

**SOUTHERN NEVADA TOURISM INFRASTRUCTURE  
COMMITTEE MEETING  
August 25, 2016**

**The meeting of the Southern Nevada Tourism Infrastructure Committee was called to order by Chairman Hill at 8:06 A.M. in the Stan Fulton Building located at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.**

**1. ROLL CALL/CALL TO ORDER/ESTABLISH QUORUM**

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

Mr. Steve Hill, Committee Chairman  
Mr. Len Jessup, Committee Vice Chairman (via telephone)  
Ms. Carolyn Goodman, Mayor of Las Vegas  
Mr. Steve Sisolak, Chairman of the Clark County Commission  
Ms. Kristin McMillan, President and CEO of the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce  
Mr. Bill Noonan, Senior Vice President of Boyd Gaming  
Mr. Bill Hornbuckle, President of MGM Resorts International  
Ms. Kim Sinatra, Executive Vice President of Wynn Resorts  
Mr. George Markantonis, President and COO of The Venetian and The Palazzo  
Mr. Mike Sloan, Senior Vice President of Station Casinos

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT**

Mr. Tom Jenkin, Global President of Caesars Entertainment

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

Ms. Betsy Fretwell, City Manager of the City of Las Vegas  
Mr. Don Burnette, County Manager of Clark County  
Ms. Rosemary Vassiliadis, Director of the Clark County Department of Aviation  
Mr. Rossi Ralenkotter, President and CEO of the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority  
Mr. Guy Hobbs, Managing Director of Hobbs, Ong & Associates

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT**

Ms. Tina Quigley, General Manager of the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada

## **STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT**

Ms. Jennifer Cooper, Communication Director for the Governor's Office of Economic Development

Ms. Melanie Sheldon, Executive Assistant and Business Development Specialist for the Governor's Office of Economic Development

Ms. Henna Rasul, Senior Deputy Attorney General, Nevada Office of the Attorney General Boards and Open Government Division

## **2. PUBLIC COMMENT: 8:08 A.M.**

Ms. Katherine Duncan, President of the Las Vegas Ward 5 Chamber of Commerce, brings to the attention of the committee a proposed \$1 billion private investment plan for the refurbishment of the Moulin Rouge site and surrounding area. The group would like the monorail extended to both the Moulin Rouge site and Cashman Field. The development group would like to explore what possible tax incentives may be available for them to pursue the development.

Mr. Barnett Sturm states his concern over the expense of the stadium and the public funding of that stadium. Mr. Sturm also details his skepticism of the benefits that the proposed stadium would have to the community.

Ms. Judy Gorney asks the committee why there has been no discussion of a public referendum to decide whether to approve the stadium.

Mr. Jim Sullivan, representing the local Culinary Union, states how important the tourism industry, particularly conventions, are to the union members, and thanks the committee for approving a recommendation to expand the Las Vegas Convention Center. Mr. Sullivan urges the committee to not support public financing of the stadium.

Mr. Todd Kessler, President of the Downtown Las Vegas Alliance, states his strong support for the Cashman Field site as the location for the proposed stadium.

Mr. Patrick Hughes, President of the Fremont Street Experience, states his support for the Cashman Field site for the proposed stadium.

Ms. Rosanne Raliola-Miele states her concerns over the proposed public funding of the stadium, stating that the county and city's priority should be education and other projects that benefit the entire community.

Mr. Ed Uehling states that he doesn't believe the police budget issue should be a component of the committee's focus and voices his concern over the cost of the proposed stadium project.

Chairman Hill closes Agenda Item 2.

**3. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES FROM JULY 28, 2016: 8:25 A.M.**

Chairman Hill opens Agenda Item 3 for a motion to accept the meeting minutes from July 28, 2016. A motion is made by Commissioner Sisolak for acceptance of the minutes. Mr. Noonan seconds the motion. The motion passes unanimously.

Chairman Hill closes Agenda Item 3.

