1. **CALL TO ORDER**
Chair Bill Ham called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

2. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR BY THE PUBLIC**
There were no comments from the floor by the public.

3. **OATH OF OFFICE**
In accordance with the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) **282.020**, an Official *Oath of Office* was administered to the appointed members of the Panel. The *Oath of Office* was administered by the Honorable Judge Nancy Allf of the Eighth Judicial District Court of Clark County.

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
*Vice Chair Tom Thomas moved, seconded by Member Ron Frye, and it was carried by unanimous vote of the voting members present to approve the January 26, 2017, agenda of the Oversight Panel for Convention Facilities in Clark County.*

5. **CHAIRMAN/PANEL COMMENTS**
Chair Bill Ham requested introductions by each Panel Member, which were briefly delivered.
Introductions of the Las Vegas Convention and Visitor Authority’s (LVCVA) team involved with the Las Vegas Convention Center District (LVCCD) included; Rossi Ralenkotter, President/CEO, Luke Puschnig, Legal Counsel, Rana Lacer, Chief Financial Officer, Terry Jicinsky, Senior Vice President of Operations, Cathy Tull, Senior Vice President of Marketing, Kevin Bagger, Executive Director of the Research Center, as well as LVCVA consultant, Randy Walker, and LVCVA Owner’s Representative, Terry Miller, Principal of Cordell Corporation.

Chair Ham encouraged the Panel Members to utilize the LVCVA staff for any information needed, and specifically referenced Mr. Jicinsky as the chief contact person for the LVCCD expansion project. Chair Ham also recognized Courtney Lipski, Executive Assistant to the LVCVA Board of Directors.

Chair Ham advised the Panel to tour the Las Vegas Convention Center (LVCC) campus in order to better understand the basic facilities.

Regular Panel meetings were scheduled for the fourth Thursday of each month at 9 a.m. in the LVCC Board Room.

This was an information item. Not an action item.

6. REPORTS AND PRESENTATION

**LAS VEGAS CONVENTION AND VISITORS AUTHORITY STAFF REPORTS**

**ITEM A. Adoption of Charter for Oversight Panel for Convention Facilities in Clark County – Report on General Governmental Obligations**

Mr. Puschnig delivered a verbal report on the general governmental obligations of the Panel and referenced NRS and the Nevada Open Meeting Law.

Mr. Puschnig requested the Panel review and approve the attached Las Vegas Convention Center - Oversight Panel for Convention Facilities in Clark County Charter.

*Vice Chair Tom Thomas moved, seconded by Member Ron Frye, and it was carried by unanimous vote of the voting members present to approve the attached Las Vegas Convention Center - Oversight Panel for Convention Facilities in Clark County Charter.*

**ITEM B. Las Vegas Convention Center District Staff Report**

Mr. Ralenkotter emphasized the importance of the LVCCD expansion project for Las Vegas. Mr. Ralenkotter presented an overview of the history and mission of the LVCVA. He briefly discussed marketing strategies, room tax revenue, and community partnerships. Mr. Ralenkotter elaborated on the economic impacts of tourism to Southern Nevada, the joint efforts of the LVCVA, the resort partners, and McCarran International Airport to promote tourism, and noted that the LVCVA worked collaboratively with the local convention centers to maximize convention space. He also reiterated the imperativeness of the LVCCD expansion project to maintain and increase the number of conventions and noted the various competitive cities and their expansion plans.
Mr. Jicinsky delineated the specifics in Senate Bill No. 1 (SB1) and the requirements of the Panel. Mr. Jicinsky also explained the roles and duties, as stated in the contract, of Cordell Corporation as the LVCVA Owner’s Representative and briefly discussed Mr. Miller’s past experience and services provided thus far with the LVCCD.

Chair Ham said that he looked forward to “the journey” and future of the LVCCD.

Mr. Miller outlined the purpose and necessity of an expansion of the LVCC and referenced client and stakeholder support. He discussed economic impact, land acquisition, and the development of the expansion project. Mr. Miller went on to present a detailed report on the specifics of the LVCC District Plan, the phases of the LVCCD expansion project, and the elements of the project budget.

Member Ron Frye inquired about the details of the budget to which Mr. Miller stated that specific details would be provided as the project moved forward.

Ms. Lacer presented an overview of past and future finance and funding components of the LVCCD expansion project. Ms. Lacer elaborated on bond issuance and refunding, full debt service impact, debt capacity and obligations, financial analysis reports, and financial planning. She referenced the financial reviews of the Southern Nevada Tourism Infrastructure Committee (SNTIC) as well as data provided by Applied Analysis. Ms. Lacer also explained room tax collection allocation and the additional 0.5 percent room tax collected solely for the LVCCD, as stated in SB1, as well as the LVCCD capital fund.

Chair Ham inquired about funding for LVCCD short term expenditures in relation to the additional 0.5 percent room tax increase, to which Ms. Lacer clarified that the additional 0.5 percent room tax collected was not the sole source of revenue for the project and expounded upon the short and long term revenue streams.

Vice Chair Tom Thomas asked if the short term credit facility was ever topped out. Ms. Lacer shared the history of the short term credit facility and explained the conditions of the current bank facility.

Mr. Jicinsky concluded the staff reports, summarized anticipated discussions at future Panel meetings, and briefly referenced the scheduling of LVCC tours for the Panel Members.

This was an information item. Not an action item.

7. PANEL MEMBER COMMENTS
Chair Bill Ham discussed potential topics for the next Panel Meeting, scheduled for February 23, including the size, scale, and design of the LVCCD.

Chair Ham suggested LVCVA staff present a clearer understanding of the competition set and proposed potential site visits by Panel Members. He went on to recommend that LVCVA staff provide a more detailed analysis of how the necessary size of a new facility was determined.

Chair Ham also inquired about the impact of a stacking effect during the renovation period in relation to square footage, to which Mr. Jicinsky stated that LVCVA staff would provide, at a future meeting, a detailed presentation on the impacts of a stacking effect.
Vice Chair Tom Thomas asked how much coordination occurred between the LVCVA and the resort partners in relation to convention space. Mr. Jicinsky answered that there was a high level of coordination and consideration between the LVCVA, resort partners, and convention clients and briefly discussed how the collaborative efforts of such benefit convention visitation. Mr. Ralenkotter added that the relationship with the resort partners and convention clients was necessary to satisfy the needs of the customers and maximize the amount of exhibit space.

Member Michael Crome inquired about exhibit space in Chicago, referenced during Mr. Miller’s presentation. Mr. Miller discussed the square footage and architectural layout of the convention space in Chicago and Orlando versus the LVCC.

Chair Ham thanked LVCVA staff for their presentation and stated that it was “very helpful.” Chair Ham also thanked the Panel for their time and attendance.

8. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR BY THE PUBLIC
There were no comments from the floor by the public.

9. ADJOURNMENT
Chair Bill Ham adjourned the meeting at 10:42 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Courtney Lipski
Executive Assistant to the LVCVA Board of Directors

Date approved: February 23, 2017

Bill Ham
Chair
1. CALL TO ORDER
   Chair Bill Ham called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. A quorum of the members was present at roll call.

2. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR BY THE PUBLIC
   There were no comments from the floor by the public.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES
   Vice Chair Tom Thomas moved, seconded by Member Michael Crome, and it was carried by unanimous vote of the voting members present to approve the February 23, 2017, agenda of the Oversight Panel for Convention Facilities in Clark County.

   Vice Chair Tom Thomas moved, seconded by Member Michael Crome, and it was carried by unanimous vote of the voting members present to approve the January 26, 2017, minutes of the Oversight Panel for Convention Facilities in Clark County.

4. CHAIRMAN/PANEL COMMENTS
   Chair Bill Ham thanked Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority (LVCVA) staff for the Las Vegas Convention Center (LVCC) facility tours provided to each Panel member and said that it was beneficial to understanding the necessity of the expansion project.

   This was an information item, Not an action item.
5. REPORTS AND PRESENTATION

LAS VEGAS CONVENTION AND VISITORS AUTHORITY STAFF REPORTS

ITEM A. Las Vegas Convention Center District Staff Report

Terry Jicinsky, LVCVA Senior Vice President of Operations, recognized the fashion marketplace MAGIC at the LVCC February 21-23, as well as CONEXPO-CON/AGG at the LVCC March 7-11, and discussed both trade shows’ engagement in the planning process for the Las Vegas Convention Center District (LVCCD).

Mr. Jicinsky introduced the LVCC District Program Scope and explained that the program scope was based on the needs of the clients, client utilization of the building, and the competitive set.

Terry Miller, LVCVA Owner’s Representative, delivered a PowerPoint presentation beginning with an elaborate outline of the LVCC District Program Scope and competitive set.

Chair Bill Ham requested additional information outlining client interviews and prospective interviews, as well as lobbying for new domestic and international clients. Chair Ham also inquired about the meeting room to exhibit space ratio. Mr. Jicinsky answered that additional information could be provided at the next meeting and explained the utilization of meeting rooms and exhibit space.

Member Michael Crome inquired about the international competitive set. Mr. Miller answered that additional information would be provided at the next meeting and noted that international trade shows were viewed as future opportunities. Member Crome also asked about the proposed square footage in the program scope in relation to client demand, to which Mr. Miller explained that the program scope outlined square footage additions based on current client demand, but additional expansion would be needed to incorporate new client demand.

Chair Ham examined the trends and probabilities of the completion of proposed convention center expansion plans in the competitive set versus the LVCC, to which Mr. Jicinsky addressed the subjectivity of the expansion plans of the competitive set and the LVCC and stated that he felt confident that the LVCCD project would be completed.

Member Ron Frye suggested LVCVA staff provide analysis of the interviews and workshops from the past two years that were used to develop the project scope.

Member Robert Cilento asked about client commitment directly associated with an expansion of the LVCC. Cathy Tull, LVCVA Senior Vice President of Marketing, provided specific examples of clients publicly committing to leasing space with the expansion and acknowledged potential new trade show clients that could be accommodated with an expansion. Member Cilento also asked how far in advance leases were normally signed, to which Ms. Tull discussed standard leasing procedure.

Rossi Ralenkotter, LVCVA President/CEO, specified the legal restrictions to the number of days allowed in the execution of leases and recognized customer and potential customer expectations relating to the LVCVA’s commitment to the completion of the LVCCD.
Vice Chair Tom Thomas examined the movement of convention attendees on a horizontal versus vertical plain as it related to travel distance throughout the campus. Mr. Miller stated that such issues would be addressed during the design phase of the project.

Mr. Miller continued his presentation expounding upon the expansion of the LVCC in Phase Two of the project. Mr. Jicinsky reiterated that Phase One of the project was the purchase and demolition of the Riviera Hotel and Casino.

Member Frye inquired about the placement of meeting space versus the exhibit space, to which Mr. Miller explained alternatives to what was depicted in the PowerPoint diagram.

Member Cilento considered the outdoor square footage proposed in the program scope. Mr. Jicinsky detailed the land acquisition strategies of the LVCVA and noted the current parcels of land to the south and east of the LVCC.

Chair Ham echoed Member Cilento’s inquiry of outdoor square footage and asked if there were concerns from current clients in regards to future outdoor exhibit space. Mr. Jicinsky noted that clients would have the opportunity to work directly with the design team in focus groups to examine the demand and clarified that outdoor exhibit space would still be available for the large equipment trade shows.

Mr. Miller continued his presentation outlining the renovation and additions of the LVCC in Phase Three of the project.

Chair Ham noted potential financial restraints and challenges in the project and suggested LVCVA staff discuss the approach to addressing such issues. Mr. Miller acknowledged the potential challenges and stated that “the weighted value” of each layer of the project would become more distinct once the designing process began.

Member Cilento suggested, from a cost perspective, it be prudent to incorporate aspects from Phase Three into Phase Two of the project.

Chair Ham inquired about a potential pedestrian connector or bridge from the west side of Las Vegas Boulevard to the east side. Member Frye noted that there was a current zoning development plan for the site adjacent to the LVCC Diamond Lot that required a pedestrian bridge over Las Vegas Boulevard.

Member Frye asked if an analysis had been conducted on the impact of the renovation on leased trade shows, to which Mr. Miller explained that such analysis would be presented. Mr. Jicinsky added that an incremental power supply to the LVCC was onsite and available for future use.

Mr. Miller continued his presentation with the examination of proposed construction phasing.

Chair Ham inquired about the renovation impact on full-facility users, to which Mr. Jicinsky stated that “incremental resources [would be] committed on the LVCVA side to make [the client’s] show user friendly.” Mr. Miller noted that the proposed north/south connector could potentially be completed, however a temporary connector would be offered during the renovation process when needed.
Mr. Miller presented various LVCCD project illustrations and design concepts.

Chair Ham queried about the sustainability component of the project, to which Mr. Miller addressed and noted the importance of sustainability in relation to the expansion and utilities in the new facility.

Vice Chair Thomas noted the rating system of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) in relation to the geography of Las Vegas. Member Frye also acknowledged the specifics of the LEED rating system.

Member Frye inquired about the technology component of the project in relation to customer needs, to which Mr. Jicinsky expounded upon the LVCVA’s business relationship with Cox Communications.

Mr. Jicinsky outlined the process of future Panel meetings.

Chair Ham examined timeline constraints and potential additional Panel meetings.

This was an information item. Not an action item.

6. PANEL MEMBER COMMENTS
Chair Bill Ham thanked the LVCVA staff for the presentation of the LVCC District Program Scope.

Member Michael Crome reinforced the idea of Panel member site visits to competitive set facilities. Chair Ham agreed that such site visits would be beneficial in understanding the competitive set and needs of the LVCCD project and encouraged Panel members to collaborate such visits with LVCVA staff.

7. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR BY THE PUBLIC
Richard Copeland, Western Region Director of the National Minority Contractors Association, emphasized the importance of the inclusion of underutilized communities in the LVCCD project. Mr. Copeland submitted the attached document to the Panel.

Aubrey Branch, Chairman/CEO of Branch Hernandez Consulting & Insurance Services, reiterated the significance of the inclusion of minority owned businesses, requested the support of the Panel, and commended LVCVA Board of Directors Chairman Lawrence Weekly, Mr. Ralenkotter, Mr. Jicinsky, Mr. Miller, LVCVA Consultant Randall Walker, and Nevada Senator Aaron Ford for their efforts in providing opportunities and support.

Chair Ham requested LVCVA staff to address concerns expressed by Mr. Copeland and Mr. Branch, to which Mr. Jicinsky replied that LVCVA staff was moving forward with such requests.
8. **ADJOURNMENT**
Chair Bill Ham adjourned the meeting at 10:46 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Courtney Lipski  
Executive Assistant to the LVCVA Board of Directors

Date approved: *March 23, 2017*

Bill Ham  
Chair
Hello Courtney

We are requesting that a minimum of 1 of 3 things be adopted by the Convention Center Oversight Panel.

Terry Jicinsky is in possession of 5 other key strategies that should also be considered.

1. That a Community Benefits Plan be put into place. We would like input in its language.
2. WRMSDC certified businesses counts toward the 15% minimum goal.
3. That the committee adopt an inclusion program similar to the MGM’s contracting program 20% MBE inclusion.

Thank You
Richard Copeland
Oversight Panel for Convention Facilities in Clark County

MEETING MINUTES

March 23, 2017
9:00 AM
Las Vegas Convention Center • Board Room
3150 Paradise Road • Las Vegas, NV 89109

OVERSIGHT PANEL

Bill Ham • Chair
Tom Thomas • Vice Chair
Gary Bogan
Robert Cilento
Michael Crome
Ron Frye
John Littell

Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority
Executive Staff in Attendance
Rossi Ralenkotter, President/CEO
Luke Puschnig, Esq., CEM, Legal Counsel
Rana Lacer, Chief Financial Officer
Ed Finger, Senior Vice President of Finance
Terry Jicinsky, Senior Vice President of Operations
Terry Miller, LVCVA Owner’s Representative, Cordell Corporation

1. CALL TO ORDER
Chair Bill Ham called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. A quorum of the members was present at roll call.

2. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR BY THE PUBLIC
There were no comments from the floor by the public.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES
Vice Chair Tom Thomas moved, seconded by Member Michael Crome, and it was carried by unanimous vote of the voting members present to approve the March 23, 2017, agenda of the Oversight Panel for Convention Facilities in Clark County, as well as the February 23, 2017, minutes of the Oversight Panel for Convention Facilities in Clark County.

4. CHAIRMAN/PANEL COMMENTS
Chair Bill Ham recognized the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority (LVCVA) trade show customers presenting to the Panel and thanked them for their attendance. Chair Ham also congratulated the LVCVA for Las Vegas being named the #1 Tradeshows Destination for the 23rd consecutive year by Trade Show News Network.
Chair Ham discussed the role of the Oversight Panel in determining the expansion and renovation plan of the Las Vegas Convention Center District (LVCCD) in relation to timing, details, and presentation of the final plan.

5. REPORTS AND PRESENTATION

LAS VEGAS CONVENTION AND VISITORS AUTHORITY STAFF REPORTS

ITEM A. Las Vegas Convention Center District Staff Report: Review of Panel Questions from February 23rd Meeting

Terry Jicinsky, LVCVA Senior Vice President of Operations, outlined the topics of discussion and reviewed the timeline for approval of the final plan.

Mr. Jicinsky introduced LVCVA trade show customers; Megan Tanel, Vice President of Exhibition & Events of the Association of Equipment Manufacturers, CONEXPO-CON/AGG; Timothy McGuinness, Staff Vice President of Global Trade Expositions, International Council of Shopping Centers (ICSC); Karen Chupka, Senior Vice President of International Consumer Electronics Show & Corporate Business Strategy, International Consumer Electronics Show (CES); and Chris Brown, Executive Vice President of Conventions & Business Operations, National Association of Broadcasters (NAB).

Mr. Jicinsky referenced Panel member questions from the February 23 Oversight Panel meeting in regards to customer interviews, meeting space, and exhibition space. Mr. Jicinsky deferred the discussion to the LVCVA trade show customers in attendance.

Ms. Tanel discussed the 2017 CONEXPO-CON/AGG trade show on March 7-11. Ms. Tanel detailed the show’s use of indoor/outdoor exhibition space, demand for additional meeting space, and her excitement for the expansion of the Las Vegas Convention Center (LVCC).

Mr. Jicinsky acknowledged ICSC’s recent trade show location bid and expressed his appreciation to Mr. McGuinness for the opportunity for ICSC RECon to remain in Las Vegas.

Mr. McGuinness recognized the strength of the trade show industry, outlined the specifics of ICSC RECon, and discussed the show’s endurance in Las Vegas. Mr. McGuinness emphasized the necessity and importance of the expansion of the LVCC, specifically in relation to the maximization of the trade show attendees’ time by containing events on the LVCC campus.

Ms. Chupka addressed the importance of the expansion of the LVCC in relation to the current limitations in meeting and exhibit space and the demands of CES.

Mr. Brown thanked the Oversight Panel and the LVCVA for collaborating and listening to the needs of the customers. Mr. Brown echoed Ms. Chupka’s emphasis on the necessity for additional meeting and exhibit space, as well as Mr. McGuinness’ prioritization to contain show events to the LVCC campus. Mr. Brown also discussed show attendee mobility and encouraged centralized meeting space in the new facility.

Chair Bill Ham thanked the LVCVA trade show customers for their presentations to the Panel.
Member John Littell inquired about amenity and technology needs of trade shows, to which Ms. Tanel emphasized the importance of flexibility in space, creative concepts encouraging brand logo, embracing the younger generations, and focusing on new and innovative ideas. Ms. Chupka provided perspective on the technological needs of shows, emphasis on usability of meeting rooms, and freight access. Mr. Brown encouraged food and beverage variety and the availability of seating, emphasized flexibility in space, and discussed infrastructure support of live broadcasting. Mr. McGuinness underlined the imperativeness of back of the house operations and the connectivity of the buildings. Ms. Chupka stated that it would also be beneficial to provide easy access points for camera crews, as well as secured drop-off locations for VIP guests.

Member Gary Bogan questioned the expectations for room design as it related to materials and the “look” of the space. Ms. Tanel and Ms. Chupka both answered that the emphasis should be on flexibility and usefulness of the space.

Chair Ham inquired about the demands of the differing generations as it related to engagement. Ms. Tanel discussed how CONEXPO-CON/AGG catered to differing generations. Mr. McGuinness elaborated on the emphasis to engage the younger generations in business discussions, but also recognized the existing entertainment offered in Las Vegas as a destination. Ms. Chupka emphasized varieties in food and beverage, lounge areas, wifi availability, and advanced technology amenities such as charging stations, that were among the priorities of younger demographics of show attendees.

