

1 COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
2 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION
3 PUBLIC MEETING #248
4
5

6 CHAIRMAN:

7 Stephen Crosby (present by telephone)
8

9 COMMISSIONERS

10 Eileen O'Brien

11 Bruce Stebbins

12 Gayle Cameron (present by telephone)
13 -----
14
15

16 MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION

17 101 Federal Street

18 Boston, Massachusetts

19 Thursday, July 26, 2018

20 10:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.
21
22
23
24

P R O C E E D I N G

1
2
3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: My name is
4 Enrique Zuniga, and this is a meeting of
5 the gaming commission. Today is July 26,
6 2018 and this is meeting number 248.
7 Chairman Crosby and Commissioner Cameron
8 are away in what turned out to be a working
9 vacation, but we have them dialed into the
10 phone. I need to establish that you can
11 hear us okay. Chairman Crosby, can you
12 hear me?

13 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I can hear you
14 fine, but I don't see the live stream up.
15 Is it up? Oh, here it is. I got it.

16 MR. BEDROSIAN: It's delayed.

17 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's running
18 behind.

19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The video
20 streaming has a few seconds of delay. So
21 our advice, Chairman, is that you listen to
22 the conversation on the phone and you mute
23 the stream.

24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Got it.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Commissioner
2 Cameron, can you hear us okay?

3 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I can hear
4 you loud and clear, Commissioner Zuniga.

5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Very good.
6 Commissioner Stebbins, can you speak into
7 the microphone to see if they can hear us
8 okay?

9 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I think they
10 can now.

11 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: All right. So
12 we've established that you can hear us.
13 All votes, if we have any votes as the
14 regulations require will be taken by roll
15 call, and we'll proceed accordingly. So
16 first, the second order of business is I
17 suppose administrative updates. We don't
18 have minutes for this meeting?

19 MS. BLUE: No, because we just did a
20 meeting last week.

21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Last week,
22 okay. So the item on the agenda begins
23 with Director Bedrosian.

24 MR. BEDROSIAN: Good morning,

1 Commissioners. So on my general update, I
2 will tell you there is no other update
3 right now other than the MGM opening and
4 staff continues to work diligently. I
5 think staff is starting to spend and I will
6 start to spend more time out in Springfield
7 certainly as August rolls around.

8 I anticipate that we will have a
9 meeting next week out in Springfield, and
10 that meeting will, I hope, culminate in a
11 potential vote by the commission to
12 delegate Commissioner Stebbins with the
13 authority to issue a temporary certificate
14 of occupancy later in the month when
15 certain preconditions are met by MGM.

16 So just to give you and the public a
17 heads-up, I anticipate next Thursday,
18 August 2nd a meeting potentially starting
19 early afternoon around lunchtime that will
20 be the culmination of staff's presentation
21 work on checking on license conditions,
22 RFA-2 conditions, regulatory gaming
23 conditions, all those the commission that
24 would give them, empower them hopefully to

1 delegate to Commissioner Stebbins that
2 authority.

3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I do want to
4 clarify for the record, the certificate of
5 operations is what you meant to say instead
6 of certificate of occupancy.

7 MR. BEDROSIAN: Did I say occupancy?
8 Yes.

9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Occupancies by
10 the City of Springfield.

11 MR. BEDROSIAN: Good news is we are
12 not in that business. You're right,
13 operations, gaming operations.

14 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: We will issue
15 the certificate of operations.

16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Can I interrupt
17 for one second, Enrique?

18 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes, go ahead,
19 Chairman.

20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I can't hear very
21 well. Is there anyway that -- Gayle, can
22 you hear them?

23 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Not as clear
24 as the commissioners, but I can hear.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: They need
that --

MR. BEDROSIAN: Hold on one second.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I think we
discovered the source. It's the speaker of
the phone. Try that now.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Without paraphrasing
the commercial, can you hear me now?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes, that is
much better.

MR. BEDROSIAN: I will very briefly
go over what I said, which is staff is
working hard and we are spending a lot more
time out in Springfield and we anticipate a
meeting next Thursday, which staff will
present to the commission all the
regulatory license conditions, commitments,
regulatory gaming, preparations and
everything which we anticipate would
empower the commission to make a decision
to delegate to Commissioner Stebbins the
authority later in August to issue a
temporary certificate of operations for the
gaming establishment at MGM Springfield.

1 So that's what we anticipate happening next
2 Thursday, August 2nd.

3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you,
4 Director. We have a practice of
5 recognizing our elected officials whenever
6 they attends our meetings.

7 MR. BEDROSIAN: There are
8 representatives from Senator Brady's office
9 here today. Thank you very much. Thanks
10 for reminding of that, exactly.

11 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Excellent,
12 thank you.

13 MR. BEDROSIAN: So which leads me to
14 the next item, which is we had received a
15 letter from representatives of MG&E, which
16 you remember was an applicant for the
17 Region C commercial license. I think I had
18 updated the commission that we had received
19 that letter in June. I anticipated
20 potentially addressing it sometime later or
21 sometime in July. I note for the calendar
22 we're still in July.

23 And what I had done I asked staff,
24 when I say staff, I mean the legal

1 department to look at both the legal --
2 some of the legal and policy issues
3 involved in that direct letter's request
4 and sort of the implication of Region C
5 again. So what I would like to do is you
6 have a memo in your packet from our legal
7 counsel. I'd like to turn it over to
8 General Counsel Blue to explain some of
9 staff's thinking at this time.

10 MS. BLUE: Good morning,
11 Commissioners. You have in your packet a
12 memo from me and my team, and the memo
13 outlines the process by which Region C was
14 considered. It was very instructive to go
15 back and look at some of that to realize
16 how long we considered Region C, and then
17 attached to the memo is a list of items
18 that the commission may want to consider.

19 I think just as a practical matter,
20 the way the commission awards a Category 1
21 Gaming Establishment License is in our
22 regulations. It's very specific. It is
23 the regs. are drafted to require a
24 competitive open kind of process with an

1 evaluation of the long and detailed
2 application that we have.

3 We do not at this time have a
4 process in our regulations for a
5 reconsideration or the award of a license
6 in a process that may be different from
7 what we already have. So that's kind of
8 the fundamental starting place.

9 Other than that, you will see from
10 our memo there are a lot of things that
11 have changed in the region. There's a lot
12 of things that we understand a little bit
13 better or differently now that we've been
14 through the process of opening PPC, and now
15 getting close to opening MGM. So I put
16 that out there for your consideration.
17 Whatever you determine you'd like staff to
18 do and you'd like us to proceed, we would
19 be happy to do that.

20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.
21 Yes, we had received that letter from MG&E
22 that you outlined, Director. I found your
23 memo very helpful, Counsel Blue. I want to
24 go around and get comments from my fellow

1 commissioners on this matter. Commissioner
2 O'Brien, do you have some thoughts on this
3 document?

4 COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: In terms of
5 where we stand today and in light of the
6 memo, my recommendation would be to set
7 this for a time in the fall when we can
8 truly ask questions of the process and come
9 up with a plan on how to go forward.

10 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I didn't quite
11 hear that, Commissioner.

12 COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: My
13 recommendation with everything that the
14 commission has before them with the summer
15 that we set a date to have a further
16 discussion of process about this letter in
17 the fall. Sometime in September would be
18 my suggestion.

19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: In other
20 words, start thinking about a process at a
21 later time.

22 COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: A process or
23 a response.

24 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Or a response.

1 Commissioner Stebbins, do you have any
2 thoughts on the contents of the memo or the
3 letter?

4 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: You know, it
5 was an interesting letter for us to get.
6 You know, certainly I don't think the
7 message has been lost on us, and I know
8 former Commissioner Macdonald being a
9 southeast native would continue to raise
10 the question of with us of, you know, what
11 about the southeast region in Massachusetts
12 and, again, not being left behind. I think
13 we all take that into consideration.

14 I know, you know, this is not up for
15 a vote. So I think to Commissioner
16 O'Brien's point, there is no action we can
17 take on either the request or future steps
18 for us to take without, again, kind of
19 shifting this down the road to another
20 meeting. And, again, hopefully after we
21 can move past the opening of MGM so that
22 staff can turn their attention to a lot of
23 the work and questions that were raised in
24 General Counsel Blue's memo.

1 Personally, I have several areas of
2 concern within the request that we got from
3 MG&E's legal counsel. But, you know, I'm
4 more than happy to take those up at the
5 appropriate time.

6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I don't think it's
7 a problem raising whatever issues are on
8 your mind. I think it clearly makes sense
9 we've got our hands full until September
10 for any significant work. I think that's
11 clear. But, you know, along with getting
12 whatever have from some of the issues now.

13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Commissioner
14 Cameron, do you have other comments in
15 relation to what -- do you have comments on
16 this matter?

17 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I do,
18 Commissioner. Like you, I found the
19 staff's memo helpful and I certainly, I
20 know that we are not voting on any of this,
21 but I certainly agree with many of the
22 recommendations. You know, it's been a
23 number of years and I certainly think that
24 would limit itself to a new gaming market

1 analysis of the region as well as the
2 analysis of what is happening here in
3 Massachusetts.

4 So, I mean, I could go to a number
5 of these issues that they recommended, but
6 I certainly agree with most of them. Many,
7 many things have changed. The environment
8 has certainly changed, the gaming
9 environment, and I think our review would
10 be a very good place to start.

11 Overall, I don't think that many of
12 the circumstances that caused us to deny
13 that license have changed from now. So
14 giving that as a thought but I just, you
15 know, the saturation point is always
16 something we're looking for and what's best
17 for the Commonwealth.

18 As we all know, we did not have a
19 competitive environment in Region C, and
20 there were many factors for that. But I
21 think doing this analytical work will help
22 us form an opinion on how to move forward
23 in Region C. So, I think many of those
24 steps would be necessary for us to have a

1 better view of the environment now.

2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right.

3 There's certainly a lot of things that have
4 changed outside -- even outside of the
5 gaming region of Massachusetts but in our
6 contiguous states that bear into a lot of
7 the discussions that we had back then.

8 So, I just want to back up a little
9 bit. The people from MG&E do point out
10 that we had issued a public statement
11 relative to having a public discussion on
12 this matter at a later time, which is what
13 they are asking us to do now. Do I get a
14 sense from Commissioners that this is
15 something that we would want to schedule
16 for a later time like in the fall?

17 We could conduct a public hearing,
18 for example, like we've done in the past.
19 We could also ask for public comment like
20 we have done in the past. Is this
21 something that any of the Commissioners
22 would agree with? Commissioner Stebbins,
23 before we got into the phone, Commissioner
24 Stebbins?

1 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yes. You
2 know, I certainly look at this request as
3 generating -- this request generates two
4 questions for us. I think there's a
5 separate track of how do we reply to legal
6 counsel from MG&E's request; and then,
7 secondly, how the commission moves forward
8 and reconsiders a lot of the questions,
9 again, raised in General Counsel Blue's
10 memo about Region C, things that may have
11 changed, things that might be different,
12 you know, certainly a public hearing or a
13 public meeting opportunity to get some
14 feedback and input would be merited. So,
15 you know, there is kind of dual paths of
16 decision I think we need to consider.

