

**Massachusetts State Lottery Commission
Official Minutes of 07/29/2025 Meeting**

Massachusetts State Lottery Commission

150 Mount Vernon Street, Suite 300

Dorchester, Massachusetts 02125

Tel: (781) 849-5555

Fax: (781) 849-5546

TTY: (781) 849-5678

Official Meeting Minutes

DATE: Tuesday, July 29, 2025

TIME: 10:30 a.m.

All Attendees Participated Remotely through Zoom Conferencing System

MEMBERS PRESENT: Deborah B. Goldberg, Treasurer and Receiver General
William J. McNamara, Comptroller
Nina X. Liang, Commissioner
Meghan S. Liddy, Commissioner
Suleyken Walker, General Counsel, Executive Office of Public Safety and Security, designee of Secretary Terrence M. Reidy

ALSO PRESENT: Mark William Bracken, Executive Director, Lottery
Sheila Capone-Wulsin, Chief Marketing Officer, Lottery
Gregory Polin, General Counsel, Lottery
Steven Martins, Chief Revenue Officer, Lottery
John Rinkacs, Chief Technology Officer, Lottery
Didier Bertola, Chief Financial Officer, Lottery
Christian Teja, Chief iLottery Officer, Lottery
Christine Mountain, Chief Human Resources Officer, Lottery
Michael Lorden, Director of Sales and Regional Operations, Lottery
Matthew DiFrancesco, Director of Operations, Lottery
Thomas Cream, Director of IT, Lottery
Subrata Baguli, Director, Cyber Security, Lottery
Delwin Dickinson, Director of Modernization, Innovation and Performance, Lottery
Liz Giffen, Director, Digital Operations, Lottery
Keith Macri, Creative Director, Lottery
Christopher Taffe, Associate General Counsel, Lottery
Austin McGovern, Associate General Counsel, Lottery
Benjamin Wood, Assistant Director, Stakeholder Engagement, Lottery
Gregory Gallagher, Assistant Director, Digital Operations, Lottery
Geoffrey Filleti, Drawing Studio and Production Manager, Lottery
Thomas Dougherty, Regional Manager, Lawrence, Lottery
Steve Moore, Regional Manager, New Bedford, Lottery
Michael Lanava, Regional Manager, Worcester/Springfield, Lottery
P.J. Vande Rydt, Regional Manager, Braintree, Lottery
Judy Rampino-Moore, Executive Assistant, Lottery
Julie Goggin, Human Resources Business Partner, Lottery

**Massachusetts State Lottery Commission
Official Minutes of 07/29/2025 Meeting**

Rich Reale, Facilities Manager, Lottery
Thomas Aiello, Manager, Product and Promotional Development, Instant Tickets, Lottery
Kristen Chaput, Manager, Product and Promotional Development, Monitor Games, Lottery
Tim Karalexis, Manager, Product and Promotional Development, Draw Games, Lottery
Jamie Martel, Social Media Coordinator, Lottery
Connor Maclean, Digital Content Coordinator, Lottery
Max O'Day, Communications Specialist, Lottery
Michelle Yitts, Marketing, Visual Media Specialist
Kerri Coyne, Marketing Specialist, Instant Tickets, Lottery
Kate Sutton, Marketing Specialist, Instant Tickets, Lottery
Justin Donnini, Marketing Specialist, Draw Games, Lottery
Julia Lehmann, Marketing Specialist, Monitor Games, Lottery
Kaitlyn Gibbons, Marketing Intern, Lottery
Kylie Campbell, Marketing Intern, Lottery

Chandra Bork, Deputy Treasurer and Chief of Staff, Treasury
Sandra DeSantis Lynch, General Counsel, Treasury
Andrew Napolitano, Communications Director, Treasury
Emily Kowtoniuk, Director of Policy and Legislative Affairs, Treasury
Lizandra Gomes, Deputy Chief of Staff, Treasury
Alexa Michon, Policy Associate, Treasury
Frankie Kennedy, Intern, Treasury
Zachary Sclar, Intern, Treasury

Christopher Shaban, Managing Director, Aristocrat Interactive
Rob Wesley, VP of North American Customer Development, Aristocrat Interactive
Shane Taylor, Account Director, Aristocrat Interactive
Harper Stephens, Senior Manager, Government Relations, Aristocrat Interactive
John Taylor, Managing Director, Faulkner & Howe, LLC
Sarah Lamberti, Senior Bid Manager, Allwyn North America
Mark Basedow, Operations Specialist, Lotto.com Inc.

Katie Macedo, Deputy Director of Leasing, Division of Capital Asset Management and Maintenance (DCAMM)
Amy Gabrila, Senior GameSense Advisor, The Massachusetts Council on Gaming and Health
Bill Egan, Managing Partner at Egan Legal Strategies, LLC

Colin Young, State House News Service
Dan Connelly, Senior Vice President, ML Strategies

Denis Kennedy, Principal at Dewey Square Group
Ashley Powers, Kearney, Donovan & McGee
Michael Travaglini, Attorney, Travaglini, Eisenberg & Kiley
Louisa Castrucci, Assistant Attorney General, Attorney General's Office
P. Doan, Attorney General's Office

**Massachusetts State Lottery Commission
Official Minutes of 07/29/2025 Meeting**

Paul Kominers, Esq., Hearing Officer, Anderson & Kreiger
Kathy Tran, Appellant

Michael William Bartlett, Member of the Public
iPhone, CGS, Member of the Public
LY, Member of the Public

I. Opening of Meeting

Treasurer Deborah Goldberg opened the Massachusetts State Lottery Commission (“Commission”) meeting at 10:30 a.m.

Treasurer Goldberg stated:

“Pursuant to the Commonwealth’s Open Meeting Law, Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 30A, Section 20, I would like to advise that any person may make a video or audio recording of this open meeting. However, I am obligated to inform attendees of any recording at the beginning of the meeting,” and she asked those who are making any recording to identify themselves as doing so.

Judy Rampino-Moore, Lottery, Colin Young, State House News Service, and Sarah Lamberti, Allwyn North America identified themselves as making a recording.

Treasurer Goldberg referenced the Massachusetts Open Meeting Law, Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 30A, section 20, and identified the following Commissioners as present: Commissioner Meghan Liddy, Comptroller William McNamara, General Counsel Suleyken Walker, Commissioner Nina Liang, and herself, Treasurer Deborah Goldberg. Treasurer Goldberg indicated that the Commissioners would be participating remotely for the meeting pursuant to Chapter 2 of the Acts of 2025, which permits remote participation by all Commissioners and allows the use of adequate alternative means, such as audio or video conferencing, to ensure public access to the deliberations of the Commission.

Treasurer Goldberg noted that the Commissioners are all participating by a conference call through Zoom conferencing and asked the Commissioners to identify any sort of technical difficulty. Treasurer Goldberg also stated that the Commissioners may participate in any votes scheduled to take place at today’s meeting and that all votes must be taken by roll call.

