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MR. SCHALLER: Good afternoon.
Welcome to everybody. My name is Michael
Schaller. I'm one of the city's casino consultants, Shefsky and Froelich. Behind me are my partners, Sid Froelich and Kimberly Copp. I'm sure they'll jump in on an as-needed basis. This is intended to be a working session, as we said in the Phase II RFP. The idea here is to be able to allow the proposers to ask questions, to hear responses from the city's perspective. To the extent we don't have an answer, we will reserve and we will get back to everybody -- I'm sorry, also Ed Pikula, who is the city solicitor.

We have a stenographer present, so
when you speak, please speak slowly and loudly. Our intention is to post the questions and the answers on the city's... on the SRA's web page consistent with our mandate to keep the process transparent.

Let me, if $I$ can before we begin, remind everybody of the protocol that was also
posted on the web page.
This is, as I said, a working
session. The sole purpose of this is to allow the proposers to ask questions of the city and its consultants.

Questions from the public or the media are not permitted at this session. Again, this is solely a working session for the proposers.

We will have... the city I should say, will schedule a public information session at which each of the three proposers will make a presentation, and at which session members of the public will be able to sign up and ask questions. So, that's coming. The date and the place are still to be determined.

I think what $I$ would like to do because, again, the purpose of this is to ask questions and get to know the people who will be responsible for providing the proposers with information as this process progresses. If we can, I'd like to have each of the key department heads stand up and introduce themselves briefly,
and then we'll start the question-and-answer period. MR. PIKULA: Start over here. THE FLOOR: Chris Cignoli, city engineer.

Al Chwalek, C-h-w-a-l-e-k. I'm the DPW director, and also a member of the City Review Committee.

I'm Steve Sevaria. I'm from Fuss and O'Neill, the DPW's engineering consultant. Pedge Lynch from the assessor's office.

Anthony Wilson, associate city solicitor.

Rhett Towles, law clerk.
Kate Kane, I'm a member of the Mayor's Advisory Committee.

Pat Sullivan, director of Parks and Building.

Lauren Stabilo, chief procurement officer.

Bob Maggi, deputy CIO.
Andrew Doty, TI.

Tom Tedford, payroll director. Joe Conant, fire commissioner. Glenn Guyer, deputy of operations, fire.

John Furman, chief administrative
financial officer.
Cecelia Goulet, acting director of
Internal Audit.
Donna Carney, 3-1-1 director.
Peter Sygnator, chairman of the
Board of License Commission.
Gilbert Nieves, assistant city
treasurer.
Steve Desilets, Building and Code commissioner.

Georgeanne Hoyman, Springfield Water and Sewer Commission, senior project engineer.

Robert Stoops, the chief engineer
for the Springfield Water and Sewer Commission.
MR. PIKULA: On this side?
THE FLOOR: Angelina Santiago, Operations manager.

Richie Allen, chairman of the
Board of Assessors.
Chris Moskel, director of the
Springfield Redevelopment Authority.
Patrick Burns, city comptroller.
Steve Lonergan, city treasurer.
Bill Cochrane, Springfield Police
Department.
Phil Dromey, deputy director of Planning.
solicitor.
Brian Connors, deputy director of Economic Development.

MR. PIKULA: Any other department heads?

THE FLOOR: Helen Caulton Harris,
director Division of Health and Human Services.
Molly Fogarty, city library.
Bill Mahoney, director of Human
Resources.
Thomas Belton, director of Veteran
Services.

MR. PIKULA: And the Mayor's
Advisory Committee members?
THE FLOOR: Jill McCarthy Payne.
Nancy Dusek-Gomez.
Haskell Kennedy.
And I'm Edward Pikula, of the City
Solicitor.
I'm Kevin Kennedy, chief development officer.

MR. SCHALLER: Thank you everyone,
for those introductions.
I don't have a particular
inclination how to do this one way or the other.
I know that Mike Mathis from MGM sent us some questions this morning that he wanted addressed at the meeting. So again, $I$ don't want to play favorites or anything, but Mike is sitting right in front of me. Why don't you start asking? You can ask follow ups, anyone else, any other proposers, for further explanation. Please go ahead.

MR. PIKULA: Before we start, we have a sign-up sheet where all the department
heads and the city officials have signed in, or are in the process of signing in. I don't know exactly where in the room it is now.