17 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. Is that
18 along the lines of what you were also
19 pointing out, Commissioner O'Brien?

20 COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Yes. I think
21 that, as you said, there is two issues.
22 One is sort of a discrete response to the
23 letter and then the other one is what, if
24 any, process follows independent of that

1 response. Absolutely I think it's
2 something that should be addressed at a
3 later time with a little more definition on
4 our part about what that conversation
5 entails, but absolutely public comment is
6 always welcome.

7 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay.

8 Chairman Crosby?

9 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes, I had a
10 couple of thoughts related to that. I
11 think the idea of doing the back -- the
12 environmental scan makes sense. I think it
13 would make sense to get that started.
14 There is no point in putting that off. If
15 we just wanted to use HRT, who has always
16 done our analysis before, we could frame
17 the question, Commissioner Zuniga, you in
18 particular are good at that, and that kind
19 of makes the relationship with HLT. And I
20 would think it would make sense for you to
21 go off and talk to them and have them send
22 us a proposed scope on how they would look
23 at the issues that are raised in items one
24 and two and get that going.

1 There is no point in waiting until
2 September to get that started. Maybe they
3 could be ready by September so they have
4 that for us. Similarly, I think asking for
5 comment now. I think the idea probably of
6 a public hearing is a good idea. We might
7 want to go out in the community to do one
8 or more as we have in the past, but I think
9 it would be great to ask for feedback now.

10 We have a letter from Senator Brady,
11 and we have a letter from one of the
12 churches, but that's the only direct
13 connection we have other than the letter
14 from MassGaming. I think it would be good
15 for us to ask for that now so we have a
16 thought of what's going on out there.

17 And then I talked with Catherine and
18 Todd about this, but I think it might be
19 worth taking a shot at seeing whether
20 there's other commercial interest. As
21 everybody knows, when we spent I guess
22 practically years the last time round
23 trying to encourage commercial applications
24 that at the end of day there was only one

1 company that and one community that could
2 get together and actually make an
3 application.

4 I had asked Todd to think about
5 whether would there be some screener
6 questions, like could we now simply ask for
7 statements of interest with enough
8 substance in the request that we could
9 screen out the complete mickey mouse
10 proposals. I am not sure we can do this.
11 As I said, I talked about this with
12 Catherine and Todd and asked Todd to think
13 about the kinds of questions we might ask.

14 But it would be useful -- if it
15 turned out hypothetically, this is not
16 necessarily the case at all, but if it
17 turned out hypothetically that there were
18 no other parties who expressed interest,
19 then we might want to rethink whether we
20 want to go through the whole RFA-2 process
21 over again with only one party interested,
22 which would be MG&E.

23 So that would be a third thing that
24 if we could took request statement of

1 interest with some degree of substance,
2 that would also prepare us for September
3 when we get around to dealing with this.

4 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Let me just
5 react quickly to that, because this is a
6 little bit what Counsel Blue was saying
7 initially. That our regulations, actually
8 the statute, doesn't really contemplate for
9 what you seem to be alluding just simply
10 asking a statement of interest or just a
11 flatout reconsideration of an applicant in
12 the past.

13 So while the statement of interest
14 or the market scanning is intriguing, I
15 would be a lot more comfortable finding a
16 way to first analyze whether it fits with
17 first the statute and, if necessary,
18 whether we would need to change regulations
19 to accommodate that. I mean, I think the
20 idea is intriguing, but I go back mostly to
21 how this was set up initially, and that was
22 a competitive process that Counsel Blue was
23 referring to.

24 I want to make sure I go in the same

1 order. I'm sorry, Chairman, did you have a
2 response to that?

3 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes. I just want
4 to make sure I understood. Were you saying
5 that you didn't think we could ask for
6 requests for statement of interest?

7 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No. I'm
8 saying I would first want to make sure that
9 our legal department thinks that it fits
10 within the confines of the statute and our
11 regulations to do that.

12 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay, that's fine.
13 I mean, I can't see why asking for a
14 statement of interest would be an issue.
15 We certainly as a practical matter have
16 that going on, you know, before, you know,
17 when we were all going around the
18 Commonwealth asking for people to express
19 interest in the various regions before we
20 began the RFA-1 process. But I don't have
21 any problem with checking with Catherine to
22 make sure that fits.

23 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: We will. I
24 mean, my sense is that that expression of

1 interest was the RFA-1 per se and the
2 400,000 non-reimbursable fee that the
3 statute provided for, but the point is
4 well-taken. We'll check with staff on
5 that. Commissioner Cameron?

6 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Could I just
7 finish up? I'm sorry to be rude to you,
8 but I just have a couple of other thoughts.
9 One was I thought there was kind of an
10 misimpression in the MG&E letter that was
11 worth addressing. The letter made it sound
12 as if the only issue that the commissioners
13 dealt with are the principal issue by far,
14 the controlling issue would be
15 commissioners dealt when we decided not to
16 award the license was the possibility of a
17 tribal casino.

18 And I made a point of going back and
19 reading our decision. We certainly made
20 reference from time to time to a tribal
21 issue and whether or not the MG&E proposal
22 properly accommodated the potential
23 financial impact of that. But we were way,
24 way more comprehensive in our concerns than

1 simply the tribal issue. So I just wanted
2 to put that on the record. That was an
3 important --

4 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That is very
5 important. I was going to actually make
6 that point myself. But it bears repeating
7 that from their letter, the MG&E people
8 make it seem as though the only or
9 certainly the most important factor in
10 their not being awarded the license was the
11 status of the tribe, and there was indeed a
12 lot of other factors that played into
13 ultimately the four to one decision not to
14 award the license, and that's an important
15 point of clarification for the record.

16 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I just have one
17 more, sorry. Just the point I'm trying to
18 make is I think I agree with everybody that
19 we can't really deal with this right now,
20 especially the way, but we ought to get as
21 much preparatory work done as we can
22 between now and mid to late September when
23 we can turn our attention to this full
24 board, and that's why I'm recommending --

1 that we recommend our suggestion was one
2 and two we trust that they are underway.

3 Also, recommendations six, seven,
4 eight and nine are things that I think that
5 we need to look at and staff can be looking
6 at so that there are suggested answers to
7 those questions when we are ready to go
8 come say mid-September and support thinking
9 about reason to believe ask for statements
10 of interest, doing the recommendations one
11 and two, getting those going and that going
12 as quickly as we can and having staff
13 follow through with recommendations on
14 seven, eight and nine I think would make a
15 lot of sense. That would put us in a
16 position to have a really, really robust
17 conversation when we get started rather
18 than starting from ground zero.

19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes, there is
20 a lot that staff can undertake. I would
21 have to check, for example, things how
22 whether we're still under current contract
23 with our consultants, for example, whether
24 we can just extend them or we need to

1 conduct another station, for example, to do
2 that market scan or market assessment
3 and -- but that's -- your point is
4 well-taken that that's work that we could
5 undertake now. So we'll turn to staff to
6 see how we can start implementing the tasks
7 that are more feasible to doing the short
8 term.

9 Commissioner Cameron, did you want
10 to the react to any of these comments or
11 make final a point?

12 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes,
13 Commissioner. I just I guess my question
14 is more about process here and the
15 consensus of the commission members with
16 regard to any work now, is it the right
17 time to move forward with some of this
18 work? I think we're talking about -- and
19 maybe there will be. There is nothing for
20 a vote on today's schedule.

21 But, for example, a market analysis
22 is really an extensive proposition to do it
23 properly, and I'm just -- maybe we do have
24 a consensus to at least move forward with

1 something like that. But I think, several
2 of these steps require, you know, a good
3 amount of work from staff. And do we have
4 a consensus among the five of us to move
5 forward with that or would those steps be
6 needed to discuss in a meeting?

7 I don't want to put this off, but
8 I'm just wondering if we really do have a
9 consensus for timing. Is this the right
10 time to move forward with all of these
11 steps? I just haven't heard that from my
12 fellow Commissioners.

13 I am weighing in my own mind what I
14 think is appropriate right now. Even
15 public comment, does the public have enough
16 information to comment wisely or would it
17 be appropriate for us to say, for example,
18 you know, conduct the market analysis and
19 then ask for public comment. I'm just
20 trying to figure out the process here.

21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And what is
22 your sense relative to your -- weighing
23 into that consensus question? What is your
24 feeling about the timing for moving on any

1 of this all things being equal?

2 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Well, I
3 frankly think staff, in particular,
4 probably has lots to do between now and
5 September, and I'm just wondering if it
6 makes any sense to move forward right now
7 trying to get some of these -- some of
8 these issues addressed or if it would make
9 more allow -- if we should wait until
10 September after we open, and then address
11 some of the issues. I'm just trying to be
12 cognizance of everybody's bandwidth and
13 what the consensus is among the five of us.
14 I'm just not sure, you know, how I feel
15 about it without more discussion with the
16 five of us.

17 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, there
18 seems to be one -- I'm sorry, go ahead,
19 Chairman Crosby.

20 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I was going to
21 obviously I agree with Commissioner Cameron
22 that if the staff doesn't feel like they
23 have the bandwidth to do like items six
24 through ten or six through nine, I will

1 obviously agree with that. What I'm
2 thinking is to the extent that we can get
3 ourselves ready, hopefully, I think that's
4 constructive, you know, if we state think
5 than we think it does.

6 I think it's a fair question, not
7 just from the standpoint of MG&E, but from
8 the standpoint of everybody in
9 southeastern, Mass. it's a fair question
10 about, is it time for us once again to take
11 a look at this? I have no opinion on it
12 frankly at this stage of the game, but I
13 think it's perfectly legitimate and I would
14 have brought this up.

15 If MG&E hadn't brought it up, I was
16 going to bring it up to the commission, you
17 know, should we, again, take a look at that
18 Region C and figure out what we do. So to
19 the extent that we can prepare ourselves to
20 be ready to go in September, I just think
21 it's best to start with. That's all.

22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. Other
23 reactions from Commissioners in the room?

24 COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: I'd want to

1 follow-up on what Commissioner Cameron said
2 and maybe clarify my initial statement,
3 which was there are two issues on this
4 agenda item. One is the response to the
5 letter; two is what, if any, process
6 follows. And I do think moving in depth on
7 anything beyond what is in response to the
8 letter prior to September is premature and
9 presupposes something will occur.

10 And I think the appropriate step in
11 September is, to Commissioner Cameron's
12 point, is we come up with a response to
13 that letter and then some consensus what,
14 if any, process follows before we're
15 sending other things out, we're bidding and
16 other contract things about testing the
17 market. That's where I stand.

18 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes.
19 Actually, that's where I stand as well and
20 that probably is the beginning of that
21 consensus and merging that Commissioner
22 Cameron was alluding. I think you put it
23 well, Commissioner O'Brien. Let's figure
24 out the short run is a response to the

1 letter, and let's turn it back to staff to
2 do that, and we can do that in short order.

3 But the issue that is more of
4 careful consideration -- and I understand
5 Chairman Crosby's point about whatever we
6 could do to prepare for is incumbent upon
7 us is one of process and regulation
8 changes, if necessary or making additional
9 commitments to consultants or studies or
10 whatnot.

