

PROCEEDING

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are calling to order public meeting 250 of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission on Tuesday, August 14th, 10:00 at our offices at 101 Federal Street. First item on the agenda as always is the minutes, Commissioner Stebbins.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Enclosed in your packet are the meeting minutes from July 26, 2018, and I move that the Commission adopt the meeting minutes subject to any immaterial corrections or grammatical changes.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any comments? I had one that was pretty small. But on page three, it's talking about the -- we had the conversation about what to do for Region C. And in the paragraph that starts out to summarize, this is where Executive Director sort of summarized what his takeaway from that conversation, it says, "Over the next

30 to 45 days, ask staff to focus on the response to the MG\&E letter." And what's written here is, "And then think about the broader issues to consider." It was more specific than that. It was really to prepare topics that we'll follow in the broader discussion, and then he went on to list -- I don't think you need to list them but he mentioned such things as the market study, expressions of interest, public comments and so forth.

So I don't want us to wake up this time next month and be right in the same place. There is some prep work that's meant to be going on. So something like prepare the topic for topics that will follow in the broader discussion. Anybody else? With that amendment, all in favor? Aye.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye. COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Aye. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes
have it unanimously. Next up is our administrative update from Executive Director Bedrosian.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Good morning, Commissioners. As you can imagine, we are just about ten days out from MGM's opening. Staff is very focused on that, but there are one or two other issues I want to update you on. One being the pending review of Wynn Resorts suitability. So the Investigations Enforcement Bureau has reported to me that they are entering their final stage of their investigation.

As many of you have likely seen from recently released reports, Wynn Resorts has announced a completion of their independent review by the board's special committee. We have repeatedly stated from the beginning that one of the four primary elements of the IEB's review centers on an assessment of Wynn Resorts, and the board's response to the findings of its independent review.

Investigators will now review and
evaluate this additional information and expect to conclude their work by the end of this month. Once the IEB's investigation is complete, we'll turn our attention to the Commissioners' preparation and finalize the format and logistics required for public presentation of the findings. So that's an update on the one thing beyond MGM .

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. I just want to through you, Director, to thank the IEB. I don't see anybody. Well, maybe some people are here from the IEB. We put a huge complicated nuance, important task on them even as we had a huge complicated task of opening the MGM Resort, staffing up dozens of people and so on and so forth, and that they've been able to do this I trust with their standard professionalism and to do it on schedule even as we are on schedule and ready to open MGM, I just wanted to thank them and point that out through you.

I believe, I don't think you said
this explicitly, but $I$ think the plan is that we will hope to have our public meeting where we will present and discuss the investigation next month, right, sometime in September.

MR. BEDROSIAN: I would say that's what our goal is with all the caveats as the Commissioners would know about investigations. But, yes, I think that's our goal.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. Anything else?

MR. BEDROSIAN: Now we can turn to the task that's most directly in front of us, which is MGM. Before I turn it over on an issue regarding the iconic sign, just an update in what is happening in the next ten days. MGM has their own internal test day afternoon. That's for their own internal consumption. They'll have their employees on the gaming floor, and they will be evaluating themselves. We will have people there to observe.

More importantly, the 16th and 20th
are two formal evaluation times where we will have people -- there will be invited guests, and we will have people there. We will do formal evaluations of how things are going on the floor and have meetings with MGM afterwards and discussions if there are any issues that need to be corrected.

Assuming, and Commissioner Stebbins will have the pleasure of some late nights I think, assuming everything goes well, and we do assume that, there would be a temporary certificate of operations issued sometime between the 20 th and 23 rd with, as you know, a press conference on the $23 r d$ and a VIP evening, and then the official opening on the 24 th so...

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: With the Clydesdale.

MR. BEDROSIAN: It's hard to believe, but that's the next ten days. I think, we'll have a strong number of staff out there working. They have been working. There will be some long nights, long days
for staff. And just as our IEB doing the Wynn review, we've had a lot folks who have kept their eye on the ball on this, so I would want to thank them because they've worked incredibly hard. And so far, and I'm knocking on fake wood here, it's been relatively smooth, so I do want to thank them for that.

Having said that, these things don't go without some issues. One of the issues that has sort of popped up is some of the signage, which $I$ will then turn it over to Ombudsman Ziemba.

MR. ZIEMBA: Good morning,
Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. So today's issue relates to the iconic sign that MGM is operating on its garage. As you are aware, the commission on numerous occasions has reviewed plans for the signs and has expressed that certain times some concerns relative to the operation of that sign.

As we all know, that there has been an ongoing concern with distracted driving throughout the United States, and most
recently specifically with the growth of the use of phones for texting and others that has become a substantial concern. But today's issue relates to the use of advertising alongside I-91. Here I wanted to just provide the general context of the regulations that apply or don't apply in this instance to the sign that faces $\mathrm{I}-91$. MGM will provide a little bit more detail about what they're proposing for the use of that sign, and they have some video showing their use, and they also have some video showing what that sign looks like from various vantage points on I-91. But let me just first give you a little bit of a background regarding how these signs are regulated both at the federal level, state level and also at the local level.

By agreements with the federal government through the Federal Highway Administration, states have agreements to regulate signs that promote advertising adjacent to national highways, and let me just give you a little background as it was
provided in a summary through a Federal Highway Memorandum in 2007.

It relates to the Highway Beautification Act, which was passed way back when in the early '60s, I think. And what this summary says is that the HBA, HBA requires states to maintain effective control of outdoor advertising adjacent to certain control groups. The reasonable, orderly and effective display of outdoor advertising is permitted and zoned or unzoned commericial or industrial areas, signs, displays and devices whose size, lighting and spacing are consistent with customary use determined by agreement between the several states and the secretary may be erected and maintained in these areas. Most of these agreements between the states and the secretary that determine the size lighting and spacing of conforming signs were signed in the late '60s and early '70s.

So after many of these agreements were formed, the US government tried to
rationalize how all of these electronic signs were being regulated among the various states. And in 2007, they issued some guidance to the states providing some recommendations on how those should be regulated by the states noting that it is up to the states to do the effective control of that advertising.

In that report, they did recommend an eight second minimum change time between images that appear on electronic signs, and there were also recommendations included in that guidance against moving images or movies on the sides of highways.

Now, there is a difference -- what we've included in your packet -- we included most these of these materials in your packet. But what I'm referring to now is off-site advertising. There is a difference between off-site advertising and on-site advertising. Off-site advertising is basically what you can imagine it is. You have a billboard that promotes businesses or organizations that are not
necessarily on the premises of the particular sign. And they are really meant as true advertising.

So the federal guidance relates to those off-site advertising signs, and that's what generally the states regulate. If you take a look at all of the states, they generally have some pretty standardized rules similar to that eight second no moving image rules that apply to all of those sort of outdoor advertising devices.

On top of that, there is also local regulation. Local regulations through their zoning codes can apply different standards to those signs, and indeed Springfield did include some measures that regulate the use of the MGM sign. What Springfield did a little while ago, I think it was back in 2016, they included two different provisions.

And one they required a report from a licensed professional to come and opine on the use of the sign. And, secondly,
they called for the ability to study the sign after it is operational, and then the city council retained the ability to provide additional conditions on that sign on a number of different categories, including moving images. The report -CHAIRMAN CROSBY: John, can I just get this straight because I wasn't sure on this. So the Springfield government has said it would be okay with them to open up with moving images after you've had a study done and after it's been running for a while, we would then reconsider whether we'll let you continue to run moving images.

MR. ZIEMBA: That's exactly right.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So they have essentially approved moving images subject to a subsequent analysis.

MR. ZIEMBA: That's exactly right.
That is exactly right. That is where we stand today. So after the initial requirements are passed by the City of Springfield, MGM did conduct that study.

That study is included in your book. And in contrast to the study that was directly related to the particular sign, the study was more of a compendium of studies.

And, in essence, the major findings of the study that is included is that from a statistical vantage point that they couldn't demonstrate safety impacts as a result of electronic signs. But I will relate one thing included in that report that relates directly to moving images. So if you pull up the BHB memorandum, which is the bureau memo.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Page number?
MR. ZIEMBA: Page number two highlighted at the bottom with the green marker. That study said, during the literature review, BHB conducted a literature review as of the time of the report. And they said, during the literature review, it was also noted that the off-site billboard industry has voluntarily chosen to adopt practices that minimize driver distraction. For example,
most off-site billboards display static images and retain the same image for at least eight seconds.

This serves two purposes. First, the driver needs to only take a brief glance to be able to absorb the information as opposed to a video image that would invite a lengthy look from a driver; second, the driver will eventually become accustomed to the message being displayed for eight seconds or more on electronic billboards and will understand that there is no need to attempt to read the billboard during a complex driving maneuver, e.g. lane change, out of fear that the message will be missed. Instead, the driver can plan a glance based on the traffic conditions knowing the message will be displayed for a reasonable amount of time. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: John, you mentioned the off-site. Were you going -are there different guidance for on-site, which appears to me this is what we have here.

MR. ZIEMBA: So this appears to be on-site. We have a memorandum from MGM Springfield's outside counsel that notes that this is an on-site premise sign, on premise sign because it is not effectively advertising for other businesses. They do note some exceptions in their memorandum. So, indeed, so this would not necessarily fall within the rubric of the state regulation for off-site premises of the signs.

The state regulation does call for a ten second minimum threshold for changeable signs. But, arguably, based on that memorandum, this is outside of that state rubric. So we would fall within the Springfield regulation, unless the Commission wants to consider other actions based on potential distraction that may be caused.

One thing I will mention is that the standard that is utilized in the industry for driver distraction is two seconds, that you don't want to have anything that causes
more than two seconds worth of distraction or else it could pose a danger on the highway.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So are there no on-site rubrics as you say?

MR. ZIEMBA: That is correct. To the best of our knowledge, there is no state regulation regarding on-site advertising that is applicable here that would be solely related to the Springfield jurisdiction. One thing $I$ will mention is that there were a couple of examples that were mentioned in the report.

First of all, the report does summarize a number of different outside studies that show that there is an impact from electronic advertising, in general, that it does pose a safety concern. It also noted in numerous other studies that it said that there should be no real concern from electronic billboards. But there were two examples in here of Massachusetts based signs that provide an example.

There is one in Springfield at the Basketball Hall of Fame and then there is one, which is the WGBH building. I drive past that almost every single day. And when it was first authorized that there was an agreement between the local residence, the Boston Redevelopment Authority and, I believe, the turnpike authority based on public reports that limited the use of that sign and restricted moving images on that sign.

I will note that $I$ have seen at least once or twice over the last year or so that the sign has moved. Indeed today it was moving quite a bit, but I just mention that as the context that there is some careful deliberations at the time between all of these various entities to try to promote safety of that sign.

And that was an example of one of the signs that is demonstrative of safety in the VHP report. And they also reference that there really has not been any significant assemblage of accidents that
resulted from that sign, but partially that could relate to the fact that it is not really been a dynamic sign for the most part over that period of years.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So there was an agreement. It is under regulation by those three groups; is that right?

MR. ZIEMBA: So, I believe, that it is guided by the Boston Redevelopment Authority, basically their local zoning. I took a look at their 2004 report, and that referenced a side agreement between the Boston Redevelopment Authority and WGBH. And as of yet, I have not been able to get that memorandum, which spells out the specific details. But what was publicly reported at the time is that it had some very, very concrete requirements in it.

In one report that $I$ read, it says, the WGBH mural displays at most three still images and sequences over a 30 second time frame. We wanted, according to the station director at the time, they wanted it to be slow from the beginning. The images do not
contain wording or phone numbers to keep driver distraction to a minimum given there is half a million vehicles that pass by it weekly.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So a 30 second time frame.

MR. ZIEMBA: Yes. So, basically, that's consistent with the national standards if you multiply eight by three, that's the 30 second time frame. But, again, $I$ have seen that move.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: They now do have moving video.

MR. ZIEMBA: As of today was the most visible moving video that $I$ have seen in six years. But, I think, I saw a flower grow once. As you've seen those sort of slow motion flowers grow, I think I saw that once maybe about a year ago. I know that's anecdotal but...

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But this is an example because of the same reasons that it's also promoting on-site, it's on-site of -- it's promoting the business of the
building. It's not promoting any other things, is it?

MR. ZIEMBA: That's correct.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: As well as the Basketball Hall of Fame, it promotes the Basketball Hall of Fame, not any other advertising.

MR. ZIEMBA: That's correct.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So it all falls under the same rubric, as you say, the agreement with the local jurisdiction. MR. ZIEMBA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And the Basketball Hall of Fame, I've seen the sign and saw it again. It's very small. It's not the large sign that we're talking about here.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Does that have moving stuff?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: It has some limited -- my understanding is it has some -- and we have been talking about this trying to do our research. It has some movement. Again, it's narrow and the size
is what, maybe --
MR. ZIEMBA: Maybe it's one quarter of the size of the MGM sign potentially. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You also mentioned that this study, which we have seen before, was commissioned by the city or -- by MGM required by the city.

MR. ZIEMBA: It was required by the city, commissioned by MGM.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Commissioned by MGM. And you characterized it as, I think, appropriately as a compendium of studies. Was that the scope of the study in the eyes of the city?

MR. ZIEMBA: Well, I believe, the city was satisfied with the scope of the study, but I'll just read specifically from the language of the memorandum. If you take a look at the City of Springfield site plan review, it said that the petitioner shall provide a report to the Office of Planning and Economic Development from a transportation professional experienced and this is on page -- it's in the thing. In
the field of traffic study impacts per Article 8, Section 8.575C.

The report shall set forth an opinion as to whether or not the operation of the sign would meet safety standards and include the basis for such opinion, specifically reviewing any adverse effects of highway traffic flow and safety with regard to distraction from animation, brightness or the size of the signs. This report shall be submitted to the OPED in review prior to the issuance of the sign permit.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So does the report issue that opinion?

MR. ZIEMBA: Well, I'll leave it to the MGM Springfield folks to detail that, but it certainly does talk about animation in one section, and it talks about more of the general compendium of studies, which is, as I mentioned, go back and forth. But I think what they -- what the consultant that issued the report issued that final finding that based on statistics that there
was no way to demonstratively demonstrate the safety impacts as a result of the statistical planning perhaps rather than the specific sign itself.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, I have a question then to the MGM people. Do you feel that the report expresses the opinion that was required here as part of the site plan with you?

MR. STRATTON: Commissioners, we do. I mean, the language in the site plan review -- I was involved in retaining the expert and had several discussions with VHP on this. The language that was used around an opinion on -- it was hard in a vacuum without the sign being constructed, without the programming, without being able to witness the sign itself and see the impact to formulate a specific opinion about the safety of that sign in particular.

So in advance in order to get a sign permit so we can build it, the only thing that the expert was left with was, well, what's out there, literature review, what
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are statistics, what do you understand is being proposed and compare it.