But all the companies and proposers' officials and representatives should be signing in as well so we have a record of that here.

MR. SCHALLER: Ed, in order to communicate with the proposers, give them information, are we going to circulate that? Will they know who the various people are?

MR. PIKULA: That was my
intention.
MR. SCHALLER: So, everybody will
get a sheet so everybody will know who everybody is, and I assume you have all the contact information on there?

MR. PIKULA: Correct.
MR. SCHALLER: Again, in trying to be helpful to the proposers as they go through this process.

So Mike, you get question number one.

MR. PIKULA: Could you please identify yourself.

MR. MATHIS: I'm Michael Mathis. I'm vice president of Global Teaming Development for MGM Resorts. We are very pleased to be here in this process. I'm very proud to have passed the first phase one, as did the other people.

I've got three questions. The
first phase RQP asks for certain background information about the companies and development experience, and we provided some general background on our company.

We were led to believe that that might also be part of the Phase II RQP deal. So, I guess at the outset I want to say that we were really impressed with the kind of detailed questions that were asked in the RFP2.

We have a large group of people going through it. It's very daunting but I think it serves the community very well in terms of things you're asking us. So, at the outset just let me say that.

But I didn't see any requests for
further development background and operations background. Maybe less a question than a comment. But we viewed the requirements in the Phase II RFP as minimal requirements. To the extent it wasn't asked for, we're going to volunteer and provide additional background information about our development history, and we want to make sure that's appropriate to go above and beyond.

MR. SCHALLER: I'm glad you asked this question. Yes, I think the city does view the criteria questions in the Phase II as being a minimum, and certainly anything that a proposer can do to help the city and its consultants understand more about your company and your proposal is certainly invited, and we will certainly take it all into account. So, whatever you want to tell us, we're pleased to consider it. MR. MATHIS: Great, thank you. The gaming statute, as you know, provides for certain portions of the commonwealth tax revenue to be allocated out.

They're somewhat specific as to the particular section and statute.

Some of those provisions relate to allocations back to the local communities. Specifically, there's a reference in the statute to a local gaming-aid fund at a healthy twenty percent.

There's a reference to a community mitigation fund at six-and-a-half percent, and there's also a reference to local capital projects fund, which is two percent.

Based on our estimates and what I understand about the way the other bidders view the market, that could be tens of millions of dollars perhaps back to the communities.

So, I know you have asked in the RFP2 for -- in consideration of the city's payment, and I understand that some of those funds would be -- it would be your intention to have them allocated toward a local gaming-aid fund or for adverse impacts.

I just wanted a clarification that the monies that will be collected and
distributed by the state and community -- which you don't control, I understand that -- that there will be some kind of consideration of the funds that would come from the state when you're evaluating how much is involved.

MR. SCHALLER: Short answer: No, simply because we view that that money is coming from the state: We don't know when it's going to come; we don't know exactly how it's going to be allocated amongst the communities; it affects all the proposers equally.

And so what we've done here is intentionally set up a competitive process. So, we will not... I'm not sure how we would think about how to take that into account in evaluating the particular proposal. So, that's really going to be between us and the state, and all the other communities that have a right to participate in those funds.

My recollection -- I haven't
looked at that section in a while -- is that there are all sorts of mechanics for establishing boards and whatnot in which various
communities will participate, decide how those funds are allocated.

Again, I wouldn't know how to think about how to provide some sort of credit. And again, it's a level playing field. Those funds are being furnished by the state, so I don't think it really affects any one proposal differently than another.

I hope that's responsive.
MR. MATHIS: It is, it is. It's
not quite the answer we were looking for.
MR. SCHALLER: Understood.
MR. MATHIS: But it is an answer.
Understood. And it is nebulous as to how much you will get and when you'll get it.

MR. SCHALLER: Anything is
possible.
MR. MATHIS: Fair enough.
Last question: MGM has been very
active, as you may know, in neighborhood council meetings, as the other bidders have as well. So, one of the things we've heard a lot, generally, is about traffic. That's not
uncommon when you're talking about a facility of this type in this community.

So, I just want a little bit of clarity on the traffic. We view the traffic study ultimately as a collaborative effort between us as the operator -- or whoever the operator is -- and their consultant, and then DPW and whoever your consultant is.

