The meeting of the Board members of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), Campus Improvement Authority was held on December 12, 2013, at the Blasco Event Wing, UNLV Foundation Building, 4505 Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada 89154. This meeting had been properly noticed and posted in compliance with the Nevada Open Meeting Law.

Board Members
Chair Don Snyder
Vice Chair Paul Chakmak
Secretary/Treasurer Michael Wixom
Mr. Rick Arpin
Regent Cedric Crear
Commissioner Chris Giunchigliani
Mr. Dallas Haun...........absent
Mr. Kirk Hendrick
Regent James Dean Leavitt
Mr. Sean McBurney........absent
Ms. Kim Sinatra....via telephone

CALL TO ORDER
Chair Snyder called the meeting to order at 12:06 p.m. Member Giunchigliani entered the room at 12:07 p.m. Chair Snyder asked Laurel Knox, Administrative Director of the UNLV Campus Improvement Authority to call roll.

ROLL CALL OF BOARD MEMBERS
Board members acknowledged their presence. A quorum of the members was present, including Member Sinatra via telephone at roll call. Chair Snyder acknowledged Sophia Long, representative from the Attorney General's (AG's) Office to assist with legal matters. The chair also acknowledged the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority (LVCCVA) staff members present to provide support for the meeting.

ITEM 1. PUBLIC COMMENT
There were no comments from the floor by the public.

ITEM 2. MINUTES
Request was made for approval of the November 21, 2013, UNLV Campus Improvement Authority Board Meeting.

Member Cedric Crear motioned, seconded by Secretary/Treasurer Wixom, and it was carried by unanimous vote of the voting members present, including Member Kim Sinatra via telephone, to approve the November 21, 2013, UNLV Campus Improvement Authority Meeting minutes.

ITEM 3. REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
The status of the Request For Proposal (RFP) process for an overall project manager to provide consulting services to the Campus Improvement Authority Board (CIAB) was provided by Gerry Bomotti, UNLV Senior Vice President for Finance and Business including dates and deadlines. A special single purpose CIAB meeting will be held on December 20, 2013, in order for State Purchasing to make the Evaluation Committee's recommendation for the preferred vendor to the full Board. Telephonic meeting participation will be available.
Mr. Bomotti stated that he contacted Kim Perondi, Assistant Chief Procurement Officer for the State of Nevada, Department of Administration Purchasing Division (State Purchasing) who is managing the RFP process for the CIAB. He informed the Board that as the process progressed, we learned more about the process. During the course of today’s meeting, we will provide clarification and updates to what was provided in earlier meetings. Mr. Bomotti indicated that nine respondents submitted proposals to the RFP and that only the respondents’ names were provided to the Board, per State Purchasing policy. State Purchasing appointed a confidential evaluation committee, per the requirements of NRS 333, to score the proposals and determine finalists. The finalists will present proposals to the evaluation committee and be rescored on December 19, 2013. If State Purchasing is satisfied the scoring is appropriate and state requirements are met, the results of the evaluation committee’s scoring will be brought to the full Board for approval on December 20, 2013.

Member Crear asked Mr. Bomotti if State Purchasing would bring the highest scored proposal or all finalists’ scores to the full Board. Mr. Bomotti referred the question to Ms. Long who was unable to answer the question. Mr. Bomotti then stated that he would come back at the public comment portion of the meeting with the answer to Member Crear’s question. Member Crear voiced his concern that the finalist chosen by the evaluation committee may not be a company that could “gel with us.” Chair Snyder commented that the working group, in addition to the full Board, had gone through the process to determine the criteria for the RFP. Vice Chair Chakmak requested that Chair Snyder ensure the Board had adequate information available to them to make an educated decision to the State Purchasing presentation on December 20, 2013.

Member Giunchigliani asked that the AG’s Office be consulted in regards to confidentiality laws of State Purchasing processes. Mr. Bomotti replied he had contacted State Purchasing and was informed that the RFP information would remain confidential until “there’s a contract,” at which point, the members of the evaluation committee and scoring results would become public. Member Giunchigliani inquired if the evaluation committee had been given categories of importance to use when ranking respondents, ensuring that the members scored consistently. Mr. Bomotti replied that the evaluation tool had been clearly defined by State Purchasing and included instructions on how to score fairly.