**4. CHAIRMAN/COMMITTEE COMMENTS: 8:26 A.M.**

Chairman Hill thanks the development team for all of their work with regards to the stadium and their attention to detail. Anticipating that the stadium discussion will take a large amount of time, Chairman Hill announces that Agenda Item 6a and 6b will be reversed so that the discussions regarding funding for the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department can be addressed first.

Chairman Hill closes Agenda Item 4.

**5. RESEARCH STAFF REPORT: 8:28 A.M.**

Mr. Jeremy Aguero, Principal of Applied Analysis, reviews additions and changes to the materials located in each committee member's binder. Mr. Aguero thanks Mr. Bill Rhoda of CSL and Mr. Guy Hobbs for their help collecting information on Tax Increment Financing areas throughout the country. Mr. Aguero also mentions data collected for Sherriff Lombardo with regards to the funding of extra police officers within the Las Vegas Resort Corridor and the various language changes to the draft stadium legislation that appeared in the previous meeting's materials.

Chairman Hill closes Agenda Item 5.

**6. COMMITTEE WORKSHOP**

**b. Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department: 8:31 A.M.**

Sheriff Joseph Lombardo of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department opens his comments by referencing a news report on Paris tourism after the recent attacks, mentioning that over the past year it has declined 10 percent. Those are the types of catastrophic events that Sheriff Lombardo hopes to prevent by increasing police presence in the resort corridor. Sheriff Lombardo mentions the different possible funding mechanisms that Mr. Aguero had previously presented to him, including a head tax on each employer based on their number of employees, as well as a resort corridor overlay funding

district. Sheriff Lombardo mentions that his preferred method of funding would be the resort corridor overlay. This would allow him to keep those police officers specifically within the resort corridor.

Mr. Aguero explains that the Strip area was analyzed to show what amount of total funding it provides for the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD) and how much of the overall LVMPD budget is spent within that area. The first table discussed notes the source of LVMPD funding, totaling slightly over \$600 million. The second table shows how much of LVMPD's budget is dedicated to the Convention Center Area Command (CCAC), which covers the Strip area. Overall, 4.7 percent of the budget is spent at CCAC and 8.1 percent of officers are deployed to CCAC. Total contributions to the LVMPD budget from the Strip area represent 13.9 percent of overall revenue. When just comparing CCAC to other area commands, CCAC represents 11.1 percent of the total budget and 13 percent of officers, much more in line with the revenue the LVMPD receives from the Strip.

Mayor Goodman asks if the proposed increases to the LVMPD budget would get the department to the Sheriff's stated goal of 2 officers per 1,000 residents. Sheriff Lombardo responds that the proposed changes would bring the number up to 1.85 officers per 1,000 residents from the current ratio of 1.8. Mayor Goodman then asks what the necessary budget increase would be to get to the 2 per 1,000. Sheriff Lombardo states that it would require an additional 200 officers, and that each \$1 million added to the budget can support eight officers.

Mr. Sloan asks whether the police services funded by the overlay district would also be allocated to those properties in the overlay district but not directly on the Strip. Sheriff Lombardo states the new officers would also be available for calls at properties in downtown and off-Strip locations such as the Palms or Palace Station.

Mr. Hornbuckle asks what the deployment of the additional officers would look like throughout the resort corridor. Sheriff Lombardo responds that the language of the bill would restrict those officers to be deployed within the overlay zone. Roughly three-fourths would be in the Strip area and one-fourth in downtown/Fremont Street area based on today's service call data. Mr. Hornbuckle asks for clarification on the number of officers that currently patrol the overlay district and how many would be added under the proposed measure. Commissioner Sisolak helps to clarify with information from the previous meeting regarding new officers. Sheriff Lombardo estimates the number of police officers in the overlay district to be 227 if the funding proposal is approved.

Chairman Hill asks for clarification of the police officer numbers. Mr. Rich Hoggan, Chief Financial Officer of LVMPD, explains that the numbers discussed include all authorized officers, some of whom are in support functions rather than patrol. Sheriff Lombardo mentions that the Downtown Area Command would also see an increase in the number of

officers. He also mentions that while there are fewer officers on the Strip than the revenue from the Strip would suggest, he has to deploy officers based on crime trends rather than revenue. He said the suggested increases to resort corridor police staffing would help create a presence to help fight terrorist attacks such as the aforementioned attacks in Paris. Mr. Hoggan assures the committee that the fiscal affairs committee would make sure that officers stay on the Strip.