II. Approval of the Minutes from June 24, 2025

Treasurer Goldberg asked the Commission to accept the minutes from the meeting held on June 24, 2025.

Commissioner Nina Liang made a motion to accept the minutes of the meeting and General Counsel Suleyken Walker seconded the motion.

Treasurer Goldberg, recognizing there was no further discussion, moved the motion to a roll call vote. Commissioner Meghan Liddy: yes; Comptroller William McNamara: yes; General Counsel Suleyken Walker: yes; Commissioner Nina Liang: yes; and Treasurer Goldberg: yes. The Motion carried.

**Massachusetts State Lottery Commission
Official Minutes of 07/29/2025 Meeting**

The minutes were approved at 10:33 a.m.

III. Executive Director's Report

Fiscal Year 2025 - Summary

Executive Director Mark William Bracken presented a year-end review of Fiscal Year 2025, noting that the figures provided are preliminary estimates. He informed the Commission that the finalized Financial Statement of Operations for Fiscal Year 2025 will be completed by the end of September, and as such, minor fluctuations may occur.

Executive Director Bracken reported that the Lottery's Fiscal Year 2025 began on July 1, 2024, and ended on June 30, 2025. He noted that this fiscal year included one fewer day of activity as compared to the previous year due to the 2024 Leap Year. Estimated revenues for FY 2025 totaled approximately \$5.962 billion, representing a decrease of about \$206.8 million from the record \$6.168 billion generated in FY 2024. Despite the revenue decline, the Lottery expects to return an estimated \$1.065 billion in net profit to the Commonwealth, exceeding the projected return of \$1.050 billion. This represents a year-over-year decrease of approximately \$93.7 million, as compared to the FY 2024 net profit of \$1.159 billion. Notably, this marks the fifth consecutive year that net profits have exceeded \$1 billion.

The estimated prize payout reached 74.07 percent, up from 73.37 percent in FY 2024, setting a new record for the highest payout percentage in the Lottery's history. Estimated retail agent commissions and bonuses totaled \$340.7 million. Additionally, Keno achieved record sales with an estimated \$1.285 billion in revenue.

He indicated that a more detailed review of the finalized figures will be provided during the September or October meeting.

Prize Payout Percentage, Fiscal Year-to-Date by Month

Executive Director Bracken presented a five-year comparison chart of prize payouts. Referring to the chart included in the meeting materials, he reported that the current fiscal year-to-date prize payout stands at 74.1 percent, the highest level in the past five years, and noted that this is a trend that has continued for most of the year. He described it as a good year for Lottery players.

Lottery Sales Update – June (Unadjusted)

Executive Director Bracken provided the Commission with an update on Lottery figures for June 2025, reporting that overall unadjusted sales were up \$3.4 million as compared to June 2024.

He noted that the estimated net profit and prize payout figures for June 2025 do not include accruals for prizes won but not yet paid. There was a significant \$8.8 million decrease in Instant Ticket grand prizes claimed, totaling \$19.2 million in June 2025 as compared to \$28.0 million in June 2024.

Massachusetts State Lottery Commission Official Minutes of 07/29/2025 Meeting

The estimated net profit for June 2025 was \$76.6 million as compared to \$69.5 million in June 2024. After subtracting a 1-day average net profit figure of \$2.6 million due to a shift in the calendar that resulted in one more day being included in the net profit figure for June 2025, the adjusted change for June 2025 versus June 2024 is an estimated \$4.5 million increase in net profit. The estimated prize payout for June 2025 was 72.11 percent, down from 73.38 percent in June 2024.

Executive Director Bracken also delivered a detailed breakdown of June 2025 sales as compared to June 2024. Instant Ticket sales increased by \$6.6 million and Mega Millions sales rose by \$1.1 million (high jackpot of \$348 million as compared to \$560 million in June 2024).

Gross Sales Results – June Sales

Executive Director Bracken reported on the year-to-date FY25 versus FY24 sales through June Unadjusted Non-Fiscal Year as well as the Gross Sales Results for June FY25 versus June FY24.

Executive Director Bracken reported that Instant Ticket and Mega Millions sales were up with Mega Millions showing the most significant gain. All other games were down. Powerball sales decreased by \$1.1 million, a decrease of 17.9 percent. Overall, total sales were up \$3.4 million with an increase of .8 percent.

Executive Director Bracken provided an update on fiscal year-to-date gross sales and noted continued strength in two product lines. Lucky for Life posted a 2.3 percent, increase of \$1.1 million, while Keno remained a top performer with sales up 3.1 percent, generating \$38.3 million in additional revenue. Other game categories experienced declines. Instant Tickets were down 1.1 percent, decrease of \$45.8 million, Mega Millions was down \$36.2 million, and Powerball was down \$120.6 million. Overall, total sales decreased 2.9 percent year-over-year, representing a \$179 million decline.

Summer Words Promotion 7/17 – 8/20

Executive Director Bracken invited Draw Games Product Manager Tim Karalexis to provide an update on the Summer Words Promotion.

Product Manager Karalexis provided an update on Summer Words, the first component of the Lottery's Summer Cash Bash promotion. He reported that this five-week promotion, now in its second week, began on July 17th and will run through August 20th. Each day, a summer-themed keyword is printed on all draw and monitor game tickets. Players can enter that day's keyword on the Lottery's website for a chance to win cash prizes. A new keyword is offered daily, providing fresh opportunities to participate with winners selected weekly throughout the promotional period. Product Manager Karalexis noted that the first entry period (July 17–23) received 52,167 entries. He described this as a strong result, reflecting both players who submitted a single keyword and those who entered all seven keywords for the week.

Product Manager Karalexis also shared details about the upcoming Summer Cash Bash event, scheduled to take place at the Lottery's Worcester Regional Office on Thursday, August 28. Five winners from the Summer Words Promotion will be selected to spin a giant prize wheel with a chance to win up to \$100,000 with a minimum prize of \$10,000. Additional attendees may be chosen to participate in the Cash Drop, where they could win up to \$1,000, and all attendees will have the opportunity to win door prizes.

Massachusetts State Lottery Commission Official Minutes of 07/29/2025 Meeting

August 12th Instant Ticket Launch

Executive Director Bracken handed the presentation over to Instant Ticket Product Manager Tom Aiello to report on the August 12th Instant Ticket launch.

Product Manager Aiello thanked the Executive Director and outlined the upcoming August 12th launch, which will consist of five games. He first introduced the \$1 price point game, “\$10,000 Bonus Play,” offering a top prize of \$10,000. This is a “no break-even” game meaning all winning tickets will pay \$2 or more and players can win up to seven times per ticket.

Next is the \$2 price point game, “\$100,000 Two For The Money,” with a top prize of \$100,000. Same as the \$1 game, it features a no break-even structure with all winning tickets totaling \$4 or more. It also offers two play styles, a key number match and a symbol match.

Following is the \$5 price point game, “\$1,000,000 Big Money,” which offers a top prize of \$1,000,000. This game also follows the no break-even format with all winning tickets paying \$10 or more.