At the outset there's been specific questions in regards to Phase II RPF about the things you're looking for, sort of at a higher level, which makes sense. We just want to make sure there will be an opportunity for what feels like a site-specific one-on-one dialogue where we talk about the things that the city would want to see and our views on it. We are contemplating future phases of that.

MR. SCHALLER: I think the way, if
I can put it in my own words, traffic is a very important consideration for the city and to the residents: Access, street widening, stop lights, right turns, left turns, all those types of things.

We see it, $I$ think, as an
intermittent process, meaning that we need some basic information from the proposers as to how you see people getting in and out of your facility: Things like number of expected vehicles, access from the highway, do we need a ramp, how you're going to pay for that ramp. Those sorts of questions are all very important to the city.

When we get that information in, as you've suggested, we will be reviewing it with our traffic consultants, and we will probably... it's likely we will come back to you with questions, refinements, and a little more information to explain this, whatever.

And then for those, for the -when we get into the host-community agreement, negotiations, all this information is going to be reduced to schedules or exhibits. At that point we would be looking for more refinements.

So, obviously you need a reaction from the city -- and possibly from the state and federal officials -- I don't know exactly what
people are going to propose, so we're mindful of the fact that you're going to need feedback from others before the plan is really personalized. MR. MATHIS: Thank you very much. THE FLOOR: Well, I'm not sure I completely understood the answer, but, you know, with any development of any significance -well, I'll speak for my department -- we would like to get involved in the early innings as much as possible. And generally speaking, what we would do in development, any time a developer is at a point where they have a preliminary site plan, they're going to come into engineering and/or water/sewer and kind of lay it on the table to the point that... of the information they have collected. And then we have a back and forth and tweak it.

I don't know if $I$ understood you to say, yeah, you're going to do that, but after they do the submission.

And I would suggest, if it's
appropriate, that after today, that we're kind of allowed to sit down one-on-one with each of
the developers on the site unique to itself, so we don't waste time and money.

MR. SCHALLER: I think it's a great, great suggestion. I answered it the way I did because I don't know what the timing is on their side in terms of being able to produce what is needed to produce and make that --

THE FLOOR: I'm surprised they
don't have it. So, that's okay.
MR. SCHALLER: Sure. No problem. THE FLOOR: The DPW is open for business.

MR, PIKULA: If I may? You know, all of you who have done this before, you have to talk with city officials and put together some documents so that you can do that. The first is going to be this sort of meet-and-greet so you have everyone's info and you have a contact sheet, and we will circulate that and you'll have it.

The second is, we want to keep a record, a log of all this, so we have as much accountability and transparency as we can have.

So, there's two documents that the department heads have been provided and will be using. One is going to be a phone log; so we would ask that you identify yourself, that you are acting on behalf of a proposer, so we can have a record of it.

And two is going to be a meeting log. And again, it will just be a document so that everyone knows who is in the room and who was there when. So that, again, we can be kept abreast that there are no sort of "back-room deals" going on or anything like that, and so that everyone gets the information they need to put together their proposals.

And the studies -- we know this is a lot of work. We know there's a lot of information, but that's what you guys do in your course of dealings.

So, toward that end we have talked a little bit about the confidentiality, or lack thereof, that Massachusetts has a very open public records law, and that's going to help you get the information from our departments.

But again, anything that you
submit is also public record. Unless, as identified in RFP, it falls under some exemption: If it's proprietary, or trade-secret-related, or that aspect in Chapter 23K that talks about an exemption for materials submitted in an application to protect the competitive nature.

So if, in fact, you're going to be giving us information that you feel should be confidential, you need to identify that. And that has to be sort of ruled upon to make sure that everyone's interests are protected -- the private interests and the competitive nature of the process that we're going through, and the public interests, and the need-to-know so we can balance those things out.

So, I would just ask that you keep those things in mind and know that we expect you to be contacted, and it may be a situation where you're going to talk to one department and they need to say, "You know, I need to get I-T involved," because you're going to gather data
that maybe they can't get their hands on. Or we need to get law involved because I need some sort of ruling on this, or $I$ need help -- so, if that's helpful.

MR. SCHALLER: I think Ed's point -- we're not trying to put the proposers in a box and say, "Give us your proposal based upon your information only."