Mr. Noonan asks about the time horizon of the More Cops sales tax. Sheriff Lombardo says that the tax is set to end in 2025, and that the fund is already running at a deficit. He mentions that he intends to discuss extensions or an elimination of the sunset with the Legislature.

Mayor Goodman states that she wants to make sure there is some mechanism to keep LVMPD funds from being held up as they have in the past. She also asks how many officers in the LVMPD have not yet been equipped with body cameras. Sheriff Lombardo mentions that he has 952 outfitted with cameras, but that outfitting all of the roughly 2,800 officers is not the goal. He is focused on equipping the uniformed officers in the field on a day-to-day basis, and for that he is about 200 short. Mayor Goodman would also like to see LVMPD be higher on the priority list for allocation of possible stadium waterfall revenue. She also suggests a possible charge through cell service providers to help fund the LVMPD. Mr. Hoggan says that they previously had meetings with the city of Henderson about adding such a usage fee to telephone service, so this is a possibility.

Chairman Hill mentions the possible cost of creating the overlay district. The Department of Taxation estimates that it would cost about \$1 million to implement the district and \$150,000 to \$200,000 per year to maintain it. He asks about making the overlay district the same as the proposed stadium funding district to help make the process simpler.

Mr. Aguero states that it is possible to make them the same, but they are not yet defined. The gaming overlay district as-is would likely not work as discussed today, but changes could theoretically be made.

Chairman Hill asks if there are other considerations that had not been mentioned. Mr. Aguero mentions the streamlined sales tax act, which is used across many states to create a more uniform tax rate and allow for taxation of internet sales. Commissioner Sisolak states that it is such a small increase he doesn't believe it would have a major effect. He also proposes increasing the sales tax throughout the county, but still separating the Strip so that the revenue produced there would be used there. The rest of the money could go into the general fund.

Commissioner Sisolak also asks what limits there are on the ability of the LVMPD to train new recruits in a timely manner. Sheriff Lombardo responds that the issues are minor; schedules can be rearranged to train officers more quickly or in larger numbers if necessary.

Chairman Hill suggests that language be added to the proposed bill to identify deterrence as an important public policy and recognizing that as the main goal of the proposal. Commissioner Sisolak asks that removing the More Cops tax sunset be included as well.

Chairman Hill closes Agenda Item 6b.

**a. Las Vegas Stadium Proposal: 9:41 A.M.**

Mr. Robert Goldstein, President and COO of Las Vegas Sands Corporation, states that real estate should not be an issue with the construction of the proposed stadium and there are two main sites that they are considering. He also states that there is a need for the \$750 million public contribution to make the project work.

Mr. Marc Badain, President of the Oakland Raiders, states that there is a signed purchase and sale agreement on the Russell Road site and, the Bali Hai site is the secondary focus. Mr. Badain then shows a series of renderings of the proposed stadium and explains the layout of the site.

Mr. Bill Rhoda, President of CSL, continues the explanation of the site layout, covering the parking facilities and possibility of ancillary development. Mr. Rhoda also identifies the various costs of the project, totaling \$1.9 billion. The team would contribute \$500 million, the public \$750 million and \$650 million from Las Vegas Sands. Mr. Rhoda outlines the annual economic benefits the stadium would bring in.

Mr. Badain continues the description of benefits, stating the exposure for the city would roughly total \$100 million per year. A study on the Indianapolis Colts measured the intangible benefits to the community to be valued at \$83 million.

Mr. Rhoda mentions the benefits to UNLV and outlines the benefit of hosting a Super Bowl. Mr. Rhoda expects the impact on Las Vegas to be double or triple the \$230 million effect the latest Super Bowl had on San Francisco. Similar effects could be expected from hosting a BCS National Championship Game or NCAA Final Four.

Mr. Goldstein explains increasing the original proposed 0.70 percent room tax to 0.88 percent would on average represent just a \$0.20 per night difference in room costs for tourists.