11 Let's put off that discussion until
12 later. Certainly not before the fall is
13 what I seem to be hearing given that there
14 seems to be quite a bit of focus at this
15 time in the MGM opening.

16 MR. BEDROSIAN: So if I could just
17 summarize I think where we are, I would
18 direct staff to focus their attention in
19 the near term in the next 30 to 45 days on
20 a draft response to the letter itself, the
21 micro issue of the letter on the
22 reconsideration.

23 And to the extent possible based on
24 the discussion today to anticipate some of

1 the items that then may follow into a
2 potential broader discussion about Region
3 C, which could be everything from what
4 would it take to do a new market study,
5 what, if anything, if the commission wanted
6 to do, you know, find out what the market
7 would bear through an expression of
8 interest, is that something we could
9 legally do under the statute regulations;
10 and if not, what changes would need to be
11 made and potentially maybe a series of
12 public comment questions based on the macro
13 issue about Region C. Is that my
14 understanding?

15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That is a good
16 summary. Any other reaction?

17 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I would only
18 just, you know, forewarn ourselves that
19 because we are taking up this issue right
20 now and we always have an open MGC
21 comment's line that we may not have to wait
22 for a public hearing before we start
23 getting thoughtful letters, communications.
24 I think even to the Chairman's point, we

1 may have potential applicants who weigh in
2 through what is just a normal comment
3 process that we always use. So we're
4 starting with this meeting -- with this
5 item being on the agenda kind of restarting
6 that conversation and probably spurring a
7 lot of comments already from the public.

8 MR. BEDROSIAN: We're always open to
9 public comment.

10 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Absolutely.

11 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Any final
12 thoughts Commissioner O'Brien, we're good?

13 COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: No, I think
14 Director Bedrosian summarized it properly.

15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Any final
16 comments?

17 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Commissioner
18 Zuniga, just one thought. Does staff have
19 enough -- have they heard from us on enough
20 to start preparing a response to that
21 letter, or are there any issues in that
22 letter that we haven't discussed that they
23 would feel or is it just strictly research
24 they will be doing with regard to items in

1 the letter?

2 MR. BEDROSIAN: Thank you,
3 Commissioner Cameron. I think we're good
4 to get started. And, obviously, if we have
5 any questions or preliminary issues, we
6 will circle back with the commission.

7 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Okay, thank
8 you.

9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay, that
10 sounds like a plan. I think it's a good
11 discussion. Let's move on to the --

12 MR. BEDROSIAN: So if we could,
13 Mr. Temporary Chairman, if we could just
14 switch up, I apologize, items four and
15 three and move up items four. Director
16 Griffin has committed to presenting an
17 outside forum which she needs to leave by
18 11:00, if possible.

19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So you want to
20 go to item four at this point?

21 MR. BEDROSIAN: Yes, please. Thank
22 you.

23 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Director
24 Griffin.

1 MS. GRIFFIN: Good morning,
2 Commissioners.

3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good morning.
4 Actually, Director, just one second. Just
5 in the event that any of the Commissioners
6 on the phone leave the phone call, please
7 let me know so that we can reflect that in
8 the minutes, but we'll assume that you are
9 still on even if you are not talking of
10 course. Go ahead, Director.

11 MS. GRIFFIN: I'm joined by my
12 colleague, Ombudsman John Ziemba, and we're
13 here to talk about the Boston Private
14 Industry Council Mitigation Fund
15 Redesignation, and so I'm going to actually
16 turn it over to John to set some context.

17 MR. ZIEMBA: Thank you, Jill. By
18 way of background, earlier this year the
19 commission voted to award two workforce
20 pilots in Region A. When we drafted the
21 guidelines back last December, we only
22 anticipated that we would have one
23 workforce pilot in each region. However,
24 given the importance of workforce

1 development in each of the regions, the
2 commission did move forward with two
3 \$300,000 grants.

4 However, it was clear at the time of
5 the award of the Region A pilots that we
6 would need to meet with the Boston PIC
7 regarding some of the specific grant
8 spending categories and some of the
9 commission's decisions regarding priorities
10 under that grant.

11 We have met -- staff has already met
12 with Boston PIC, and they have made the
13 request that Jill will outline for you. We
14 also, during the meeting with the Boston
15 PIC, we also requested that they meet with
16 the Metro North Regional Employment Board,
17 and that meeting has occurred as well.

18 As you recall, when we previously
19 awarded two workforce pilots in Region B,
20 we asked them to coordinate as well, which
21 they did subsequent to our award. And I
22 think we have some good news in that regard
23 here, so let me turn it back to Jill.

24 MS. GRIFFIN: So, as you remember,

1 you voted to approve \$300,000 to the
2 Private Industry Council grant. And the
3 marketing and the data management staff
4 advised that we would like to talk with the
5 applicant following the vote and talk about
6 the use of those funds, and so those are
7 the funds in question.

8 The Private Industry Council has
9 requested that rather than using them for
10 marketing and data management that they
11 reprogram those funds to use for staff, and
12 they indicated that they currently don't
13 have staff capacity at this time to handle
14 the grant management.

15 Staff thought that this was a
16 reasonable use of these funds for this
17 year. Now, this is a 26,765. Obviously
18 it's not enough for a full staff position.
19 However, on the Private Industry Council
20 has had conversations with other funders in
21 the region and has had some promising
22 conversations about potential match of
23 those funds.

24 COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: So is this

1 request contingent on them getting matching
2 funds or is this simply the request to
3 release the funds?

4 MS. GRIFFIN: It's not contingent
5 upon the matching funds. It's to utilize
6 for a consultant use or whatever they deem
7 appropriate.

8 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I've had a
9 chance to visit with Director Griffin on
10 this issue. I was encouraged by the fact
11 that the Boston PIC, again, you know, you
12 work with these entities, they have certain
13 geographical boundaries they need to work
14 in. Happy that Boston also put in an
15 application. We awarded the application,
16 because obviously they cover the City of
17 Boston, which is outside kind of the host
18 community's regional employment or
19 designated regional employment for whatever
20 is happening here, you know, there is
21 better alignment on projects because there
22 is some cross-collaboration that can
23 happen, because they are all sharing
24 certain partners.

1 So I'm glad that they are making
2 some programmatic alignment through all
3 this. I compliment them on kind of getting
4 the administrative cost down to where it
5 is. It now reflects less 10 percent of the
6 award, which I think is great. It
7 certainly allows more money to be put out
8 for the programmatic use. And, you know,
9 if -- you know, I know how rebs and PICs
10 are stretched for financing, so I'm glad
11 they're making this happen with this
12 request. I'm glad that they are also
13 pursuing some other money.

14 As I said before when we went
15 through this community mitigation grant, I
16 still think it's a great, new story for us
17 to think about, \$300,000 award to Metro
18 North, \$300,000 award to the Boston PIC and
19 leveraging other cash and in-kind
20 contributions, we're putting close to about
21 million-dollars on the street for workforce
22 development for not only our licensee but
23 for the communities. So, I think that's --
24 I think that's even -- I think that's an

1 incredible new story.

2 So I wholeheartedly support your
3 recommendation. I think it's great. Great
4 work to you and John for bringing the
5 parties together.

6 MS. GRIFFIN: Thank you,
7 Commissioner. Commissioner O'Brien, I
8 wanted to just follow-up on your question
9 about the contingency. I had a
10 conversation with the funder in question.
11 They need to bring it before their board
12 like we are doing today, but it sounds very
13 promising. So I want to let you know that.

14 And thank you, Commissioner
15 Stebbins, for bringing up those points
16 about the meeting and the collaboration.
17 We're very encouraged. And I did want to
18 emphasize that the staffing we think
19 appropriate for this year and future years
20 we're hoping and expecting that the two,
21 you know, if they decide to reapply in the
22 future that they would come together as a
23 single applicant as like what happened in
24 Region B.

1 But they had a promising meeting on
2 the 24th of July. They talked about
3 collaborating together to convene all the
4 career councilors in the region to talk
5 about and get updated regarding the Encore
6 jobs and to talk about general hospitality
7 needs of other employers in the region.

8 They talked about training funds and
9 best leveraging all the training funds, and
10 they talked about collaborating for
11 outreach and community engagement and
12 opening up training programs for all in the
13 region, you know, and developing a regional
14 sector focus for hospitality. So we're
15 very encouraged and think that
16 reprogramming those uses with these
17 collaborative efforts would be a really
18 good use.

19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you,
20 Director. Any reactions from Chairman
21 Crosby on this topic?

22 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Just that it
23 sounds great, and the section by
24 Commissioner Stebbins is really interesting

1 and helpful.

2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.
3 Commissioner Cameron?

4 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: No, I agree.
5 Corroboration is what everyone has been
6 hoping would happen and, you know, sharing
7 those funds. And as Director Griffin just
8 explained, that sounds positive.

9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.
10 Yes, it's great when there's different
11 groups trying to strive for a common goal.
12 We really encourage efficiencies through
13 collaboration, so I'm glad to see that in
14 the future. So is there a motion from the
15 request or any other discussion?

16 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: If there is
17 no other discussion, I'd move that the
18 Commission approve the use of \$26,765 of
19 the previously approved \$300,000 grant to
20 the Boston Private Industry Council towards
21 a staff and consultant position.

22 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you,
23 Commissioner Stebbins. Commissioner, is
24 there a second?

1 COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Second.

2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. Motion
3 is made and second. I'll go now in roll
4 call. Commissioner Stebbins?

5 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yes.

6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Commissioner
7 O'Brien?

8 COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Yes.

9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Chairman
10 Crosby?

11 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Yes.

12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Commissioner
13 Cameron?

14 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And
16 Commissioner Zuniga votes yes. The ayes
17 have it unanimously. Thank you.

18 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Great work.

19 MS. GRIFFIN: Thank you.

20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The next item
21 on the agenda would be Director Vander
22 Linden. Is there a need or time to set up
23 or transition? We're all set?

24 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Commissioner

1 Zuniga, I want to watch this presentation
2 with the video as well as the audio, which
3 I can't do while I'm hooked up live. So we
4 don't have anymore votes to vote, right?

5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No, we don't
6 have anymore scheduled votes.

7 CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. So I do
8 want to watch the presentation, but I'm
9 going to sign-off on the meeting formally
10 and watch it on screen.

11 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. So we
12 should note for the record then that
13 Chairman Crosby is leaving the meeting,
14 although he will be watching the stream,
15 because he's clearly interested in the
16 topic. Thank you, Chairman. Director
17 Vander Linden.

18 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Great. Good
19 morning, Commissioners. I am joined by
20 Drs. Heather Gray and Debi LaPlante from
21 the Cambridge Health Alliance Division on
22 addiction. I've worked with both of these
23 fine people for the past several years now
24 in evaluation of various responsible gaming

1 programs, including the GameSense program,
2 which will be presented to you today, as
3 well as PlayMyWay and the voluntary
4 self-exclusion program. So thank you for
5 coming.

