ understand that you have to strike a balance between having an area that you can control with some monitoring and roving security, et cetera.

But I, generally, favor this request.

## CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Other

questions or comments?
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yes.
I generally favor the outdoor plan as presented.

I did want to go back, if we can, Mr. Chairman, and talk about some of the
other spaces that you have licensing.
I know we're going to talk about the 2:00 to 4:00 issue.

But reading some of the local follow-up to the original presentation, laying out a license opportunity for Kringle Candle, Indian Motorcycle, just to make sure I'm on the right page to dispel the notion that, hey, you can walk into those places at any time and get a beer.

It's more that if you guys wanted to have a special event within those spaces, that you would have the opportunity to do that without having to come back for a special license. It wouldn't be Kringle Candle for a glass of wine at 10:00 a.m. in the morning, because you have an event going on. It's not that all of those places will be serving alcohol on a regular, daily basis.

MR. STRATTON: That's
correct. That's correct.
Various of the license areas
will be activated only on a limited basis,
on an event basis.
The Kringle Candle experience is
not going to compete. Tap is right across. At Tap, you're going to be able to have a number of beers on tap, any cocktail you would like.

They're going interact closely with the farmer's market and the ice skating rink.

So some of the concepts that we've discussed is do you have hot toddies that you can get at Kringle Candle next to the ice skating rink or do you have some kind of limited, boutique-craft drinks that are consistent with what they're doing there and the experience that's in the plaza would be out of Kringle.

Armory is going to be an event basis.

So I think what you're suggesting is right. This isn't going to be a full-time bar scene in each one of the licensed areas.

There's certain areas that that is
one of the primary focus, including Tap and Center Bar.

But various of the outlets are much more limited and event driven.

MR. CONNELLY: And
Commissioner Stebbins, to that point, too, that was one of the things we discussed early on, which was in some of these areas where the alcohol service may be infrequent, including it in the license.

So, one, it could be part of this discussion and really covered in a comprehensive fashion; and two, provide MGM with the flexibility to activate it without having to submit a special event permit. Because while infrequent, it will probably be somewhat regular. It didn't make sense to go the latter route.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: No, I was just going to say, obviously, at the appropriate time $I$ want to talk about two ideas for putting conditions on the license.

But we can do that at the
appropriate points.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Not
relative to the outdoor space?
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Relative to the whole thing, the liquor license. But, obviously, what they're suggesting and planning for the outdoor space is kind of unique. And, I mean, it's -- even though we've had great local examples of where it worked, the other piece being the $2: 00$ to $4: 00$, again, these are both kind of unique pieces.

I would suggest that we do kind of a three-month or a ninety-day review that will take them from August almost into November when some of the plaza activity may be kind of winding down, because it gets a little colder.

But I also want to have us discuss, possibly, authorizing the need to have the ability to suspend a portion of the license, not that we're expecting trouble, but give them that opportunity to either suspend any part of the license
until they can have a chance to modify or review or correct a strategy for compliance. So...

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Those are both good suggestions.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Can
you just finish your presentation?
I'm looking at your last page here on the training and responsible serving.

Did you want to mention that
before we --
MR. STRATTON: I did cover
it briefly, Commissioner, when I was talking about the culture of compliance and our training program.

So, no, I'm fine, unless
there are any questions.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I
just had a question --
MR. STRATTON: Sure.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: --
about techniques for slowing down consumption and kind of the effects of over-intoxication.

You mentioned those two areas.
I just -- just, maybe Jason would be the appropriate person, I'm not sure, to talk about that.

MR. RUCKER: So some of the techniques for slowing down consumption is slowing down conversation over coffee or food or slowing down the speed of service in general. So do a 20 -minute round time instead of a 10-minute time.

So the bartenders and the servers have all these tools at their disposal. They just need to know how to utilize them, which we teach them in the training class.

What was the other piece of it? COMMISSIONER CAMERON: The effects of over-intoxication, dealing with the intoxicated guest.

I would be interested. I know those are challenging events. So I just was interested in your experience in those areas.

MR. RUCKER: So the first
step of any of it, before you give them any alcohol at all, is to size them up. Even when they're coming on the property for the first time, we're going to have a conversation with them: Hi. How are you doing tonight? What are your plans?

Where do you want to go?
So to provide customer
service, but if they're not answering questions quite correctly or they're showing they're already intoxicated, then we go to our next steps, which is to call security. And then we get involved and speak to them, figure out what we need to do on that next piece.

And to recognize the signs of
over-intoxication, looking for that slurred speech, the rapid changes in mood, just things like that.

And then that's how they assess it and bring us in to the loop.

MR. STRATTON: And I think
it's important to clarify on that piece that while our servers and managers are
trained to identify situations of over-intoxication, they don't engage in the process of shutting folks off.

That's -- Jason can speak to
this, but the cocktail server, if they notice it, they get a manager. A manager observes. And then they call security. Any interaction with a guest in terms of their state of intoxication or refusal of drink is handled by security and not by servers.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay.
I know that at PPC, we've been successful with our -- working as a team, gaming agents, State Police, Plainville Police, as well as security, as a force multiplier and really working, getting people into Ubers, but then actually looking at that event after the fact.

Okay. So we had to put this person in an Uber. Let's go back to the video and maybe they've identified a bartender who did over-serve, and it's a training opportunity.

I'm just hopeful that the same thing will occur. It's a larger scale. There will be more incidents.

I'm very hopeful that that team approach can be successful here.

MR. CARATOZZOLO: Yeah, typically, so what happens is security will do a report. It's e-mailed to myself. Then we actually -- I sit down with the beverage team, the beverage manager, and then the employee and we have a coaching session and discuss next steps.

Usually over two, three
infractions, we start moving -- or actually, two infractions, we start moving to discipline, depending on the infraction.

So usually we get ahead of this way before it gets out of hand. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay.

MR. CONNELLY: Just one
point on the outdoor consumption and the security plans surrounding the special events, speaking of the team work.

I know it's been discussed that prior to any special event that there would be a lot of coordination between MGM and the gaming agents and the GEU to identify the anticipated number of people coming in, what that security plan looks like.

And as a matter of fact, correct me if I'm wrong, but that will be part of the security submission?

MR. RUCKER: Correct.
MR. CONNELLY: So that,
again, this -- there's -- there will be -they have indicated there will be a lot of forethought in terms of planning for security and that will be clearly communicated well in advance with -- in a partnership fashion with the GEU and with the gaming agents.

MR. BEDROSIAN: I would actually request, not only part of the security submission, but as part of the license that there be a staff-level approval with the GEU of the whole
activation of the plaza area. So that we would work, obviously, in the next month or so together.

If we saw physical surveillance --
I mean, physical barriers, we think that could be enhanced, keeping in mind life and safety discussions, if there was a surveillance, if there was, for example, that back alley, the luxurious back alley as it's been described, someone from gaming agents or State Police said it might be better to have a camera back there, we would have authority to do that before we gave final approval for the beverage license in that area.

I think -- I'm not looking for mor work, but $I$ think that final approval and the dialogue between now and then could help prevent issues that might just pop up if at the end they followed this, whatever model they had there, and we found out later on we wanted to add conditions.

So we would also work with the
ABCC person on that also. Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I was
going to make another point about barriers earlier.

And that is that it's also a responsible gaming aspect to allow people to go outside, even if they have a drink halfway, to finish it up, to take breaks.

I think it's an important feature. Let's not forget that everybody who might be going to the casino is going there to gamble in the first place.

So I would like the notion that they will be able to walk in and out, again, depending on what's going on in the plaza, and you thought of it accordingly.

I think it's also an aspect that we should remember.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anything else?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No.
I think you probably get the message that we're cautious and concerned and really do appreciate that you understand that and have worked with our team to put those
safeguards in place.
MR. STRATTON: We do very
much appreciate it. And for the past four weeks, Mike has asked me, So what are you working on? I said, The alcohol licensing, alcohol licensing. So we've been working very closely with staff. And it's been a really great collaboration. I know there are concerns. And I think we through that collaboration, really, developed a plan that best serves both us from a business standpoint and the Commonwealth and the MGC. I think we're aligned in making sure it's a really safe and responsible experience, but that serves the underlying purpose of the project.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I
think it's also important to note, you know, we did get a number of comments through MGC comments and a letter from the Mass Restaurant Association, again, voicing various concerns.

There isn't this notion of when
you finish drinking someplace else, go to MGM because they're the kind of wild, wild west and all the rules are thrown out the window.

You guys are still held to the same compliance laws that everybody else in Massachusetts is.

You carry the same liability that every other bar and everybody else does.

So it's not that you guys don't take that role seriously, and we won't take that role seriously, but my opinion is this is still something new, and we want to work with you, but, obviously, be cautious and thoughtful about how we enact it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It sounds
like we pretty much have consensus that this is a fine, but with the cautions that everybody's discussing.

Just a slightly different perspective. It's sort of unfortunate that D'Vinci Park, I know this is not your responsibility, but part of that ambience,
having that really nice park there, especially if there are places to sit, I think it would be a natural wish for people, it's a natural place for the bid to have events, and in the normal just the course of the wandering around, experiencing this outdoor space, it would be kind of unfortunate not to be able to take your glass of wine or your beer and go sit and chat.

Maybe you can work something out with the city. But it seems kind of unfortunate in a way to block that piece off.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That
was my point about the fencing, by the way.

Because that -- but I understand it's the back of the Armory.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But...
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay. So
shall we move on then?
So we clearly have a consensus, I
think, on this one.
Should we move on to the two
hours? Should we take a quick break before we do that?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Sure.
(Recess taken from 11:27 a.m.
to 11:37 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think we are ready to reconvene our meeting.

And we are back on Item No. 4 with Director Connelly.

MR. CONNELLY: And when we left off, Mr. Chairman, I believe the intent was to transition to discussing the 2:00 a.m. to 4:00 a.m. aspect of the gaming beverage license.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Correct.
MR. CONNELLY: So as a refresher, MGM Springfield is requesting that they be allowed to serve alcohol on the gaming floor between the hours of $2: 00$ and 4:00 a.m.

That is newly allowed, based on an amendment that was signed by Governor Baker, I believe, last July.

I was surprised when I looked back and saw it's almost been a year.

Importantly, alcohol service between 2:00 and 4:00 is only allowed on the gaming floor because a patron must be actively engaged -- this is by statute -actively engaged in gaming in order to be served.

So they are requesting those hours
for the gaming floor, and they do -- and I'll turn it over to Seth, if you don't mind, to speak to the plan as to how they will kind of do that reduction from the overall licensed area to just the gaming floor and how they'll maintain security and integrity of the gaming floor and alcohol service during that time.

MR. STRATTON: If I could, I
mean, at the last meeting, I believe we walked through the specifics of the plan, and we're happy to revisit any piece, but
what I would like to do is update you on some of what we've done since, because I think there was a desire by the Commission to hear public comments.

I know you received some. We did some work on our end, but where we spoke with a couple of different stakeholder groups, in particular, the City of Springfield, both the Casino Oversight Committee and the City Council as well as the Mayor, and we did.

We met -- we met with them, walked through the plan, much like we did with the Commission several weeks ago, and then took them on-site and showed them the limited bars that will be -- essentially, there will be no bars open, but the limited ability to have a drink and where you could have it between two and 4:00 a.m. and how that's segregated and controlled, and we got really positive feedback.

In fact, anecdotally, but based on the conversation with the Chair of that

City Council Casino Oversight who was originally opposed and had drafted an opposition letter, after meeting with us and seeing it on-site, changed his mind and, I believe, submitted a comment letter to the Commission supportive of this -- of this 2:00 a.m. to 4:00 a.m. service.

The Mayor as well was impressed with our approach, how it's narrowly tailored, and felt that it was important for our success and I believe has also been supportive through a written submission.