Chair Snyder asked the Board to refer to the RFP process chart provided in the back-up documentation. He pointed out that only evaluation committee members and State Purchasing representatives could be present at the December 13 and December 19, 2013, meetings. State Purchasing will present the Evaluation Committee’s RFP recommendation to the full Board for approval at the meeting on December 20, 2013.

Member Giunchigliani requested that Mr. Bomotti inquire of State Purchasing if subcontractors listed on the respondents’ proposals were confidential in the event she would need to disclose any associations because of her political status. Board members were assured that this issue will be addressed prior to vote of the Board at its December 20 meeting.

Member Crear commented that if the project manager was included in the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) supply chain, certain requirements must be met regarding the disclosure of sub-vendors. Mr. Bomotti replied that the CIAB RFP process was under State Procurement policy and not under the NSHE Board of Regents policy, therefore the supply chain requirements of the Board of Regents would not apply. Nevertheless, he said that he would follow up to see if they can be included in the final agreement.

Member Leavitt said that he hoped State Purchasing would present the group of finalists instead of the highest scored finalist for the Board to compare proposals.

Member Arpin asked if the CIAB was subject to public official conflict of interest regulations to
which Member Giunchigliani replied that the Board members would not have to disclose financial information because they did not receive stipends.

ITEM 4. PRESENTATION

Dr. Mark Rosentraub made a presentation regarding various stadiums, including state-of-the-art college stadiums that had been recently built, which are currently under construction or are currently in the planning stages.

Dr. Rosentraub stated that having a football stadium on a university campus enhances the student experience. He added that UNLV was at the heart of regional diversification and that its partnership with the hospitality industry was legendary. He discussed Sam Boyd Stadium and described it as a "fine facility with great sight lines" but past the point of obsolescence. The fan experience and its seating options were limited, according to Dr. Rosentraub, and its distance from campus was an obstacle. He commented that he felt the stadium's architecture was lacking and that architecture should be designed to create a "Kodak moment" where, for example, students go to take graduation pictures with their parents. Dr. Rosentraub said that Sam Boyd Stadium did not fit the Bowl Championship Series (BCS) guidelines.

Dr. Rosentraub clarified what he meant by "fan experience" and suggested fans go to sports facilities to watch multiple games – the one being played in the facility, in addition to five or six other games in their fantasy team leagues. Focusing on the fan experience is what would bring fans to events, according to Dr. Rosentraub. He encouraged the CIAB to consider amenities offered at a stadium that could not be replicated at home. Principle one of designing a stadium was to offer fans an experience that was not available to them elsewhere, according to Dr. Rosentraub. Designing a facility for social space was principle number two. Dr. Rosentraub stated that he felt social space could become economic space. He said that National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) teams had a big advantage over National Football League (NFL) teams because of the large number of students in the fan base. He added that "students are part of the show" at college sporting events.

Recognition that a stadium was not built for "tomorrow or next week, but for 15 years from now" was important, according to Dr. Rosentraub. He referenced Las Vegas' Nielsen rating of the 40th largest market, projected to rank in the mid 30's in 10-15 years. He commented that the higher ranking would make Las Vegas a more attractive partner for college sports networks than Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Member Giunchigliani asked Dr. Rosentraub what months of the year that college football games were played, to which he responded that games began around Labor Day weekend. Member Giunchigliani requested that Dr. Rosentraub clarify what he wrote in an article that stated that UNLV played games at night because of the afternoon desert heat. He responded that the PAC-12 asked Arizona State University to change their stadium's shading system so football games could be played in the afternoon at the beginning of the season. He explained how ESPN, ABC, and CBS television contracts work with college sports and what is required in regards to the facility and its flexibility.