So, I think, they provided the best opinion they could at the time with the information available. And, I think, one important point, in that same site plan review, we were talking about the sign pre-permit but there is also language in that approval on paragraph $D 4$ that says that, and I'm reading straight from the site plan the signage approval by the city, the same document that we're referencing the language in, it also requires a review of the proposed signs solely as the materials, lighting, moving images, portability and impacts to abutters and/or any public ways shall be completed after the approved signage has been installed and are operational to determine if any additional conditions are required.

So, I think, that the approval contemplated that we're going to look at it in advance to get some information to allow the permit to issue. And once it's
operational, we have an obligation to look at it and perform some review and be able to do that specific review using information available at the time and we have -- I don't believe it's in the packet, but we have been working with the City of Springfield and the city solicitor to come up with a proposed study to look at the sign as soon as we turn it on. And then once traffic normalizes three months out, in a year out, to look at crash data and look at the operation of the sign to do that analysis.

So, I think, it's a two-part analysis is that, does the literature show that it's a problem to prevent issuance of the permit? The answer is no. The city was comfortable issuing the permit, and then we look at the actual sign and perform some analysis once it's operational is what, I believe, was contemplated and what we're prepared to do.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So in other words, there be an update to study if --

MR. STRATTON: I've been working with TDC, who is our traffic consultant, and we have a proposal that they just provided an outline. We haven't engaged them yet, but we have a proposal of that study, which we're prepared to move as soon as we turn the sign on before we open in the next week to get some baseline information and then look at it once we --

So the time period that they propose is suggest the time period for data evaluation post-MGM opening -- post-MGM opening a six-month period from roughly $12 / 1 / 2018$ to 5/31/2019 that allows for the grand opening of traffic volumes to normalize, a pre-MGM opening analysis seven-day period from 8/15 to 8/22 to evaluate operations following illumination of the sign, and then they're going to look at pre-viaduct reconstruction. They can look at historic crash data, a six-month window from 12/1/2014 to May 31, 2015 that coincides with the same seasonal time period to evaluate.

So they'll have three snapshots to look at crash data and evaluate whether there is any impact resulting from the sign. So we have that process underway to engage in that study.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I'm sorry for asking a fundamental question. But then why would we have jurisdiction over this? We're contemplating a vote here. But what would we be voting on if according to some of these arguments, $I$ guess, it fell under the jurisdiction of the city and it appears that they will study it afterwards like the site plan review contemplated if all of that logic falls --

MS. BLUE: No, I think that's correct. I think there are many items that we've talked about in the past where both the commission and the city have jurisdiction over those items for potentially different reasons. You, as the person who approves the final design and the final opening, could weigh in on the sign if you felt that was something you
wanted to do.
I think what we're trying to do is present to you where that discussion stands now so that you can determine if you want to take action on it. But as the person who issues the final certificate to open, you do have a say in something like the sign.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But our say could be we'll leave it up to the city. We don't have to make a yes or a no.

MS. BLUE: Yes, that's correct. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Were you finished, John? Unless somebody wants to jump in -COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I'm going to hold until after the presentation, and then hold my questions til then.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Bruce, did you want to say something?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Yes. Let me just have a quick question before we move to the presentations. The BHB memo that's included in the packet, on page one under the City of Springfield zoning code, the
last sentence in the last paragraph says, the provisions of the zoning code aim to allow outdoor advertising signs that can be used in a way that communicates important information about MGM Springfield and its special events while not needlessly drawing a driver's attention away from the critical driving task. Is that kind of -- is what VHB saying reflective of what you feel the agreement is with the city and the city council and the permits?

MR. STRATTON: Yes, and -- sorry, the answer is yes. And, I think, when you see the presentation of the video, which Michael will walk us through, you will see that there are certainly ways we could utilize animation and video in a way that could probably call more attention to our project and be more distracting. I think you'll find that it's -- and, I think, some of you saw it on the front side of the property when you were out there. But I think that you'll find that it's tasteful, not highly distracting but is a way in this
modern era where people are used to moving images all the time to entertain folks and get their attention.

I mean, the point -- we have conflicting goals here. The point of the sign is to get someone's attention and look at the information on the sign, but we want to do it in a way that's balanced and doesn't needlessly distract. And, I think, we've struck that balance and as you'll see in the video that we present.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I'm sorry, did you just say you wanted to entertain folks? I don't know if $I$ heard the first part of your comment.

MR. STRATTON: Yes, I mean, part of --

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: You want to entertain folks while they're driving?

MR. STRATTON: We're an
entertainment company. We want to reflect that there is entertainment at the property and an entertaining sign, it's all about entertainment. Now, you can be
entertained, $I$ believe, and not be distracted. And that's what goes to the balance --

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I actually never heard anyone talk about being entertained while they drive, but I hear what you're saying.

MR. MATHIS: Commissioners, if I can just add, and I think going through simulation will be helpful. I think you saw it all live out at the resort is I would suggest to you that there is static signs that can be very distracting, and that there is video dynamic signage that can be less distracting. So, I think, the actual content is important. I know you don't want to be the police of our content. I don't think that's workable.

So some of this is, as we've discussed in prior hearings, a little bit of trust in us as operators that have done this in many different venues across the world on our judgment to safeguard and to strike that right balance.

Seth is right. The point of a sign is to get someone's attention, but not so much so that they have an accident. That doesn't help us to have I-91 clogged up with accidents beyond what we might do to our customers, our employees, our community residents.

So I came down here because this is a really important issue for us, and we can talk about it at the conclusion. But I respect Ombudsman Ziemba's concern around this. I know it comes from a sincere concern about public safety. But everything out about our project is wow, and I just wanted to make sure that consistent with that that we were making a case for what we think is an appropriate sign but also reflects the standards of our resort and the best in class uses of signage as part of the experience.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Are you finished, John, to go to the presentation?

MR. ZIEMBA: Yes, I think that will be useful.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So you're passing the ball to Mike?

MR. ZIEMBA: Mm-hmm.
MR. STRATTON: Yeah. And I'll just really briefly set it up. We talked about a lot of this already. But back in March, our March update, we walked through this issue and we had a explained to you where it stood then and what our status next steps were. And, so, we talked about this sign being exempt generally from MassDOT jurisdiction, within the jurisdiction of the city, the city council approval conditioned on the submission of the report, which we discussed here today. We submitted that report. The signed permit was issued.

So at the time in March, you know, when we talk about the status and next steps, we talk about completion of the sign infrastructure. That is now complete. We talked about the issuance of the city sign permit. That has been issued. We discussed that the digital sign would be in
place by July of 2018. The digital sign is in place, and that the programming was to be determined. We will show you in a moment the programming. And that if subject to further city review, once the sign is operational to determine whether additional conditions are required.

We've been working collaboratively with the city. We've kept Mr. Ziemba, Mr. Delaney in the loop on what that review looks like, the scope of the study, the information we would gather, and that's what I discussed here today with engaging TEC to look at data once it's operational, look at the start data and look at the future data and do that analysis to determine whether additional conditions are required.

So, I think, we've followed those next steps as we discussed several months ago here. And with that, I'll turn it over to Mike to review with you the programming and how we see this sign operating and benefiting the project.

MR. MATHIS: Thanks, Seth. Mike, can you play? This is a view direct on of our iconic sign. It is a combination of dynamic video, animation as well as stills. So, I think, when you saw it at the resort on the plaza side, you had a sense of how the content would mix. It would be a combination of statics that, I think, followed the eight second rule mixed in with an occasional video dynamic.

As you look at this shot, I want to follow it up with a video of what it actually feels like to drive up 91, because you don't really have this direct view. This is just for your ability to look at the content head-on, but that is not the view that you have driving, which I think is impactful.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is there, in your programming, is there a limit for the length of the moving video? These little clips here are quite short. Is there a limit?

MR. MATHIS: None that we've imposed
intentionally, but that's just part of our creative process to do short video clips. So if that piece of it is important, we can certainly discuss it and maybe codify that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I hadn't really
thought about it until just watching this, but these video clips that I have seen so far is so short. This one is actually slightly longer.

MR. MATHIS: Yeah, I think that motorcycle one is the longest.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It actually -- it doesn't take much longer than it does to just look at a big billboard. Maybe it would be a lot more -- I've been wresting with this thing all along, and I still am. But it would be a lot more challenging if the video went on while you drove all they way by and went past.

So from my standpoint, if we decide to either don't take a position or do something in favor limiting it to these short little things is material just as I watch it now.

MR. MATHIS: We're happy to voluntarily commit to programming it consistent with these durations if that gives you some comfort. That's what we would do practically anyway. But if you're looking for a commitment to do that, we're happy to do that. If $I$ can, $I$ just want to show you the actual drive up.

In some ways, this is even less dramatic than the $W G B H$ sign we've been talking about because that sign, as you know, is perfectly perpendicular and you see that sign all the way up the pike. This one as you approach our resort is running parallel to the drive. In fact, you almost miss it, which is a little bit of the reason we want some interesting content on is to the right there. You may have to replay it, because you may have missed it.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Isn't that part of issue is it will be something that someone will turn their head to look at, because it is really inviting and something
that isn't common here. I realize it's common in Las Vegas, but it's just not common to drivers here. I almost have more concern because of this.

MR. MATHIS: I'm not a traffic expert. As I know, none of us are on this. There's a few different ways to look at it. I would suggest to you if you had video staring at you for the whole drive up, that could potentially take your gaze away for more than the two seconds we talked about. Going 60, 70 miles an hour and making that turn that you described wouldn't last more than two seconds by its very nature.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: We would hope.

MR. MATHIS: We would hope. But this is not precedent setting, as we've talk about in the past. We do this on the Las Vegas strip, and I know that's not conclusive. We do it on the I-15 highway on the back of the strip, and it's not even precedent setting within the Commonwealth. As I said this morning, we came up
the pike, Seth and I, and WGBH sign had crashing waves against the shoreline that was staring at us all the way up. The most distracting part of it was us feverishly trying to grab a video clip to show the Commission.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: But after many, many years of having the sign there that people are accustomed to that sign now, I think, is part of the issue here.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, it starts somewhere, WGBH, right?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Without any -- very static. The agreement was to have static when that sign opened. How many years? Many years, John. We talked about that.

MR. ZIEMBA: 2007.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What do you have on $I-15$ ?

MR. MATHIS: We have dynamic signage on the back of the Mandalay Bay and some of our other resorts, for example, I think there is a shark tank. We have the shark
tank, which is world famous aquarium and it has the shark swimming through the water, for example. So I task my folks in Clark County that work with Clark County on the development side, we have extremely dynamic signage on the Las Vegas Boulevard, including one of the neatest signs I've ever saw is from one of our competitors, Wynn, and I know Bob is here that can talk about this, that has a moving bar that actually goes up and down mechanically and reveals video as it moves, but that's on the Las Vegas strip.

And I wanted to make sure that from a highway perspective, which $I$ know is a little bit different because you're moving faster, we also have the same thing on I-15 which sees, you know, millions and millions of cars each year as busy as I-91, and we have video on the back of those ginormous, very large screens as well.

So there's precedent in our industry, and they continue to approve them in Clark County. There's also precedent
now in the Commonwealth. So with ten days left, we're obviously really judicious about our time and the kinds of things that we want to talk to you about. But I was walking the property, I think, three days ago and a construction worker stopped me and said, Mr. Mathis, I just have to let you know, because they were working in the plaza and seeing the signage that you saw that there is something wrong with your loop. The highway doesn't have any of that -- any of this material that we are seeing in the plaza, and the public should see it. It's great. It just looks like a billboard out there. And that's what really concerns me is anybody that feels like anything is just at our property.

We've got really creative folks that provided, $I$ think, really interesting content that highlights all the non -- as you saw, there's bowling highlighted there, Indian Motorcycle. It's all the great non-gaming retail that we've always bragged
about and want to get people excited about, and it's not just gaming.

So we have the highest standards in everything we do, and that includes signage and marketing. And, I think, this package that we presented to you is reflective of that, and I wanted to fight for it.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mike, are you aware of what signage you might be have, MGM employees in Detroit? I always kind of closely relate the Springfield project to your project in Detroit. Do you happen to have an idea of what signage?

MR. MATHIS: We didn't look at that. I think part of the distinction of Detroit is it's on the surface streets, and not directly on the highway. So that's why I try to draw analogies to $1-15$ in Las Vegas and, again, the WGBH, I thought that would more relevant. I didn't look at that jurisdiction. Plus that jurisdiction is a city by city standard. So, again, that's why I thought the highway one was more relevant.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I did check with New Jersey. Because as you come into Atlantic City, all the billboards, they are required to utilize state standards there, because there are actual billboards coming into Atlantic City and they're total advertisements for the casinos, but they do adhere to the state standards.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: You mean the eight second still image standard?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Correct. Ours is ten. New Jersey is I don't know if they use the federal eight standard or if they have a different standard, but they are required to use state standards.

MR. STRATTON: If I could add up one more point because it came up in the discussion with the city and TDC. One of the opportunities that we missed by not turning this on now is the ability to look at data when the sign is on dynamic prior to our increased traffic that our project generates, and that is -- whether that's relevant, but that's certainly a data point
that City Solicitor Bacula, that would be important to collect and request that when we outline our study we look at that.

And in the proposal I have from TDC, they would certainly look at that to see because we do expect an increased traffic flows on 91. And so it is a -- we'll forever lose the opportunity to look at preopening impact, if any, and see -- and that will be a relevant data point to determine whether, in fact, there is impact from the sign with lower traffic flows versus higher traffic flows. So that's one of the reasons we want to say flip the switch now, and then be able to look at that data in the next two weeks.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But what about that argument that Commissioner Cameron makes about the accustomed -- the factor of getting people used to something that's not all new, which appears to be the case in the WGBH example, that they turn it more dynamic after there's enough familiarity with the property.

MR. STRATTON: I mean, that is a -we understand that point. We think that the combination of static with the -- as I think when we watch the video showing the sign, it was tasteful. I mean, I'm advocating for the company. To my view, I don't find it distracting. I think that we may want to have more wow down the road. I think we struck a balance of saying, let's early on make it very limited to ensure in an abundance of caution that there -- it's not distracting. And, so, it's a fair point, but we're confident that the wait is now as we are preposing it strikes that balance.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I just have a couple of concerns, one being, and the Chairman brought this up, he really said we don't have any standards, and now I just heard we want more wow down the road. So I do have a real concern that, you know, there are no standards here. You can do as much video as you want, and you really can't assure us that there is anything
built in to keep it safe.
I know it's hard to do that. But, you know, I'm really concerned that the first three months are when there are so many people coming, so many people excited, and we also are invested in you having a great opening and a couple of major crashes will not help. So, I guess, I just really struggle. I typically don't like to, you know, step on the toes of the city. But I do have real concerns here about this from a public safety standpoint.