Mayor Goodman asks if there are any potential issues that have been identified at the Russell Road site. Mr. Goldstein states that there will be necessary excavation, but that no major issues are foreseen.

Mr. Sloan asks how the public can be assured that the Raiders would stay long enough for the debt to be paid off. Mr. Badain responds by saying that their initial lease would be coterminous with the debt payments, but they expect it to be five years longer. He also mentions that the Raiders have never broken a lease. The league would also require a non-relocation agreement to ensure the team does not move again in a short period of time.

Mr. Noonan asks what discussions have been had with UNLV about the location and construction of the stadium. Mr. Andy Abboud, Vice President of Government Relations and Community Development at Las Vegas Sands, responds by saying the stadium would absolutely be the home of UNLV football. He believes that the stadium would significantly help any pitch that UNLV would make to join the Big 12 Conference. Mr. Goldstein also mentions that they have been approached by a Major League Soccer franchise that is interested in moving to Las Vegas and using the stadium.

Ms. McMillan asks if the stadium cost breakdown explained previously applied to both sites. Mr. Rhoda responds that it specifically applied to the Bali Hai site, but that the two were very similar in total cost. Ms. McMillan asks about the cost savings associated with the Cashman site that were mentioned during public comments. Mr. Badain responds that the Russell and Bali Hai sites are their preferred locations, and Cashman is not a primary focus. Mr. Goldstein mentions that while land acquisition cost would be less with Cashman, there is a benefit to being closer to the Strip for all surrounding development. Mr. Rhoda adds that the Cashman site had the lowest favorability ratings of the proposed sites.

Commissioner Sisolak asks if the possibility of acquiring both sites and using one for additional parking is still on the table. Mr. Badain confirms that it is still a possibility. Commissioner Sisolak asks Mr. Ralenkotter to discuss what the media exposure would mean for the area. Mr. Ralenkotter explains it expands the Las Vegas brand and will bring in a larger number and variety of visitors. Commissioner Sisolak asks for clarification about the costs for the training facility. Mr. Badain explains that the Reno facility for summer training camp would be paid for by the team, and the \$100 million facility in Las Vegas for year-round training is what is included in the project.

Commissioner Sisolak asks if it would be possible to recommend a range of public funding to the legislature. Chairman Hill states that is a possibility. Mayor Goodman asks if the range is a possibility for the developers. Mr. Goldstein says that the \$750 million is absolutely necessary. Without the \$750 million he says that Sands will not be involved with the deal. Mayor Goodman asks if the Cashman site would allow for the public financed amount to be decreased. Mr. Goldstein states that the \$750 million remains a constant.

Chairman Hill asks Mr. Goldstein to clarify his statement. Mr. Goldstein states that he speaks for the Adelson family, not the Raiders or Majestic Realty.

Chairman Hill clarifies that the stadium will be publicly owned. Mr. Goldstein emphasizes the importance of that statement. Las Vegas Sands will own nothing when the stadium is completed. Mr. Badain emphasizes the commitment on the NFL's part by allowing the move. Mr. Goldstein mentions that no other private investors are offering to help, it is not an excellent financial investment on the part of the Adelson family, but they think it is important for the community.

Chairman Hill states that he would like to get a consensus on a specific recommendation, as he believes it stands a greater chance of being considered by the Legislature.

Mr. Hornbuckle asks Ms. Vassiliadis about the possible issues with air traffic at McCarran International Airport. Ms. Vassiliadis states that sites further away from the center line of McCarran's runways will be better, therefore the Russell Road site is less likely to be an issue. Bali Hai also seems workable.

Mr. Hornbuckle asks whether the 0.88 percent hotel room tax increase would alone be sufficient to raise the \$750 million. Mr. Aguero confirms that it would. Mr. Hornbuckle asks if there is also a request from the developers to create a Tax Increment Financing (TIF) district around the stadium. Mr. Goldstein responds that the \$750 million is required, and a TIF would be welcomed but not absolutely necessary.

Ms. Sinatra voices concerns over the allocation of money raised from the room tax, citing previous efforts to raise the room tax that were supposed to benefit schools but where the revenue ended up being used for other things.

