

IMPACT OF THE WYNN RESORT CASINO ON NEIGHBORING COMMUNITIES

AUGUST 29, 2013

Prepared for:

Wynn MA, LLC 3131 Las Vegas Boulevard South Las Vegas, Nevada 89109

Prepared by:

RKG Associates, Inc. Economic, Planning and Real Estate Consultants 634 Central Avenue Dover, New Hampshire 03820

www.rkgassociates.com

Economic Planning and Real Estate Consultants

Impact on Neighboring Communities

This report presents RKG's fiscal and economic analysis of the potential impacts of the proposed Wynn Resort Casino on the communities adjacent to the City of Everett. There will be significant, positive indirect economic impacts on the neighboring communities from the one-time and ongoing employment and potential incremental local spending generated by the project.

The Massachusetts Environmental and Policy Act (MEPA) set forth a very specific and defined process for addressing all environmental impacts including traffic and transportation. Wynn MA LLC has retained a number of consultants to adhere with this process and address these impacts, including Fort Point Associates the lead environmental consultant and Vanasse & Associates to address traffic impacts. Wynn MA LLC has already provided an extensive preliminary study to MassDOT and its neighboring communities. After receiving additional comments and information, the Developer intends to file a more comprehensive analysis this fall and a final proposal in the Spring of 2014. This is consistent with the MEPA process.

Based on its fiscal and economic analysis, RKG highlights the following key benefits:

Employment

- **Employment (one-time):** 10,000 jobs during the project's 2-3 year construction process, with 5,200 direct jobs and 4,800 indirect jobs
- **Employment (recurring):** 5,400 annual, recurring jobs (both direct and indirect) generated as a result of the project's ongoing operations
- Wages (one-time): \$380 million in one-time construction wages created during the project's 2-3 year construction process and an additional \$335 million in indirect wages
- **Wages (recurring):** Almost \$300 million in annual, recurring wages from direct and indirect employment created by the project

Direct Local Spend and Housing

- **Direct Local Spending:** \$15-\$23 million in local-wage spending from direct employees; in addition, the ongoing non-gaming operations of the project likely will generate \$40 to \$50 million of annual purchases of goods, with the vast majority likely coming from local providers
- **Off-Site Consumer Spending:** Additional non-gaming spending likely will be captured by the numerous restaurants, stores and entertainment venues in downtown Boston, Everett, and neighboring communities
- **Impact on Housing:** Increases in direct and indirect incomes and expenditures will contribute positively to the overall economy of the Commonwealth and the housing sector

Municipal Services

• **City Municipal Services: The** Developer has agreed to fund \$5 million per year as an impact fee to the City of Everett. In RKG's opinion, the actual additional costs

that the City will incur as a result of providing municipal services to the resort casino, will be approximately \$2.5 - \$3.5 million annually.

1. Employment & Wages

The proposed resort casino will create significant positive impacts on employment and wages in the City of Everett and the neighboring communities of Malden, Medford, Somerville, Chelsea, Revere and Boston

The proposed resort casino is estimated to create approximately 3,200 - 4,000 jobs. For this analysis we have assumed 3,627 full-time equivalent employees when fully operational, along with 5,155 employees during the 2-3 year construction process. This level of employment and spending will indirectly support an incremental 6,658 new jobs within the state and regional economy (4,867 during construction and 1,791 long-term). The salaries and wages paid to these employees (direct and indirect) are estimated to total over \$718 million during the construction phase and over \$304 million annually once the project is operational. It is important to note that the majority of these wages will go to residents of the six adjacent cities and that a significant percentage of these wages will be spent in the community, creating an economic "multiplier" impact throughout the local economies.

In order to estimate employment and wage impacts, RKG collected and analyzed baseline statistics on employment conditions in the City of Everett and three comparative areas including:

- The neighboring cities of Malden, Medford, Somerville, Chelsea and Revere,
- the City of Boston, and
- the Boston Metro Region, which for this analysis includes Essex, Middlesex, Norfolk and Suffolk counties, combined.

RKG then utilized American Community Survey (2007-2011) data from the U.S. Census Bureau to quantify the size of the local labor force and the composition of that labor force. Key data used by RKG included: the number of employed persons in each city, the work locations of local workers, the home locations of those workers holding jobs in the local communities, and the variations in these statistics by major industry sector.

The following findings were identified from a review of the data, as described in more detail in the tables below and those that follow in the Appendix:

- Over 100,000 unemployed persons resided in the rest of the Boston Metro Region
- Everett and the neighboring cities (excluding Boston) were exporters of labor, namely more persons lived in these cities than the number of local jobs at businesses located there. In comparison, Boston was the reverse, as more persons had jobs at local businesses than the workforce that resided in Boston.

• Combined, Everett and the adjacent cities (excluding Boston) exported over 11,300 resident workers in the arts, entertainment, recreation and accommodations and food service industry, while Boston imported over 12,000 workers in this sector.

The analysis then estimates the ongoing employment at the resort casino, by place of residence of the workers. RKG assumed that 95% of the ongoing employment will be filled with local workers (5% filled from outside the local area), resulting in an estimated 3,463 workers to be hired locally, as indicated in Table 1 below.

Applying the average annual wage for these workers by sector / occupation, results in a total of nearly \$154 million in annual wages, which would generate annual state income tax receipts of slightly more than \$6 million, as indicated in Table 1 below.

	Total Direct	Out-of-Region	Net Local Direct	Avg. Annual	Total Wages	Estimated Tax
Sector or Use	Employment	Employment	Employment	Wage	(\$ mil.)	Receipts (\$ mil.)
Operating	3,287	(164)	3,123	\$41,459	\$129.46	\$4.99
Construction	340	0	340	72,072	24.50	1.05
Total	3,627	(164)	3,463	\$44,464	\$153.97	\$6.03

Table 1 – Estimated NET New Local and Ongoing Employment

Sources: TMG Consulting, Wynn Resorts, and RKG associates, Inc.

(1) Assumes that 5% of Total Direct Employment will be out of region.

Many of the estimated 3,463 net new local jobs likely will be allocated to Everett residents (due to the hiring preference indicated by Wynn MA LLC) as well as the neighboring communities. Based on RKG's analysis of commuting patterns, the City of Everett and neighboring community residents will likely make up the majority of the employment.

The analysis also estimated the wages associated with the net new employment, by location, as well estimating local spending impacts and indirect statewide wages.

Based on numerous studies of consumer spending patterns, RKG estimates that between 10% and 15% of income is spent on food and other retail goods and services. This analysis assumes that most groceries and other food is purchased locally, as are many other retail goods such as drug store purchases, some hardware, gasoline and so on. Also, personal services such as barbers, nail salons and dry cleaning are purchased locally. RKG estimated that between \$15 and \$23 million in local wages likely will be spent in the local communities.

It is important to note that the \$15-\$23 million does not include the impact on local spending during the construction phase of the project. Many of the construction workers employed at the site will live in Everett and the six neighboring cities, and a portion of the wages paid to them, which in turn support additional job and wages in the economy, will be spent at the local level. During construction, local spending in Everett and the abutting communities will be significant. For example, if each of the estimated 5,155 construction workers spent an average of \$5 per day on lunch, gas and other

convenience-style items, total local spending would be on the order of more than \$6 million over the 2-3 year construction period. This will directly benefit many retail and service businesses in the adjacent cities.

Since construction workers tend to be somewhat more mobile than full-time workers, these impacts may be spread out over a larger geography than estimated for the operational employment above.

2. Direct Local Spending

In addition to the local spending resulting from the direct employment, the proposed resort casino will purchase tens of millions of dollars of goods and services each year from a variety of sources – many of which will include local businesses – to support its non-gaming operations. The project, once fully operational, is anticipated to generate annual non-gaming revenues of \$150 million. Purchases of goods to support these operations likely will be in the \$40-50 million range annually. While the Developer's purchasing initiatives are not known in full detail at this time, the vast majority likely will be sourced from local providers including businesses located in Everett, Malden, Medford, Somerville, Chelsea, Revere and Boston. This local spending will support additional jobs and result in additional local taxes.

3. Potential Off-Site Consumer Spending

The proposed Wynn Resort Casino will add a major destination component to the mix of current tourist and visitor venues in the greater Boston metropolitan area, including Everett and neighboring communities, such as Somerville. As a result, the overall customer appeal, or "gravity" of the market is increased and complimented by all, which should stimulate incremental visitation and tourism spend in the area.

To what extent the economic activity and consumer spending at the resort casino will stimulate spend in the neighboring communities is difficult to estimate, as a review of the literature uncovers state-level research that is generally inconclusive. However, it is generally conceded that the typical tourist/visitor to a resort casino "spends" across several sectors not just the gaming sector.

The following table presents information on the typical distribution of tourist/visitor spending, averaged among resort casino patrons in Las Vegas and the Mississippi Gulf Coast. Approximately 70% of the average visitor's budget to these two destinations is spent on non-gaming amenities.

	Average of	f			
Average Daily	Las Vegas, NV and Gulf Coast, MS				
Tourist / Visitor	\$	% of total			
Gaming / gambling	\$123	30%			
Lodging	98	24%			
Shopping	46	11%			
Food and drink	68	17%			
Transportation	41	10%			
Entertainment	28	7%			
Total	\$403	100%			

Table 2 – Typical Spending Distribution among Resort Casino Tourists/Visitors

From the information in the preceding Table 2, the typical resort/casino patron spent slightly under \$125/day on gaming and gambling, representing 30% of their daily expenditures. Another \$45/day was spent on shopping and nearly \$70/day on food and drink, with \$30/day on other entertainment. Some of this non-gaming/gambling spending will likely occur on-site at the resort casino; however, some likely will be captured by the numerous restaurants, stores, and entertainment venues in downtown Boston, Everett, and the neighboring communities.

The distribution of the non-gaming/gambling spending, by community, would be speculative at best, and more so for a specific destination. However, using Assembly Row/Square as an indicative example, given its proximity to the proposed resort casino, it is reasonable to assume that some spill over will occur at local retail establishments. The RKG analysis conservatively estimates that approximately 1.0%-3.0% could occur at Assembly Row/Square, indicating incremental sales potential of \$3.0+ million annually at this specific location from resort casino tourists/visitors.

4. Impact on Housing

Because it is believed that most of the employees at the Wynn Resort Casino will be drawn from Everett, the neighboring communities and the greater Boston metro area, there will be little measurable impact on housing markets. However, the increase in direct and indirect incomes and expenditures will contribute positively to the overall economy of the Commonwealth and the housing sector in general.

5. City-Municipal Services

The Developer has agreed to fund \$5 million per year as an impact fee to the City of Everett to mitigate any additional municipal services costs associated with the new resort casino. It should be noted that large scale projects largely impact the host city for municipal services. In RKG's opinion, the actual additional costs that the City will incur will be closer to \$2.5 - \$3.5 million. The resort casino will utilize its state of the art construction, in house security systems along with a large security team to offset some portion of the additional municipal services. The ability for the City of Everett to fund the costs with guaranteed payments from the Developer is rare and a significant benefit to this project and the neighboring communities.

Appendix:

Everett, Adjacent Community, and Boston Labor Demographics

·							
	9	Surrounding		Metro			
	Everett	Cities [1]	Boston	Area [2]			
Population 16 years							
and over	33,087	232,141	518,562	2,934,154			
Civilian labor force	23,747	164,523	355,317	2,021,514			
Employed	21,289	150,435	319,146	1,868,765			
Unemployed	2,458	14,088	36,171	152,749			
% Unemployed	10.4%	8.6%	10.2%	7.6%			
Not in labor force	9,326	67,413	162,835	909,853			
% not in labor force	28.2%	29.0%	31.4%	31.0%			
Armed Forces	14	205	410	2,787			
[1] Includes Malden; Medford; Somerville; Chelsea & Revere							
[2] Essex; Middlesex; Norfolk & Suffolk Counties							
Source: American Communi	ty Survey (2007	7-2011) & RKG A	ssociates, I	nc.			

Table 3 – Everett & Comparative Areas:Labor ForceStatistics (2010)

WORKERS IN RESIDENCES & GEO OF WHERE WORKS					JOBS IN	N PLACE	& GEO FROM WHERE \	NORKERS R	ESIDES
Workers in		Workplace of Everett		% of			Jobs in Everett Held		
Residence	#	Workers in Residence	#	Residence	Local Jobs in	#	by Workers from	#	% of Jobs
Everett	21,195	Everett	3,090	14.6%	Everett	13,230	Everett	3,090	23.4%
		Boston	5,849	27.6%			Boston	1,308	9.9%
		Chelsea	611	2.9%			Chelsea	539	4.1%
		Revere	434	2.0%			Revere	818	6.2%
		Malden	1,442	6.8%			Malden	946	7.2%
		Medford	896	4.2%			Medford	513	3.9%
		Somerville	702	3.3%			Somerville	521	3.9%
		Everett Surr. Cities	9,934	46.9%			Everett Surr. Cities	4,645	35.1%
		Essex County	1,216	5.7%			Essex County	1,934	14.6%
		Rest of Middlesex Co.	5,406	25.5%			Rest of Middlesex Co.	2,182	16.5%
		Norfolk County	739	3.5%			Norfolk County	407	3.1%
		Rest of Suffolk Co.	323	1.5%			Rest of Suffolk Co.	125	0.9%
		Rest of Boston Metro	7,684	36.3%			Rest of Boston Metro	4,648	35.1%
		Total	20,708	97.7%			Total	12,383	93.6%
Source: ACS (20	006-2010)	& RKG Associates, Inc.							

	E	verett		Surround	ing Cities	[1]	City	y of Bostor	ו
	Workers in	Jobs in	Diff-	Workers in	Jobs in	Diff-	Workers in	Jobs in	Diff-
Industry Sector	Residence	Place	erence	Residence	Place	erence	Residence	Place	erence
Construction	1,821	1,048	(773)	8,373	5,293	(3,080)	10,240	24,668	14,428
Manufacturing	1,859	734	(1,125)	10,406	5,749	(4,657)	14,432	17,480	3,048
Wholesale trade	438	1,197	759	3,920	3,368	(552)	5,103	7,436	2,333
Retail trade	1,836	1,943	107	14,719	9,174	(5,545)	27,170	32,057	4,887
Transportation and warehousing,									
and utilities	1,206	756	(450)	5,637	5,164	(473)	9,983	23,036	13,053
Information	220	24	(196)	3,776	2,021	(1,755)	8,902	15,912	7,010
Finance and insurance, and real									
estate and rental and leasing	1,606	1,868	262	10,570	5,162	(5,408)	31,035	79,907	48,872
Professional, scientific, and									
management, and administrative									
and waste management services	2,634	727	(1,907)	23,493	7,707	(15,786)	48,334	88,602	40,268
Educational services, and health care and social assistance	4,174	2,554	(1,620)	38,853	26,033	(12,820)	98,317	161,811	63,494
Arts, entertainment, and									
recreation, and accommodation									
and food services	2,678	1,279	(1,399)	15,701	5,861	(9,840)	35,845	47,884	12,039
Other services, except public									
administration	1,927	959	(968)	8,835	5,868	(2,967)	14,871	21,311	6,440
Public administration	881	313	(568)	5,761	5,109	(652)	14,484	33,758	19,274
Total	21,280	13,402	(7,878)	150,044	86,509	(63,535)	318,716	553,862	235,146
[1] Includes Malden; Medford; Somer Source: American Community Survey (2	1] Includes Malden; Medford; Somerville; Chelsea & Revere								

Table 5 – Everett & Comparative Geographies: Comparison of Workers in Residence & Jobs in Place Employment by Industry



Wynn MA, LLC: Public Outreach in Massachusetts

Presentation to the Massachusetts Gaming Commission

November 7, 2013

Wynn MA, LLC Presentation to the Massachusetts Gaming Commission November 7, 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1. "Wynn MA, LLC: Public Outreach in Massachusetts," November 7, 2013.
- "Economic and Fiscal Impact Evaluation of the Proposed Wynn Casino Resort Development in Everett, Massachusetts." Prepared by RKG Association, Inc. March 25, 2013.
- 3. "Impact of the Wynn Resort Casino on Neighboring Communities." Prepared by RKG Association, Inc. August 29, 2013.
- 4. "Trip Generation Calculations: Wynn Everett Resort Broadway (Route 99)." Prepared by Howard/Stein-Hudson Association and Vanasse & Associates, Inc. October 30, 2013.
- 5. "Wynn MA, LLC Public Outreach Draft Document," November 7, 2013.





Wynn MA, LLC: Public Outreach in Massachusetts

Presentation to the Massachusetts Gaming Commission

November 7, 2013



Wynn's Approach to Public Outreach

- Study, understand and focus on the actual impacts as required by law and regulation
- Develop a plan to mitigate any impacts resulting from the development and operation of Wynn's Everett project
- Create a meaningful dialogue with communities about Wynn's experience in and knowledge of the gaming industry generally, and the Everett proposal specifically
- Communicate with all stakeholders: government officials; civic groups; residents; trade associations; minority, women and veteran businesses; and state and regional stakeholders
- View the relationship as a long-term commitment, re-open discussions if significant unanticipated impacts arise





Approximate Land Boundary Distances from Everett

- Malden: 13,300 feet (2.50 miles)
- Boston: 2,800 feet (0.53 miles)
- Medford: All water boundaries
- Somerville: All water boundaries
- Chelsea: 11,000 feet (2.08 miles)
- Revere: 3,700 feet (0.70 miles)

Number of Roadways Entering Everett

- Malden: 20 total, including 2 major (Route 99 and Main)
- Boston: 1 (Route 99)
- Medford: 1 (Route 16)
- Somerville: No direct connection
- Chelsea: 24 total, including 1 major (Route 16)
- Revere: 7 total



Studies and Reports

- "Economic and Fiscal Impact Evaluation of the Proposed Wynn Casino Resort Development in Everett, Massachusetts." Prepared by RKG Association, Inc. March 25, 2013.
- "Impact of the Wynn Resort Casino on Neighboring Communities." Prepared by RKG Association, Inc. August 29, 2013.
- Significant areas of study under the DEIR
 - Transportation (water, rail, roadways, bicycle, pedestrian)
 - Air quality and greenhouse gas emissions
 - Wetlands and waterways
 - Storm water, groundwater, wastewater and water supply
 - Geotechnical
 - Solid and hazardous wastes
 - Construction management
 - Historic and archaeological resources
- "Trip Generation Calculations: Wynn Everett Resort Broadway (Route 99)." Memo Prepared by Howard/Stein-Hudson Association and Vanasse & Associates, Inc. October 30, 2013.



Outreach to Communities

- Malden
- Boston
- Medford
- Somerville
- Chelsea
- Revere



Malden

- Designated a Surrounding Community
- Surrounding Community Agreement
- Over a dozen meetings on project, including traffic flow and transportation infrastructure; Wynn/Malden small business partnerships and civic engagement



<u>Boston</u>

- Designated a Surrounding Community
- Active, ongoing discussions—several November meetings pending
- Numerous meetings/communications: Boston's Host Community Advisory Committee, Meetings with Boston Harbor Association, Charlestown Mothers Association, Neighborhood Council, Charlestown Against Drugs, Business and Cultural Community, Waterfront Coalition, MassPort, BCEC, Convention & Visitors Bureau
- Heavy focus on Charlestown neighborhood, emphasis on traffic/transportation infrastructure



Medford

- Not designated a Surrounding Community
- Several meetings/communications with Mayor, as well as Chamber of Commerce, City staff, business owners and residents
- Comprehensive project update, including updated traffic study figures, scheduled for November 25th
- Biggest challenge has been disconnect between Wynn's offer to mitigate all impacts and City's desire for substantially more than that



<u>Somerville</u>

- Not designated a Surrounding Community
- Active, ongoing discussions despite Mayor being a public opponent of Project
- Numerous meetings/Communications with Mayor and City, and with Chamber of Commerce, community activists and residents



<u>Chelsea</u>

- Not designated a Surrounding Community
- Several communications/meetings with City Manager, City staff, legislator and Chamber of Commerce
- Comprehensive project update, including updated traffic study figures, scheduled for November 25th



<u>Revere</u>

- Not designated a Surrounding Community
- Revere Mayor on the record that he's not interested in discussions with Wynn
- Revere previously prohibited from entering a Surrounding Community
 Agreement
 White
 I.Wite



Conclusion

- Dialogue with potential Surrounding Communities will continue throughout next several weeks
- Focus is on Wynn mitigating impacts
- Wynn's goal is to execute as many Surrounding Community Agreements as possible prior to the December 31st application deadline







Prepared for:

Wynn Resorts Ltd. 3131 Las Vegas Boulevard South Las Vegas, Nevada 89109

Prepared by:

RKG Associates, Inc. Economic, Planning and Real Estate Consultants 634 Central Avenue Dover, New Hampshire 03820

Tel: 603-953-0202

Web: www.rkgassociates.com

Economic Planning and Real Estate Consultants

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	ummary1
A. Introductio	on and Overview1
 Assessi Adjusti Other 	pacts for Everett
 State Sales Income 	enues
	npacts7
II. Appendix .	
A. Property 1. Casing	Taxes8 D Resort Estimated Assessment8
1. Prelim 2. Buildir	pact – City of Everett
 Fees a Sales Emplo 	pacts - Massachusetts 19 and Revenues 19 and Occupancy Taxes 21 oyment, Wages and Income Tax 22
 Fire D Assess Buildin Police Econo 	verett Interviews 24 Department 24 sor 24 ng Inspector 24 24 24 Department 24 Department 24 Sor 24 Department 24 Sor 25 Department 25 Omic Development 25
E. Addition	al Supporting Tables25

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. Introduction and Overview

RKG Associates (RKG) has been retained by Wynn Resorts Ltd. (Developer) to prepare an analysis of the economic and fiscal impacts that would be associated with the proposed development of a Wynn Casino Resort in Everett, Massachusetts. The purpose of this analysis is to provide assistance to the Developer in the planning and permitting process of the proposed project by estimating the direct and indirect tax revenues that will be generated on a one-time and a recurring basis, including various sales taxes, fees and property taxes that will be paid over the course of construction and during operation of the facility.

The Wynn Casino Resort is proposed for development on a 29.9-acre parcel (1 Horizon Way), a former industrial site abutting the Mystic River and Route 99 in the City of Everett, Massachusetts. As indicated in Table I-1, the proposed development is to include approximately 1.3 million square feet (SF) of resort development with an additional parking garage (estimated to be 1.4 million SF and accommodating 3,500 spaces). The Developer's estimated total construction costs, inclusive of labor, materials and other "hard" costs (excluding indirect costs, soft costs and site improvements) is \$956.7 million. The total investment by the Developer in the project including land, furniture, fixtures, equipment licenses, design and other costs is anticipated to approach \$1.3 billion.

Proposed	Estimated SF of		
Development by Use	Use	WD Est Const \$	WD Con\$t/SF
Casino	155,900	\$97,400,000	\$625
Hotel	600,200	\$275,500,000	\$459
Food & Beverage	63,300	\$39,600,000	\$626
Retail	100,000	\$28,560,000	\$286
Entertainment	40,000	\$13,440,000	\$336
Spa	13,000	\$7,800,000	\$600
General Admin	88,400	\$45,200,000	\$511
Subtotal	1,060,800	\$507, 500, 000	\$478
Back of House (BOH)	258,900	\$86,700,000	\$335
Subtotal	1,319,700	\$594,200,000	\$450
Parking Garage	1,400,000	\$262,500,000	\$188
Site and Sitework		\$100,000,000	
TOTAL	2,719,700	\$956,700,000	

Table I-1 – Proposed Wynn Casino Resort Development

This chapter presents the summary findings and conclusions of RKG's analysis, particularly with respect to the economic and fiscal impacts to the City of Everett and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The more detailed assumptions, inputs and analysis which form the basis for these findings and conclusions are presented in the Appendix of this report.

B. Fiscal Impacts for Everett

Table I-2 summarizes the estimated economic and fiscal impacts associated with proposed Wynn Casino Resort in Everett, Massachusetts. These findings assume full build-out and occupancy and are presented in constant dollars. In actuality the construction and resulting fiscal and economic impacts associated with the casino resort would be phased in over time. Preliminary information from the Developer indicates a multi-month construction period with 2016 estimated to be the first full year of full operations. Accordingly, assessment and property tax impacts (along with employment, wages, sales tax and income tax receipts) would be subject to build up during the construction period. As an example, the City of Everett Assessor noted that January is the assessment date for the ensuing fiscal year and that in terms of ongoing construction; the "billed" property tax reflects that which was built as of June 30th.¹

SUMMARY IMPACT			Commonwealth of
ANALYSES		City of Everett	Massachusetts
Ongoing Receipts			
Net Property Taxes		\$17,700,926	NA
Sales Tax		\$547,500	\$6,193,750
Hotel Tax		\$2,052,000	\$1,949,400
Gaming Tax		NA	\$207,055,000
Słots Renewal		NA	\$1,800,000
Income Tax (Direct)		NA	\$6,294,044
	Total	\$20,300,426	\$223,292,194
Short Term Receipts			
Income Tax (Direct/Const.)		NA	\$16,339,849
Sales Tax (Const.)		\$2,870,100	\$23,917,500
Gaming License			\$85,000,000
	Total	\$2,870,100	\$125,257,349
Employment			
Ongoing Direct		3,627	NA
Ongoing Indirect			1,791
Short Term Direct			5,155
Short Term Indirect			4,867
	Total	3,627	11,813
Wages			
Ongoing Direct		\$160,781,597	NA
Ongoing Indirect			\$143,641,736
Short Term Direct			\$382,680,000
Short Term Indirect			\$335,686,896
	Total	\$160,781,597	\$862,008,632

Table I-2 - Proposed Wynn (Casino	Resort Developme	nt - Summary Findings
-----------------------------	--------	------------------	-----------------------

Source: Wynn Resorts & RKG Associates, Inc.