And, I think, a lot of work has been done by, you know, federal and state agencies who really understand this business, and they have standards for a reason. And I understand this isn't quite an off site. But even in your own literature, as John pointed out, you know, most have done this voluntarily because they don't want to distract drivers.

I actually think if you popped every eight seconds, it would be very attracting without having that distraction of a video.

It's not something we're accustomed to here, and I really do have concerns about the safety, in particularly, the first three months. I'm concerned, okay, we're going to it study in three months. But if there's a couple of major crashes in those three months, that's not the good thing to open by.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Are you suggesting, Commissioner, that you might be open to doing it after the crunch is over if we went say pick a date 90 days that at that point you'd be willing to reconsider?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I would love to see, I would love -- again, the study would be important to me, what happens for those three months even if it's eight seconds of a static dynamic display. I mean, those are impressive. But yet I really am -- I think the video is eye-catching and you want to see what happens, the bowling, it goes up and there are beers in there and, you know, you just want to see that. So I do have concerns,
and I just think to open it -- to allow it and then study it is kind of the cart before the horse here.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But that's what the city approved.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I understand that. I understand that but...

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's one of the hard issues for me is that we have typically been very deferential to the cities, and I know you respect this as well. I know you're as torn as we are all on this. But yesterday I felt like I was going to vote, if we have -- I'm not even sure we should really be voting on this in a way, because the city has more expertise than we do.

But if we were to make a decision, I was going to say that I thought, hey, there is on highway signage, which is not part of a company, neither any jurisdiction that I can find, including Nevada, I had John look up Nevada, or the outdoor advertising board itself with the exception of entertainment
districts in the outdoor advertising board, which is kind of a strange exception, none of the potential regulatory agencies or even the industry association suggests or permits moving signs.

So I was thinking -- okay. So why would we want to be first here? On the other hand, there's, as everybody agrees, there's no evidence affirmatively one way or the other or if there is mixed evidence both ways, there is no way that you can draw a conclusion as to whether this is a problem or not. And the city is probably more invested in it than we are. They are the ones who approved it. They're going to take more flak than we are if there's an issue. They approved it with a study.

So now I'm thinking, you know -and, honestly, for what it's worth to the extent that you're one's own judge that makes any difference, you know, it doesn't strike me as anymore distracting than some of those incredible big digital signs on the southeast expressway.

So I end up -- and there is the press, which is worth something, you know, that regulatory agencies around here and the communities apparently, even BRA, don't have their air on fire because of the evolution of the GBH thing. So I kind of lean all things considered to supporting the city, maybe strengthening it a little bit, you know.

I thought two things, one would be to permit it only during non-rush hours, but also to make sure -- but, I think, there are deadlines in calling for the studies, but I kind of lean towards given the complete paucity of any data one way or the other, and that we are all just using our sort of commonsense and anecdotal experience that we probably ought to go with the city, and let them figure it out.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think the city has a lot expertise, but I don't know that highway signage is one of them. I think that's the state's expertise, and they have clearly weighed in.

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: If I could just give my thoughts. For me, the question of whether this falls under the jurisdiction of outdoor advertising or not in terms of a public safety question is a distinction without difference for me. This is sort of a loophole that has been out there in terms of regulating on-site billboard advertising. To me, I'm informed by looking at the industry standards and then looking at what are the state standards for safety. And with all due respect to the city, I do think this is more of a highway safety issue.

When you look at the fact that the industry says stay away from dynamic and if you're going to do them in other circumstances, you know, if you're going to roll from one static to another, stick with between eight to ten.

I had a very different reaction. I did think it was a districting striking video, entertaining but distracting. And a distinction between this and the GBH sign,
in addition to GBH starting slowly, people getting used to it, it being easier to see without having to turn, they still don't have telephone numbers. They still don't have wording, et cetera. And quite a bit of yours do, in fact, do that because you're trying to draw people in.

So on balance to me, I do think we have jurisdiction in terms of our oversight of the license and the premises. I think when you look at industry standards and I think when you look at what this is doing, I think in the interest of public safety, starting slower making sure that three, six month that even you and the city acknowledge would not be an appropriate time to test. Pushing anything over the bounds to risk any sort of driver distraction to me is not a prudent choice.

So to the extent that we are voting in our over jurisdiction that overlaps somewhat with the city, I would not be inclined to allow that sign in that location to have dynamic interest.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Just to be clear, I don't disagree that we have authority. We absolutely have the right to speak to this. Whether we want to or not is a question but we absolutely have the right, no question have the authority. Other peoples sort of general comments?

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I was somewhat concerned obviously reviewing the material looking at the two examples that they use. What's interesting about the two examples that you use is that, I'm not familiar with the Clark County signs, but the GBH sign on the Hall of Fame side actually face the oncoming traffic. I think what you showed from the video is you really don't have a clear view of what the message is on the sign until you're almost on top of it.

You know, I would even suspect I'd feel differently if there maybe there was something along the south side of your parking garage that was something that somebody had a longer chance to view as
they're driving up.
You know, and like the Chairman and certainly sensitive to this balance between what the city's authority is and, again, what our authority is. But I do go back to what BHB talked about in reviewing the city's provision is that they definitely want to allow MGM to provide information about special events; however, again, they say, while not needlessly drawing a driver's attention away from the critical driving task.

And some of those images to me would distract me. And, again, a moving image as I am going by it and it's over to my right as opposed to right in front of me, I would consider that a distraction. I certainly would feel comfortable saying start with the eight second or ten second intervals but try not to, again, have a dynamic message that flashes something or moves something that might distract a driver as they are going by.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: If I were MGM, I'd
be sitting there thinking, well, let's rebuild our sign and make it horizontal, and they'll be in favor, which seems weird to me that we would be encouraging them to put up a big horizontal sign but...

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: But, again, just going back to the examples they're sharing, they are not something that's --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, there aren't any other examples. That's the problem. There's very little data out there.

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Maybe there is a reason for that, though. You're talking about driving at high speeds in vehicles. I mean, that might not be the best spot for it.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Mr. Zuniga, do you have --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I tend to see the other aspect. I think some of the moving images, $I$ mean if a wheel is rotating, I'm sure it's moving but it's not necessarily, I don't know, creating something that really distracts. I mean,
you can get a glance at a moving wheel or a bowling ball that's going to get to the end of a bowling table that happens to have beers, and you can kind of expect what is happening.

So I do get the point about if all we're talking about is the moving image being what puts us over the edge, I can see why the content, which is hard to get into from our perspective, is just a slippery slope, and I'd rather in that case defer to the city.

I do see, and you make very compelling arguments towards safety and notion of at least perhaps initially to have some real adherence to the standard to the extent that we can program and try to strike that. You can try to strike that balance between drawing people in and complying with the standard. And as data begins to, you know, accumulate or at least the drivers get accustomed to it, maybe the issue about being to the side or not is consequential or not consequential, and we
can then have data to go with.
So perhaps in the interest of consensus, I'll go along with that. I was initially thinking like you, Mr. Chairman, that if the city approved this and people are comfortable with it, I would go along. But, apparently, there seems to be a majority emerging already, and I would rather then encourage MGM to think about whatever they can do to comply with the standard as it is and begin to accumulate data to continue the requirements in the site plan review.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It feels to me like most of us are fairly close whichever side of the issue we're on. Would it be acceptable to if we said let's not permit it for either 90 days or whenever DOT tells us traffic is back to its pro-opening norms. I'm sure they have traffic counts, and they know when we've gotten through whatever the Mass. increase. So 90 days or later if whenever the traffic is back to a norm. And at that point, we would
reconsider this and with no predetermined outcome but at least a commitment that say we will take another look at this once we're through the crunch period.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Commissioners, can I just add one data point? And I feel compelled to, because I just got this message from Councilor Bacula, who's a representative obviously of Springfield, and I will just say exactly what it says.
"I am sending a letter of approval for the plan. It is being typed now. Our office of Planning Economic Development is the approving authority. Ed Bacula, City Solicitor." It was sent to me at 10:59, so two minutes ago. Just a data point. That's all.

MR. STRATTON: And if I could, you know, as we were listening to this discussion, $I$ certainly, as Mike said, we fully respect the concerns. We understand that this is a tricky issue, and I've been trying to figure out why the gaming commission and the city seem to be on
different pages on this issue.
And, I think, the other factor about this sign that we haven't talked about and one of the benefits to it is the revitalization of Springfield, and what we're doing in Springfield and the desire to the city to bring people to the area and have people drive by and feel like there's a vibe, there's something exciting going on in Springfield. And, I think, that's part of what this sign represents and is doing is somewhat of a beacon to people that come to Springfield, come experience not only MGM but what's going on in Springfield.

And, I think, that's really why the city and the folks in the city are supportive of giving us the opportunity to do this, because they want to see those folks come drive by, not necessarily read the message on the sign but say, wow, there's something -- we don't see this anywhere else. We see this in Boston, the WGGB sign and now we see one in Springfield. There is something going on
here.
And, I think, that is why -- and why I would suggest deferring to the jurisdiction of the city to allow us to do that makes sense and why there is probably some -- and I know you all want us to be successful, but I think it represents not just us but the residents in the community being excited about bringing people and feeling like there is something new and exciting in Springfield. So I just -that's my opinion on why there is somewhat of a difference between the city and the commission on this issue, but I think it's an important factor.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You know, as I said, I'm very reluctant to override the city. But I think at this point it looks like we have probably three people who are prepared to vote against doing this. Would one or more of you be acceptable to the idea of committing that we will rethink this come either 90 days or whenever the traffic has hit post-opening norms with no
promises simply saying, the worst concern is that period of time. We will look at this again in some period of time.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I think we certainly can look at it again. I'm just not sure that three months is enough time to have enough data. I'm just --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Data on?
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: On the roadway and crashes, and anything else that may be going on out there. So I'm just a little concerned about the time. Not that I don't want to revisit, but I'm just not sure. I think the three months only came from the city. I just don't know. I would defer to our traffic experts of what the appropriate amount of time is to study something like this to have enough data to be worthwhile.

MR. ZIEMBA: Well, I don't know what that would be. But, I think, that an important marker that was indicated by MGM itself was December 1st identified was a date by which they thought most of the
traffic would subside. What would be necessary after that date would certainly be an important consideration. But if the Commission were amenable to doing that, we could certainly consider something. At about that time if there's not enough data, then we could postpone whatever review we wanted to do if the Commission chooses to go in that direction.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: That would be appropriate.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So we have a presumption of three months but not an absolute commitment. Are you okay with that, Commissioner Zuniga?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes, I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Commissioner O'Brien, would you be okay with that?

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: That's fine.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Somebody want to put that into a motion? Commissioner Zuniga?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I was going to
vote against it, so I'd rather not.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, you're going
to vote against opposing it with the commitment of rethinking.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Oh, okay. Well, I was going to go along with everybody here. So anybody want to frame -- I'm going to vote in favor of this. Does anybody want to frame that?

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Or
articulate. Want to do it?
COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Are we taking this in stages and saying there's a vote on the request to go dynamic at present or are we deferring?

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What I was suggesting, and we can do whatever we want, what $I$ was suggesting is that we vote to not permit the motion sign but also commit to reconsidering that in 90 days unless for some reason we decide not to.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: If we break those votes, I'll vote for the second one.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Okay, whatever. I mean, it looks like if $I$ vote for it, we'll win. It will pass if it's one, but we might have a consensus if it's -- I don't care.

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: I'll move, and you can tell me whether I'm summarizing what you're looking for. Mr. Chair, I would move that the Commission deny any request to have static movement in the sign identified and discussed earlier by the representatives of MGM currently present without prejudice such that in 90 days we can revisit the issue of whether there will be dynamic images allowed on the sign referenced.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's what I was looking for. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Second.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: We want to make that 90 days from post-opening.

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: 90 days post-opening.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So I had a second.

Further discussion? All in favor?
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Aye.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I went along, yes.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed is nobody, so that vote is passed unanimously.

MR. BEDROSIAN: And just to clarify, that was no dynamic movement.

COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: No dynamic.
MR. BEDROSIAN: Right.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We know it's the vote passed.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Right, for the record. Then, I guess, so the intent of the Commission then is that they would follow current standards as they should follow outdoor advertising highway standards.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Which is the eight seconds?

MR. BEDROSIAN: Yes.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Which is what the video followed, I think, that was changing every eight seconds.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And whatever the research -- this is just, you know, casual but whatever research of usage now, usage during that $90-$ day period, whatever research you think that might be constructive to help us make decisions, please -- I know you have been talking to TDC about doing something, but maybe they can rethink a methodology that will give us -- help give us some kind of data that makes us -- that we can use in our next round. Okay. Anything else on this topic or your update?

MR. BEDROSIAN: No, thank you.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thank you.
MR. ZIEMBA: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm going to have a quick adjournment, and we'll be back.
(A recess was taken)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We're ready to reconvene public meeting 250 and we are at Item No. 4, the Investigations and Enforcement Bureau, Loretta Lillios.

MS. LILLIOS: Hi, good morning. The IEB is here to ask you to consider a request made by our licensee Plainville Gaming and Redevelopment and its parent company, Penn National Gaming. Specifically they have asked the Commission to grant interim authorization to allow it to close on October 1st of this year on a planned real estate transaction.

The real estate involved is the real estate located at the Plainridge Park Casino, the gaming facility in Plainville. And you have a report in your packet as well as chart, chart $A$, that details the transaction. There are representatives from the two parties to the planned transaction that are here today. Attorney Albano sitting at the table today
represents both parties. We have Frank Donahue, Justin Sebastiano and Steven O'Toole from Penn and Brandon Moore from the other party Gaming and Leisure Properties, Incorporated.

And I would just like to say from the outset that all of the parties and these individuals have been extremely helpful to the IEB over the past couple of months in their responsiveness and forthcoming have really assisted us in understanding the transaction that's described in your report, and that I'll touch on this morning.

So as detailed in the report, PGR, our licensee, has entered into a purchase and sale agreement with Gaming and Leisure Properties, Incorporated whereby GLPI will acquire the real estate associated with PPC, the casino, for $\$ 250$ million. And PGR, our licensee, would then sublease the property at PPC through subsidiaries as shown on chart A in your report. And the subsidiaries are Pinnacle MLS on the Penn
side and Gold Merger Sub on the GLPI side.
The rent payable under the lease would be a $\$ 25$ million flat rate annually, and the lease with all of its renewal options exercised would run to April of 2051. Under this arrangement, PGR would remain an indirect wholly owned subsidiary of Penn. PGR would continue to hold the Category 2 gaming license, and PGR would continue to be the operator of PPC.

Our gaming law requires that this real estate transaction be approved by the Commission, and our regulations state that there are two stages to this approval process, interim authorization and then final approval. We're before you now on the interim authorization piece.

