The meeting of the Board members of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), Campus Improvement Authority was held on November 21, 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.............. absent
Secretary/Treasurer Michael Wixom
Mr. Rick Arpin
Regent Cedric Crear
Commissioner Chris Giunchigiani
Mr. Dallas Haun............... absent
Mr. Kirk Hendrick
Regent James Dean Leavitt
Mr. Sean McBurney
Ms. Kim Sinatra............... absent

CALL TO ORDER
Chair Don Snyder called the meeting to order at 12:06 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 at roll call. Chair Snyder stated that Vice Chair Paul Chakmak, Member Dallas Haun, and Member Kim Sinatra had pressing business to attend to and had informed him of their absence. Rose Marie Reynolds, Deputy Attorney General, was acknowledged as the representative from the Attorney General’s (AG’s) Office to assist with legal matters as well as the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority (LVCVA) staff members present to provide support for the meeting.

ITEM 1. PUBLIC COMMENT
Ed Uehling commented on agenda item number five. He stated that he hoped the UNLV Campus Improvement Authority would consider the economic impact of the stadium on the Las Vegas economy. He said that the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority (LVCVA) was perhaps the "largest university in the world" due to the millions of visitors who come to learn the latest business concepts. He commented that he felt there was no connection between the University and the LVCVA and made the suggestion that UNLV send professors to the LVCVA to "give the courses over there and vice versa."

ITEM 2. MINUTES
Request was made for approval of the October 31, 2013, UNLV Campus Improvement Authority Board Meeting.

Member Cedric Crear motioned, seconded by Member Chris Giunchigiani, and it was carried by unanimous vote of the voting members present to approve the October 31, 2013, UNLV Campus Improvement Authority Meeting minutes.
ITEM 3. **WORKING GROUP REPORT**  
The Working Group provided a verbal report of the meeting that was conducted on November 7, 2013, to discuss the Request For Proposal (RFP) process.

Chair Snyder introduced the supporting documentation including the minutes and the RFP timeline. He announced that the working group initiated the RFP on November 8, 2013, to secure a project manager. Member Giunchigliani suggested that the selected project manager take into consideration the proposed renovations to the Thomas & Mack Center and determine how that would interface with the stadium project. She also suggested that the project manager be made aware of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and Clark County agreement that would potentially restrict land development on campus. Chair Snyder informed Member Giunchigliani that her two concerns would be addressed at agenda item number four. He added that part of the project manager’s responsibility would be to conduct due diligence in regards to what restrictions, if any, would apply to the stadium project. Member Giunchigliani requested that copies of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between Clark County and the FAA be distributed to the board members at the next board meeting.

ITEM 4. **UNLV MASTER PLAN**  
There was a presentation of the 2012 Campus Master Plan Update. (A copy of the 2012 Campus Master Plan Update was found in the UNLV Development Advisory Board binder that was previously provided to Board members.)

Chair Snyder introduced David Frommer, UNLV Executive Director of Planning and Construction. Mr. Frommer presented the UNLV master plan, approved by the Board of Regents in November 2012. He recognized the following consultants who worked on the project: SmithGroup JJR, Kimley-Horn, Capitol Airspace, AVS Group, and Bob Dincecco, UNLV Director of Planning and Design.

Mr. Frommer stated that the purpose of the master plan was to support the University moving forward with expanding its research, academic, and athletic campus life core mission. The master plan addressed how the stadium could make UNLV a more attractive campus to students, staff, and faculty while serving as an asset to the campus, the Nevada hospitality industry, and the broader community. His presentation focused on the impacts of a 50,000 seat covered stadium and the accompanying ancillary parking, transit, and traffic issues.

Mr. Frommer discussed the distributive parking model and stated that the proposed structured parking would recapture approximately 40 acres of land assets that could be used in a more effective manner for core programs. Mr. Frommer also noted that the distributed parking model was determined to be the most cost effective manner in the planning to manage traffic, as opposed to the traffic pressures one sees today on-campus for Thomas and Mack Center events where the access and parking is largely available at the Swenson Street and Tropicana Avenue area. He stated that the Regional Transportation Committee of Southern Nevada (RTC) worked closely with the University to build a transit center that would tie into a stronger transit capability on campus and a possible shuttle service. Plans for additional signalized intersections, turn lanes, right of way, and a pedestrian bridge were presented. The master plan assumed four to six-story buildings that would create a denser campus, nearly doubling the campus facility build-out capacity footprint for academic and research capabilities, according to Mr. Frommer.