We also met -- we convened two meetings with local law enforcement where we invited all surrounding law enforcement. Not every community was able to attend, but we had two meetings that included members of law enforcement from not only the City of Springfield, but East Longmeadow, Longmeadow, Chicopee -- I believe those are the three -- and walked through the plan, had questions and answers, and no real concerns were
expressed from any of those groups, and they appreciated the information.

Finally, as we --
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: There's
been no formal position taken by any of the other agencies?

They didn't -- they didn't formally say yes or formally say no? MR. STRATTON: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well, the state groups have weighed in. State law enforcement came out in opposition to this. So the unions have come out. The organizations, yes.

MR. STRATTON: And I don't think -- originally when the law was passed, not in response to our plan, correct.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
That's accurate. That was, in general, before the specifics of your plan were made public.

MR. STRATTON: Then the
final group we spoke to, we actually met with some of local proprietors of some of the more popular bars and restaurants that are neighbors of ours in the downtown area, and we convened some meetings to walk them through our plan, took them on-site, gave them the opportunity to ask questions, which they very much appreciated and expressed no concerns with from a competitive standpoint, with us being able to have this narrow exception.

I believe it was my
understanding that one or two of them may have submitted written comments. I don't know whether they ended up doing that, but we had really productive discussions with those local proprietors as well to ensure that they didn't feel -- weren't surprised and didn't feel like it would be unfairly competitive.

So unless you have -- unless you
would you like me to -- I do think we walked through it previously. I'm happy to go through it again or if there's
specific questions on the plan and how we would shift from regular service to 2:00 to 4:00 a.m., I think our folks here would be happy to address that. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I
think your plan is solid. But like any plan, it's the implementation that's really important here.

So I guess my questions were about the word getting out and how you intend to get that word out, and part of it is not what you say, but what you do.

Those individuals who are in neighboring communities who may say, okay, the bars closing here, it's 1:00, let's go to MGM so we can continue drinking.

That's a real concern. It was a big concern in Plainville with all of the chiefs there, the Plainville area, and just how you intend to -- I know more importantly than for the plaza, but for the -- for this extended drinking period, this idea of over-intoxication, your techniques for slowing down, and your
initial interaction with folks entering the building will be critical for public safety.

So I just wanted to hear a little more about that piece.

MR. STRATTON: Sure. I think in terms of kind of getting the word out, we're not going to affirmatively -we're certainly not going to affirmatively advertise, hey, one of the great things about MGM Springfield is you can drink until 4:00 a.m.

What we've said is we're going to be very clear that our bars are closed at the same time as other bars in the community close.

I don't want -- we don't plan on having, at this point, an affirmative public education program around that.

I think it's going to be gaming customers, when they come, they'll understand that, oh, as long as I'm gaming, I can continue to consume alcoholic beverages until 4:00 a.m.

So it will be more through word of mouth, and I think at the same time, and I would like to pass it to Jason to address the latter part of the question, but the education is around this is not a place to come and continue to party after bars close, that will be through word of mouth and experience when those folks first try to come here for that purpose and realize that's not what we're engaged in.

So maybe if you could speak to that a little bit, Jason.

MR. RUCKER: So one of the best things about our property is the open nature of it, being able to enter it from basically any side around the property.

After midnight, we close down eight of our eleven entrances and we only have three left available.

So we're looking at the hotel entrance, the plaza entrance, and the valet/self-parking entrance.
So it's a lot easier for us to screen, to size up and to speak all the
individuals coming on the property at that time. So we get a lot better sizing of each person coming through to verify why they're here.

If they tell us, I just got back at the other bar, we want to come here to party, we're going to ask them to go home and come back another day.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So
your security will be specifically trained to be aware of this issue, this concern?

This is in your reading comments.
Comment after comment was really about the continuation of the ability to become intoxicated and then get on the roadways.

So your security will be specifically trained on this issue and be looking for those individuals who may be coming to continue their drinking and being advised that this is just an opportunity for those who are here to game?

MR. RUCKER: That's correct.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay.

Thank you.
COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: What
about -- I'm sorry. So on the other side, the people that are wrapping up and leaving the premises via vehicle, I mean, so that you're going to check people and engage them on the way in.

What about process on the way out?
Because there were some concerns raised particularly at 4:00 a.m. departure time coinciding with people going to work.

MR. RUCKER: Very similar
exit process as well.
Of course, when they leave,
the food and beverage establishment or wherever they were drinking, they're going to do their size-up process on the way out. And if there's an issue, notify security again.

If we see them going out the door, we'll engage them, Hey, have a good night.

And then if at that point we see an issue, like, How about a ride share? How about another way home? Do you have a
designated driver? Can you call a friend?
Or if they just blow us off, we have the DEU on-site, that they can intervene right then and there and assist us on that.

MR. STRATTON: I think that's a really important point. While we take responsibility for and really engaging in that process, I think that's where the partnership with the gaming enforcement unit on-site is going to be really critical.

I mean, there are very few
places where patrons are going to be consuming alcohol and literally to walk out the door to their car, they're going to have to walk by a trooper.

That's going to be a disincentive and a significant, I think, tool that will we have. It's going to discourage intoxicated driving, because we will have law enforcement right there on-site and we can work very closely with the gaming enforcement unit to ensure that there's
safe conduct going on, especially at that hour.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Is
there anything that you've analyzed or projected relative to who might be those patrons at those hours, more likely to be, whether staying at a hotel, or another -a nearby hotel?

MR. STRATTON: No formal analysis, but $I$ think maybe Anthony, if you -- Anthony has been operating casinos for quite some time, and if you could speak to, generally, that the customers at that hour, and especially those gaming who would be eligible for extended service.

MR. CARATOZZOLO: Typically,
the people gaming at this type of hour would be a convention guest, who are usually staying in a hotel, either our hotel or they would be in a local hotel. Typical locals, typically, don't stay that late.

```
    I mean, Springfield naturally
```

shuts down at 9:00 p.m., as it is.

I think they're used to shutting down at 2:00 a.m. because that's when all the bars close.

So I think, typically, it would be a convention guest or a hotel guest, because they usually have fun, have a great time and then go to their room or jump in a ride share and go back to the Sheraton, which is right down the street.

That's what we're anticipating, and I've anticipated over the last 19 years, working in Mississippi, Las Vegas. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Did you see some of the shift workers also, I know in Atlantic City, the group of individuals that work until midnight, and they could be nurses, all kinds of shift workers that would not even come in until, say, 1:00, and like the fact that they had the opportunity to game or to -- and to have a cocktail in those hours where there's typically nothing going on?

I know that was somewhat of a phenomenon was the shift workers coming
in.
MR. CARATOZZOLO: Yeah,
typically, in the markets I've worked, I haven't seen a lot of that.

Because we're more of a resort, we charge a premium price, and late night our table games, it's -- our limits are usually a little bit elevated.

So I don't -- I typically haven't seen that.

I know maybe in Atlantic City, it was a little bit more in tune.

But here, I mean, I don't envision that. I don't see it being --

And another thing is our employees aren't going to be allowed to come in. We have certain restrictions on that.

So my employees in food and beverage, they're not going to be allowed back on property to enjoy until two hours after their shift, which by then, the shift will be over. The service will be over.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Since
you mentioned, when would you -- have you determined whether or at what time might you lower the limits on bets, at what point in the evening?

Or if it's a trade secret, you can tell me later. I doubt that it is.

MR. STRATTON: It could be that none of us here know.

MR. CARATOZZOLO: Yeah, I mean, there are folks in the company that would be able to speak to that better.

I think it's really contextual
with the technology. It's less of an issue to make those changes, because with our visual limits.

So I think it will depend on the day of the week, seasonal, who's in town. If a large convention is in town, then it's really supply and demand. We're really just trying to manage capacity on the tables. And if we can -- if we can justify a rate increase, we'll do that just to sort of thin out the crowd a
little bit.
So I think it's case-by-case,
really.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I know
when $I$ read the reports from $B B C$, that there are times when somebody's inebriated and somebody arranges for a ride home, either it's security your -- security or our GEU folks. Is that -- who runs that program?

Is that a formal program, and who does that?

Lisa, you're nodding. Maybe Bruce or somebody who knows?

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: We work together, the security team, we work together with GEU. We do, actually, get involved with taxis to get a ride home.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But it's sort of an informal? If somebody needs it? You don't have a standing deal with Uber or something to be on call?

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: I think we've been working on something with

Uber, maybe Lyft, (Inaudible) taxi services.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I think having -- having some such capacity in place, maybe even being willing to pay for the ride, you know, would be another nice kind of assurance.

We -- Commissioner Zuniga and I were at a meeting with Lindsay Tucker, who is the Associate Commissioner of the Department of Public Health and the co-chair of the Public Health Trust Fund Executive Committee, along with Commissioner Zuniga. And she brought up that what was somewhat her, but also implied Department of Public Health position on this. And Commissioner Zuniga her if there was any -- she was predisposed against it, as you might imagine.

But she, in answer to Mr . Zuniga's questions, said yes, there was data on this that she thought would be helpful or we thought would be helpful.

We asked her to send it.
We've all had a chance to look at it. But some of it was quite lengthy. And I asked Commissioner Zuniga if he would be willing to speak to what she said so everybody gets a complete picture. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I
would be more than happy to, and please tell me if I'm going into too much detail.

But there was a lot of -- there were a lot of links and attachments in the e-mail that she forwarded.

I included -- I asked the staff to
include what I thought was the most relevant, and I'll speak to that as much as I can on a summary level.

One of the attachments that they sent was a study by somebody named Han, and others, about the increasing hours of sale. It was a study of studies, essentially.

And that's -- and they were looking at studies throughout the world, really, that looked at when jurisdictions
increased the hours of sale at different times.

What's very relevant and different from what we're considering here, these countries or jurisdictions that increase the hours throughout the country, which is not what's happening, in my opinion, at this -- in here.

There's a very specific and narrow question for us, but I'll speak to it very general -- generally, because $I$ think it's also important.

There were, obviously, some harms that came on some of these studies around the world or increasing hours in serving for more than two hours. And there were inconclusive harms or effects when the increase was for two hours or less, which I find very just serendipitous, really, because, what we're considering here is the two-hour mark or two-hour increase.

Nonetheless, as I mentioned before, these increases were throughout entire jurisdictions. And it occurred to
me when $I$ was reading this study of studies that that would be relevant if, say, the legislature was thinking about increasing hours throughout the state as opposed to just at the casino floor.

There's another study that I also
included in the packet, which I thought was most interesting.

It's from the Journal of Health
Economics. And they looked at the -- when a casino is introduced in a jurisdiction, they tracked what's called ARFA, related fatalities. And the authors were able to ascertain that ARFA, fatalities go down, actually, fatalities go down --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Facilities
go up.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
Facilities go up when a casino is introduced but only in rural counties.

They actually go down on populous counties, which $I$ think it was just not what I think -- what the DPH, what they intended when they were submitting the
comments.
At least -- and they have very much an example that is very relevant in that study, and that is in Milwaukee, the Milwaukee county population, 936,000, versus South County -- Sauk County, Wisconsin, population, 17,000. ARFAs went up in the rural county. Fatalities went up. But they actually went down in Milwaukee County.

Again, it's a counterintuitive result that the authors hypothesize that in rural counties, people drive longer or more hours or more miles while intoxicated and that -- that makes fatalities go up.

But there's a substitution effect, they theorize, when they go -when we analyze the populous counties in which people are doing something else when when a casino comes in as opposed to just drinking.

Now, what's interesting here is not only that a counterintuitive result, but the fact that at least in very rough
numbers, Hampden County is a medium-sized county. It's not rural. But it's not at least as populous as the example in this study that I mentioned earlier of Milwaukee County.

So I -- I don't know how that cuts, except that it's -- it's seemingly in the middle.

I, actually, asked that question of the people from BSA, Bureau of Substance Abuse, who initially forwarded this study.

The other -- those were the main -- obviously, this might not -Middlesex County is much more populous than two million people, but we're not considering that at this point.