Chairman Hill states that much of what needs to be finalized with the proposal relates to specifics as to how the process will work, and what must be done before the committee can finalize a recommendation. Chairman Hill asks Mr. Aguero to go over the summary of the bill draft and explain changes. Mr. Aguero reads the bill summary, explaining the necessity of different language throughout.

Chairman Hill directs everyone to Appendix B of the draft of the proposed bill and asks about the structure and status of the Stadium Authority Board and what changes have been requested.

Mr. Aguero explains the different sections and what they include, such as detailing what actions the Stadium Authority Board can take, who appoints the seven board members and what limitations there are on the actions of the Stadium Authority Board. He also states that the developers have concerns over the appointment of board members; initially most members would be appointed by public entities even though the project was mostly privately funded. The Stadium Authority Board has the ability to enter into contracts,

approve designs, enter into lease agreements, and other abilities. The developers believe that those decisions should be subject to review by the developers.

Chairman Hill states that he believes the Stadium Authority Board should remain a majority public body and asks rest of committee for opinions. Mr. Hornbuckle agrees. Mr. Abboud responds that the appointment of the board is not critical to the development team, but it is critical that they have enough flexibility to operate the stadium in an efficient way.

Mr. Hornbuckle asks to clarify what level of representation the public and developers have on the board as originally proposed. Mr. Aguero responds that five members would be publicly appointed and two would be appointed by the developers.

Chairman Hill asks for opinions on whether language should be added to simplify the role of the board as it concerns the approval of stadium sites and designs. Committee members agree that they want to pursue such language.

Mr. Hornbuckle asks for clarification on the powers of the Stadium Events Company. Mr. Dan Ventrelle, Executive Vice President and General Counsel for the Raiders, responds that the roles of the Stadium Events Company would be specified in the lease agreement rather than in the legislation. Mr. Hornbuckle asks whether the Stadium Events Company has the direct power to handle the day-to-day activities of the stadium. Mr. Ventrelle confirms.

Ms. Sinatra states that her understanding is that the Stadium Authority Board negotiates the lease and has oversight responsibilities, but that the day-to-day operations fall to the team and developers. She also asks for research on similar projects to see how they have been structured. Mr. Aguero states that that information can be resubmitted to the committee.

Mr. Hornbuckle asks what topics the developers would bring before the board for approval. Chairman Hill states topics such as stadium design or site choices. Mr. Hornbuckle states that he is more concerned about recurring topics, such as an annual budget and MGM competing against a board where the public has no say. Mr. Abboud acknowledges the concern and states that it is something that should be resolved regarding the structure of the board. He reiterates the developers' willingness to sit down for as long as needed to settle on details. Mr. Hornbuckle asks about the use of a TIF in the project. Mr. Abboud reiterates that a TIF is something the developers would be interested in, but the room tax to cover the \$750 million is the focus.

Commissioner Sisolak asks to clarify what the TIF would be used for if the room tax was to cover the \$750 million. Chairman Hill states that originally the TIF was planned to be a part of the financing, but the new proposal means the TIF would be unnecessary to get the \$750 million. Mr. Abboud states that the development team simply does not want to close

the door on TIF if it becomes useful in the future. Mr. Hobbs states that TIF alone is not a great source of financing because of its speculative nature, therefore it would be more useful for the operations side and bolster the operating revenues if necessary. Commissioner Sisolak states that he doesn't feel the TIF is necessary if the room tax would cover the \$750 million. Mr. Abboud states that the reason they were uncomfortable with the TIF for financing was the uncertainty of the revenue.

Mr. Noonan asks where the \$3.5 million to be allocated to UNLV comes from and where it ranks in the waterfall of things to be funded from excess revenues. Mr. Aguero states that UNLV's placement is after bond repayment, capital projects and the operation of the stadium authority board; but ahead of LVMPD and the events fund.

Chairman Hill states that he would like the language in the recommendation to allow complete authority on the part of the Stadium Authority Board other than specific exclusions, rather than a list of the authorities of the Stadium Authority Board. Mr. Hornbuckle comments that the powers still need to be tied back to the representation.