Member Giunchigliani asked if UNLV owned any land by the Nathan Adelson Hospice to which Mr. Frommer replied that the hospice was leasing the property which was an asset of the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), under a long term lease. The adjacent Desert Research Institute (DRI) is also an occupant on this NSHE land. Member Giunchigliani commented that she felt the Board should be sensitive and consider the occupants of the hospice when determining where to locate the stadium.
Chair Snyder commented that the RTC was willing to converse with the Campus Improvement Authority on transportation and transit issues. He added that similar conversations with the Rossi Ralenkotter, LVCVA President/CEO, about the master plan for the Las Vegas Global Business District (LVGDB) be integrated with discussions with the RTC to make sure that all parties were in sync to improve transportation and transit throughout the resort corridor.

Mr. Frommer updated the Board on proposed improvements to the Thomas & Mack Center, made possible by $47 million dollars of authorized state funding. He acknowledged the consulting team of Klae Juba, the primary architectural firm of Woods Bagot and Sink Combs Dethlefs, and the construction manager at risk team of Whiting Turner. Mr. Frommer stated that it would cost approximately $60 million dollars to address the base improvements of replacing the original mechanical, plumbing, fire alarms, smoke control, and fire sprinkler systems, to improve access to the concourse, meet the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) regulations, and to add new seating to the Thomas & Mack Center, among other items indicated in the scoping and cost estimate document in the PowerPoint presentation. He stated that the University had a fund-raising effort underway and would look to other funding sources to secure the remaining $13 million dollars to complete the proposed improvements, as well as additional fundraising efforts for a potential west addition to the building estimated to cost $20m, that is not part of the current funding and scope of work of the project.

Member Crear commented that the Thomas & Mack Center was currently one of the most profitable arenas in the country, turning over a tremendous amount of events. He said the goal would be to accentuate and enhance what was happening at the Thomas & Mack Center as the stadium project moved forward. Member Giunchigliani suggested that the thirty year-old concession and vendor leases be reviewed to ensure that the University generated additional revenue. Chair Snyder replied that the leases had been negotiated over the years. He then addressed Member Crear, stating that the Thomas & Mack Center has been one of the more successful collegiate arenas in the country and would help to establish a neutral site facility model. Member Giunchigliani voiced her concerns about the ADA improvements and flooding issues on campus to which Mr. Frommer replied that the ADA improvements must be made and that the flooding issues on campus have been addressed and are in the process of being improved through both campus projects and cooperative partnerships between Clark County and UNLV, such as the improvements currently underway to the Tropicana Wash on and adjacent to campus.

Secretary/Treasurer Wixom asked Mr. Frommer to speak to access issues of getting to and from the campus. Mr. Frommer stated that the expectation for private vehicles coming to UNLV for a 60,000 person event at the stadium would be approximately 11,000 vehicles. He noted the planning team looked at the application of access/parking demand management systems as a part of the access and traffic issues, such as the use of a demand management system to direct patrons at the point of sale (POS), printed on the event ticket, with a suggested route to use a specific access to campus, among other items to address access issues and manage ingress and egress vehicle flows. Mr. Frommer also reinforced the importance of the use of transit based solutions, via RTC, Coach operators and other opportunities, which is a current major part of access and traffic planning for Thomas and Mack Center events, such as NFR, where more than half of attendees access the events through these transit services. Secretary/Wixom asked if a study had been conducted on the traffic capacities of Flamingo Road, Swenson Street, Paradise Road, and Harmon Avenue for 11,000 vehicles. Mr. Frommer stated a study had been done and that UNLV was also considering Maryland Parkway and Tropicana Avenue as additional access ways to the roads and streets previously mentioned. Secretary/Treasurer Wixom requested that a specific study on the road/street capacity be done for the Board to make an informed decision. Chair Snyder suggested a collaboration between UNLV, the RTC, and the LVCVA to discuss transit issues and how to reduce the flow of traffic with transit options. Mr. Frommer stated that he could provide a traffic study performed by Kimley-Horn and additional background material related to the stadium project. Chair Snyder suggested that
Kimley-Horn make a presentation to the Board.