6 As you know, in 2015 Plainridge Park
7 Casino opened up and with it came the very
8 first GameSense program information center
9 in the United States. At the GameSense
10 information center, patrons can access a
11 variety of information intended to increase
12 informed player choice, including how games
13 work, the probability of winning and
14 explanation of house advantage and tips and
15 tools to promote positive play.

16 The information is available in a
17 variety of different formats, but probably
18 most powerfully is when it comes from the
19 knowledgeable and friendly GameSense
20 Advisers who have been there since the
21 beginning 16 hours a day, seven days a
22 week.

23 Our responsible gaming framework
24 that the commission adopted is recently

1 Version 2 just recently a few months ago
2 and Version 1 back in 2014, adopts an
3 evidence-based and precautionary approach
4 basically saying where evidence exists, we
5 will use that evidence and we'll implement
6 programs that are in line with that
7 evidence-based approach.

8 However, where there is an element
9 of risk and a potential for harm, we won't
10 sit back and wait for evidence to emerge.
11 We will use a precautionary approach.
12 Basically that the lack of scientific
13 certainty should not and will not be a
14 reason to postpone measures to prevent
15 harm.

16 The GameSense program is really an
17 example of our implementation of this
18 precautionary approach. When the
19 commission first adopted GameSense and
20 moved forward with the GameSense
21 information center, while there was
22 promising evidence that moved us in the
23 direction of adopting this program,
24 including that it fit very well with the

1 commission's overall agenda and mission,
2 that the evidence was uncertain or it was
3 in its beginning stages. And, so, we took
4 what I feel like a very aggressive step to
5 evaluate this program.

6 What you will hear today is
7 accumulation of basically four evaluation
8 efforts. The information is very
9 interesting, and I think that it's very
10 promising to me as we continue down this
11 road with GameSense. We will use the
12 information that is presented today as we
13 begin to -- as we continue to think about
14 how do we improve the GameSense program?
15 What steps do we need to do to help our
16 GameSense Advisers be more successful, more
17 effective in the work that they are doing?

18 And so with that, I think I'll go
19 ahead and turn this over to Dr. Gray and
20 Dr. LaPlante.

21 MS. GRAY: Good morning,
22 Commissioners. On behalf of Dr. LaPlante
23 and the Division of Addiction, I'd like to
24 thank the commission for inviting us to do

1 this research and to present on it this
2 morning.

3 I'd like to start with a little
4 context for the GameSense program and
5 Director Vander Linden covered some of
6 this, so I'll be brief. As you know, in
7 2011 Massachusetts passed the Expanded
8 Gaming Act and that act included several
9 mandates designed to mitigate potential
10 harm that might come from expanded gambling
11 opportunities, and one of those was the
12 requirement for on-site complimentary
13 substance use, compulsive gambling and
14 mental health counseling.

15 Just about three years after that,
16 the Commission adopted the GameSense brand
17 to fulfill this requirement and it required
18 that all new gambling venues would provide
19 space for a GameSense information center to
20 be staffed by the Massachusetts Council on
21 Compulsive Gambling.

22 In the spring of 2015, you
23 contracted with us at the Division on
24 Addiction to evaluate GameSense and the

1 other responsible gambling initiatives. As
2 Director Vander Linden mentioned, those
3 include PlayMyWay voluntary budgeting
4 system and the voluntary self-exclusion
5 program.

6 Shortly after that, Plainridge Park
7 Casino opened and with it opened the very
8 first GameSense program in the United
9 States. Massachusetts was a real leader
10 here. Just this past year, as you might
11 know, MGM implemented GameSense throughout
12 its properties in the United States.

13 So we took the first six months
14 after Plainridge Park opened to develop a
15 system for evaluating the program. We
16 worked very closely with the GameSense
17 Advisers, and they were wonderful partners
18 with this along with Director Vander Linden
19 and Teresa Fiore.

20 So we used a lot of feedback from
21 the GameSense Advisers on how this system
22 should work. They were willing to try lots
23 of different things, and really the focus
24 in these first six months was developing a

1 system for the GameSense Advisers to
2 classify the interactions they were having
3 with the patrons on the floor and others.

4 So from December 2015 to May 2016,
5 we had our first wave of data collection,
6 and that became report one. Shortly after
7 that started, the SEIGMA team went into the
8 field and did their first survey of
9 Plainridge Park patrons, and they followed
10 that with another survey in the summer of
11 2016 but actually became part of that --
12 part of that became our third report.

13 In August 2016, we made some
14 refinements to our data collection system
15 and launched our second wave of data
16 collection, which also lasted six months.
17 That became the basis for our second
18 report. In May 2017, we conducted a survey
19 with Plainridge Park employees. That
20 became our fourth report. And then just
21 last month, we delivered our comprehensive
22 evaluation of GameSense and that brings us
23 to today.

24 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Before you go

1 there, Doctor, can I just make one
2 observation? This commission -- you made
3 it seem in your remarks that we adopted
4 GameSense exclusively to fulfill the
5 requirement of the on-site space for
6 substance and mental health, but that was
7 not our intention.

8 Our intention was to adopt GameSense
9 for the higher goal in the same paragraph
10 in the legislation, which includes a number
11 of strategies, public health strategies and
12 the overall mitigation of potential harm.
13 Just wanted to clarify that.

14 MS. GRAY: Okay, thank you. So now
15 I'll get into a little bit more detail
16 about our four reports. Report 1
17 summarized that for six months of data
18 collection, and it included two sources of
19 information. The first were checklists or
20 computerized records of services that the
21 GameSense Advisers provided. The idea was
22 that any time a GameSense Adviser
23 interacted with a patron or someone else,
24 they were to use an iPad and to describe

1 that interaction on some basic dimensions.

2 And then we also wanted to get the
3 impressions of the people who were using
4 the program. That included mostly patrons
5 but also Plainridge Park staff and others,
6 and so those became our visitor surveys.

7 Report 2 took the same form as
8 Report 1 except whereas in Report 1 we
9 focused a lot on the user's satisfaction
10 with the program. In Report 2 we turned
11 more to their thoughts and behavior
12 surrounding responsible gambling.

13 Report 3, as I mentioned, was our
14 analysis of SEIGMA's patron intercepts. We
15 only focused on the GameSense questions,
16 and Report 4 was our analysis of our
17 Plainridge Park casino employee survey.

18 So we situated all of this work
19 within the RE-AIM framework, and that's a
20 way to conceptualize the impact of a public
21 health program. You can see it includes
22 five dimensions, which together spell out
23 RE-AIM. The first dimension is Reach, and
24 that's the question whether the right

1 people are receiving the program.
2 Effectiveness, is it working as intended?
3 Adoption, is it being adopted in the right
4 settings? Implementation, is it being
5 implemented in the way that it was
6 originally intended? And finally
7 maintenance, is it being sustained over
8 time?

9 As you'll notice in our presentation
10 today, we focus mostly on the first of
11 these dimensions, Reach, and focused
12 slightly less on effectiveness just given
13 the nature of the work that we did.

14 So it's important if we are studying
15 effectiveness to know the intended purpose
16 of the program, and so here you see a
17 section of the 2014 responsible gaming
18 framework. And that stated that GameSense
19 was designed to serve as a patron central
20 point of contact for inquiries and
21 enrollment into voluntary responsible
22 gaming programs and services, including
23 self-exclusion programs, play information
24 and management systems and educational

1 tools to assess play risk, provide
2 responsible gaming tips and increase
3 players' knowledge of how games work while
4 dispelling common gambling myths. That
5 last part is important because we know that
6 there are a lot of gambling myths that can
7 contribute to gambling-related problems.
8 So it's important to try to dispel those
9 when possible.

10 And this framework evolved. As you
11 know, there is an updated version of the
12 responsible gaming framework that came out
13 in May of this year. Again, GameSense is
14 in this framework designed to serve as a
15 central point of contact, and this
16 framework adopts a relatively new term of
17 positive play, and that is defined in the
18 framework as gambling within personally
19 affordable limits, being honest with
20 oneself and others about one's gambling and
21 not being significantly negatively impacted
22 I believe in luck or other superstitions.

23 Now I'm going to turn more towards
24 our methodology. As I mentioned, we spent

1 about six months working closely with the
2 GameSense Advisers in developing a system
3 for them to categorize their interactions,
4 and this was a system that we developed and
5 that we are confident in as of December of
6 2015.

7 So they had four choices when they
8 came to classify their interactions. One
9 was simple, and this often includes
10 something as simple as giving directions to
11 something inside the casino or providing a
12 greeting, maybe someone comes to the
13 GameSense center to take a break to get a
14 bottle of water and doesn't go beyond that.

15 Instructive is when a GameSense
16 Adviser delivers information about
17 responsible gambling or problem gambling to
18 the visitor. That's usually a patron but
19 could be someone else, and it's a one-way
20 interaction. It's the GameSense Adviser
21 giving information, but it's not a
22 conversation.

23 Demonstration is just what it sounds
24 like. So, for instance, the GameSense

1 Adviser might use the demonstration of
2 pulling a marble out of a bag and then
3 putting it back in to show that slot
4 machine play is independent from one play
5 to the next and not like a conveyer belt
6 where if you just wait long enough, then
7 you'll get the win.

8 And, finally, exchange was the most
9 substantive kind of interaction, and that
10 was a real conversation between a GameSense
11 Adviser and a visitor about responsible
12 gambling or problem gambling. And we gave
13 the GameSense Advisers a lot of information
14 about what those terms meant, and we
15 actually did a lot of training to make sure
16 they understood all of these categories.

17 Now, all of the surveys that I'll be
18 presenting today from Reports 1 and 2 come
19 from visitors who had exchange
20 interactions. So at the direction of the
21 commission, we only surveyed visitors who
22 had this kind of interaction with GameSense
23 Advisers. And we want to be cautious in
24 stating that the results of our visitors'

1 surveys don't necessarily generalize two
2 people who only had the other kinds of
3 interactions.

4 So now I can start to get to some
5 findings. Starting with Report 1, we found
6 that in those first six months of data
7 collection, the GameSense Advisers reported
8 5,659 interactions, and that translates
9 into about 31 interactions each day. We
10 asked how many people they interacted with,
11 and the answer there was 9,342. This we
12 know is somewhat of an underestimate,
13 because they didn't always record the
14 number of people involved. But we know
15 there were at least that many, and that
16 translates into about 52 visitors a day.

17 Now we got an estimate from Penn
18 National about how many patrons were coming
19 to the casino each day during that same
20 window, and we used that to come up with an
21 estimate of Reach. So that indicates that
22 on average each day, the GameSense Advisers
23 were directly connecting with about
24 .67 percent of casino patrons.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: What was the
2 window, Doctor?

3 MS. GRAY: The window -- the dates
4 was December 2015 to May 2016.

5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So what
6 happens when a customer comes more than
7 once to the casino?

8 MS. GRAY: That's part of the
9 number. They would be counted twice. But,
10 also, if a visitor spoke to a GameSense
11 Adviser more than once in a day, that would
12 also be counted twice. So we describe in
13 the report there is some uncertainty but
14 it's present in both counts, the numerator
15 and the denominator.