Commissioner Sisolak proposes that all board members be Clark County residents. Mr. Ventrelle says that the developers are open to all of these discussions. Commissioner Sisolak asks whether after the initial construction, the Stadium Authority Board will approve large capital expenditures. Chairman Hill replies that assuming the Stadium Authority is providing the funding, it has to approve the budgets. Mr. Ventrelle acknowledges that is a reasonable expectation but that there should be allowances for upkeep and upgrades to ensure the stadium remains a premier NFL facility. Mr. Hobbs clarifies that the Stadium Authority Board will be subject to local government requirements. The capital expenditures fund of the waterfall is a subsidiary fund of the Stadium Authority Board, which would have control over it.

Chairman Hill asks if there was a suggestion to eliminate the events fund and replace it with an infrastructure fund. Mr. Ventrelle responds that it may have been a suggestion to maintain flexibility of the funds, but it wasn't a significant change or suggestion. Mr. Hornbuckle expresses his support for redirecting money from promoting events to infrastructure expenditures.

Mr. Hornbuckle asks for an explanation of the options of asking the state to implement the proposed room tax increment, require the room tax be implemented, or enabling the room tax to be implemented. Mr. Hobbs states that the issues relate to taxation and debt. If it is state legislation that implements the tax, the state debt limit and the 20-year debt term limit requirement may be invoked, whereas the current model uses the county's 30-year debt terms. Commissioner Sisolak asks if a decision would require a simple majority of the County Commission. Mr. Hobbs says that as long as the legislation says the county "may" impose the tax and issue the bond, it would require a simple majority. If the state legislation

read “shall” impose, the county vote would likely not matter. If the county issued legislation to impose the tax on its own, it would require a super majority vote.

Chairman Hill asks Mr. Aguero to explain how the funding waterfall is currently structured in the bill proposal. Mr. Aguero says that the waterfall is in order of priority for the allocation of revenue. The first priority is bond repayment and the rest of the options are at the discretion of the Stadium Authority Board.

Commissioner Sisolak asks what the payments, to UNLV, each year are for since the university is no longer donating land to the project. Mr. Aguero states that there is a clause that states it is to be paid only if land was dedicated to the project by the university.

Chairman Hill states that the leftover money from the waterfall should be put in a reserve fund to be used as needed, but only for uses already identified in the waterfall, and that the use would likely be for capital improvements to keep the stadium up to standards. Mr. Ventrelle agrees.

Commissioner Sisolak asks if the Private Seat Licenses (PSLs) are subject to the preferred rate of return for the developers. Mr. Aguero responds that it is a capital item and the developers’ return is unrelated.

President Jessup comments on the \$3.5 million dollars for UNLV, stating that in his mind those payments were not just to offset a lease of land, but also to offset the revenue losses associated with closing Sam Boyd Stadium. Mr. Gerry Bomotti, Senior Vice President of Finance and Business at UNLV, explains that non-football events at Sam Boyd bring in roughly \$3.5 million per year, and without a university-owned stadium, revenue would be lost to the new stadium. Mr. Hornbuckle asks what the situation would be if Sam Boyd didn’t close and chose to compete. Mr. Bomotti responds that the financial analysis on the part of UNLV shows that Sam Boyd won’t be viable if the new stadium is built. Chairman Hill states that the committee will only recommend giving that money to UNLV if Sam Boyd closes.

Commissioner Sisolak asks to clarify who would pay the operating costs for UNLV football games. Mr. Ventrelle states that it relies on the assumption that rent will be paid.

Chairman Hill asks what the makeup of the Stadium Authority Board would look like according to the Campus Improvement Authority Board (CIAB). Mr. Bomotti states that of the 11-member board, four would be approved by the UNLV Board of Regents, one by the Clark County Commission, one by the Governor, one by the Speaker of the Assembly, one by the Nevada Senate leadership, one by the LVCVA and the LVCVA would recommend people in the casino/resort industry for the final two spots to be approved by the nine other members. Chairman Hill asks whether that decision was the result of discussions with legislators or just the result of the CIAB deliberations. Mr. Bomotti says

it did include some discussion but it is the makeup that makes sense for a stadium on their campus.