Chair Ham discussed the need for a more inviting pre-function area, small gathering places, and additional seating and asked if the expectation was to formalize these spaces or allow each show to create spaces as needed. Ms. Chupka reemphasized the importance of flexibility in space and encouraged the incorporation of natural light. Mr. Brown discussed the importance of break areas and suggested that it would be beneficial to formalize lounge spaces and also incorporate customizable spaces for shows to utilize.

Chair Ham asked if sustainability was an important aspect for trade shows, to which Ms. Chupka suggested that sustainability was becoming more important to show attendees. Mr. McGuinness said that although it was an important aspect, it would not deter ICSC from choosing Las Vegas. Ms. Tanel added that sustainability was the “right thing to do” and offered ideas on how a new facility could incorporate such. Mr. Brown agreed that sustainability was important, but that it would also not deter NAB from choosing Las Vegas.

Member Ron Frye requested Ms. Chupka provide the Panel with the ratio of meeting room versus exhibit space, to which Ms. Chupka briefly discussed the demand for both the smaller and larger spaces. Member Frye asked the customers for their thoughts on the future of trade shows. Ms. Tanel responded that the International Association of Exhibitions and Events (IAEE) was currently working on a futurist study of the industry. Mr. McGuinness added that the predictability of the trade show industry was limited, however the industry was very competitive. Mr. Brown agreed that the predictability was limited. Ms. Chupka reiterated the importance of flexibility offered to exhibitors.

Chair Ham expressed his appreciation to the presenters.

Mr. Jicinsky summarized the commonality in demand from each presenting trade show customer and discussed the need for flexible venue space.
Mr. Jicinsky stated that “the real value of having our clients here is to use it in designing our program” and introduced Terry Miller, LVCVA Owner’s Representative, to comment on how the conversation would continue with the customers.

Mr. Miller addressed the Panel and stated that the conversations with customers and stakeholders would be continual in order to encourage business growth throughout the destination. Mr. Miller also elaborated on the importance of flexibility and the anticipation of demand.

Mr. Jicinsky went on to discuss how international venues were in the competitive set and introduced Hugh Sinnock, LVCVA Vice President of Customer Experience, to provide perspective on international convention centers.

Mr. Sinnock delivered a PowerPoint presentation of his visit to the following competitive convention centers in Asia: Korea International Exhibition & Convention Center – KINTEX in Goyang, South Korea; COEX, Convention and Exhibition Center in Seoul, South Korea; AsiaWorld-Expo in Hong Kong, China; Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC) in Hong Kong, China; China International Exhibition Center (old and new) in Beijing, China; Shanghai New International Expo Centre (SNIEC) in Shanghai, China; and National Exhibition Convention Center (NECC) in Shanghai, China.

Chair Ham thanked Mr. Sinnock for his report.

Mr. Jicinsky explained how the competitive set concepts would assist in the design process and allow for the inclusion of trends and new ideas.

Mr. Jicinsky and Mr. Miller answered Panel member questions from the February 23 Oversight Panel meeting. Mr. Miller discussed the prioritization within the budget plan. Mr. Jicinsky discussed the expansion and renovation program as they related to Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) building certification.

Member Frye suggested the use of Green Globe certification versus LEED, to which Mr. Miller agreed.

Vice Chair Tom Thomas spoke about the potential geographic sustainability concepts that LEED did not recognize, to which Mr. Miller acknowledged. Mr. Jicinsky said that the final plan would allow flexibility to address certification throughout the process.

Mr. Jicinsky discussed potential concurrency with certain renovation projects during the expansion construction.

Mr. Jicinsky noted planned Panel member competitive set site visits in Chicago, Orlando, and San Diego in April. He went on to discuss the domestic and international competitive set as it related to forward-thinking design work.

This was an information item. Not an action item.
ITEM B. Las Vegas Convention Center District Staff Report: Presentation of the Budget, Schedule, and Funding

Mr. Miller discussed the LVCCD program budget through a detailed analysis of the construction cost budget, contingency budget, and soft cost budget.

Chair Ham expressed his concerns with projected costs in comparison to competitive markets, to which Mr. Miller explained the specific costs associated with the projects in those markets and identified the differences between competitive projects and the LVCCD. Chair Ham requested a cost comparison and analysis of disparities in costs.

Member Ron Frye discussed soft cost items as well as third party source for the cost analysis, to which Mr. Miller recognized local and national contractors that provided cost information. Member Frye also inquired about escalation in cost, to which Mr. Miller identified. In addition, Member Frye asked about operating supplies and equipment costs, to which Mr. Jicinsky answered that those costs were included in the capital funds of the operations budget.

Member Frye and Mr. Miller examined the budgeted costs allotted for a contractor. Chair Ham suggested that such specifics could be discussed as the process moved forward. Chair Ham reiterated the importance of the presentation of a cost comparison.

Mr. Miller briefly discussed the LVCCD schedule and cash flow.

Member Michael Crome inquired about the project timeline as it related to the expansion versus the renovation and additions. Rana Lacer, LVCVA Chief Financial Officer, answered that the cash flow for the renovations and additions had been programmed into the model.

Ms. Lacer provided a brief history of funding for the LVCVA and presented the financing program for the LVCCD.

Chair Ham asked Ms. Lacer about pledged revenue and debt services, to which Ms. Lacer outlined room tax revenue and various revenue streams for the LVCVA versus operating costs. Ms. Lacer discussed LVCCVA bonds and recognized Marty Johnson with JNA Consulting Group, LVCVA Financial Advisor, and Kendra Follett with Sherman and Howard, LVCVA Bond Counsel, in the audience.

Member Robert Cilento inquired about total revenues, to which Ed Finger, LVCVA Senior Vice President of Finance, and Ms. Lacer outlined.

Member Crome asked about the revenue growth assumptions and general obligation bonds, to which Mr. Finger explained the percentage of revenue growth and outlined the specifics of general obligation bonds. Ms. Lacer noted her appreciation of the general obligation bonds and examined the benefits of such.

Member John Littell discussed how the metrics in Las Vegas were changing and expressed his concerns with the overall budget. Member Littell suggested that milestones and financing for each milestone be incorporated in the plan.
Chair Ham explained the purpose of the Oversight Panel as it related to approving a plan for the LVCCD. Chair Ham explained how the plan should incorporate four distinct tenets; the envisioned product of the expansion and renovation, the method of procurement, scheduling, and budget. He also expressed the importance of the Panel’s insights for the purposes of checks and balances.

Mr. Jicinsky acknowledged that the initial plan was one of many steps in the entire process of the LVCCD project.

This was an information item. Not an action item.