16 Now we start to look at how the
17 GameSense Advisers were -- that's
18 strange -- categorized in their
19 interactions. We have a little glitch
20 here. You see that they categorize their
21 interactions. 70 percent of them were
22 simple. And, again, that was something
23 like giving directions or a simple
24 greeting, 13 percent were instructive. The

1 mystery category there is demonstration,
2 and that was just one percent.

3 So when they started, they didn't
4 have a lot of demonstrations that they were
5 using regularly that increased and about
6 16 percent where those exchange
7 interactions where they had a real
8 conversation.

9 Now we have some visitor survey
10 findings. So one of the questions we asked
11 and we asked this of everyone who completed
12 the survey was, did you have any of the
13 following concerns when you began your
14 conversation with a GameSense Adviser? In
15 other words, what prompted you to speak to
16 the GameSense Adviser? And you can see
17 about 70 percent of them said that they
18 were curios about GameSense. This was not
19 too surprising. It was a new program.
20 They didn't know who these people with the
21 green shirts and what were they all about,
22 and they wanted to find out. You can see
23 that the other options were endorsed less
24 often.

1 So, for instance, 39 percent said
2 that they spoke to a GameSense Adviser
3 because they wanted to learn more about how
4 gambling works. About 2.5 percent said
5 that they wanted help or information about
6 problem gambling. And that's something
7 that we saw often that said that more
8 extreme level of help was not often
9 reported.

10 We asked, did you learn about any of
11 the following? And we asked this among a
12 smaller group of people. So 77 percent or
13 so said that they learned strategies to
14 keep gambling fun, and the numbers went
15 down from there, 48.4 percent, so they
16 learned how gambling works.

17 This is interesting because
18 PlayMyWay hadn't been implemented yet
19 during this wave but still 26.4 percent
20 said they learned how the play
21 management -- it didn't have any -- would
22 work, what it would be and so we think that
23 the GameSense Advisers were anticipating
24 this program and already speaking to

1 patrons about it.

2 Now we asked, how satisfied are you
3 with your interaction with the GameSense
4 Adviser? You can see that 77.8 percent
5 said they were extremely satisfied, and
6 that was the biggest category of course.
7 16.7 percent said they were very satisfied.
8 We asked, as a result of your conversation
9 with the GameSense Adviser, will you do any
10 of the following? They can select as many
11 as they wanted.

12 The most often selected answer was
13 tell someone about the GameSense info
14 center, and 56.9 percent of people endorse
15 that option. Now we have no way of knowing
16 whether they actually did any of these
17 things, but this is at least what they said
18 they would do as a result of that
19 conversation.

20 We included both the options reduced
21 gambling behaviors and increase my gambling
22 behaviors, because we didn't go into this
23 with any assumptions that the direction --
24 that it would only go in one direction. We

1 know that public health programs often have
2 unintended consequences, and we wanted to
3 leave that option open.

4 Now I'm going to turn to Report 2.
5 In this case, the GameSense Advisers
6 reported 7,878 interactions or about 44 a
7 day. These interactions involved 16,993
8 visitors, most of whom were patrons. That
9 was true in the first wave as well, and
10 that translates to about 94 visitors a day
11 or about 1.33 percent of casino patrons.
12 So that's another estimate of Reach.

13 In terms of how they categorize
14 their interactions, this is similar to
15 Report 1 and in Report 1 70 percent were
16 simple and in Report 2, 73 percent were
17 simple, 15 percent were instructive,
18 2 percent were demonstration and 10 percent
19 were exchange.

20 So we asked a question about how
21 they might, again, this is only for
22 exchanged visitors, people who had a
23 conversation with a GameSense Adviser,
24 about how they might hypothetically use

1 those GameSense Advisers in the future. We
2 asked, if you felt you were starting to
3 lose control over your gambling, would you
4 feel comfortable asking a GameSense Adviser
5 for help? And here we have a distinction
6 that I'm introducing for the first time
7 between first-time respondents or people
8 who completed the survey for the first time
9 and repeat respondents, who have completed
10 a survey for the second time.

11 So you can see that among first-time
12 respondents 89 percent answered yes to this
13 question, 11 percent said they weren't sure
14 and none said no. And among repeat
15 respondents, 97 percent said yes, they feel
16 comfortable asking GameSense Adviser for
17 help, two percent weren't sure and one
18 percent said no.

19 Now, you might remember this
20 question from the first round and the first
21 round we asked, will you do any of these
22 things as a result of your conversation?
23 So we repeated that question for first-time
24 survey respondents, and then we also asked

1 it among repeat respondents to try to get a
2 sense of do people do what they say they
3 are going do. I'm sorry, I've jumped ahead
4 here. This is a question of why they
5 talked to a GameSense Adviser. Sorry about
6 that.

7 So this question we see that for
8 first-time respondents, similar to the
9 first round, about 77 percent said that
10 they spoke to a GameSense Adviser simply
11 because they were curious. You can see
12 that that drops among repeat respondents.

13 So after people are repeatedly, you
14 know, interacting with GameSense Advisers
15 that curiosity isn't driving them anymore.
16 For the repeat respondents, the most
17 frequently endorsed option was I wanted to
18 learn more about strategies to keep
19 gambling fun, and that was at 61.2 percent.

20 Again, you can see in the very
21 bottom row that it was rare for people to
22 say they spoke to a GameSense Adviser
23 because they wanted information or help
24 with a gambling problem.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Doctor, remind
2 me, how is repeat defined here?

3 MS. GRAY: Sure. So if someone had
4 an exchange with a GameSense Adviser and
5 that person indicated that they had never
6 completed a survey before, they were asked
7 to complete a survey and they were
8 considered a first-time responder. And we
9 knew that it was a first-time respondent
10 when we looked at the data, because it was
11 on a different color paper.

12 And, so, if they had a conversation
13 with a GameSense Adviser and they said yes,
14 I've already done the survey, then the
15 GameSense Adviser would administer that
16 green survey and had somewhat overlapping
17 questions and some new questions, so we
18 could tell which was which.

19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So there is
20 only one repeat.

21 MS. GRAY: Yes. They were only
22 asked to do it twice at the most. Is that
23 what you mean?

24 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. After

1 the repeat only, it only means a second
2 interaction, a second meaningful
3 interaction or what was exchanged, a second
4 exchange.

5 MS. GRAY: This is an important
6 distinction. So it doesn't tell us how
7 many times they've had an exchange. It
8 tells how many times they've done a survey.
9 Now, ideally, they do a survey after every
10 exchange. That was our intention with
11 GameSense Advisers. In fact, their
12 response rates were really high, 85 percent
13 in round one and at least 79 percent in
14 round two.

15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But wouldn't
16 that turn off the respondent potentially?

17 MS. GRAY: To ask them?

18 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: To ask them --
19 every time there's an interaction, to ask
20 them to do a survey, an exchange?

21 MS. GRAY: You mean would it turn
22 them off from speaking to a GameSense
23 Adviser?

24 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No, from

1 filling out the survey. I already filled
2 it out.

3 MS. GRAY: Right. So that's why we
4 didn't ask them to do it more than twice.
5 I think the GameSense Advisers were pretty
6 good at emphasizing we know you did this
7 before, but this one has slightly different
8 questions.

9 MR. VANDER LINDEN: I would also say
10 the GameSense Advisers do roughly
11 90 percent plus of the voluntary
12 self-exclusions and individuals that
13 entered into the voluntary self-exclusion
14 program through the -- with a GameSense
15 adviser were not asked to complete a
16 survey, correct?

17 MS. GRAY: Not for this, because
18 they were doing one for our evaluation of
19 the voluntary self-exclusion.

20 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Right. So I
21 just want to emphasize that in terms of I
22 wanted information or help about problem
23 gambling, it would -- that group that
24 specifically came to the GameSense

1 information center for help were not
2 counted in that category.

3 MS. GRAY: That's true. While we're
4 on this topic of repeat versus first time,
5 another distinction I want to make is that
6 it doesn't tell us how many total
7 interactions a person had with a GameSense
8 Adviser. So they could have had 30, 40
9 simple interactions or instructive or
10 demonstration, and then the first time they
11 have an exchange that's when they first ask
12 for a survey. So their total GameSense
13 exposure, if we consider all the different
14 kinds of interaction, is separate from
15 their first time or repeat, and that will
16 become important in some future findings.

17 So now I'm going to go on to the one
18 that I already introduced and this is a
19 question of, as a result of your
20 conversation with a GameSense Adviser, will
21 you do any of the following or it was
22 worded for the repeat respondents, did you
23 do any of the following?

24 So here we see that 68.2 percent of

1 first-time respondents said, I will seek
2 out information about how to keep gambling
3 fun. And then about 54 percent of the
4 repeat respondents said that they did do
5 that after their conversation.

6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: What is it,
7 54?

8 MS. GRAY: 54.3 percent of the
9 repeat respondents. It's the last column.
10 And then we asked -- one of the options
11 was, I will think about changing my own
12 gambling behavior and 36.9 percent of
13 first-time respondents said that they would
14 do that, and 38.8 percent of the repeat
15 respondents said that they did do that,
16 that they did think about changing their
17 gambling behavior.

18 And this corresponds to a
19 pre-contemplated stage of change if you're
20 familiar with the stages of change and how
21 it relates to changing one's own behavior.
22 So they are thinking of making a change but
23 aren't quite ready to do it yet. Moving
24 on.

1 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Just to clarify
2 on that point, the stages of change, if
3 they are pre-contemplated, they are not
4 willing to consider, they don't even think
5 about making the change but the
6 significance to me of this finding is that
7 it's indicating to me that perhaps they are
8 moving down through the stages of change,
9 and they are perhaps moving into the
10 contemplation or even preparation prior to
11 the action stage. So, I would take that as
12 a very positive finding that perhaps even
13 if there is not a behavior change that we
14 can measure that there is movement in the
15 stages of change.

16 MS. GRAY: Then we also see
17 similar -- along similar lines we see that
18 22.1 percent said that I will spend less
19 time or money gambling, and then
20 26.4 percent said that they did spend less
21 time or money gambling, so those may be a
22 further solution of change.

23 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. What I
24 noticed from this chart, and maybe this is

1 kind of like what you're talking about, is
2 that there is one that goes down, the first
3 one, the fun part, goes down between the
4 first and the repeat. But the other three,
5 the responsible ones go up, right?

6 MS. GRAY: Right. And, so, it might
7 have something to do with their reasons for
8 going to talk to the GameSense Adviser more
9 than one time in the first place. So they
10 might already have been more seriously
11 thinking about changing their behavior, and
12 that's what prompted them to talk to the
13 GameSense Adviser.

14 MS. LAPLANTE: Did we do a
15 statistical compare? We did one. So even
16 though the percentages look like they might
17 be going up and down, it is a possibility
18 statistically speaking they are same and
19 they are not.

20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes, margin of
21 errors. That's great to the next slide,
22 but hold that thought.

23 MS. GRAY: We couldn't do
24 statistical tests on this, because the

1 surveys were completely anonymous. That
2 goes to the concern about the burden on the
3 participants whether they would want to
4 complete a survey if we asked for their
5 name. So there was no way to track from
6 one person's first-time survey to their
7 repeat survey. It's hard to know the
8 degree of overlap. Let's look at this one.