Member Giunchigliani mentioned right of way availability, light rail, and bus rapid transit (BRT). She also commented on the Las Vegas Convention Center's proposed master plan and her desire to know how it would affect traffic flow and capacity on Cambridge Street, Claymont Street, Swenson Street, and Sierra Vista Drive. She also stated there may be the possibility for park-and-rides. Chair Snyder stated that a holistic solution was needed to tie the various elements of transportation and transit together.

Member Leavitt agreed with Member Giunchigliani about researching the possibility for park-and-rides. He added that it would take time to get to and from the campus for events regardless of what measures were taken to alleviate congestion. The stadium location on campus would be ideal, but the location of the stadium’s proximity to the resort corridor may not be ideal, according to Member Leavitt. He commented that a dose of patience and realism would be important when considering the traffic circulation issue.

Member Crear inquired if it was the Board’s or the project manager’s task to create a parking model. Chair Snyder replied that the traffic and parking issues, fitting into the master plan, need to be a part of the conversation to help assess the overall feasibility of the stadium project. Member Leavitt suggested the possibility of looking into available federal, state, or county funding for traffic improvements of the feeder streets considered state highways. He requested that the estimated costs of the traffic projects be divided out in the final cost analysis to reflect what the costs would be to UNLV and to the resort industry. Chair Snyder commented that he felt the extent to which the Board collaborated with other entities would be the extent to which there would be "other funding sources that can help get done the right thing."

Member Giunchigliani asked if the stadium project had components to enhance the University, such as sustainability and the possibility of LEED certification. Mr. Frommer replied that discussion had taken place to add to the quality of the campus experience and to reduce operation costs, being a good steward of the environment. For context, over the last five years, UNLV has had a partnership with NV Energy to add 780 kilowatts of solar power to the campus, according to Mr. Frommer. Member Giunchigliani brought up the topic of stadium maintenance and thought that the Board should remember to include maintenance dollars in the discussion. She also stated that she felt at some point, the Board had to make a finding to show the legislature that consideration was given in regard to how a stadium would transform the campus, advance it as an economic engine, improve recognition and exposure of UNLV, increase recruiting, retain faculty and staff, and improve overall campus connection – all points from Mr. Frommer’s master plan presentation.

At 1:24 p.m., Chair Snyder announced that a break would be taken and the meeting would reconvene at 1:30 p.m.

Chair Snyder reconvened the meeting at 1:35 p.m. and asked Mr. Frommer to return to the podium. Mr. Frommer presented the proposed improvement to the Thomas & Mack Center including the replacement of systems original to the facility, point of service improvements for concessions, restroom renovation, seat accessibility, and ADA improvements. He stated that UNLV was focused on the $47 million dollar state-funded portion of the project. The University's goal was to identify an additional $13 million dollars for comprehensive improvement to the systems and components in the Thomas & Mack Center, according to Mr. Frommer.

Member Arpin asked if the expansion of the SI Redd Room, other ground level areas, and the upper deck were part of the base or future planning. Mr. Frommer replied that the SI Redd Room and ground level area improvements were part of the future planning and the upper deck, part of the base. He stated that the base improvements to restrooms and concourse facilities require expansion of that level, and the structure created for that concourse level
expansion creates the core structure for the expansion of the Si Redd Room and Events Rooms that could be further capitalized upon through incremental funding and enhancements. Member Arpin posed the possibility of a smaller stadium used mostly for UNLV football games that would occur on Saturdays when campus traffic was low and current parking adequate. Chair Snyder commented that the master plan was assuming a 60,000 seat, covered stadium, and if the vision changed, the components of the master plan would have to be revisited, including parking.

Chair Snyder thanked Mr. Frommer for taking the time to present the UNLV master plan. He stated that he felt the material was beneficial to the Board members as well as the public to broaden the perspective as to the thoughtful planning process that had taken place.

Member Hendrick inquired about what current University facilities would be displaced if a stadium was built on the proposed location. Mr. Frommer replied that the proposed stadium location would be where low-density facilities currently exist, such as the softball field, the track, baseball field, football practice fields, tennis courts, and an intramural sports field. Those facilities would be relocated west of Swenson Street and Paradise Road, off of Tropicana Avenue. An ancillary benefit of relocating those facilities would be creating a better urban university experience and a more pleasant welcome to Clark County and Las Vegas when driving north on Swenson Street towards the UNLV campus and the Las Vegas Strip/Hospitality and Convention Center corridor. Member Hendrick referred to Mr. Frommer’s comments of a possible need to build below grade due to FAA height restrictions and asked if any studies on the water table had been conducted. Mr. Frommer responded that soil borings had been collected and water is typically seen on campus at a depth of 12-18 feet in several areas on campus. He added that the Mendenhall Center’s basement was constructed lower than that depth and was equipped with a dewatering system. The campus had experience with dealing with water and Mr. Frommer stated that he did not see it as a factor that would preclude construction of a stadium, but would have to be dealt with and added into the project scoping and cost model.