Product Manager Aiello then introduced the \$10 price point game, “\$100,000 Max Winnings,” with a top prize of \$100,000. He noted this is the first time the Lottery has launched a \$10 game with a top prize at this level. A key call-out featured on the ticket is, “Best Chance to Win \$100,000 on a MA Lottery \$10 Ticket.” He explained that traditional \$10 games typically include top prizes of \$4,000,000 and \$1,000,000. For “\$100,000 Max Winnings,” the Lottery maintained similar overall odds and payout percentage, but redirected funds normally allocated for the higher top prizes to supplement the \$100,000 prize tier. This allowed the game to offer 80 prizes of \$100,000, adding variety to the \$10 portfolio while still appealing to players.

Rounding out the August launch is the \$20 price point game, “\$10,000,000 Instant Millions,” with a top prize of \$10,000,000. This ticket features three bonus spots and allows players to win up to 23 times per ticket. Prominently displayed above the title is the call-out, “Top Prizes From \$1 Million to \$10 Million.”

August 12th Instant Ticket Launch – POS

Product Manager Aiello next presented the Point of Sale (“POS”) materials developed to support the August launch. He stated that this launch’s POS will feature an 8.5” x 11” poster and a 5-inch decal. The poster will showcase all five tickets. Key callouts featured include, “Over \$311,000,000 in Total Prizes” and “Over 11,700,000 Total Winners.” The decal will focus on the \$10 and \$20 tickets, utilizing the same callouts featured on the ticket fronts for both games.

August 12th Instant Ticket Launch – Commercial, Social Media Video, and CFD Animation

Product Manager Aiello turned the presentation over to Lottery Creative Director Keith Macri to discuss the design, concept, and theme behind the August campaign.

Creative Director Macri thanked the Commission and explained as with all Lottery campaigns, the creative team looks for opportunities to explore non-traditional approaches in order to capture public attention. The goal, he said, is to stand out from the “noise” created by competing advertisers,

Massachusetts State Lottery Commission Official Minutes of 07/29/2025 Meeting

whether on billboards, television, or other platforms, and to create content that makes viewers stop scrolling, keep the channel on, and engage with the message.

For this campaign, the team chose a satirical approach to advertising, borrowing the visual style and messaging tone often seen in certain legal or “advice” commercials, but without presenting the Lottery as a source of actual legal or advisory services. The POS materials reflect this concept, featuring bold, eye-catching imagery, large callouts about winnings, a prominent block of cash, and graphic elements reminiscent of traditional law-firm advertisements.

Creative Director Macri then introduced video elements developed for the campaign. While the preview shown to the Commission did not include audio, he explained that the final versions will be repurposed for multiple formats and will include audio. The visuals add motion, attitude, and further reinforce the theme, featuring imagery such as a gavel, money flying, and strong central prize callouts. He described the television commercial as deliberately adopting the aesthetic of certain “low budget” ads, bright graphics, exaggerated performances, and over-the-top delivery, because these traits are attention-grabbing and recognizable. To carry this concept, the team created the character, “Max Winnings.” The name was inspired by the \$10 ticket “\$100,000 Max Winnings,” with Creative Director Macri noting it immediately suggested the persona of a “winning advocate” and someone whose sole mission is to encourage others to win. In the commercial, Max Winnings is portrayed as a charismatic but self-conscious “winning enthusiast” who loves being the center of attention. Creative Director Macri explained that this character was intended to bring personality, humor, and memorability to the campaign. Creative Director Macri played the video for the Commission.

Creative Director Macri shared that his favorite part of the campaign’s closing sequence is that the jingle was not only written in-house but also performed by the Lottery’s Senior Graphic Designer Ashley Moore. He stated that she created all of the campaign graphics and personally sang the jingle. He noted that the character of Max Winnings was portrayed by another Lottery employee, Editor & Producer James “Jimmy” Brockett. Creative Director Macri expressed pride in the collaborative spirit of the Lottery team, particularly the Marketing Department, highlighting how staff are always willing to participate, even in humorous or “silly” ways, to bring creative ideas to life. The answer is always yes, he said, emphasizing how rewarding it is to work in such a cooperative and engaged environment.

Creative Director Macri then introduced an additional video component. In addition to the previously presented commercial, planned for Connected TV (“CTV”) and YouTube, the campaign will feature social media content designed for platforms such as Instagram and Facebook. This content is created in a different aspect ratio for optimal display in social feeds and is intended to meet audiences “where they are.” He explained that the goal is to provide multiple touchpoints for the campaign – commercials, billboards, CTV spots, out-of-home placements, and social media pieces, all consistent in theme without being repetitive. The featured social media video focuses on the \$20 ticket, “\$10,000,000 Instant Millions,” and provides viewers with a deeper introduction to the character of Max Winnings. Before thanking the Commission for their time and the opportunity to present, Creative Director Macri played the final video for the Commission.

IV. Matters Requiring Approval of the Massachusetts State Lottery Commission

VOTE (1): The Executive Director is authorized to continue to work with the Commonwealth’s Division of Capital Asset Management and Maintenance and to execute a Second Amendment to

**Massachusetts State Lottery Commission
Official Minutes of 07/29/2025 Meeting**

Lease the premises at 150 Mount Vernon Street, Dorchester, Massachusetts with the below vendor pursuant to terms that are consistent with those discussed and/or presented at this meeting:

Bayside Merchandise Mart SPE, LLC
150 Mount Vernon St., Ste 500
Boston, MA 02125

The total maximum obligation for the ten (10) year lease period, which ends on February 18, 2029, shall not exceed sixteen million, one hundred sixty-seven thousand, six hundred forty-nine dollars and six cents (\$16,167,649.06).

Comptroller William McNamara made a motion to continue to work with the Commonwealth's Division of Capital Asset Management and Maintenance and to execute a Second Amendment and Commissioner Nina Liang seconded the motion.

Executive Director Bracken provided an update regarding office space needs in preparation for the upcoming launch of iLottery next summer. He explained that the Lottery intends to acquire approximately 4,100 additional square feet at its Dorchester headquarters to accommodate an anticipated expansion of staff. Executive Director Bracken noted that the Lottery was fortunate to identify available space opening up on the fifth floor of the building. Currently, the Lottery occupies roughly one-third of the first floor and the entirety of the third floor. The addition of space on the fifth floor will help support the operational demands associated with iLottery. He informed the Commission that Katie Macedo, Deputy Director of Leasing from the Division of Capital Asset Management and Maintenance ("DCAMM"), was present at the meeting to address any technical or leasing-related questions.

Executive Director Bracken stated that the cost increase for the additional space is proportional to the Lottery's current per-square-foot rate. He described the leasing arrangement as a straightforward amendment, to be executed in coordination with DCAMM and the Lottery's existing vendor. The new lease arrangement will run concurrently with the Lottery's existing contract.