9 Now we're starting to look at total
10 GameSense exposure. If you remember a few
11 minutes ago, I told you that there was a
12 count for each person about how many total
13 interactions they had had with a GameSense
14 Adviser of all four types. Of course we
15 had to rely on the patrons, other visitors
16 to give us that number, their best
17 estimate. We had no way of tracking that.
18 So we started to look at the relationships
19 between that total GameSense exposure and
20 some thoughts and behaviors.

21 So what we found among the
22 first-time respondents was that total
23 GameSense exposure was unrelated to all of
24 the 15 responsible gambling knowledge and

1 behavior outcomes. Those would be things
2 like whether they've used a certain
3 responsible gambling strategy in the past
4 year or whether they answer correctly to
5 questions about the most likely outcome of
6 a slot machine play.

7 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You know what,
8 I'll let you finish this slide but I have a
9 question. It's to each of the findings.

10 MS. GRAY: So same thing when we
11 considered the questions that fell under
12 the category of reactions to GameSense.
13 This was more along the satisfaction
14 questions like whether they would recommend
15 GameSense to a friend. Here we saw that
16 total GameSense exposure was unrelated to
17 most of the resources and treatment
18 knowledge outcomes except several outcomes
19 that involved PlayMyWay.

20 So, for instance, people who had had
21 more total interactions were more likely to
22 be aware of PlayMyWay, more likely to be
23 aware of their local gambling treatment
24 resources, more likely to understand how

1 PlayMyWay works, and more likely to
2 identify correctly the purpose of
3 PlayMyWay.

4 So, for instance, if you look at the
5 question of, you know, whether they
6 understand how PlayMyWay works, the people
7 who answered that question correctly
8 reported about 3.5 total interactions with
9 a GameSense Adviser, people who answered it
10 incorrectly reported about 1.5. And
11 finally among the repeat survey
12 respondents, that total GameSense exposure
13 wasn't related to any of the survey
14 responses.

15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: How can you
16 tell they're unrelated?

17 MS. GRAY: Well, in this case, a lot
18 of these questions were simple right or
19 wrong answer. And, so, we looked at the
20 groups of people who got it right and the
21 groups of people who got it wrong, and then
22 we looked at how many total interactions
23 each group reported, again, relying on
24 their best estimate of how many

1 interactions they had had. And then we did
2 a statistical test to see if that count of
3 interactions was different between the two
4 groups.

5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And the drive
6 means let's say a gambling myth or what is
7 the getting it right?

8 MS. GRAY: I can give you some
9 examples if you'll bear with me just for a
10 minute. I believe -- so for one of the
11 GameSense questions it was -- maybe I will
12 look it rather than give you my best
13 estimate. Let's see. That's the SEIGMA
14 report. So a question like, how does
15 PlayMyWay work, the correct answer is,
16 players set limits and get notifications
17 when they are close to or reach their
18 limits. That's the right answer. A wrong
19 answer will be something like, player set
20 limits and can't gamble anymore once they
21 reach their limits.

22 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: What page
23 are you on?

24 MS. GRAY: I'm sorry. I'm on page

1 101. Another question about the purpose of
2 PlayMyWay, this question simply was, what's
3 the purpose of PlayMyWay? And the correct
4 answer is, to help players monitor their
5 gambling. This is on page 103. And an
6 incorrect answer would be to put a limit on
7 how much people can gamble.

8 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Most people,
9 regardless of their exposure, answered
10 their questions correctly, right?

11 MS. GRAY: Yes.

12 MR. VANDER LINDEN: So could it also
13 be just a factor of the questions that were
14 asked and so there wasn't necessarily a
15 very good indicator of the impact of
16 exposure to GameSense?

17 MS. GRAY: Yes. We talk about the
18 potential for a ceiling effect and the
19 limitations in the report and in the
20 presentation today. For some of these
21 questions, there is a possibility that the
22 rate of answering correctly was so high
23 that the GameSense Advisers really couldn't
24 push it one way or the another.

1 Dr. LaPlante is pointing out on page
2 103 that 86 percent of first-time survey
3 respondents answered the question, what is
4 the purpose of PlayMyWay correctly compared
5 to 95.3 percent of repeat visitors? So
6 those rates of answering that question
7 particularly were pretty high, and that
8 might be because the GameSense Advisers are
9 doing a good job of explaining how the
10 program works.

11 I'm going to move on to the third
12 report. SEIGMA surveyed 479 patrons, and
13 this is a different population. You'll
14 recall that in Reports 1 and 2 we were
15 looking at a segment of a segment, right,
16 so just the people who had exchange
17 interactions with GameSense Advisers. Here
18 they really broadened it. They opened it
19 to anyone who happened to be in the casino
20 on the day that they were surveying, and
21 they intercepted people on their way out of
22 the casino, and their response rate was
23 22.4 percent.

24 MR. VANDER LINDEN: And if I may,

1 this survey conducted by SEIGMA, the patron
2 intercept survey, the GameSense questions
3 were a small part of a much larger survey,
4 and the original intention of that effort
5 by SEIGMA was the piece about trying to
6 understand where players are coming from,
7 whether they are coming from out of state
8 or in state and what their spend is both at
9 the casino and then their surrounding area.
10 And at the end, there was a series of
11 questions about GameSense knowledge and
12 exposure.

13 MS. GRAY: So we started the
14 GameSense section of the survey with a
15 pretty basic question. Are you aware of
16 the GameSense program? We found that
17 56.9 percent were aware of the program.
18 Again, this is people who are on the casino
19 floor on their way out. And we asked those
20 people -- well, SEIGMA asked those people,
21 have you spoken to a GameSense Adviser?
22 They found that 18.1 percent said yes.

23 This is another estimate of Reach,
24 and that corresponds to 9.6 percent of all

1 respondents.

2 MR. VANDER LINDEN: And just to be
3 clear, the intercept happened at all three
4 entrances or exits to the casino, not just
5 the entrance or exit right near the
6 GameSense information center.

7 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But it was
8 around them sampling, right? It was one
9 out of every six people, so you have a good
10 broad sample.

11 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Right.

12 MS. GRAY: Much broader than our
13 visitor surveys. That was why we -- that
14 was the purpose.

15 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And in this
16 one, we already account for the repeat
17 factor.

18 MS. GRAY: Because they are telling
19 us -- yes, yes. Because this is coming
20 from the patrons themselves. This isn't
21 coming from an estimate provided by the
22 GameSense Advisers.

23 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Correct.

24 MS. GRAY: So we might start to

1 notice a trend here. 98 percent said that
2 they were satisfied with the information
3 provided by the GameSense Adviser. And
4 most of them thought that their particular
5 GameSense Adviser was helpful. 91 percent
6 either agreed or agreed strongly that their
7 GameSense Adviser was helpful. None of
8 them disagreed. 59 percent said they
9 learned something new about gambling.

10 We asked, did your interaction with
11 the GameSense Adviser change the way you
12 gamble? We observed that 58 percent said
13 no. This gets cut off a little bit, but
14 it's 20 percent who said, yes, I've changed
15 how I think about my gambling but I have
16 not changed how I actually gamble. And
17 22 percent said, yes, I have changed how I
18 gamble.

19 And if you recall back to a few
20 slides, we saw about 24 percent or so of
21 people in our surveys who are saying that
22 they had changed how they gamble as a
23 result of their conversation, so
24 highlighting some consistent findings.

1 So for the most part, we didn't find
2 associations between GameSense exposure and
3 their self-reported gambling activity on
4 the day of the survey, so I'll show you two
5 findings here. If you look at how much the
6 reported spending on the day of survey, the
7 people who were aware of GameSense spent
8 about the same as those who weren't aware
9 of GameSense. And then people who had
10 spoken to a GameSense Adviser spent about
11 the same as those who did not speak to a
12 GameSense Adviser. You might notice a
13 slight difference there in the amount spent
14 but it wasn't statistically significant, so
15 we'll call those even.

16 Now moving on to our last report.
17 This, as I mentioned, was our survey of
18 Plainridge Park employees. We had 258 of
19 them complete a survey. They did so at 104
20 town hall style meetings. We got about
21 72 percent of people who attended the town
22 halls. Unfortunately, not all of them
23 attended a town hall, even though it was
24 described as mandatory. So our sample

1 represents 52 percent of all the employees
2 at that time.

3 We found that 58.5 percent said that
4 they had interacted with a GameSense
5 Adviser. And then we wanted to dig a
6 little bit deeper into this question of
7 what was the conversation like. And so we
8 asked, did you talk to a GameSense Adviser
9 about problem gambling or responsible
10 gambling? And we saw that 33.5 percent had
11 done so. So, presumedly, the rest of them
12 just had a casual conversation with a
13 GameSense Adviser.

14 We found out most people,
15 71.4 percent, had never referred a patron
16 to a GameSense Adviser. And most of the
17 time those people, 88.1 percent, said it
18 was simply because they had -- the
19 opportunity had never come up. They never
20 felt a reason to refer someone to a
21 GameSense Adviser. We found that exposure
22 to GameSense Advisers was highest among
23 security and surveillance employees, which
24 makes sense and lowest among food, beverage

1 and retail employees.

2 We asked a series of questions to
3 try to understand their understanding of
4 the GameSense program. Given especially
5 because this program was so new, we wanted
6 to know whether they understood how it
7 works and what it's all about. So one of
8 the questions was, what do GameSense
9 Advisers do?

10 We found that they were aware that
11 GameSense Advisers are responsible for
12 greeting people, teaching people to avoid
13 gambling beyond their limits, enrolling
14 people in PlayMyWay, enrolling people in
15 voluntary self-exclusion and helping to
16 connect people to problem gambling or other
17 mental health treatment.

18 But at the same time, they weren't
19 aware that GameSense Advisers are
20 responsible for giving people directions,
21 teaching about odds and probabilities,
22 teaching people how to play the casino
23 games, unenrolling people from PlayMyWay
24 and unenrolling people from voluntary

1 self-exclusion.

2 One of the questions was, who can
3 use the GameSense program? So most, but
4 not all, respondents understood that casino
5 patrons can use GameSense, 88.9 percent.
6 About two months before our survey, the
7 employees at Plainridge Park had gotten a
8 newsletter that specifically said that
9 they, too, can use the program as a person
10 of resource but only 37.9 percent knew it
11 at the time of our survey.

12 This might be some room for
13 improvement as far as their training and
14 understanding of the program. We found
15 that 42.7 percent of the employees
16 correctly identified how PlayMyWay works.
17 Now, of course, the GameSense Advisers
18 themselves are mostly responsible or they
19 are responsible for enrolling patrons in
20 PlayMyWay, but there could be opportunities
21 for other employees to discuss the program.
22 So it's useful to know did they understand
23 it. And only 9.1 percent accurately
24 identified the characteristics of the

1 voluntary self-exclusion program at
2 Plainridge Park.

3 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Mark, remind
4 me, are PPC employees restricted from
5 gambling at PPC?

6 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I wonder if
8 that at least potentially, partially
9 explains the low number -- similarly low
10 number of employees who think they can use
11 it as a resource.