6. **PANEL MEMBER COMMENTS**

7. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR BY THE PUBLIC**
There were no comments from the floor by the public.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**
Chair Bill Ham adjourned the meeting at 11:59 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Date approved: *April 27, 2017*

---

Courtney Lipski
Executive Assistant to the LVCVA Board of Directors

Bill Ham
Chair
Oversight Panel for Convention Facilities in Clark County

MEETING MINUTES

April 27, 2017
9:00 AM
Las Vegas Convention Center • Board Room
3150 Paradise Road • Las Vegas, NV 89109

OVERSIGHT PANEL

Bill Ham • Chair
Tom Thomas • Vice Chair
Gary Bogan
Robert Cilento
Michael Crome
Ron Frye
John Littell ......absent

Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority
Executive Staff in Attendance
Rossi Ralenyotter, President/CEO
Luke Puschnig, Esq., CEM, Legal Counsel
Rana Lacer, Chief Financial Officer
Ed Finger, Senior Vice President of Finance
Terry Jicinsky, Senior Vice President of Operations
Terry Miller, LVCVA Owner’s Representative, Cordell Corporation

1. CALL TO ORDER
Chair Bill Ham called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. A quorum of the members was present at roll call.

2. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR BY THE PUBLIC
There were no comments from the floor by the public.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES
Vice Chair Tom Thomas moved, seconded by Member Michael Crome, and it was carried by unanimous vote of the voting members present to approve the April 27, 2017, agenda of the Oversight Panel for Convention Facilities in Clark County, as well as the March 23, 2017, minutes of the Oversight Panel for Convention Facilities in Clark County.

4. CHAIRMAN/PANEL COMMENTS
Chair Bill Ham commented on his recent visit to the San Diego Convention Center with LVCVA staff, Vice Chair Tom Thomas, and Member Gary Bogan.

Member Michael Crome thanked LVCVA staff for his recent visit to McCormick Place in Chicago and said it was an “insightful” experience.
Vice Chair Tom Thomas expressed his appreciation to staff for the San Diego Convention Center site visit and recognized specific aesthetics of the facility.

Chair Ham discussed the benefits of convention center site visits in relation to the planning process of the Las Vegas Convention Center District (LVCCD) project.

5. REPORTS AND PRESENTATION

LAS VEGAS CONVENTION AND VISITORS AUTHORITY STAFF REPORTS
Terry Jicinsky, LVCVA Senior Vice President of Operations, reviewed the discussion topics for the meeting.

ITEM A. Las Vegas Convention Center District Staff Report: Review of Panel Questions from March 23rd Meeting
Terry Miller, LVCVA Owner’s Representative, delivered a PowerPoint presenting responses to the questions and requests raised by the Panel during its regular meeting on March 23.

Chair Bill Ham encouraged the Panel to propose their comments and suggestions in writing to LVCVA staff to ensure efficiency in the approval process of the LVCC District Plan.

Member Ron Frye inquired about Panel involvement in the selection of the project designer, to which Mr. Miller answered that input from the Panel would be incorporated in the selection process.

Member Michael Crome asked if the LVCCD Committee was a subcommittee of the LVCVA Board of Directors, to which Mr. Miller confirmed that it was and stated that Chuck Bowling was the Chair of the LVCCD Committee.

Member Ron Frye questioned the project budget projections in relation to accessibility of the expansion site. Mr. Miller elaborated on accessibility of the expansion site and said he felt confident with the proposed project budget.

Chair Ham asked if information was available from other competitive convention centers’ expansion and renovation projects that could be used as comparison with the proposed project budget costs. Mr. Miller outlined the project costs of current expansion and renovation projects in comparison to the LVCCD proposed project budget. Chair Ham requested LVCVA staff provide additional materials comparing project costs from other facilities.

This was an information item. Not an action item.

ITEM B. Las Vegas Convention Center District Staff Report: Presentation of Delivery Methods for Design and Construction
Mr. Miller delivered a PowerPoint presentation outlining three primary methods of consideration; Design-Bid-Build, Construction-Manager-at-Risk, and Design-Build, as well as staff’s recommendations for each phase of the LVCCD project.
Chair Ham requested clarification on the length of the design process in each of the delivery methods, to which Mr. Miller explained the design process within each method. Chair Ham requested additional material supporting LVCVA staff’s analysis of the design process in each delivery method.

Member Ron Frye and Mr. Miller discussed the specifics of the delivery methods in the design process and Member Frye provided additional risks and benefits of each. Member Frye expressed his concerns with the delivery methods and suggested that the design work could begin sooner than proposed.

Chair Ham addressed the Panel’s concerns with the design timeline and requested additional supporting material to the delivery methods.

Member Frye requested copies of the project schedule and requested clarification on the specifics of the Design-Build method, to which Mr. Miller provided.

Rana Lacer, Chief Financial Officer, continued the presentation and introduced Ed Finger, Senior Vice President of Finance. Mr. Finger delivered a PowerPoint presentation outlining the affordability of the financing program of the LVCCD project.

Chair Ham inquired about projected revenue and requested the revenue growth comparison between 2018 and 2024, to which Mr. Finger discussed projected revenue growth in relation to the additional 0.5 percent room tax as stated in Senate Bill 1 (SB1). Ms. Lacer clarified projected revenues and costs upon completion of the LVCCD project.

Chair Ham asked about the transfers in excess collection fees, to which Mr. Finger provided clarification.

This was an information item. Not an action item.

**ITEM C. Las Vegas Convention Center District Plan Document Timeline**

Mr. Jicinsky presented a proposed timeline for submittal of the draft LVCC District Plan document.

Chair Bill Ham asked the Panel to submit written comments in reference to the LVCC District Plan document to staff and requested the scheduling of an additional Oversight Panel meeting in early May.

Member Ron Frye inquired about the actualization of the LVCC District Plan, to which Mr. Jicinsky answered that it would be a formal document.

Chair Ham and Mr. Jicinsky discussed the approval timeline of the LVCC District Plan.

This was an information item. Not an action item.
6. **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION FOR LVCC DISTRICT PLAN**  
Mr. Jicinsky noted the supporting documentation for the LVCC District Plan provided in the backup materials of the meeting.

   This was an information item. Not an action item.

7. **PANEL MEMBER COMMENTS**  
Chair Ham expressed his appreciation to LVCVA staff and emphasized the importance of a fully vetted draft project plan.

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR BY THE PUBLIC**  
Tanya Burtis, Business Development Manager for Associated Builders & Contractors Nevada Chapter, read the attached letter addressing project labor agreements.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**  
Chair Bill Ham adjourned the meeting at 10:22 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,  

Courtney Lipski  
Executive Assistant to the LVCVA Board of Directors

Date approved: *May 11, 2017*  

Bill Ham  
Chair
April 10, 2017

Board of Directors
Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority
3150 Paradise Rd.
Las Vegas, NV 89109

Dear Board Members,

I write today on behalf of the Associated Builders and Contractors and the merit shop construction industry in Nevada. As you may know, more than 80% of the construction workers in Nevada chose to work without union representation. Including a large majority of small, veteran, women, and minority owned businesses.