Dr. Rosentraub presented pictures and data of various college stadiums including: Florida Atlantic University, University of Houston, Texas Christian University, Baylor University, University of Minnesota, University of Washington, and Arizona State University (ASU). Member Crear asked what the impetus was for ASU to make the decision to design an open stadium as opposed to a closed one. Dr. Rosentraub said that he felt the decision was based on the fact that there were two domed stadiums in the market and not a need for a third. Member Arpin asked if there was data on the potential temperature change as a result of the shading system proposed by ASU, and if research was conducted on its structural performance in strong winds. Dr. Rosentraub replied that Member Arpin's questions should be directed to the
project manager. Chair Snyder commented that he read an article referencing Baylor University’s wind testing on shading structures and agreed that it was important for the project manager to address. Member Giunchigliani suggested that solar cells be considered into the design and structure of the proposed UNLV stadium.

Pictures and data of other types of stadiums, including Syracuse University’s covered “pop-up” dome and NFL stadiums were presented by Dr. Rosentraub. He shared the Miami Dolphins’ renderings for an aspirational shading system and the facilities of the Arizona Cardinals and the Dallas Cowboys. The proposed Minnesota Vikings stadium was also discussed. He compared the social spaces, architecture, functionality, and the size and location of the scoreboards of the different stadiums. He stated that the aspirational Vikings stadium would construct an entire wall of glass to take advantage of the night city scape of Minneapolis. He suggested that the CIAB consider that concept for the proposed UNLV stadium to capture the view of the Strip. Dr. Rosentraub cautioned the CIAB of installing a massive video display board, stating that if the board was too large, it would raise costs dramatically, divert fan’s attention from the game on the field to the semblance on the screen, and require substantial structural planning that wouldn’t lend itself to a pleasing architectural appearance.

Dr. Rosentraub shifted his presentation to Major League Soccer (MLS) stadiums. He discussed the stadiums of the New York Red Bulls, Sporting Kansas City, Seattle Sounders FC, Los Angeles Galaxy, and Chivas USA. He mentioned Munich, Manchester United, Bundesliga and Premiereship League soccer stadiums in Europe.

Member Giunchigliani inquired if there were new college football rules regarding stadiums that should be considered, to which Dr. Rosentraub replied the issues were related to television and safety.

Vice Chair Chakmak commented that the issue between ASU and the PAC-12 Conference regarding stadium shading was due to the heat at a day game in Phoenix. He added that the climate of Las Vegas was hot, but different from Phoenix. Dr. Rosentraub suggested tasking a Greenspan School of Journalism and Media Studies student with researching the temperature and weather conditions of the last 10-15 years of Mountain West games to determine what would be needed for a facility.

Member Arpin commented that he understood BCS stadium regulations to include a minimum of 50,000 seats and that 65,000-seats was favored to be competitive. He added that from a college stadium prospective, benches may be more preferable for students and would allow more seating capacity than a stadium full of individual seats with arms.

Member Leavitt asked Dr. Rosentraub if the stadium was designed for college football games and not as an entertainment venue, how would that affect the resort industry. He also asked for Dr. Rosentraub’s opinion on what he would envision and design as the proposed UNLV stadium. Dr. Rosentraub responded that he felt the value of the venue to the hospitality industry was valid and that the proposed 15 events would bring new economic activity to the region. He added that he would minimize the use of “chair-back benches,” confine them to student seating, and install a video scoreboard on one side of the stadium. He would ask the project manager to see data on a Teflon cover with a forced air system to determine how that would affect the ambient temperature. If the data was not favorable, he would argue for a covered stadium, not domed. He felt it imperative to build a facility that would capture Las Vegas’ "most synecdocchic images in the world" and stated that what happens in the future of the state’s economy would rest on what happens on the campus of UNLV.

Chair Snyder pointed out that Las Vegas was very different from other collegiate markets and that there was opportunity for the entertainment, hospitality, and resort industries that couldn’t be served without the proposed UNLV stadium. Dr. Rosentraub added that if the stadium would
not work for the hospitality sector, it would make no sense for UNLV. He commented that the facility would change UNLV, and when it changed UNLV, it would change the region.