¹ NOTE discussions with the City of Everett Assessor revealed that as of June 30, 2014, the City of Everett will collect a local option ales tax (0.75%) on construction materials – which have been included in this analysis.

1. Assessment and Unadjusted Property Tax

The proposed Wynn Casino Resort is estimated to have an assessment value of approximately \$609.4 million, as presented Table I-3. This estimate includes values for the building improvements, without the Developer's super-adequacies² (at \$129.1 million) of the development, as well as land and personal property. Applying the current FY2013 commercial property tax rate in Everett of \$43.04 per \$1,000 in valuation, results in an estimated property/personal tax liability (net of the current taxes paid on the land parcel) of nearly \$25.85 million at full build-out. However, this is prior to adjustments for the cost of providing municipal services to the property, as well as any impacts on existing tax receipts to the City such as state aid for education or general government³.

FY 2013	
Value Estimate (millions)	RKG / M&S
Building Components	\$416.20
30% Non-taxable	NA
Garage 1/	\$89.25
Land 2/	\$10.47
Owners FF&E (net)	\$93.50
Total	\$609.41
Commercial Tax Rate (FY 2013)	\$43.04
Tax Liability	\$26.23
less existing liability	(\$0.38)
NET Tax Liability (prior to adjustments)	\$25.85

Table I-3 - Estimated Assessment and Property Tax (unadjusted)

Source: RKG Associates

1/ Parking structure - reflects estimated value of \$25,000/space

2/ 29.9 acre site per Assessor records, assumed to be \$350,000/acre

currently valued at \$295,500/acre, sold in 2009 for \$267,500/acre

This analysis assumes that the project would be added to the tax base all at once. In reality, it will be added over a period of 3-4 years as construction is completed and the finished property is assessed and eventually added to the tax rolls. RKG estimates that total property taxes paid during three years of construction will less than \$15 million, as shown in Table I-4. The adjustments to state aid would also be made gradually over a longer time period (4-5 years) due to the methods used by the state to calculate aid for individual communities.

Furthermore, this analysis assumes that the current non-residential tax rate of \$43.04 will remain steady throughout the 3+/- year construction process and be applicable when the resort casino is fully operational. Tax rates, which are set by the City on an annual basis, will likely be different when the project comes 'on-line', therefore these are only estimates of the magnitude of the actual revenues that may be received. Once the facility is built and additional tax revenues are received by the City, the City Council may elect to use some of these

² Super-adequacy refers to an excess in the capacity or quality of a structure or structural component as would be determined by prevailing market standards and assessment practices.

³ This calculation assumes that the entire project would be completed and in operation immediately. In reality, the total assessed value will be phased in over the construction and start-up period estimated to be approximately 3 years, during which time the City's tax rate may change.

additional funds to reduce the tax burden on non-residential tax payers. A reduction in the tax rate will result in lower tax revenues from the proposed facility.

Estim	ated Property Tax	x Liability During	Construction	
Year	2014	2015	2016	2017 /1
Property Taxes	\$0.54	\$3.00	\$11.06	\$26.23
/1 - Assumes casino op	oens in 2017			
Source: RKG Associates				

Table I-4 - Estimated Taxes During Construction

Adjustments to Estimated Tax

The first adjustment to be made to the estimated \$25.85 million in taxes is the estimated cost to provide municipal services to the Wynn Casino Resort. Utilizing an average cost per employee approach⁴, RKG estimates that these costs would be approximately \$1,800 per employee, or slightly more than \$6.6 million at full build-out as presented in Table I-5.

Table 1-5 - Municipal Service Costs

Non-Residential Service Cost	\$22,363,095	
Employment in Everett [1]	12,184	
Average Cost per Employee	\$1,835	
Proposed Employment at build-out [2]	3,627	
Estimated Service Cost at build-out	(\$6,656,987)	
[1] 1st half of 2012 per MA EOL&WD + 1,550 City of Everet		
[2] 3,287 casino/resort jobs & 340 on-going construction TMG Consulting	jobs per Wynn Resorts &	
Source: City of Everett; Wynn Resorts & RKG Associates, In	с.	

It is important to point out that this analysis of municipal service costs uses an average cost approach that assumes the new Casino Resort will require City services in the same manner that other commercial and industrial properties do. This assumption likely overstates the municipal service costs. The casino resort will, in fact, require significantly less in terms of City provided services due to its state-of-the-art construction, in-house security systems and location on the periphery of the community, among other reasons. However, use of the employee-based costing methodology provides a conservative estimate of the fiscal impacts on the City.⁵ The actual additional costs that the City of Everett will incur to provide municipal services to the new facility are estimated to range from \$2.5 to \$3.5 million per year.

⁴ Also referred to as the "Employee Anticipation Method"

⁵ The proposed Resort Casino will be very much 'self-contained' and will require far fewer public services than an equivalent size commercial development (for example a shopping mall or mixed-use center). As a luxury destination, it will be built with the highest quality fire protection and suppression systems, have extensive and highly trained security personnel and systems in place, and will include such features as on-site emergency medical support and equipment. Thus, public safety needs will be substantially less than more traditional multi-building and multi-owner development. As a single owner property, the administrative burden on the City will be significantly less than for an equivalent size development with multiple owners.

Adjustments to the estimated property tax contributions from the Wynn Casino Resort project must also be made in the state aid received by Everett for education as well as the amount of state aid received for the general government. In short, as a community's property wealth improves, such as would be realized by developing a casino resort in the community, the dollar amount for state aid for education and for general government services would decrease, since state aid formulas are based in part on a community's property wealth as well as resident income levels. Table I-6 presents RKG's preliminary estimates of these impacts, at \$1.3 million and \$185,800, respectively. RKG's adjusted estimate of the net ongoing property tax from the Wynn Casino Resort to the City of Everett is approximately \$17.6 million annually.

Potential Tax Revenue (net existing)	\$25,848,852	
Municipal Service Costs	(\$6,656,987 (\$1,305,097	
Potential loss in Education Aid [1]		
Potential loss in Gen. Gov. Aid [1]	(\$185,842	
Adjustments Total	(\$8,147,926	
Net Fiscal Impact (Preliminary)	\$17,700,926	

Table I-6 – Municipa	Service Costs	and State	Aid Adjustments
----------------------	---------------	-----------	-----------------

The assessed value of the facility and the resulting property tax revenues, will decline over time as the property depreciates. However, continued reinvestment in the facility by the operator will help to maintain the assessed value and resulting tax revenues⁶.

3. Other Municipal Revenues

In addition to the property taxes paid by the new resort, the City of Everett will also realize substantial one-time and annual revenues from other taxes and fees, including building permit fees, hotel taxes and meals taxes.

a) Building Permit Fees

The construction of the casino resort will generate fee revenue for the City in the form of building permit fees to cover the costs of building inspection and code compliance. Under the City's existing policies, it charges a fee of \$15 per \$1,000 of cost for structural building construction plus additional fees for electrical, plumbing, HVAC, mechanical and other building components in order to cover the costs associated with inspection of the facility to assure that it meets state and local building and life-safety codes. However, for large complex construction projects such as the proposed resort casino, permit fees are typically negotiated as part of the permitting process based on the need for specialty inspection firms to undertake the inspection process. The fees paid during construction are intended to cover the City's costs associated with inspections and are therefore considered as a "wash".

⁶ The new state gaming legislation requires that the facility reinvest a minimum of 3.5% of the gross gaming revenue annually, or approximately \$24 million per year. Industry practice is to reinvest 100% of book depreciation.

b) Hotel Taxes

Discussions with representatives of the City indicate that a 6% local option sales tax on hotel revenues will soon be enacted. The Developer has estimated annual hotel revenues of approximately \$34.2 million, resulting in new tax revenues to the City of nearly \$2.1 million.

c) Food & Beverage Taxes

The City has also enacted a 0.75% local option sales tax on all food and beverage revenues. Based on the Developer's estimated annual revenues of nearly \$73 million, this will result in annual taxes of almost \$547,500 to the City Everett.

d) Other Revenues

The casino enabling legislation requires impact fees to be paid by the Developer to the host community (as well as surrounding affected communities), the amounts of which are yet to be determined. In addition, the legislation sets aside a portion of the annual gaming taxes paid to the state for local municipal impacts. The annual gaming revenue is estimated to be \$828.2 million/year over the first five years. The resulting state tax, at 25%, equates to an estimated \$207.1 million annually. Of this, 6.5% is targeted to the Community Mitigation Fund, which is estimated to generate an average of \$13.5 million in the first five years of operation. The allocation of these funds to Everett and the surrounding communities has not been determined, but it is likely that the City could receive a major share of this revenue. Similarly, 20% of the state gaming tax, or approximately \$41.4 million per year, is earmarked for a special Gaming Local Aid Fund that will be used by the state to augment general government aid to communities (please note Table II-11).

Other municipal revenues the City will receive include excise taxes on any motor vehicles that are registered at the resort, along with increased sewer and water revenues from the facility. These latter revenues are restricted to offset costs within the water and sewer enterprise funds, but may result in a lowering of rates due to the expected high usage rates for the hotel, restaurants, casino and assorted entertainment venues.

C. State Revenues

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts will significantly benefit from the construction and operation of the Wynn Casino resort in Everett. Revenues will be generated from several sources, include taxes and fees paid by the Developer under the terms of the new state enabling legislation, state sales taxes collected on goods and services, and state income taxes on employment earnings. Once operating, it is anticipated that the casino resort will generate on the order of \$207.1 million per year in license-related fees and taxes, \$8.1 million in sales taxes and \$6.3 million in income tax from direct employment. One time revenues include \$85 million for the up-front license fee, \$23.9 million in sales taxes and \$16.4 million in income taxes during construction and pre-opening. These estimates do not include indirect or induced impacts resulting from secondary expenditures or employment resulting from the direct impacts.

1. State Gaming Tax and Fee Revenues

The Developer estimates that the average annual gaming revenue over the first five years will be \$828.2 million annually. The legislation specifies that 25% of this total, or approximately

\$207.1 million per year, will be paid to the state and distributed to a variety of funds and uses (including 6.5%, or \$13.5 million into a Community Mitigation Fund to assist the host and surrounding communities). In addition, there is a one-time application fee of \$400,000 and a licensing fee of \$85 million. Annual license renewal fees are estimated at \$1 million and the annual slot machine license fee of \$600 per unit is anticipated to raise \$1.8 million per year.

2. Sales Tax

The resort will collect and pay the state retail sales and use tax of 6.25% on estimated retail sales (including food and beverage) of \$73 million in the first full year of operation, generating approximately \$4.6 million in sales tax annually. The state also collects a 5.7% tax on hotel sales that will generate another \$1.9 million on taxable sales of \$34.2 million. On-going sales taxes will also be paid by the resort on the goods (and some services) that it purchases to support operations. However, detailed estimates of this spending were not available. RKG estimates that the state will also collect \$23.9 million in sales tax on construction materials.

3. Income Tax

The Developer estimates that the casino resort will directly employ approximately 3,627 fulltime positions when operating. At an average annual wage of \$44,300 this translates into taxable wages of \$160.8 million and approximately \$6.3 million in new annual tax revenues to the Commonwealth.

RKG estimates that the construction of the facility will generate approximately 5,155 direct jobs (full time equivalent) during the three year construction period, and based on an average wage of nearly \$74,230 will result in tax revenues of \$16.4 million.

D. Indirect Impacts

The construction and operation of the casino resort will result in indirect economic impacts throughout the Commonwealth as a result of the spin-off spending from direct purchases for the casino resort as well as from the re-spending of incomes generated by employees, suppliers and others. These indirect impacts can be estimated using a variety of economic methodologies including static and dynamic input-output models. Using the RIMS II multipliers from the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, it is estimated that the 3,627 direct operating jobs at the resort would generate an additional 1,791 indirect/induced jobs elsewhere in the state economy, bringing in another \$143.6 million in wages, and assuming an effective tax rate of 4.2% this translates into \$6 million in income tax receipts. RKG estimates that the construction of the facility will support the creation of an additional 4,867 short-term jobs throughout Massachusetts (generating an additional \$14.1 million in income tax revenues).

II. APPENDIX

This Appendix presents more detailed analyses of the fiscal revenues and costs associated with the proposed Wynn Casino Resort, including discussions of property taxes, municipal service costs and other related fiscal impacts on the City and state.

A. Property Taxes

One of the largest sources of revenue for the City of Everett will be the real and personal property taxes paid by the proposed casino resort. How the facility will be assessed during construction and once it is completed will be determined by the City's Assessor. Typically, non-residential real estate is valued for tax purposes utilizing a combination of appraisal methods including the depreciated cost approach, a market-based comparable sales approach, or an income approach. This section presents an estimated assessment value, for taxing purposes, of the proposed development once it is fully operational.

1. Casino Resort Estimated Assessment

The following presents two approaches to estimating the potential taxable real property assessments for the proposed casino resort, both based on construction costs, one utilizing costs as provided by the Developer and the other utilizing cost estimates, by select component, from the most recent (January 2013) edition of *Marshall & Swift Valuation Services*. The total construction costs associated with the Wynn Casino Resort have been estimated by the Developer at \$956.7 million, as presented in Table II-1. These include labor costs (\$382.7 million); materials costs (\$430.5 million); and other costs at \$143.5 million.

The estimated construction costs, excluding the garage and site improvements, is \$594.2 million which includes costs for the basic building(s) at \$232.9 million; another \$232.3 million for interior equipment (plumbing, electrical and mechanical systems for example); and \$129.1 million for high quality interior finish such as carpeting and wallpaper as well as personal property such as tables, chairs, slot machines, hotel beds and the like. Construction costs also include \$362.5 million for site improvements, underground parking garage, signage and other features of the property. Indirect costs and estimated contingencies are not included. The total anticipated investment in the project, including indirect costs, fees, licenses, soft costs and preopening expenses is \$1.3 billion.

Total building costs, excluding the garage, are estimated to be \$450 per square foot, higher than that of typical commercial buildings in Everett or the greater metro-Boston area. These costs do not include land value or the owners FF&E, which includes the casino games, slot machines and other specialized items, most of which would be considered taxable personal property. It is important to note that these total building costs include the basic building structure and the required infrastructure (HVAC, plumbing, electrical, etc.) as well as the "extras" that are inherent in first class casino construction – extensive security systems, redundant utilities, designer finishes, top name brands, highest quality furniture, complex audio-visual systems, etc. A portion of these costs would not be allocated to the real estate, but would be considered personal property for taxation purposes.

Proposed	Estimated SF of	WD Est Const \$	WD Const/SF	WD Total Labor Costs	WD Total Materials Costs	WD Total Other Costs
Development by Use	Use		\$625	\$38,960,000	\$43,830,000	\$14,610,000
Casino	155,900	\$97,400,000	\$459	\$110,200,000	\$123,975,000	\$41,325,000
Hotel	600,200	\$275,500,000	\$626	\$15,840,000	\$17,820,000	\$5,940,000
ood & Beverage	63,300	\$39,600,000	\$286	\$11,424,000	\$12,852,000	\$4,284,000
Retail	100,000	\$28,560,000	\$336	\$5,376,000	\$6,048,000	\$2,016,000
Entertainment	40,000	\$13,440,000	\$600	\$3,120,000	\$3,510,000	\$1,170,000
Spa	13,000	\$7,800,000	\$500	\$18,080,000	\$20,340,000	\$6,780,000
General Admin	88,400	\$45,200,000	\$478	\$203,000,000	\$228,375,000	\$76,125,000
Subtotal	1,060,800	\$507,500,000		\$34,680,000	\$39,015,000	\$13,005,000
Back of House (BOH)	258,900	\$86,700,000	\$335			\$89,130,000
Subtotal	1,319,700	\$594,200,000	\$450	\$237,680,000	\$267,390,000	
Parking Garage	1,400,000	\$262,500,000	\$188	\$105,000,000	\$118,125,000	\$39,375,000
Site and Sitework	_, ,	\$100,000,000		\$40,000,000	\$45,000,000	\$15,000,000
TOTAL	2,719,700	\$956,700,000	172	\$382,680,000	\$430,515,000	\$143,505,000

Table II-1 - Estimated Project Construction Costs (total)

These costs are also assumed to include above-average costs for design fees, security during construction, and other "intangibles" which are not subject to property taxation; however, the costs as provided were not sufficiently detailed to accurately break these out⁷. The construction costs illustrated in Table II-1 form the basis of estimating assessment value for the proposed casino resort, with the following inputs and/or assumptions made by RKG:

- Super-adequacies Because of the intangibles included in the cost estimates given above and according to estimates from the Developer, these equate to approximately \$129.1 million, which will be adjusted against the total of \$607.7 million.
- **Garage** The developer has estimated that the costs to construct a 1.4 million square foot underground garage with 3,500 spaces will be approximately \$262.5 million, or \$188 per square foot. These costs are considered extraordinary due to the unique requirements and location of the site, and would not all be subject to taxation. For valuation purposes, RKG has assumed a typical cost for structured parking at \$25,000 per space, or \$87.5 million.
- **Owner's FF&E** This represents furnishings, fixtures and equipment that is primarily related to the gaming operations and includes the slot machines and table games and is in addition to the FF&E included in the other building elements. The Developer estimates this investment to total \$110 million, of which RKG estimates that approximately 85%, or approximately \$93.5 million, would be taxable as personal property under Massachusetts regulations. This FF&E would depreciate at varying rates ranging from 3-10 years and would therefore reduce the tax liability each year unless replaced on a regular basis.
- Land According to the current tax records, the approximate 29.9-acre site⁸ is assessed at slightly more than \$8.8 million, or \$295,500 per acre as presented in Table II-2. The current taxes are \$380,300. Discussions with the City of Everett Assessor indicate that

⁷ The construction costs illustrated in Table II-1 also are used to determine the economic impact at the City and state level through the jobs that are generated along with the income and sales taxes that are paid.

⁸ Discussions with the Developer indicate that there may some additional assemblage of abutting parcels, but until such time they have not been included in this analysis.
several other large, non-residential parcels in the community have assessed values ranging from \$306,400/acre to \$442,700/acre as also indicated in Table II-2. In this analysis, the current taxes of \$380,300 are deducted from the estimated valuation and the 29.9-acres of land are assumed to be valued at \$350,000 per acre.

LAND	Acres	Land Assess	Assess/Acre	Total Assess	Тах
Site	29,90	\$8,835,800	\$295,512	\$8,835,800	\$380,293
Comps					
Exxon	64 23	\$11,924,300	\$185,647	\$15,106,500	\$650,184
Exxon	1 14	\$595,900	\$522,719	\$595,900	\$25,648
Exxon	11 17	\$8,269,200	\$740,503	\$9,516,800	\$409,603
Еххол	15.70	\$5,984,900	\$381,204	\$9,318,600	\$401,073
Exxon	0.38	\$1,609,700	\$4,202,872	\$1,609,700	\$69,281
Total	92.62	\$28,384,000	\$306,453	\$36,147,500	\$1,555,788
Boston Sand and Gravel	10.92	\$4,835,000	\$442,725	\$5,401,500	\$232,481
Gateway S/C	72.60	\$18,311,600	\$252,226	\$22,334,400	\$961,273
Gateway S/C	4 05	\$3,175,500	\$784,074	\$13,891,900	\$597,907
Gateway S/C	15.00	\$8,090,800	\$539,387	\$15,444,90D	\$664,748
Total	91.65	\$29,577,900	\$322,727	\$51,671,200	\$2,223,928

Table II-2 - Land Values

Source: City of Everett Assessor and RKG Associates, Inc

The estimated taxable value of the Wynn Casino Resort, utilizing adjusted Developer supplied cost estimates, is \$656.67 million as presented in Table II-3 below and the preliminary estimate of taxes, prior to adjustments, is nearly \$27.9 million.

Table II-3 - Estimated Assessmen	of the Wynn Casino Resort
----------------------------------	---------------------------

FY 2013	
Value Estimate (millions)	WD Costs
Building Components	\$594.20
30% Non-taxable	(\$129.07)
Garage 1/	\$87.50
Land 2/	\$10.47
Owners FF&E (net)	\$93.50
Total	\$656.60
Commercial Tax Rate (FY 2013)	\$43.04
Tax Liability	\$28.26
less existing liability	(\$0.38)
NET Tax Liability (prior to adjustments)	\$27.88

Source: RKG Associates

1/ Parking structure - reflects estimated value of \$25,000/space

2/ 29.9 acre site per Assessor records, assumed to be \$350,000/acre

currently valued at \$295,500/acre, sold in 2009 for \$267,500/acre

a) Cost Approach Methodology

In order to independently estimate assessment value and possible property taxes, RKG also reviewed cost estimates, by select component, from the most recent (January 2013) *Marshall & Swift Valuation Services* and these are presented in Table II-4. This methodology is often used by tax assessment officials when the sales comparison and income approaches to value are not able to be applied, as in the case of new construction of a unique facility such as a resort

casino. The information presented is for construction costs adjusted for the current local economy/region and expressed on a per square foot (SF) basis. In all instances, RKG considered the level of built space to equate to Class "A" Excellent or Good properties, whichever was the higher dollar value. Prior to reviewing the findings presented in Table II-4, RKG considers it important to review what the *Marshall & Swift* estimates contain and what they do not contain as cost elements.

Per Marshall & Swift, their published base costs *include* the following:

- Final costs to the owner including average architects' and engineers' fees. These, in turn, include plans, plan check and nominal building permits, and surveying to establish building lines and grades.
- Normal interest on only the actual building funds during period of construction and processing fee or service charge are included.
- Normal site preparation fees including finish, grading and excavation for foundation and backfill for the structure only are included.
- Fees for utilities from structure to lot line figured for typical setback except where specifically noted are included.

Per Marshall & Swift, their published base costs typically do not include the following:

- Costs associated with buying or assembling land such as escrow fees, legal fees, property taxes, right of way costs, demolition, storm drains, or rough grading as examples.
- Costs associated with land planning and/or preliminary concept and layout costs.
- Yard improvements including signs, landscaping, paving, walls, yard lighting, pools or other recreation facilities.
- Off-site costs including roads, utilities and fees as examples.
- Marketing costs to create first occupancy.

Considering these factors and as indicated in Table II-4, the overall estimated assessed valuation based on construction costs for the various components listed equates to nearly \$416.2 million, or an average of \$315 per SF, and average 70% of the similar costs (which include the super-adequacies) provided by the Developer. The parking garage cost, for assessment purposes, is estimated at \$25,500 per space base from Marshall & Swift. This does not include the extraordinary costs associated with an underground (and below river level) garage which would be considered as 'super adequate' and not subject to taxation. The site costs at \$100 million (including mitigation of the contaminated site) are offered as the same as for the Developer's estimate. All told, this estimate is \$605 million or approximately 63% of the Developer estimate.

Estimated SF of	RKG/M&S	•	RKG/M&S as % of WD Total
Use			
155,900	\$313	\$48,738,808	50.0%
600,200	\$310	\$185,866,982	67.5%
63,300	\$349	\$22,090,064	55.8%
100,000	\$241	\$24,134,610	84.5%
40,000	\$420	\$16,795,779	125.0%
13,000	\$244	\$3,167,008	40.6%
88,400	\$332	\$29,374,602	65.0%
1,060,800	\$311	\$330,167,852	65.1%
258,900	\$332	\$86,030,366	99.2%
1,319,700	\$315	\$416,198,218	70.0%
1.400.000	\$64	\$89,250,000	34.0%
		\$100,000,000	100.0%
2,719,700		\$605,448,218	63.3%
	Use 155,900 600,200 63,300 100,000 40,000 13,000 88,400 1,060,800 258,900 1,319,700 1,400,000	Use Con\$t/SF 155,900 \$313 600,200 \$310 63,300 \$349 100,000 \$241 40,000 \$241 40,000 \$244 88,400 \$332 1,060,800 \$311 258,900 \$332 1,319,700 \$315 1,400,000 \$64	Use Con\$t/SF Co\$ts 155,900 \$313 \$48,738,808 600,200 \$310 \$185,866,982 63,300 \$349 \$22,090,064 100,000 \$241 \$24,134,610 40,000 \$420 \$16,795,779 13,000 \$244 \$3,167,008 88,400 \$332 \$29,374,602 1,060,800 \$311 \$330,167,852 258,900 \$332 \$86,030,366 1,319,700 \$315 \$416,198,218 1,400,000 \$64 \$89,250,000 \$1,000,000 \$64 \$10,000,000

Table II-4 - Potential Cost Estimates of Proposed Development from Marshall & Swift

b) Summary

The following Table II-5 table summarizes the estimated taxable value and preliminary property taxes (prior to additional adjustments) of the proposed casino resort in Everett. The difference in estimated values and taxes, between the cost approach utilizing Developer input and the *Marshall & Swift* input is approximately \$50 million, with the Developer estimates as the greater of the two. In this analysis, RKG has opted for the conservative estimate (\$607.7 million), reflective of the cost estimates from the *Marshall & Swift* as may be basis for the City of Everett Assessor in estimating value for the Wynn Casino Resort. This results in an estimated property tax of \$25.85 million prior to adjustments.