The IEB conducted an initial investigation in accordance with the regulations. As a first step in this process, we scoped out the transaction and identified six entities and six individuals to go through the qualification process. That is outlined on pages two and three of
the report. Two of the companies that we identified and five of the six individuals previously went through the qualification process with the Commission and were found suitable before, and this investigation refreshed those background reviews.

A little background on GLPI, which would be the landlord and purchaser of the real estate at PPC. GLPI is a publically traded company known as a real estate investment trust or a REIT. GLPI was spun off from Penn National and incorporated in February of 2013. It has elected to be taxed as a REIT. And as such, it's required to adhere to a number of internal revenue code rules and treasury department rules. And some of the features of REIT and some of those essential rules are also outlined in the report.

GLPI is in business of acquiring, financing and owning real estate property that is then leased back to gaming operators. And the leases require that the operators remain responsible for all
operating expenses, real estate taxes and capital expenditures.

The agreement between GLPI and Penn to sell PPC's real estate to GLPI is one in a series of planned and interrelated transactions that are scheduled to take place immediately before simultaneously whether immediately after the transaction involving PPC.

The most significant of the transactions is Penn's planned acquisition of Pinnacle Entertainment. Pinnacle is another regional operator. And the result of the transaction will be that in the aggregate, Penn will acquire the gaming operations of 12 facilities across the United States and sell the real estate for PPC, and GLPI will acquire the property assets of PPC and one other casino in Ohio.

Trooper Tom Roger and financial investigations supervisor Monica Chang worked on this investigation, and I did want to draw your attention that despite a heavy workload at the moment, there was
knowledge that there is a planned closing date in the fall for this transaction, and they made it happen without sacrificing the quality or scope of the investigation.

I would like to ask Monica to comment on some of the anticipated impacts of the series of transactions on Penn.

MS. CHANG: Good morning,
Commissioners. So as explained by Penn and together with Pinnacle through their joint press rerelease, the impact of the planned transaction is expected to be favorable. So, operationally, the combined company will -- the combined companies will increase in scale through addition of the Pinnacle properties to Penn's portfolio, which allows them to have greater economies of skill and also increase purchasing power.

The geographically diverse by complimentary properties will allow Penn to expand its footprint both regionally, sorry, but also to states. The combined customer-base of the two companies, which
is estimated to be around five million in active players, that will give rise to promotional and also marketing opportunities for Penn.

Financially, the diversification of the added properties will translate to financial stability, also increasing free cash flow and also generation of cost energies. The creation of the free cash flow will be used to have Penn service their long-term debt as part of this acquisition.

And, concurrently, the cost synergies of the expected 100 million a year, that will be generated at both the corporate level and the operational level at the properties either through the reduction or elimination or corporate redundancies, but also improving operational efficiencies at the property levels.

So after the announcement and the press release of this planned transaction, the stock of both companies went up, so
that just suggests market confidence in the overall transaction. So one of the components of this planned transaction, specifically the scope of our interim authorization, is the PPC real estate asset sell the lease back to GLPI. That can be seen as a source of financing for Penn but also a long-term investment for GLPI.

So the proposed long-term lease obligation, so that establishes a fixed 25 million in annual rental payment from PPC, but that 25 million translates to a stable inflow of cash in the form of rental income for GLPI. So as we've seen through this interim review, GLPI's financial results have been improving since their spinoff in 2013. So the addition of the PPC real estate sell lease back will supplement that growth.

So, overall, the impact of the transactions have been well-received by both Penn and Pinnacle shareholders but also through the public. I just want to reiterate that as part of this interim
authorization of review, the investigators, we focused on this PPC selling the transaction and the related qualifiers that were scoped in.

As a continuation of the suitability investigation, that will allow us to the opportunity to verify, further evaluate and then conclude on the general impact that I already talked about today. But, more importantly, to really affirm the transaction details once everything finalizes and approves and is signed off, which will be later this year.

MS. LILLIOS: So also as part of, thank you, Monica, as part of this initial investigation, the IEB, as I mentioned, had ongoing communications with the parties. We reviewed the submissions from each of the qualifiers. We conducted criminal record checks in accordance with our usual protocol. We verified licensing and suitability status of GLPI in the various license -- in the various jurisdictions where it has undergone that kind of review.

We reviewed the lease terms for the PPC re-transaction, considered the litigation status of each entity qualifier, performed research through a number of law enforcement and public databases, performed initial financial reviews for each qualifier.

We evaluated the qualifiers and the transaction based upon the standard set forth in 205 CMR 116.105 in which provide that the Commission may approve interim authorization allowing the real estate transaction to close if it finds that eight criteria have been met, and those eight criteria are discussed on pages 22 to 24 of the report. First of all, the qualifiers did submit completed forms, licensing division verified the submissions, and the IEB also confirmed the completed submissions were made from each qualifier.

A copy of the trust, which is required by the regulation was submitted to the Commission. The Commission approved the Plainridge nominee trust on June 21st.

That trust, as you may recall, provides that if there is a suitability issue that arrises after interim authorization is allowed, then the Commission may order that the PPC property return back into the trust or to PGR. And if there is a suitability issue at the final determination stage, the property goes back to PGR. So, essentially, there is a provision that could unwind the whole transaction as it has to do with our licensee in the event of a suitability issue.

The regulations also require a background review for the trustee of the trust. Mr. Timothy Wilmont, who's the chief executive officer and a director at Penn, is the trustee. He went through suitability already in the initial stages of the license that was issued back in 2013, 2014. A report on his background appears as Exhibit 8 in your packet.

Mr. Wilmont has a long history in gaming. Started out in Harrah's, joined Penn in 2013 and he is licensed in many
jurisdictions, and the IEB recommends a suitability finding on him that he's established suitability by clear and convincing evidence.

Another factor has to do with our
initial review of suitability for all of the qualifiers, and $I$ can state that after the review that we performed that we uncovered no information that undermines a suitability finding. But, of course, as we move to the final stage, we will do supplemental reviews, supplemental information will be reviewed and we will do a full suitability invest.

In addition, the invest that we've conducted indicates that the transaction involving PPC will result only in the transfer of the real property. The licensee will remain the same and GLPI by all the terms of the lease and all of the federal rules that it has to comply with by all indications will remain a passive landlord in the situation.

Another regulatory requirement that
has been met is that each of the qualifiers certified in writing under the pains and penalties of perjury that they aren't aware of any derogatory information that could undermine suitability. And, ultimately, the IEB's information is that allowing the transaction to close now would be in the best interest of the Commonwealth in terms of allowing an uninterruptive flow of tax revenues and continued employment of the individuals who are employees of PPC at the moment.

Also, by all of the information that we have reviewed, there is no change in control at the facility now. Again, operator remains the same. Should the Commission approve interim authorization for the sale of the real estate, now the closing may take place and the IEB would continue with its final investigation, which under the regulations must be completed within a year.

There is a racing component to this that, I believe, tracks the analysis that
we've given you and given in the report. Catherine may wish to speak to that in more detail.

MS. BLUE: So, Commissioners, in
your packet you have a letter that meets the qualifications of 128A Section 11C. It is a similar process to that, which we used when Suffolk Downs transferred its property. I reviewed the letter. They meet the requirements of 128A, so we should be okay with transferring the racing part of this property as part of this overall transfer.

MS. LILLIOS: If the Commissioners have any questions, and certainly the parties are here directly to address anything that you may have.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I note that we're the 11 th jurisdiction to look at this matter, to review the matter without any issues elsewhere, very well-prepared report, certainly no issues. I did -- my one question was a separate letter to Dr. Lightbown requesting approval from the
racing division, and I see that Penn racing folks are here.

So I'm sure that is to assure us that there would be no disruption of racing operations or integrity with this sale. So I just -- obviously we have authority over the racing division, so that's within our jurisdiction. But other than that, really clean and see no reason why we wouldn't approve this.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else?
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you for that summary and the report. It's really thoughtful and well-written. I'm familiar with these transactions. I think, as you pointed out, Director, they are very economical. They make sense, and it's in the benefit of both Penn and GLPI and as a consequence of PPC. I do have a couple of questions. I suspect the answer might be the same for those questions of the Penn folks but perhaps Mr. Albano or others.

Are there any provisions in the lease or remedies if say Penn or PPC in
this case is not awarded a license after the end of this license towards that payment? I know Penn guarantees the payment to GLPI going forward regardless of what happens. But are there any provisions that allow Penn to renegotiate a lease, for example, with GLPI?

MR. ALBANO: May I defer to
Mr. Moore on that?
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Sure.
MR. MOORE: So Brandon Moore. I'm general counsel of Gaming and Leisure Properties. So the question with respect to the lease, if $I$ understand it correctly, is if Penn National Gaming -- the affiliate Penn National Gaming were not to be relicensed, what would happen under the lease. The way the lease is structured is it's a unitary lease. So you're right in the sense that there is no individual rent property by property.

However, there is a provision in the lease. It's Section 14 point -- it's in Section 8 and then 14.6. 14.6 will provide
that if Penn were to lose a license for something that's a reason outside their control, so, for instance, in Iowa shortly after the lease was put into effect, the Iowa property in Sioux City was the license was ended, and it went to a new party.

The provision in the lease provides that if a license is lost in that situation, there is a reduction in rent. So we will reduce their rent by a prescribed formula in the event of a loss of a license. That's in the lease as it stands today in both the Penn lease and the Pinnacle lease, which is what this property will be a part of.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Now, what happens -- you mentioned that the rent is not considered as a property by property but there is a rent number associated with PPC, in this case a 25 million. Is there -- what happens if the property cannot quote/unquote afford the rent payment going forward?

MR. MOORE: So under the master
lease, which is this will be a part of, Penn will still have to pay the rent. So we have decided between us and Penn that the contribution to the base rent under that Pinnacle lease will be 25 million for our acquisition of the land and building associated with the Plainridge property.

But if for some reason say there was a snowstorm or a flood or $I$ don't know what it might be there, $I$ don't know what the geography is that would cause some sort of sensation of the operations, the rent would still be due. So that's the way those leases are structured. And, presumedly, the support from all the other facilities that go into that lease would support that payment of rent.

So unless there was a situation where the lease was terminated and the doors were closed, the lights were shut off, there would be no interruption in the rent stream.

Now, there could be at the end of the rent term, it gets a little hairy and
when we get into the lease dynamics and this property is a flat contribution of rent, the other properties have a percentage rent component so if there was a deterioration in the operations there because of competition or something else, they would conceivable get a rent adjustment downward every two years under that Pinnacle lease, and it's designed to just make sure that the operator stays healthy.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Tell me more about that. I didn't quite realize that was the case.

MR. MOORE: So when we structured the master lease, there are a number of properties on that lease. There are three basic components to the rent under all of our master leases, which is a base rent that never changes, a building base rent, a land base rent that is set up front that doesn't change, and then there's a percentage rent component that you do a look back under the Penn master lease it's
every five years, under the Pinnacle mater lease that this is a part of, it's every two years. And you look at the net revenues over that two-year period and the rent can go up or down based on the success of the facilities during that period.

When we looked at the Plainridge property because there are new properties coming into the state and other factors, both we and Penn agreed that we wouldn't have a percentage rent piece to this. We'll pick up a number. We'll put it in as flat rate rent. We've also excluded it from some of the other calculations under the lease so that it doesn't go into those calculations.

So that's just the function of the negotiation between the parties of saying let's just pick a number, put it in and we'll keep it aside. So in the lease, when you see it in the lease, you won't see Plainridge 25 million. You'll see an addition to the base rent under that Pinnacle lease of 25 million that reflects
our acquisition of the Plainridge property and its addition to our portfolio.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So the increase or the decrease in revenues component is one that the parties look at in the aggregate?

MR. MOORE: In the aggregate, that's right.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Every two years.

MR. MOORE: Plainridge won't be part of that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But it doesn't apply to Plainridge.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It doesn't because --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. It's exempt from that feature.

MR. MOORE: It's exempt from that feature. Yes, that's exactly right.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I hadn't thought about this before. But in the event that the license for Penn National at Plainville was not renewed and was awarded to somebody
else, how would the transaction between GLPI and the somebody else work?

MR. MOORE: So the way that it's structured in the lease, and we haven't encountered this, so I can't tell you -- in the Iowa example I gave, that license was actually awarded to somebody else. They built a brand-new facility that wasn't on our property, so we had no part of that.

In the situation that, I think, you're suggesting where if Penn were to lose the lease but you recognize that that facility, which is designed and built for gaming and somebody else could step in and run those machines on day one so you don't have the two-year period to build a new facility or something like that and we were to enter into a new lease, what the lease provides is that what we would do is enter into a new lease with a new tenant, whoever that was going to be, under substantially similar terms to the lease we have now.

Now, there is rug here where, and it gets into the business negotiation between
the parties, if the problem is that the rent was too high, then the whole lease is in jeopardy. And, I think, we find ourselves, the Gaming and Leisure Properties, faced with the notion of if the rent construct is too high, then we're probably going to be forced to renegotiate rental payments and those sorts of things. Again, we haven't encountered that to date. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: But the case -I'm thinking more -- just for the record, this is an utterly hypothetical, but it is a hypothetical that I think it's worth thinking about. If we were not satisfied with the performance of Penn National and we decided to rebid and give opportunity to somebody else to come in and bid and somebody else came in and bid, and I'm asking this of you, but $I$ would like to have you think about this as well and Loretta, wherever you went, you know, are we compromised -- is the Commission compromised in its ability to make an objective decision based on the leverage
that GLPI has on a new license holder? If you make life miserable for the new license holder in terms of how you'll rent to them, does that put us at a disadvantage and being able to be objective in assessing whether or not Penn National is indeed the best operator?

MR. MOORE: So from our perspective at GLPI, we don't think so. We believe that we're kind of at your mercy. So, obviously, you control ultimately whether or not gaming happens at that location, that property. There is no better use presently at that property. The highest and best use is undoubtedly gaming. So we are a little bit at your mercy in the sense that you have the license, a tenant. That tenant has to choose that facility that we own to conduct their gaming in.

And if they don't, then we have a very expensive facility that the next best use the rent will be derived, I can only surmise will be substantially lower than the rent we'll generate today.

And I will say, we also view ourselves as a bit of a partner to the state in the sense that our interest as a triple net landlord is for the lights to be on and the machines to be running at all times. To the extent that that doesn't happen, whether or not there's a master lease supporting it, eventually the house starts to crumble. And, so, our interest is always to have a tenant, and we don't get our rent until you get your tax dollars.

And, so, we believe we are aligned with you in the sense that if Penn is doing a terrible job at running this facility, that's bad for us as well. So we're going to want a new tenant in there as well that will reinvest in the property and, you know, put money back in, refresh machines, do things that presumedly in this case Penn is not doing.

So we believe we're aligned with the state -- with the Commonwealth in that regard. And in that, I mean, we are --
from a financial standpoint, we're financially sound because of our structure, not because we do it better. We're more financially sound than most of the gaming operators out there, because most of the cash flows goes to our shareholders, so our business is very simple.