12 MR. VANDER LINDEN: You know, casino
13 employees are a high-risk group. And I
14 agree with Heather that that's probably
15 something that we can take a look at when
16 we think about how we're communicating with
17 casino employees, what the purpose of the
18 GameSense program and who is focusing on
19 it, absolutely.

20 MS. GRAY: Moving on. We asked
21 about employees' opinions about the
22 GameSense program. Again, this is
23 something they could communicate to patrons
24 whether they intend to or not, their

1 opinions about the program could be
2 communicated to the patrons. And so we
3 asked one of the opinion questions was, do
4 you agree or not GameSense encourages
5 people to think about their own gambling
6 behavior? And most people agreed,
7 86 percent.

8 And then we balance this with
9 potential negative impacts, like GameSense
10 interferes with player enjoyment. We found
11 that 60 percent disagreed with that
12 statement, 18 percent agreed that GameSense
13 does interfere with player enjoyment and
14 22 percent didn't know.

15 Employee exposure to GameSense is
16 simply, have you ever spoken to a GameSense
17 Adviser?

18 MR. VANDER LINDEN: It just reminded
19 me of a finding, I think it was from the
20 first survey, that talked about whether or
21 not it enhanced their visit to Plainridge
22 Park Casino that I don't think that you
23 captured in the power point, but it's an
24 interesting contrast to that specific

1 question or perception of PPC employees.

2 MS. GRAY: Right. So if you ask
3 people who had a conversation with a
4 GameSense Adviser whether it enhanced their
5 experience that day, most of them said yes.

6 So we look to see whether people who
7 had interacted with a GameSense Adviser
8 responded differently than those who
9 hadn't. Found out for the most part that
10 was unrelated, but I'll highlight where it
11 was related.

12 Respondents who had ever interacted
13 with a GameSense Adviser were more likely
14 to be able to identify what the GameSense
15 Advisers did, understand how PlayMyWay
16 works and correctly answer one of our
17 questions about the independence of slot
18 machine play, but they weren't more likely
19 to know that they can use GameSense as a
20 personal resource, understand how voluntary
21 self-exclusion works. Sorry, you won't be
22 able to read that. I don't think I can
23 either. Let's see. Understand their own
24 role in intervening with patrons with

1 potential gambling-related problems and
2 have positive or negative opinions about
3 the program.

4 So if you're an employee who works
5 in say one of the restaurants and you had
6 an interaction with a GameSense Adviser,
7 your opinions about the program are the
8 same as someone who hadn't. Sorry, that's
9 the last one there. The one that's tough
10 to read I'll just point out, we asked if
11 they understood their role in the system.

12 The questions were, let's see,
13 should PlayMyWay employees try to determine
14 if a patron has a gambling problem? Only
15 half of them knew that they should not try
16 to do that. It's not on here, so I'll just
17 say it. And then 64 percent knew that they
18 weren't supposed to intervene with someone
19 whom they thought had a gambling problem.
20 So those are some other potential room for
21 improvement.

22 So I think I'm at my conclusions
23 now. Thanks for bearing with me through
24 all these findings. First in terms of

1 Reach, we have a few estimates of Reach.
2 In our first two reports where we relied on
3 the census of GameSense Adviser activities,
4 our estimates were about one percent and
5 about 70 percent of those were simple,
6 superficial. In the SEIGMA report, the
7 estimate was closer to 10 percent.

8 So we conclude that at least during
9 our windows of observation, interactions
10 that directly relate to promoting
11 responsible gambling among casino venue
12 patrons were rare. So questions for you
13 would be, does this extent of Reach fulfill
14 your program goals and is the cost per
15 patron acceptable?

16 We found across all of our reports
17 high satisfaction with the program and with
18 the GameSense Advisers. Another consistent
19 finding was most respondents who had spoken
20 with a GameSense Adviser reported that they
21 learned something new about gambling or
22 strategies to keep gambling fun, and about
23 20 percent reported change their behavior
24 as a result of their conversation. For the

1 most part, respondent's responsible
2 gambling knowledge and behavior was
3 unrelated to their GameSense exposure.
4 That comes from Report 2.

5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Can I go back
6 a little bit?

7 MS. GRAY: Sure. To the previous
8 slide?

9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The first one,
10 yes. The way you laid out it would assume
11 that the cost benefit is equal to all
12 patrons, but we know that in this
13 industry -- this industry heavily relies on
14 a small piece of the population to get most
15 of the revenues. Have you thought about
16 how whether that has a cost benefit?

17 MS. GRAY: Whether that has a cost
18 benefit?

19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Affecting the
20 right people, not just everybody on average
21 but for the sake of argument that a typical
22 player, this is a term that you came up for
23 the PlayMyWay way or those at risk or those
24 experiencing problem gambling, did you

1 analyze that or is that part of a cost
2 benefit analysis?

3 MS. LAPLANTE: I think I understand.
4 I think that this particular evaluation
5 wasn't designed really to do a full cost
6 benefit analysis, and I think that if you
7 were to advance in that direction that
8 those are things that certainly would want
9 to consider, you know, who are the best
10 targets and whether or not your reach
11 within particular target groups goes up and
12 down and what you want your reach to be for
13 particular target groups. I think that
14 that's what you're saying, and I think that
15 would be something that's really valuable
16 to integrate into a formal cost benefit
17 analysis.

18 MR. VANDER LINDEN: I think that
19 Reach also needs not to be narrowly defined
20 as an interaction with a GameSense Adviser
21 but the extent at which the GameSense
22 program works across the spectrum of
23 different types of providing information in
24 different types of ways. Certainly, and as

1 I said in my opening remarks, that the
2 interaction with the GameSense Adviser or
3 the GameSense Advisers are the heart of
4 this program but there is a -- but it's not
5 right for every patron and that GameSense
6 is expressed on in the casino and for that
7 matter outside of the casino in different
8 ways.

9 MS. LAPLANTE: We agree with that.
10 I think that one of the conclusions in our
11 report is that we can go beyond just
12 looking at GameSense Adviser interactions
13 and look at each involved with things like
14 let's say pamphlets and other ways of
15 information distribution. You do some
16 commercials and things like that.

17 So I think a formal analysis that
18 incorporates all of those potential avenues
19 would be important, and our particular
20 evaluation at this point wasn't designed to
21 go in that level of detail but hopefully
22 this provides some early preliminary
23 information that points you in the right
24 direction.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.

2 MS. GRAY: Just to mention that an
3 exception here concerned PlayMyWay, we
4 found that both patrons and employees who
5 had interacted with a GameSense Adviser
6 tended to know more about PlayMyWay and we
7 think that, again, it goes back to the
8 GameSense Advisers being really
9 enthusiastic about describing the program
10 and how it works, and especially because
11 our second round of data collection
12 happened just two months after PlayMyWay
13 was implemented, so it was really on their
14 minds. They were doing a really good job
15 of describing it.

16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I know you're
17 also evaluating PlayMyWay but remind me or
18 tell me this is something I just came up
19 with on my own. But is it fair to
20 attribute the rate of usage to PlayMyWay at
21 least partially to the GameSense Adviser
22 interaction just by the number of people
23 that sign up at the kiosk as opposed to the
24 machine, for example?

1 MS. LAPLANTE: That would be
2 interesting to look at specifically
3 GameSense Advisers -- (inaudible).

4 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: PlayMyWay.

5 MS. GRAY: We did count in wave
6 two -- the GameSense Advisers gave us an
7 estimate of how many people were coming up
8 to them with questions about PlayMyWay and
9 how many were saying good or bad things
10 about PlayMyWay, so there were a lot of
11 good conversations. So I would suppose
12 that the GameSense Advisers were
13 encouraging people to enroll. Also, they
14 had incentives to enroll, the patrons
15 themselves had incentives.

16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. It's
17 one thing for me to sign up if a machine
18 tells me but what if a person I know I
19 always say hi to says, here, we're doing a
20 promotion.

21 MS. GRAY: Yes, it makes sense. So
22 some cross report limitations. As I
23 mentioned at the outset, our visitor
24 surveys don't represent all of the casino

1 patrons. Only those who chose to discuss
2 problem gambling or responsible gaming with
3 the GameSense Advisers. Because of the
4 nature of our evaluation, we can't
5 establish any causal effects. We can't say
6 that GameSense did something or did not do
7 something. It would take a more rigorous
8 evaluation designed to establish those
9 causal pathways.

10 Halo effects refer to the visitors'
11 perceptions of the GameSense Advisers. You
12 might remember from our first presentation
13 here we asked not just was the GameSense
14 Adviser helpful, you know, were they
15 knowledgeable, were they caring, did they
16 listen to? They had really high
17 evaluations of the GameSense Advisers on
18 all of those dimensions.

19 It's possible we know from other
20 research in this area that usually what
21 will happen is a person has a really
22 general either positive or negative
23 impression of someone. Like you think
24 about your server at a restaurant, you

1 either like them or you don't and then that
2 if it's positive, it's a halo effect where
3 you say, yes, every dimension they are
4 great at. We think that's probably
5 happening to some extent here. It doesn't
6 take away from the fact that the visitors
7 really like the GameSense Advisers, and
8 that would be at the heart of the halo
9 effect.

10 We talked earlier about a ceiling
11 effect or restriction of range where if
12 people mostly already know the correct
13 answer, then the GameSense Advisers would
14 have trouble pushing it up any further. We
15 think that might have happened with some of
16 the questions.

17 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Interesting.

18 MS. GRAY: Some recommendations.
19 Now in the report -- for each of the four
20 reports, we made recommendations and the
21 commission responded to many of them as we
22 were going and they've already, for
23 instance, made efforts to increase
24 GameSense Advisers' clinical supervision on

1 the basis of some of our observations.
2 They took some steps to improve messaging,
3 to improve GameSense awareness.

4 Some current program evaluations are
5 to repeatedly evaluate the legislative fit
6 as the ability of GameSense info centers to
7 address substance and mental health issues
8 remains unclear.

9 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: What do you
10 mean by legislative in this context?

11 MS. GRAY: I think this goes back to
12 the point you raised at the beginning about
13 whether GameSense is only designed to
14 fulfill this legislative mandate or it has
15 a broader role. So, if GameSense has the
16 broader role that you mentioned earlier,
17 then that legislative fit might not be so
18 much of a question. It's just when we see
19 in the legislation mental health and
20 substance use issues as part of the
21 counseling service, we know working with
22 GameSense that that's not typically
23 covered, and so we see sort of a disconnect
24 there.

1 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Is that what
2 you think the legislature intended?

3 MS. GRAY: Well, we're just basing
4 it on what the legislation stays.

5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: In that one
6 instance, not the broader --

7 MS. GRAY: Exactly.

8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: -- the broader
9 interpretation.

10 MS. GRAY: Right.

11 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Would you have
12 a counseling center at a casino, for
13 example?

14 MS. GRAY: I'm not a commissioner,
15 and I don't think --

16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, have you
17 seen it anywhere else in the country?

18 MS. GRAY: I don't believe so, no.

19 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Or the world
20 for that matter.