Member Giunchigliani asked Dr. Rosentraub what the minimum and maximum footprint of the stadium should be, to which he replied that a power conference would look for a stadium that could seat approximately 50,000. He detailed how the potential UNLV student population at football games could be 30,000 in the future, especially if seats were reserved for students. He referenced the student ticket policies of the University of Michigan, University of Southern California, Ohio State University, and Pennsylvania State University. Member Giunchigliani asked if reserving tickets for students was a policy decision that the Board of Regents would need to make prior to any recommendation of a stadium, to which Dr. Rosentraub said he thought so. He said he thought in 15 years, UNLV would be at a very different place with higher student ticket demand. Member Giunchigliani stated she felt UNLV was currently a commuter school and asked if students had been surveyed as to how they would enhance the student experience. Dr. Rosentraub pointed out that it was just as important to survey the students who chose to attend another college. She then asked if a remodel of Sam Boyd Stadium was an option, to which Dr. Rosentraub answered that he did not know the answer to that question but would not advise to renovate because renovation costs generally exceeded the value. Chair Snyder commented that the seven mile distance between Sam Boyd Stadium and the UNLV campus cannot be changed and that was the biggest challenge of making it an asset for the campus, the resort industry, and the community as a whole.

Dr. Rosentraub likened the situation to “two buckets of opportunities;” there was a need for the campus, and a need for the hospitality industry. He said he hoped the Board saw that there were multiple ways that both needs could be met.

Member Giunchigliani added if the CIAB made a determination that a stadium was feasible, then the project manager would look at funding abilities. She said that she felt part of the funding conversation should include a UNLV School of Medicine and referenced AB335, Section 24.5(3), which states: “this group may study the need for, feasibility, and financing alternatives for any other undertaking.” She commented that nothing should be done in isolation at this point.

Member Arpin asked if $50-100 million dollars was a reasonable cost to add a non-retractable, full roof and weather-controlled environment to a 50,000 seat stadium, to which Dr. Rosentraub responded that was a fair number.

Member Hendrick asked if Dr. Rosentraub had ever encountered an off-campus stadium that was miles from the primary campus, to which Dr. Rosentraub stated no. He said the goal has always been to create the total package. He added that the University of Michigan was competing for the best and brightest 18 year-olds and that football on the campus was part of the puzzle. Chair Snyder responded that if he heard correctly, Dr. Rosentraub was stating that a stadium would not only deliver athletically, but on the academic side because of the quality of students that would be attracted to the university.

Vice Chair Chakmak stated that he thought the presentation was exactly what the Board was looking for to understand what was happening in the world of stadiums. He said that the gaming industry had been supportive of UNLV athletics and academics and would continue because UNLV was viewed as a key point to the economy and the future of Las Vegas, including producing key leaders in gaming companies. He added that the gaming industry had already moved forward to address their entertainment venues, whether it was MGM, Caesars, or Boyd Gaming and suggested that the focus of on-campus football be unimpeded. He urged the Board to be cautious and not become bogged down in attempting to accomplish too much, but keep the stadium project to a point where something could be brought to fruition.
Dr. Rosentrub said that the Baylor University example may be one that would afford flexibility to the resort industry and meet the goals of an aspirational football program. He suggested designing some type of stadium shading to put the university in a position to answer affirmatively when a power conference called to inquire if games could be hosted at flexible times of day.

Member Arpin acknowledged Dr. Rosentrub's "great comments" and stated that his personal belief was that a facility the size of Baylor's, with expandable capacity and the right roof structure for Las Vegas, would do two things; first, it would meet the needs of UNLV, and secondly, the majority of the 15 proposed events to be held in the stadium would be very feasible. He added that he felt the NFL ProBowl would "love to have their players come to Vegas for a week and get a little vacation."

Member Crear said that the highest temperature at a Baylor game was 112 degrees in 2000 and that would be a "nice day" in Las Vegas in the summer. He commented that it was "brutal" going to Las Vegas 51s baseball games and that the temperature was 102-105 degrees at night.

Chair Snyder commented that the dialogue from Dr. Rosentrub's presentation was what he had hoped for and would help the Board focus on areas for the project manager to address. Dr. Rosentrub left the meeting at 2:25 p.m.