We take and rent. We pay out
90 percent of that net income in dividends to our shareholders. We keep ourselves levered at a point where we believe is prudent, which we've said is about five and a half times levered. And as of today, Fitch Ratings came out with a rating on our debt today, hadn't previously rated us. We had only been rated by Moodies and S\&P. Finch has rated us investment grade.

So we have two of the three agencies have investment grade ratings on our debt. So we believe we will bring a stability to gaming that we bring a partner that we're after the same things you are. Make sure there's a tenant in there that's doing a good job and paying the rent and keeping
the machines running.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Do you or, Enrique, do you have any different sense of that?

MR. BEDROSIAN: And, I think, you're required -- if for some reason Penn, again, hypothetically, somehow really tanked and lost a license, it's a Category 2 license. There's no obligation you put someone in that facility. You could put it back out to bid. Now, again, I think to GLPI's point, they'd be incentivized to make sure there is someone in that facility. So it would be awful hard -- it strikes me the economic model might be hard for someone to go build on something as opposed to occupy something that's already there.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That's well said.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else?
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: That said, I
mean, there's a number of scenarios that you can think of. But it ultimately goes
down to the questions we asked of the parties earlier and said when it comes to licensing, that's really -- or relicensing, that's really a risk they're willing to take. They understand that that's their highest and best use, and they'll make a case to continue running it for as long as they can.

I have a question of Penn. In the terms, some of the disclosure -- thank you, Mr. Moore. Some of the prior disclosures and some of the remarks that Ms. Chang made, there's a notion there will be about $\$ 100$ million in annual savings as part of this transaction going forward.

Can you tell us a little bit about that and what happens if those -- how is that going and what happens if those don't really come to fruition?

MR. SEBASTIANO: Sure. Justin
Sebastiano, VP of finance and treasurer at Penn National. So you mentioned the $\$ 100$ million of cost savings, these are the synergies that we announced -- when we
announced the deal back in December of '17. And, so, it's actually been going extremely well. During the our due diligence, we came up with that number. After we made the announcement and we're able to really dig in more with help from the Pinnacle corporate teams and property teams, we have more faith in that number now.

And it's basically 50/50 between corporate -- the corporate structure savings and what is out in the properties. We think that probably happens over a 24-month period post-close and probably split roughly 50/50. Maybe a little bit we'll get in $Q 4$ of this year. We've announced on our last conference call that we expect to close the transaction very early fourth quarter.

So they won. Obviously there's the corporate redundancies, the duplicative costs of being a public company, you know, you don't need these costs now since there's going to only be one public company. So those sorts of costs will come
day one. But the real bulk of it will probably happen over the 24 -month period after that.

So we think the corporate redundancies happen much sooner, and some of the property savings that we will have will be through predominantly through the cost of good sales and procurement and just getting that purchasing power, and that economy is a scale you would get becoming a much larger company.

While we haven't quantified publically how we're going to do that, we haven't laid out per se the blueprint obviously for competitive reasons. But while we were very comfortable with that number, now we are extremely confidant in that 100 million. I would also say that there is likely revenue synergies on top of that. And, so, we feel very comfortable with the number, and we really can't wait to start operating this company as one larger company.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Revenue
synergies, can you help me understand that, what that might be?

MR. SEBASTIANO: Sure. And when we were talking about the five-million player database, just getting more of those customers in from the Pinnacle Properties. Pinnacle does not have a Las Vegas strip asset. We can now cater to those Pinnacle database players and have them come to the Las Vegas strip where we have a property in Tropicana, Las Vegas, MGM Resorts and the local market.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Great, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody else, questions or comments? I think we have a vote. Is that next?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Sure. Let me make the motion noting that, as I noted before, that this is a fundamental economic transaction, something that results in real benefits to the parties simply because of the structure. There will be better cost of capital that was mentioned before in
terms of the capacity of GLPI to borrow. So I will move that the Commission approve the proposed transaction of the interim authorization for the sale of Plainridge Park Casino to GLPI as described here today.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
discussion? All in favor? Aye.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously. Thank you, folks.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Mr. Albano looks like he wants to say something.

MR. ALBANO: If I may, just I want to be clear that is -- is the racing approval subsumed within the interim authorization that the Commission just voted on? That's my question.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: General Counsel

Blue is nodding yes.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes.
MR. ALBANO: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Thanks again. We're asking Ombudsman Ziemba to return.

MR. ZIEMBA: Mr. Chairman,
Commissioners, we're joined by Plainridge
Park for the quarterly report for the second quarter of this year. We are joined here by Ruben Warren, Vice President of Finance, Michele Collins, Vice President of Marketing, Kim Dixon, Vice President of Human Resources, Jason Gittle, Information Technology Director, Lance George, General Manager and Lisa McKenney, Compliance Manager are also here to answer any questions you may have. And with that, I turn it over to Ruben.

MR. WARREN: Good morning. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good morning. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Good morning, Ruben.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Good morning.
MR. WARREN: No more hypotheticals.

So our second quarter presentation in the state's fourth quarter, revenue grew in our second quarter, so \$44 million in net slot revenues. That's 3.3 percent better than the prior year. That is with disruption in our slot floor. We built a high limit facility with a VIP component, and Michele will get into the details of what that looks like. Our total state revenue 17.6 million, horse race revenues of just under 4 million and total taxes of 21.6 million in the quarter.

For lottery, continues to be a great story for us. Just under a million-dollars for the second quarter. 932,000 was the number. That's just under 11 percent growth, so great partnership and I think our customers, you know, love the convenience of the terminals being on the property. For life to date, lottery has made about $\$ 8$ million on our property through the terminals. And that's with, you know, partnering with our host communities not really affecting the host
communities. We've actually grown those as well and that's with, you know, people coming into the area, so $I$ think it's a great partnership for both lottery and our host communities as well.

For the state, for the qualified spend $\$ 1.5$ million for the total -- for the quarter with 89 percent or 1.3 million being in the state of Mass. That number is slightly elevated due to some of the construction projects that we had on the properties. The normal average for Mass. is 75 percent. This quarter is slightly above because of those reasons.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Was that the high limit area that you redid recently, for example?

MR. WARREN: Yes. So we did on the horse racing side, we did the barn roofs in that quarter and payments came in for that and then partial payments for the high limit room as well. You'll see most of those payments for the high limit room in the next quarter.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thanks.
MR. WARREN: For our host and surrounding communities, 243,000 was the total spend. That's about 15.5 percent of our total qualified spend in the quarter. And then a Wrentham vender benefited from, you know, the construction on the property, i.e. the 64 percent here for that jurisdiction, for that community.

Diversity, continues to be a good story overall. So we exceeded the goal in our second quarter, 24 percent compared to the 21 percent goal. For the women business enterprise, 14 percent compared to the 12 percent goal, minority-owned is right at the six percent goal and the veteran business at five percent.

And, so, through some of these spectrums, our top three venders for women business enterprises, printing and signage, seafood and Tito tickets for the slot machines. For the minority-owned businesses, it would be technology, printing and marketing promotional gifts.

And for the veteran business, it's marketing promotional gifts, food and beverage, equipment repair, food and beverage disposable items. And through the partnership with Derek and Jill, the state and Vericloud, we have identified, you know, a few more venders to sure up some of the areas that we're having issues with historically.

And through the corporate procurement partnership, they brought in a veteran-owned business, i.e. the elevation and the percentage for the second quarter. And, so, things are continuing to improve for the areas that we had submissions with prior year.

Compliance, good story for the second quarter. Just under 650,000 people through the doors. And our security checked right at 21,000 folks. That's about 3.3 percent of all visitors to the property. And the major components of that that we turned away, 291 total folks were either invalid IDs or no ID and just over

100, you know, folks that's either underage or minors that attempted to get on the floor that were turned away.

With that, I'm going to turn it over
to Kim so that she can go over our employment update.

MS. DIXON: Good morning. As of the end of the second quarter, our employment was up by 12 people, 477, full time represents 305 , which is 63.9 percent of the workforce, and part time is 172 , which represents 36.1 percent of the workforce. In terms of our breakdown of our employees, our numbers remain significantly the same. Diversity went up slightly to 26 , veterans have remained the same at five percent, Massachusetts has gone down slightly one point to 64 percent, and our local hiring is at 34 percent.

Our male and female breakdown is 53 percent male and 47 percent female. We continue to focus on our in-state and local hiring. We are attending the recruit military job fair coming up in two weeks.

During the second quarter, we attended the BBC job fair and we also held an on-site job fair. We are enhancing our social media recruitment as well with our talent acquisition team focusing on member only job ward, south shore jobs on Facebook, et cetera.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Kim, just a quick point. I know Director Griffin isn't here this morning, because she's at one of our Access and Opportunity Committee meetings. I know you're in the process of kind of reshaping the workforce development plan for Penn or PPC.

MS. DIXON: Yes.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: You know, I was just on your website this morning. You still have anywhere between 35 and 40 openings. Do you consider those kind of ongoing openings or are we still experiencing some turnover or are some of those new positions or kind of what's the mix?

MS. DIXON: A little bit of all. So
we do have some reoccurring positions that continue to -- we have continual turnover. Our turnover is actually lower than it's ever been. So year-to-date we're at about 19.4 percent, and annualized we are much less than we were in 2017. We're down like 20 percentage points from 2017's annualized number. We do continue to focus on the in-state hiring as well working with the career fairs. We have all our positions posted. We're looking at setting up something on site soon.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay. Just with talking with some folks from the governor's Skills Cabinet, more focused on, you know, they were looking for updates for progress with MGM, but they said we should circle back, go down and visit Plainridge, bring in the career center folks and see how, again, we might be able to work with you, especially at this time when you're kind of redoing the workforce development plan. So I'd be happy to work with you on that.

MS. DIXON: Absolutely. Next, to continue our update on our Women Leading at Penn Initiative, so our next topic that we'll be discussing in the month of July is gender bias. We also wanted to give you an update on our women's expo. So, again, we're thrilled to have Gail as our keynote speaker. Our advertisements have been posted. We'll be able to hold about 225 attendees and about 26 venders.

So we've had significant interest with the chamber selling tickets, as we speak. And I just wanted to mention, too, some of the additional speakers that are going to be there. Jennifer Weissman is a new addition. She is our chief marketing officer from Penn National. She is one of the founding women with the Women Leading at Penn Initiative, and Jennifer is going to talk to the group about the initiative and, you know, the plans for Penn going forward. So we're excited to have Jennifer on the panel as well.

```
The rest of the speakers, Jen is
```

going to -- Jen Osojnicki, I said that wrong, she's going to talk about authenticity and social media being authentic. Jen and the rest of the group are all local, so they are all from Massachusetts. So we're excited that they all came here. Ashley Pare, she owns Own Your Worth and she is going to discuss negotiation stills. Shelly Burman-Rubera, she's going to discuss about woman succeeding in business, so small business owners and then Dr. Mary Medeiros is going to focus on women in health care, so those will make up the breakout sessions for the women's expo. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. MS. COLLINS: All right, so for
local community, we continue to support the local charities on a quarterly basis and some of these you'll see quarter over quarter. But some highlights include we sponsored restaurant night for Lenore's Pantry at Slacks at the property. We also participated in the Penn initiative For

Relay for Life. So every year what they do is they have all of the properties participate to see how much money we can each raise. It's a competition really. And this year we came in 7 th out of 20 properties where we raised over $\$ 25,000$ for Relay for Life. On a whole, Penn actually raised $\$ 427,000$ this year.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Where does that money go?

MS. COLLINS: Relay for Life.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: There's an organization called Relay for Life?

MS. COLLINS: Yes. So we work specifically for the North Attleboro chapter. But, yes, it's cancer, all kinds of cancer. It's not specific to one. In addition to that, we have been working with a local artist. His name is Theodore Arthur Charron. He is raised in North Attleboro at his grandparents' farm, and he went to the Art Institute of Boston. He graduated in 1972, and he is well-known for many of his paintings. He has been
recognized for over 100 nationally.
So what we've done with him is we've taken some of his artwork and if you've walked down from Slacks to the racing area, we've displayed his artwork along those walls, which is a nice area to put it. We're allowing our customers, who if they opt to choose to spend their comp. cash on a piece of art, they can do so.

So this is just very new. I think we put them up about three weeks ago. So it's exciting. And he's also going to be riding in the starter car taking photographs of live racing, and then he's going to print, draw the pictures and we're going to do a promotion for our guests where they will receive a print of the picture.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Cool.
MS. COLLINS: In addition to that, we continued our sponsorship with NESN and Red Sox with Winning Wednesdays. So as the Red Sox continue to have their lucky streak, we're at 12 wins for Wednesdays,
which puts us at nearly $\$ 10,000$ already towards our 2019 goal for Relay for Life, so that's very exciting.

We've also continued our Fenway concert series sponsorship. This allows us to do activation to reach out to people and increase our awareness, but it also allows us to host our VIP guests in our suite so we can do kind of an experience with our host and the players so that they can enjoy something we don't offer at the property.

Then we partnered Beasley Media Group doing an Xfinity concert series where what they do is they have a concert winners. They bring a bus of 25 people to Flutie's beforehand, so they get to experience the restaurant and then there's transportation to and from the concert venue.

For marketing highlights, we just had our three-year anniversary. As Ruben mentioned, we also finished the new high limit area as well as the VIP lounge. In this area, it's a more private area for our
customers to play the high limit games, which is something that they were asking for, and we increased the count from 38 to 45 in that area. So so far it's been a great success, and they're really enjoying the privacy of it.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Michele, remind me, what is the high limit threshold; what do you call high limit?

MS. COLLINS: It's any of the higher games, so we have $\$ 100, \$ 25, \$ 10$. And then in addition to that, we are bringing back Murphy's Boxing for their final boxing match in September. So we had done a four year -- a four time deal with them, so September will be the last one that we do for this year. We're also adding --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Is that something you will likely renew?

MS. COLLINS: It does. It's a totally different demographic than what we'd normally get, so it's nice to be able to use the racing side for that and still have the excitement on the gaming side.

So, essentially, it's not much crossover but it's still something that is exciting to offer. We started to work on the outdoor apron a bit. And $I$ don't know if you've been there recently yet, but what we've done is we've taken the shack that was out there and we added a bar to it. So now when we do outdoor events, it allows us to offer cocktails and hot dogs. We actually just had our banquet manager rent that space out for a company to do their company party outdoors, which was really nice. And, again, something different. So we're just working with our existing footprint to create new items that we can offer to the community and to our guests.

In addition to that, we're adding a what we call a grab in game, which is essentially just kind of a snack bar for a customers to grab a quick salad, grab a quick sandwich, and that way they don't have to wait in a restaurant and it's just something quick and easy for them to grab. We will be putting in the food court.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Tell me where that outdoor bar is again.

