

QUESTION 1:

Can you provide us with a definition of “Gaming Analysis” in the context of the Scope of Work?

ANSWER:

The gaming analysis is to be a calculation of the direct and indirect financial impacts and employment that may be anticipated should Options 1, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1 or 3.2 of the Belmont Park Redevelopment Study be undertaken. Financial impacts based on “competitive location issues”, including residual effects on existing lottery games, charitable gaming, live horse racing, off-track wagering product and video lottery gaming should be included within an analysis. The present parameters of video lottery gaming authorization, absent Belmont exclusion, should be maintained.

ESDC is open to any of the various economic models generally utilized with gaming impact forecasting. While selection of the methodology is left to the discretion of the bidder, an RFP response should identify models to be used and the various assumptions that will be developed for the analysis. These assumptions should include but not be limited to: identification of the adjustments to demographic data accounting for physical and practical visitation limitations; methodology for establishment and application of participation rates; and establishment of daily win per patron with overnight adjustments and methods of calculation for various direct revenues. A narrative identification of various multipliers for indirect and induced economic impacts and incremental non-gaming spending impacts expected to be used in the gaming analysis should be included.

QUESTION 2:

If our firm were to serve as either prime or subconsultant on the Belmont Park RFP, would we be prohibited from participating in any future EIS-related work on the project?

ANSWER:

As indicated in the RFP, a Consultant retained for any work related to the services requested in this RFP would be precluded from participating in efforts associated with the development of the parcels. This would include the preparation of an EIS.

QUESTION 3:

The RFP indicates that the consultant will conduct “an analysis of the economic impact of the proposed uses identified in the Study.” Does this mean that the consultant should conduct an economic and fiscal impact analysis for each of the eight development scenarios outlined in the FX/Fowle report, or should the analysis focus on the scenarios determined through the market analysis to represent the highest and best use for each site?

ANSWER:

Proposers should provide economic and fiscal impact analyses for those development options determined to be the highest and best use. Proposers are free to also include the cost of doing additional scenarios as a separate line item, if desired.

QUESTION 4:

Will the ESDC consider extending the date of delivery of proposals from May 29th for 30 days?

ANSWER:

The proposal due date is May 29, 2009.

QUESTION 5:

Can a subcontractor from the consultant team be eligible to participate with or advise, any developer bidding on the site?

ANSWER:

The restrictions that apply to the selected Consultant also apply to subconsultants on the Consultant's team.

QUESTION 6:

In the event ESDC decides to move forward with this project, should we assume this will be a ground lease or a sale?

ANSWER:

The State has not yet decided what the transaction to allow development will be.

QUESTION 7:

In the gaming analysis, should it be assumed that the "present parameters of video lottery gaming" include VITs at Aqueduct?

ANSWER:

Yes.

QUESTION 8:

Does the ESDC want us to include an estimate of the amount of gaming revenue that will come from in-state versus out-of-state?

ANSWER:

If determined to be an effect of video lottery gaming introduction at Belmont, yes. For instance, a retention of in-state dollars presently flowing out would be an effect of introduction. Likewise, any out-of-state dollars drawn into the state as a result of video gaming at Belmont would be relevant. The assumptions used to calculate this estimate should be included.

Admittedly, the likelihood of travel from out-of-state to a Belmont gaming facility, given the proximity to facilities offering similar or enhanced products (e.g., Connecticut and Indian gaming facilities; New Jersey and the proximity to Atlantic City or Eastern Pennsylvania gaming locations; and Aqueduct's location to state borders in comparison to Belmont), is reduced. Excepting a possible destination nature of a constructed hotel complex or spikes associated with specific racing events such as The Belmont Stakes, significant expectations from out-of-state will likely be discounted.

QUESTION 9:

Does the possibility for the introduction of table games exist at some point in the future? And if so, is that something the ESDC wishes to be analyzed?

ANSWER:

The introduction of table games at video lottery gaming venues is speculative, and therefore, should not be included in any analysis.

.....

ADDENDUM

Please send **ten (10)** copies of your response to be delivered no later than **May 29, 2009, 10:00a.m. EST.**