Table II-5 - Summary Comparison of Estimated Property Tax Values

FY 2013 Value Estimate (millions)	WD Costs	RKG / M&S
Building Components	\$594.20	\$416.20
30% Non-taxable	(\$129.07)	NA
Garage 1/	\$87.50	\$89.25
Land 2/	\$10.47	\$10.47
Owners FF&E (net)	\$93.50	\$93.50
Total	\$656.60	\$609.41
Commercial Tax Rate (FY 2013)	\$43.04	\$43.04
Tax Liability	\$28.26	\$26.23
less existing liability	(\$0.38)	(\$0.38)
NET Tax Liability (prior to adjustments)	\$27.88	\$25.85

Source: RKG Associates

1/ Parking structure - reflects estimated value of \$25,000/space

2/29.9 acre site per Assessor records, assumed to be \$350,000/acre

currently valued at \$295,500/acre, sold in 2009 for \$267,500/acre

B. Fiscal Impact – City of Everett

This section presents trends in revenue and expenses for Everett, Massachusetts, over the past three fiscal years and evaluates potential fiscal impacts associated with a proposed casino resort development. Municipal service costs are estimated utilizing the employment anticipation

methodology. Additional adjustments to account for any potential loss in state aid as a result of the increased property wealth in Everett are also factored. As shown in Table II-6, over the FY 2010 through FY 2012 time period, the general fund revenues in Everett have exceeded expenditures, by an average of nearly \$13 million, while enterprise fund revenues have been less than expenses in two years and averaged a surplus of \$1.3 million over the three years.

City of Everett,				
MA - Surplus	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	Average
General Fund				
Revenues	\$149,691,146	\$156,917,240	\$167,872,706	\$158,160,364
Expenditures	(\$140,692,889)	(\$147,447,346)	(\$147,164,766)	(\$145,101,667)
Surplus or (Loss)	\$8,998,257	\$9,469,894	\$20,707,940	\$13,058,697
Enterprise Funds				
Revenues	\$4,266,454	\$4,485,819	\$4,314,838	\$4,355,704
Expenditures	(\$4,433,339)	(\$4,698,319)	(\$64,447)	(\$3,065,368
Surplus or (Loss)	(\$166,886)	(\$212,500)	\$4,250,392	\$1,290,335
NET Surplus or (Loss)	\$8,831,371	\$9,257,394	\$24,958,331	\$14,349,032

Table II-6 – City of Everett, MA: Surplus Funds

Source : City of Everett. MA and RKG Associates, Inc.

1. Preliminary Fiscal Impact Analysis

Fiscal impact analysis is defined as "a projection of the direct current public costs and revenues associated with residential or nonresidential growth to the local jurisdiction in which the growth is taking place⁹." In determining the fiscal impact of the proposed development, estimates were made concerning changes that may occur to the community's expenditures and revenues because of the proposed development. In most instances, a determination of these financial changes is derived from an evaluation of household and/or employment changes caused by the proposed development, and measuring the average "cost" associated with servicing this development against any potential change in revenue (typically property taxes) from it. Various standardized methods for analyzing fiscal impacts exist, varying with the type of project and the amount and quality of the data that is available. For non-residential projects of this nature, a widely accepted methodology is the "employment anticipation" approach, which is used here to estimate the impacts of the proposed casino resort on the City of Everett.

a) Methodology

RKG's approach to estimating the net fiscal impact of the proposed casino resort development in Everett consisted of the following steps.

- Constant 2013 Dollars and Timing All estimates in this analysis, unless otherwise noted, are in constant 2013 dollars. The project was assumed to be built in its entirety and fully operational within the context of the FY 2013 budget year.
- *Estimation of Municipal Revenue* The major source of on-going municipal revenue from the project would be property taxes. For this preliminary analysis, RKG estimated that the project at full build-out would have a total assessed value (land, building and personal property) of \$607.7± million.

⁹ Robert W. Burchell, et. al, <u>The New Practitioner's Guide to Fiscal Impact Analysis</u>. Center for the Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University, 1985.

- *Estimation of Municipal Expenditures* Using the average of the budgeted expenditures for FY 2011 through FY 2013 (adjusted for state aid) RKG allocated municipal costs between residential and non-residential uses based upon a blended average of the distribution of taxable accounts and assessed values for each use. The underlying assumption in this methodology is that various municipal department budgets would be allocated proportionally between residential and non-residential and non-residential and non-residential and non-residential and non-residential department budgets would be allocated proportionally between residential and non-residential uses, as measured by assessment data.
- Average Cost Based on the employment anticipation method in which the nonresidential municipal costs are divided by total employment in Everett, an average cost per employee can be derived¹⁰. This cost is then used as the basis for forecasting municipal expenditures associated with providing services to the proposed casino development at full build-out¹¹.
- Deductions for Potential Loss in State Aid Potential losses in future state aid may result in Everett since the property wealth of the community could increase significantly as a result of a \$607.7± million increase in assessed valuation. This in turn may affect the method in which State aid is calculated for the City of Everett.
- *Estimation of Net Impacts* Based upon the projected increase in property tax revenues directly associated with the project, the municipal cost estimates and other deductions due to a potential loss in state aid are subtracted from the revenue estimates to yield the "net" change. Another step was to subtract the property taxes currently being paid on the site of the proposed project in order to avoid double counting.
- *Potential Impacts Not Evaluated* Finally, this analysis focused only on direct impacts related to the project itself and does not address any potential direct, indirect or induced impacts elsewhere in the City, the surrounding communities or the region (other than the statewide multiplier impacts for employment, wages and resulting income tax), as outlined in the legislation. Such additional impact could be associated, but not limited, to the following:
 - Community development and/or new housing development, either market-rate or work-force, for any of the 3,000+ workers at the proposed casino resort.
 - Economic development and/or impact to local/regional businesses and State Lottery sales, including small and minority-owned businesses.
 - Workforce development for job training either locally or regionally.
 - Infrastructure impacts to Everett or surrounding towns, or to any state/federal highway.
 - Health and social impacts associated with gaming.
 - Impacts associated with any nearby live entertainment venues.

¹⁰ This includes an estimated 1,550 municipal and school employees per the City of Everett Human Resources Department. ¹¹ This average cost approach assumes that the new resort casino will require City services in the same manner that other commercial and industrial properties do. This assumption likely overstates the municipal service costs. The casino resort will, in fact, require significantly less in terms of City provided services due to its state-of-the-art construction, in-house security systems and location on the periphery of the community, among other reasons. An alternate methodology would be to undertake a marginal cost analysis, based on individual municipal department requirements and financial circumstances.

b) Municipal Expenditure Allocation: Residential to Non-Residential

In order to estimate the cost of municipal services for the proposed development, RKG evaluated an assessment summary obtained from the City of Everett. As presented in Table II-7, a blended average was derived from residential (74.3%) and non-residential (25.8%) assessment characteristics in order to apportion costs between the uses.

	No		
FY 2013	Residential [1]	[2]	Total
Accounts	8,756	1,565	10,321
% of Total	84.8%	15.2%	100%
Assessed Value (\$ mil)	\$2,261.04	\$1,297.53	\$3,558.57
% of Total	63.5%	36.5%	100%
Blended Average	74.2%	25.8%	100%
[1] Includes count of 163 mixed use pa	arcels.		
[2] Commercial, Industrial & Personal	Property		
Source: City of Everett & RKG Associate	es, Inc.		

Table II-7 – City of Everett Allocation to Non-Residential Uses (FY 2013)

Approximately 74.2% of the City of Everett municipal expenditures (or costs associated with "running the town") are assumed to be related to residential uses and properties. Conversely, 25.8% of the municipal costs are associated with non-residential development. Table II-8 allocates the average FY 2011 through FY 2013 City expenditures based on the preceding proportions. Select categories, such as education, were allocated totally to residential uses. Other categories such as police and fire expenditures were allocated evenly in order to reflect the relatively more intense use of these resources required by non-residential uses.

					% Allocated to Use		Allocated Cost	
Expenditures by Department/Category	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	Average	Resid.	Non-Res	Resid.	Non-Res
General Government	\$4,828,515	\$5,679,444	\$7,277,145	\$5,928,368	74.2%	25.8%	\$4,398,095	\$1,530,273
Police	\$8,781,954	\$8,882,383	\$9,032,751	\$8,899,029	50.0%	50 0%	\$4,449,515	\$4,449,519
Fire	\$7,753,355	\$7,504,909	\$8,265,756	\$7,841,340	50.0%	50.0%	\$3,920,670	\$3,920,670
Other Public Safety	\$1,629,053	\$2,050,110	\$3,031,889	\$2,237,017	74.2%	25.8%	\$1,659,582	\$577,435
Education	\$54,604,260	\$57,386,360	\$61,034,102	\$57,674,907	100%	0%	\$57,674,907	\$0
City Services	\$9,154,605	\$8,669,608	\$8,704,779	\$8,842,997	74.2%	25 8%	\$6,560,379	\$2,282,619
Human Services	\$1,905,342	\$1,576,860	\$1,782,005	\$1,754,736	100%	0%	\$1,754,736	\$0
	\$952,229	\$971,644	\$1,148,115	\$1,023,996	100%	0%	\$1,023,996	\$0
Library & Recreation	\$8,767,505	\$8,111,579	\$7,580,867	\$8,153,317	74.2%	25.8%	\$6,048,724	\$2,104,593
Debt Service	\$41,010,774	\$32,032,674	\$32,711,153	\$35,251,534	74.2%	25.8%	\$26,152,152	\$9,099,383
Fixed Costs	\$139,387,592	\$132,865,571	\$140,568,562	\$137,607,242	81.5%	17.2%	\$113,642,756	\$23,964,48
Total Expenditure	(\$36,350,741)	(\$44,046,699)	(\$50,304,796)	(\$43,567,412)	100%	0%	(\$43,567,412)	\$0
Less Chapter 70	(\$6,397,351)	(\$5,881,793)	(\$6,332,499)	(\$6,203,881)	74.2%	25.8%	(\$4,602,490)	(\$1,601,39)
Less General Gov. Total (Less State Aid)	\$96,639,500	\$82,937,079	\$83,931,267	\$87,835,949	67.7%	23.1%	\$65,472,853	\$22,363,09

Table II-8 – City of Everett Allocation of General Fund Expenses by Use

The average expenditures for the City of Everett were \$87.83 million when deducting state aid revenue (Chapter 70, Education, and General Government). Utilizing the previously developed allocation ratio, approximately \$65.5 million of the City's operating expenses (inclusive of school and library/recreation) were associated with the residential use. Approximately \$22.4 million of the City's expenses were a result of "servicing" its non-residential properties. Referring to Table II-8, expenditures for Police represent approximately

18.6% of total expenditures for non-residential uses (prior to allocations). Expenditures for Fire accounted for 16.4% of total expenditures for non-residential uses and fixed costs for another 38% of costs associated with services for non-residential uses.

c) Municipal Service Costs for the Proposed Development

Based on the employment anticipation method in which the non-residential municipal costs are divided by employment in Everett, an average cost per employee can be derived. According to the most recent ES-202 data (through the second quarter of 2012) from the Massachusetts Executive Office of Labor and Workforce Development, employment averaged 10,634 persons employed at private-sector businesses in Everett. Dividing the estimated non-residential service costs (\$22.4 million) by this employment base, plus the estimated 1,550 City employees, results in an average cost of \$1,835 per employee for municipal services. The proposed project is forecasted to create 3,627 direct jobs at full build-out of the casino resort, which includes 340 ongoing construction and facility/maintenance positions related to annual upkeep, maintenance and capital reinvestment in the property. Therefore the estimated cost to provide municipal services to the project would be slightly more than \$6.6 million, as shown Table II-9. This estimate equate to approximately 15% of the estimated service costs for non-residential uses in Everett, inclusive of the proposed casino resort.

Table II-9 – Average Service Cost Estimate

Non-Residential Service Cost	\$22,363,095
Employment in Everett [1]	12,184
Average Cost per Employee	\$1,835
Proposed Employment at build-out [2]	3,627
Estimated Service Cost at build-out	(\$6,656,987)
 [1] 1st half of 2012 per MA EOL&WD + 1,550 City of Everett [2] 3,287 casino/resort jobs & 340 on-going construction TMG Consulting 	t employees jobs per Wynn Resorts &
Source: City of Everett; Wynn Resorts & RKG Associates, Inc	C

It is important to point out that this analysis of municipal service costs assumes that the casino resort will utilize City services in the same way that other commercial and industrial properties in the City do. The casino resort may, in fact, require significantly less in terms of services due to its state-of-the-art construction, in-house security systems and location on the periphery of the community. Use of the employee-based costing methodology therefore provides an overly conservative estimate of the fiscal impacts on the City.

The proposed casino resort will be very much 'self-contained' and will require far fewer public services than an equivalent size commercial development (for example a shopping mall or mixed-use center). As a luxury destination, it will be built with the highest quality fire protection and suppression systems, have extensive and highly trained security personnel and systems in place, and will include such features as on-site emergency medical support and equipment. Thus, public safety needs will be substantially less than more traditional multi-building and multi-owner development. As a single owner property, the administrative burden on the City will be significantly less than for an equivalent size development with multiple owners.

The major requirement for additional municipal services for urban resort casinos is for public safety services, including police, fire and emergency medical response. Other services, such as those provided as part of general government activities (administration, accounting, public works, etc.) are not impacted as much due to the fact that the resort casino will be under single ownership and in a single location. Other city services, such as schools, will not be directly impacted at all.

As a hypothetical example, if a marginal cost analysis determined that a new fire station near the project that would need be manned by up to 10 new fire fighters was required, and that 5 or 6 new police officers would be needed to augment existing service levels, the estimated operational costs (which consist primarily of additional labor) would be on the order of \$1.5 million per year, The annual debt service to cover the capital costs of the new station and equipment might add approximately \$1 to \$2 million, resulting in a total cost of \$2.5 to \$3.5 million. Even with additional direct costs for other City services, the total actual municipal expenditures would be significantly less than the \$6.6 million estimated by using an average cost approach.

d) Effects on State Aid in the Future

The largest budget item for a City/Town in Massachusetts is typically for education and the formulas for calculating an annual foundation (town or district) budget and resulting state contribution are based on the Chapter 70 statutes, in order to ensure adequate spending levels are maintained through an equitable combination of local property taxes and state aide. A school foundation budget is derived by applying different multipliers to various educational cost categories and the results for the City of Everett, based on a model obtained from the MA Department of Education (MA DOE), are exhibited in Table II-16 at the end of this section. For FY 2013 the foundation cost is \$74.3 million. The primary source of foundation funding is local property taxes, which for calculating state aid is capped at 82.5% of the foundation budget. The actual allocation of funds (local/state) is based on a City/Town's equity (property) and wealth (income) as determined by the Department of Revenue (DOR). Another key DOR factor in calculating an annual foundation budget is the municipal revenue growth factor (MRGF) which is applied to a prior year's contribution to determine a preliminary contribution for the current years. Trends in Everett's MRGF are exhibited in Figure II-1 at the end of the section.

The calculations in determining state aid for the City of Everett in FY 2013 are shown in Table II-17 at the end of this section. Line 7 indicates that the combined local share (effort of property wealth and income) is \$23.8 million, which is less than the 82.5% cap (line 9). The calculations are then carried forward to the right side, where the FY 2012 contribution is multiplied by the MRGF, which in turn yields a preliminary contribution for FY 2013 (Line 15) of \$25.4 million. This figure is compared to the prior (or target) local contribution (line 10); and 15% of the difference (since the preliminary share is above the target) is subtracted in order to determine the required local contribution; the result is \$25.3 million in local contribution or 34% of the foundation budget for FY 2013. The proposed casino resort development will affect the City of Everett in terms of state aid, since the property wealth would increase significantly as a result of the project. Also, as the project comes on line a spike in the MRGF will result, which further reduces the share of state funding the City would

receive. While the impact would not occur in the first year, it would likely be phased in over time.

(1) Hypothetical Analysis

To ascertain the potential impact on the local share of education costs, RKG utilized the financial model from MA DOE, and made a few changes based on the following assumptions:

- The assessment of the proposed project (\$607.7± million) would be phased in over three years, for an average increase of \$202.5 million per year beginning in FY 2014, and continuing through to FY 2016. In FY 2017 and FY 2018, the FY 2016 equalized assessment remained constant.
- For the MRGF, a 5% factor was used in for all fiscal years.
- The foundation budget was assumed to remain constant for the five-years.
- Utilize the same factors in the DOE worksheet for each year in determining the combined effort yield.

The result of this hypothetical analysis (Table II-18, at the end of this Appendix) indicates that the local share would increase by \$1.6 million in the first year, and then \$1.8 and then \$2.1 million in the next year. A cumulative increase of \$6.5 million would result over the five-year period, or an average shift of \$1.3 million per year from state aid to local revenue, representing a 3% decline over the average education aid (FY 2010 through FY 2013).

(2) Effects to State Aid for General Government

State aid for General Government is reportedly factored in a similar manner as Chapter 70 aid, and any major shift in a community's wealth can influence the amount of annual aid. Although a financial model to estimate this revenue for Everett was not available, it would be reasonable to assume that a similar percentage loss in Chapter 70 fund (-3%) would also occur for General Government aid. Based on the three year average revenue of \$6.2 million, an annual loss of \$185,800 may result for Everett.

e) Summary

Based on the preceding assumptions, and on a property tax revenue estimate of \$25.8 (net existing tax on the 29.9-acre parcel), the "net" fiscal impact of the proposed casino resort in Everett is positive by an estimated \$17.6 million, as shown in Table II- 10^{12} .

¹² NOTE that this estimate is preliminary in nature, and does not address any potential direct, indirect or induced impacts elsewhere in the City, the surrounding communities or the region as a whole.

Potential Tax Revenue (net existing)	\$25,773,532
Municipal Service Costs	(\$6,656,987)
Potential loss in Education Aid [1]	(\$1,305,097)
Potential loss in Gen. Gov. Aid [1]	(\$185,842)
Adjustments Total	(\$8,147,926)
Net Fiscal Impact (Preliminary)	\$17,625,606
 Estimated average annual loss over 5 yrs due to increase in pr analysis) Source: City of Everett: Wynn Resorts & RKG Associates, Inc. 	operty wealth (see text for

Table II-10 – Net Fiscal Impact of Proposed Casino Resort in Everett

2. Building Permit Fees - City of Everett

The City of Everett has a flat building permit fee of \$15 per \$1,000 of construction value according to the Director of Inspection Services and City fee schedules and are used to cover the costs of inspections. Permit fees for electric/mechanical, plumbing and gas are developed under a separate schedule, specific to the work, as in number of fittings, A/C units and so on. The Director indicated that once a more definitive schedule could be provide a separate worksheet of estimated fees could be developed. For large complex construction projects such as the proposed resort casino, permit fees are typically negotiated as part of the permitting process due to the need for specialty inspection firms to undertake the inspection process. These fees are used to cover the costs incurred by the City for inspections during the building process in order to assure that life safety and building codes are met, therefore they are considered to be a 'wash' from a net revenue perspective.

3. Sales and Use Taxes

The City of Everett has initiated a local option sales tax of 0.75% on food and beverage sales, indicating estimated annual tax revenue of \$457,500. Everett is also enacting a 6% local hotel sales tax that could realize \$2.1 million annually from the proposed 550-key room hotel development at the casino resort (presented in Table II-12 along with the estimated state impacts and estimated total sales). Combined these new revenues total approximately \$2.6 million annually.

C. Fiscal Impacts - Massachusetts

The proposed casino resort in Everett will have a net positive economic impact on the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. There will be several sources of direct funding to the state for application fees and licenses, as well as financial benefits derived from various sales and income taxes from the direct and indirect employment that will be generated. The key findings of the analysis are summarized next:

1. Fees and Revenues

• Application Fee – the new casino legislation specifies that each applicant for a casino license pay a \$400,000 non-refundable fee, to be used by the Gaming Commission to cover costs associated with process the application (this fee has already been paid by the Developer upon their submission of initial application for a state license).

- Licensing Fee the legislation stipulates that the licensee pay the state \$85 million at opening of the facility. The annual license renewal fee has not been established, but is estimated at approximately \$1 million.
- Gaming Tax the legislation specifies that 25% of gross gaming revenues from a casino resort (defined as the amount bet less amounts paid off in winnings) be paid to the state. The Developer has estimated that the first five years of operation will generate approximately \$828.2 million annually in gross gaming revenues, resulting in a tax payment to the Commonwealth of approximately \$207.1 million. This amount is estimated to increase at 2.5% annually. The legislation earmarks this tax revenue for several distinct categories as follows:
 - 6.5% to a Community Mitigation Fund (\$13.5 million) to be used by the host community and surrounding communities to mitigate impacts of the casino;
 - 4.5% to a Local Capital Project Fund (\$9.3 million), also potentially available to the host community;
 - 20.0% to the Gaming Local Aid Fund (\$41.4 million), a portion of which may be available to the host community;
 - 2.0% to the Massachusetts Cultural Council (\$4.1 million);
 - 1.0% to the Massachusetts Tourism Fund (\$2.1 million);
 - 10.0% to the Commonwealth Stabilization Fund (\$20.7 million);
 - 14.0% to the Education Fund (\$29 million);
 - 10.0% to the Debt Reduction Program (\$20.7 million);
 - 15.0% to a Transportation & Infrastructure Fund (\$31.1 million);
 - 5.0% to the Public Health Trust Fund (\$10.4 million);
 - 2.5% to the Race Horse Development Fund (\$5.2 million, with a minimum payment of \$1.7 million); and
 - 9.5% to the Gaming Economic Development Fund (\$19.7 million).
- Slot Machine License Fee set at \$600 per machine and estimated to bring \$1.8 million annually to the Commonwealth.
- **Public Health Trust Fund** a proportional fee (of a total \$5 million) relative to other casino resorts in the state, estimated to be \$1.6 million annually for the proposed casino resort in Everett, dedicated to addressing problems associated with compulsive gambling and/or other addictive services.

In all, these fees and licenses are expected to generate approximately \$207.1 million annually for the Commonwealth (plus the \$400,000 application fee and one-time gaming license of \$85 million in the first year). The estimating gaming tax and its components are highlighted in the following Table II-11.

I d Die II-1 I - Esiling		9	
Estimated Gaming		Revenue in	
Revenue - 5 yr avg	Visits	mill\$	Per Visit
Local Market	5,883,601	\$685,67	\$117
Overnight Guests	265,593	\$52,24	\$197
Tourism	2,014,000	\$86,68	\$43
Traffic Intercept	78,130	\$3,63	\$46
Totals	8,241,324	\$828.22	\$100
Source: TMG Consulting, Wynn	Resorts & RKG Ass	ociates, Inc.	
Gaming Tax to Massachusetts		Revenue in mill\$	Percent of Total
MA Cultural Council		\$4.14	2.0%
MA Tourism Fund Community Mitigation		\$2.07	1.0%
Fund Local Capital Project		\$13.46	6.5%
Fund		\$9_32	4.5%
Gaming Local Aid Fund		\$41.41	20.0%
Commonwealth Stabilization Fund		\$20.71	10.0%
560002810011000		- R	
Education Fund Debt Reduction		\$28.99	14.0%
Program		\$20.71	10.0%
Transportation & Infrastructure Fund		\$31.06	15.0%
Public Health Trust Fund		\$10.35	5.0%
Race Horse			
Development Fund		\$5.18	2.5%
Gaming Economic			
Development Fund		\$19.67	9.5%
TOTAL		\$207.06	100.0%

Table II-11 – Estimated Gaming Tax and Components

Source: RKG Associates, Inc.

2. Sales and Occupancy Taxes

The Commonwealth (as well as Everett) is projected to also receive income from sales tax and hotel occupancy tax, as presented in Table II-12. Retail sales are projected to total approximately \$26.1 million and applying the state's 6.25% sales tax results in \$1.6 million in annual sales tax revenue and applying the same tax rate to the estimated \$73 million in food and beverage revenue results in \$4.6 million in additional new tax revenues to Massachusetts. The state levies a 5.7% tax on hotel revenues and based on estimated room revenue of \$34.2 million, and additional \$1.9 million is realized annually by the state. In total, annual estimated state sales/occupancy tax revenues are \$8.1 million.

Estimated Sales &			
Occupancy Taxes	Sales in mill\$	Recipient	Taxes
Retail Sales	\$26.10	State 1/	\$1,631,250
		Everett	NA
Food/Beverage	\$73.00	State 1/	\$4,562,500
		Everett 2/	\$547,500
Hotel	\$34.20	State 3/	\$1,949,400
		Everett 4/	\$2,052,000
TOTAL		State	\$8,143,150
1		Everett	\$2,599,500

Table II-12 -	Estimated	Sales and	Occupancy	Tax
---------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----

Source: TMG Consulting and RKG Associates, Inc.