MS. COLLINS: On the apron off of -if you're facing the racing area, off to the right, it was that white brick building. So we kind of refinished it and added a granite bar and stools.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Oh great. I'll have to take a look.

MS. COLLINS: It looks great. And, also, we will be launching our win/loss -our monthly win/loss statements. So Jason Gittle will be walking you through that process with you. But what it is going to do is allow our customers to go onto marquee rewards on line and actually get their statement each month versus yearly, which is the current standard with Penn. So they will be able to see their win/loss statements, print them out and access them whenever they want to. So he'll walk you through that right now.

MR. GITTLE: Good morning. I would say just at a high altitude description of
the project, roughly five or six months ago we were approached by members of your staff that we needed to develop and offer our patrons a monthly win/loss statement. Typically, we've issued at Penn National has issued at all of the properties an annual statement. Sometime around February 1st is when that occurred.

So from a high altitude, this project came at a time technology-wise for Penn where I'm not certain if you're aware, we're changing our data warehouse for our corporation Penn National. The term "puma" if you've heard of it has made it's way to puma two.

So one of the challenges in developing something of this nature that pulls information from our old data warehouse, otherwise known as Puma, it's to make sure that it's forward compatible with what Plainridge Park will be using sometime in the January, February time frame we're scheduled.

The puma two engine has been ruled
out that two or three properties thus far successfully. Don't anticipate any failures on their approach to the Plainridge property. So what you're seeing here won't be impacted by that change that's coming.

As you know, just a couple of quick thank you's. One is to Todd, Todd Grossman, who has kind of served as a guiding point as to the law and what we need to provide folks. We had several conversations over the last four or five months on tweaks and things along those lines to what you're about to see. Also, Alena Jacks of the MGM IT deployment team, had several conversations. It would be a good thing to mention her as well to make sure what we're providing from Penn perspective is similar to what they will be providing shortly from an MGM perspective, and we think you'll see similarities.

Finally, Lisa McKenney and Michele Colins from a compliance and marketing perspective locally helped steer us in the right
direction as well, which arrives you to this point.

In your package, plan $B$ was to provide you some still shots. But late in the game, we decided maybe plan $A$ would be better, and that's to show you a live demonstration.

Without further ado, the web player profile is located within a larger web engine or larger website referred to as marquee rewards, www.marqueerewards.com, allows the public to go in and take a look at all things Penn National, all things promotional Penn National. It has a secure element to it that it links this website, this public website securely to all of our patrons, and we refer to that secure piece as the web player profile.

So if you're a patron at any one of our properties, it is a place to log into and see things like promotional offers, tracking of their loyalty points and tier points and what that means in their evolution as a customer of Penn.

The log-in, thanks, Mike, for setting this up, we've created around the e-mail addresses that are given to our baseline gaming system as well as most of the major social engine credentials. So it's important to note that we don't need to have your e-mail address for you to log in and see the web player profile. You can use your Facebook, Twitter, Yahoo, all the typical social media.

If you'll allow me a brief moment to log in. We're picking on one of our hosts. As I had mentioned, we are logging in securely with a user name, which is typically the e-mail address and a password that you're able to select within the website in your creation.

This brings you into a secured area where you're able to, save this for you guys, where you're able to view things as I told you before your offers, your tier info and you're also able to find information on local and entertainment -- local entertainment and entertainment across the

Penn enterprise. And, I believe, folks, there is an account -- this is a different layout. This is a layout for also designed to work with phones and tablets and things of those nature.

So there is a my account section that allows you to log in and see different things across the enterprise. Here's where what we've done typically is an annual PDF that you can see as I hold my curser over. This is the typical functionality where if you were to select the year, you're able to see and download a PDF that shows their win/loss on an annual basis. One number, folks, one number.

The screen that has been added with a dynamic check so that the customers are able to see their play in each month that there is an active rating at the Plainridge facility. So you don't see months where there are no active ratings, and that's a discussion that Todd and I have been going back and forth on and still under discussion whether we want to presenting no
rating versus presenting a zero rating are two entirely different things here. So right now we're excluding anything -- we are not including months that do not have trips.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Is there a reason there why 2016 -- is this just dummy data?

MR. GITTLE: Yes, sir. This is a test account, and we didn't mess around with it in 2016. So as we dynamically take a look at the play on this account, we were testing obviously in 2015. You can see the equation of coin in minus coin out plus jackpots equals the total. That gives you a total number for the month of win/loss, green being win, red being loss. And, again, you can hop around it dynamically. This is the same math you'll see from the other licensee opening in ten days, same thing. And then finally --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Can you just open up 403 again, open up that May number? So that means that the better bet $\$ 163$ and won

556, am I getting that right?
MR. GITTLE: Yes, sir. So one of the things we took from Mr. Grossman is that we're potentially -- one of the adds or the revisions that you'll see in the coming month is we're going to add definition to what these terms mean that are more layman in nature.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Right. Coin in and coin out is obscured to a lot of folks.

MR. GROSSMAN: We talked about the coin in number. It does not mean that the person took $\$ 163$ out of their wallet and put it into the machine. That's the total amount they bet going up and down.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Well, this is a topic I've had with some folks and that was completely obscured to people, I think. I mean, people think that you go in with \$100 and if you lose it, you have lost $\$ 100$. But your system says if you started out winning 100 and then you lose everything, you have lost 200, right? So the consumer thinks they lost 100, and the machine
thinks they lost 200 .
So explaining that to people --
maybe I'm -- I've talked to a lot of people about it, and people intuitively think it means, how much cash out of my pocket did I lose? And, in fact, it means something different because it counts the money you theoretically had when you had wins, not theoretically. I mean, you did have but if you've chosen to cash out at that point, but that's really confusing to people.

MR. GITTLE: So we had the same feedback from Mr. Grossman. We're going to be adding -- as we said, right here in this white section next to going in and going out, we're going to give a better description of what it means.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm interested to
know whether any of you -- is there any feedback from customers about whether they -- like your marquee rewards players, whether they understand this distinction; is there anyway -- that probably doesn't come up very often.

MS. COLLINS: It does come up. But if they're an experienced gambler, they typically do understand what it is. But somebody just walking in and signing up for a card, it is very confusing. But we try to just explain to them that it's literally every time they hit that button that's what the coin in is. It has nothing to do with what they physically put in the machine. But, again, when they want offers and they're trying to figure out what they should be getting versus what they are getting, it is confusing.

MR. GROSSMAN: Which is why we've talked about adding words like "estimated" in here. Because the total is not necessarily the pure total money that you actually won or lost. There is a number of different factors. So using words like "estimated" kind of gets you closer to what that number actually reflects.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Except it's not estimated. Given the definition, it isn't estimated. It is real, and that's the
number that we report, you know, to the state, and that's what we tax against and so forth. So when we report win, you know, what was the win or what was the drop, what was the payout, it's based on that algorithm, so it's not really estimated.

MR. GROSSMAN: That might not be the best word. Well, the tax is different. Tax is based on the actual drop. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: GGR. I'm sorry, I misspoke. When we report GGR and tax, we also report coin in.

MR. GROSSMAN: We do report that in.
That's right. So the word "estimated" might not be ideal. But as Mr. Gittle mentioned, they'll work on some explanation for here so people understand what these numbers mean.

MR. GITTLE: You know, what's important here is to layout that the law speaks in different terms, not coin in and coin out. It speaks in terms of total bets. So, I think, it would be a useful exercise to tie these terms into what the
law states, and it might be more understandable for our audience.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Perhaps I've been looking at this for awhile, but I think it's pretty straightforward when you make the addition to come up with a total, but I'm glad you're working on them.

MR. WARREN: Can I add one thing? So estimated could be our customers don't always understand you have to have the card in, and sometimes they think the card is in and they are betting. So, I think, the estimated is really saying that if you insert the card appropriately, it's going to track your play. And if you don't, there's going to be this, you know, estimation really what you lost, so it's really on the customers -- I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It doesn't count what you sneak over to the other machine and don't use your card and just play with cash, right?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: By the way, this term is going to be -- that point is
going to be a lot more important with the tables because that talk about rate play, that really becomes as good as an estimate anybody can do, but it's still an estimate.

MR. GITTLE: Yes, sir. And without giving you testimony for another licensee, you'll find that their presentation of the data is very similar to what we're proposing here. But with one additional breakout, they break out slots versus table games.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Great.
MR. GITTLE: So to close the presentation, if we were to run a PDF of annual win/loss, this is what the patron would see. And as I had said earlier, this is what we have been doing to date. This is a presentation of one number versus what we're proposing in the same time period on a monthly basis, the statement is also available but you'll see some similarities to the dynamic screen we presented here with a monthly breakdown of their win/loss. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That annual
statement was set up as a letter. Did you mail that out or do you mail that out?

MR. GITTLE: We have not typically mailed them out, only if they've requested it. We typically make them available out of this web player profile.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And we discussed that and said that was okay. I thought it was interesting it sets up like a letter. MR. GITTLE: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It's good for tax purposes, by the way.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I would think patrons would appreciate this change because every other financial transaction we make we're notified monthly of what that is. So we're very accustomed to being notified monthly of whatever that is.

MR. GITTLE: And that lingo that you just mentioned was a base part of how we formed this and took a look at things like credit card statements and how they present data. We've arrived at this. Technically, we are ready to launch. There are some
compliance hurdles and some things that we're signing off internally. We've picked a date of September 1st, and we can be ready technically to do that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. Thank you, Mr. George, too, for your oversight here. Is that it? We will switch over to Wynn.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you everybody, really good numbers. You can see the effort is there, so appreciate it. Look forward to the event in September.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Mike, can we do a break for minute? Let's do a break.

> (A recess was taken)

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We're ready to reconvene. We are still with Ombudsman Ziemba.

MR. ZIEMBA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So next up we have the quarterly report for the second quarter for Encore Boston Harbor. We're joined by Robert DeSalvio, President of Encore Boston

Harbor, Jacqui Krum, Senior Vice President and General Counsel and Peter Campot, Director of Construction. Let me turn it over to Bob.

MR. DESALVIO: Thank you, John. Good afternoon, Commissioners. Very pleased to report there's been significant progress on the site since our last quarterly update. And while I know the entire team is dedicated to getting the MGM up and running, I would suggest after the opening and when you can catch your breath, please call to arrange for some tours because I think you'd be very impressed at progress since our last quarterly update, and it's going really quickly on site. I want to say before I turn it over to Peter say --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I just highlighted Janice to --

MR. DESALVIO: To get some tours maybe in the fall would be great. Before I turn it over to Peter to jump right into the construction update, Peter, thank you
for you and the team and John Fish at Suffolk for really moving this thing
forward. So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Peter Campot.

MR. CAMPOT: Good morning.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Good
afternoon.
MR. CAMPOT: Afternoon, yes. I'd like to point out that we're going to put up the first letter of the sign on the north side of the building tonight, and it's static.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: No moving.
MR. CAMPOT: We're on schedule. We have 314 days to go. I'd like to point out before I go too much forward that the team is just -- I'm working with a great bunch of people, the construction managers, Suffolk is doing a great job. We have 150 people in the office there. The design team and everybody is really pulling it together to make it happen. All of the trade partners have been doing a great job
and the entire workforce has just been outstanding, and they're all excited about the job and the quality has been excellent.

We're averaging about 1,600 workers a day on site. Most of those are in the first shift with selected trades on the second shift. We're 69 percent complete from a time standpoint, 66 complete from a labor standpoint and just over 70 percent complete from a cash standpoint. So we're tracking really well, and we're excited about that.

I wanted to point out that in this presentation that Jacqui insisted that I use June 30th photos, I want permission next time to use current ones because we've made a tremendous amount of progress in the last six weeks.

If we go to the next slide I'll show you -- so in the site work, we planted about 60 or 70 percent of all the major trees and all the walkways are being installed. And you will see on the South Peninsula we're on schedule to complete the

South Peninsula by the 1st of September. There will be some minor plantings, but that includes the natural -- the artificial turf on the South Peninsula. Then at the front entry on Broadway, we're also those planting large trees are planted. And we probably have about 75 percent of the pavement installed, and we'll continue to work with that around the entire site.

There's a view of the South
Peninsula. It's much more developed today. Keep going. So the walkway, which is just fantastic. The garage structure, we're punching out the B4 and B3 levels. Those will be ready to be turned over in October. We won't be using them, but we will complete them and get the punch list done. The B2 level is right behind that, and the B1 level is also in great shape. We're using those for temporary storage. We'll turn those over later, but we they are all essentially complete.

This is an image of the front of the casino. That is all enclosed now, all the
stone. There's a little bit of green sheathing left where the bus entry is, but that's all almost complete. You can see on the podium there's an image of the tower. That curtain wall is complete now to the roof.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: You mentioned you were putting up the first letter you said on the north side.

MR. CAMPOT: The north side.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Are you going to have signs on both north and south?

MR. CAMPOT: North and south.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So the big one will be south, but there's going to be --

MR. CAMPOT: South. The Encore name is slightly smaller on the north side. Because as the building swoops, the E had to be smaller to fit that in. It starts tonight.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Oh, the capital E is much as the other --

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: It's on the lower end.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It's on the lower end.

MR. CAMPOT: So that will be done this week. And the south side will be done the first week of September. The tower cranes, just for the record, are scheduled to come down the next 30 days. The first one comes down starting about the 20 th. That's a big milestone for us to get those tower cranes down. That allows us to finish where they penetrate the roof and the podium level. So that's a big milestone. And the temporary hoist is scheduled to come down to mid-September, and that allows us to enclose the remaining pieces of the tower and, you know, finish those rooms up that we left out.

The podium gaming -- go to the next image. So the light fixtures are actually hung in this space right now, and we are installing the raised flooring. We had about 20 to 25 percent of the raised flooring is all in the gaming area. The gaming area is about a month ahead of
schedule right now, which is great because that will allow us to move the gaming machines in. As everybody knows, that's crucial to have the time to install those timely. So that's continuing to develop, and we're right on schedule.

This is the center bar area. And, again, the stairways are open now and we are installing the railings on those stairways as you go up to the upper limit gaming. The convention area is about a month ahead of schedule. The facade is more developed and you can see now, I think, the next -- that's in end. There's another view of the tower and the development of that facade, but that's mostly enclosed now. We're installing the glazing in those openings as you come around in the convention center.

The building is completely weather tight at this point. The hotel tower, we're installing the drywall on the 27th floor. Floors 5, 6, 7 and 8 are almost complete. We're carpeting floors 5 and 6
right now as we speak. Tile is up to about the 16th floor. That's always one of our finishes because a ton of stone -- one of our challenges making sure that we have enough people for the finishes. That's proceeding just as planned, if not better, so we're pretty excited about that. So the whole assembly line of the tower is on schedule to start turning those rooms over in December.

Then you can see a view here of the curtain wall and of the Mystic River. But that curtain wall is complete up to the top of that structural steel on the south side. There is only about may 80 panels left to go. So the curtain wall will be complete 100 percent in two weeks.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: That's a great picture, great view.