Chairman Hill asks whether a college stadium, in the event the NFL team does not relocate, would operate at a loss. Mr. Bomotti states that initially he believes it would be difficult for UNLV football to operate at a profit, but that the financials will be much better than with Sam Boyd. It is also dependent on the performance of the football team and the ability of UNLV to join a major conference.

Commissioner Sisolak expresses concern that the use of stadium revenues to fund programs at UNLV might have opposition from the north, feeling it is unfair to fund one university rather than the other. Ms. Sinatra responds by saying the money would be coming from the south, and that UNLV has significant catching up to do.

President Jessup mentions that out of roughly 120 Division I football programs, only approximately 20 are profitable.

Mr. Hornbuckle asks for clarification on whether the stadium location would be changed if the NFL stadium falls through and the collegiate stadium is built. Mr. Hornbuckle also expresses concerns over the air traffic issues with the UNLV site. President Jessup agrees that it must be put on a suitable site.

Chairman Hill asks whether the NFL franchise has the ability to commit before the NFL allows it, since the legislation is dependent on the NFL decision. Mr. Ventrelle states that the Raiders are willing to work out the specific language of the bill, but they have been consistent in their commitment.

Chairman Hill references a comment about specifying the rights of the Stadium Events Company and asks if the team and developers would be willing to sit down and discuss what those might be. Mr. Ventrelle replies that, yes, they are certainly willing, but the specifics are tricky because it is ultimately a function of what the lease agreement says.

Chairman Hill asks for clarification about a comment regarding the location or relocation of an NFL franchise. Mr. Aguero says that it was to cover both an expansion team and a relocation scenario.

Chairman Hill responds to a section in the recommendation regarding future taxes, stating that the committee cannot bind the Legislature or prevent it from passing future bills. Mr. Ventrelle clarifies by stating they only seek the type of protection that is standard in these types of deals.

Commissioner Sisolak expresses concerns over the possibility that, if the college stadium plan is implemented, the language currently leaves students open to the possibility of

tuition increases to fund the stadium. Mr. Bomotti states that UNLV would be willing to change language to make sure the money comes from stadium operating funds or private parties.

Commissioner Sisolak asks what the makeup of the Stadium Authority Board looks like after the day's discussion. Mr. Aguero states that the makeup remains unchanged from the original proposal, but the powers of the board would change to reflect a different balance. Chairman Hill states that no official decision has yet been made, but asks committee members to send Mr. Aguero their suggestions for the makeup of the board so that the different scenarios can be included for the following meetings.

Mr. Hornbuckle asks to clarify the issue with a state verses county vote. Chairman Hill explains that if the legislation simply allows the county to increase the tax, the state would only require a majority of 50 percent plus one. If the state legislation directly implements the tax or requires the county to do so, it would require a two-thirds majority.

Chairman Hill closes Agenda Item 6a.

**7. SEPTEMBER 15<sup>TH</sup> MEETING PREVIEW: 1:00 P.M.**

Chairman Hill identifies the September 15<sup>th</sup> meeting topics as identical to the current meeting, further refining the committee's recommendations and legislation drafts.

Chairman Hill closes Agenda Item 7.

**8. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS: 1:01 P.M.**

Commissioner Sisolak asks whether Chairman Hill intends to have a vote on September 15<sup>th</sup>. Chairman Hill responds by saying that it is too soon to tell whether the committee will be able to make a decision at that point. He would like the committee to have enough time to review a new draft before making such a decision.

**9. PUBLIC COMMENT: 1:01 P.M.**

Mr. Uehling states that he is surprised that other large gaming corporations are not backing the stadium project. He also expresses concern over the lease status of the Bali Hai site with the Clark County Department of Aviation.

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

**CHAIRMAN HILL OPENS AGENDA ITEM 10 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION.  
MAYOR GOODMAN MAKES THE MOTION TO ADJOURN THE COMMITTEE**

**MEETING. MR. MARKANTONIS SECONDS THE MOTION. THE MOTION  
PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**