Member Leavitt said if it cost $50-100 million dollars to cover the proposed stadium, he felt it made sense to do so for events to be hosted 365 days a year. He said he hoped the Board would look at the stadium from a 30-year view and that it would be considered a resort and university facility that the public should have access.

Vice Chair Chakmak commented that a key point lacking in the conversation was funding. He suggested that it was not the direct, but the intangible Return on Investment (ROI) that would add to the quality of student life and was something that could not be measured on paper. Member Arpin echoed Vice Chair Chakmak's comments and said that no matter what facility was constructed, a five percent direct ROI would be projected. He went on to say that he felt the gaming industry was "not at the table for an economic decision, but because of the intangibles that could be brought to UNLV and the resort companies. Someone has to step up to pay for it." Member Arpin stated that $100 million dollars to construct a cover for the proposed stadium was a lot of money and that a project manager should be able to tell the Board if that number was accurate.

ITEM 5. AGREEMENT AND MOU WITH CLARK COUNTY

INFORMATION ONLY

Copies of the Interlocal Agreement dated from 1996 and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOA) dated from 2012 were provided with the opportunity to discuss.

Gerry Bomotti, UNLV Senior Vice President for Finance and Business stated that the 2012 MOU between Clark County and the UNLV Board of Regents showed past discussions with the RTC and other appropriate county entities concerning a stadium project. He indicated that the MOU may have lapsed given that the conditions were not all met, but that the County was clearly willing to work with the CIAB on this project and would likely be willing to revise the agreement, depending upon the outcome of the CIAB.

Mr. Bomotti referenced the 1996 Interlocal Agreement as a partnership between the airport, Clark County School District, and UNLV to relocate Paradise Elementary School onto the UNLV Campus. The key issue relevant to this discussion was that UNLV and the Board of Regents agreed to height limitations relative to development. Mr. Bomotti stated that an agreement would have to be reached with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) in order to build within the current height restrictions. He said that Capital Air Space had previously submitted nine
height technical reports to the FAA and that resubmitting would likely result in the same technical analysis. The previous mega-events center was proposed at approximately 150 feet above ground, which Mr. Bomotti said he thought was feasible to consider as total height but must be finalized with the FAA to get their formal approval.

Member Giunchigliani asked who Capital Air Space was contracted with and for how long, to which Mr. Bomotti replied they were contracted with UNLV to do individual assignments which could be extended. She asked Mr. Bomotti who Capital Air Space was working with at the airport, to which he replied airport leadership, specifically Jeff Jacquet. Member Giunchigliani commented that she felt the project manager should meet with the airport regularly to ensure the MOU was not impacted and that the necessary applications were made.

ITEM 6. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

For Possible Action

Mr. Bomotti returned to the podium to say he had reached a representative at the AG’s Office. He stated he was informed that the State Purchasing representative would be in Las Vegas on December 13, 2013. That representative would work with him to compose written responses to the RFP process questions from this meeting.

Leonard Hamilton, Project Director, Minority Business Development Agency, asked if the Board had considered AB294, in conjunction with NRS 231, as to how it could be used to drive business to small businesses in Nevada. Member Crear commented that he was unsure if the Board was allowed to respond to public comment, but requested that a report be brought back addressing Mr. Hamilton’s inquiry.

Chair Snyder referenced the list of meeting dates in the back-up documentation and highlighted the single purpose meeting to act on the recommendation from State Purchasing on December 20, 2013. He informed the Board that the next CIAB meeting would be on January 9, 2014, and asked the Board to submit agenda items that they wished to be heard.

Member Giunchigliani asked if a telephone number was provided to join the meeting on December 20, 2013, to which Chair Snyder replied that the number would be sent out to the Board members.

ITEM 7. **ADJOURNMENT**

For Possible Action

Chair Snyder adjourned the meeting at 2:46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laurel Knox
Administrative Director
UNLV Campus Improvement Authority

Date Approved: January 9, 2014

Donald D. Snyder
Chair
UNLV Campus Improvement Authority