What we are trying to do is have an orderly process so that everybody is treated the same, so it's a level playing field for all the proposers, so you have access to all the department heads. And again, we just walk in and try to do this in an orderly fashion.

Anything else from MGM?
MR. MATHIS: No, thank you.
MR. SCHALLER: Troy, go ahead.
MR. STREMMING: Thank you.
Troy Stremming. I'm a senior vice
president of government relations and public affairs for Ameristar Casinos. I just want to start with a follow-up to that question. So, is the protocol
that we would actually contact them directly, or do we need to go through your office first to let you know that there's some contact? I want to make sure we're not violating the prohibited communications.

MR. PIKULA: I can speak to that. There's no prohibition for you to contact department heads to get the information you need. You should know that there will be a phone log, there will be a meeting log, and we want to keep track of that so that we're not crossing any lines here. That being said, as they feel they need guidance, they can contact us.

MR. SCHALLER: Anything else from
Ameristar?
MR. STREMMING: Yes. We have a few questions.

Again, we want to thank everyone for being here and taking time out of your busy day for this. I want to say we're very pleased and proud to be moving into Phase II, so we look forward to working with all of you.

The first question we had regarding the time line with the extension now to January 3: Will that also result in the other action dates that are on your calendar being moved forward? And if so, will you put that in the calendar? MR. SCHALLER: I'm glad that you raised that. This is one of those questions that the city has to reserve on. We don't know yet. I don't want to predict movement of the dates. I think we indicated in Amendment Number One that the city may consider changing the other dates, but for right now we're taking it one step at a time. So, we don't know that. MR. STREMMING: Our second question regards the public information section that we talked about earlier. There are a lot of details about that in the RFP2. We're trying to get a better feel -- particularly in light of questions that we encounter from the public -- will those actually be questions from people who are Springfield residents? Could people come in
from outside the community, or even the state, to ask questions? Is there some type of parameters on pre-qualification, just so the questions are specific to each. MR. SCHALLER: I don't think we have nailed it down to that point yet. I can tell you the way we have done it in the past, it has worked well. It's that each proposer gets to make a presentation, thirty to forty-five minutes, something in that range. And as to who goes first, second, or third, we'll have to figure that out. There's advantages to each. The way we have done it is... had limited it to Springfield residents because they're the ones that are most impacted by that. We've had them sign up, give their names, where they live. We don't have them do anything ahead of time. We do it actually at the session.

Then they have, say, three minutes to ask questions of anybody or everybody, and we will have city people there because some of the questions may pertain to the city and the
process.
I know that Mr. Kennedy is working on the date and the place, and I'm sure we will have information very soon. I know people have schedules and everything has to be organized. MR. STREMMING: Thank you. The next question we had was regarding schematic versus concept designs. We had some discussions back and forth. We want to make certain that all of the proposers understand exactly what is wanted. It's our understanding that you don't want construction documents?

MR. SCHALLER: Right. To that point, which we were asked earlier in the week, we had posted -- I believe today -- to the SRA web page, Amendment Number Two. And that Amendment Number Two, as long as we're on it, let me just tell people what's in it.

Amendment Number Two covers three items. One is the question that Mr. Stremming just asked, which is, we are clarifying what we mean by schematic drawings. We're explaining
that... we took out the word "schematic," and we said we're just looking for drawings that illustrate, at a minimum, the list of items -- I think there were ten items we were looking for -- which have to be drawn to scale, but they are not intended to be detailed, architectural plans.

There were two other points in
response to issues that were raised by proposers. And again, this is already on the web page. But since you asked, let me just go into it.

We were asked by several
proposers... we had changed the date, extended the date from December 14 to January 3, the submission date. We then wanted to clarify that notwithstanding that extension of the submission date, the $\$ 400,000$ application fee to the state still had to be paid by December 14, and the $\$ 250,000$ Phase II submission fee still had to be paid by December 14. But that the evidence that the proposer had become an applicant, in other words, all the forms that have to be filed with
the state under the RFP1 don't have to be filed until January 3. So, that clarification is posted.

And then there was a final clarification. The Exhibit A to the Phase II which was captioned "Acknowledge consent and the release" provided in paragraph three that the releasor -- in other words, the proposers -were agreeing that the city does not acknowledge or agree that any of the submitted information is confidential and/or proprietary... again, in response to a comment.