1/ State sales tax of 6 25%

2/ Local option sales tax of 0.75%

3/ Sate occupancy tax of 5.7%

4/ Pending local occupancy tax of 6.0%

3. Employment, Wages and Income Tax

The Developer has estimated that the casino resort will support approximately 3,287 full-time equivalent positions, ranging from management level jobs to servers, housekeepers and service personnel. Also, the ongoing maintenance and capital re-investment in the facility would result in 340 construction related jobs. These direct jobs will result in the support of an estimated 1,791 indirect jobs elsewhere in the Massachusetts economy. Approximately 44% of the direct positions are related to the casino, with the rest spread among the other property components and construction/maintenance. Table II-13 breaks out employment by location (or use) and provides an estimate of the anticipated earnings and tax receipts. State income taxes on the direct wages paid to the employees, based on an effective tax rate indexed to the average annual wage, is estimated at \$6.3 million per year, while income taxes from indirect jobs are estimated at \$6 million.

Sector or Use	Direct Employment	Avg Annual Wage	Total Wages (\$mil)	Est Tax Receipts (\$mil)	Indirect Employment	Indirect Wages (\$mil)
Casino	1,581	\$39,179	\$61.95	\$2.33	389	\$57.49
Hotel	278	\$41,973	\$11.69	\$0.46	198	\$10.84
Food & Beverage	736	\$38,659	\$28.45	\$1.07	312	\$26.63
Retail	42	\$38,035	\$1.59	\$0.06	20	\$1.23
Entertainment	0	\$41,000	\$0.00	\$0.00	0	\$0.00
Spa	31	\$34,000	\$1.05	\$0.04	22	\$0.81
General Admin	619	\$50,987	\$31.56	\$1.30	528	\$25.15
Subtotal	3,287	\$41,459	\$136.28	\$5.25	1,470	\$122.15
Const.	340	\$72,072	\$24.50	\$1.05	321	\$21.50
TOTAL	3,627	\$44,329	\$160.78	\$6.29	1,791	\$143.64

Table II-13 – Employment, Wages and Income Tax

Source: TMG Consulting; Wynn Resorts & RKG Associates, Inc.

In addition, the construction of the casino resort (totaling an estimated \$956.7 million) is anticipated to generate approximately 5,155 full-time equivalent jobs over the time period that the project is being built. This estimate assumes that approximately 40% of the total hard costs construction cost budget represents labor (typical) and average construction wages for Everett (from Massachusetts Executive Office of Labor and Workforce Development through first half of 2012). Applying an indirect employment multiplier to the construction impacts results in supporting another 4,867 indirect jobs located throughout the Commonwealth's economy. The \$382.7 million in direct construction wages result in state income taxes of nearly \$16.3 million, while state sales tax on construction materials and assumed as 100% taxable (Massachusetts as the point of sale or place of transfer) totals \$23.9 million, as presented in Table II-14. Additionally, discussions with the City of Everett Assessor revealed that as of June 30, 2014, the City of Everett will collect a local option sales tax (0.75%) on construction materials which have been included in this analysis and afforded an estimated \$2.8 million to the City.

Table II-14 - Construction Employ	ment & Impacts
Construction Costs and	
Impacts	
Labor	\$382,680,000
Materials (sales tax)	\$382,680,000
Materials (personal property	
tax)	\$47,835,000
All Other	\$143,505,000
TOTAL	\$956,700,000
Employment Impacts	
Employment Impacts	6202 CR0 000
Labor Costs	\$382,680,000
Average \$ - const. for Everett	\$74,230
Estimated Direct FTE's	5,155
Indirect Multiplier	0.9441
Indirect FTE's	4,867
for Wages	
Indirect Multiplier	0.8772
Indirect Wages	\$335,686,896
State Income Tax - <i>direct</i>	\$16,339,849
estimated indirect	\$14,119,083
State Sales Tax	\$23,917,500
Potential Local Option Sales	
Tax - City of Everett	\$2,870,100

Table II-14 - Construction Employment & Impacts

Source: TMG Consulting; Wynn Resorts & RKG Associates, Inc.

D. City of Everett Interviews

RKG met with a sampling of City of Everett officials and department heads in order to garner their input and concerns, if any, regarding the proposed casino resort and their department's capacity to provide adequate municipal services. The following summarizes these discussions.

1. Fire Department

The Fire Chief indicated that his department had declined by a dozen personnel over the last three years, and that the department was down from 107 to 95 persons. The department responds to perhaps 5,000 calls annually with 3,000 as medical related. Call activity is expected to increase in the City following the opening of the casino resort and of particular concern is the insularity of the location. The road network is poorly configured and congestion/back-up is possible, slowing response times. Ideally the casino resort and that general area of the City would best be served by a fire sub-station with two bays (pump truck and ladder truck and living quarters for four to six persons per shift (4-shifts). Salaries (with benefits) for potential additional fire personnel were estimated to range from \$70,000 to \$80,000 per individual. Equipment costs could equate to \$850,000 for a pump truck and over \$1 million for a ladder truck.

2. Assessor

The City of Everett Assessor noted that construction value does not necessarily equate to market value, and is aware of the unique contribution of over-improved properties or those with super-adequacies. Per the Assessor, the City of Everett could not offer the Developer any tax or TIF (tax increment financing) agreements as per Massachusetts General Law. The City's property values are re-certified every three years by the Massachusetts Department of Revenue. The Assessor indicated that the underlying land value of the proposed casino resort would likely change little from its current assessment, but offered several comparable properties in the City as a second value reference. The City Assessor noted the timing of assessments, commenting that January is the assessment date for the ensuing fiscal year¹³. In terms of ongoing construction, typically the "billed" property tax reflects what is built as of June 30th. In terms of personal property, if the "owner" is not a corporation then personal property is taxed at the local tax rate (*this analysis assumes that personal property is taxed at the local Everett rate*).

3. Building Inspector

Discussions with the Director of Inspection Services indicated that in an ideal situation there would be a single point-person, or contact, from the Developer, who would interact with the department. Also, the department may request a full-time dedicated inspector for the proposed casino resort. In both instances this would streamline interaction between the Developer and the department. It was also offered that the site and plan review work be completed by an outside and independent planning professional. The department fee schedule was discussed and the Director indicated that a more refined estimate of electrical, plumbing and mechanical and HAVC could be offered as the level of detail of the proposed construction is presented.

¹³ By way of example, the assessment value of a property is established as of January 2013 and becomes the basis for property taxes for fiscal year 2014 (or July 2013 through June 2014) and billings are quarterly, August 1, November 1, February 1 and May 1.

4. Police Department

The Police Chief noted that the department has been stable at around 91 personnel for several years, despite rising call activity and workload. The number of police calls to a casino resort is expected to be high, reflecting a similar experience at neighboring retail and commercial venues. The Police Chief has contacted police departments in other locales (such as Detroit). Questions were raised regarding the casino resort's ability to share information, such as video camera feeds of the parking and other public areas should the need arise. Would there be a simple request process to accommodate this? The Police Chief indicated that a potential substation in the neighborhood with the casino resort could best serve the public safety for both residents and casino patrons alike. Additionally staffing of 14 to 18 officers (at around \$75,000 per) would be appropriate, as well as three to four civilian staff (\$35,000 per). The department allows up to three responses to false alarms in a calendar year, per commercial establishment, after that the billed cost is \$300 per response. The Police Chief also raised concerns regarding staffing for special events, such as concerts where traffic could be an issue. One more concern was raised regarding whether a 500-room high rise hotel complex would negatively impact communications.

5. Economic Development

The Director of Economic Development, similar to the Fire and Police Chiefs, questioned the impacts that the casino resort would have on an already highly compact, congested neighborhood with poor ingress/egress and traffic circulation. One hope was that the casino resort v could stimulate discussion for an MBTA "T" stop in Everett (tied into the Newburyport line). The Director realized the potential and opportunity for spin-off development from the casino resort, despite that that most adjoining parcels are small in size and in fractured ownership.

E. Additional Supporting Tables

The tables starting on the following page support the analyses described in the previous sections of the Appendix.

Expenditures by					Perc	ent of Total		# Chan	ge	% Chai	nge
Department/Category	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	Average	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	2011-12	2012-13	2011-12	2012-13
General Government	\$4,828,515	\$5,679,444	\$7,277,145	\$5,928,368	3.5%	4.3%	5.2%	\$850,929	\$1,597,701	17.6%	28.1%
Police	\$8,781,954	\$8,882,383	\$9,032,751	\$8,899,029	6.3%	6.7%	6,4%	\$100,429	\$150,368	1.1%	1.7%
Fire	\$7,753,355	\$7,504,909	\$8,265,756	\$7,841,340	5.6%	5.6%	5.9%	(\$248,446)	\$760,847	-3.2%	10.1%
Other Public Safety	\$1,629,053	\$2,050,110	\$3,031,889	\$2,237,017	1.2%	1.5%	2.2%	\$421,057	\$981,779	25.8%	47.9%
Education	\$54,604,260	\$57,386,360	\$61,034,102	\$57,674,907	39.2%	43.2%	43.4%	\$2,782,100	\$3,647,742	5.1%	6.4
City Services	\$9,154,605	\$8,669,608	\$8,704,779	\$8,842,997	6.6%	6.5%	6.2%	(\$484,997)	\$35,171	-5.3%	0.40
Human Services	\$1,905,342	\$1,576,860	\$1,782,005	\$1,754,736	1.4%	1.2%	1.3%	(\$328,482)	\$205,145	-17.2%	13.0%
Library & Recreation	\$952,229	\$971,644	\$1,148,115	\$1,023,996	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%	\$19,415	\$176,471	2.0%	18.2
Debt Service	\$8,767,505	\$8,111,579	\$7,580,867	\$8,153,317	6.3%	6.1%	5.4%	(\$655,926)	(\$530,712)	-7.5%	-6.5
Fixed Costs	\$41,010,774	\$32,032,674	\$32,711,153	\$35,251,534	29.4%	24.1%	23.3%	(\$8,978,100)	\$678,479	-21.9%	2.1
Total Expenditure	\$139,387,592	\$132,865,571	\$140,568,562	\$137,607,242	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	(\$6,522,021)	\$7,702,991	-4.7%	5.8%
Less Chapter 70	(\$36,350,741)	(\$44,046,699)	(\$50,304,796)	(\$43,567,412)							
Less General Gov.	(\$6,397,351)	(\$5,881,793)	(\$6,332,499)	(\$6,203,881)							_
Total (Less State Aid)	\$96,639,500	\$82,937,079	\$83,931,267	\$87,835,949				(\$13,702,421)	\$994,188	-14.2%	1.2

Table II-15 – City of Everett: Expenditures by Fund and Category (FY 2011 – FY 2013)

Table II-16 – City of Everett: Chapter 70 Foundation Budget

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Office of School Finance

FY13 Chapter 70 Foundation Budget

93 EVERETT

			B	ase Foundatio	n Componen	ts									
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	
	Pre-	Kinderg	jarten		Jr Higt√	High	ELL	ELL	ELL	Voca-	Special Ed	Special Ed	Low Income		
	School	Half-Day	Full-Day	Elementary	Middle	School	РК	KHalf	KF - 12	tional	In District	Out of Dist	Elem	Other	TOTAL*
Foundation Enrollment	120	0	390	2,084	1,324	1,844	C	0	797	18	242	64	2,976	1,922	6,517
1 Administration	21,834	D	141,919	758,354	481,795	671,020	0	0	290,023	6,550	607,785	160,737	0	D	3,140,018
2 Instructional Leadership	39,434	0	256,320	1,369,667	870,172	1,211,932	0	0	523,812	11,830	0	0	0	0	4,283,167
3 Classroom and Specialist Teachers	180,818	0	1,175,310	6,280,28B	3,511,197	7,191,469	0	0	3,617,253	119,338	2,005,542	0	8,068,794	3,936,839	36,086,847
4 Other Teaching Services	46,374	0	301,442	1,610,782	736,649	B54,154	0	0	492,571	8,338	1,872,543	2,456	0	0	5,925,309
5 Professional Development	7,152	D	46,505	248,549	171,170	231,150	0	0	128,660	3,730	96,745	0	177,606	114,704	1,225,971
6 Instructional Equipment & Tech	25,237	0	164,042	876,572	556,901	1,240,994	0	0	335,234	21,199	B1,431	0	0	0	3,301,609
7 Guidance and Psychological	13,156	0	85,521	456,988	386,482	674,749	0	0	232,648	6,586	0	0	0	0	1,856,130
8 Pupil Services	5,233	0	34,029	272,710	283,000	908,882	0	0	104,295	8,872	0	0	0	0	1,617,021
9 Operations and Maintenance	50,212	0	326,367	1,743,971	1,201,200	1,622,105	0	0	902,923	29,634	678,928	0	1,246,172	804,819	8,606,330
10 Employee Benefits/Fixed Charges	43,644	0	283,678	1,515,943	915,718	1,225,301	0	0	729,311	19,425	741,696	Û	789,830	510,099	6,774,646
11 Special Ed Tuition	0	0	0	0	0	0	C	0	0	0	0	1,471,660	0	0	1,471,660
12 Total	433,092	D	2,815,132	15,133,825	9,114,286	15,831,755		0	7,356,730	235,503	6,084,671	1,634,852	10,282,402	5,366,461	74,288,708
13 Wage Adjustment Factor	103 7%											Found	ation Budge	t Per Pupil	11,399

* Total foundation enrollment does not include columns 11 through 14, because those columns represent increments above the base. The pupils are already counted in columns 1 to 10.

Total foundation enrollment assigns pupils in pre-kindergarten and half-time kindergarten an enrollment count of .5.

Special education in-district headcount is an assumed percentage, representing 3,75 percent of K to 12 non-vocational enrollment and 4.75 percent of vocational enrollment.

Special education out-of-district headcount is also an assumed percentage, representing 1 percent of non-vocational K-12 enrollment.

Low income headcounts are the number of pupils in columns 1 through 10 who are eligible for free or reduced lunch.

Each component of the foundation budget represents the enrollment on line 1 multiplied by the appropriate state-wide foundation allotment.

The wage adjustment factor is applied to underlying rates in all functions except instructional equipment, benefits and special education tuition.

The foundation budget shown on this page may differ from the final number used in the formula, due to rounding error.

Source: MA DOE

Table II-17 – City of Everett: Calculations for State Aid (Chapter 70) Allocation (FY 2013)

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Determination of City and Town Total Required Contribution FY13

93 EVERETT

Effort Goal		FY13 Increments Toward Goal
 2010 equalized valuation Property percentage Local effort from property wealth 	4,013,223,400 0.3221% 12,927,918	13)Required local contribution FY1225,064,63014)Municipal revenue growth factor (DOR)1.90%15)FY13 preliminary contribution (13 x 14)25,540,85816)Preliminary contribution pct of foundation (15/8)34.38%
4) 2009 income5) Income percentage6) Local effort from income	674,196,000 1.6124% 10,870,667	If preliminary contribution is above the target share:17) Excess local effort (15 - 10)1,742,27318) 15% reduction toward target (17 x 15%)261,341
7) Combined effort yield (row 3+ row 6)	23,798,585	10)10)10)10)10)10)10)10)19)FY13 required local contribution (15 - 18), capped at row 825,279,51720)Contribution as percentage of foundation (19 / 8)34.03
8) Foundation budget FY13 9) Maximum local contribution (82.5% * row 8)	74,288,708 61,288,184	<i>If preliminary contribution is below the target share:</i> 21) Shortfall from target local share (11 - 16)
10) Target local contribution (lesser of row 7 or row 9)	23,798,585	 Added increment toward target (13 x 1% or 2%)* *1% if shortfall is between 5% and 10%; 2% if shortfall > 10%
11) Target local share (row 10 as % of row 8)	32.04%	23) Shortfall from target after adding increment (10 - 15 - 22)
12) Target aid share (100% minus row 11)	67.96%	24) FY13 required local contribution (15 + 22)25) Contribution as percentage of foundation (24 / 8)
Source: MA DOE		

RKG Associates, Inc.



Figure II-1 – City of Everett: Trends in the Municipal Revenue Growth Rates

		÷	Н	lypothetical Analys	is	
	FY-2013	FY-2014	FY-2015	FY-2016	FY-2017	FY-2018
Equalized Value	\$4,013,223,400	\$4,215,777,806	\$4,418,332,212	\$4,620,886,618	\$4,620,886,618	\$4,620,886,618
0.3221%	\$12,927,918		\$14,232,908	\$14,885,402	\$14,885,402	\$14,885,402
Aggregated Income	\$674,196,000	\$674,196,000	\$674,196,000	\$674,196,000	\$674,196,000	\$674,196,000
1.6124%	\$10,870,667	\$10,870,667	\$10,870,667	\$10,870,667	\$10,870,667	\$10,870,667
Combined Effort Yield	\$23,798,585	\$24,451,080	\$25,103,574	\$25,756,069	\$25,756,069	\$25,756,069
Foundation Budget	\$74,568,924	\$74,568,924	\$74,568,924	\$74,568,924	\$74,568,924	\$74,568,924
MAX local contribution (82.5%)	\$61,519,362	\$61,519,362	\$61,519,362	\$61,519,362	\$61,519,362	\$61,519,362
TARGET (lesser of Combined/or MAX)	\$23,798,585		\$25,103,574	\$25,756,069	\$25,756,069	\$25,756,069
Target Local Share	31.91%	32.79%	33.66%	34.54%	34.54%	34.54%
Target Aid Share	68.09%	67.21%	66.34%	65.46%	65.46%	65.46%
Required Contribution (Prior Year)	\$25,064,630	\$25,279,517	\$26,857,355	\$28,664,720	\$30,749,239	\$31,307,106
Municipal Revenue Growth Factor	1.90%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%
Preliminary contribution	\$25,540,858	\$26,543,493	\$28,200,223	\$30,097,956	\$32,286,701	\$32,872,461
Preliminary as % of foundation	34.25%	35.60%	37.82%	40.36%	43.3%	44.1%
IF Prelim ABOVE Target share		55				
Excess Local Effort	\$1,742,273	\$2,092,413	\$3,096,648	\$4,341,887	\$6,530 <i>,</i> 632	\$7,116,392
15% reduction toward Target	\$261,341	\$313,862	\$464,497	\$651,283	\$979,595	\$1,067,459
Required Local Contribution	\$25,279,517	\$26,857,355	\$28,664,720	\$30,749,239	\$31,307,106	\$31,805,002
% of Foundation	33.90%	36.0%	38.44%	41.2%	42.0%	42.7%
IF Prelim BELOW Target share						
Shortfall from Target Local Share						
Added Increment Toward Target (1% if						
shortfall is 5% to 10%; 2% if > 10%						
Shortfall from Target after adding Increr	nent					
Required Local Contribution						

\$1,577,838

\$1,807,365

Table II-18 – Potential Impact to Chapter 70 Funding from Hypothetical Analysis

Source: MA DOE & RKG Associates, Inc.

Prior Year (Reduction in Chapter 70)

\$497,896

\$557,867

\$2,084,519





IMPACT OF THE WYNN RESORT CASINO ON NEIGHBORING COMMUNITIES

AUGUST 29, 2013

Prepared for:

Wynn MA, LLC 3131 Las Vegas Boulevard South Las Vegas, Nevada 89109

Prepared by:

RKG Associates, Inc. Economic, Planning and Real Estate Consultants 634 Central Avenue Dover, New Hampshire 03820

www.rkqassociates.com

Economic Planning and Real Estate Consultants

Impact on Neighboring Communities

This report presents RKG's fiscal and economic analysis of the potential impacts of the proposed Wynn Resort Casino on the communities adjacent to the City of Everett. There will be significant, positive indirect economic impacts on the neighboring communities from the one-time and ongoing employment and potential incremental local spending generated by the project.

The Massachusetts Environmental and Policy Act (MEPA) set forth a very specific and defined process for addressing all environmental impacts including traffic and transportation. Wynn MA LLC has retained a number of consultants to adhere with this process and address these impacts, including Fort Point Associates the lead environmental consultant and Vanasse & Associates to address traffic impacts. Wynn MA LLC has already provided an extensive preliminary study to MassDOT and its neighboring communities. After receiving additional comments and information, the Developer intends to file a more comprehensive analysis this fall and a final proposal in the Spring of 2014. This is consistent with the MEPA process.

Based on its fiscal and economic analysis, RKG highlights the following key benefits:

Employment

- Employment (one-time): 10,000 jobs during the project's 2-3 year construction process, with 5,200 direct jobs and 4,800 indirect jobs
- **Employment (recurring):** 5,400 annual, recurring jobs (both direct and indirect) generated as a result of the project's ongoing operations
- Wages (one-time): \$380 million in one-time construction wages created during the project's 2-3 year construction process and an additional \$335 million in indirect wages
- Wages (recurring): Almost \$300 million in annual, recurring wages from direct and indirect employment created by the project

Direct Local Spend and Housing

- **Direct Local Spending:** \$15-\$23 million in local-wage spending from direct employees; in addition, the ongoing non-gaming operations of the project likely will generate \$40 to \$50 million of annual purchases of goods, with the vast majority likely coming from local providers
- Off-Site Consumer Spending: Additional non-gaming spending likely will be captured by the numerous restaurants, stores and entertainment venues in downtown Boston, Everett, and neighboring communities
- Impact on Housing: Increases in direct and indirect incomes and expenditures will contribute positively to the overall economy of the Commonwealth and the housing sector

Municipal Services

• City Municipal Services: The Developer has agreed to fund \$5 million per year as an impact fee to the City of Everett. In RKG's opinion, the actual additional costs

that the City will incur as a result of providing municipal services to the resort casino, will be approximately \$2.5 - \$3.5 million annually.

1. Employment & Wages

The proposed resort casino will create significant positive impacts on employment and wages in the City of Everett and the neighboring communities of Malden, Medford, Somerville, Chelsea, Revere and Boston

The proposed resort casino is estimated to create approximately 3,200 - 4,000 jobs. For this analysis we have assumed 3,627 full-time equivalent employees when fully operational, along with 5,155 employees during the 2-3 year construction process. This level of employment and spending will indirectly support an incremental 6,658 new jobs within the state and regional economy (4,867 during construction and 1,791 long-term). The salaries and wages paid to these employees (direct and indirect) are estimated to total over \$718 million during the construction phase and over \$304 million annually once the project is operational. It is important to note that the majority of these wages will go to residents of the six adjacent cities and that a significant percentage of these wages will be spent in the community, creating an economic "multiplier" impact throughout the local economies.

In order to estimate employment and wage impacts, RKG collected and analyzed baseline statistics on employment conditions in the City of Everett and three comparative areas including:

- The neighboring cities of Malden, Medford, Somerville, Chelsea and Revere,
- the City of Boston, and
- the Boston Metro Region, which for this analysis includes Essex, Middlesex, Norfolk and Suffolk counties, combined.

RKG then utilized American Community Survey (2007-2011) data from the U.S. Census Bureau to quantify the size of the local labor force and the composition of that labor force. Key data used by RKG included: the number of employed persons in each city, the work locations of local workers, the home locations of those workers holding jobs in the local communities, and the variations in these statistics by major industry sector.

The following findings were identified from a review of the data, as described in more detail in the tables below and those that follow in the Appendix:

- Over 100,000 unemployed persons resided in the rest of the Boston Metro Region
- Everett and the neighboring cities (excluding Boston) were exporters of labor, namely more persons lived in these cities than the number of local jobs at businesses located there. In comparison, Boston was the reverse, as more persons had jobs at local businesses than the workforce that resided in Boston.

• Combined, Everett and the adjacent cities (excluding Boston) exported over 11,300 resident workers in the arts, entertainment, recreation and accommodations and food service industry, while Boston imported over 12,000 workers in this sector.

The analysis then estimates the ongoing employment at the resort casino, by place of residence of the workers. RKG assumed that 95% of the ongoing employment will be filled with local workers (5% filled from outside the local area), resulting in an estimated 3,463 workers to be hired locally, as indicated in Table 1 below.

Applying the average annual wage for these workers by sector / occupation, results in a total of nearly \$154 million in annual wages, which would generate annual state income tax receipts of slightly more than \$6 million, as indicated in Table 1 below.

Sector or Use	Total Direct Employment	Out-of-Region Employment	Net Local Direct Employment	Avg. Annual Wage	Total Wages (\$ mil.)	Estimated Tax Receipts (\$ mil.)
Operating	3,287	(164)	3,123	\$41,459	\$129.46	\$4.99
Construction	340	0	340	72,072	24.50	1.05
Total	3,627	(164)	3,463	\$44,464	\$153.97	\$6.03

Table 1 – Estimated NET New Local and Ongoing Employment

Sources: TMG Consulting, Wynn Resorts, and RKG associates, Inc.

(1) Assumes that 5% of Total Direct Employment will be out of region.