MR. CAMPOT: I was up there yesterday at the very top of the swoop 380 feet. The views are spectacular. It's really amazing. And that's just a view of the skyline.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: There's nothing behind the swoop, right, on the roof?

MR. CAMPOT: No. Just structural steel, elevated machine room, that type of thing. We're on schedule. If there is any particular questions, I think I covered most of it.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I just had a question. You mentioned artificial turf. So in between all those plantings you're going to use turf.

MR. CAMPOT: Yes. Well, in the center area, there's an artificial lawn, and there's two smaller areas either side that there's an artificial lawn.

Everything else between those plantings is 100 percent planted with shrubs or flowers. We're staring to plant the roses out there right now. It's really beautiful.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So everything
will be planted out other than some turf areas in the middle.

MR. CAMPOT: That's right.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So no natural grass. You don't use any natural grass, just turf.

MR. DESALVIO: Just to comment on that event lawn, that space is about 20,000 square feet and it's going to get a tremendous amount of use. And if you went with regular grass, you know, you look great the first day, then you start putting a tent up and run events on it and then you put some rain it, and then next thing you know it's just mud.

So for that area, similar to what we do in Las Vegas, there's certain areas where you put artificial product, and especially in a high use area like that, just makes all the sense in the world but everything else is, you know, all natural landscape.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And the newer turfs are pretty realistic looking.

MR. DESALVIO: They are great
looking. And they will give us, again, the flexibility to use that. It has drainage
components that are built into it. So you're not worried about puddling or flooding or any of that, so it's good for us.

MS. KRUM: And it looks much better during the winter, too.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What has been your experience with the labor force; have you had any trouble -- you said you were concerned about maybe getting the people for the tiles.

MR. CAMPOT: If you remember before, one of my challenges I've always been worried about is getting enough high quality tradespersons for the finishes. To date, we've had no problem at all. The response has been great, really, really terrific. One other point I wanted to make is the marquee sign on Broadway is scheduled to be erected in September, so that's pretty exciting.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Also static.
MS. KRUM: Also static.
MR. DESALVIO: No video screen on
that one.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: There's a note in the bigger report on page seven. It said back in April that you filed a license application for phase one of the DCR harbor walk connector project. Can you just kind of refresh our memory as to what piece of the connector that is?

MR. CAMPOT: So we have that permit for phase one, and that's the first piece that connects us over to the DCR property. We also have permission almost there for phase two also. So we expect to do phase one and phase two this fall. So we'll put that walkway in from our property all the way over to DCF.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Great, thank you.

## MR. DESALVIO: Jacqui?

MS. KRUM: Sure.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: One second, Jacqui. What about, either both of you, where are we on the possibility of the bridge?

MS. KRUM: I was actually just going to address that. Before we get into off-site infrastructure, $I$ know that there were questions about the pedestrian bridge. So our corporate team has authorized us to go ahead with the design and permitting for the bridge. So we will be paying for that. Obviously it will have to be done in close coordination with both DCR and DOT and MBTA.

So there's a number of components to this. One is, the actual bridge of course, but it connects over to the DCR park. And we're working with DCR to see how that can be redeveloped, and if we can get a connection into the head house, which will connect us to the Assembly Row T-station. You know, the last thing we want is a bridge that drops off in the middle of nowhere and people don't have access, and it's very difficult to cross the tracks at that point. So it would add a substantial amount of walking if it just dropped off into the DCR park. So we're working very
closely with all the different agencies, including John. And we hope to have more of a report as we move forward.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great.
MS. KRUM: On the off-site
infrastructure, as you know, we've broken it into four different packages. The first one, which we call as $C P-1$, which is Broadway and the truck route, has been our biggest challenge to date. What we have been trying to do is coordinate with Eversource who received permission to put in a transmission line along the same routes. And for obvious reasons, both the city and Eversource and we all wanted to coordinate that efforts so we weren't rebuilding all the streets, and then having Eversource come in sometime within a month or a year later and ripping out the streets and putting in a transmission line.

We've been in close coordination with Eversource. But for various reasons, they are significantly delayed on their project. And we're trying work out how we
can add extra shifts, how they can add extra shifts and try to get back on scheduled whether we just need to go ahead.

We do have a plan currently, but it's a very tight plan. It does have all the work complete before opening, but it would mean that we would have to go back in the spring rather than finishing up in the fall.

On CP-2, this is Route 16. And as you can see, we're scheduled to complete this fall. On CP-3, this is Malden and Wellington and the MBTA station also on schedule to complete this fall. And CP-4 is Sullivan Square and the MBTA station. The work that we're doing in the actual station has been more time-consuming than we anticipated, but we are still on schedule to complete this fall.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Jacqui, I noticed on this graph you have some things that start green, which is work completed and then they extend to pink, which is delayed.

MS. KRUM: That shows the delay -so that isn't work completed. Sorry, that is the work that should have been completed by that time, but it's been delayed through the yellow.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: But they don't appear to be in the critical path.

MS. KRUM: No. If we needed to go back in the spring for any of this, we could. But our goal is to try to get it done in the fall. Bob?

MR. DESALVIO: Great. I wanted to provide an update on our diversity in the project. The design phase, not too much new there. Our goal on the MBEs was 7.9 percent and we are finishing up at about 8.9 percent, exceeding that goal. The WBE goal, which was 10 percent, we're currently at about 7.8, and we have been over the last few quarters trying to add whatever we could on that particular goal. On the veteran goal it was one percent, and we far exceeded that at 6.6. So, overall,
the goal was 18.9, and we came in at a very strong 23.3 percent over our initial goal. And the design work is pretty much wrapping up at this point.

The contracting side has been an incredible story. On the MBE front, we are five percent goal. We are at about six percent currently, and that represents about $\$ 75$ million worth of work. The WBE goal was 5.4, and we're at 10.8 percent and over $\$ 136$ million. And the VBE goal was one percent. We're at about 2.6 percent currently hovering a little over 32 million.

So in total, we had a goal of 11.4 percent. We're currently running 17.4 percent, and that represents \$218 million worth of work on a total of about 230 contracts. So we're very pleased with the effort that the team has put forth on trying to be as inclusive as possible.

On the construction workforce, we're doing very well there as well. On the minority front, we had a goal of
15.3 percent. We're currently hovering just below 25 percent at 24.9. Our female numbers have been very impressive. A goal of 6.9, and we're right at 6.8. So we're hovering right around the goal.

And I'm sure you probably saw this week, but this was the subject of a really great feature that Contessa Brewer did with CNBC. They came and visited our property. They spoke with the commission. They spoke with MGM and that story got spun out all over the place. Lots of nationwide coverage on that, because both our projects and MGM are far exceeding what is the typical norm of two to three percent for females in the construction workforce, and we've been far exceeding that number. And it was really a great story, and got lots of national attention.

On the veteran goal, we had a goal of three percent. We're currently over double that. It's 6.4 percent. So, again, another great story this quarter as well on the construction workforce.

The outreach is three pages and I was looking at this, and in some months it's almost an event a day. And, so, we have people all over the place covering just an amazing variety of local and community and diverse organizations to try to get our word out. It's been extremely successful. The job events have been very encouraging, including one we just had recently in Everett that we had a morning and an evening session that was terrific.

So I will not -- I'm not going to read you all these names, but you can see that it's really a very, very wide cross-section of community groups and our team has done a wonderful job in terms of doing that outreach. So with that, I want to open it up for questions from any of the Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Bob, this is an impressive list. Is it a combination of kind of site updates versus vending opportunities versus employment opportunities? I mean, is it an equal mix
or is it predominantly in the workforce side?

MR. DESALVIO: It's going to move more towards workforce as we obviously are going to get into that very large hiring wave after the first of the year, and you can't do that in a short window. So there is a lot of prep work to that hiring wave. So I looked out the other day at what Jenny and the employment team were doing, and it's skewing now much more towards workforce.

And then right behind that, we're in the process of preparing for the commission the vender goals. So it's going to move from a heavy emphasis in employment to right behind that on procurement for goods and services for after we open. So we kind of tailor the events to what the current needs are, but right now it's going to be a big spike in employment events.

MS. KRUM: But there's also a significant part of community outreach. So, you know, last week or the week before,
we had a whole team from our office go out and pull the water chestnuts from the Mystic River. It was a great event. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Really, wow. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Jill has got some very fit, positive feedback on your workforce development plan. One professional wrote that he'd never seen a workforce development plan as impressive and as comprehensive as that in his life. He was a professional in the business, and also saw the doorknockers that you are putting out in Everett. Where are those going?

MR. DESALVIO: They did them all throughout the community. And one of the main goals was to promote the event that we just had and, you know, the mayor was there and a lot of the city councilors. And as I mentioned, we did two sessions, one at eight in the morning and one at six in the evening. We had lines out the door and down the street. We had to do crowd control at a hiring event. And people were
walking around saying, I don't get this. I thought there was low unemployment and yet we were just jammed out there.

So it tells us that, yes, there is low employment but, I think, our story is really positive. And if people are looking for a career and want to be with a company for a long time, hopefully we will be a job of choice because we were very, very impressed with the results. People came in. They were well-dressed. They had resumes. We brought in all of our department head so they could literally in one room just go around and make stops at about 15 different tables and check in with department heads.

So, you know, and the mayor he really was -- when you think about his involvement with the project, his number one item was jobs for Everett residents. He loved the project. But for him, it was a lot about the employment and he couldn't have been more proud, I think, at that event when he saw that finally after all
this time this is where the fruits of the labor really paid off.

And the doorknockers was a great idea to just go out there and literally let people know that there was an event coming up and also to introduce our web portal and what's going on. There is a lot of excitement about that.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I've used those many times in political campaigns and days gone by, but I don't know that I've ever seen that for employment or even a business.

MR. DESALVIO: It works. Got people out. It was great news.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I saw it as well and thought it was a great idea. And obviously your numbers -- all of your efforts are really paying off. It's just really nice to see how much effort and the results are there, so really good work.

MR. DESALVIO: Thank you. Thanks, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I share the
same thoughts. Can I go back a little bit to the Eversource? You mentioned the effort is tight. Of course you cannot control all of it. There are some requirements that you have to do, but it's behind the Eversource work. Can you speak a little bit about what would be the situation if they continue to have their delay on their side?

MS. KRUM: Yes. So we've had numerous meetings with them and the City of Everett. And one of the things that we are considering is whether at some point we just go ahead with the work that we need to do. Unfortunately, that means they would have to come back at a certain point and rip a portion out and go back and do that, but that's certainly under consideration.

We're also talking to our contractor
to see what we can do to really expedite that work in the springtime. So they seem confident that if Eversource does what they need to do over the course of the fall and a little bit into the winter that they can
do that in time. We just would have liked to have finished the work in the fall so... MR. DESALVIO: Yes. You remember our original schedule we had said if we could, we'd love to do all that roadwork in this calendar year, and then we just wouldn't have to worry about it next year. But this one piece, unfortunately, dragged out a little bit. But that's why we left ourselves a good buffer in there for just, you know, you start roadwork and you never know what is going to happen. So I'm glad we left a little buffer, and hopefully we can catch that up, and we will make sure we are done by the spring.

MS. KRUM: And Eversource has gone back to the city and asked for some relief in terms of the times of day that they can work and the number of crews that they can have. So the city has been very accommodating in getting that done. Obviously, we're trying to balance that with significant traffic delays along the Broadway area. And so, I think, the
nighttime work has certainly gone a long way.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And, remind me, that work is related to the casino or not?

MS. KRUM: No, it's completely unrelated. It's a transmission line that goes through Chelsea, Everett and other communities, and we were just trying to coordinate.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Sure. Well, it would be a pity if we ever have to find ourselves in a situation where you have to do the work for compliance with 23K, and then somebody else is going to go rip that work out later on.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Section 61, yes.
MS. KRUM: Well, as you can
appreciate, too, what we don't want is to be open and then they open the streets again. And I must say, Eversource has been working with us in good faith to do this. They've run into delays that were frankly unanticipated. You know, they've hit
utilities that they didn't anticipate, so that requires research. And it is a coordinated effort to get it done. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. Anybody else?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Great. Thank you very much.

MR. DESALVIO: Thanks,
Commissioners.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All right. Item
No. 7, racing division.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: You skipped
6.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: I'm sorry, what
was 6?
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Paul.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Nothing personal.
MR. CONNELLY: No offense taken.
Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, I have before you today 11 positions to consider for exemption. These positions are all at MGM Springfield. One is an MGM Springfield employee in the bowling alley, and the
remaining are all at western Mass. News. These are all in line with previous exemptions that have been granted. I reviewed these with MGM and found them all to be suitable in terms of the criteria that the Commission set forth earlier this year, and I'm recommending that they be exempted.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Paul, quick question. The bowling alley attendant position, do we know how many jobs that actually translates into, like how many people they actually plan to hire for that position?

MR. CONNELLY: I do not have an exact number, the headcount for that.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Must be a handful.

MR. CONNELLY: I believe it would be a handful. I think of a typical, you know, having seen the bowling alley, the number of lanes, how busy it will be, a couple of shifts per day, so it would be a good number of folks but certainly not a
tremendous number.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Who's western
Mass. News, a tenant of the --
MR. CONNELLY: That's correct. They are a tenant right off of the outdoor plaza. So in that block there, they have western Mass. News will be a tenant. They will produce news in that space, you know, with kind of the floor to ceiling window. So as I've heard it described, it's going to be pretty interesting walking by you will be able to see the business of news happening, so to speak.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: I think it's the old Channel 40 ABC affiliate in Springfield.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I agree with the recommendation. I'm just curious as to why we didn't exempt them from the getgo or deem them to be perhaps questionable of exemption, but I agree with the recommendation.

MR. CONNELLY: Sure. And a lot of
that, Commissioner, it's a good point. It's because some of these positions weren't really identified until this point in time. So we have been kind of taking them as they come, which is why, for example, the bowling alley attendant is an MGM employee. It's a newer position that they've created frankly, I think, out of whole cloth. Because as far as I'm aware, I don't know if there's another bowling alley attendant at MGM. I could be wrong. I know they have to generate these positions at a corporate level and cascade them down.

So there will, which brings up the point, this won't be the last time, I imagine, I'm in front of you. Certainly not -- Encore, there's the entirety of the work really there to be done. Plainridge there could be additional exemptions as well as MGM in terms of requests that $I$ might bring before you. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Other discussion? COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr. Chair,

I'd move that the commission approve the gaming service employee exemptions as provided in the packet.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Any further
discussion? All in favor? Aye.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes have it unanimously.

MR. CONNELLY: Not forgotten but brief.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Now Item No. 7, Dr. Lightbown.