I can answer any questions if anybody has --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you.
MR. STRATTON: One point,
somewhat relevant, that $I$ think might be of interest to the commission, and Anthony can speak to this, but on the substitution
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One thing that's unique
about casinos versus, say, other establishments where you can consume alcohol at the same time is we're generally giving the alcohol away. And what that means is that we're controlling much more carefully how much and how frequently you're getting it, because we're spending millions and millions of dollars in giving this away, versus an establishment that's selling it and is incentivized to the frequency and the volume to increase.

And what is the -- if it's okay disclosing, how much money do you spend in --

MR. CARATOZZOLO: It's millions, ten of millions of dollars in hard costs that get charged back to the casino.

But we also, typically, in a bar, it's an ounce-and-a-half pour. On the casino floor it's 7/8 of an ounce.

So you have to have multiple drinks to even equal to one drink of a typical retail establishment.

MR. STRATTON: What's the
typical round time?
MR. CARATOZZOLO: So,
typically, it's a 20 -minute round time.
On a graveyard shift with a limited staff, it actually goes to closer to a 30 -minute round time.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You
know, I -- you reminded me of another main point that I wanted to mention around the first study of studies, and that is that the authors also point out very importantly that the effects of regulation in those expansions was not analyzed in those studies, which I think is the most relevant piece that we were considering here.

Because in countries where they expanded the hours, it was throughout, but people already had those licensures or those licenses and have the incentives
that you alluded to to sell more and faster.

We have the ability, as Commission
Stebbins was saying earlier, to limit conditions, look at however many -- for however many days, let's say, or period of time and see how it -- what happens, what kind of person is engaging in both gambling and drinking, what kind of customer at that time, what is the volume.

We have a had some of the comments as to the notion that there will be an inflow of people or an outflow of people at that time. I find hard to substantiate just on the logic that there's extended hours.

So it's another point that I
wanted to make.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you.
That was really helpful.
Other questions? Thoughts. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Just a quick question, because, obviously, during this 2:00 to 4:00 time frame,
you're only serving people who are actively gaming.

Do your table game dealers go through any type of training to also identify somebody who is sitting right across from them who might be intoxicated or over-served?

MR. CARATOZZOLO: Typically,
a table game dealer will notify the cocktail waitress, because there could be a shift change, it could be a break, it could be a new person coming on that hasn't served them yet.

So, typically, the dealers are the first to identify. They actually identify with the pit boss. The pit boss will notify the beverage manager, who makes that assumption, and then we move to the security cut-off point, if that happens.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And they are all going to be going through training, right?

MR. CARATOZZOLO: That's
correct.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Seth, I
have a question that, in a way, is probably more relevant when this was in the legislature than now.

But what's the argument? Why is it -- why does it make sense to single out people who are gaming for the ability to drink for another couple of hours as opposed to watching a West coast baseball game or being in a late night movie theater?

What's the argument on which this notion was sold?

MR. STRATTON: I can't speak to the -- I can't speak to the argument on which it was sold, because we weren't selling it.

But I think what I can speak to is that it's an industry issue.

You heard from us before that Detroit is the only other property in our entire portfolio that does not have 24/7 alcohol service.

So folks are used to going to
casinos throughout the country and having an experience where they can game and consume alcohol without a cut-off hour.

So it's really a -- it's really a competitive -- it's an industry competition.

It's ensuring consistent experience, as much as we can, throughout industry properties.

And so I think it's not that
someone gaming, there's something about the experience that's -- that's different from watching a game where you would like to have someone drinking.

It's just where the jurisdictions that started gaming, it's always gone hand in hand with extended service and to stay competitive and to deliver the experience that our customers expect. We want to be as competitive as possible.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And remind me, Connecticut does not, right?

Connecticut stops at 2:00.

Remind the other jurisdictions, nearby jurisdictions.

MR. STRATTON: That's my understanding that Connecticut currently stops at 2:00.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And Rhode Island? Does anybody know?

MR. STRATTON: I don't know Rhode Island.

> CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do you
know, Lisa?
VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: It's
2:00 a.m.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: 2:00.
Okay. Other thoughts?
We probably ought to take this one as a separate matter.

So does someone want to present motion on --

MR. BEDROSIAN: The only other thing, I think Commissioner Stebbins had a thought about either giving, whether it's myself or Director Connelly or both of us, just sort of the emergency
authority as a condition to whatever you decide. And I would just suggest that that emergency authority would then require us to come back at the next public meeting and, obviously, report whatever we did.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If I can be so presumptuous, Commissioner Stebbins, I think you made two suggestions.

One was that we give the executive director the authority to intervene on any of the approval that we give here on $a$ realtime basis and then to report.

And then the second was that there be some quite rigorous, for the sake of discussion, three months out, quite rigorous analysis of the consequences of these decisions.

So let's say on the 2:00 to 4:00
issue, that those two things are preconditions. If we do go forward on the 2:00 to 4:00 issue, that it would have those two preconditions.

Is that okay with everybody?

Did I characterize that
accurately?
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yes.
I mean, the 2:00 to $4: 00$ is part of the gaming alcohol license.

My suggestion or conditions on the license would extend to the full casino license.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But since
we're going to vote on the 2:00 to 4:00 separately, it would be covered under your two broader amendments or conditions.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.
Does somebody want to make a motion on the 2:00 to 4:00 issue?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, I can take a position --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- if
that's helpful for the discussion.
I'm willing to go along with the
request, with those conditions.
I'll mention that -- something
that $I$ updated you all in a prior meeting, which I would think would operate here very much, and that is the amount of commitment that your company is making towards the gaming program, which includes having discussions -- empowering your employees to have discussions around gambling for a long time, which I would put same here, you know, engaging in a lot of alcohol while gaming for a long time.

What I've seen of your colleagues, this real commitment and empowerment that I find is very helpful in this discussion. There's powerful incentives for those employees to have those discussions. And I would be looking for those kinds of signs and evidence in our own property here as we continue with these conditions, but that's my position.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Let's
just --
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I'd be inclined to allow with this with the commitment -- my issue, really, is public
safety. And I really was looking for and I think I heard a commitment to pay attention to this issue, which means the training of staff, a collaborative working environment with the gaming enforcement unit, which includes our gaming agents as well as the security staff.

So I think with all of these safeguards in place and the commitment, I'm inclined -- and, again, I do like the idea of giving our executive director immediate authority and the three-month rigorous -- let's make sure that we're not having a problem with public safety.

MR. RUCKER: Commissioner
Cameron, if $I$ can, to the extent $I$ wasn't clear, part of the reason I'm here is because it's a very serious topic, and you absolutely have our commitment.
I would -- if you -- if not
required, I would ask to come back after 90 days and collectively give a report card on how we did.
And it's not just our job. We're
going to rely on your team as well to help us with these difficult issues.

And I would welcome you to keep us on a short leash. That's how I've envisioned keeping the team, on a short leash, because we view this very seriously.

I have to answer to folks within the company if we do not manage this well. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you. COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: I do not in any way question the commitment of MGM in this regard or in anything you've come in front of us so far, but I have to stay, on balance, the public safety concerns and the concerns about people gaming into the night and having continued alcohol access, on balance, $I$ am just not convinced that at this point, the Commonwealth is -- it's in the best interests of the Commonwealth to extend from 2:00 to 4:00.

I would not be in favor of the extension.

## CHAIRMAN CROSBY:

Commissioner Stebbins?
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I, like my colleagues, I mean, you know, the comments and questions that were raised to us are around the issues of public safety.

I applaud the fact that you did reach out to the -- not only the host community, but the surrounding community. I'm disappointed that you didn't get 100 percent participation or engagement.

That said, I do have a level of comfort in terms of the procedures and the training that you're willing to provide and offer.

However, I think the conditions I want to recommend will -- might quickly end that if this does not go off well, because $I$ think we're kind of both on the hook to make sure this succeeds.

So I'm predisposed to support the 2:00 to 4:00 a.m. service continuation.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That is a majority.

I am -- I'm a 51/49 on this. I -originally, I would have thought this is a crazy idea. And frankly, I think it's very peculiar that the legislature chose to single out this particular cohort as being able to drink for an extra two hours. If there's any cohort you were going to single out, this would have been the last one I would thought you would have singled out, that is, people who are gambling.

I have, on the other hand, which I think the end of this paragraph, I'm going to be -- this is the 51, that I've learned in my years here that a casino is a very stupid place to be a criminal and is probably the safest place to drink in Massachusetts.

It's more regulated and more attended to and more trackable than probably any place there possibly is.

So I think at the very end of the
day, I very marginally would go along with this, as I sort of would tend to any time, give people more freedom to do what they want in a properly supervised environment. So I guess that we have about a 4 to 1 on -- so I think we could lump it all into one.

We have that issue, which is clearly a consensus, a majority. So maybe we could lump it into a single motion to adopt the plan with the attendant conditions.

MR. BEDROSIAN: So is this -- I just want to be clear.

Are you now talking about voting on the full license with the caveat that you've just discussed on the 2:00 to 4:00 a.m.?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. The full license, as presented, with the outdoor scheme and with the extension of the drinking hours and with the conditions that you've already established, plus the two conditions that Commissioner

Stebbins --
MR. BEDROSIAN: And if I
could just ask for one more condition, which I think I discussed it a little bit, on the outdoor plaza, $I$ just would like staff to have the ability, maybe through me, to do one final walk-through before the property opens, to make sure the gaming agents, State Police, ABCC are all fine with the eventual plan as it ends up.

The scheme -- the diagram looks fine. But they're working hard. I want to make sure whatever it is matches whatever the Commission's expectations are.

That would be just one additional item.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I
think that's appropriate --
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I agree
with that. All right.
Well, Commissioner Stebbins, do you want to articulate a motion?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:

Sure.
Mr. Chairman, I move that the Commission approve the gaming alcohol license for MGM Springfield, as provided in the packet, with consideration of the conditions already presented to us by Director Connelly, in addition the following conditions:

1) that this Commission review the alcohol license 90 days after the opening of MGM Springfield; that we afford the executive director the opportunity to review the outdoor service plan with Commission staff and our licensee prior to opening; and that this Commission authorize the executive director to suspend any portion of the license or modify any staffing or procedures of the license for compliance and report back to the full Commission at the next convenient meeting.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well said.
Second?
COMMISSIONER CAMERON:

Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is there
further discussion?
All in favor signify, by saying
aye.
Opposed?
COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: I am
opposed.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We didn't give you a choice --

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: I
want the record --
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You're a
nay on this one right.
So that motion passes 4 to -- 4
$1 / 2$ to $1 / 2$.
MR. STRATTON: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right.
Thank you.
MR. BEDROSIAN:
Mr. Chairman, just in terms of process, we have item 5-A which has some guests who have traveled the GLPI legal issues. And then the rest $I$ think are mainly internal.

It feels like you probably would want to get something to eat at some point, but potentially if we could hang in there and do the one issue with our guest, we can let them make whatever afternoon travel plans they have and then get something to eat and clean up afterwards.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes. Maybe just go on through. Because I think the other things are pretty -- let's do this.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Sure.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Let's do that. Then we'll talk about it. See what time it is.

All right. So we'll welcome the
folks from GLPI, attendant lawyers and what have you.
(Pause in proceedings.)

MR. GROSSMAN: Ernie
Grossman.
Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and
the Commissioners.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good afternoon.

MR. GROSSMAN: We're here before you on the transfer of interest matter involving GLPI and Penn National Gaming. There is a letter in your packet that's been submitted by the parties outlining the issue.

As it mentions, today we're here on a very narrow issue but just to kind of tee things up, and then I'll turn it over to the petitioners to introduce the whole lineup and run through the issues, I thought I would give you a brief overview of what we're here for today and the transfer of interest process in general.

We can obviously move quickly through any parts that aren't entirely useful at the moment.

But just to kick things off, I would just mention that the Commission as you know has been notified that there is a proposed transaction in which the premises
of the gaming establishment comprising Plainridge Park Casino owned by Plainridge Gaming and Redevelopment LLC, which is our gaming licensee and a subsidiary of Penn National Gaming will be transferred to an entity time owned by Gaming and Leisure Properties, Incorporated, which is known as GLPI.