Many of the estimated 3,463 net new local jobs likely will be allocated to Everett residents (due to the hiring preference indicated by Wynn MA LLC) as well as the neighboring communities. Based on RKG's analysis of commuting patterns, the City of Everett and neighboring community residents will likely make up the majority of the employment.

The analysis also estimated the wages associated with the net new employment, by location, as well estimating local spending impacts and indirect statewide wages.

Based on numerous studies of consumer spending patterns, RKG estimates that between 10% and 15% of income is spent on food and other retail goods and services. This analysis assumes that most groceries and other food is purchased locally, as are many other retail goods such as drug store purchases, some hardware, gasoline and so on. Also, personal services such as barbers, nail salons and dry cleaning are purchased locally. RKG estimated that between \$15 and \$23 million in local wages likely will be spent in the local communities.

It is important to note that the \$15-\$23 million does not include the impact on local spending during the construction phase of the project. Many of the construction workers employed at the site will live in Everett and the six neighboring cities, and a portion of the wages paid to them, which in turn support additional job and wages in the economy, will be spent at the local level. During construction, local spending in Everett and the abutting communities will be significant. For example, if each of the estimated 5,155 construction workers spent an average of \$5 per day on lunch, gas and other

convenience-style items, total local spending would be on the order of more than \$6 million over the 2-3 year construction period. This will directly benefit many retail and service businesses in the adjacent cities.

Since construction workers tend to be somewhat more mobile than full-time workers, these impacts may be spread out over a larger geography than estimated for the operational employment above.

2. Direct Local Spending

In addition to the local spending resulting from the direct employment, the proposed resort casino will purchase tens of millions of dollars of goods and services each year from a variety of sources – many of which will include local businesses – to support its non-gaming operations. The project, once fully operational, is anticipated to generate annual non-gaming revenues of \$150 million. Purchases of goods to support these operations likely will be in the \$40-50 million range annually. While the Developer's purchasing initiatives are not known in full detail at this time, the vast majority likely will be sourced from local providers including businesses located in Everett, Malden, Medford, Somerville, Chelsea, Revere and Boston. This local spending will support additional jobs and result in additional local taxes.

3. Potential Off-Site Consumer Spending

The proposed Wynn Resort Casino will add a major destination component to the mix of current tourist and visitor venues in the greater Boston metropolitan area, including Everett and neighboring communities, such as Somerville. As a result, the overall customer appeal, or "gravity" of the market is increased and complimented by all, which should stimulate incremental visitation and tourism spend in the area.

To what extent the economic activity and consumer spending at the resort casino will stimulate spend in the neighboring communities is difficult to estimate, as a review of the literature uncovers state-level research that is generally inconclusive. However, it is generally conceded that the typical tourist/visitor to a resort casino "spends" across several sectors not just the gaming sector.

The following table presents information on the typical distribution of tourist/visitor spending, averaged among resort casino patrons in Las Vegas and the Mississippi Gulf Coast. Approximately 70% of the average visitor's budget to these two destinations is spent on non-gaming amenities.

	Average of	ł			
Average Daily	Las Vegas, NV and Guif Coast, MS				
Tourist / Visitor	\$	% of total			
Gaming / gambling	\$123	30%			
Lodging	98	24%			
Shopping	46	11%			
Food and drink	68	17%			
Transportation	41	10%			
Entertainment	28	7%			
Total	\$403	100%			

Table 2 – Typical Spending Distribution among Resort Casino Tourists/Visitors

From the information in the preceding Table 2, the typical resort/casino patron spent slightly under \$125/day on gaming and gambling, representing 30% of their daily expenditures. Another \$45/day was spent on shopping and nearly \$70/day on food and drink, with \$30/day on other entertainment. Some of this non-gaming/gambling spending will likely occur on-site at the resort casino; however, some likely will be captured by the numerous restaurants, stores, and entertainment venues in downtown Boston, Everett, and the neighboring communities.

The distribution of the non-gaming/gambling spending, by community, would be speculative at best, and more so for a specific destination. However, using Assembly Row/Square as an indicative example, given its proximity to the proposed resort casino, it is reasonable to assume that some spill over will occur at local retail establishments. The RKG analysis conservatively estimates that approximately 1.0%-3.0% could occur at Assembly Row/Square, indicating incremental sales potential of \$3.0+ million annually at this specific location from resort casino tourists/visitors.

4. Impact on Housing

Because it is believed that most of the employees at the Wynn Resort Casino will be drawn from Everett, the neighboring communities and the greater Boston metro area, there will be little measurable impact on housing markets. However, the increase in direct and indirect incomes and expenditures will contribute positively to the overall economy of the Commonwealth and the housing sector in general.

5. City-Municipal Services

The Developer has agreed to fund \$5 million per year as an impact fee to the City of Everett to mitigate any additional municipal services costs associated with the new resort casino. It should be noted that large scale projects largely impact the host city for municipal services. In RKG's opinion, the actual additional costs that the City will incur will be closer to \$2.5 - \$3.5 million. The resort casino will utilize its state of the art construction, in house security systems along with a large security team to offset some portion of the additional municipal services. The ability for the City of Everett to fund the costs with guaranteed payments from the Developer is rare and a significant benefit to this project and the neighboring communities.

Appendix:

Everett, Adjacent Community, and Boston Labor Demographics

	5	Surrounding		Metro
	Everett	Area [2]		
Population 16 years				
and over	33,087	232,141	518,562	2,934,154
Civilian labor force	23,747	164,523	355,317	2,021,514
Employed	21,289	150,435	319,146	1,868,765
Unemployed	2,458	14,088	36,171	152,749
% Unemployed	10.4%	8.6%	10.2%	7.6%
Not in labor force	9,326	67,413	162,835	909,853
% not in labor force	28.2%	29.0%	31.4%	31.0%
Armed Forces	14	205	410	2,787
[1] includes Malden; Medfo	ord; Somerville	e; Chelsea & Re	vere	
[2] Essex; Middlesex; Norfo	lk & Suffolk Co	unties		
Source: American Communi	ty Survey (2007	-2011) & RKG A	ssociates. I	nc.

Table 3 – Everett & Comparative Areas: Labor Force Statistics (2010)

Table 4 – Everett: Worker in Res	idence and Places of Work (2010)
----------------------------------	----------------------------------

WORKE	RS IN I	RESIDENCES & GEO OF W	HERE W	ORKS	JOBS IN	PLACE	& GEO FROM WHERE W	ORKERS RE	SIDES
Workers in Residence	#	Workplace of Everett Workers in Residence	#	% of Residence	Local Jobs in	#	Jobs in Everett Held by Workers from	#	% of Job
Everett 2	21,195	Everett	3,090	14.6%	Everett	13,230	Everett	3,090	23.4%
		Boston	5,849	27.6%	1	Il Jobs in # by Workers from # % rett 13,230 Everett 3,090 Fett 13,230 Everett 3,090 Chelsea 539 Revere 818 Malden 946 Medford 513 Somerville 521 Everett Surr. Cities 4,645 Essex County 1,934 Rest of Middlesex Co. 2,182	9.9%		
	1	Chelsea	611	2.9%			Chelsea	539	4.1%
		Revere	434	2.0%			Revere	818	6.2%
		Malden	1,442	6.8%			Malden	946	7.2%
		Medford	896	4.2%			Medford	513	3.9%
		Somerville	702	3.3%	50 T		Somerville	521	3.9%
		Everett Surr. Cities	9,934	46.9%			Everett Surr. Cities	4,645	35.1%
		Essex County	1,216	5.7%			Essex County	1,934	14.6%
		Rest of Middlesex Co.	5,406	25.5%			Rest of Middlesex Co.	2, 182	16.5%
		Norfolk County	739	3.5%			Norfolk County	407	3.1%
		Rest of Suffolk Co.	323	1.5%			Rest of Suffolk Co.	125	0.9%
	- 03	Rest of Boston Metro	7,684	36.3%			Rest of Boston Metro	4,648	35.1%
		Total	20,708	97.7%			Total	12,383	93.6%

	Everett			Surround	ing Cities	[1]	City of Boston		
2.10	Workers in	Jobs in	Diff-	Workers in	Jobs in	Diff-	Workers in	Jobs in	Diff
Industry Sector	Residence	Place	erence	Residence	Place	erence	Residence	Place	erence
Construction	1,821	1,048	(773)	8,373	5,293	(3,080)	10,240	24,668	14,428
Manufacturing	1,859	734	(1,125)	10,406	5,749	(4,657)	14,432	17,480	3,048
Wholesale trade	438	1,197	759	3,920	3,368	(552)	5,103	7,436	2,333
Retail trade	1,836	1,943	107	14,719	9,174	(5,545)	27,170	32,057	4,887
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities	1,206	756	(450)	5,637	5,164	(473)	9,983	23,036	13,053
Information	220	24	(196)	3,776	2,021	(1,755)	8,902	15,912	7,010
Finance and insurance, and real estate and rental and leasing	1,606	1,868	262	10,570	5,162	(5,408)	31,035	79,907	48,872
Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste management services	2,634	727	(1,907)	23,493	7,707	(15,786)	48,334	88,602	40,268
Educational services, and health care and social assistance	4,174	2,554	(1,620)	38,853	26,033	(12,820)	98,317	161,811	63,494
Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services	2,678	1,279	(1,399)	15,701	5,861	(9,840)	35,845	47,884	12,039
Other services, except public administration	1,927	959	(968)	8,835	5,868	(2,967)	14,871	21,311	6,440
Public administration	881	313	(568)	5,761	5,109	(652)	14,484	33,758	19,274
Total	21,280	13,402	(7,878)	150,044	86,509	(63,535)	318,716	553,862	235,146

Table 5 – Everett & Comparative Geographies: Comparison of Workers in Residence & Jobs in Place Employment by Industry

7







MEMORANDUM

To:	Mr. Lionel J. Lucien, P.E. Manager, Public/Private Development Unit MassDOT Highway Division	Date: October 30, 2013
From:	Keri Pyke, HSH Associates Elizabeth Peart, HSH Associates Jeffrey Dirk, Vanasse & Associates, Inc.	HSH Project No.: 2012206
Subject:	Trip Generation Calculations Wynn Everett Resort - Broadway (Route 99) Everett, Massachusetts	

Overview

Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates (HSH) and Vanasse & Associates, Inc. (VAI) and have prepared updated trip generation for the Wynn Everett resort (Project) to be located off Broadway (Route 99) in Everett, Massachusetts.

Since submission of the two earlier memos on trip generation¹, the trip generation process has been broadened beyond vehicle trips to now include overall person trip estimates and trips for other travel modes, including public transportation, water transportation, walk/bicycle, tour buses, and employee shuttles from remote parking facilities.

This memo is organized into the following sections:

- Project Description
- Trip Generation Methodology
- ▶ Trip Generation Rates
 - Non-Gaming Land Uses
 - Gaming Land Uses
- Trip Generation Characteristics
 - Time Periods (including traffic flow profile)
 - Internal Capture Rates
 - Pass-By Trip Rates
- Travel Mode Shares
 - Automobile
 - Public Transportation
 - Tour Buses
 - Walk/Bicycle
 - Neighborhood Employee Shuttle
- Summary

¹ Jeffrey S. Dirk, VAI, to Lionel Lucien, MassDOT, July 25, 2013 and revised August 2, 2013, "Trip Generation Calculations, Wynn Everett Resort – Broadway (Route 99), Everett, Massachusetts"

Project Description

Wynn Everett will be a casino and resort project located on about 32 acres of undeveloped land between the Mystic River, Broadway (Route 99), and the MBTA Commuter Rail tracks.

The Project will include the following major elements:

- Hotel 500 rooms,
- Retail shops and restaurants 108,095 sf (exclusive of gaming-related retail and restaurant space);
- Night clubs/lounges 17,096 sf,
- Casino area 3,972 gaming positions (3,072 slot machines and 900 seats at 150 gaming tables) and ancillary retail shops/restaurants within 170,000 sf.

An on-site parking garage with about 2,900 spaces will serve hotel guests, casino patrons, and visitors to the retail shops, restaurants, and night clubs. Most employees will be required to park off-site and ride a shuttle bus to the Project site. The Proponent plans to lease spaces in approximately three off-site parking facilities, potentially located in Malden, Medford, and Everett. Primary vehicular access will be provided at a new signalized intersection on Broadway (Route 99.

The Project will also have a water taxi/shuttle dock serving as a new stop for water transportation routes. The initial plan is to provide service with stops in Downtown and South Boston, with expansion as demand increases. Additionally, the Project will incorporate new outdoor amenities including an extension of the Mystic River Walk and parklands, and pedestrian and bicycle connections between the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) Mystic River Reservation and Lower Broadway.

Trip Generation Methodology

Time Periods

At gaming casinos, trip activity varies by month, day of week, and time of day. Based on available gaming data², visitation is typically highest on Fridays and Saturdays. After a review of recent traffic volume data on Broadway (Route 99) near the site and hourly trip activity patterns at similar gaming facilities (discussed in more detail in the Gaming Land Uses section), it is estimated that the Project's peak periods of travel activity will occur on a Friday and Saturday after 7:00 p.m. and will not overlap with the typical commuter peak hours. However, the highest combination of Project and roadway traffic is expected to occur on Fridays between 4:00 – 6:00 p.m. and Saturdays between 3:00 – 5:00 p.m. See the Traffic Flow Profile section at the end of this memo.

For this study, trip generation data has been summarized for daily conditions on a typical Friday and Saturday and for one peak hour during the periods listed above.

² The review included data from the Casino de Montreal, data from the Casino St. Charles, and "Gaming Casino Traffic", Paul C. Box and William Bunte, Institute of Transportation Engineers, March 1998.

Trip Generation Rates

The trip generation for the Project is based on statistics published by ITE and empirical trip rates obtained from similar gaming facilities.

Non-gaming Land Uses

Vehicle trip generation estimates for the Project's non-gaming components use rates derived from ITE's Trip Generation³ Manual. These ITE vehicle trip generation rates are used to estimate the number of "unadjusted" vehicle trips associated with the Project. Unadjusted trips reflect the expected number of trips if all trips are made by private automobile. In an urban setting like the Project site in Everett, however, these "unadjusted" vehicle trips need to be "adjusted" to account for other travel options such as public transportation, water transportation, walk/bicycle, tour buses, and employee shuttles from remote parking facilities. An interim step of applying internal capture rates and pass-by rates further refine the trip generation estimates to reflect the particular characteristics of the development program and building site. Travel mode shares and rates for internal capture and pass-by trips are discussed in later sections.

The following ITE land use codes (LUCs) were used to estimate the unadjusted vehicle trips for the Project:

- LUC 310 Hotel This land use code is defined as a place of lodging that provides sleeping accommodations and supporting facilities such as restaurants, cocktail lounges, meeting and banquet rooms, limited recreational facilities. Note that LUC 330 for Resort Hotel was also reviewed for this analysis. Because LUC 310 yields a higher number of trips per room, it was chosen to be most conservative (highest impact). Calculation of the number of vehicle trips uses ITE's average rate per room for Friday p.m. peak hour trips and fitted curve rate for other periods.
- LUC 820 Shopping Center A shopping center is an integrated group of commercial establishments that is planned, developed, owned, and managed as a unit. A shopping center's composition is related to its market area in terms of size, location, and type of store. Calculations of the number of trips use ITE's fitted curve rate average rate per 1,000 sf.
- LUC 925 Drinking Place A drinking place contains a bar, where alcoholic beverages and food are sold, and possibly some type of entertainment, such as music, television screens, video games, or pool tables. Calculation of the number of vehicle trips uses ITE's average rate per 1,000 sf for all time period periods.

Because patrons and employees will have different travel characteristics, particularly for the gaming component, the patron and employee trips are treated separately in the remaining steps of the trip generation process. Patrons will travel longer distances than employees and are more likely to drive. Most employees will live within a reasonable commuting distance and will use more public transportation services. By disaggregating total trips into patron/visitor trips and employee trips⁴, the appropriate mode share adjustments can be made to each group.

³ Trip Generation, 9th Edition; Institute of Transportation Engineers; Washington, DC; 2012

⁴ Disaggregation proportions were based on non-work and work person trip rates from Boston Transportation Department, *Transportation Access Plan Guidelines*, 1989, for hotel, retail, and night club/lounge land uses. Note that only the proportion of non-work vs. work was adopted and not the trip rates.

The unadjusted vehicle trips were converted to person trips based on average vehicle occupancy (AVO) rates. From the most recent survey⁵ of national vehicle occupancy rates, an AVO of 2.2 persons/auto was adopted for non-gaming patrons (social/recreational category), and an AVO of 1.13 persons/auto was adopted for employees (work category).

Gaming Land Uses

The trip characteristics of the gaming component of the Project (inclusive of gaming-related retail and restaurant space to be located within the casino) were developed using empirical trip rates obtained from similar gaming facilities located in urban markets. Initial screening data (including traffic volume and demographic (population) information) was obtained for the following facilities:

- Casino de Montreal Montreal, Quebec, Canada *
- Casino St. Charles St. Louis, Missouri
- Hollywood Casino Columbia, Ohio
- Resort World Casino at Aqueduct Queens, New York *
- Rivers Casino Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
- Sugarhouse Casino Philadelphia, Pennsylvania *

After review of data from all facilities, the three casinos identified above with an asterisk (*) were found to be most similar to the Project with respect to 1) market area and demographic base, 2) the number of gaming positions and resort amenities, and 3) proximity to available public transportation services.

Traffic volume data was collected at these selected facilities on a Friday and Saturday in June 2012 and April, May, June, or July 2013, along with resort information (i.e., number of gaming positions/tables and resort amenities provided) for each respective site.

It should be noted that each of the sites that were surveyed included gaming-related retail and restaurant space located within the casino, and each had an off-site or separate hotel. As proposed, the Project will include 3,072 slot machines and 150 gaming tables, each of which will provide an average of six gaming positions, resulting in a total of 3,972 gaming positions (3,072 slot machines with one gaming position each + 150 gaming tables x 6 gaming positions each = 3,972 gaming positions).

Daily and peak hour vehicle trips rates were developed based on trip rates derived from traffic counts conducted at the Casino de Montreal over a continuous 24-hour period on both a Friday and Saturday in July 2013. To estimate the traffic characteristics of the Project's gaming component, the empirical trip rates were applied to 3,972 gaming positions.

From this data, the peak-hour and associated traffic volume on a Friday and Saturday were identified for each facility and normalized to a number of unadjusted vehicle trips (patron and employees) per gaming position. The detailed traffic count data and calculated trips rates for each of the selected sites are shown in Table 1.

⁵ "Summary of Travel Trends: Summary of 2009 National Household Travel Survey", Federal Highway Administration, June 2011.

			Vehicle Trip Characteristics							
Location	Gaming Positions ^a		Direction		day Hour Trips per position	lour Peak Hou Trips T per I		Gaming Area (sf)	Public Transit Services	On Site Hotel?
Sugarhouse Casino Philadelphia, PA	Slots <u>Tables^b</u> Total	1,602 <u>354</u> 1,956	In <u>Out</u> Total	422 <u>415</u> 837	0.22 <u>0.21</u> 0.43	480 <u>592</u> 1,072	0.25 <u>0.30</u> 0.55	45,000°	Subway	No
Casino de Montreal Montreal, QC, Canada	Slots <u>Tables</u> Total	3,000 <u>714</u> 3,714	In <u>Out</u> Total	511 <u>513</u> 1,024	0.14 <u>0.14</u> 0.28	514 <u>680</u> 1,194	0.14 <u>0.18</u> 0.32	526,830ª	Subway/ Bus	No
Resorts World Casino at Aqueduct New York, NY	Slots <u>Tables</u> ^b Total	4,525 <u>475</u> 5,000	In <u>Out</u> Total	659 <u>835</u> 1,494	0.13 <u>0.17</u> 0.30	825 <u>817</u> 1,642	0.17 <u>0.16</u> 0.33	763,000ª	Subway/ Bus ^e	No
Wynn Everett Everett, MA	Slots <u>Tables</u> Total	3,072 _ <u>900</u> 3,972	In <u>Out</u> Total	559 <u>597</u> 1,156	0.14 <u>0.15</u> 0.29	616 <u>597</u> 1,268	0.16 <u>0.17</u> 0.33	197,322 ^ª	Bust	Yes ^g

Table 1. Comparison of Selected Gaming Facilities

^eAssumes six gaming positions per gaming table.

^bElectronic gaming tables (i.e., one gaming position per table).

Gaming hall only

^dIncludes gaming hall, casino-related entertainment and retail uses.

"Includes three subway lines and four bus routes.

Includes eight bus routes.

⁹Hotel trips to be calculated separately.
The Sugarhouse Casino rates were eliminated from the comparison because 1) the resulting trip rates at the Sugarhouse Casino are significantly higher than those shown for Casino de Montreal or Resort World Casino at Aqueduct and 2) the number of gaming positions and gaming area at Sugarhouse Casino are significantly smaller than others surveyed. The average of vehicle trip rates from the Casino de Montreal and Aqueduct were adopted for the Wynn Everett site and converted into associated person trip rates by using mode share observations at Casino de Montreal.⁶

The gaming trips have been disaggregated into patrons and employees by data observations at Mohegan Sun in Uncasville, CT.⁷ Only the proportion of patron trips to employee trips was adopted, not the trip rates. Based on this data, about 8% of daily Project gaming trips will be made by employees. During the Friday and Saturday peak hours, employee trips will represent about 4% and 7% of all gaming trips, respectively.

By disaggregating trips into patron and employee components, the appropriate mode share adjustments can be made to each group.

Similar to the non-gaming land uses, the number of unadjusted vehicle trips for gaming trips was converted to person trips based on average vehicle occupancy (AVO) rates. Based on the most recent survey of national vehicle occupancy rates, an AVO of 2.0⁸ persons/auto was adopted for gaming patrons and an AVO of 1.13 persons/auto was adopted for gaming employees.

Internal Capture Rates

The standard trip generation procedure includes estimation of trips for each individual land use. When large projects have a mix of uses at one site, however, the interaction between land uses is estimated by "internal trips". An example of an internal trip is a hotel guest who also visits the on-site gaming, retail shops, restaurants, or nightclubs.

For this Project, the highest internal trip activity will occur between the hotel and the gaming components. The hotel is an integral element of the resort, and it will generally not compete with the numerous other hotels located in and near downtown Boston, which serve other business and tourist markets. It is anticipated that many hotel guests at the Project will stay on-site once they arrive, but some are expected to travel to other Boston-area destinations. This aspect of trip making activity is incorporated into the trip generation process by adopting a 75% internal trip capture rate for hotel guests.

For the retail, restaurant, and nightclub components, a 20% internal trip capture rate was adopted for patrons, reflecting the fact these uses will attract many customers who will not visit the gaming component.

⁶ After incorporating the specific trip generation characteristics and travel mode shares for the Everett site as presented in later sections of this memo, the resulting revised vehicle trip rates for the Project's gaming facility are generally unchanged from those shown in Table 1, with 0.29 vehicle trips/position during the Friday peak hour and 0.32 vehicle trips/position during the Saturday peak hour. The slight difference for the Saturday peak is due to the specific travel mode share assumptions for the Everett site.

⁷ Draft Environmental Impact Statement - Proposed Mashpee Wampanoag Initial Reservation and Resort Casino, October 17, 2008, p. 7-70.

⁸ Scott Thornton, VAI, to John Thomas, Beals and Thomas, October 4, 2012, "DEIR Traffic Component – Mohegan Sun at Palmer, Palmer Massachusetts". p 17.

An internal capture rate was not applied to 1) gaming component trips, because casino patrons are the primary trip generator of the Project or 2) any Project employee trips, because workers travel to only one job and not multiple on-site destinations.

Pass-by Rates

Pass-by trips have been accounted for in the trip generation process. A pass-by factor accounts for people that are already travelling on Broadway (Route 99) who will stop at the Project and then continue onto another destination. For this Project, only a portion of patron trips generated by the retail and restaurant components are designated as pass-by trips.

Based on ITE research, about 34% of traffic generated at retail centers with restaurants can be classified as pass-by trips. To ensure a conservative (higher impact) assessment, and given that the Project's commercial establishments will not directly abut Broadway (Route 99), a lower pass-by trip rate of 10% was adopted for the retail, restaurant, and nightclub components.

Pass-by rates were not applied to the gaming component patron trips or any Project employee trips.

Travel Mode Shares

For this study, trip generation data has been summarized for daily conditions on a typical Friday and Saturday and for one peak hour on Friday afternoon between 4:00 – 6:00 p.m. and on Saturday afternoon between 3:00 – 4:00 p.m.

Autos and Taxis

Patrons and employees not assigned to one of the travel modes discussed below will drive. Patrons will park on site and most employees will drive to off-site parking facilities and travel via employee shuttle bus to the Project. Limited employee parking will be provided on-site.

A portion of patrons will arrive via taxi. Based on vehicle type observations at the Aqueduct casino in July 2013, taxis comprise 14% of the auto/taxi volume totals. For this study, it has been assumed that 10% of auto/taxi group is taxis and 90% is autos.

After accounting for other travel modes, 69% of patrons will drive and 8% will arrive via taxi. A lower proportion of employees, 44%, will drive to the off-site parking facilities.