21 MS. LAPLANTE: Actually, I don't
22 know the answer to that, but I wouldn't be
23 surprised if some did.

24 MS. GRAY: Or at least tried to.

1 MS. LAPLANTE: I don't it's
2 necessarily that we're advocating that that
3 happen, but maybe that's a change, maybe
4 striking that part from the legislation if
5 it doesn't exist.

6 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, we do
7 have the power to interpret our own
8 statute, so we feel we have.

9 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I was
10 thinking about that this morning trying to
11 go back to the number of meetings that we
12 had to resolve a number of policy
13 questions. I couldn't recall whether that
14 one came up and sign as a group but that
15 just doesn't make sense. That's like --

16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It doesn't, I
17 believe. You speak quite a bit about first
18 do no harm. I think that it will work
19 trying to read the letter, the specific
20 letter of that one sentence about the
21 on-site space to provide counseling
22 services, it would actually potentially
23 produce more harm.

24 MS. GRAY: I will say that the

1 GameSense Advisers as a result of some of
2 our earlier observations got some more
3 training, and they particularly got mental
4 health first-aid training, which covers. I
5 have gone through it myself, some of you
6 might have as well, it covers a whole range
7 of issues, including substance use and
8 mental health issues. They might be more
9 prepared to deal with those kinds of crises
10 than we know.

11 MR. VANDER LINDEN: The GameSense
12 Advisers, in fact, currently are in the
13 midst of a four-week orientation for the
14 new GameSense Advisers coming on and it was
15 true with Plainridge Park Casino, but they
16 have extensive training. And as you said,
17 they go through the first aid. They go
18 through the basics of motivational
19 interviewing, problem gambling 101 and, in
20 fact, advanced coursework and that they
21 visit a GA meeting in the area.

22 They're familiar with -- they're
23 oriented to the services, mental health,
24 substance abuse, other services that exist

1 within the community where they are
2 working. And, so, while they are not
3 clinicians or, I guess, that's not entirely
4 true. Most of them are not clinicians. I
5 would not envision a counseling services
6 being provided on space, but they are
7 equipped some of the very basic skills and
8 knowledge that would equip them to address
9 a range of different issues that they would
10 be presented with when a patron is in
11 distress.

12 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Which is what
13 Commissioner Stebbins was alluding to some
14 of the earlier conversations when we
15 decided with this program.

16 MS. GRAY: And I'll wrap up here.
17 Our final set of recommendations concern
18 the evaluation of the program. So, we
19 recommend establishing objectives, for
20 instance, to do with Reach but can be
21 measured and that the commission invest in
22 measuring progress toward those objectives
23 at Plainridge Park Casino and at the two
24 forthcoming info centers.

1 I think on the basis of the data
2 we've collected so far, it's premature to
3 conclude that GameSense promotes positive
4 play among most patrons or increases
5 players' knowledge of how games work while
6 dispelling common gambling myths, and that
7 future work could document those kinds of
8 effects by investing in randomized control
9 trials, reassess positive play before and
10 after GameSense exposure. Thank you again.

11 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you
12 very much.

13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Let me go to
14 questions from fellow Commissioners, if
15 any.

16 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Not to put
17 Mark on the spot but be curious at some
18 point talking with you and Teresa is to
19 what the results show, strategies are kind
20 of next steps that you're going to
21 undertake as well as you think about the
22 site at Springfield. It's going to be
23 different than PPC. It's a different
24 layout, you know. I know we are awaiting a

1 presentation from you and Elaine in the
2 coming weeks and kind of the new rollout,
3 the new image in advertising in the
4 program.

5 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes. I'm really
6 excited about some of the findings in here
7 that it highlights some areas that I think
8 that we can really expand on. So, for
9 example, the demonstration in
10 interactive -- types of interactions is
11 quite low, and I think it would highlight
12 our need to continue to develop new games
13 to engage patrons with keep those games
14 fresh, keep the GameSense Advisers excited
15 about doing those so that we can see that
16 type of interaction grow. Because I really
17 do believe that those types of interactions
18 are effective at promoting the overall
19 goals of the program.

20 I think that there's great
21 opportunity in working with casino
22 operators in both the basic training of
23 GameSense, the new employee training of
24 GameSense but as well ongoing training of

1 GameSense up to and including really
2 letting them know that this is a resource
3 for the employees at the casinos.

4 There's a host of other ways in
5 which I think that this evaluation will be
6 really, really helpful for us in moving the
7 program and advancing it.

8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I agree with
9 that very much, the employees, the Reach,
10 the demonstration, you know. It's easy to
11 fall into whatever the raffle that works or
12 the bag of marbles but somebody might just
13 quickly say, I've already seen that one and
14 bypass it if we're trying to keep doing
15 that over and over. I think it cuts to the
16 heart of how establishments work, but
17 you're right, thinking creatively is
18 something we should think about.

19 Commissioner Cameron, if you're
20 still with us, do you have any comments for
21 our group of researchers? I'm going to
22 take that as perhaps not. Maybe she put it
23 on mute or maybe --

24 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Can you hear

1 me?

2 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes, I can
3 hear you, Commissioner.

4 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.
5 So, listen, I thought it was a very
6 interesting presentation, informative and
7 you, Mark and Commissioner Zuniga, you just
8 made my point that I was going to make,
9 which is the Reach whole evaluation is to
10 then incorporate and include the process
11 and, you know, sharing these results with
12 both the GameSense Advisers and the
13 operators I think is a critical piece and
14 then, you know, really tweaking what is a
15 very good program to make it stronger, and
16 Mark just made that point. And so those
17 were my thoughts on listening to the
18 evaluation, how important it is to then
19 incorporate the findings to strengthen the
20 program.

21 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. I think
22 we're all committed to the ongoing
23 evaluation of everything that -- the
24 research and evaluation of everything we

1 do, and I think there's a great roadmap of
2 a number of things for us to follow-up on
3 this. Thank you very much, Dr. Gray and
4 LaPlante. This was great.

5 MS. GRAY: Thank you.

6 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you
7 very much.

8 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Okay. Does
9 that conclude item under Director Vander
10 Linden?

11 MR. VANDER LINDEN: Yes, it does.
12 Thank you.

13 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Great. I was
14 thinking we might need a break, but it
15 doesn't appear. We should keep the next
16 item on the agenda, because we already got
17 through number four would be the
18 Commissioner updates.

19 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I just have
20 two real quickly. Director Griffin and I
21 were informed by the folks at MGM that it
22 looks like October 9th, which is going to
23 be our -- is expected to be our last AOC
24 meeting out in Springfield wrap-up that MGM

1 is planning a diversity celebration post
2 after the AOC meeting and certainly that's
3 something we are all invited, so certainly
4 hope we can get -- I'll add that to our
5 schedules.

6 And, again, because I think what has
7 been a good working relationship with the
8 Skills Cabinet, they informed us it appears
9 that they are going to make a capital
10 investment into Bunker Hill Community
11 College to upgrade some of their culinary
12 space, again, to help address a lot of the
13 local workforce shortages in terms of
14 culinary. So, just those two items to
15 share with you.

16 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Very good.
17 That process -- that AOC process has been
18 in my estimation greatly received by that
19 community, the overall community of
20 business leaders advocates and diversity
21 advocates and --

22 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: The whole
23 process, and I think if you talk to MGM,
24 they are hoping that other stakeholders in

1 the region can kind of pick up the example
2 they've set and kind of carry it forward
3 into new construction projects as the
4 region continues to grow.

5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. And
6 Director Griffin has done a fantastic job
7 chairing that committee I might add.
8 Commissioner O'Brien, any updates?

9 COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: No.

10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Commissioner
11 Cameron, any updates on your end?

12 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I have
13 nothing now, thank you.

14 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.
15 Well, I'll just mention that I just came
16 from the conference -- the annual
17 conference of the National council on
18 Problem Gambling. There were -- we
19 continue to be recognized as quite
20 progressive and ahead of the pack when it
21 comes to all the research and evaluations
22 we are doing of programs.

23 There was a lot of discussion around
24 sports betting, for example, and the

1 keynote speakers, many in the panels on the
2 general sessions and the breakout sessions
3 all point to if you're going to do --
4 expand into sports betting, take a look at
5 what Massachusetts did when they expanded
6 into casino gaming who resources research,
7 who resources in program evaluation and
8 harm mitigation, which again, continues to
9 be just a theme that for which we are
10 recognized not just nationally but
11 internationally.

12 There were two delegations in that
13 conference, one from Japan and one from
14 Saipan. The people from Japan came just --
15 beginning of this week came to
16 Massachusetts. We had arranged for this
17 events to that conference to take a look at
18 the GameSense center and PlayMyWay, because
19 they're quite interested in implementing
20 those or advocating for this limitation of
21 those programs in the newly approved Japan
22 expansion or casino expansion.

23 Secondly, we met people from Saipan
24 who want to come in September. They did

1 not want to come in the winter for climate
2 reasons, purely for climate reasons, but
3 they want to come and take a look at the
4 same thing, GameSense, PlayMyWay, again,
5 approaches in the United States that have
6 never been done before and for which we
7 continue to take a lot of credit.

8 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: That's
9 encouraging.

10 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And one last
11 thing, MGM received a corporate social
12 responsibility award in that conference
13 largely due to their efforts on GameSense
14 on a corporate level. So even our
15 licensees are getting some recognition,
16 quite a bit of recognition I might add on
17 these efforts.

18 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: That's good.
19 This is interesting. This isn't the first
20 time we have had folks visit from Japan in
21 this case to look at GameSense. But I
22 remember, I think, it was consultants came
23 to look at how we did the process of where
24 to award a casino license. So they were

1 here, I think, over a year ago to kind of
2 explore that process with local officials,
3 so hopefully we're a good example for them
4 to follow.

5 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Right. Well,
6 and to be fair, we did a lot of what they
7 are doing and came up with these programs,
8 you know, not on our own but with the help
9 of people who had already gone through it.
10 Okay. So if that's it for updates, there
11 is no other business, Director, we're all
12 set? Is there a motion to adjourn?

13 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: So moved.

14 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Motion is made
15 and second. Commissioner Stebbins?

16 COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yes.

17 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Commissioner
18 O'Brien?

19 COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Commissioner
21 Cameron?

22 COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Yes.

23 COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And
24 Commissioner Zuniga votes yes, four to

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

zero. We are adjourned. Thank you very
much.

(Meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

APPEARANCES:

MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION STAFF:

- Catherine Blue, General Counsel
- Edward Bedrosian, Executive Director
- John Ziemba, Ombudsman
- Michael Sangalang, Digital Communications
Coordinator
- Jill Griffin, Supplier, Diversity and Workforce
Development
- Mark Vander Linden, Director of Research and
Problem Gambling

GUEST SPEAKERS:

- Debi LaPlante, Ph.D, Director of Research and
Academic Affairs, Cambridge
Health Alliance, Division on
Addiction
- Heather Gray, Ph.D, Associate Director of Academic
Affairs, Cambridge Health
Alliance, Division on
Addiction

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

I, KRISTEN M. EDWARDS, COURT REPORTER,
do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and
accurate transcription of my stenographic notes,
to the best of my knowledge and ability.

WITNESS MY HAND, this 2nd day of
August, 2018.

Kristen M. Edwards