GLPI is a publicly traded REIT. And the parties, of course, are here today to more fully explain any details of the transaction. Chapter 23 K expressly allows for transfers of interest. And it discusses it in a number of areas. The Commission has crafted regulations which more fully set out the regulatory framework for which a transfer of interest is processed by us. That's in Sections 116.08 through 116.10 .

In essence, the process is really designed to do two things: It's first designed to ensure that the Commission has an opportunity to determine whether the transfer will result in any new
qualifiers, and ensure that they are able to go through the RFA-1 suitability process to give the Commission and the IEB time to conduct an investigation, and ultimately for the Commission to determine the suitability of any new qualifiers.

Secondly, it's designed to
determine whether the transfer will result in any change of control over the gaming license; such that the quality of the operation or any agreements, the hosting surrounding community or otherwise, will be affected in any way by the transfer.

Today we're here on the request of the parties to make two initial legal determinations in advance of the decision that will be upcoming before you in approximately a month that has to do with -- deal with the interim authorization of the deal that will be presented to you.

So we'll go through the deal in much more detail in about a month. But we're here on just these two preliminary
matters. The first preliminary matter pertains to the terms of the lease that will result from the transaction. And the second pertains to the -- certain terms of the trust agreement. I don't want to steal their thunder, so I'm not going to get into the particulars. But they will explain to you exactly what they are.

As a general matter, $I$ can
represent to you that the legal department supports -- I believe the IEB as well, supports the proposal, and the legal interpretations that will be forwarded to you here today by the petitioners.

And before we turn things over, I thought it might be helpful just to quickly run through the law of transfers of interest, if that would be helpful. We'll obviously need to go through it in a little more detail before the next hearing. But just to help calibrate where we are in the process here today, I can just run through some of the particulars that govern transfers of interest.

They provide, essentially, as follows: That no person can transfer a gaming license or a gaming establishment or any associated structure or real property, premises or facility without notification to the IEB and subsequent approval by a majority of the Commission.

The Commission must require that anyone with a financial interest in a gaming establishment be qualified for licensure by meeting the criteria that's outlined in Sections 12 and 16 of Chapter 23K.

The transfer is also subject to Commission regulations Section 129.01, which essentially looks at whether the transfer will result in any change of control over the gaming license.

If there is such a change, the transferee is, essentially, required to agree to assume all of the existing obligations.

For the Category II licensee, there is a law in place that says that
there can be no transfer of the gaming license for the first five years from the date of issuance, unless there are certain enumerated circumstances in play.

That's not the case here. The gaming license is not being transferred, just the gaming establishment.

A change of control itself -- and this is a determination the Commission will be called upon to make eventually -is defined in the regulation to mean a transfer of interest which directly or indirectly results in a person obtaining greater than 50 percent ownership in a gaming licensee or which results in or is likely to result in significant change to the management or operation of a gaming license.

For what it's worth, the present situation does not appear to involve any such change of control. This appears to be a straight real estate type transaction.

Whenever a person contracts to
transfer any property relating to an ongoing gaming establishment as opposed to an open market transfer, under circumstances which require that the transferee be deemed suitable, as is the case in this particular situation, the contract shall not specify a closing or settlement date, which is earlier than 121 days after the submission of a completed RFA-1 application. This provision is in place to allow the IEB and the Commission adequate time to investigate, at least on a preliminary basis, the suitability and overall suitability of the transaction and the transferee.

The RFA-1 application is required to be accompanied by a fully executed and approved trust agreement. That's one of issues that we're here for today, to have a look at the trust agreement.

The trust is a vehicle that is designed to effectuate a clean separation of a transferee that is deemed ultimately possible deemed unsuitable from any
interest in the gaming license or in a gaming establishment, if that scenario should arise. That's why we have the trust.

The Commission is required to hold a hearing and render a decision on what is referred to as interim authorization. That's the next step in the process after today.

If the Commission grants interim authorization, the closing or settlement of the deal may occur.

The interim authorization process was included in the process in recognition that the full suitability investigation may take some time to fully complete.

So as not to keep the whole transaction in a holding pattern, this process, this interim authorization process that's designed to allow the deal to close with, essentially, only a preliminary finding of suitability and finding of the overall assessment of the transaction having been completed.

I think once that is allowed, if it is allowed, the Commission may at any time after that order all interests subject to the transaction to be moved into the trust, if there exists reasonable cause to believe that the proposed transferee may be found unsuitable. If a prospective transferee fails or refuses to transfer a property into the trust, they will be deemed to be unsuitable.

When it comes to the ultimate decision, there are just a couple of quick principles that I would throw out there, just to provide a full understanding of these transfers of interest. And they are that the Commission may place any additional conditions or restrictions on a transfer that the Commission deems suitable.

The Commission shall reject a gaming license, transfer, or transfer of interest in the gaming establishment to any unsuitable person.

The Commission shall not approve
of any transfer that would result in the transferee having a financial interest in more than one gaming license issued by the Commission.

The Commission may reject a transfer if the Commission considers the transfer unsuitable.

And alternatively stated and finally, the Commission may reject any proposed transfer that in the opinion of the Commission would be disadvantageous to the interests of the Commonwealth.

And we define disadvantageous to the interests to include such things as: Not meeting the suitability standards; not complying with any particular law or regulation that -- is overseen by the Commission; and that they don't meet Section 121.09 relative to the change of control.

So that's, essentially, an abridged version of the rules that govern the transfer of interest and the process. As you can see, we're just in advance of
the interim authorization, which again will be coming back before you in about a month's time.

Ms. Lillios, Ms. Blue, and I are all available to take any questions as this progresses. At the moment, though, if there are no questions, I thought I would just turn it over to Attorney Albano who represents the parties. And he can certainly introduce the team, and then walk you through the proposal.

MS. LILLIOS: If I can just
jump in by way of introduction that we have Chris Rogers that I think many of you have -- if not all of you have met before. He's vice president and deputy general counsel for Penn National. And with him is Brandon Moore, senior VP, general counsel and secretary for GLPI. Traveling with him today is Melissa Ferullo, who is the director of licensing and legal affairs for GLPI; and, of course, Mr. Albano, local counsel for both parties for purposes of this transaction.

MR. ALBANO: Good morning,
Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. My name is John Albano.

## CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good

 afternoon.First, on behalf of both of the applicants -- all of applicants, I wanted to thank the Commission for taking the time to address these two specific issues relating to the proposed transfer. It's greatly appreciated that you've made the time to hear us on that.

As Mr. Grossman explained, the two
specific issues are: First, under the proposed transaction, the property will be sold to a subsidiary of GLPI, and then will be leased back to the licensee.

The first issue is: How long does that lease have to be as a matter of law under Chapter 23K. That's the first issue addressed.

The second issue as Mr. Grossman mentioned, is related to the terms of the trust that are required under the interim
authorization regulations, which as he explained are meant to ensure that if a -for lack of a better term -- problem arises, there can be a clear separation between the transferee and the control of the real estate, or in other instances the license. And we believe, as I'll explain, the trust we have proposed does effectively address both the letter and spirit of the regulation.

I did think -- we thought together, actually, that subject to the Commission's desires, of course, that because this is the first time we've come before you on this and because we're going to be addressing two pretty specific issues, that it might be helpful, in fact it might avoid you feeling frustrated during my presentation of these two issues, if you heard a bit about the overall transaction and had an opportunity to ask any questions just from sort of a very high level understanding that we will be back to drill down in as much detail as
anyone desires in just a matter of weeks.
If that would be helpful, then what I would propose is that I turn it over to -- first to Mr. Rogers and then to Mr. Moore for that overview. If that's agreeable.

## CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Sounds

good to me.
MR. GROSSMAN: At a high level.

MR. ROGERS: Very well.
Thank you.
My name is Chris Rogers.
I'm the deputy general counsel at Penn National. So this all started about a year and a half ago when Penn received a letter from Pinnacle suggesting that the two companies combine.

Upon receipt of that letter, we began an almost year-long process of negotiating with Pinnacle on a potential transaction, and what would that look like.

You might be curious why it took a
year. There was a couple of reasons. One, we had to agree on valuation and who would be the acquirer. And we ultimately settled that Penn would be the acquirer in the transaction. And we settled on an evaluation that included not only a cash component for their stockholders but also an equity component. And the rationale for that was: One, to permit Penn to reduce the amount of debt it would need in order to complete the financing; but also to permit the Pinnacle shareholders to participate in the upside of the company combined company through equity in the combined Penn entity.

The other reason why it took a while to get the deal done is that we knew that there would be required divestitures in connection with the transaction. So in Ohio and Indiana, they're statutory limits on the number of licenses, and we knew that we would be required to divest of one in both of those jurisdictions. We also knew that both Penn and Pinnacle had
strong presences in Kansas City and St. Louis. And although there was not statutory limitation on the number of licenses, we knew that the FTC would be interested in that from a anti-competitive standpoint. We decided at the outset that we would do some divestitures in those two markets as well.

We contacted Boyd Gaming
Corporation, a very well-regarded regional gaming operator who's been licensed in a number of different jurisdictions, as our preferred divestiture partner. And we agreed with them early that they would buy the operations of four of the casinos currently operated by Pinnacle; one in Kansas City, one in St. Louis, one in Indiana, one in Ohio.

So that brings us to how GLPI gets into the story. So GLPI is a reed that was spun off from Penn in 2013. In connection with that spin-off, Penn contributed the real estate for substantially all of its properties to

GLPI and entered into a long-term master lease with GLPI pursuant to which Penn leases those properties to conduct gaming operations.

Since the spin-off, GLPI did its own transaction with Pinnacle in which it acquired all of the real -- substantially all of the real estate for Pinnacle and entered into a separate lease with Pinnacle, which we call the Pinnacle Master Lease.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: This was
all prior to the merger discussions?
MR. ROGERS: Correct.
So when Penn did the spin-off, we did not yet have a license for Plainridge. So it was not included as part of what was given to GLPI, and Penn owned the real estate, and has owned the real estate since opening.

So because we were required to do divestitures, the properties being divested were part of the Pinnacle Master Lease with GLPI. So they have one lease
that covers multiple properties. And we would need to do an amendment to remove those properties out of the lease. And GLPI would enter into a new lease with Boyd Gaming with respect to those four properties.

So we started to talk to GLPI about how that would work and how we could do the amendment to the lease and divestitures.

At that time, we came to the conclusion that we thought it made sense to add Plainridge Park into the Pinnacle Master Lease and sell the real estate to GLPI.

Now, the advantage of doing that is that we received 250 -- or will receive $\$ 250$ million of proceeds for the real estate, that we can then use to fund the transaction with Pinnacle. So it allowed us to reduce the amount of debt we would otherwise incur in the transaction.

So because of that, we ended up
doing -- agreeing to a transaction in

December of last year, that involved four publicly traded companies. So in addition to Penn and Pinnacle, it also involved Boyd and GLPI. What was unique about this deal was, when it was announced, all four companies had their stock trade higher. I mean, it was uniformly applauded by the market, and really was a win-win for everyone.

For Penn, it really is a tremendous opportunity for us to increase our scale. We were able to get access into new markets where we currently don't have a presence. And we were able to get some additional customers into our database that we think would allows us to more effectively compete with some of our competitors.

So for what it means to Massachusetts, the impact will be minimal from an operational standpoint. Penn will continue to be the operator.

The real estate at Plainridge Park will be owned by GLPI and will be leased
to Penn as part of a master lease that includes the other properties that are being acquired from Pinnacle.

And the advantage from a Penn perspective is we think this transaction really does give us the size and scale to more effectively compete with the Caesars, MGMs, the Wynns of the world, while also giving us a much stronger balance sheet with a company that has more geographic diversity and a larger cash flow.

So with that, I'll turn it over to Brandon sort of to explain in a little bit more detail about GLPI.

MR. MOORE: Good afternoon.
I guess first I'd like to thank you for delaying your lunch. As a person who values their lunch, I appreciate that.