Public Transportation

Buses and Subway

The Project site offers opportunities to take advantage of nearby MBTA public transportation services, including bus routes along Broadway (Route 99) and the Orange Line at Wellington, Sullivan Square, and Malden Center stations. Convenient connections to the Orange Line from all other MBTA subway lines can be made at various downtown stations, including Downtown Crossing (Red Line and Silver Line), Haymarket (Green Line), North Station (Green Line), and State (Blue Line).

<u>Patrons</u> – While a small number of local patrons may travel via existing MBTA bus routes to the Project site, for trip generation purposes it has been assumed that 0% of patrons will use buses. Some patrons from the larger Boston metropolitan area, however, will travel to the Project via the

MBTA's extensive subway and commuter rail network. According to the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission (MAPC)⁹, 7.3% of all person trips in the Boston area are made via public transportation. The Proponent will provide shuttle service (for patrons and employees) between the Project site and nearby Orange Line stations, potentially including Sullivan Square, Wellington, and Malden Center. The final shuttle routes will be determined through on-going discussions with MBTA. Service may be expanded to include Logan International Airport, North Station, South Station and other major transportation hubs and will be coordinated with the MBTA. Given the Project's proximity to the Orange Line, and the plan for frequent casino shuttle service from Sullivan Square and Wellington stations, it is estimated that 10% of patron trips will use the Orange Line.

<u>Employees</u> – A much higher proportion of employees than patrons will use transit because most employees will be local residents and very limited employee parking will be available on-site. After review of the Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) journey to work data¹⁰ for Everett (host community with preferential employment), adjacent communities, and the wider Boston region, it is estimated the 30% of employees will use public transportation. This total has been further disaggregated into 20% to the Orange Line and 10% to local MBTA bus routes. Employees will travel between the nearby Orange Line stations and the site via the shuttle described previously, under "Patrons." The Proponent will enhance MBTA bus stops on Broadway (Route 99) near the site entrance, which serve MBTA routes 104, 105, and 109. Employees who live in local neighborhoods can also ride the employee shuttle bus operating between off-site parking facilities and the Project site. The shuttle system and operating characteristics are still conceptual, but the study team anticipates that 20% of employees will use the shuttle, and 15-minute headways (four buses/hour) would provide an appropriate level of service.

Commuter Rail

The patrons and employees who will make the necessary transfers from existing commuter rail hubs at North Station or South Station to the Orange Line have been included in the estimate of public transportation trips. While the Proponent will assist the City of Everett in facilitating the location of a potential future flag-stop for a new commuter rail station on the Newburyport/Rockport line, which runs along the western edge of the Project site, for trip generation purposes no trips have been assigned to this potential future service.

Water Transportation

The Proponent will institute frequent, passenger water transport service between the Project site and key Boston Harbor landing sites. The initial plan is to provide service with stops in Downtown and South Boston, with expansion as demand increases. While a feasibility study of water transportation has been conducted for this Project, including proposed boat capacities and service frequency, a full market study of ridership is not yet complete. It has been assumed that boats will operate with an average of 20% occupancy and that 3% of patrons and employees will use water transportation to the site.

Tour Bus

 ⁹ Boston Metropolitan Long Range Plan, Metropolitan Area Planning Council, September 2011.
¹⁰ Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS), 2010 Demographic Profile of Massachusetts Towns <u>www.ctps.org/datacatalog_share/content/boston-region-mpo-2010-census-demographic-profile</u> (accessed September 4, 2013)

From the July 2013 vehicle counts at Casino de Montreal, about 138 tour buses arrived at the casino per day on both Friday and Saturday. Observations at Mohegan Sun in Uncasville, CT, indicate that 80 to 120 tour buses arrive per day, serving about 12% of patrons, a rate also adopted for the Mohegan Sun at Palmer¹¹.

After reviewing these observations, it has been assumed that 10% of Project patrons will arrive via tour bus. Assuming 20 passengers per bus (although capacity will be higher), 83 tour buses are estimated to arrive on Friday and 97 on Saturday. No employees will use tour buses.

Walk/Bicycle

No patrons are assumed to walk/bicycle to the Project. Recent journey to work data for Everett residents indicates that 4.5% currently walk/bicycle to work. While a concentration of employees will be from Everett and able to walk/bicycle to the Project site, many employees will live further from the site and not be able to easily walk or bicycle to work. To reflect these characteristics, a walk/bicycle mode share of 3% was applied to Project employee trips.

Summary

Table 2 shows a summary of travel mode shares for patrons and employees.

Travel Mode	Patrons	Employees
Automobiles Park on site	69%	0%
Taxi <u>Park remotely (connect to employee shuttle)</u> Total	8% <u>0%</u> 77%	
Public Transportation Orange Line (connect to transit shuttle) Local Bus <u>Water Transportation</u> Total	10% 0% <u>3%</u> 13%	20% 10% <u>3%</u> 33%
Employee Shuttle Bus ¹	0%	20%1)
Tour Bus	10%	0%
Walk/Bicycle	0%	3%
Total	100%	100%

Table 2. Travel Mode Shares

 The employee shuttle bus will operate between off-site employee parking facilities and the Project, with local neighborhood stops along the route. In total, 44% of employees are forecasted to park remotely and ride the shuttle and 20% of employees are expected to board/alight at neighborhood stops.

¹¹ Scott Thornton, VAI, to John Thomas, Beals and Thomas, October 4, 2012, "DEIR Traffic Component – Mohegan Sun at Palmer, Palmer Massachusetts". p 18.

Using the person trip estimates for each time period and the travel mode shares from Table 2, an estimate of trips per mode are summarized in Table 3 and Table 4, for daily and peak hour conditions, respectively.

Table 3. Daily Trips

	्य अत् ज्याः भ	Autos/ Taxis	Transit Shuttles	Tour Buses	Employee Shuttles	Total Vehicles	Transit	Walk/ Bicycle
		Vehicle trips	Vehicle trips	Vehicle trips	Vehicle trips	Vehicle trips	Person trips	Person inps
				Fride	yc			
Patrons	In <u>Out</u> Total	8,576 <u>8,576</u> 17,512	Shared Use	83 <u>83</u> 166			3,017 <u>3,017</u> 6,033	-
Employe	es In <u>Out</u> Total	1,361 <u>1,361</u> 2,722	Snarea Use		288 <u>288</u> 576		1,153 <u>1,153</u> 2,306	105 <u>105</u> 210
Total	In <u>Out</u> Total	10,117 <u>10,117</u> 20,234	288 <u>288</u> 576	83 <u>83</u> 166	288 <u>288</u> 576	10,776 <u>10,776</u> 21,552	4,169 <u>4,169</u> 8,338	105 <u>105</u> 210
				Satu	urday			
Patrons	In <u>Out</u> Total	10,415 <u>10,415</u> 20,830	Shared Use	97 <u>97</u> 194	2		3,594 <u>3,594</u> 7,188	•
Employe	es In <u>Out</u> Total	1,640 <u>1,640</u> 3,280	Snarea Use	2	288 <u>288</u> 576		1,387 <u>1,387</u> 2,778	126 <u>126</u> 252
Total	In <u>Out</u> Total	12,055 <u>12,055</u> 24,110	288 <u>288</u> 576	97 <u>97</u> 194	288 <u>288</u> 576	12,728 <u>12,728</u> 24,110	4,982 <u>4,982</u> 9,964	126 <u>126</u> 252

Table 4. Peak Hour Trips

		Autos/ Taxis	Transit Shuttles	Tour Buses	Employee Shuttles	Total Vehicles	Transit	Walk/ Bicycle
		Vehicle trips	Vehicle trips	Vehicle trips	Vehicle trips	Vehicle trips	Person Inps	Person trips
				Fride	у			
Patrons	In <u>Out</u> Total	732 <u>690</u> 1,422	Shared Use	7 <u>7</u> 14	2		252 <u>237</u> 489	*
Employee	es In <u>Out</u> Total	108 <u>151</u> 200	Snarea Use	2 10 11	12 <u>12</u> 24		90 <u>126</u> 216	8 <u>11</u> 19
Total	In <u>Out</u> Total	840 <u>841</u> 1,681	12 <u>12</u> 24	7 <u>7</u> 14	12 <u>12</u> 24	871 <u>872</u> 1,743	342 <u>363</u> 705	8 <u>11</u> 19
				Satu	urday			
Patrons	In <u>Out</u> Total	866 <u>822</u> 1,688	Shared Use	8 <u>8</u> 16			299 <u>283</u> 632	
Employe		130 <u>159</u> 289	Snarea Use	-	12 <u>12</u> 24		109 <u>133</u> 242	10 <u>12</u> 22
Total	In <u>Out</u> Total	966 <u>981</u> 1,977	12 <u>12</u> 24	8 <u>8</u> 16	12 <u>12</u> 24	1,028 <u>1,013</u> 2,122	408 <u>416</u> 824	10 <u>12</u> 22

The detailed trip generation calculations and resulting trips are attached to this memo.

Traffic Flow Profile

To help define the peak traffic flow condition to be assessed for the Project, automatic traffic recorder (ATR) counts were conducted on Broadway (Route 99) in June 2013 on a typical Friday and Saturday. A traffic flow profile was developed for Project patron trips using temporal data obtained from the Casino de Montreal.

To estimate the hourly distribution pattern of future volumes on Broadway (Route 99), the existing volumes were added to the forecasted Project volumes. The resulting distribution is shown in the graphs attached to this memo. The brown bars in the graphs represent the respective peak hours on Broadway (Route 99) and for the Project. For Build conditions analysis, the peak hour volume will include the sum of both peaks even though these do not occur simultaneously. This approach to establishing the peak hour volumes will result in a conservative (highest impact) analysis condition as the actual peak-hour of the Project is expected to occur after the traditional commuter peak-hour and most likely after 7:00 p.m. on both a weekday and weekend.

Summary

Upon concurrence by MassDOT with the trip-generation methodology and establishment of design hour conditions, HSH/VAI will prepare supporting information and calculations in order to substantiate the tripdistribution pattern for Project-related traffic and the establishment of the study area to be assessed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

cc:

- M. Maddox Wynn Resorts, LTD (via email)
- J. Errickson City of Everett Department of Planning and Development (via email)
- J. Fitzgerald World Tech Engineering (via email)

C. Gordon (via email)

D. Gaquin, Esquire – Mintz Levin (via email)

J. Fay - Fort Point Associates, Inc. (via email)

ROUTE 99 24-HOUR ROADWAY TRAFFIC VOLUMES WITH CASINO PEAK-HOUR ON ROADWAY PEAK-HOUR PROFILES

Route 99, south of Dexter Street Hourly Traffic Volumes with Project-Generated Trips Average Friday



Start Time

Route 99, south of Dexter Street Hourly Traffic Volumes with Project-Generated Trips Average Saturday



Start Time

EMPIRICAL DATA

Comptages

Casino of Montréal

Date: Friday, July 19, 2013 Jour: vendredi



TOTAL Véhicules, Piétons et Cyclistes

		-	-
	Total	al	Gra To
		-	2
- 8		10	-
		-	1
			1
			1
	1	19	1
1			1
1		100	2
1		10	2
1		1	1
		-	2
		- 12	-
	-	- 10	2
1	1		2
1	-	1	2
	-	- 1	2
1	-	- 17	2
100	-	- 10	1
100		- 10	1
1	-	-	1 2
1	-		-
	-		- 2
1	+	25	1
1	1	1	-
1 3	-	1	
0	0	0	5
0	0	0	0 0

								٤.	iom	pta	ge	2)	ſ	;	11	, I	6
-	-	-	-		_		-		1			o of	Мо	ntr	éal							· · · · · · ·	+ - F		- 6 - 4 5
	Daths Jour		iny, Judy Idreck	19. 2013																	1	10	► 1 →	ŧr.⇒	
-					-					Ŧ		e ge		ate							L	٦,		1	\Box
	-		Malne	Allanta	-	_	-	-	Main	anitrance	_	C ye	illei	all		parking	-	-	-		Office	parking	-	-	-
Période	-		1	1	1¢		-		T	3	1	1			1	1		1	1	-	1	i.			Gastiff Intel
-	ð	Z		Chines	City and	Tussi	ð	104	-	Chanter D	145	Telai	ð	2	-	-	City te	Tribil	ð	2	Alinea		16	Tobal	Autom
de	.56	6	•	1	-	-	-		1	1	-	H	-				-			_	-				160
215 0:30 230 0:45	33	15	2	2	_	34	85	10	2	2	-	195 197	-			-	-	1	-	_	_		-	1	143
1.00 1.16	20 21 31	7	1	1 2		31 36 38	#5 72 78	2 10	1	1 2	1	66 76 87	-			-	-				_	-			106
130 145 145 200	N 24	7	1	1 2		11	70	7 10	1	1		73	-			-		1000				-	-	1	105
200 2.16	15	4	-	1	_	20	67 76	3	-	1		71	-	_	-	-	-		-				-	1	91
230 245	12	1	-	1	_	23	67	12	1	1		71	_		_	_			-	-				100	94 80
2.00 315 315 3.30	11	2	1	2	-	14	6.) 38	6	1	1		- 11	-			-				120					87 67
3 30 345	11	7	-	2	-	22	67	12	-	1 2	-	70 50					-	1000		-				1	92
4 00 4 15	1	1	•	1	-	17 13	35	7	1	1	-	43 40	-			-	-			-	-			1-21	60 55
4.30 4.45	10	1	4	2	-	10	30 37	4	1	1		29			100		-	1222					1		50
5.00 5.15	17	1	1	2		18.	28	2	1	1		32	-	-	-					-	2		-	2	50
530 545 545 000	35	1	1	1 2		30 30 28	35 25 33	3	1	2		38	-								_		-	1182	65 70 71
6.00 8.15	25 18	4	2	1		26 15 14	39	4	1	2		40	-	-	_			10.00		-					71
8 30 8 45 6:45 700 7.00 7.15	15 20	1	1	2	-	30	21	3	2	2		23	-	_	_					-		-		1	58
7:15 7:30	23	4	2	1		30	18		2	1	1	12	-		1.4		-	1		-			-	1007	52
7:45 8:00	17	1	1	1	-	20	1	1	1	2		14	-	_	-			1000	-	-	-	1			34
8:15 8:30 8:30 8:45	43	1	-	+	-	14	8	-	1	1	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	100	-	-	-	-			19
5.45 9-00 9.00 9.15	77	1	1	2	-	33	14	1	1	2	-	18	-	-	-		-	They are	-	-			-	4210	51 55
9 14 9 20 9 20 9 45	35	2	2	2	-	41	13	2	1 2	2	-	10			-	-						-	-		59 93
0 45 10 00	10	2	1	1		60 54	21	5	1	2	-	2						A.C.		-			1		84 76
10.15 10.30	.61	1	1	7		44	15 30	2	1	2	1.00	27	-	1.1	-		-	1000					-		96
10.45 11:00	85 64	1	1 2	2	-	78	26	1 2	1	2	52	28			-			1212						12	93
11:30 11:45	54 71	-	1	2		61 78	34 29	4	1 2	2	-	41			-			123	-	-	1				104
11.45 12.00	50	1	1	1	-	74	33	2	1 2	1	2	N			-			100		-	1	-	-	1.00	114 107 120
12.15 12:30 12:30 12:45		2	2	2	-	#0 71	32	2	1	2		40		-				101/		-	-	-		Comet.	112
12.46 13.00	72	1	-	1	1	141 779	48	2	2	1	1	54 43 53			-			1						1	122
13:15 13:30	62	6	2	2	_	97 91 98	52	1	1 1	2		37			_			ATT DE						1000	150
13:45 14:00 14:00 14:35 14:15 14:30	75	5	+	1 2	-	61. 77	**	1	1	1		4			-						1		-		131
14 30 18 45	114	5	2	2	-	122	89	5	1	+	1.	13	-		-			60241	-	-	-	-	-	1000.1	201
16:00 15:15	60	4	1	3	-	540	67	-	1 2	1	1	76	-	-		-	-	24.0			-		-	The state of	144
15:00 15:45	27	2	2	2		95 78		4	1 2	1		81	-	-	-			100	F		-			ALC: N	180
16:00 10:15 16:16 16:30	69 53	2	2	2		78	62	4	2	1		70						100						100	145
16:45 17:00	60 52	1	2	1 2	-	67 50	71	8	2	1	-	11			-			1					-		149
17.00 17.15 17:16 17:30	30	1	2	7	1	- 60/ - 67	50	1	1	1	-	64								-	-	-	-	234.4	151
17:30 17:45 17:45 18:00	83	5	2	2		80	n M	1	1	1	-	78	-							=	-	-	-		169 157 157
18:00 18.15 18:15 18:30	84	10	2		7	4.0	61 53	1	1	1	1	- H	10					1000	E		-	-	-		170
18:45 19:00 19:00 19:15	101	2 15	1	1 1 2	-	121	76 64 73	17	1	1	1,	74		-	-	-	-	123			-		-	222	195
19:15 10:20 19:15 10:20 19:20 19:45	132	7	1 2	1	1	141	71	11	1 2	- 2	-	85		-	-	-	-	1	-	F	-		-	2.51	227
19:45 20:00	102	12	1	2	1	112	75	10	1 2	2	1	11		F	-		-	100			_	-	-		207
20.15 20.30	108	6	2	1	1	118	79	1	1	2	-	P1 78		-	-	-	-	122.55	F			-		100	200
20.45 21:00	134	11	1			143	13 43	4	1	3	1	81 103			-	-	-	1	F	-	-				230
21 15 2130	174	10	1	2		127	80	13	2	1	-	105		E	-	-	-		F		-	-	-	100	232
7145 22-00 22:00 22:15	107	13	1 2	2	2	139	\$9 101	10	1 2	1		117			-		-		-			1	-	100.0	232
22 15 22 30 72 30 22 45	107	17	1	- 2		117	125		1 2	2	-	180		E	-			ACT AT	-		-	1		100	259
22 45 22 40 23 10 23 15	13	5	1 2	2	1	H	93 108	7	2	2	,	117		-	-						-	-	-	12	197
23 15 73 30 23 20 23 45	#	7	1	2	-	106	126	5	2	1		156						038	-		-		-		252
TOTAL		14	2 121	1 137	17	82	125		2 122	1 139	16	8113	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1257

Comptages

Casino of Montréal



Date: Saturday, July 20, 2013 Jour: samedi

TOTAL Véhicules, Piétons et Cyclistes

-	T		N	lain entra	ance	_					ntrance					Other	parking						parking Out			1
Péri	ode F			in Sing	Bus				1	sud	ST CO	bus				pus	Bus	bus			g	ree bus	r Bus	bus	Total	Grand
_		Car	Taxi	Employee	Charter E	City bus	Total	Car	Taxf	Employee	Charter	City b	Total	Car	Taxl	Employee	Charter	City b	Totai	Car	Taxi	Employee	Charter	City bus	TOTAL	Total
de	à		-	μ μ	-			-	-	-	-		10	-	-	-	-	-			1		(C)			23
0:00	1:00	241	46	10	3	1	13	497	55	5	5		-	-	-	-			_			1000	1. S.			21
1:00	2:00	117	22	3	5	1	8	453	38	7	6		13	-	-	-				-	-	-			-	20
2:00	3:00	87	55	3	5		8	389	64	6	6		12		-	-				-	-	-		-	-	26
3:00	4:00	76	43		4		4	262	51	15	7		22					-			-		-			
4:00	5:00	43	28	2	5		7	146	33	10	5		15				1 11									22
5:00	6:00	50	17	3	4	10.00	7	105	18	5	4		9				1			-		1	1			16
		72	11	4	6		10	120	12		6	1	6		1.00					1	$\Gamma = 2$				1.7.1.7	16
6:00	7:00				-		11	99	7		6		6	1000		(17.7.7									<u>1</u> 12	17
7:00	8:00	72	8	5	6	1	-		-		6	-	6		-										1	16
8:00	9:00	107	3	4	6		10	63	6		-		-		-			-								14
9:00	10:00	196	4	4	5		9	82	8		5		5		-		-		-	1.00		-	-	-	1.	16
10:00	11:00	246	7	4	6		10	84	7		6	-	6	-			-	1	-					-	10000	18
11:00	12:00	301	13	4	6	1	11	134	15		6	1	7						-	-	-		-	-	-	18
12:00	13:00	355	30	5	6	1	12	165	19		6		6	-											+	18
13:00	14:00	424	30	6	5		11	209	36		6	1	7		-				-	-			1	t	1	13
14:00	15:00	492	28	5	3	1	9	289	24		3	1	4						1				1	1	1	19
15:00	16:00	436	24	7	6		13	260	25	-	6 6	2	8		-			-	1-		1		1	1	1	23
16:00	17:00	495	47	6	7	2	15	334 329	39 40	-	8	1	9	3	-		-			3			1			25
17:00	18:00	385	27	7	8		16	329	37	-	4	1	5	6		-		-	1	6	1					20
18:00	19:00	343	37	7	7	1	15	277	37		4	2	6	8	273		1			7	3				1	19
19:00	20:00	169 276	40	8	5	2	14	283	38		5	2	7	6	1				T	7	18				1	21
20:00	21:00	337	40	7	9	1	17	348	40		8	1	9	6						6	97		-		1-	26
21:00	-	292	39	7	10	1	18	426	48		6	1	7	6	133				1	7	197		-		-	25
23:00		561	38	7	6	1	14	453	42		7	1	8	4					-	6	32	-	-	-	1	
_	DTAL	6173	687	125	136	14	275	6158	740	48	137	14	199	39	406	0	0	0	0	42	348	0	0	0	0	474

	Data Jour	Sah Miri	edi	ly 20 201	3			\$ -			ino	of l			,	parking						ר'		-
F	5	1	1	2	City bus	тиві	ð	1	-	and Bar	City bus	Total		8				Tutat	ADVANT OF	Ę	~		Total	Caread Solat Asting
8 015	77	16	3	6	0	17	110	17	1	ð	-	130	141		_	à	-	1	143	-		-	10281	222
045	63 54	9	2	2		75 H	139	12	1	1	-	154	-	_	_				-	-			100	204
1:15	40	12 E 7	2	-	-	43	121 128 114	14 10	+	1 7		134 140 123	-	-	_		_	1	-	_			- August	185
1,45	28	2	1	1		X	105	7	2	1	_	113	-	-	-	-			-	0	-			151
2:15	24	11	-	1		17	111	17	2	1		131	_	-					-			-	1-	168
245	20	11	2	1	-	33	13	12	1	1	_	07 101	-	_			_				-		1	129
3:15	11	12	-	1	-	27	56	5	3	2		70	-	-	1	-		100	-					97 131
3:45	22	1		2		H	66	15	6	1	-	14 70	-									-	200	122
4:15	11	10	1	1	-	29	49	12 12	3	1		85 59	-						-		-			94
445	10		1	2	-	-13	41	5	2	1	-	50 29		-			-	10	1	-	-	-	-	69
6/16 E 30	12		-	1	-	7	37	+	2	1	1	3				-		1	-	1	-		1	2 70 67
6.00	22	1	2		-	24	35	6	<u> </u>	1 2		43	1	-		-				-			2254	67 67 70
6:15	20 18	1		1		23					-	44	1	100	-	-	_				-		1900	53
6.45	16 18	1	1			21		1		1	-	29	-		1		_					-	0.00	55
7:15	21	1	1	2	-	23	25	1	-	2		33 28 38	-	3		-	-	1			-			56
7.45	17		1	2	-	290	19	1	-	2	-	22	-	_	_	-			1				- 100	42
8:15	15	-	-1	1		22 28	14		_	1	-	25		_	-		-			-			100	40
8.45 9:00	31	1	+	1	-	4	70	1	_	2	-	23	-	-		-	-			-	-		1.8	63
9.15 9.20 9.45	45 40 33	7			-	4	31	3	-	2	-	33		-	-	-		1		-		-		75
9.45 10.00 0 10:15	56	1	1	2		60		1	2	2	-	22	-	-		-		-		-			100 DA	82 78
	63	1	1	2		10	23	2	-	1	61. s	3		-		-		A COLOR	-			-	1	94 102
5 11:00	60	2	1	1		82	21	+		?		24	-		-			1					732	86 94
6 11:50	70	2	1	1	-	74		2		2	-	12			-		-	1.00	-			_	-	108
5 1200	17	4	1	2	-	H	41	7		2	1	81 53							-	-		-	So.cl.	145
5 1230	84 97	+	2	+		35	63	5		2	-	21 54	5	_	-	-	-	1	-			100	-	134
5 13.00	95 69	7	1	2	1	100	4	8		1	1	41 84	-		-			1.0	-		-			148 163 168
5 13:30 0 13:45	92 111	6	2	2		102		10	-	2	-	64 C3						1.54				-	-	101
5 14:00 14:15	122	7	1	1	-	131	61	5	-	2		64	-										100	195
8 14:30 10 14:45	110	8	1 2	1	1	127	N	1		T	1	76				1						-	-	212
15 15:00 X0 15:15	127	-	1	2		134	77	3	-	1 2	-	89 83 72									-		100	226
15 15:30 15:45	130	1	2	2		18	64	8		1 2		12				-		2.6.5	-			-	17	103
15 16.00	100	10	2	2	+	117	78	13		1	1	90 100		=			200	122				-	1000	260
15 16:30 10 16:45 15 17:00	124	# #	1 2	1	1	110	61	10		1		10 10	-	1		-	-	1		_				231
17 15	\$1 50	-	2	2	1	8	12	3		1		106		12			1	1	1		1		10.11	205
15 15:00	102	4	2	3	-	113	74	17		1	1	81 110					1	1	+	-	-	-	1	205
18.15	93 69	10	1	1	1	1.105	74		100	1	1	HZ H	1			-	1	1	2	1			2	191
10 18.45	1/ 94	16	2	2		126	95	15		2	1	196	1		-			1		1		-	11.1	219
10 19.15 15 19:30	P3 10	D 10	3	1	1		76	7	-	1	1	45	2	115	-		-	107	2	1			1	191 229 243
30 19.45 45 20:00	15	19	2	1	- 1	81	63	1	-	1	1	84 71	2					110	1	-			Lik	177
20 15 15 20 30	17 64	0	1	1 2	1	17	10	4		2	-	18	1	-	-	-	=	1		1		_	-	185
30 2045 45 21.00	61		2	2	-	10.78	77	12		2	1	84 88 88	2		-	-		2	7	6		_	4	174
00 21:15	60	15	2	2	1		26	12		3	1	113	2			-		2	2	17			19	244
20 21:45 45 22:00	14	15	1	1	-	117	107	1	-	1	-	104	2			-	1	2	2					255
00 22:15 15 22:30	113	5	2	2	-	16125	100	11	=	1	1	110	7		-		-	17	2	51		-	- 44	315
30 22.45 45 22.00	13	12	1	3	-	101	09	13	-	2	1	114	1	F	-	-	-	2		32		-	34 JT	256
00 23 15 15 23 20	157	1	1	1	1	- 154 - 164 - 165	105	10		2	1	118	1		-	-	-	1	+	10		-	211/ 2.0	296
00 2345 45 0.00	127	10 3 687	1	136		1834	11		45	137		130	1	405	0	0	0	413	1	8 348	0	0	0 290	262