Treasurer Goldberg, recognizing there was no further discussion, moved the motion to a roll call vote. Commissioner Meghan Liddy: yes; Comptroller William McNamara: yes; General Counsel Suleyken Walker: yes; Commissioner Nina Liang: yes; and Treasurer Goldberg: yes. The Motion carried.

VOTE (2): For the reasons set forth in the attached memorandum dated July 24, 2025, the Executive Director is authorized to enter into contract negotiations for a full-service iLottery platform and related services with:

NeoGames US LLP dba Aristocrat Interactive
20 Cabot Blvd., Suite 300
Mansfield, MA 02048

This selection is made pursuant to a competitive bid process (RFR LOT # 2601).

Any proposed contract resulting from negotiations will be submitted to the Massachusetts State Lottery Commission for final vote and approval.

Massachusetts State Lottery Commission Official Minutes of 07/29/2025 Meeting

Commissioner Nina Liang made a motion to enter into contract negotiations and General Counsel Suleyken Walker seconded the motion.

Executive Director Bracken stated that, since the passage of the online lottery law last summer, the Lottery team has been hard at work researching, crafting, issuing, and scoring an RFR for an online lottery systems and related services. This leads to today's vote, which asks the Commission to authorize the Executive Director to enter into contract negotiations with NeoGames US LLP, doing business as Aristocrat Interactive.

Executive Director Bracken recapped the process to date:

Last August, the Lottery issued two procurements. The first was an RFR for a consultant to assist in drafting the RFR and to provide expert knowledge of the online lottery space. Through this process, the Lottery contracted with Gaming Laboratories International (“GLI”), a world-renowned testing and insights company, not just in the lottery industry, but in the broader paid gaming space as well. The Lottery was able to leverage GLI’s experience and expertise to provide technical guidance throughout the process, offer input on system requirements, explain regulatory considerations, and share best practices from other states involved in online lottery. Their involvement supported the Lottery's PMT in ensuring that the solicitation was comprehensive, well-organized, and aligned with both our goals and current industry practices.

The second procurement was an RFI issued to potential qualified bidders, inviting them to speak with the Lottery about their online systems and games. Over a three-week period, 10 companies delivered more than 25 hours of in-person presentations. These sessions were highly valuable, offering first-hand demonstrations of iLottery platforms and facilitating discussions about implementation, industry practices, fintech considerations, and interactive Q&As.

The information gathered through this RFI process, combined with the industry presentations and extensive conversations with peers and colleagues from other lottery programs, played a critical role in shaping the final RFR.

The Lottery assembled a Procurement Management Team (“PMT”), which consisted of:

- Mark William Bracken – Executive Director
- Christian Teja – Chief iLottery Officer
- John Rinkacs – Chief Technology Officer
- Didier Bertola – Chief Financial Officer
- Steve Martins – Chief Revenue Officer
- Sheila Capone-Wulsin – Chief Marketing Officer
- Liz Giffen – Director of Digital Operations

In addition to the PMT, advisory members included:

- Franklin Carreiro – Assistant Director of IT
- Del Dickinson – Director of Modernization, Innovation, and Performance Management
- Greg Polin – General Counsel
- Lee Conroy – Manager of Procurement

Beyond the PMT and advisory group, the Lottery leveraged the expertise of dozens of staff across departments including Finance, Cybersecurity, Marketing, Security & Compliance, IT, and others ensuring that no stone was left unturned in the evaluation process.

Massachusetts State Lottery Commission Official Minutes of 07/29/2025 Meeting

Beginning in the fall and continuing through today, the PMT met as a group twice weekly in addition to numerous smaller working sessions being held throughout each week.

The RFR was issued at the end of April, with a response deadline of June 13, 2025. The Lottery received five proposals from the following companies:

- Allwyn North America, Inc. (“Allwyn”)
- IGT Global Solutions Corporation (“IGT”)
- NeoGames US LLP, doing business as Aristocrat Interactive (“Aristocrat”)
- Pollard Banknote Limited (“Pollard”)
- Scientific Games, LLC (“Scientific Games”)

The proposals were evaluated using a weighted scoring system that reflected the Lottery’s key priorities for a successful iLottery implementation. Prior to the issuance of the RFR, evaluation criteria were set across four categories:

Technical (70%)

- Cost (15%)
- Supplier Diversity (10%)
- Invest in Massachusetts (5%)

This structure provided a balanced framework to assess each bidder’s platform, cost-efficiency, and alignment with the Lottery’s diversity and economic development goals.

Evaluation Process Breakdown:

Phase I – Business Requirements

Proposals were first reviewed to ensure compliance with all mandatory submission requirements, including completion of required forms and adherence to legal and administrative criteria outlined in the RFR. All five bidders satisfied the Phase I requirements and advanced to Phase II.

Phase II – Technical Evaluation

This phase centered on a detailed and comprehensive assessment of each bidder’s proposed solution. A standardized score sheet developed prior to the proposal submission deadline, and aligned with the RFR structure, was used to ensure consistency and accuracy in evaluations.

The technical evaluation represented 70% of the total score, emphasizing the importance of selecting a solution with strong functional capabilities, scalability for future growth, proven reliability, and potential to generate the highest gross sales. These elements were critical to achieving a successful launch and delivering a user-friendly player experience that maximizes profits for early childhood education and care.

Each proposal was collaboratively reviewed by the PMT, with focus areas including, but not limited to:

- Platform architecture
- Security and compliance
- Player account management
- Games
- Content integration
- Marketing

Massachusetts State Lottery Commission Official Minutes of 07/29/2025 Meeting

- Reporting tools
- Retail inclusions
- Responsible gaming features

Upon completion of the review, technical scores were finalized and locked from further edits.

Phase III – Cost Evaluation

After finalizing the technical scores, cost proposals were released to the PMT for evaluation. Cost accounted for 15% of the total score. Each bidder's cost tables were carefully reviewed, with attention to pricing structures, individual cost categories, and overall alignment with the Lottery's operational and financial objectives.

To ensure competitive and advantageous pricing over the contract term, the Lottery issued a request for Best and Final Offer ("BAFO") along with a clarification question to all five bidders. This allowed vendors to refine their pricing proposals and ensured a clear understanding of cost assumptions.

Scoring

Evaluation scores were based on a total of 10,000 possible points:

- Technical: 7,000 points
- Supplier Diversity: 1,000 points
- Invest in Massachusetts: 500 points
- Cost: 1,500 points

Executive Director Bracken referred to the meeting materials revealing the total point scale for each of the five bidders:

- Aristocrat: 8,019.00
- Scientific Games: 7,948.00
- Allwyn: 6,847.57
- Pollard Banknote: 6,145.90
- IGT: 5,932.57

Executive Director Bracken reported that, following the completion of the evaluation process, the Procurement Management Team unanimously recommends opening contract negotiations with NeoGames US LLP, doing business as Aristocrat Interactive, for the Full-Service iLottery Platform and Related Services.