Second, I just want you to know we have a long way to go. But working with your staff has been fantastic. Everybody here has been very helpful to us in these nuanced issues and helping us work through this. Given the fact that we're new to
this jurisdiction, we very much appreciate that.

This is a little bit odd because we haven't had an opportunity to tell you who we are and why we're involved too much before bringing in front of you a couple of very nuanced issues that impact our business. So I'll just take a couple of minutes and tell you a little bit about GLPI. And if you have any questions, I'm happy to get into more detail. But I think that probably will come at some subsequent hearings.

But as Chris mentioned, we're a publicly traded real estate investment trust. We started with a Penn properties. We purchased a casino outside of St. Louis in Illinois shortly after the spin-out. And then we purchased the Pinnacle assets. After that, we performed a casino outside of Pittsburgh. And we're currently under agreements not only with Penn to buy two additional casinos in this transaction but we recently announced a transaction to buy
the real estate portfolio of Tropicana Entertainment. So we're working on that transaction as well.

So we brought the scope. And since then there have been a couple of competitors come out. So since while we were the first gaming focused REIT, obviously, Caesars reorganized their business and came out, spun out of a bankruptcy, a REIT, and MGM did a similar transaction, although for much different reasons, where they have sort of a captively held but separate traded REIT.

So the presence of REITs in gaming is becoming more prolific with each and every transaction that occurs in the gaming space.

For us, we're a passive landlord; meaning that he don't get involved in the operations of our tenants. Our REITs are triple net REITs; meaning that the tenants are responsible for not only the property operation but the maintenance, the insurance, the real estate taxes, the
whole nine yards. So we are really not involved in the day-to-day operations of any of our tenants at these facilities. And they're all leased on a long-term basis.

So for us, while we are involved in this up front and, obviously, in the transaction to acquire the real estate. And to contribute depends -- deal in that way after the transaction we're not really involved in the property level day-to-day operations.

I'll just say a little bit about the lease structure, because I think that's important and the issues you're focused on today. Our leases are generally 35-year leases. So the lease with Pinnacle that this property would be going into was put in place in 2016. So it's in year three of a total term of 35 years.

Now, it's structured so that it has a ten-year initial term and then five-year renewals. Those are all at the
option of the tenant. So we as the landlord, as long as the tenant is not in breach of the lease don't have a right to kick our tenants out until the end; and no incentive to, quite frankly. For us, our objective is to make sure that we always have tenants in our buildings. Unlike any other REIT, vacancies are bad for us.

So if Penn were to agree to be there for 80 years, that would be great for us. There are accounting reasons why we don't have longer term leases. And we don't need to get into that unless you would like to. But suffice to say that those leases become a different character, more like a financing if you enter into a long-term lease, it includes the buildings and things like that. So that 35 years wasn't any desire on behalf of the tenants or the landlord to kick anybody out at the end of 35 years. It was more structured to ensure that these leases met certain requirements to be a true lease.

So those are the terms. And at
the end of the term, we have a very unique feature in our leases. So our struggle as a landlord in this -- and the reason why I don't think there were any gaming REITs prior to ours -- was the highest and best use of all these properties is gaming. So the next best use for any of these properties is something that generates much less revenue and rent than what $a$ gaming establishment would.

So our concern was always that at the end of this 35 years, how do we ensure that if Penn or Pinnacle or Boyd or Eldorado, whoever it might be, doesn't want to run these properties anymore, how do we ensure that we get somebody else in there that does want to run these properties, rather than just having the license move across the street or next door or to a neighboring county.

So we have a provision in our
leases that at the end of the term, whenever that might be, if -- assuming we don't renegotiate a new lease with our
tenants and our tenants want out, how do we transition to the new tenant? So that provision is structured so that if Penn at the end of the term decides they no longer want to be a tenant in our buildings, they're required under the lease to sell their operating assets to a new tenant that will enter into a new lease with us in that building to continue the gaming operations.

And there are all sorts of nuances in those provisions to ensure that they get fair market value, that our lease is fair market. But the desire is to ensure at the end of that lease term not that gaming stops or that you have to reissue a new license to a whole new establishment that's going to build a new casino and you're going to have two or three years or -- certainly more than a year where it's dark while somebody constructs something new, we have the same interest you do, which is, essentially, make sure that those properties never go dark.

And so that provision has been put in place to let them out, let them get fair market value for their assets, but ensure that there's a new tenant in that building that, obviously, will be subject to the licensure of the various gaming agencies that will continue to operate those facilities.

So that's our goal long term is always to have a tenant in there. And that's why that provision is in the lease.

The only time we get involved in the operations of the tenant -- and it's not even the operations -- is we have some minimal capital investment requirements in the lease, which is pretty typical for REITs.

Ours are actually less than yours and your gaming regulations. So it doesn't really implicate anything in Mass. Yours are more stringent, as are many others, than what ours would be.

We, obviously, have obligations in there that the tenant maintain the
properties. Because as the tenant in our properties, we want to make sure that the HVAC systems are maintained; that the roofs are maintained; that the parking lots are kept maintained; all the things that are affiliated with the ownership of the land and the building.

Other than that, we don't really get involved. We have very few approval rights. The only thing that Penn, Pinnacle -- and they're all the same. Our leases currently are all the same in this regard -- have to come to us if they're impacting the structural integrity of the building. So if they want to tear down walls or they want to remove -- they want to build on, or they want to attach to the building, we do have certain rights in the agreement to see those plans, to ensure that our -- they've hired a certified architect, that they meet all the local zoning requirements.

And the goal there is just, these are our buildings. And if -- while Penn
is a triple net tenant and they have an obligation to indemnify us and things go wrong there, if the building falls down and people are injured, that's going to be on us too. Yes, we'd have an indemnification right, but we're going to be front and center as the property owner in those.

So we want to make sure that those buildings are properly maintained. And if they do construction in those buildings that the integrity of those buildings is maintained.

So to date, we've had many, many instances where Penn has come to us with either a notice or an approval request. Same with Pinnacle. Same with our friends at Casino Queen. And we've -- to date we've never said no. So there's nothing that's come across our desk that we've said, Wow, this is a concern to us as a REIT.
So we're really not in it to
determine whether or not it's profitable
or whether or not it's something that we might like. We're in it to make sure that the structural integrity and footprint of our building is something we understand and we know, and we know has been done right.

So the only other thing I would like to point out, and then happy to answer any questions you have about us, is, you know, we view ourselves as a value add to gaming in these jurisdictions.

Because as a REIT, we are aligned not only in that we want the same thing you do; we want a tenant in there that's running the facility; it's operating it in a way that is maximizing the revenue for not only you but for us. Because, obviously, if you're not getting your tax revenues, we're not getting our rent. And we want to make sure that if they're not interested in operating that property anymore or they're doing so in a manner that's letting that property deteriorate, that we step in and say, Hey, that's not
what you've agreed to; that's not good for us; and I don't think it's good for you.

And if they decide they no longer
want to operate the property, we are sitting there as well wanting somebody else in there to do it, just like you would. And probably bringing forth people that we think might, for you to determine whether or not they could be licensed to do so.

We also -- and not a desertion to the gaming companies, but because of our structure from a financial perspective we're a higher rated credit risk. Because we are -- and GLPI specifically is currently split-rated. We're investment grade with $S \& P$ and we're a notch below at Moody's.

But because of the nature of a REIT, where we distribute 90 percent of our net income in dividends to our investors, we don't incur a lot of debt. We don't have a lot of operations. So we are financially -- REITs generally
financially are pretty strong creatures. Now that's not to say that there aren't periods in history where REITs got in trouble, they have.

Mortgage REITs had problems in the late '80s and early '90s. I think there are some retail REITs that are struggling a little bit. Most of it vacancies and lack of -- their rents are going down, their tenants are disappearing. That's a much different scenario than we have here. If that should happen to us, I can't tell you we won't have a problem, too. If gaming suddenly is no longer wanted and these guys can't justify operating these facilities, we'll have the same problem you will.

You know, your tax revenues will go down. Our tenants won't be able to pay the same rents. We'll be struggling to figure out what we do next. So I don't want to pretend like we're bullet proof. We're not. But I think we're very similarly aligned to you folks.

I think I'll stop there. I mean, there's so much we could talk about and do with respect to our interests and what we do and what we try to do. But I think that that will come later. I think those are the things that are probably germane to the issues in front of you today.

But that being said, I'm happy to answer any questions you have about us.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you. COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: The question that $I$ have, if I'm understanding this correctly, that even if you were to redo -- not getting into the details of how, but even if you restarted the clock, the maximum time would be 35 years for a lease and renewal options for reasons unrelated to --

MR. MOORE: I think so. I mean, what you have to do, because these are unitary portfolio, so Penn, Pinnacle, whomever, doesn't have the right to just get rid of one property. So they're all tied together in a cross-collateralized.

And that allows us to pay a little bit more. There's more security in that. Because of that, you have to look at the useful life of all the properties in the lease. And we did a useful life analysis and determined that 35 years is about as far as we could push it under these facilities.

Now I know that someone foolish in the sense you say, Well, gosh, there are buildings that have been around for hundreds of years. You could go around Boston and find buildings that have been here for well over 100 years.

Unfortunately, the tax and accounting rules don't quite support that. Even though we know people maintain their buildings, they improve their buildings. They do things to ensure that the structural integrity is maintained and they last. Who knows how long, right?

But we're stuck in that. That really gets into accounting treatment as well. And without getting too deep into
the weeds in an area where $I$ don't belong, being accounting, the accounting rules are changing in 2019, such that things previously recognized as operating leases will have to be treated as capital leases in many circumstances. That doesn't apply to us at the REIT.

So the lease that we're purporting to put this into, we, for the most part, and these leases somewhat are chopped up, and this gets pretty nuanced, but we believe that we'll have operating lease treatment for that which is -- which is optimal for us.

If we were to put a 60-year term on a lease, clearly that's going to be treated more like a financing than it is a true lease.

So from our perspective, it complicates it. We probably will have to carve that out into a separate lease, which I'm not going to tell you it can't be done, it certainly can. It's just much more complicated and not quite as secure
as what we're proposing today.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you.
Mr. Albano.
MR. ALBANO: If I may
then -- and I'm not going to repeat the letter, I know you have that in front of you. But if $I$ could just briefly address the two points that are in front of you.

The first is statutory
interpretation question: Do -- after a transfer, does a licensee have to have the legislature say licensees must have a lease that extends 60 years beyond the term of the then-license.

And we looked at -- first at -say the answer is no. You're not surprised to hear that. But we looked first at the transfer provisions of the statute and the regulations.

And certainly, the legislature contemplated that licensees were permitted to transfer facilities operate after they were up and running, with the focus being on whether the new owner was suitable to
be an owner and whether the -- I think in the language of the regulation, whether the transfer -- it could be rejected if the transfer was disadvantageous to the Commonwealth.

No provisions in the statutory provisions about transfers or in the regulations that say, And by the way, if you transfer the property, you have to have a new lease that goes out another 60 years.

I think the reason for that -- a couple of reasons for that under this statute. First of all, that requirement alone wouldn't, I would suggest, get the Commission what it's interested in, which is the security of a long-term facility.

You do get those -- that security in the terms of the lease that you will have in front of you. Because the lease says to the tenant: You must... You must operate a gaming facility in order to be a tenant on a property.

And as Mr. Moore explained, if for
some reason at the end of the 32 years that will remain on this lease, it was not renewed, the licensee would be required to enter into an auction process to deliver to the Commission a successor tenant for your review. And upon approval, there would be a new licensee in that property for a minimum of a ten-year lease. And, obviously, the expectation here is that it wouldn't stop at ten years, that's just the starting point.

So in terms of the security that's granted to the Commonwealth, we do say that's present in this situation.

The reason the legal issue came up is because of section -- perfectly reasonable question for the staff to ask, because Section 15 of the statute when it talks about an applicant before you even have your facility constructed, says so if your -- "no applicant shall be eligible to receive a gaming license unless the applicant meets the following criteria." And there's about -- scores of them.