We clarified that that was the case unless the city determined otherwise pursuant to the section of Phase II that deals with confidentiality. So, those have been posted.

MR. STREMMING: Great.
MR. PIKULA: You know, we actually
talked about batting order for making proposals, and we actually thought the best way to do it was to shuffle the deck and cut cards.
MR. STREMMING: Seems fair.

The next question we had is -- and I will just reference page nine of the RFP2. It's regarding the zoning ordinances for casinos, which we know currently don't exist. Do you have any idea as to timing when these might exist, or if there's some draft document that we might get to review subsequent to this process?

MR. PIKULA: Phil Dromey is our Planning director. Phil, raise your hand. He is the person to meet with to go over zoning requirements. You know, those are very site-specific questions, particularly if there's properties that may need variances, or some other changes.

But for the most part if you look at our existing zoning ordinances, every site is going to require a special permit. And a special-permit-granting authority in Springfield is the city council.

So, Phil can go over the process for that and we can talk about the timing of it, but that's probably something that comes down
the line.
The other thing you should know is we do have a proposed zoning ordinance in front of the city council. It is posted on our website for the Planning Department. So, you can look at that. Again, I don't want to step on Phil's territory here, but for the most part it's the same requirement that you have under the existing, in that there would still be a special permit required.

Anything else that you want to add to that?

MR. DROMEY: No. Again, under the current ordinance you would require a special permit from the city council for what is considered to be an indoor place of amusement. Under the proposed ordinance, which is right now in committee and only has about thirty-plus days to expire or be approved, there is, in addition to the indoor place of amusement, we also have proposed a peer review system which would trigger a review, basically starting at a site-plan review by the administrative staff all
the way up to the city council.
My opinion is that would probably trigger an additional special permit due to the size of the project.

There is no current idea to create a casino zone that I'm aware of. We believe this is covered under the existing ordinance which could be used for the special-permit-granting authority -- as well as the proposed zone also has regulations that would cover casino operations. MR. PIKULA: Phil, maybe you could also talk a little bit about site-plan review. The existing ordinance for the city really doesn't have site-plan review, but as a condition of any special permit, we always require special site-plan review. And again, Phil would be the person to talk to in terms of the requirements process there. MR. DROMEY: It kind of just... under our current zoning ordinance there is no technical-site-plan review process except for the Department of Public Works. If you require
a special permit, you kind of theoretically go under the site-plan review process. That's kind of the same avenue that we have taken with the new document, although there is sufficient site-plan review process contained in the document. If you require a certain permit from the city council, you go through that simultaneously rather than having to go through the planning board routine.

Under our current ordinance there
is no site-plan review process, unless you require a special permit, and then you go through that process under the city council. Under the new ordinance, although we have a specific section for site-plan review process at the planning board level, if you require and trigger a higher review -- which I believe this one would -- site review simultaneously under the city council for the special permit. So, it wouldn't require you to go to a planning board and then the city council for a special permit. MR. SCHALLER: Clear as day.

MR. DROMEY: Just to follow up on
that... I do believe that all of the areas that are being proposed, I don't believe... I mean the south end is, depending on how far it goes, there may be some need for zone changes.

I certainly believe that the Page Boulevard, the least-restricted zone in the city as industrial Zone A and allows a special permit. Even though the north end of it... there's a mixture of business and industrial.

The south end is where you start to get a mixture of business and, in some areas, the further south you go in the south end, you do tend to hit some residential districts, so there may be some requirements for zone changes as well as certain variances for heights and for setbacks.

MR. PIKULA: One other thing: Did you want to talk about urban-renewal districts as well in terms of approvals there?

MR. DROMEY: Yes. Again, depending on what section of the city you're located in, there could be additional reviews
required by the Springfield Redevelopment Authority. I think those are probably specific to the south end, and I think the north end has an underlying urban-renewal zone now that are under the urban-renewal plan, though. There are specific -- as an overlay to the underlying zoning that you require -- sometimes more restrictive regulation regarding signage and height, so those do require, sometimes, waivers by the Springrield Redevelopment Authority and additional site-review plan process through that particular board.

MR. STREMMING: I have just a few more.

The top of page eighteen in the RFP2, there's a discussion regarding temporary casinos and if the Commonwealth would approve that... somewhat, we were a little surprised to do that.