Aqueduct Casino Turning Movement Counts Count Date:Friday, June 21, 2013

• [113		vay Blvd East	6.7.2	(H) Ja		Juct Rd South	15	1. 35		way Blvd West	1. 11		
Chud Time	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	Veh Total	
Start Time		THU	I rugu	7	41		55	8			35	2	174	174
4:00	43			2	62		53	6			40	4	191	365
4:15	36			2			63	â			49	3	212	577
4:30	57			4	43						45	1	167	744
4:45	33			5	40		49	0			32	e		
5:00	48			2	40		52	8			52		216	
5:15	55			11	45		64	2				-		
5:30	43			0	59		56	8			51	ę		
5:45	54			6	37		43	8			58	4	192	
				2	47		47	4			60	1	202	
6:00	48			2	48		63	6			48	4	218	821
6:15	61			4			47	é			50	ŧ	5 190	802
6:30	56			2	37			0			58			787
6:45	36			0	44		39	8			00		,	

G/н	- A -		North				luit Ave East			
Start Time	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	Veh Total	1-Hr Veh Total
4:00	6.013	The states	19	0		100 C	28	0	47	47
4:15			27	0			29	0	56	103
			43	ő			34	0	77	180
4:30			23	ő			38	0		241
4:45			23	ő			37	0	75	269
5:00				0			42	Ő	- 2 - 2 - 2	29
5:15			40	0			34	Ő		28
5:30			31	U			22	4	47	26
5:45			25	0				0		26
6:00			34	0			34			24
6:15			34	0			33	0		
6:30			22	0			37	C		24
6:45			36	0			51	C) 87	281

. 1	W.	Aqued		71012	N. E. Maria	Aquedu From	ct Road South	1		
Start Time	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	Veh Total	
4:00		66		1		25		3	3 91	91
4:15		68		0		29		1	97	168
4:10		66		Ő.		40		C	106	294
		62		ő		24		1	88	380
4:45		70		ő		37		ç	107	396
5:00				0		36		1	133	432
5:16		97		0		27		1	81	407
5:30		54		0		24			90	411
5:45		66		0		15		, i	77	381
6:00		62		0					5 135	383
6:15		98		0		37			2 69	371
6:30		37		0		32				384
6:45		76		0		27			0 103	304

Entire Study Area

Peak Hour An	alysis
4:00-5:00	1365
4:15-5:15	1407
4:30-5:30	1494
4:45-5:45	1454
5:00-6:00	1469
5:15-6:15	1462
5:30-6:30	1451
5:45-6:45	1414
6:00-7:00	1452

Aqueduct Casino Turning Movement Counts Count Date:Salurday, June 22, 2013

Peds 7 4 5 3 3 2 2 3 3 2 1 3 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 5 5 3 3 7 1 9 Peds	Left 32 39 49 44 26 55 51 61 30 61 61 61 61 61 25 55 44 400 42 55		Right 30 30 50 40 50 61 56 52 50 55 52 59 71 57 52 43 71 57 52 61 56 57 52 63 63	Peds 0 1 3 6 6 8 6 8 8 14 11 11 8 8 8 12 3 11 1 0 7 6		Thru	Right 556 555 533 700 439 511 500 544 411 855 644 410 813 813 813 813 813 813 813 813 813 813	Peds 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	207 187 224 208 197 204 207 204 207 204 225 231 211 239 207 231 247 247 247 247 248 208 208 208 208 208 208 208 20	703 816 816 834 853 834 851 834 851 834 801 801 801 801 801 801 801 801 801 801
7 4 5 3 3 3 2 1 1 1 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	32 39 27 49 44 26 55 51 36 61 36 61 36 44 40 42 48		30 40 34 51 56 52 50 55 52 55 52 55 52 52 71 57 52 43 71 58 48 48	0 1 3 6 6 6 14 11 8 8 8 8 8 12 3 3 11 7 7			55 53 70 43 49 51 50 54 41 65 54 40 51 81 83	302201011000	207 187 224 208 197 204 207 204 225 231 211 231 231 231 231 231 231	79 81 82 81 83 83 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85
5 1 1 3 2 2 1 1 1 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 10 2 2 5 5 3 3 1	27 49 44 26 56 51 36 81 62 55 44 60 42 42 48		40 34 59 51 56 52 50 55 59 71 57 52 43 71 58 43	3 6 8 14 11 8 5 8 8 12 3 11 0 7 7			53 70 43 49 51 50 54 41 05 54 41 05 54 40 51 51 83		187 2 224 2 208 197 204 225 231 211 211 2390 207 2391 217 2392 237 2393 247 247 247	70 82 81 83 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85
5 3 2 1 1 1 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	44 24 26 55 51 61 30 61 30 62 55 44 0 0 42 48		59 51 56 55 50 55 55 52 59 71 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 8 43 71	8 6 14 11 8 5 8 12 3 11 0 7			43 49 51 50 54 41 65 54 40 51 51 83		208 197 204 225 231 1211 0239 207 202 207 202 242 1247	
3 2 1 1 3 0 0 0 0 2 2 5 5 3 3 7 1 Peds	24 26 55 51 31 81 81 62 55 44 60 42 48		51 56 52 55 52 59 71 57 52 49 71 58 48	6 6 14 11 8 5 8 8 12 3 11 0 7			51 50 54 41 65 64 40 51 51 83	0101000	204 225 231 231 239 207 242 207 242 247	6 63 6 83 8 9 9 9 9 9 9 9
i 1 3 0 0 0 0 2 5 5 3 3 1 7 Peds	58 55 51 36 81 62 55 44 6 0 42 48		52 50 55 52 59 71 57 52 49 71 58 48	14 11 8 5 8 8 12 3 11 0 7			50 54 41 65 54 49 51 51 83	101000	225 231 231 231 239 239 242 242 242 242	6 83 85 90 90 93 93 94 94 94 94 94 94 94 94 94 94 94 94 94
1 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	55 51 36 81 82 55 44 60 42 48		50 55 52 59 71 57 52 43 71 58 48	11 8 5 8 12 3 11 0 7			41 65 54 40 51 51 83	10001	211 239 207 242 1 247	81 94 95 95 95 95 95 95
0 0 0 2 10 2 5 3 3 5 2 5 3 3 5	61 36 61 62 55 44 6 0 42 48		52 59 71 57 52 43 71 58 48	5 8 12 3 11 0 7			65 54 40 51 51 83		0 239 0 207 0 242 1 247	90 91 91 92 92 91 91 91
0 0 2 10 2 5 3 3 5 9 Peds	36 61 62 55 44 60 42 48		59 71 57 52 49 71 58 48	8 12 3 11 0 7			49 51 51 83		242	2 84 7 94 9 91
0 2 10 2 5 3 3 1	62 55 44 60 42 48		57 52 43 71 58 48	12 3 11 0 7			51 51 83		1 247	7 94 9 91
2 10 2 5 3 1 1 Peds	55 44 60 42 48		52 49 71 58 48	11 0 7			83		2 216	
Peds	60 42 48		71 58 48	0 7				2		9
5 3 1 Peds	48	1	48					6	0 257	/ 9
Peds							51 64		0 222	
	-			11			56		0 224	
			luit Ava		1					
	140	Thiru	Right	Peds	Veh Total	1-Hr Veh Total				
9 0 0 0		,	38	0	65	1044				
7 0	0)	52	0	70					
9 0 8 0			59 42	Ó		307 312				
4 0	C	3	49	0	93	340				
			58 48			363				
1 0		3	56			385				
			30	0	74	358				
4 (C			60							
		0	55	2	104	375				
5 0		0	49	2	94	360				
					125	367				
			48			397				
5. 20	1				1					
Peds	Lott	Thru	Right	Pods	Veh Total	T-Hr Volt Total	İ.			
0	×	38	3	0	0 77					
				0		307				
	5	39	9	0	0 77	303				
				0	0 01	315				
()			1	2 64					
		22	2		0 50	278				
						247 258				
	3	31	1	(0 80	273				
	3	27	7	1	0 66	267				
					0 93	267				
		34	4		88 0	314				
	44 00 3000 1700 1400 1400 1400 1000	44 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	4 0 0 3 0 0 1 0	4 0 0 56 3 0 0 46 1 0 0 66 1 0 0 57 4 0 0 30 14 0 0 60 10 0 0 62 10 0 0 63 10 0 0 43 10 0 0 63 10 0 0 63 12 0 0 63 12 0 0 38 0 34 0 38 0 34 0 34 0 35 0 39 0 38 0 32 0 38 0 32 0 38 0 32 0 28 0 22 0 28 0 22	4 0 0 56 0 3 0 0 46 0 11 0 0 57 1 4 0 0 57 1 4 0 0 60 0 14 0 0 60 0 14 0 0 60 0 14 0 0 60 0 14 0 0 60 0 14 0 0 662 0 14 0 0 65 2 10 0 0 43 0 10 0 0 63 0 12 0 0 53 0 12 0 0 36 0 14 0 36 0 0 14 0 36 0 0 0 36 0	44 0 0 56 0 102 30 0 46 0 91 11 0 0 56 0 96 17 0 0 57 1 94 14 0 0 60 0 104 14 0 0 60 0 104 10 0 60 0 104 10 0 62 0 93 10 0 0 43 0 83 10 0 0 49 2 94 10 0 63 0 61 12 0 0 53 0 125 12 0 0 48 0 87 12 0 36 0 66 0 34 0 83 0 87 10 35 0 88	44 0 0 56 0 102 363 3 0 0 46 0 91 356 3 0 0 56 0 96 385 11 0 0 57 1 94 398 44 0 0 60 0 104 398 44 0 0 60 0 104 398 44 0 0 60 0 104 398 44 0 0 60 0 104 371 10 0 0 65 2 104 375 10 0 0 43 0 63 384 10 0 63 0 91 367 12 0 0 53 0 125 406 136 0 48 0 87 397 12	4 0 0 56 0 102 363 3 0 0 56 0 99 365 7 0 0 57 1 94 356 7 0 0 57 1 94 356 7 0 0 57 1 94 356 44 0 0 60 0 104 371 9 0 0 652 0 93 365 10 0 0 652 104 375 100 0 43 0 63 379 15 0 0 49 2 384 380 12 0 0 53 0 125 409 12 0 0 53 0 125 409 12 0 0 36 0 77 367 141	4 0 0 56 0 102 363 3 0 0 56 0 90 365 11 0 0 57 1 94 396 14 0 0 57 1 94 396 14 0 0 60 0 104 371 10 0 62 0 93 365 10 0 62 0 93 365 10 0 65 2 104 375 10 0 65 2 104 375 100 0 43 0 63 394 100 0 49 2 344 380 112 0 0 53 0 125 409 112 0 0 149 2 344 380 12 0 0 53 0 125 409 141 0 63 0 77 305 </td <td>44 0 0 56 0 102 363 33 0 0 46 0 91 365 31 0 0 57 1 94 385 34 0 0 57 1 94 385 34 0 0 57 1 94 385 34 0 0 60 0 104 371 94 30 0 74 356 10 0 62 93 365 10 0 62 93 364 100 0 43 0 83 364 100 0 49 2 344 380 15 0 0 48 0 87 397 122 0 0 53 0 125 406 122 0 0 34 0 83 307 0 34 0 64 307 0 35 0</td>	44 0 0 56 0 102 363 33 0 0 46 0 91 365 31 0 0 57 1 94 385 34 0 0 57 1 94 385 34 0 0 57 1 94 385 34 0 0 60 0 104 371 94 30 0 74 356 10 0 62 93 365 10 0 62 93 364 100 0 43 0 83 364 100 0 49 2 344 380 15 0 0 48 0 87 397 122 0 0 53 0 125 406 122 0 0 34 0 83 307 0 34 0 64 307 0 35 0

HV Includes Trucks, Buses

TRIP-GENERATION CALCULATIONS

Wynn Everet	t - T	rip G	Sene	ratio	on							-	<u>.</u>		Lune .	10	-		Er	nplo	yees	5	1			din 1		1
Howard/Stein-Hudson A October 29, 2013	ssocial	tes																							12	Emplo	we Shuttle Ridership	
												Employee Person Trips	Public	NGE	Emp Public MBT/		W	loyee ater portation	Emp	loyne Bicycle	-	Empl Au		11	boarding	ployees Malighting at thood stops	Employees boarding/slighting at remote parking facilities	Total Ridenship
Second	Are	Columy	Voluçie Tripo part	Unindification Vehiclo		Farrage Tops		d mark of an		fastiget Joint für	Phiron Parson		Share	Person	Share	Person	-	Person	Shere	Penan	Share	Parson Ugu	Aide AVD	Adm	Share	Person Trees	Pamon Trips	Person Trips
FRIDAY DAILY	900; #MNO1	Tomi In Out	8 20 4 10 4 10	4102 2051 2051	20 20	8 376 4 188 4 188	work 14.4% 14.6%	pop-Work 65 2%	10134 100 035 100 035	1237 619 619	7138 3560 3569	***	20% B B	614 534	10% E.S.	1 2	3% %	-		5.0	44%, 44%, 44%	21) 71	1.13 1.0 1.0	22	20% 179 E	124 121	m	
Night Club/Lounge as humois 3	17 1 HSF	Yolai In Dul	130 19 64 10 69 10	7028 1164 1164	2 2	4,602 2,401 2,401	12 9% 12 9%	87 1% 87 1%	100 0%	618 309 309	4184 2082 2082	**	25 275	9 N	3 5		* 2	3	5	;	ara Mil	55	: 10 10	127 121	16 x	**	131 136	
tetail (shopping center) estudies t	10A I KSF	Tota hs Oul	68 09 33 04 33 04	7143 35/2 3572	20 20	14 57 1 7 286 7 280	15 0% 15 0%	85 0% 85 0%	100 0%	2192 1091 1091	12789 6 (85 6185	ieni seut	5 .5	28	545 195	50 SR	75	11	28	15 18		41 0	10	47	195 204	218 296		eos. Iuti
Gaming no turneto S	3972 pe-Xima	Total In Out				35 872 (2 948 17 958	8 2% 8 2%	91 0% 91 8%	100 0%	2048 1474 1474	33024 16512 10512	1474 1474		20	988 195	147 147	n 9	2	n N		44% 49%	1.2	10	534 524		2	:	945 945
FRIDAY DAILY Total		Totai In Duit	-		-	83,771 71,360 31,865	_	TTOP IN COLUMN		0185 3412 3452	55735 28358 38968	8385 5497 3497	12	1000		11.2.3	1	1 1 1		738 106 105	N.	5075 1517 1657		81212 15611 12641		944 485 6347	01867 17628 17629	40 ji ji
FRIDAY PM PE	AK 500 rooms	Tolai Fi	051 0.35 0.29	303 177 128	20 20	623 381 262	work 0 074 R 374	Non-work 100 D% 11 7%	loini 100 D% 100 D%	22 0 27	601 361 240	* 	13	:	5.5	1.00	5 .2	0		;	35		10	:	22	1	1	
Aght Clubit.counge en Insteam 3	17 I KBF	Total In Out	15 48 10 53 4 96	265 175 140	21 21	546 350 180	14 5% 5 6%	65 5% 04 4%	100.0%	63 52 10	48.3 308 175	** 30	1.1	10 2	10% 10%	5 1	016 316	2 0	24 24	8	44% 44%	10 5	111 133	18. 3	5.6	3	7 5	м Э
letall (shopping center) Is transis 4	108 1 KSF	Tata) In Cul	5 84 2 80 3 04	63 I 303 328	20 20	12NB 618 670	27 3% 27 3%	72 71. 72 716	100 0% 100 0%	351 169 183	938 449 487	879 185	R.S.	24	ion. Vet	т. 9	-34 18	\$	38 75	1	471 1975	2.2	1.53 1.52	a Ti	E S	34	14 10	ä
Samling as facilitatis 5	3972 petitimat	Tathi In Oul				7,835 1,365 1,465	3 67% 11 47%	P3 2% A8 6%	100 0%	219 93 165	2615 1318 1300	45 168		ii	975 189	5 17	28 35	3	**	1	44% 44%	2.2	10	21 85	275 326	11 30		ä
FRIDAY PM PEAK Total		Toin! In				5,29 I 2,708				055 274 381	4,638 2435 2008	855 228 323		107 55		10.2		201 1 1		30 A	2.4	254 120 103	5.ª (275 104 117	-	104 10 78	288. 129 148	455 125 244

11/5/2013

Wynn Evere	tt - T	rip G	iene	ratic	n							R						1.2		Er	nplo	yees	5		_	_	-		1
loward/Stein-Hudson / October 29, 2013	Associat	es									- 1	1														111	Employ	ee Shutlle Ridenship	- 4
													ployee on Trips	Public OR/	loyee Transit NGE NE	Public	loyee Fransit - ABUS	W	loyea ster ortation	Emp Walk/			Emple			boarding	loyees alighting at hood stops	Employees boarding/alighting at remote parking facilities	Total Ridership
legen al	144	Cristery	Vehice Tops per und	(and and Uthers Tree	tustenti uchicia eliterence use	Pertan Tran		f work of the		Engineer person Vice	Falser Forest Teles		15	albert	Person	Sham	Parson	Down	Person	Store	Person	Sheet.	Person	Auto	Autos	Stare	Person Tripe	Person Trips	Person Trip
SATURDAY DA	ULY	Total	9.00	4515		9 270	work	em-work	lotal	1302	7858	1							1.1			40%	300	1.10	254	70%	158	700	438
re homory 2	(noon)	O.	*50 *52	2256 7258	20 20	4 810	15% 15%	85 2% 85 2%	100 075	681 681	3929 3929		188	20%	138 138	10%	68 68	376	20 20	3.47	20 20	4496	300	110	288	20%	136	300	438
Nghi Club/Leonge retenants)	17 H KS#	Tein In Out	542 85 71 43 71 43	3142 1231 1251	2 I 2 I	5 037 2 5 18 7 5 18	12 9% 12 9%	87 195 87 195	00 0%	648 324 324	4389 2104 2184		724 124	20% 20%	85 65	40% 10%	37 37	3W 3W	10 16	3% 3%	10 10	84% 41%	143 143	1.13 1.13	121 127	20%	85 85	143 143	707 207
Refail (shopping center) na lintum f	108 1 KSF	Tein In Out	09 77 44 89 44 89	9704 4852 4852	20 20	10 794 9 897 4,897	15 015 15 015	85 0% #5 0%	100 0%	2964 1482 1482	10830 8415 8415		482 482	2194 2014	20% 20h	10% 10%	148 148	7% 3%	46 44	316 394	64 46	44% 44%	867 652	1.18 1.19	878 978	20% 20%	208 298	052 872	1748 1348
Gaming one horizonte S	3072 p+10e1 ii	Total In Out				41 013 20 957 20 957	8 23-	9 8% 11 8%	100.0%	3436 1717 1717	38470 19739 19239		1717	20%	343 143	10% 10%	(72 172	3% 3%	62 112	3% 3%	52 62	6675 4475	750 266	6.90 1.93	63%) 1.80	20% 20%	343 343	758 758	10599 10900
SATURDAY DAILY Total		Toloi In				75 864 37 982 17 882				8,409 4204 4304	67,658 33778 33778		8408 4204 4254		1882 841 841		841 420	-	252 128 176		282 128 636		3700 1380 1480		3250 1640 1840		1582 841	3700 1850	53762 2001 2001
SATURDAY PE	AK H	OUR				Contraction of the	wath	non-weik	Inini	a reason					5	1.5			200	25.5	1.45				in a l	1.1	1 1 1 1		
Hostei ven hunivesta 7	fice exame	Take In Def	070 039 031	349 195 154	2 D 7 D	713 399 314	0 0% 8 3%	100 014 91 7%	100 0%	20 0 78	687 399 288	1	@ 28	20% 20%	÷.	10%	-	.1% 3%	1	3% 3%	* 2	44% 44%	а Ф	10		50. 7 50.4	*	12	17 17
Night Clubil.counige Initiality 3	911 617	t dat tr	16 30 R 65 6 72	280 165 915	2 I 2 I	578 341 237	14.5% 5.0%	85 5% 94 4%	100 0%	03 50 13	515 201 224		-	70% 20%	10 3	10% 10%	- 1 - 1	3% 3%	1	3% 396	1	41% 44%	22 8	10 10	20	20% 20%	3	22 8	32 B
Retail (shopping conter)	100 I KSF	Teiní In Cnil	851 442 408	ካፖር 478 44 በ	20 20	1 875 975 900	77 3% 27 3%	72 1% 72 7%	100 0%	512 265 246	1364 708 555		286 240	20% 213%	53 49	10%	27 28	3% 3%	3	1% 3%	;	44% 46%	117 108	7.75 1.35	104 08	20% 20%	83 49	837 108	170 (87
Gamling an hadron 1	3972 proberti	Total In Chil				3 121 1 513 1,604	0 8% 3 3%	09 1% 92 7%	100 0%	172 14 118	2000 1500 1490		14 718	20% 20%	3 24	10%	1	3.# 3.#	1	42 MC	3	94% 88%	* 51	10	46	20%	3 24	8 57	0 78
SATURDAY PEAK HOUR Tatat		Total In Out				0,288 3,224 3,058				732 329 103	5 568 2900 2856		7.52 N20 403		140 68 81		/3 30 40		22 10 17		22 10		372 145 177		289 170 159		145 05 91	3722 148 177	460 215 250