But one of them is: Own or acquire within 60 days after a license has been awarded the land where the gaming establishment is proposed to be constructed, provided that -- and let me paraphrase -- ownership of the land shall include a tenancy of 60 years or more from the license.

So we say the way to read that statute is it's saying: Okay. There's only dirt, no facility. Someone's coming in, they're being considered for a license. And they either have to own it or we'll treat you as an owner if you have a 60-year lease.

It makes perfect sense at the outset of the construction of a facility. But I would suggest it also makes perfect sense that when the legislature got around to talking about transfers of real estate, there was no need to include that sort of provision. Indeed, the licensee no longer will be the owner of the real estate if the Commission approves this transaction.

So the language of Section 15 doesn't even apply in this special, We'll treat you as an owner if you have this sort of super long lease.

So that's why we say, and we're asking for approval of a transaction that has -- starts out with a 32-year lease, I would say substantial probability of 42 , and reasonable likelihood, at least, of extending beyond that.

That's all I have to say about the lease term, unless there's any questions on that.

That leaves me with the trust
instrument. The interim authorization regulations sensibly say that if we grant -- if the Commission grants interim authorization and this closing occurs, subject to being undone if final authorizations occur, that if after initial interim authorization is granted, the Commission determines that the transferee may not be suitable. There must be a trust provision that says, All
right, at that point you've -- the transaction is closed, but you need to transfer the land in this case to the trust. And then we'll see what happens. Down the road, if you are determined to be suitable, you may get the property back. If not, it may be auctioned. Many different outcomes could occur.

Again, I think, as Mr. Grossman said, all with a clear purpose of ensuring that if there is a suitability problem, that transferee is -- there is clear separation from that transferee, and in our situation the real estate.

So we propose a trust that we believe adheres to both the letter and the spirit of the regulations in this way.

Here we know Plainridge has been the owner. And I think I can go so far as to say that's been a good thing, people like Plainridge as the owner. We think you're going to like GLPI as the new owner.

But if there were to be a problem
that arose in this transaction, we think first the most practical and beneficial result is: Ship the property back to the entity that owns it now, and that is your licensee who you regulate and who you know, rather than to a trust or, God forbid, an auction, then what do we do at that point?

So the proposal we have in the trust is that if there is a problem with interim authorization, then at GLPI's option, it could either -- the property either goes to the trust or the regulations or right back to the licensee.

And the last thing I would say about that is I think that's basically the same thing as saying what we'd all agree on anyway, which is, if you've got two parties in front of you, they want a transaction approved or an interim authorization approval before you, they could at any point say, Thank you but never mind. We're not going to do a interim authorization. We'll file a new
application and wait the full-time to see if it's approved. That's effectively, I would say, all this trust instrument is doing.

So for that reason, we've asked for approval of the trust provisions as well.
ask, it sounded from your prior comments from the group that as part of this transaction, the property is going under the Pinnacle Master Lease. Mostly because of convenience, because that's the only master lease that you're opening, as opposed to the Penn Master Lease, which is originated from because you are not on that lease?
MR. ALBANO: Yeah.

Absolutely. That's exactly right.
So we could have put it in the
Penn lease but we thought since we were already making amendments to the Pinnacle lease it would be easiest to put it in
there.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Is the
Penn lease very different from the Pinnacle lease?

MR. ALBANO: No. They are very, very similar. The term is slightly different.

MR. MOORE: The leases are
almost identical. And the reason -- the leases are almost identical primarily because we went through some FTC review, and the FTC last taken an in-depth look at our leases. We own five or six casinos in the St. Louis market. We have two casinos out of three in the Baton Rouge market. The terms of that lease were very -- took a very long time to construct those leases.

The Pinnacle lease only differs in that the initial term is ten years as opposed to Penn's, which is 15. The total term of both is 35.

The Penn lease has a percentage rent component, they both do, a very small
percentage rent component. The Penn lease resets every five years, Pinnacle every two years. So there's some nuanced economic terms that are a little bit different. But all the substantive terms of the lease are the same.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else?

Director -- I mean, Attorney Lillios, we know from a legal standpoint we've been briefed that our staff is comfortable with this, as there's been some preliminary background checking and so forth, suitability checking.

MS. LILLIOS: So the IEB's been involved in all of the discussions about these two preliminary issues with you. Part of this interim authorization period is that we identify qualifiers for this transaction, and that we get full applications; the multi-jurisdictionals from the individuals; business entity disclosure forms from the new entities. That process of those submissions
have been complete. We are at the initial
stages of starting that initial invest review. But from -- everything from the multiple meetings we have had with these individuals as well as some of the qualifiers who were previously qualified before in connection with the initial licensure.

To date, there's no information otherwise. But, of course, we have not completed the initial investigation yet.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But, obviously, you're comfortable enough to be okay with the preliminary decision?

MS. LILLIOS: Well, the
decisions that you're making today are initial legal decisions that the IEB is comfortable with in terms of, you know, any impact on the suitability questions.

And when we come to you the next time, which I expect will be in August, that will be for interim authorization where we will have preliminary recommendation regarding
suitability.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Got it. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So
we're only approving -- you're asking -we're asking to consider the approval of the trust on those terms? And those were the lease term that Mr. Albano already talked about, and the provision that goes back -- if ultimately the transaction is not approved, back to the agency. Is that a fair statement? MR. GROSSMAN: That's exactly right. It's just those two narrow issues. It's the terms of the lease as far as the reversionary ability of the beneficiary and the actual length of the lease.

I'm sorry, the term -- the reversion of the trust and the term of lease. Otherwise, everything else will be handled at the next hearing.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Fine.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We'll get
to hear all this again.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'm
just curious, I may not remember to ask this question. What happens under the terms of the agreement to Plainville Gaming and Redevelopment after they transfer the --

MR. ALBANO: It is there.
It is the licensee. It's the operator.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It
will continue to be the operator?
MR. ALBANO: Under Penn
National's control. No change whatsoever.
MR. GROSSMAN: At the next
phase, that will be one of the considerations is whether there's any change of control or change at all to the gaming licensing, which is the Plainville Gaming and Redevelopment. So you will get to look at that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right.
Anybody else? Do we have a motion?
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I
would be happy to move, Mr. Chairman, that the Commission approve the request from
the licensees to include the trust terms as stipulated here.

MR. GROSSMAN: I would
consider moving that the -- you approve the trust as it was submitted in accordance with those terms. And separately approve the length of the resulting lease. You'll be able to take a second look at. But at the moment, you are comfortable with the lease terms.

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Are
we saying fact specific the length of their lease? Or just saying that the 60 years does not apply as a matter of law? MR. GROSSMAN: That's more specifically.

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: It would be the question of law, whether the 60 years is applicable, not necessarily the 35 years is inappropriate?

MR. GROSSMAN: That's
exactly right. I would say two separate motions.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'll
strike my prior motion and make a motion to approve the terms of the trust as submitted and discussed here today.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN:

Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

COMMISSIONER CROSBY: The ayes have it unanimously.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Then
we need to -- I --
MR. GROSSMAN: I would
suggest the second part is that you agree with the interpretation of Section 15, paragraph 3 of Chapter 23 K that the 60 -year language does not serve as a bar in this instance.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'll
move that the Commission agree with the staff read and recommendation that Section 15B that pertains to applicants not apply -- and specifically the 60-year provision relative to lease of the land does not apply to current licensees as discussed here today.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second? COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN:

Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes
have it unanimously.
(Pause in proceedings.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We will
adjourn for half an hour. We'll be back at 1:35.
(Lunch recess from to 1:35 p.m. to
2:45 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are reconvening at $2: 45$, I think. We left a little after 1:30. And we are on to Item No. 5.

> Katherine Blue.

MS. BLUE: Good afternoon,
Commissioners. We're on item 5B.
In your packet you have a letter from MGM there requesting a waiver from one of Commission's regulations. And this is regulation -- the regulation regarding gaming schools. It's 205 CMR 137.02, Section (2) (a)12. And that regulation requires that as part of the gaming school curriculum for table games that the people involved in training to -- to learn table games be provided with -- or be required to take CPR training.

MGM has requested a waiver from that provision of our regulation. They've outlined the reasons for their waiver in the letter that's in the packet. They cite two predominant reasons which is they have a highly trained security force who is more able to deal with these kinds of issues, and also because the dealer at the table is there to protect assets as opposed to providing medical assistance.

I know that we have come before you recently for waivers, and $I$ just want to provide you with the standard for granting the waiver as you consider whether you'd like to grant this one.

Our regulation 205 CMR 102.03
Section (4) says that "The Commission may in its discretion waive or grant a variance from any provision or requirement contained in Section 205... where the Commission finds," and there's four things you have to consider: "Granting the waiver or variance is consistent with the purposes of Chapter 23K; granting the
waiver or variance will not interfere with the ability of the Commission to or the bureau to fulfill its duties; granting the waiver or variance will not adversely affect the public interest; and not granting the waiver or variance would cause a substantial hardship to the person requesting the waiver or variance."

So I think MGM has outlined its request and why it's making its request. I think there is certainly an argument that they have met the waiver standards. But there's also other arguments on the other side.

And I wanted the Commission to have an opportunity to discuss this and then ask any questions it has.

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: How
long is the CPR class, in hours?
MS. BLUE: A couple of
hours.
COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN:
That's it?
MS. BLUE: Approximately
about two. We offer it here at our facility. And it's about two, maybe three hours.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: They have
to come to here from Springfield.
MS. BLUE: No, no. I'm just
sharing that we at the Gaming Commission provide it to our employees. It takes a couple of hours of time.

No. This is provided at the gaming school as part of the curriculum.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I'm
not persuaded at all that they shouldn't go because they should -- their training is their training and they can't fit it into the curriculum.

But I am persuaded that the fact that their primary job is to protect the assets is -- does make sense to me. You step away from that table, and all of those chips are at risk and those things.

So that piece of the argument makes some sense to me. I'm all in favor for everybody being CPR trained, frankly.

And I think it's only good.
But I do see the point that stepping away from the table and the fact that everyone else in a close proximity is trained is something to consider here.

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: I
don't know if counsel can answer this question or not, but I'm not persuaded that a half-day class is a substantial hardship.

But to your point, that doesn't mean functionally having them step away to respond to that is the best way to handle it.

Is there a process for them to alert security personnel? I mean, ideally I'd like to see them CPR certified so they know who to flag.

MR. NOSAL: Thank you,
Commissioner. I appreciate the opportunity. And certainly defer to Attorney Blue as to providing you with some additional information.
But if it's helpful, I'll try to
answer the questions that you have. It's my understanding, first of all, that the company does have a very specific emergency response plan that covers obviously CPR, and that Mr. Rucker, who was here earlier, obviously will oversee that particular function.

I can't answer specifically as to
whether or not there's a particular protocol for alert. But you heard today other circumstances about the interaction between, certainly wait staff and other service aspects and security and the interaction with management as well, that I feel pretty comfortable saying that there -- there certainly will be a way of alerting security in this what we view as a very controlled environment in order to get a person as much help as possible.

The only other thing $I$ want to add just in connection with the petition just to be clear that this is a joint petition on behalf of the institute and MGM.

And Commissioner O'Brien, you did
indicate earlier, you know, is it only a couple of hours? You're not convinced.

If you look at the criteria that they're required to teach, one issue on behalf of institution is that this requires a completely different set of expertise. So it requires them to bring in a separate person, adding an additional resource. And $I$ know we've been sensitive around keeping the costs controlled for this.

So while I don't dispute it's only a couple of hours, it is a very different aspect that requires a different level of expertise in order to provide this at the institute as well.

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: So is
the substantial hardship monetary argument because it would be passed on to the students, or that MCCTI couldn't absorb the cost of hire.