So, I guess the question we have is, is that something that the city is actually considering? Or is that something that it is
not considering?
MR. SCHALLER: I'm going to let Mr. Froelich answer that.

MR. FROELICH: We had asked the question several months ago to Karen Crosby as to what their position is going to be on that topic. As you know, the city could well have interest in that. We don't want to be pushing uphill. The statute, if you read it literally, does not contemplate temporary casinos.

On the other hand Crosby said, "What I'm telling you is I don't know. I'm not telling you no. We're going to look at it. We're going to consider it and get back to you." The only conversation that was had in addition to that was it generates more revenues, which most states are interested in doing. So, we're going to get a better answer down the line.

MR. STREMMING: Obviously it's
very important because it can be viewed two different ways. The sooner to get revenues, but at the same time across the country there have been temporary casinos that stay temporary way
too long. So, we want to get some clarification.

MR. SCHALLER: I think the reason he asks the question -- we know it's subject to all sorts of things: Subject to getting a site, subject to tax rate, subject to all sorts of -how long I can keep it open so I can recover my capital? We recognize that there's a whole host of questions that you're going to have.

This is more of the case of, take everybody's temperature and see if all the proposals say this is the greatest thing since sliced bread, and go back to the commissioners and say, "Hey, we would like you guys to consider it because our proposers would really like to do something within that parameter."

MR. FROELICH: I think we're going to take the lead from the state.

MR. PIKULA: The state has issued a policy framework where they're looking for feedback, and I think there's one on this issue here.

MR. STREMMING: The next question
we had regarding the studies that are required, obviously there are a lot of studies. Our traffic study alone is going to be quite voluminous. There is a request that we provide, I think it's twenty-two copies of everything that we provide to the consultants.

What we want to better understand is, does it make more sense for us to provide you with an executive summary in each of those twenty-two copies for each of the studies that are required, and then give you the actual studies separately in separate appendices? Because otherwise, as you might imagine, you're going to get volumes and volumes of documents. MR. SCHALLER: I think it's a good idea, Troy. I think different people are going to be reviewing it. Truthfully, us reading a fifty-page document on traffic doesn't make much sense. Al is going to be doing that. So I think it's a great suggestion. We'll come up with... let's assume that we're going to do it that way, in a summary, and then we'll specify that that's what
we're going to do is produce a summary of those sections, and then we'll specify how many copies of the actual report should be provided to the various departments, because there's no reason for us to get twenty-two of those.

I think that's a good thought.
We'll post something on the website that's more specific. We'll go through each of the studies and see if in some cases we would like multiple copies. Let me make a note.

MR. STREMMING: Then we have just
one last question regarding page ten. I think the exact language that you used in page ten regarding the project construction schedule, the project construction -- it is project construction schedules. But we assume what you're looking for there is a complete project development schedule so that we're talking about from the time of approval of getting a license to opening, and not from the time of putting a shovel in the ground to opening. Obviously, that could be quite different between the projects.

MR. SCHALLER: Yes, yes, I think that's a good point, very helpful.

MR. STREMMING: That's all I have.
Thank you.
MR. SCHALLER: I don't mean to
disparage you because you're in third place.
MR. STOLYAR: Again, thanks very much for everybody here.

My name is Alex Stolyar, S-t-o-l-y-a-r, vice president of corporate development for Penn National Gaming.

A lot of the questions have been covered so this shouldn't take too long. One of the questions we had was about how you're sort of going to weigh different subject matters in the selection process.

For example, land costs. You know, speaking from our perspective, as we were looking around for a country site to do our proposal on, we chose to focus on the urban core of the city.

One of the things that goes along with that is higher land costs. You can go out
in a cornfield and build something a lot cheaper, or buy the land a lot cheaper.

We're trying to get a sense of how
the city is going to value or, you know, quantify the amount that we're spending on land relative to other proposals.

MR. FROELICH: I think this is clearly a factor. I think there are aspects of land acquisition that are... they start with money but they also tell you "here's what we're doing." So, it will be looked at conversely, you know, someone is spending $\$ 100$ million on real estate, the city is still very interested in what is it going to get. It's going to get taxes, real estate taxes and the like. But it's certainly very interested
in what the revenue sharing, if you will, the dollar amount it's going to receive.