Executive Director Bracken provided an overview of Aristocrat Interactive and its joint venture with NeoGames (NPI), emphasizing their extensive experience and market presence. NeoGames currently offers a turnkey iLottery platform in eight U.S. jurisdictions via the NPI joint venture. Their platform, NeoGames NeoSphere, is operational in:

- U.S. Jurisdictions: Michigan, North Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia (under NeoGames); New Hampshire (as Aristocrat Interactive)
- International Markets: Alberta (Canada, AGLC), Czech Republic (Sazka), and Minas Gerais (Brazil, Lotominas)

Regarding their content studio and game offerings, NeoGames/Aristocrat Interactive is:

- Live in 12 jurisdictions, with 11 additional jurisdictions in the process of going live in the U.S.
- Selling games to the Georgia Lottery

**Massachusetts State Lottery Commission
Official Minutes of 07/29/2025 Meeting**

- Preparing to go live in Kentucky and Pennsylvania

International game sales are currently ongoing in:

- Europe: Austria (Win2Day), Croatia (Hrvatska Lutrija), Greece (OPAP), Hungary (Szerencsejatek), Italy (Lottomatica, Sisal), Lithuania (Olifeja), Portugal (Santa Casa), Turkey (Sisal), and Ukraine (UNL)
- In development: 9 international projects underway with Premier Bet (Africa), BCLC (British Columbia), LEIA (Europe: Denmark, Finland, France, Norway, Sweden), Toto (Netherlands), and Tipos (Slovakia)

U.S. Market Share:

Executive Director Bracken noted that according to Q1 2025 data from the Eilers Report:

- 69% of gross iLottery wagers in the U.S. are made via the NeoGames NeoSphere platform (either directly through Aristocrat or through NPI)
- 17% through IGT
- 8% through Scientific Games
- 6% through Intralot
- Less than 1% through Pollard

Executive Director Bracken also noted that the last three competitive bids for a full-service online lottery provider were awarded to the NeoGames NeoSphere platform:

- West Virginia (via NPI joint venture)
- Michigan and New Hampshire (directly with Aristocrat Interactive)

Executive Director Bracken concluded that Aristocrat's proposal earned the highest overall score and offered a solution that almost perfectly aligns with the Lottery's strategic objectives. The proposed platform demonstrated unmatched strengths in core areas essential to a successful iLottery program, including system reliability, scalability, player account management, responsible gaming features, mobile and web integration, and strong analytics capabilities. Aristocrat's proposal represents the best value to the Commonwealth, delivering both the functionality and long-term support needed for a successful program launch and more importantly sustained operations, providing the Lottery with a proven platform for driving revenue and profit that will allow the Lottery to fulfill its mission of maximizing funding for early childhood education and care.

Treasurer Goldberg thanked Executive Director Bracken and asked the Commissioners if they had any questions.

Comptroller William McNamara raised a question regarding vendor focus and relationship management, noting the extensive reach and scale of Aristocrat Interactive and NeoGames, including their presence in multiple U.S. states and international jurisdictions. Given the size and success of the vendor, he asked how the Lottery would ensure that Massachusetts receives the share of the focus and sufficient attention and support as a key client. Executive Director Bracken explained that the Lottery is currently in a blackout period, and as such, no discussions have taken place with any vendors beyond notifying them of the vote being held. He confirmed that the integrity of the procurement process has been maintained throughout. Executive Director Bracken added that Massachusetts is expected to become one of the leading online lottery programs in the country, making it highly likely that all vendors, including those not selected as the platform provider, will

Massachusetts State Lottery Commission Official Minutes of 07/29/2025 Meeting

have a vested interest in working collaboratively with the Lottery. He noted that while Aristocrat Interactive is being recommended for the platform, other vendors may still supply games for integration, further strengthening future collaboration. He also highlighted a key benefit of selecting Aristocrat Interactive in that the company has a mature platform, already deployed in major iLottery markets such as Michigan, Virginia, and North Carolina. Because the platform is shared across multiple jurisdictions, enhancements made for one state often benefit others. This collaborative environment allows Massachusetts to benefit from ongoing innovation and improvements developed for other clients, ensuring sustained support and system advancement.

Commissioner Meghan Liddy inquired about the operational history of the NeoGames NeoSphere platform in other states, specifically asking how long it has been in use in states such as New Hampshire, and whether formal references had been provided from those jurisdictions. Executive Director Bracken responded that Michigan has been operating off of the NeoSphere platform since the inception of its iLottery program, which began approximately 11 to 12 years ago. He confirmed that New Hampshire has been live on the platform since launching its iLottery operations approximately 5 to 6 years ago. Executive Director Bracken further explained that New Hampshire had originally implemented the platform through the NeoPollard Interactive (NPI) joint venture, a collaboration between NeoGames and Pollard Banknote. However, that joint venture is no longer active in new bidding efforts, and the two companies now bid separately. As a result, New Hampshire recently selected Aristocrat Interactive as its vendor to continue operating on the NeoSphere platform while contracting directly with Aristocrat for additional services moving forward. Executive Director Bracken also noted the successful implementation of the platform in Virginia, which has been live for approximately 4 years and currently maintains the highest iLottery sales in the country. North Carolina has also been operating on the NeoSphere platform for a couple of years.

Commissioner Nina Liang raised a question to better understand the division of liability and data ownership in the new iLottery system. She acknowledged the Lottery's experience in data protection and privacy and inquired about what is currently known regarding the vendor's data management practices and how responsibility will be divided between the Lottery and the platform provider.

Executive Director Bracken responded that, as with the Lottery's current operations, the Lottery will retain ownership of all player and operational data, even though it will reside on a third-party system. He noted that this is similar to the current arrangement with Gamby, the vendor responsible for operating the Lottery's mobile app and website, where the data resides in the back-end systems but remains under the Lottery's control. To provide additional detail, Executive Director Bracken invited Chief Technology Officer John Rinkacs to address the technical and data security aspects of data handling under the proposed platform.

CTO Rinkacs explained that the Lottery's cybersecurity team has already conducted an initial review of the vendor's responses as part of the RFR process. He emphasized that:

- The Lottery will own the data
- The vendor will have responsibility for certain financial transactions, including banking, deposits, and related payment processing
- Further details around data protection, system access, and responsibility will be addressed in the implementation and contracting phases

CTO Rinkacs noted that the Lottery intends to work closely with the vendor to ensure strong data protection protocols are in place and that data remains clearly under the Lottery's ownership and control.

Massachusetts State Lottery Commission Official Minutes of 07/29/2025 Meeting

Treasurer Goldberg, recognizing there was no further discussion, moved the motion to a roll call vote. Commissioner Meghan Liddy: yes; Comptroller William McNamara: yes; General Counsel Suleyken Walker: yes; Commissioner Nina Liang: yes; and Treasurer Goldberg: yes. The Motion carried.

Before moving to the next item on the agenda, Executive Director Bracken took a moment to express his appreciation to the Lottery staff and the Commission for their continued support throughout the iLottery procurement process. He acknowledged the extensive effort and commitment required over the past year, noting that the scoring process began nearly one year to the day from when the joint committee released the state budget indicating the launch of online lottery and the team worked diligently through a complex and comprehensive process, culminating in the current recommendation. Executive Director Bracken recognized the work as a significant achievement and extended his gratitude to everyone involved, stating that he was proud of the Lottery team's dedication and execution.