Notice: Notice: Notice and Note eccession with Editors 1. Use 3. Second 2. Mailtonia Hausated Tread Servey 2.11E. Top Conversion Natio Editoria. ULC 3.102 (Healing) Average rate for proved model find came for really. Seawabay, and pank Sasaddry 3.11E Top Conversion National Conversion National Conversion National
Wynn Evere	tt - T	rip C	Sene	ratic	on								11.1									Pat	rons	3	-		-						
foward/Stein-Hudson / October 29, 2013	Associat	es										Patro	Internal	Patro	n Pasa-	Patron Person	Patron Tra ORA	NGE	Patron	n Water					-			(P	atron Autof				
	ten	Chilling	Tryin part :	Unadjusted Vehicle	National validad	Parion Typi		of work of, our		Country of the second states	form Farme Tigs	T	Penen	Parcel	Person	Trips After setemat and past-by	<u>- u</u>	Person	Transp	Person		Patron T Parton	AVO of Tour	Tour Dutes	Shure		AVO of	Autos	Shirk	Patron Ta Panos Inco	Palron AVO of	Tern.	Total Total Autom
	500 mani	Totol In Cuil	8 20 4 10 4 10	4102 2051 2051	20	8 376 4,188 4 188	werk 14 8% 14 8%	non-Walk 85 2% 85 2%	tojal 100.0% 100.0%	1237 619 619	7 108 3509 3509	76% 75%	2877 2077	0% 0%	:	esy mi	10.0%	8B BA	3.0% 2% 2%	27 27	10.016 0%	0 0	20 20 20	:	68.0% 80%	616 676	20 20	300 308	8.0% M 8%	79 78	20 2.0	38 38	205 346
Right Chubil counge as locate 1	IT 1 KSF	Total h Ord	01 80 01 80 01 80	2328 1164 1164	23 33	4,802 2,401 2,401	12 5%	87 115 87 116	100.0%	618 309 309	4184 2042 2082	298 288	40 49	11	-	1464 1404	10% 10%	140 140	3% 3%	44 41	0% 0%	0 0	20 20	÷,	80% 80%	1010	2.2 2.2	480 480	816 876	117	20 20	60 58	510 518
tetali (shopping center) ee iyotule 4	108 I KSF	Toisi In Qui	P5 09 33 04 33 04	7143 3572 3572	20 20	14 571 7 280 7 286	15 0% 15 0%	85 0% 85 0%	00 075	2182 1091 1091	1 2349 0 105 6 105	20% 20%	1220 9251	40% 40%	olo Bip	esst esst	10% 10%	454 434	9% 3%	130 130	0% 0%	0 0	10 50	\$	575. 675	29972 7062	11	5907 5900	2	349 347	78 20	174 154	1015 1025
Saming In human 5	3072 (1956/01)	Tatal In Out				35,972 17 986 17 986	A 216 A 216	81 815 91 6%	00 0%	2948 1474 1474	33024 18512 18512	0%	:	3.3	-	34640 76017	58 35	1001	11	11	11	1001 9033	20 20	53 83	80% #09	(1383 (1383	20 20	5607 5607	ens. ens.	(321 (321	20 20	101 701	6358 6808
FINDAY DAILY Total		tinal an Out				45.727 31.809 31.888	-			6985 3492 3497	54729 24555 24568		800 107 404		1011 838 825	44410 77064 72095		441 201 201	1	13.82 1898		3345 1453 1451		160 83	4.00	15018		15652 7820		3713 1858 1814		100	8756 1130
FRIDAY PM PE	SCO TROMS	Tolei 91 Qiji	0.61 0.35 0.20	205 177 128	2 h 7 o	873 251 252	 0 0% 8 3%	100 FS 100 FS	- Maint 100-015 100-015	22 0 71	601 361 240	20% 15%	11.0	12	-	2	55	1	22	1	5 8 34	0	R.R.	0	23	25	18 29	19.0	23	1	20 20	;	36 29
Night Club/Louingn en herhan 3	17 1 KSF	Tota In Oul	15 49 10 53 4 95	205 175 m	2 + 7 +	546 300 168	14 5% 5 8%	R5 5% pa 4%	100 0%	63 52 10	483 308 175	004 205	23	178 515	- 27 M	in B	10% 10%	211 10	5.0	1	U%	- # - #	2	4	675 675	140 10	22 21	94 34			20 20	1	17 64
tetall (shopping center) en luntete f	108 1 (\$F	Tolal In Dul	5 54 2 80 1 04	63 i 303 328	20 20	1 780 615 670	27 3% 27 3%	72 7% 72 7%	100 0% 100 0%	351 189 183	036 449 487	-	ie N	395 105	2	300 300	10%	31 34	3% 3%	8 10	014 17%	0	20 20	0	60% 6(%	217 235	22 22	100 107	ONL ENG	78 27	3 D 3 D	13 14	112 127
Samlog an tailein S	3972 (routine)	Tota Ni Out				2,835 1 368 1,466	3 8% 15 4%	NS 29)	100 07% 100 01%	218 53 166	2616 1315 1300	0% 2%		0% 0%		ejila 1800	10% 10%	132 130	7M 3M	38 30	10%	132 130	20 20	7	80% 74%	908 0.07	20 20	484 468	8%- 11%	105	20 20	63 62	607 601
FRIDAY PM PEAK Total		Toin				5 291 2 708 2 583				655 274	4,538 2435 1793		104 411 111		142 20	A)40 1414 1423		320 104 142	1	113 68		262 152 130		56 7 T	4.5	2604 1338 1018		129-0 8/53		105 158		70	7022

11/5/2013

÷2

Wynn Evere			Sene	ratio	on															w.		Pat	rons	;	4								-
łoward/Stein-Hudson October 29, 2013	Associa	les											ei loternal Trips		o Pasa- By	Putton Person Tripa	Patron Tra ORA	neit NGE	Petron	Water		Patron	our Bue			Patro	n Auto		Patron Auto	Tazi Patron Ta	ń		Total
	Det.	Grippey	Vohicia Trips per Linii	Usedjusted Vehicle Talas		Person Trips		of while vs. nor area foblicatio 6		Employon parson htps	Patron Person Trips	Parce	Perkor M Ups	Percen	Person Not	After arts(na) and pass-by	Shire	Person Ings	Shink	Parson Inpa	Stars	Pargon	AVO of Tour Bus	Thur Batter	51:010		AVO al	Auton	Ebers	Parson		Twin	Taxla» Autos
	MLY	Teteji In Out	0 03 4 52 4 52	4515 2258 2258	2 0 2 0	9 720 4 610 4 610	work 1396 1595	860 work 85 7% 85 2%	lolai 100 0% 100 0%	1362 681 Gali	7858 3928 3929	12.5	55	410 410	:	812 192	10%	9.4 140	3% 3%	29 29	D% 0%	0	20 20	U D	80% 82%	878 U74	2.0 2 D	330 339		17.17	20 20	8.6	179 339
ght Club/Lounge Liberate 3	17 1 437	l olar In Oul	142 81 71 43 21 43	2442 1221 1221	2 I 2 I	5,037 2,518 2,518	12.9% 12.9%	87 195 87 195	100 0% 100 0%	648 3124 3124	4388 2194 2194	20%		1076 1076	230 230	9630 1630	10% 10%	104 184	3% 3%	40 48	0% D%	0	20 20	0	60% Rq%	1080 1050	42 29	452 4 <u>52</u>	8% 8%	123 123	2.0 2.0	627 612	584 568
tall (shopping center) feamete 4	KSF	Teloi In Out	89 77 14 89 44 89	4704 4812 4857	20 20	10 794 9 897 9 897	15 0% 15 0%	63 (0%) 65 (0%)	100.0%	2004 1482 1482	16830 6415 8415	20%		10%	812 842	6801	10%	580 580	3% 3%	1)7 177	094 094	8		£	60% 69%	4086 6085	22 22	1843 1848	816 276	471 471	20 2.0	276 238	2084 2084
inling locations 5	3972 position i	Total In Cul				41,913 20 057 20 057	8 2% 8 2%	11 #15 91 8%	100 0%	3435 1717 1717	39479 10239 19230	098. 098	0 0	0% 0%	0 0	10230 10230	iow iow	1024 1024	3% 3%	677 877	40% 10%	1028 1026	20	ф7 87	1400 1410	13275 53275	2 D 2.0	6038 6638	816 704	1530 60%	7.0 2.0	77D 770	7408 7408
ATURDAY DAILY		Tole M Ord				23,304 33 842 37 982				#104 4204	87 506 38778 33778		10137 0080 5080		2122 1081 1085	11200 37048 27048		0530 2788 2788		1889 820 829	30	564B 1024 1824		194 07 117		38184 19077 2007		18814 0307 8307		4424 2212 3212		2216 1108 1108	20630 10435 10415
	SOD movemb	Total	70 39 31	14.00	30 30	713 309 314	work 0.0% 8.3%	100.0% 100.0% 91.7%	lotal 100 0% 100 0%	26 0 25	687 158 204	70%	300 210	D% 0%	:	N ⁶	2.5	10 7	5.5	3 2	0% 0%	0	20 20	U O	80% 80%	69 60	20 20	35 25	816 876	8 0	20 2,0	4 3	30 20
ght Club/Lounge Isomele 3	17.1 X21	Tolai Ia Out	16 18 9 86 6 77	280 165 115	2 1 2 1	578 141 237	14 576 9 575	85 5% 94 4%	100 0%	63 50 13	515 291 224	20%			20 72	1	2.5	*	n .15	÷	0% 0%	:	20 20	3	60% 60%	141 108	22 72	6a 50	rni. Rhi	14 19	20 20	a T	n M
tall (shopping center) Inomole 4	108 I KSF	Tolai In Out	851 442 408	920 478 441	70 20	1 N76 N75 900	27 37. 27 37.	72 75) 72 796	100 0%	512 260 245	1364 709 855	20%		11	n 6.	**	10% 10%	50 48	3 <i>%</i> 34	10	0% 0%	4	20 20	0 0	8/7% (%7%	343 310	22 22	150 924	674 8%	40 37	20 20	20 19	176 103
eniop Nature 1	3072 positivo	Totel In Cut				3 121 1 513 1 608	0 976 7 3%	99 115 82 115	100 0% 200 001	132 14 118	2990 1500 1490	0% 6%		2.2	9	1000	10% 10%	150 140	396 376	48 46	10% 10%	150 140	20 20	1	0-6796 Ball 95	1038 1028	3'0 5 D	618 634	5% 5%	120 718	70 2.0	60 ED	370 874
ATURDAY PEAK HOUR otal		Toisi In Qiri				6 288 3,729 3,050				732 329 403	5 556 2900 2056		800 201		188 100 83	8477 2005 2117		448 230 218		134 89 65		299 150 149		1 + +		3088 1887 1502		1508 773 733		358 164 174		18.2 (13 679	1868 (166 822

Notice

11/5/2013

Wynn Everet	tt - T	rip G	iene	ratic	n							Subat		TANK .	1.453		Trip	Genera	tion Sum	mary		46,661	and the	24 aug	
Howard/Stein-Hudson A October 29, 2013	Associal	es												Public Transit	hê e	Employe	e Shuttle	to Orampet L	t Shutte we Statems at . nd Wellington	Tour	Burrets	Employee Autos		Patron Autoffaxi	Entre.
Companya	Dee.	Smerry	Volume Transat	Un adjunted Vehaas Titles	Notice of the second se	Per set Tres	Γτορομίκο	ol work vs. ri	on-wark 1955	Employee protect bits	Falson Fasters Trait	At Persons	Orange Live Passenpers Trips	MBTA Bus Passenger Trips	Water Transportation Passerger Trips	Passonger Trus Providence the set origination of any seter	House th bankal	Enserget Trip Cristeret corr Parate cristing of George Core	manufally seeming	Passonger Tree	Bus Tops	Auto topa Anto interesting	Pation suite bigs. Pain an alle	Pation Int Mps.	Paten Auto + Tao tiga
FRIDAY DAILY	500 reama	fotal In Ciul	5 20 4 10 4 10	4102 2041 2051	20	6 376 4 135 4 180	work 14 8% 14 8%	85 2% 85 2%	totel 100 0% 100 0%	1237 819 111	713# 3569 2589	1011	213 213	80 82	45 43	308 308		215 213				#	11		24
Night Club/Lourige are twente 3	17 1 KSF	Totel In Out	536 19 08 10 85 10	2328 1154 1184	2 8	4 802 2 401 2 401	12 9% 12 8%	87 mil. 87 mil.	100 0% (00 0%	618 209 209	4184 2017 2012	1773 1775	204 208	11 31	63 51	108 108		208 208		3	1	49 95	:	0 0	12
Retail (shopping conter) tor tomate 4	108 1 KSF	Tolei In Chil	65 09 33 04 33 04	7141 3572 3572	20 20	14 571 7 286 7 268	15.0%	85 (%) 85 (%)	100 05 100 05	2182 1031 1091	17389 6198 6105	5427 5427	857 802	100 109	183 167	508 693		N52 862		1	4	415 15		17e 11e	
Gaming see training 5	3972 positions	Toini In Out				35 972 17 986 17 980	8 2% 8 2%	91 8% 91 8%	100 0%. 100 0%	2948 1474 1474	33024 10512 18512	1705/1 1792/16	1048 1048	147 147	54D 540	841 114.1		1048 1048		1051 1897	53 83	ni Ti	140) 1400	art Art	8108 605
FRIDAY DALLY Total		Fotal In ENE				63 721 31 850		- Angeler		6025 3492 3492	56708 28368	63300 20090	903A 3019	807 340	11/02 BO P	4470 2235	528 281	UONB 1010	670 270 1	3302 1861 7894	1945 80 9-11	2747 1985 (1915	12	Fag	4134L 2479 2479
FRIDAY PM PE	AK	1110			10.00		wolk	non-work	tolal			EXUMA	0001210	1.000	Sec. Sec.	a contra a		Sec. 1.	川江、金田、		12.2.1	NUMBER OF	ALD DO NO		
Histel Instanting 2	500	Toini In Qui	0 81 0 35 0 28	305 177 128	20 20	023 361 262	0.0% 8.3%	100.0%- 91.7%	100 0%	77 0 77	501 351 240	rni E A	1	1	2	54		10			1.	1.1	32 20	13	3
tõgit Club/Lounge aas haimite 2	17 I KSF	Toini In Cul	15 49 10 53 4 96	265 175 90	21 21	540 360 180	14 515 5 675	85 5% 94 4%	100 0% 100 0%	53 52 10	483 308 175	269 (33			ñ 4	34 7		32 14		4	-3	1	(28) (28)		4
Rotall (shopping center) are lamate 4	KSF	Toini In Oui	5 84 2 80 3 04	631 303 328	2 D 2 D	1 288 618 670	27 3%. 27 3%.	72 7¥. 72 7%	100 0%	351 169 183	936 449 487	463 523	65 71	17 10	54 18	10A 117		05 73		1	2	1	90 102	0 9	44
Garoling Mar lucture 3	3972 pastisnii	Total In Col				E #35 1 368 1 #56	3,8% 11,8%	06 2% 85 8%	100 014	219 53 186	2616 1316 1300	1308 1400	142 163	\$	41 44	.34 107		142 183			1	20 0	454 849	8 8	4
FRIDAY PM PEAK Total		Totel Inc.				5.091 2.505 2.565				055 274	4 638 2435	4454 2210	E07 248	45 17	132	4 10 176	24 10 12	507 248	24 12 11		14 7	200 100 101	(209 653	153 29 74	1421 772 800

Wynn Evere	tt - T	rip G	Sene	ratic	on								1	0-5-7	1 2 1 4 1 h	and the second	Trip	Generati	on Sum	mary				1.20	
Howard/Stein-Hudson / October 29, 2013	Associal	es												Public Transit		Employe	e Shuttle	Transit S to Orange Line Sullivan and 1	Stations at	Tour	Зилав	Employee Autos		Patron Auto/Tax	
Contempt	Siza	Ciriogory	Volukin Tuja par unit	Unađusted Vahitla Titps	National vehicle cecuptedy rate	Person Tilps		n of work vs. [sog loomot	ion weak blos 6)	Employne porson idpa	Patron Patron Titps	All Persons	Orange Line Poseengers	MBTA Bus Passinger Trips	Water Transportation Passenget Trips	Pensenger Organ nexhisarhaade klang roules		Patrons arriving at Orange Lina	Shuttle Bus Trips Itead on overlage headway of 10 minutes (broughout (the day to 2 stations	Personger Trips	<u>Bun Tupn</u>	Auto trips Referensity	Patron auto tripo.	Patron last trice.	Paten Auto + Tou tipo
SATURDAY DA		Total In Onl	9 D1 4 52 4 12	4515 2258 2758	20 20	N 220 4,610 4 0 i D	werk 15% 15%	85 2% 85 2%	(nini 100 0% 100 0%	(362 661 681	7856 3929 3920	1960 1400	234 734	08 58	18 80	430 430		934 234					400. 200	4 2 2	111 129
Night Club/Lounge ang lumate 3	01 637	Total In Dut	902.M 11-0 11-0	2442 1221 1221	21	5 037 2,5 18 2 5 18	12 17% 12 19%		100.0%	040 324 324	4389 2194 2194	1760 11140	\$10 218	n p	58 68	207 207		218 219		1		01 114	482 487	e N	u
Ratull (shopping center) see lumine t	INA. Kar	Talei In Cuit	#5 77 44 85 44 50	9704 4952 4852	20	19 704 9 847 9,887	15 07. 1:- 025		100 0% 100 0%	2064 1482 1482	15830 8415 8415	1373 7373	686 889	148 148	221 221	948 948		855 985		1		97 01	388	iii ii	
Gaining we hatiole 6	3972 pertines	Tojel In Cetl				4 913 20,057 20,057	8 2% 8 2%		100 0% 100 0%	3435 1717 1717	18470 19239 19239	20067 20067	7287 2207	17g 173	1120 629	1099 1099		2287 2287		1024 1024	#		arta Hea	in m	12 a 10
SATURDAY DAILY Total		Toini In Qui	- 1/2/			25.564 107.562 37.592				8,409 4204 4204	N7,550 310718 31178	63/06 31883 31863	7211 3608 3608	041 420 420	1011 050 050	6382 2801 2891	67R 28A 2HB	7211 3606 3600	578 268 268	3/848 1/924 1924	97 117	2000 1840	9507 8307	中國	19632 TRAM State
SATURDAY PE	AK H	OUR Totel	0 70 0 79 0 31	349 196 154	70 20	713 308 114	 0.0% 8.3%		100.0%	R • R	F-M7 399 788	100 9.1	40 12	1		:		10 12		5.1			ţ.		a i
Night Club/Loange teo tustetti 2	17 I KSF	Totel In Cel	16 NA 9 65 6 72	280 165 115	2 # 7 #	578 341 237	14.5% 5.6%			03 50 13	515 291 224	26/1 170	30 18	1	n 6	72 B		70 18		T.		*		37	10 10
Retail (shopping center) ies footnole 4	108 1 KST	Toini In Out	8 51 4 42 4 08	920 478 441	20 20	975 900	27 3% 27 3%			517 288 246	1384 709 655	7(53 704	103 66	1) 25	23 21	170 151		103 98		1	4	E.	ne cu	in a start and a start	邗
Gaming and Interiory B	3972 praillase	Tolw In Dut				3 121 1 513 1,806	0 9% 7 3%			132 14 175	29910 1500 1490	1513 5608	180 173	1.	45 48	u 75		153 173		en 10		4	虚	1	411. 134.
SATURDAY PEAK HOUR Totol		Total In Oui				6 268 3 229 3 059				732 329 403	5 558 2900 2006	1209 21129 2050	404 200 794	n - n 40	150) 70 77	468 211 258	103	194 290 298	ра Ц	8 E 2	1	200 100 100	138	92 41 10	1

Notice: Not

11/5/2012



WYNN MA, LLC PUBLIC OUTREACH DRAFT DOCUMENT NOVEMBER 7, 2013

.

DOCUMENTED OUTREACH

		MALDEN OUTREACH		
Date	Organization	Malden Representative(s) Present	Wynn Official(s) Present	Description
June 25, 2013	City of Malden	Gary Christenson, Mayor of Malden; Kevin Duffy, Strategy & Business Development Officer, City of Malden	Steve Tocco and Bob Havern	Project Briefing
July 8, 2013	City of Malden	Gary Christenson, Mayor of Malden	Steve Tocco, Kim Sinatra, Jacqui Krum	Project Briefing
July 18, 2013	City of Malden	Kevin Duffy, Strategy & Business Development Officer; Ron Hogan, Strategic Planning Analyst	Steve Tocco, Bob Havern, John Tocco, Chris Gordon, Sarah Kelly, Jeff Dirk	Review of Traffic Flow and Transportation Infrastructure
July 22, 2013	City of Malden	Kevin Duffy, Strategy & Business Development Officer; Ron Hogan, Strategic Planning Analyst; Patrick Johnston, Everett Police Officer	John Tocco	Kevin and Ron toured the Malden River and Wynn site from the water with Officer Johnston.
August 13, 2013	City of Malden	Kevin Duffy, Strategy & Business Development Officer	Steve Tocco	Project Briefing
August 21, 2013	City of Malden	Kevin Duffy, Strategy & Business Development Officer, City of Malden; Stephen Wishoski, Executive Director, Malden Redevelopment Authority; Ron Hogan, Strategic Planning Analyst, City of Malden; and Deborah Burke, Assistant Executive Director, Malden Redevelopment Authority	Steve Tocco; Chris Gordon	Parking Issues Meeting
August 22, 2013	City of Malden	Gary Christenson, Mayor of Malden; Ron Hogan; Kevin Duffy	Gamal Aziz; John Tocco	Introduce additional Wynn executive team members to the Mayor and discuss future development plans
September 9, 2013	City of Malden	Kevin Duffy, Strategy & Business Development Officer; Ron Hogan, Strategic Planning Analyst; Councilor Jim Nestor; and Councilor David D'Arcangelo	Steve Tocco; Bob Havern; John Tocco	Kevin and Ron introduced the Malden representatives who were appointed to negotiate the surrounding community agreement
September 16, 2013	City of Malden	Kevin Duffy, Strategy & Business Development Officer; Ron Hogan, Strategic Planning Analyst; Councilor Jim Nestor; and Councilor David D'Arcangelo	Steve Tocco, Bob Havern	Surrounding Community Agreement Negotiation
September 18, 2013	City of Malden	Kevin Duffy, Strategy & Business Development Officer; Ron Hogan, Strategic Planning Analyst; Councilor David D'Arcangelo	Steve Tocco, Bob Havern, John Tocco, Jacqui Krum	Surrounding Community Agreement Negotiation

WYNN MA, LLC PUBLIC OUTREACH DRAFT DOCUMENT

NOVEMBER 7, 2013

DOCUMENTED OUTREACH

the second second		MALDEN OUTREACH		
September 19, 2013	City of Malden	Kevin Duffy, Strategy & Business Development Officer; Ron Hogan, Strategic Planning Analyst; Councilor Jim Nestor; and Councilor David D'Arcangelo	Steve Tocco, Bob Havern, John Tocco, Jacqui Krum	Surrounding Community Agreement Negotiation
September 30, 2013	City of Malden	Kevin Duffy, Strategy & Business Development Officer	John Tocco	Career Showcase and Vendor Opportunities
October 8, 2013	City of Malden	Kevin Duffy, Strategy & Business Development Officer	John Tocco	Surrounding Community Agreement Negotiation
November 5, 2013	City of Malden	Kevin Duffy, Strategy & Business Development Officer; Ron Hogan, Strategic Planning Analyst	John Tocco	E-mail from John to Kevin and Ron with updated trip generation projections

WYNN MA, LLC PUBLIC OUTREACH DRAFT DOCUMENT NOVEMBER 7, 2013

.

DOCUMENTED OUTREACH

have a strength of the strengt		BOSTON OUTREACH		1
Date	Organization	Boston Representative(s) Present	Wynn Official(s) Present	Description
May 29, 2013	Boston Harbor Association	Vivien Li, Boston Harbor Association; and others	Jamie Fay, Sarah Kelly	General overview of municipal harbor plan
July 9, 2013	Boston Harbor Association	Vivien Li, Boston Harbor Association; and others	Jamie Fay, Sarah Kelly, Charles Norris	General overview of project EENF to Boston Harbor Association Harbor Use Committee
July 15, 2013	Charlestown Business Community	Diane Grant, Charlestown Business Community	John Tocco	Email re: setting up a meeting
September 26, 2013	Charlestown Business Community	Diane Grant, Charlestown Business Community	John Tocco	Email re: setting up a meeting
July 12, 2013	Charlestown Mothers Association	Jennifer Rossi, Charlestown Mothers Association	John Tocco	Email re: setting up a meeting
July 24, 2013	Charlestown Mothers Association	Rebecca Love, Co-president, Board Member, Charlestown Mothers Association; Jennifer, M. Rossi, Charlestown Mothers Association; Laura L. Carroll, Charlestown Mothers Association	John Tocco	Overview of Wynn Project and discussion regarding impacts to Charlestown
October 3, 2013	Charlestown Mothers Association	Charlestown Mothers Association Board of Directors	John Tocco, Chris Gordon	Project Briefing and Discussion of Sullivan Square
October 21, 2013	Charlestown Mothers Association	Sal LaMattina; Representative from Gene O'Flaherty's office; Members of the Charlestown Mothers Association	John Tocco	Project Update
August 12, 2013	Charlestown Neighborhood Council	Tom Cuhna, Chairman of the Charlestown Neighborhood Council; David Whelan, Vice Chair of the Charlestown Neighborhood Council; Mike Charbonnier; Sullivan Square Precinct Representative for the Charlestown Neighborhood Council	John Tocco	Email requesting the opportunity to speak with the Charlestown Neighborhood Council
August 13, 2013	Charlestown Neighborhood Council	Mike Charbonnier; Sullivan Square Precinct Representative for the Charlestown Neighborhood Counci	John Tocco	Telephone call to try and set up a briefing/meeting with the Charlestown Neighborhood Council
September 26, 2013	Charlestown Neighborhood Council	Tom Cuhna, Chairman of the Charlestown Neighborhood Council; David Whelan, Vice Chair of the Charlestown Neighborhood Council; Mike Charbonnier; Sullivan Square Precinct Representative for the Charlestown Neighborhood Council	John Tocco	Email re: setting up a meeting
October 9, 2013	Charlestown Neighborhood Council	Tom Cuhna, Chairman of the Charlestown Neighborhood Council; David Whelan, Vice Chair of the Charlestown Neighborhood Council	John Tocco	Another email requesting to meet with the Charlestown Neighborhood Council
October 31, 2013	Charlestown Neighborhood Council	Mike Charbonnier; Sullivan Square Precinct Representative for the Charlestown Neighborhood Counci	John Tocco I	Project Briefing
October 31, 2013	Charlestown Neighborhood Council	Charlestown Neighborhood Council	John Tocco	Project Briefing