It's going to be considered but we're not going to take it any further, anything encroaching dollar for dollar, for instance, if you were out-negotiated by someone and ended up paying more, the city is going to be interested
in what's in it for the city, relevant consideration.

We're interested in making sure
business stays in the city, so to the extent you're displacing someone, they're going to stay in the city -- that's a plus.

But specific weighting, no, we're not going to do that with the specific weighting. At the end of the day it's still subjective. We don't know, and have never been able to figure out the points score system because there's an element of -- does the city like it? Is it a plan that it likes? Is it a plan that it feels comfortable with? Those are very hard to weigh in terms of points. So, factored in by the biggest is what are we going to get? How many jobs do we get? How much money do we get?

MR. STOLYAR: Okay, understood. There was mention in the RFP about the... nobody should be able to flip this project, to be able to just transfer ownership right away.

MR. SCHALLER: Correct.
MR. STOLYAR: Does that apply to
inner intra-party transfers as well?
MR. SCHALLER: We just started
looking at that. Let me kind of give you the broad brush. Number one, the city is going through this extensive process to select, and has been fortunate to attract three world-class developers. We're going to get to know you very well over the next couple of months, and your proposals.

We are relying upon your
experience, financial ability, and so forth in large part in making this very difficult decision that we have to make. To then allow the proposer to immediately turn around and sell it to a stranger to the process, we don't think would be responsible and in the best interest of the city. Now that is sort of the $\$ 30,000$ response. But it's not responsive directly to your question.

Certainly public company
shareholders, even though they are the ultimate
owners of the project, we're not restricting -we have no -- at least right now -- present intention to prevent that transfer.

Similarly, if a company decides -and we had this happen in the City of Detroit -if an entire company decides to sell itself to another major company, we're not trying to prevent that sort of organic change. We recognize in some of your structures, we believe, are going to have individuals or trusts or other entities of possibly local people.

In those situations we're going to allow more leeway because we understand that people do things for estate-planning purposes, maybe they want to cash out early or whatever. So, small pieces obviously, small percentages are not -- at least are not going to try to restrict.

What we're really interested in is doing business with a particular proposer. We want to make sure at the end of the day we're still doing business with that proposer and not a stranger.

I know I'm not being very specific. That's one of those items that we just put a line item in the Phase II to alert people that there would be transfer restrictions but we have not yet worked out all the precise details.

MR. FROELICH: I want to offer that by simply saying if there's a substantial partner in your deal as a result of Phase II -and obviously all of you could end up with additional partners or additional investors, and that person is important to the deal, financial standpoint, or for some other significant point -- our preliminary thinking is we felt we'd try to apply that kind of important an individual to somebody who is not key to the deal, either financially, operationally, or in some other method I can't think why we would have to transfer.

MR. SCHALLER: We're trying to be practical and realistic that we know there are good and legitimate reasons for people to want to transfer. And as long as we know we have the
company that is doing business with the important people, important entities, that we're probably okay with that. MR. STOLYAR: Thank you. You're seeking a financing commitment of 120 percent of the project budget with the RFP?

MR. SCHALLER: Would you direct me to that? Are you sure that wasn't in the state act? I just don't recall it off the top of my head.

MR. STOLYAR: It might be in the state act. I thought that was in the local one as well. I could be mistaken.

The question is, in relation to that kind of commitment, is that going to be focused on the project budget or the project scope?

MR. SCHALLER: I can't answer
that. I don't think that was something that we were seeking. I'll take another look at that in here and we'll post a response.

MR. FROELICH: I'll go through it
as well. We'll put it in writing. MR. STOLYAR: Has the City of Springfield done any work, any studies on what it anticipates the local impact to be, both on the City of Springfield and on the neighboring communities?

MR. SCHALLER: Not as yet. We will be doing that. The city is in the process now of engaging consultants, additional consultants. And one of the reports, one of the studies we will be commissioning is an impact study. But that's not yet started. MR. STOLYAR: And when that impact study is done, will that also take into account the amount of property taxes that the new casino development will be providing? MR. SCHALLER: Yes. MR. STOLYAR: That will all be taken into account with the local impact? MR. SCHALLER: Correct. MR. STOLYAR: Excellent. Those are my questions. MR. SCHALLER: Very good. Thank
you very much.
Any of the other proposers have any follow-up issues, anything? We're here to help you.