Treasurer Goldberg, in a lighthearted response, remarked that Executive Director Bracken might finally get a short break from screen time though she acknowledged that the next phase may be just as demanding.

VOTE (3): For That the Massachusetts State Lottery Commission hereby ratifies and adopts the Decision and Recommendation of Paul Kominers, Esq. (hearing officer sitting by designation) in re: Appeal of Kathleen Tran

General Counsel Suleyken Walker made a motion to ratify and adopt the Decision and Recommendation and Comptroller William McNamara seconded the motion.

Hearing Officer Paul M. Kominers, Esq. provided a summary of his decision. He stated that this matter involves an appeal from the denial of payouts on five high value tickets submitted by Ms. Kathleen Tran, each purchased from a different store. When asked about the origin of the tickets, Ms. Tran claimed they were given to her as unscratched birthday presents, which she said explained her unfamiliarity with four of the five retail locations that sold the tickets. However, Hearing Officer Kominers noted that four of the tickets were purchased after Ms. Tran's birthday, and two of them were validated at the same stores where they were purchased. He emphasized that, while he would be the last person to discredit someone's testimony solely because a birthday gift may have been given belatedly, he could not credit the overall narrative presented, which is that Ms. Tran received all five tickets as post-birthday gifts, and two of them were validated at the exact same locations where they were sold, that she waited a full month before attempting to redeem them, and yet claimed not to be familiar with the stores. Because he discredits the testimony regarding the two validated tickets, he also discredits the testimony with respect to the remaining three tickets. For these reasons, Hearing Officer Kominers recommended that the Commission affirm the Lottery's decision to deny payouts on all five tickets.

General Counsel Greg Polin asked if any Commissioners had questions for Hearing Officer Paul Kominers before the Commission heard directly from Ms. Kathleen Tran.

General Counsel Suleyken Walker requested further clarification regarding the "green ticket" referenced in Hearing Officer Kominers' decision. She asked what made that particular ticket less persuasive and why it was ultimately not approved, even though some details aligned with Ms. Tran's explanation.

Massachusetts State Lottery Commission Official Minutes of 07/29/2025 Meeting

Hearing Officer Kominers acknowledged that the green ticket was indeed the closest call in the case, as noted in his written decision. It was the only ticket for which Ms. Tran had any prior familiarity with the store where it was purchased, which was a Sunoco station in Brookline. Importantly, the green ticket was never validated. When questioned by a Lottery investigator on the day she submitted the tickets, Ms. Tran initially stated that she did not know where any of the tickets came from. However, when presented with a list of store locations, she indicated that she was familiar with the Brookline store and believed the green ticket came from there, which turned out to be correct. Despite this partial alignment, Hearing Officer Kominers explained that the Lottery typically expects a claimant to proactively identify the purchase location of a ticket, not simply acknowledge familiarity after being shown a list of stores. Additionally, given that he had already found Ms. Tran not credible with respect to the other four tickets, this inconsistency influenced his assessment of the green ticket as well. General Counsel Walker then asked for clarification as to whether Ms. Tran claimed to have purchased the green ticket herself, rather than having received it as a gift. Hearing Officer Kominers responded that Ms. Tran stated all five tickets were gifts, including the green ticket. The difference in this case was simply that the green ticket was purchased at a store she was familiar with, not that she had claimed to have bought it herself.

Commissioner Liddy asked for clarification regarding the ticket validation process, confirming her understanding that validation occurs when a ticket is scanned and confirmed as a winner at the location where it was purchased. Hearing Officer Kominers explained that validation can occur at any licensed Lottery sales location. However, in this particular case, two of the five tickets submitted by Ms. Tran were validated at the same stores where they were originally sold.

Before the Commission heard from Ms. Tran, General Counsel Polin stated that the Lottery agreed with the outcome of the hearing officer's decision. He explained that, based on the evidence presented, the Lottery believed it was more likely than not that the tickets were obtained through improper transactions. The Lottery did not find Ms. Tran's explanation (that the tickets were gifts) to be credible or plausible. Based on this conclusion, and in the absence of any more likely explanation, the Lottery maintained that the tickets were improperly assigned and that it was under no obligation to make payment. This position was also presented during the hearing.

General Counsel Walker asked for additional clarification on how the Lottery normally treats gift situations. She commented that it would seem reasonable for someone who received a ticket as a gift not to know where it was originally purchased. Hearing Officer Kominers responded that his reading of the law does allow for the gifting of unscratched tickets. However, he noted that such situations can make it difficult to establish a proper chain of custody if the Lottery has concerns. Attorney Kominers said his understanding of the law is that once a ticket is scratched and has become a claim on the Lottery, it is no longer freely assignable, except under very limited circumstances defined in statute, such as placement into a family trust; gifts among friends or even among family members are not considered valid assignments unless executed through that narrow exception.

Treasurer Goldberg asked for clarification about whether Ms. Tran had claimed the tickets were already scratched when she received them. Hearing Officer Kominers clarified that Ms. Tran stated all five tickets were given to her unscratched, and that she scratched them herself.

General Counsel Polin expanded on the earlier question from General Counsel Walker. He noted that while it is understandable for someone to be unfamiliar with the store where a gifted ticket was purchased, it is highly unusual for an individual to present five high tier winning tickets and claim that four were gifts. The statistical probability of winning in that manner is very low. Furthermore, when someone brings in a \$1,000 ticket and claims it was a gift, it raises reasonable questions about whether it was truly given as a gift, or whether there might have been some underlying transaction.

Massachusetts State Lottery Commission Official Minutes of 07/29/2025 Meeting

General Counsel Polin confirmed that, based on the information available at the hearing, the Lottery did not find her explanation plausible or credible and supported the denial of the claims, in alignment with the hearing officer's decision.

General Counsel Walker said the explanation helped clarify the Lottery's reasoning, especially with regard to the emphasis placed on knowledge of the stores and the timing of validation.

General Counsel Polin offered additional clarification, noting that Ms. Tran said two specific tickets were received by her as gifts in an unscratched state. However, Lottery records showed those same tickets were validated at the stores they were sold, and she had also stated she was unfamiliar with those stores. To be validated at the store of sale, each ticket had to be scratched and scanned at that particular store, and this conflicted with her stated explanation.

Treasurer Goldberg acknowledged that this clarification resolved an earlier point of confusion.

Commissioner Liddy asked for a final clarification specific to the green ticket, questioning whether Ms. Tran had claimed that she had personally purchased that ticket at the store in Brookline.

General Counsel Polin noted that Hearing Officer Kominers' decision reflected that the green ticket in question had been purchased by Ms. Tran. Commissioner Liddy asked for confirmation on whether that particular ticket had been validated. Hearing Officer Kominers responded that it had not been. Commissioner Liddy then sought clarification on the timing of the claim, asking whether Ms. Tran first approached the Lottery office with all five tickets in June of 2022. Hearing Officer Kominers confirmed that timeline.