Two weeks ago the Senate Government Affairs Committee held a hearing on SB 464, which if passed, would allow a mandated project labor agreement (PLA) on the construction of the Las Vegas convention center expansion. It was represented at the hearing that this legislation has the full support of the LVCVA Board. Was this legislation approved by the full LVCVA Board? If so, was it a discussion item on a public meeting agenda? Is it the intent of the LVCVA Board to mandate a PLA as a condition to bid on the convention center expansion?

As you may be aware, Government-mandated PLAs are typically special interest schemes that require companies to hire through the union halls instead of putting their own employees to work. It discriminates against the vast majority of the private construction workforce simply based upon their labor affiliation. It also stifles competition because it discourages those companies that chose to work non-union from bidding contracts with PLA requirements.

In this light, I am requesting LVCVA clarify its position on SB 464. Thank you for your time and I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Mac Bybee
President/ CEO
ABC Nevada Chapter
OVERSIGHT PANEL for Convention Facilities in Clark County

MEETING MINUTES

May 11, 2017
9:00 AM
Las Vegas Convention Center • Board Room
3150 Paradise Road • Las Vegas, NV 89109

OVERSIGHT PANEL

Bill Ham • Chair
Tom Thomas • Vice Chair
Gary Bogan
Robert Cilento…….absent
Michael Crome
Ron Frye
John Littell

Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority
Executive Staff in Attendance

Rana Lacer, Chief Financial Officer
Luke Puschnig, Esq., CEM, Legal Counsel
Ed Finger, Senior Vice President of Finance
Terry Jicinsky, Senior Vice President of Operations
Cathy Tull, Senior Vice President of Marketing
Terry Miller, LVCVA Owner’s Representative, Cordell Corporation

1. CALL TO ORDER
Chair Bill Ham called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. A quorum of the members was present at roll call.

2. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR BY THE PUBLIC
Randy Lavigne, Executive Director for the American Institute of Architects (AIA) Las Vegas and Nevada Chapters, read the attached letter to the Panel.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES
Vice Chair Tom Thomas moved, seconded by Member Ron Frye, and it was carried by unanimous vote of the voting members present to approve the May 11, 2017, agenda of the Oversight Panel for Convention Facilities in Clark County, as well as the April 27, 2017, minutes of the Oversight Panel for Convention Facilities in Clark County.

4. CHAIRMAN/PANEL COMMENTS
Chair Bill Ham thanked Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority (LVCVA) staff for their responsiveness and diligence and stated that he looked forward to the culmination of a final LVCC District Plan at the next Oversight Panel meeting.
5. **LAS VEGAS CONVENTION CENTER DISTRICT STAFF REPORT: REVIEW OF QUESTIONS FROM APRIL 27, 2017, MEETING**

Ed Finger, LVCVA Senior Vice President of Finance, delivered a PowerPoint presentation in response to finance related questions raised by the Oversight Panel during its regular meeting on April 27, 2017.

Chair Bill Ham inquired about the LVCCD project income versus expenses, to which Mr. Finger elaborated on the specific analysis used to determine such projections.

   This was an information item. Not an action item.

6. **DISCUSSION ON THE DRAFT LVCC DISTRICT PLAN**

Terry Jicinsky, LVCVA Senior Vice President of Operations, introduced the draft LVCC District Plan and offered his gratitude to the Panel members for their support and diligence throughout the process.

Member Ron Frye asked if a revised project timeline would be presented, to which Mr. Jicinsky answered that the Plan would incorporate a timeline which allows for flexibility.

Member Michael Crome inquired about the difference in the project timelines of each potential delivery method, to which Mr. Jicinsky explained that the timeline assumptions “have an opportunity to be adjusted.”

Chair Bill Ham discussed the timeline presented in the draft Plan in relation to utilizing the Construction-Manager-At-Risk (CMAR) delivery method. Terry Miller, LVCVA Owner’s Representative, stated that the anticipation was for Phase Two of the project to be completed prior to the 2021 Consumer Electronics Show (CES) and outlined the specifics of how the completion date would be achieved.

Vice Chair Tom Thomas examined the role of selection teams for the design and construction professionals and asked what the Panel’s role would be in relation to those selection teams. Mr. Jicinsky answered that the Plan calls for the Chair or his designee to serve on the selection team. Vice Chair Thomas expressed his appreciation for LVCVA staff’s motivation to expedite the project. Mr. Jicinsky noted the importance of the involvement of the Panel, as well as the LVCVA Board of Directors throughout the process.

Mr. Jicinsky noted the two-phase approval process of the Plan. Chair Ham discussed the diligence and detail necessary for Phase Three of the project versus Phase Two.

Mr. Jicinsky outlined the role of the Panel after the approval of the Plan.

Vice Chair Thomas discussed the potential for quarterly Panel meetings and suggested that materials presented to the Panel be consistent with materials being utilized to determine the progress of the project.
Chair Ham requested clarification on the mechanics of the selection teams and the correlation to the role of the Panel. Mr. Jicinsky outlined the specifics of the procurement process requirements as stated in the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) and noted how such processes had been performed in the past.

Rana Lacer, LVCVA Chief Financial Officer, recognized the unique nature of the establishment of the Panel’s role in local government agency processes and outlined the methods and procedures of procurement in relation to compliance with NRS and ethical standards.

Mr. Jicinsky acknowledged that Cordell Corporation would act as the administrator of the procurement process, but would not be a voting member.

Chair Ham asked if the selection teams were part of a public process or an internal procurement process by the LVCVA, to which Ms. Lacer answered that it was the latter and would be an internal process with the recommendations of the selection teams being made available to the public after completion of their efforts. Chair Ham inquired about the scoring requirements of the selection team, to which Mr. Jicinsky outlined the process that includes the selection team approval of the selection criteria and the weighted values of each.

Member Crome expressed his concerns with the selection teams in relation to the role of the Panel, to which Mr. Jicinsky explained that the Panel would be involved and have direct input in the selection team. Member Crome requested that the construction experts on the Panel have the opportunity to offer insight directly to Chair Ham.

Chair Ham acknowledged the importance of understanding the public procurement process and expressed his appreciation to staff for thoroughly providing the Panel with sufficient information.

Ms. Lacer and Mr. Finger presented additional detail on the financing of the LVCCD.

Chair Ham inquired about the projected expenditures presented, to which Ms. Lacer thoroughly explained how those projected expenditures were established. Member Crome also inquired about the ending fund balances, to which Ms. Lacer justified.

Mr. Finger continued his presentation on the financing of the LVCCD.

Mr. Jicinsky discussed the inclusion of minority-owned, woman-owned, and veteran-owned businesses in the project. Chair Ham asked if policies would be established to incorporate such inclusion, to which Ms. Lacer examined the organizational policies utilized. Member Crome asked when an inclusion plan would be presented to the Panel, to which Mr. Jicinsky answered that it would be prior to the procurement process.

This was an information item. Not an action item.

7. PANEL MEMBER COMMENTS
Member Ron Frye stated that he appreciated the work of LVCVA staff on drafting and revising the Plan.
Member John Littell asked about a potential scope change, to which Mr. Jicinsky explained that a budget parameter would be established. Member Ham and Mr. Jicinsky discussed the presentation of the budget parameter.