I know that, Ed, you had a few items on the lobbying.

MR. PIKULA: I can. You should know that all of our department heads have been briefed as to the applicable laws under Chapter 268A which is our state ethics law, and Chapter 55 terms of office of campaign and political finance, because there are rules about political activity, and there are rules about talking in support of or in opposition to ballot questions. So, we're going to err on the side of caution here, and $I$ would just ask that each of you consult your local counsel as to what laws may be applicable to you, what filings you may have to do, if any, with regard to ballot questions, as those issues come forward.

The only other thing I have is, has someone seen the sign-up sheet? If we could make sure we have everyone on it. Rhett, if you
could make sure that each of the proposers has had a chance to see that. Why don't you start right there. Make sure everyone who is here on behalf of the casinos, a representative or an agent or attorney, signs in so we have a record of who was here.

MR. SCHALLER: We found your question. I'm glad -- we were thinking of it differently, which is why $I$ drew a blank. MR. STOLYAR: They have it in here as twenty percent.

MR. SCHALLER: It's in Section 3E
of Phase II and what we were looking to elicit from this was to make sure that the proposers could handle financially a twenty percent cost overrun. We're not looking for a financing commitment here. We want to know, based upon all of your financial ability, your project, you're estimating a cost of $\$ 800$ million which includes land and everything else, we want to make sure you can handle that magnitude of cost overrun on your project.

I hadn't really thought about,
should it apply to construction costs only?
Should it include professional fees? I'm fairly confident that all the proposers here will be able to handle that sort of... if there's a cost overrun of that magnitude.

MR. STOYLAR: So, I guess let me ask my question another way then. Let's say we're fortunate enough to be selected and we do start to have cost overruns, will we be able to reduce some of the scope of the project? In other words, can the scope be reduced as long as the total amount invested stays at or above what it was committed to?

MR. SCHALLER: I'm sorry. I don't understand exactly what you're asking. You're saying that you submit a proposal, and then at some point you change the proposal and now you need to amend it, or this is during the building stage?

MR. STOYLAR: Yes. Let's say
during the design or the building stage, whenever it is, let's say the size of the entertainment venue needs to be reduced...
however the total amount --
MR. SCHALLER: What flexibility do you have?

MR. STOYLAR: Can parts be increased as long as the total budget stays the same or doesn't go down?

MR. SCHALLER: That's a good
question. It's something that we are thinking about now as it comes to the host community agreement. Obviously what we're doing is... ideally what we are trying to do is when we get to the final proposal, we are trying to sort of freeze that in time and use that, what you're proposing as we will schedule those items as part of the host community.

So, if you're telling us you're going to build four hundred hotel rooms at a cost of "X," that's what we expect you build. Now, being realistic about it, we will probably have some language that if there's a material change, you have to come back to us and get our consent. So, there will be some room because we understand that once you start
developing, there may be reasons, good and valid reasons, to make a change for a variety of reasons. So there will be some flexibility, if that's what you're asking.

MR. FROELICH: To be clear, we're anticipating that if a developer says, "I'm going to build a 150,000 square foot gaming floor, seven restaurants, and a four hundred room hotel," that's what we expect to have delivered.

MR. SCHALLER: Right. If you're telling us you're going to build a Cadillac, don't give us something else.

MR. FROELICH: I didn't want Michael's answer to be sure, you have to get our consent. It will be difficult to obtain our consent if it's a material variation from what was selected.

The reasons for that are
multi-fold. Not only is that the basis for which you chose the developer more likely than not one of the reasons that the state said yes, you're suitable. But remember, we went out to
the citizens and got a vote. That vote is based on that host community agreement, and what was promised to be built. If that's not what is going to be built, citizens aren't going to be happy with us, or with you guys. So, it's going to be a hard area.

There are circumstances, but they're going to have to be huge and they're probably going to have to be extraneous to your project -- it's probably going to have to be "war broke out," of that type.

MR. STOYLAR: Understood.
MR. SCHALLER: We're here to help. So, does anybody have anything else?

MR. FROELICH: Remember, we're from the government. So, we've heard that story before, we're from the government. We're here to help.

MR. SCHALLER: Ed?
MR. PIKULA: No. Just make sure we have all your contact information.

MR. SCHALLER: Thank you.
(Public meeting concluded.)
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