MR NOSAL: I think they are required to absorb the cost right now. Certainly, $I$ think it would be helpful
considering all the cost controls and the attempts to keep the tuition to the -- at the most reasonable level as possible. COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Do we know an actual dollar amount? MR NOSAL: I don't have that, Commissioner. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: In the letter, the second page, top paragraph, kind of addresses the rationale for security, because it's more than just the service, it is also -- it is also the crowd control, the contact of paramedics and collecting the information from the victim, all of those things, which are better handled by security.

I'm not concerned that there's not someone close by to handle the situation. It just -- I agree that the training is good for everyone to have. But the part of this that did -- was persuasive was they're protecting that -- stepping away and leaving all those chips unguarded is not in anyone's best interests.

Obviously, saving a life is. And if there's someone right there to handle that function within seconds, $I$ think that that piece of the request is okay.

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: But
the requirement they're seeking waiver from is not that they be mandated as job description to perform $C P R$, just they don't have to get the certification, right?

MR NOSAL: It's actually -it's a requirement for the curriculum that they actually be trained. That's an element, if you look at the CMR. It includes everything you have to do.

Again, this is limited to only table game dealers; that they're required to go through, I think there's 12 different elements that they're trained in. And one of them is the CPR component. We're just asking to take the CPR component out of the training.

For practical matter, this requirement, my understanding, again,
applies to the institute not to the company. So there's not a separate mandate that all table game dealers be CPR certified. It's only if you've gone through the institute's training that that part of the curriculum. And we're supporting that and providing the additional information to the Commission in connection with that to say that this function will be clearly covered by security, making that not necessary to be part of the curriculum.

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: I
guess the point $I$ was making is everything on page 2 in terms of who would execute is not impacted by whether or not these people get trained in $C P R$; is that correct?

MR NOSAL: I believe that
would be correct, yes.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I
don't know how this is a substantial hardship, just by going through the request. I think -- I was also trying to
think of the other one, the other part of waiver, which is the public interest.

I actually think that somebody being at least able to spot a symptom as quickly as possible, just having some awareness, which was the purpose, in my view, when we first wrote those regulations, just having had at least the notion that you need to call security as soon as you see these symptoms. Perhaps that is going through some kind of training and awareness. I don't think anybody is talking about certification by the way. It's just the notion of going through the training, actually serve the public interest. I don't know how these -- so in my view, kind of like two elements of the waiver that kind of work against it. I actually agree -- I was also with mixed feelings because of the protection element. But if we're just looking at the waiver, $I$ have a hard time actually getting past two elements of the waiver. So I'm in general reluctant to --

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Your
point is very well taken, that recognizing the symptom and being able to call security over instantly is a factor here.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It could be critical time.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes. Rather than not knowing if you don't have the training, and the person might struggle for more time, because someone didn't recognize the issue.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I -we've already -- I think we've already had one class that has gone through that did have CPR as a component of their training.

I guess I question -- I hear the other arguments, you know, I think that Commissioner Zuniga's point, you know, having that awareness, that training awareness, whether you actually leave the table to conduct the actual CPR itself is certainly a challenge if you're walking away from your table.

I feel a little reluctant to maybe grant the exemption. But in the meantime, maybe kind of revisit the regs, and the curriculum is all laid out in the regs we adopted, what Pennsylvania gave us. I feel more willing to do that than to grant an exemption when we're not sure we meet the standards of the exemption.

I know that that might impinge on time when this is coming up in terms of the schedule for the next class or the class that's currently going through. But I think there's some valid points to be made of -- if not full certification, some awareness of training of the customer who becomes in distress. Because I think that is part of serving the public.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: If
you attend for half a day you're technically certified. So it's not any more onerous. So you're having the training, and you have the hands-on technique, and then you are technically certified.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It seems
if I'm understanding this right, there is a policy at MGM that in the event of such a problem, the security people are the ones who are mandated to deal with that.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes, yes.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Not the table games person; not the table servers; the -- so we're training for some people to do something that the company's rules tell them not to do -- or tell somebody else to do.

The job is to get the -- is to get the security person to come over and take care of that medical emergency, number one.

And number two, if I understood the other point one of you said, if you come up from Foxwoods, you don't need to be trained. You just go in and get accepted as a job. You don't have to go through this training, so --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: YOu
know how to deal already?
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If you
already know how to deal, you don't need to go through the MCCI program.

So we have sort of a weird thing here. We've put up a rule that applies to some dealers, a training requirement that applies to some dealers, but not to all dealers. So we ought to fix that one way or the other. If we think it's important, then we ought to require it of everybody on the one hand. And on the second hand, we're suggesting a role for these table -for the dealers that is not consistent with the protocols of their company.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: But
the rules weren't set up to be particularized to a licensee. They were set up to look out for the interests of people there.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And I think the --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But if
we're going to stick with that, then we
ought to make them undue this rule.
COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Or
just make everyone get certified.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Under this
rule, the supervisor -- under their policy 900, the supervisor, if there is a detailed response of each security team member to a life-threatening blah, blah, blah.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But
it's not in conflict. That rule is not in conflict with our regs. It supplements our regs, which was my point about just the awareness, which was the original -COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes, yes.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, that's different. That seems to be a different issue. If they're spending whatever amount of time is required in awareness, maybe it ought to be part of the policy 900, that as part of this overall emergency response, having table dealers be trained to recognize the
problem, that makes all kinds of sense to me.

But as it stands, it seems like we have a variety of inconsistencies in this policy.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I
don't see the inconsistency in the policy. It's actually a policy of them. They're voting -- they're quoting a CMR because we're asking them to submit their plan. COMMISSIONER CAMERON:

Right.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That's
the regulation. When they do, it seems pretty reasonable that they would have certain people trained, and there's a protocol.

I just simply see it independent from a requirement of having this training.

I think the point you make is an interesting one relative to some disparity. But that has to do with where we place these regulations in the training
and certification of the Mass Career Casino Institute which was --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If we believe -- I'm really mixed on this, frankly, I don't know which way I would come down on this. I'm trying to think it through logically. If we think it's important that dealers be trained in CPR, then we should make them all trained in CPR.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I would argue that we already did when we promulgated the prior regulations of -for the casino certification, for the training.

What we are now considering is a waiver from that, and -- which is what I'm focusing on. Does it meet the four elements in the waiver? And I have a harder time getting past waiver reason No. 3 and No. 4, because it's neither in the -- I don't think it's a substantial hardship to the person requesting it.

To the case in point, we already
have a class that went through it. And I don't think that this would adversely affect the public interest. Quite the contrary, it actually enhances the public interest.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do you
think it's important -- do you think it's important enough that we ought to have every -- all dealers have this training?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So we
ought --
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It's
important -- which is where we put it in the -- when we certified where we put the regulations for the training for the Mass Career Casino Institute. Now --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If you go
through that. But that's only if you go through that.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: But
they have to go through MGM specific training, right, so --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But MGM
specific training would be compatible with this protocol, which I imagine from what it says, teaches table games people who see a problem to signal the security, according to what it sounds like their protocol, that's what MGM would train them to do.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And
again, which is not in conflict with having gone through two hours of training to recognize the -- it doesn't mean that they will do it. They just have to go through the training.

MS. BLUE: The issue really
isn't whether the training is valuable or not. The issue really is, we have a regulation that requires this as part of the table games curriculum, MGM and the MCCTI are asking for a waiver. They have to meet the standard. You have to be comfortable that they meet the standards to grant them a waiver.

If you feel comfortable, you can grant it. If you don't, you don't have
to. The separate issue of whether it should be part of the curriculum at all is a different conversation for the committee to have.

## CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That was

Commissioner Stebbins' point, right? So maybe we should deal with this. If you take that literally, really the only issue here is whether or not the request for a waiver meets the criteria we've laid out. You really stick to the letter of that, then your point becomes very significant.

Maybe the better way to deal with this is for us to decide whether we really believe that all dealers should have CPR training or not. And if they should amend our regs, say that. And if they should not amend our regs, to take it out.

MS. BLUE: So our regs only have this under the curriculum. So there is no broader place in our regs to require all dealers to have $C P R$ training.

There could be conversations around the internal controls that MGM
submits as to who gets trained and who doesn't. That's a separate issue.

We only have this requirement as a curriculum requirement. And that's what makes it a little bit tough too.

So either we are comfortable that we can let MCCTI take this out of their curriculum for this particular purpose, or we think that it doesn't meet the waiver standard, and it stays in the curriculum.

But at some point in the future the Commission can revisit what the curriculum is in general; not just this particular part of the curriculum, but the whole curriculum.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'm on
the latter part of that, which is I, you know, narrowly think that the waiver request at this point doesn't meet the standards that we set out for waivers. And that if we need to revisit this issue, come back and think about it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So what do
you -- do I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Let me see if $I$ can articulate it better than the last time. I will move that the

Commission does not grant the waiver petition from MGM and MCCTI, relative to the training on $C P R$ measures as presented here and discussed here today.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
discussion?
How many days is the
training?
MS. BLUE: The training is a couple of hours, between --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: No. The
overall training?
MS. BLUE: The overall
training, I don't know. Jed, Do you know?
MR. NOSAL: The number of
hours is in the reg.
MS. BLUE: It goes over a period of weeks, I believe.

MR. NOSAL: The training
hours -- if you look at Section -- I don't know if you have it -- 137.02,
"Curriculum," it's broken down. It depends on the type of game you're being trained with. But maximum is 200 hours to deal craps.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So you're talking a pretty small percentage.

Any further discussion?
So the motion was what? Remind me.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: To deny the waiver as requested here.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in
favor of denying the waiver, please say aye.

Opposed?
All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The denial
is passed unanimously.

MS. BLUE: Items 5C through
5 J are regulation requests that you have seen before. They were the subject of this morning's regulation hearing, so this -- those regulations are in the final promulgation process. We have received no comments on any of these regulations.

So they are ready to move to the final stage and get finished up.

The last two regulations are new. And so we can talk a little bit more about them. This will be the first time that you're seeing them. So we're asking you to begin the promulgation process. Just thought it would be helpful to know kind of where we are in each one.

5C, this -- we're asking you to approve the final draft version of 205 CMR 101. That's the adjudicatory proceedings, that the new hearing regulations that we have gone over and have been in front of you a couple of times.

Again, they were at the public hearing this morning. We received no
comments.
And so we're asking your
authorization to complete the promulgation process.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So
Mr. Chair, I move that the Commission approve the amended small business impact statement for 205 CMR 101, "Adjudicatory Proceedings," included in the packet. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second.

## CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any

discussion? Further discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes
have it unanimously.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I
further move that the commission approve the version of the 205 CMR 101,
"Adjudicatory Proceedings" as included in
the packet and authorize the staff to take all steps necessary to finalize the regulation promulgation process.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes have it unanimously.

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: 5D is
the final draft version of 205 CMR 115, and then all of the other sections of our regulations that needed to be adjusted once we made changes to the adjudicatory proceedings in 101.

So we're asking today for you to approve that final draft version. And the amended small business impact statement so we can complete the promulgation process
for those -- that group of amendments.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Mr. Chair, I move the Commission approve
the amended small business impact
statement for 205 CMR 115, et al., hearing
procedure updates included in the packet.

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN:
Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any
discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes
have it unanimously.
MS. BLUE: 5E is the final
draft version of 205 CMR 138.6.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Katherine, do you want me --
MS. BLUE: I forgot. I'm

```
sorry. Yes.
```

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Mr. Chair, I also move the Commission approve the version of 205 CMR 115, et al. hearing procedure updates as included in the packet, and authorize the staff to take all steps necessary to finalize the regulation promulgation process.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
Second.

## CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any

discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes have it unanimously.