At that point, General Counsel Polin asked Treasurer Goldberg for permission for Ms. Tran to speak. Treasurer Goldberg agreed, and the floor was passed to Ms. Tran to voice her objections to the recommendation.

Ms. Tran addressed the Commission, thanking them for the opportunity to speak. She respectfully asked that the Commission not adopt the hearing officer's recommendation. She stated that while she understood the Lottery's obligation to uphold the integrity of the claims process, she believed the recommendation was based on speculation rather than facts. Ms. Tran explained that she had testified truthfully at every stage of the appeal and that four of the five tickets were gifts from friends or family, something she described as a completely legal and a common occurrence. She acknowledged that some of the tickets were validated at the stores where they were purchased but argued that this did not indicate misconduct. She pointed out that it is not unusual for gift-givers to check if a ticket is a winner before giving it, which she said could explain the validation records. Regarding two specific tickets, Ms. Tran shared that she often works from home and does not go out frequently. When she realized she had winning tickets, she asked her husband to validate them because she was shocked and wanted to confirm they were real. She denied any suggestion that she acted on behalf of others as a runner or was part of a fraudulent scheme, stating that there was no proof to support such claims. She emphasized that she had not received payment or compensation from anyone and had no motive for wrongdoing. She described herself simply as someone who got lucky, not a fraudster or broker. Ms. Tran drew a comparison to social media giveaways, noting that although the chances of winning may be slim, people do win, and she has personally won six online giveaways. She said she had provided proof and documentation to support those past wins and had also offered the best information she could during this claims process, even if she had trouble recalling details of a specific store years after the fact. She acknowledged that three years had passed since the initial claim and said her inability to remember some store details did not mean she had been dishonest. Ms. Tran expressed concern that if her claims were denied based solely on

Massachusetts State Lottery Commission
Official Minutes of 07/29/2025 Meeting

improbability, it could set a troubling precedent in which simply being lucky might be treated as grounds for suspicion. She asked the Commission to consider the lack of concrete evidence against her and to look beyond statistical assumptions. Ms. Tran stated that she had cooperated fully, remained transparent, and submitted what she believed were legitimate claims. She concluded her remarks by respectfully asking the Commission for fair consideration.

General Counsel Walker asked Ms. Tran to clarify a point she had made about ticket validation. She stated that Ms. Tran seemed to suggest that it was normal for someone to validate a winning ticket before giving it as a gift.

Ms. Tran responded that what she meant was that she assumed that would be normal behavior, generally speaking, people might go to a store to check if a ticket is a winner. However, in her specific case, she had her husband check the tickets because she mostly stays at home.

General Counsel Walker confirmed that Ms. Tran was saying she had received the tickets as gifts from family and asked whether those tickets were given to her months after they were purchased. She also asked whether Ms. Tran then scratched the tickets and had her husband validate them afterward. Ms. Tran clarified that she had felt under pressure when she first went to the Lottery office to submit the tickets. She said that experience was overwhelming because she didn't expect to be questioned, and it was the first time she had ever been put in a room and interrogated about something she didn't think she had done wrong.

General Counsel Walker then asked for clarification on which tickets had actually been validated. Ms. Tran stated that two of the tickets had been validated, as previously noted by General Counsel Polin and Hearing Officer Kominers, and that those validations occurred at the stores where the tickets had been purchased.

Commissioner Liddy echoed General Counsel Walker's earlier point. She said that based on Ms. Tran's earlier comments, it sounded like Ms. Tran understood it to be common practice to validate a ticket before giving it as a gift. Ms. Tran clarified her earlier statement. She explained that when a person scratches a ticket and realizes it might be a winner, it's normal to go to the store to check if the prize is real. That was what she meant, not that gift-givers routinely validate tickets before giving them, but that people generally confirm a win after scratching.

Commissioner Liddy then asked for confirmation: was Ms. Tran saying that her husband went to validate the tickets because she was in disbelief? Ms. Tran confirmed that, yes, he had done so because she couldn't believe she had actually won.

General Counsel Walker asked whether only two of the tickets were validated in that manner. Ms. Tran confirmed that was correct. She explained that after realizing any prize over \$500 had to be claimed in person at the Lottery office, she decided not to have her husband keep checking tickets at retail locations. Instead, she chose to bring them all to the Lottery office in Dorchester to check their validity directly.

General Counsel Polin pointed out that the decision in this case specifically noted that the two validated tickets had been validated at the same stores where they were originally sold.

Treasurer Goldberg asked for clarification, if the two validated tickets were scanned at specific stores, was Ms. Tran familiar with those locations? General Counsel Polin confirmed that the decision reflects she was not familiar with the two stores where the validated tickets were scanned.

Massachusetts State Lottery Commission Official Minutes of 07/29/2025 Meeting

Treasurer Goldberg then asked whether that unfamiliarity suggests she did not validate the tickets herself. General Counsel Polin responded that Ms. Tran testified during the hearing that she did not validate them and that now she seemed to be saying her husband had validated them instead, unless he was misunderstanding her.

Ms. Tran confirmed that her husband had validated the tickets.

Hearing Officer Kominers noted that the explanation that her husband had validated the tickets was not presented during the director-level hearing, and he was confident it was not presented during the commission-level hearing either.

General Counsel Walker said she was having difficulty understanding the relevance of whether or not a ticket was validated, and where. She asked what difference it made if Ms. Tran scratched the tickets herself and brought them in, what was the significance of the validation process in this context?

General Counsel Polin explained that validation is an electronic record of when and where a ticket is scanned. If a ticket is worth \$1,000, it cannot be claimed at a regular Lottery retailer; it must be processed either at a Lottery office or through the official app. So, if a \$1,000 ticket is validated at a retail location, it means it was scratched and then scanned there. The date and time of validation are recorded in the system.

General Counsel Walker clarified that if the tickets were supposedly given as gifts and unscratched, then any validation at the point of sale prior to the gift-giving would be inconsistent with that claim. General Counsel Polin confirmed this, stating that if someone says they received an unscratched ticket as a gift, but that ticket was validated at the retail location it was purchased from, that would be a clear inconsistency. That discrepancy was part of the basis for denying the claim.

Treasurer Goldberg noted that this was a critical fact. Treasurer Goldberg ask for clarification regarding the timing of the sale versus the timing of the scratch/validation.

General Counsel Polin added that for each ticket, the Lottery has data on when the book was activated (each book typically contains 100–200 tickets), as well as the exact date the ticket was validated (in the case of the two that were scanned) and the date on which all five tickets were presented for claims.

General Counsel Walker asked whether the Commission had the option to take the matter under advisement. General Counsel Polin confirmed that the Commission was not obligated to vote on the matter at this meeting and could choose to defer action if members felt they needed more time.