Chair Snyder referred to the back-up documentation entitled "UNLV Campus Master Plan Handout Material to Support Presentation" and said it provided a good summary of what was envisioned for the stadium as a benefit to campus, the economy of the community as a whole, and the resort industry.

**ITEM 5.**

**PRESENTATION**

There was a presentation designed to help the Board define the vision for what the stadium should be in order to best meet the needs of all stakeholders - UNLV, the community, and the resort industry.

Chair Snyder announced that Gerry Bomotti, UNLV Senior Vice President of Finance and Business had been called away on business and that the chair and Mr. Frommer would present agenda item number five. He went on to say that a lot of history and evolution of the stadium concept had occurred over the past three years. He suggested that the Board use the time before the project manager was engaged to discuss the stadium vision and narrow the focus towards a consensus. Chair Snyder asked Mr. Frommer to provide the history and a frame of reference for the stadium project.

Mr. Frommer began by stating that the project started as a “mega-events center.” The original conversation began by asking “what are we trying to attract here?” The pursuit turned to what kind of events would drive a facility that would add value to the campus and be an economic driver for the valley. The conclusion was a 50,000 seat, covered, spectator facility to possibly host Pac-12 Conference championship games, music festivals and concerts, UFC events, etc. He suggested before seat count or construction was discussed, that the Board determine “what are you trying to support and attract.” A list of questions to consider included: what target
events would be attracted, what would the roof requirements be, what would the surface requirements be, and what exterior spaces for staging or operations would be needed, was provided in the back-up documentation. As a planner and architect, those were some core facility program questions Mr. Frommer said he would pose before drawing any conclusions.

Chair Snyder stated that after the last board meeting, he reflected on feedback he'd received and thought that the visioning process needed to have a clearer focus, given the short period of time to determine feasibility. He stated that "the worst thing that could happen here is that nothing happens here." The most important thing for the University, according to Chair Snyder, was to have an on-campus, state-of-the-art collegiate stadium that would be the catalyst for the campus evolution in the master plan, and would meet the aspirational goals of those associated with the University. He said that the extent to which the stadium would go beyond that, was the extent to which it would serve the entire community and the resort industry and would require their encouragement and support.

He expressed his intentions to spend the next two or three meetings "dialing-in" on the base vision. He suggested that Dr. Mark Rosentraub return to the Board and present a list of state-of-the-art collegiate facilities recently constructed, under construction or in the planning stages and include what athletic power conference events would require in terms of seat count and configuration, and examples of stadiums that would meet the Board's minimum criteria.

Member Leavitt left the room at 1:57 p.m. and returned at 1:58 p.m.

Member Arpin made a formal request to the Chair for a presentation by Dr. Rosentraub. He then stated that the Board was charged with a very specific task and geographical boundary. He posed the notion that if a very large facility was to be built, the campus may not be a feasible location due to the factors mentioned throughout the discussion. He added that he was confident that a slightly smaller facility would be "easier to make work" given the site limitations.

Member Giunchigliani stated that she did not want to rule out a covered stadium. She suggested there may be technology available to create a comfortable environment in a partially shaded, open-air facility. She commented that she felt a mega-events center was not appropriate and that the Board should consider a stadium that would be relevant for the future. When considering feasibility, she suggested looking at additional economic benefits to campus, like Wi-Fi connectivity. The need for football to return to campus, to build campus community, and to create an economic generator that would complement, not compete with the private sector was what Member Giunchigliani stated she wanted out of the process.

Member Crear made a request to see the cost analysis of both a covered and uncovered stadium. He commented, as a fan and citizen, that he wanted to see a domed stadium that could be utilized year-round, if feasible. He mentioned that the Thomas & Mack Center was thirty years-old, but did not appear as dated as Lawler Events Center at the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR). He urged the Board to find the right size of stadium and not "shoot ourselves in the foot" when considering future relevance.