MS. BLUE: 5E is 205 CMR
138.62. This is "Payment of Table Game Progressive Payout Wagers." This is an amend regulation for the institution of table games. This was one we heard this morning as well in the hearing.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do we have
a motion?
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So
Mr. Chair, I move that the Commission approve the amended small business impact statement for 205 CMR 138.62, "Payment of Table Game Progressive Payout Wagers; Supplemental Wagers Not Paid from the Table Game Inventory," included in the packet.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any
discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes
have it unanimously.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I
further move the Commission approve the
version of 205 CMR 138.62, "Payment of
Table Game Progressive Payout Wagers;
Supplemental Wagers Not Paid from the
Table Game Inventory" as included in the packet and authorize staff to take all steps necessary to finalize the regulation promulgation process.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY:
Discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes
have it unanimously.
MS. BLUE: 5F is the final
amended version of 205 CMR 143.02, for
"Progressive Gaming Devices."
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do we have
a motion?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: We
do.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right.
COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: I
move the Commission approve limited small business impact statement 205 CMR 143.02, "Progressive Gaming Devices."

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY:
Discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes
have it unanimously.
COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: I
further move the Commission approve the version 205 CMR 143.02, "Progressive Gaming Devices," including packet, taking all steps necessary to finalize the
regulation promulgation process.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY:
Discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes
have it unanimously.
MS. BLUE: 5G is the final
draft version of 205 CMR 146.23. This is
the "Fiscal Characteristics of the Chase the Flush Table."

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second --
no. Do I have a motion?
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'll
move that the Commission approve the amended small business impact statement for 205 CMR 146.23, "Chase the Flush Table Physical Characteristics" as included in the packet.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY:
Discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes
have it unanimously.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I
further move that the Commission approve the version of 205 CMR 146.23, "Chase the Flush Table Physical Characteristics" as included in the packet, and authorize staff to take all steps necessary to finalize the regulation promulgation process.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I
further second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY:
Discussion?

All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes
have it unanimously.
MS. BLUE: 5H is final draft
version of 205 CMR 146.63. This is
"Progressive Wager Equipment."
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Motion?
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS:
Mr. Chair, I move the Commission approve
the amended small business impacts
statement for 205 CMR 146.63, "Progressive
Wager Equipment," included in the packet.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY:
Discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes
have it unanimously.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I
further move that the Commission approve the version of 205 CMR 146.63,
"Progressive Wager Equipment," as included in the packet and authorize the staff to take all steps necessary to finalize the regulation promulgation process.

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN:
Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY:
Discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes
have it unanimously.
MS. BLUE: Section 5I is
final draft version of 205 CMR 146.59.

This is the "Physical Characteristics" for the "Criss Cross Poker Tables."

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So
Mr. Chairman, I move that the Commission approve the amended small business impact statement for 205 CMR 146.59, Criss Cross Poker Tables, Physical Characteristics," included in the packet.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY:
Discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes
have it unanimously.
COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: I
further move that the Commission approve the version of 205 CMR 146.59, "Criss

Cross Poker Tables, Physical

Characteristics," as included in the packet and authorize staff to take all steps necessary to finalize the regulation and promulgation process.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY:
Discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes
have it unanimously.
MS. BLUE: 5 G is the final
draft version of 205 CMR 146.58. This is the "Physical Characteristics" of the "Crazy 4 Poker Table."

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN:
Mr. Chair, I move the Commission approve the amended small business impact statement for 205 CMR 146.58, "Crazy 4

Poker Table, Physical Characteristics," included in the packet?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY:
Discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes
have it unanimously.
COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: I
further move the Commission approve the version of 205 CMR 146.58, "Crazy 4 Poker Table, Physical Characteristics," as included in the packet and authorize staff to take all necessary steps to finalize the regulation promulgation process.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
Second.

## CHAIRMAN CROSBY:

Discussion?

All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes
have it unanimously.
MS. BLUE: 5K is an
amendment to 205 CMR 135.01 and 205 CMR 139.04. This is the first time it's before the Commission. And I know Commissioner Stebbins may want to weigh in on this too. We have talked about this before, about addressing the definition of "Veteran." That definition shows up in 135. That's about the only place in our regs it shows up. If you remember, back when we started the process, we did Veteran certifications, and then at some point OSD started to do Veteran certifications.

The change in this definition mostly syncs it up with what OSD does, but it takes care to make sure that we're not
impacting any contracts that are currently held by Veteran Certified Enterprises that have been certified under the prior condition. So it's going to -- this change will not impact existing contracts. But as we move into operations, it will provide for people being certified by OSD. And I think it stops us or our certification too, does it not?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: It kind of takes us out of the certification business for folks that we're helping with construction.

What we've encouraged folks to do is to get their VBE certification from the OSD. Our meetings with OSD show it does not take a great deal of time to get them through that process. And we actually allocated some funds to OSD to help them with that.
But it -- again, we stepped in when there was a need to be filled. And now I think we're kind of stepping out of it and giving agencies that do this as
their course of business the ability to do the actual review.

I personally -- one of the things I was always worried about is -- because the nature of our review only asks for some background information, some of their discharge information, that we hate to ever have a situation where somebody says, Hey, I'm a VBE and they're not a VBE. This kind of takes us again away from what our stop gap solution was and provide some more permanent solution. And again also helps our licensees get credit for doing business with VBE's and maybe through their interaction with SDO also opens them up and makes them more aware of other bidding opportunities that they could have with the state.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So what happens when somebody just leaves a contract open ended and decides to continue just for the casino purposes?

How do we know that eventually -everybody's going to go OSD as intended
here?
MS. BLUE: I think we think
most of current contracts are for construction purposes. And we'll be moving out of construction. So let's assume there was a company that could provide both construction and post construction services.

They would most likely have to enter into a new contract. And at that point they would be covered but these new rules for post construction.

One of the things we were
concerned about when we drafted it was that we did not want to impact current contracts and current construction projects that we're trying to calculate how many VBEs they had on-site.

So this really will impact the operations portion. Once construction's done, it shouldn't be an issue.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is it clear that the criteria are, essentially, identical? So we won't have approved
somebody as a VBE who can't -- VBE who can't get approved by OSD?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: No, no.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Our criteria are pretty much the same.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yes.
The criteria was pretty much the same. Yeah. The two biggest pieces demonstrate that you have discharge papers that show you're a veteran. And we added a page to our licensing documents that allowed an individual to do that.

I think where SDO offers some value is that there's a big piece of minority women are Veteran Business Enterprise, designation comes through, does the person actually manage and run the company? And I think they were able to do a much deeper dive on that than we were in a position to do.

So I think, you know, this kind of helps us, again, moving away from something that we've found a quick
solution to and putting it so that everybody is on firm and solid ground for licensees to say they do business with this number of VBE's as well for the VBE to continue pursue some opportunities.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But it is likely to my point that with OSD rules, the businesses now have to provide more evidence of actual ownership and control, not just papers of some individuals who is associated with the business.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So there
is some -- there is some possibility that -- but it's too bad, because the OSD's doing a better job than we would have done.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: In a nutshell, yes.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.
So do we need to move --
MS. BLUE: Yes. We'll start this -- we'll start the promulgation process. We'll take comments, have a public hearing down the road and bring it
back to you for final approval.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay.
Commissioner?
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Just
want to make sure I'm on the right spot.
I move the Commission approve the
small business impact statement for the amendments to 205 CMR 135.01,
"Definitions," and 205 CMR 139.04,
"Reports and Information to Be Filed with the Commission," as included in the packet."

COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY:
Discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes
have it unanimously.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I
further move that the Commission approve the version of the amendments to 205 CMR 135.01, "Definitions," and 205 CMR 139.04, "Reports and Information to be Filed with the Commission," as included in the packet and authorize the staff to take all necessary -- steps necessary to begin the regulation promulgation process.

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN:
Second.

## CHAIRMAN CROSBY:

Discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes
have it unanimously.
MS. BLUE: 5L. These are
amendments to the reports and reconciliation, gross gaming revenue.

And I think -- as you've seen us
come back to you before with changes on
some of these reporting requirements, we are conforming the reg to what we've determined is really the best practice. So the reg as it was originally drafted, talked about the gaming licensee sending us money, and it wasn't as clear on the true-up. What you see now is what we actually do.

We send them an invoice. We detail how we true it up. So we think it makes more sense. We're enshrining what we think is the best practice for now. So that required a certain change in clarification to our regs. This is beginning the process. So we will take it through; we'll get comments; we'll go through the public hearing process and then bring it back for final approval. COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Is there a "be" missing from that sentence redlined, be refunded?

MS. BLUE: That might be,
yes. We'll clean it up before it goes out.

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Okay. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So do we have a motion?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Makes
sense to me.
Mr. Chair, I move that the
commissioner approve the small business impact statement for amendments 205 CMR is 140.04, "Reports and Reconciliation Regarding the Gross Gaming Revenue Tax" and -- as included in the packet.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
Second.

## CHAIRMAN CROSBY:

Discussion?
COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN:
Should we be writing this in the active voice instead of the passive? We're striking out active voice --

MS. BLUE: You mean the reg? COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Yeah.

For the reg language, can we clean that up?

MS. BLUE: Yes, we can clean
that up.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That was a
good one.
Any other discussion?
All in favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes
have it unanimously.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON:
I further move the Commission
approve the version of amendments to 205
CMR 140.04, "Reports and Reconciliation
Regarding Gross Gaming Revenue Tax," as
included in the packet, and authorized
staff to take all steps necessary to begin
the regulation promulgation process.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
Second.

## CHAIRMAN CROSBY:

Discussion?

> All in favor?

Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes
have it unanimously.
MS. BLUE: Thank you.
That's all of the regulations for today.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you.
The last item on our agenda is
commissioner updates.
Anything?
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I
have one. I just returned from panel -sitting on a panel in Niagara Falls, gaming conference with our colleagues from Canada.

And as we usually do, we did receive accolades for our responsible gaming, in particular our PlayMyWay GameSense as well as our research from a number of Canadian regulators.

And in addition to that, our colleagues were most interested in sports
betting, because they really feel like it will affect what they do there.

They do not have the ability to have In-Game Betting, so they were very -very interested in what we do -- will do state by state.

And -- as well as while we were in
conference, their senate passed cannabis on a recreational basis for the entire country. And they gave it to the gaming regulators to regulate.

So there was much discussion about that, that they have a new industry to regulate.

And our colleagues -- rather, our
former consultants from Spectrum Gaming, as well as HLT, send their regards to all the Commissioners.

And of course, you know, talked fondly about their assistance to us in the past. So just wanted to pass that along.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.
Thank you.
So is -- don't the different
provinces of Canada have different admin--- jurisdictional structures?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: They
each have -- they do -- they regulate
gaming by province. But the federal
government has now given them cannabis to regulate by province as well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY:
Interesting.
Anybody else?
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I
had the occasion on Monday to talk to the governor's advisory commission on travel and tourism, which the group consists of pretty much all the regional tourism counsels from around the Commonwealth.

So it was a great way to update them on where we are with our licensees, what their impact is going to be, as well as the direction of some of the monies that come from the taxes on our Class 1 licensees. Some of that going towards tourism. Some of that going towards gaming economic development fund.

There was a lot of general
interest and not from the host regional tourism councils, but from others to say, Hey, how can we get -- how can we find an opportunity to work with the licensees to get somebody to come explore fly fishing up in Franklin County or make sure they're aware of the 400 th anniversary of Plymouth; and, you know, making sure that visitors to all the facilities have a chance to get out and explore the state and maybe extend their visits.

So Director Griffin and I talked about, it might be worthwhile for the appropriate folks that are licensees to have a chance to be in front of this group and think a little bit more statewide about how some of their guests and visitors might want to take in some other activities that are of interest to them.

Some of the RTC's also wear a dual hat as a chamber of commerce. So we also talked about the purchasing and supplying power that isn't geographically restricted
because MGM wants to buy seafood. The best place is probably not the Connecticut River but Glocester and New Bedford or up and down the coast. So it was a good conversation and some good kind of follow-up to do items as a result.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.
Anybody else?
Do I have a motion to adjourn?
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So
moved.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA:
Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in
favor?
Opposed?
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: The ayes
have it unanimously.
Thank you all.
(Concluded at 2:18 p.m. )