Executive Director Bracken added context from the decision. He pointed out that Ms. Tran claimed she received the tickets unscratched and lived in Dorchester at the time. According to her, when she realized she had potentially won, she asked her husband to go out and validate the tickets. However, two of the validated tickets were purchased and validated at stores located in Randolph and Stoughton. He emphasized the improbability of this detail: if the tickets were purchased randomly by family members and the Tran household didn't know where they originated, it seemed highly unlikely that her husband would just happen to return to the exact same stores in those towns Randolph and Stoughton to validate them, out of all possible store locations in the greater Boston area.

Massachusetts State Lottery Commission
Official Minutes of 07/29/2025 Meeting

Ms. Tran clarified that her husband is a package delivery driver with varying routes. She explained that after discovering one of the scratched tickets was a gift from a friend who worked at a specific store, her husband, while assigned to that route, decided to check and validate the ticket at that location. She added that he happened to be assigned to that area again and used the opportunity to validate the ticket.

General Counsel Walker asked Ms. Tran if she had ever provided the names of the individuals who gifted her the tickets. Ms. Tran replied that she had provided names at the beginning of the process, specifically during her initial interview at the office, which she believed was conducted by Compliance Analyst Kevin Floster. She noted that the tickets were an assortment from different family members and friends, and she gave those names at that time.

General Counsel Polin reiterated that a full hearing had already taken place in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, with a full transcript available. He stated that, to his knowledge and as confirmed by Attorney Kominers, Ms. Tran never mentioned the explanation about sending her husband out to validate the tickets during that hearing. Ms. Tran responded that she had been through many interactions and may not have mentioned it during the background phase but believed she had brought it up either in the hearing or during earlier interviews.

Commissioner Liddy inquired whether any evidence had been presented regarding the Brookline ticket, particularly given that Ms. Tran did not initially identify the store where it was purchased. Ms. Tran explained that her mother lives in Brookline, and she had dropped her off and then stopped at a nearby store where she purchased the green ticket.

General Counsel Walker sought clarification, noting that Ms. Tran had just stated her husband handled the validation. Ms. Tran responded that she was referring specifically to the green ticket which she had purchased herself, not the others.

Commissioner Liddy asked Hearing Officer Kominers whether that testimony was documented in the hearing. Hearing Officer Kominers stated that it was reflected in Compliance Analyst Floster's investigative report, although it was not addressed further during the hearing.

Commissioner Liang expressed concern about the improbability of two separate winning tickets being validated at the exact stores where they were purchased, one in Randolph and one in Stoughton, especially when both tickets were in hand. She questioned why both would not have been validated at the same time and place and noted that the likelihood of them being validated at their points of purchase seemed too coincidental to be accidental.

Executive Director Bracken emphasized that in Ms. Tran's first interview with Compliance Analyst Floster, which Executive Director Bracken identified as the initial step in the process and therefore likely the freshest in her mind, she was unable to say where either winning ticket had been purchased. Referring to the written discussion and decision, Executive Director Bracken quoted: "[She] could not tell Mr. Floster in June where either ticket had been purchased, and disclaimed familiarity with the stores where they were identified for her." Executive Director Bracken noted that this was her very first interaction with Compliance Analyst Floster, and at that time she could not provide the purchase locations. Yet, today, in her more recent statements, Ms. Tran offered new information not previously disclosed, specifically, that she had sent her husband out after speaking with friends, and that his route, which may have passed through Randolph and Stoughton, led him to the exact two stores where the winning tickets were purchased. Executive Director Bracken questioned why weren't both tickets validated at the same store. He stressed that it's very unusual and unlikely that someone would validate one ticket in Randolph and then drive to Stoughton to then

**Massachusetts State Lottery Commission
Official Minutes of 07/29/2025 Meeting**

validate the other ticket. He further emphasized that none of this new information was offered at any point earlier in the process, including during Ms. Tran's very first interaction with the Lottery. Executive Director Bracken acknowledged that time had passed since that initial interview and this kind of detail would have been most fresh and relevant during the initial investigation.

Commissioner Liang agreed and stated that if ticket "A" was purchased from store "A" and ticket "B" was purchased from store "B," and there was no knowledge at the point of validation of which ticket was purchased at which store, the odds of matching each ticket to its purchase location, validating them in two separate stores when both tickets were in hand, would be extremely unlikely. She explained that if she personally had both winning tickets in hand, without knowing where either was purchased, and happened to pass by a store where one of them had been bought, she would naturally take the opportunity to validate both tickets at that store. However, that is not what occurred in this case. Instead, each ticket was validated separately at the exact store where it had been purchased. Commissioner Liang noted that this feels more intentional than coincidental, which is where her confusion arises, how did it happen that, by chance, each of the two tickets were validated at its original purchase location, separately, when the stated intention was to validate both tickets together.

General Counsel Walker agreed and acknowledged that this was why she was struggling with the relevance. She could not see why it was significant that Ms. Tran did not know where the tickets were purchased, as these had been given as gifts. What was more relevant to her was when the tickets were validated, why they were not all validated at once, and why someone would scratch one gift ticket one day and not scratch all of them together. She acknowledged that this information was much more persuasive to her than focusing on Ms. Tran's knowledge about where the tickets were purchased. She added that this might be relevant to the green ticket, but not to anything else.

Treasurer Goldberg agreed, stating that this explanation clearly articulated the progression of events and provided a very compelling argument that the tickets were not gifted in the manner described by Ms. Tran. She also pointed out that historically, presenting multiple high-level tickets at once triggers enhanced review, making details like validation, timing and location even more significant. She asked General Counsel Walker whether the matter should still be tabled for further review. General Counsel Walker stated that given the discussion and its inclusion in the meeting transcript, she now felt comfortable moving forward with a decision. General Counsel Polin confirmed that the dialog on this topic would be included in the meeting minutes and if there is further appeal the meeting minutes would be part of the administrative record.

Treasurer Goldberg, recognizing there was no further discussion, moved the motion to a roll call vote. Commissioner Meghan Liddy: yes; Comptroller William McNamara: yes; General Counsel Suleyken Walker: yes; Commissioner Nina Liang: yes; and Treasurer Goldberg: yes. The Motion carried.

V. Other Business – Reserved for Matters the Chair did not Reasonably Anticipate at the Time of Posting

After asking if there was any other business to discuss, Treasurer Goldberg sought a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Nina Liang moved to adjourn and General Counsel Suleyken Walker seconded the motion.

Treasurer Goldberg, recognizing there was no further discussion, moved the motion to a roll call vote. Commissioner Meghan Liddy: yes; Comptroller William McNamara: yes; General Counsel

Massachusetts State Lottery Commission
Official Minutes of 07/29/2025 Meeting

Suleyken Walker: yes; Commissioner Nina Liang: yes; and Treasurer Goldberg: yes. The Motion carried.

The Commission meeting adjourned at 11:48 a.m.

List of Documents and Exhibits Used:

- MSLC July 2025 Commission Meeting Book
- MSLC Meeting Executive Director's Report, July 2025