Secretary/Treasurer Wixom likened the discussion to turning several dials at the same time - a visionary dial, a cost dial, and a revenue dial. He stated that the vision wasn't relevant unless it could be paid for and financed. It was his understanding that UNLV could not generate enough revenue from football alone to pay for a stadium, resulting in the need to create other revenue generating opportunities. He stated that he felt the stadium could not be built if the revenue could not be generated to pay the bonds. Chair Snyder replied that much depended on the funding model and the project would clearly be a public sector-private sector partnership. Secretary/Treasurer Wixom commented that he felt the Board wanted to create something iconic that would be a reflection of the community, but he also wanted to be able to pay for it.
Member Leavitt agreed with the Board members who commented. He said he was a huge proponent of building a stadium on campus, but understood Member Arpin's concern regarding if the limited space would be the correct space. He agreed with Member Crear about seeing the cost analysis for a covered and uncovered stadium. Member Leavitt suggested creating a coordinating committee and a set of rules to determine whether resort properties or the University would host certain events. He added that if the Board would decide that a collegiate stadium was feasible, that it be built with future expansion in mind.

Member Arpin echoed Member's Leavitt's point regarding stadium expandability, citing the Cowboy Stadium and the Olympic Stadium in London as examples. He stated that Las Vegas attracts different kinds of events and that the stadium should be no different. Chair Snyder stated that Dr. Rosentraub could provide a list of similar stadiums that had a proven track record of flexibility to meet the demands of the marketplace. Member Arpin referenced the Electric Daisy Carnival which is scheduled to occur outdoors in June 2014 and that he thought the Pro Bowl was played in Honolulu, Hawaii, because of the city, not because of the facility. Member Hendrick stated that he agreed with the comments of the other Board members. He commented that there were a significant number of proposed events that would be important for Las Vegas in terms of the economic impact that would not come if the stadium was built open-air. As an alumnus of UNLV, he said he would like to see students being able to walk to a football game or concert. He agreed with the concept of constructing a stadium that could be expanded or covered in the future.

Member MCBurney stated that he supported the scope and the vision of the project. He recognized that the discussions were being accelerated because of the timeline. He was interested in having the project manager validate the scope and vision and to suggest additions or variations that would make sense to the Board. Member MCBurney requested that the Board be provided with the profit and loss statement for the Sam Boyd Stadium and a list of events currently hosted there.

Member Crear mentioned his experience with casino openings and described it as "brutal and demanding." He stated that casinos, like the Wynn, are master planned and that it was appropriate for the Board to consider the UNLV master plan when discussing the stadium.

Member Giunchigliani stated that she wondered what other events UNLV may want to hold in the stadium. She suggested that the project manager look at other events that could be staged there not previously discussed. She commented that she would explore the business improvement districts and hoped the experts would as well. The possibility of creative taxes or state funding for higher education facilities may be available, according to Member Giunchigliani. She said she agreed with Member Hendrick about constructing a facility that could be expanded and stated "you always want to design for what might be." She mentioned that she spoke with Member Sinatra prior to the meeting, and conveyed Member Sinatra's desire to not rule out a covered or uncovered stadium until the cost analysis had been presented.

Chair Snyder said that he appreciated the Board members' input and thoughtful consideration. He stated that the conversation helped to dial-in the focus for the next meeting.

ITEM 6.  
PUBLIC COMMENT  
FOR POSSIBLE ACTION

Pet Christenson, President, Las Vegas Events, commented that the discussion had been interesting and a worthwhile process. He referenced the list of proposed stadium events and stated that it was compiled with the assumption of a 55,000 seat, state-of-the-art stadium that included a 100-yard video screen. When looking at the list, Mr. Christenson commented that every event would not be as viable without the assumed stadium to lure them. He questioned the footprint of the stadium and the ability of the campus to manage it. He added that he felt the
campus would go in a different direction with that type of heavy-loaded venue. The Thomas & Mack Center opening was a learning curve for the campus to accept the commercial entity versus the campus entity, according to Mr. Christenson. He mentioned how the Strip corridor was plotting outdoor event spaces that would accommodate 25,000-40,000 seats for festivals, possibly competing with proposed events for the stadium. Mr. Christenson suggested that the Board consider three things: a covered stadium versus an uncovered stadium, creative scheduling to accommodate events if an open-air stadium was determined feasible, and the emerging festival market in Las Vegas.

ITEM 7. **ADJOURNMENT**
Chair Snyder adjourned the meeting at 2:36 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
Laurel Knox
Administrative Director
UNLV Campus Improvement Authority
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