MS. LIGHTBOWN: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Today the first item on the agenda is the Suffolk Down request for additional race days. They've asked for September 15 th and 16 th to be added, and along with that request comes the request for 1.1 million in racehorse development
funds for the purse money, which is consistent with what they have been spending over the weekend so far. Today I've got Bruce Barnett, Legal Counsel and Jessica Paquette, Communications Director from Suffolk if you have any questions.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I know there was a concern last year because of football or whatever else happens in September you didn't do quite as well with the September dates as you did with the summer dates. The same concern this year or...

MS. PAQUETTE: I would have to go back and check the numbers from last year. I think we're early enough into the football season with the preseason would be opening.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Julian Edleman won't be playing anyways.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: It is a way for our local folks to race and others, and certainly I agree with the recommendation to allow these dates.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And it always
seems to generate enthusiasm and pretty bit of audience and hopefully tells our legislature that, yes, there should be a future for thoroughbred racing, so that's a positive too. Any other comments?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It's not a question for the request. But how was the last weekend, the one was that was the last minute or the last day in jeopardy of not coming to fruition?

MS. LIGHTBOWN: They did well. We really didn't have horses that scratched because of the legislative thing. I think it was resolved early enough that everybody still came that wanted to. There was a lot of rain earlier in that day, so the races came off the turf except for the big race they were going to have. So there were horses that scratched for that reason, but that could happen any time.

MR. BARNETT: I don't know, Commissioners, if you've had the pleasure of meeting Jessica Paquette, Communications Director, but Chip sends his regards and
his apologies for not being able to be here. Between the two of us, we're hoping to maybe make up for the gap but ask her if she has anything to say about last weekend.

MS. PAQUETTE: I thought the weekend went very well. We did have, like Dr. Lightbown said, the races came off the turf but I didn't think they were really that many scratches considering the field size really held up for both days of the weekend, and the crowds were good. We had a pretty solid crowd on both days. Even with the rain, $I$ think some of the uncertainty leading up to it at least made people excited to come out once they realized they could.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I had the opportunity to attend Sunday's races, and Executive Director Bedrosian did as well, and we both got to attend the George Brown memorial race, which was a very nice tribute and very good race, too. So, anyway, just wanted to add that that it was really nice to be there and feel that
energy again.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Mr. Chair, I also support the request and Dr. Lightbown's recommendation. I did have a question, though. Is there -- just looking at the other item on your agenda about the Mass. breeders requesting a race at Finger Lakes, does that impact your ability to field Mass. bred races for the dates you have in September?

MS. LIGHTBOWN: My understanding is that the Mass. breeders are planning on trying to race the Norman Hall stakes, and that one hasn't been able to be raced at Suffolk, and that would be nice if it could be done at Suffolk this year. It's for two year olds, so they are not typically ready that early in the season so it needs to be run later.

So my understanding is that's going to be aimed for the September dates, and the Mass. breeders are aware of the Suffolk request. And one of the reasons why they put in their request was to have races so
the horses would be fit still despite the six-week gap from the August date to the September date.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you.
MR. BARNETT: On the dates that I've seen for the breeders in the Finger Lakes, they don't have any September dates. They have August, October, November, I think.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: They were looking for two in September but okay.

MS. LIGHTBOWN: That's an error on my part on the memo in my recommendation letter on the Mass. breeders, which I'll correct when I get to that part. They are looking for -- let's see. They're not looking for the September. They're looking for October, November on their dates.

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Okay, thank you.

MS. LIGHTBOWN: So it doesn't interfere with Suffolk.

MR. BARNETT: If I might, since you brought up the Mass. breeders, we've usually taken pains to explain -- well, you
know, we don't have to explain to you that the racehorse development fund money, a portion of it is set aside for the breeders and a portion of it is general purses, and we usually explain how we run on behalf of the MTBA races, the stakes races where they use the breeders' portion of the money.

This year we've also done a few races from Mass. breds that are not part of the breeder's program. They are out of the rest of the general fund of the purse money. We've done a few of those so far. We're planning on a couple of them for the September weekend if you approve it to, again, increase the chance for the local horsemen to run it and earn some purse. COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Thank you. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: So, Mr. Chair, I move that the Commission approve the request of Suffolk Downs for two additional days of racing, September 15th and 16, 2018 and that the Commission approve the additional $\$ 1.1$ million for purses for these dates.

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

MR. BARNETT: Thank you very much.
MS. PAQUETTE: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you.
MS. LIGHTBOWN: Sorry for the delay.
We have an extra person on our agenda today, so I wanted to make sure I had everybody right. We have a request before us for the Massachusetts Breeders Association to race races at Finger Lakes. This is something the Commission has approved since the legislation changed, I believe, it was in 2015.

Today we have Catherine Reagan, board member, Arlene Brown, board member and secretary and Donna Parrera, board member if there is any questions.

And as I stated in my memo regarding this, I stated the months wrong. They've got two in August. And then instead of September, it should be October and November. And they had a letter that describes the different races they are planning on racing. And as stated, they are hoping to be able to race the Norman Hall stakes in September at Suffolk. So if you have any questions.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Anybody?
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: I know we had one comment that was not in favor of this, and we've gone through this before. And, I think, until there is a full-time racetrack in Massachusetts where these folks can run, there is no perfect solution. But it is an opportunity for the breeders to make their money back. It's the only way they can take that money is when they run races and win races, so $I$ 'm in favor of allowing the additional races.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I was going to speak to that comment, and perhaps ask a
couple of questions. The rational I've gone along with, but now we've become a little bit of an accumulative effect that makes us -- at least makes me wonder.

There's always a provisional year that the legislation gets approved on and continues their uncertainty.

So can I ask, there has been a breeding program through this last year. What can you tell us relative to, you know, the incremental benefit on the most recent years with the moneys coming to the program? Are you seeing any change in activity? You mentioned two new foals in your letter here instructs me a little bit as anecdotal. But what else can you tell us relative to the actual breeding program? MS. LIGHTBOWN: Tap the microphone. COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And your name.

MS. BROWN: I've been in
communication with someone outside of the state who represents mare owners, and they were inquiring about our breeders program.

They see that we can race in other states, and they wanted information on our breeders program because some of their mare owners were interested in dropping their foals here this year. So I sent them all the information, and they are very interested in it.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Which is a great sign. But what about actual breeding? What has taken place in the last couple of years?

MS. BROWN: I believe we have 13 two year-olds registered, which is down. As far as yearlings, we won't know until -yearlings get registered, which will be next. It's hard to tell until they are actually registered how many were dropped in the state.

MS. LIGHTBOWN: There was a noticeable drop after there became a shortened thoroughbred meet. There were, you know, usually around 35 or so foals a year, and Arlene can comment on that further. But once it happened it was known
there was going to be a shortened meet, it dropped down to about ten foals a year. And then there was enough to last year to 13. Hope to improve on.

And one thing we can do is this winter, Department of Agriculture also shares responsibility for the breeder program as well as the gaming commission. Some of the regs. are in 128, which is solely the agriculture regulations and then some of it is also in the gaming commission regs.

And certainly one thing we could do over the winter is get together with the group and maybe brainstorm ideas that might help on the breeding end of it so it's not just a racing program where you are getting money for racing. Obviously that's important, but it's also important some of the other states have looked at different ways of encouraging the breeding aspect of it more.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And where I was leading to -- thank you for that -- is
there a component here of an opportunity cost, meaning are we allowing these requests to go to races, to go purses and perhaps inadvertently keeping the money that would be available for actually breeding, you know, or is it purely a demand or a supply question in terms of breeders just not being interested in taking advantage of the breeding program because of the uncertainty and the short meet?

MS. LIGHTBOWN: Yes. I think the uncertainty plays a big part of it. Certainly the idea is like increasing breeders' rewards can make a difference. There already are rewards like that in place for the owners of the stallion, the mare and that type of thing. But, certainly, one thing to look at is would increasing that help. Some of the other states pay people for the amount of time those horses are actually kept in the state, and that encourages that type of activity also. So there's different things
that can be looked at.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And, I think, one of those -- but my simple understanding of the breeding program is that this is the longest sort of long lead item in order to have -- let's just say that, you know, next year the legislature finally addresses this, you know, shortened renewal of the racing statutes, we would still need two years or more for the breeding program to come, you know, to come to fruition.

So if we were to assume that next year the legislature was going to address this with more certainty toward thoroughbred racing, couldn't this be an opportunity for us, for everybody, to start thinking about the two year lag that it takes to breed or until then where we can see a breeding program?

MS. LIGHTBOWN: If there was some type of a more long-term solution where there was a little more stability, it would encourage people to breed. And they do take the long-term view. They are looking
down the road two or three years. So if they look at the racing legislation and see that it looks like there's going to be a viable place for their horses to race in Massachusetts, maybe two or three years down the road, it will impact breeding right away. But, obviously, those horses wouldn't be in the pipeline to race for two or three years, but it would increase the breeding.

MS. REAGAN: I can tell you from my own personal observation that the last couple of years with the Finger Lakes program in conjunction with Suffolk Downs has produced a reliable target for breeders and owners to aim at and --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: The 10 to 13, in other words?

MS. REAGAN: Exactly. So just what you saw today with Suffolk Downs, the breeders and the horsemen all working together for their date so they don't step on each others' toes, there's a place to go. There's a reasonable way to aim your
horses. That has produced the interest that Arlene was talking about. And in the letter, it referenced those two gentlemen that came to our meeting. They were very excited about this program.

I mean, they were talking about their investors that were also interested in the program and how -- I don't think I can adequately describe to you how much it takes to get a horseman out of the barn and go to a breeders meeting in Dedham on a weeknight. For them to come and drive as far as they did and explain their enthusiasm is kind of like a tip of the iceberg. There is a lot of enthusiasm, and you will see more foals in Massachusetts because of it. And it is directly related to a regular programming of races where they can count on purses.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: And if someone were to come to fruition that someone was going to build a racetrack and they got all the right, you know, permits and legislative changes needed, would that
help the breeding program?
MS. REAGAN: Yes. They just need a target to aim at. That's it. Place to bring them, place to run them.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: So on that note, if there was a sudden demand for more breeding money, and I know this is not how we think of the racehorse development fund, there's no pots, if you will, there is no reserves for any one of these, would you then be requesting or assuming a lot more of the money that's available for the breeding program; would you be able to expand it to respond to it?

MS. BROWN: That has been a little bit of a problem. Because as the amount of money for thoroughbreds decreases, so does the amount money for breeding decrease. So we've had to cut the number of stakes races we run, and we've had to cut the purse money for the stakes races, and that doesn't help encourage breeding when they see us having to cut so...

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: I guess that's
where I was going. If we're all spending the money on the races, does that come at a cost towards a potential demand, additional demand from the breeding program?

MS. BROWN: Yes, it does.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: What did the -prior to Suffolk Downs closing, how was the thoroughbred -- how was the breeders' share spent; what was it spent on?

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: It wasn't.
MS. LIGHTBOWN: It was spent on
purses for their races and breeder awards. When a horse races and they're a Mass. bred, the stallion owner and the mare owner get bonuses. So that money in addition to the purse money would come out of the part of their percentage of the handle.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: It's always been used. I think of it as sort of like we did in the women in construction, there's a demand side and a supply side. You know, you could use money to encourage people to have foals or to breed foals by paying incentives. If you have a foal, you'll get
some money. That's the supply side. The demand side is to have races with purses. And from this letter that we got from Ms. Adele Celine, he or she, whoever this is, was suggesting --

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: He.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Was suggesting that the supply side ought to have the money. That the money ought to go to incentives to breed directly as opposed to racing, which creates a demand for horses. It sounds like we've always -- the thoroughbred money has always gone in substantial amounts to purses, even back in the day when they were lots more horse racing, lots more thoroughbred racing going on.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Well, there was no racehorse development fund back then. This is the money that we're overseeing.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: That's true. But it was for the first couple of years when we had a full --

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Yes. But I suppose a lot of have it is driven by the shorter meet. The shorter meet creates this constraint on the demand or on the supply side.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We're talking demand side.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: On the demand side, which then gets us to these kinds of requests can we then race elsewhere in Finger Lakes and whatnot.

MS. BROWN: What Mr. Celine says in his letter it's not too far off the block. The problem is we're bound by a law. We tried to address that. We had an amendment that went in, and that whole law got changed and they just extended the Chapter 128, 129. So we have been trying to, but we're bound by that law, you know. There's only so much we can do.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: We've been trying to make that point to the legislature as well.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We appreciate
that, too. Is there a debate within the breeder world as to the better way to spend money; do some people think it's best to put it on purses and other people think it's best to put it in direct incentives like payments for foals; is there a debate, a philosophical difference there?

MS. BROWN: We've discussed it. And like $I$ said, we had an amendment going in, maybe a total rewrite of Chapter 128 as far as we were concerned. I mean, that law has been in effect for $I$ don't how many years, but it has to be updated. But our hands are tied until we change that law.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So you can't use the --

MS. BROWN: The only awards that it allows in that law is 30 percent to the owner, 25 percent to a breeder and 15 percent to a registered Massachusetts stallion for that horse. There are no other awards that we can change. We can't even change those percentages.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Out of the
breeders' share.
MS. BLUE: 128, this is the Agriculture Act, so that determines what they can do with their breeding money.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: With their share.
MS. BLUE: Yes.
MS. BROWN: We realize there are other ways we can encourage breeding, but we're bound by that law. We keep trying to putting in --

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: So this person, Mr. Celine apparently doesn't understand that.

MS. BROWN: I think he does. He has been at our board meetings, I think every one of them. I think he understands that.

MS. LIGHTBOWN: I think there's more just a disagreement on how much money should be allocated. It's both of those ideas are important. You need the money for the racehorses for purse money, and then you also need the breeders' awards and both of those are important for a breeding program. And then it's just some people
have philosophical differences on how much should be allocated.

MS. REAGAN: A balanced approach to the --

MS. BROWN: And we don't argue that there shouldn't be other awards. It's just trying to get it done.

COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: And it's this one-year extension that creates everything, all of these problems.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Mr. Chair, I move that the Commission approve the request to the Massachusetts Thoroughbred Breeders Association to run six additional races.

CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Second?
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Second.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Further
discussion? All in favor? Aye.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Opposed? The ayes
have it unanimously.
COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Thank you. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: Good luck. COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Thank you. CHAIRMAN CROSBY: And we are on to Item 8, Commissioners' updates. We've got one from Commissioner Cameron already about Suffolk Downs. Any others, anybody? Well, we wish you well, Commissioner Stebbins, in your --

COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Designated commissioner with no sleep.

MR. BEDROSIAN: Just for the record, this was the Commissioner's 250th meeting.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: 250th, wow.
Move to adjourn the 250 th meeting.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: All in favor? Aye.

COMMISSIONER CAMERON: Aye.
COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STEBBINS: Aye.
COMMISSIONER ZUNIGA: Aye.
CHAIRMAN CROSBY: We are adjourned.
(Meeting adjourned at 1:12 p.m.)
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