Vice Chair Thomas suggested the Panel be engaged more frequently than established in Senate Bill No. 1. Mr. Jicinsky discussed the frequency of future reports provided to the Panel.

Chair Ham requested additional standardization in the final Plan document. He also stated that LVCVA staff provided a thorough presentation of the Plan and emphasized the importance of continued involvement by the Panel.

8. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR BY THE PUBLIC
Ms. Lavigne recognized the AIA trade show at the Las Vegas Convention Center in June 2019.

Chair Bill Ham complimented Ms. Lavigne on her representation of AIA.

Ms. Lacer expressed her appreciation to the Panel.

9. ADJOURNMENT
Chair Bill Ham adjourned the meeting at 10:20 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Courtney Lipski
Executive Assistant to the LVCVA Board of Directors

Date approved: May 25, 2017

Bill Ham
Chair
May 11, 2017

Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority (LVCVA)
Board of Directors and the Oversight Panel

Dear Board Members, Oversight Panel Members and Staff of the LVCVA,

As an honorary member of the American Institute of Architects (AIA) and its 90,000 members; as Executive Director of the AIA Las Vegas and AIA Nevada Chapters; and on behalf of the 2,901 architects who are licensed, registered and practice in the State of Nevada, I am asking that you recognize, acknowledge and engage the abundance of talented, nationally acclaimed and respected architects that live and practice right here in our own state and provide an economic benefit with each and every project they design. They lead firms that offer a collective history with convention, hospitality and entertainment venues that exceed hundreds of years.

When Nevada architects work . . . the whole design and construction industry works. Projects that begin with the architect’s design concept generate jobs for contractors, engineers, consultants, interior designers, landscape architects and others, who in turn hire the construction workers, the sub-contractors, suppliers and manufacturers . . . and so on. For every $100M of capital funds invested in our state’s building infrastructure, we create jobs for 6,000 Nevadans. It begins with the architect and ends with a healthy economy.

Of the 2,901 registered architects in the State of Nevada, 537 are residents who live and practice in our state, create jobs and contribute to the economic well-being of our communities through their practice. We understand that SB464 is intended to be a benefit for local "small" businesses, however, the required qualification for architecture and engineering firms to earn less than $2.5M in annual revenue causes concern when used to qualify a firm’s capacity, capability and experience. That qualification should not become an impediment to our local firms with the portfolio and experience qualified to play a major role given the intended scope of both the expansion and renovation of the LVCC. Furthermore, the requirement that 15% of the project be subcontracted to small local businesses should be a minimal guide only. Local firms regardless of size and income should be given the opportunity to participate on a project whose objective is to keep the Las Vegas brand and it’s Convention Center on top and ahead of other competitive convention and tourism markets.

The 550 architect, associate and allied members of the AIA Las Vegas Chapter represent a diverse range of firms, large to small, whose specialties and breadth of professional experience cannot be calculated by an arbitrary revenue amount. These firms are prepared to provide exceptional design, planning and construction management services for the Las Vegas Convention Center (LVCC), and are truly interested in advancing the vision of the LVCC into the future. They are invested in this community just as the LVCVA is, and should play an integral role with this extraordinary and significant project.

It is our hope that the Board of Directors and the Oversight Panel for the Las Vegas Convention Center will engage local architects, engineers and design professionals in this project which will result in the most successful outcome for our Las Vegas and Southern Nevada communities. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Randy Lavigne, Hon. AIA
Executive Director
AIA Nevada / AIA Las Vegas

401 South Fourth Street, Suite 175 * Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
702-895-0936
1. CALL TO ORDER
Chair Bill Ham called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. A quorum of the members was present at roll call.

2. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR BY THE PUBLIC
Randy Lavigne, Executive Director for the American Institute of Architects (AIA) Las Vegas and Nevada Chapters, thanked the Panel members for their participation in the Las Vegas Convention Center District (LVCCD) project and expressed the excitement of the local architect community’s involvement.

Jack Zunino, President of the American Society of Landscape Architects Nevada Chapter, voiced his appreciation, on behalf of the local landscape architect and design community, for opportunities throughout Nevada.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES
Member John Littell moved, seconded by Vice Chair Tom Thomas, and it was carried by unanimous vote of the voting members present to approve the May 25, 2017, agenda of the Oversight Panel for Convention Facilities in Clark County, as well as the May 11, 2017, minutes of the Oversight Panel for Convention Facilities in Clark County.
4. **CHAIRMAN/PANEL COMMENTS**
Chair Bill Ham said he was looking forward to the progress of the next phase of the LVCCD project.

5. **LAS VEGAS CONVENTION CENTER DISTRICT STAFF REPORT: REVIEW OF QUESTIONS FROM MAY 11, 2017, MEETING**
Terry Jicinsky, LVCVA Senior Vice President of Operations, delivered a PowerPoint presentation in response to questions raised by the Oversight Panel during its regular meeting on May 11, 2017.

   This was an information item. Not an action item.

6. **LAS VEGAS CONVENTION CENTER DISTRICT PLAN AND 2017 OVERSIGHT PANEL RESOLUTION**
LVCVA staff requested the Oversight Panel: 1) Approve the Las Vegas Convention Center District Plan (LVCC District Plan), as presented; 2) Approve and adopt the Resolution providing for the issuance of bonds in one or more series up to $900 million for the purpose of financing Phase Two of the project; 3) Authorize the Chair and the Vice-Chair to sign the Resolution; 4) Provide for all other matters relating thereto as defined in the Resolution; and 5) Recommend approval to the Las Vegas Convention Center District (LVCCD) Committee and the LVCVA Board of Directors.

Member Michael Crome arrived at 9:07 a.m.

Terry Miller, LVCVA Owner’s Representative, delivered a PowerPoint presentation overview of the LVCC District Plan.

Ed Finger, LVCVA Senior Vice President of Finance, continued the PowerPoint presentation briefly outlining the LVCCD project financing.

Member Ron Frye clarified for the record that the approval was specifically for the LVCC District Plan document and would incorporate all items previously discussed.

*Member John Littell moved, seconded by Vice Chair Tom Thomas, and it was carried by unanimous vote of the voting members present to: 1) Approve the LVCC District Plan as presented; 2) Approve and adopt the Resolution providing for the issuance of bonds in one or more series up to $900 million for the purpose of financing Phase Two of the project; 3) Authorize the Chair and the Vice-Chair to sign the Resolution; 4) Provide for all other matters relating thereto as defined in the Resolution; and 5) Recommend approval to the LVCCD Committee and the LVCVA Board of Directors.*

On behalf of Rossi Ralenkotter, LVCVA President/CEO, Rana Lacer, Chief Financial Officer, expressed staff’s appreciation of the Panel for their guidance, expertise, and collaboration throughout the process. Ms. Lacer emphasized the importance of the LVCCD project for the community.
7. PANEL MEMBER COMMENTS
Chair Bill Ham said that the collaboration and cooperation of the Panel and staff had been “fulfilling and rewarding.” Chair Ham outlined the approval process of the LVCC District Plan and the next steps of the LVCCD project. He also congratulated and thanked the Panel members and LVCVA staff for their efforts in the development and approval of the LVCC District Plan.

8. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR BY THE PUBLIC
There were no comments from the floor by the public.

9. ADJOURNMENT
Chair Bill Ham adjourned the meeting at 9:23 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Courtney Lipski
Executive Assistant to the LVCVA Board of Directors

Date approved: October 25, 2017

Bill Ham
Chair
CALL TO ORDER
Chair Bill Ham called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m. A quorum of the members was present at roll call.

COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR BY THE PUBLIC
Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority (LVCVA) Las Vegas Convention Center District (LVCCD) Committee Chair Chuck Bowling recognized LVCVA Board of Directors Chair Lawrence Weekly in the audience, welcomed Board Chair Weekly to provide remarks, and thanked him for his continued leadership.

Board Chair Weekly thanked LVCCD Committee Chair Bowling for his leadership of the LVCCD Committee and offered his gratitude to the members of the LVCCD Committee and the Oversight Panel for Convention Facilities in Clark County (Panel) for their time and efforts on the LVCCD project.
Board Chair Weekly discussed his history with the Las Vegas Convention Center and expressed his excitement for the future of Las Vegas and the LVCCD. Board Chair Weekly also thanked Rossi Ralenkotter, LVCVA President/CEO, Governor Brian Sandoval, and the Nevada legislators who supported the LVCCD project.

Committee Chair Bowling also recognized LVCVA Board Member John Marz in the audience.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES**

*Vice Chair Tom Thomas moved, seconded by Member Michael Crome, and it was carried by unanimous vote of the voting members present to approve the October 25, 2017, agenda of the Oversight Panel for Convention Facilities in Clark County, as well as the May 25, 2017, minutes of the Oversight Panel for Convention Facilities in Clark County.*

**LAS VEGAS CONVENTION AND VISITORS AUTHORITY STAFF REPORTS**

A. **Report on Compliance with Senate Bill 1 of the 2017 Nevada Legislative Session**

Rana Lacer, LVCVA Chief Financial Officer, provided the Independent Auditors’ Report on compliance with Senate Bill 1 of the 2017 Nevada Legislative Session for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2017.

This was an information item. Not an action item.

B. **Las Vegas Convention Center District Design Competition Presentations**

Terry Jicinsky, LVCVA Senior Vice President of Operations, provided a detailed overview of the selection of the design competition finalists and discussed the schedule and purpose of the presentations. Mr. Jicinsky recognized Terry Miller, LVCVA Owner’s Representative, as the facilitator of the presentations.

**Presentation by RV Architecture/Friedmutter Group**

Mr. Miller introduced the first design competition presentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM</th>
<th>ATTENDEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RV Architecture, LLC</td>
<td>Rafael Viñoly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV Architecture, LLC</td>
<td>Chan-li Lin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV Architecture, LLC</td>
<td>Jay Bargmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedmutter Group</td>
<td>Brad Friedmutter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Wallace Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>Carol Wallace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumming</td>
<td>Graham Flight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSimone Consulting Engineers</td>
<td>Stephen DeSimone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEA Consulting Engineers</td>
<td>Robert Finnegan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RV Architecture/Friedmutter Group presented their design for the LVCCD.

Mr. Miller facilitated questions from the Panel, LVCCD Committee, and LVCVA staff.
Committee Member Kristin McMillan thanked the presenters for their presentations, inquired about the design firm’s experience with convention centers, and asked how the fundamental needs of the project had been incorporated into the proposed design. Rafael Viñoly provided examples of his experience with large convention centers domestically and internationally. Mr. Viñoly explained the importance of understanding the fundamental necessities of the users and operators of the convention center and expressed the importance of designing a flexible building with the ability to change and grow.

Member Ron Frye inquired about the architectural look of the building during Phase Two and Phase Three of the project. Mr. Viñoly illustrated the specific design during each phase.

Committee Member Carolyn Goodman asked Mr. Viñoly to elaborate on the advantages of his knowledge and experience, as well as his team’s experience. Mr. Viñoly detailed the importance of forward-thinking specific to the way-finding ability of a building, the convenience for its users, and the flexibility of the building’s growth.

Member Frye inquired about the price of the tensor cables in the design as well as the graphics that would be displayed on the cables. Mr. Viñoly stated that only the price of the cables and lighting had been incorporated in the total project budget and explained that the banners were meant to remain as a component of the operational cost of the facility.

Committee Member Goodman asked about the cost of a digital reader board, to which Mr. Viñoly reiterated that it was not a part of the project budget and again expressed the benefits of the lighting component of the cables for the specific incorporation of banners.

Chair Bill Ham inquired about the amount of glass incorporated in the building design, to which Mr. Viñoly detailed the benefits of the glass throughout the building design and explained the window cleaning mechanism incorporated within the design.

Committee Member McMillan asked how site security has been taken into consideration during the design process. Mr. Viñoly expressed his ideas to mitigate security concerns and provided examples of systems that could be used within the building process.

Committee Chair Chuck Bowling alluded to the importance of out-of-the-box thinking and also made a statement that the collaboration of the LVCVA and private sector would work to ensure that the best practices in site security would be incorporated in the project. Committee Chair Bowling reinforced the imperativeness of customer and operator input in the project. Committee Chair Bowling also inquired about other examples of tensor cables incorporated in building designs and the mobility component of the building. Mr. Viñoly provided transportation ideas that could be incorporated in the project and elaborated on the history and advances in technology of the cables.

Mr. Jicinsky asked Mr. Viñoly what potential challenges could arise, how he would overcome those challenges, and how the budget schedule would be met. Mr. Viñoly emphasized his team’s relationship with Las Vegas, their enthusiasm and experience, and the ability to incorporate local talent.
Ed Finger, LVCVA Senior Vice President of Finance, inquired about the components of the design incorporated in Phase Two and the magnitude of cost in Phase Three. Mr. Viñoly illustrated which components of the building design were incorporated in Phase Two. Graham Flight elaborated on the budget and cost estimates of each phase of the project.

Mr. Ralenkotter asked about the potential impact of the neighborhood as a result of the design. Mr. Viñoly explained the significance of his team’s design and its benefits to the destination. Mr. Ralenkotter inquired about the cost percentage of the “wow factor” or cable structure in the design, to which Mr. Viñoly elaborated and then went on to express the importance of building a unique facility.

Committee Member Ricki Barlow discussed the innovative convention center expansion projects around the country and asked how the presented design would be more inventive, to which Mr. Viñoly explained the incorporation of brand clarity, visual power, and unique building structure.

**Presentation by TVS Design/Design Las Vegas**

Mr. Miller introduced the second design competition presentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TVS Design</th>
<th>Design Las Vegas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TVS (Atlanta)</td>
<td>TVS Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSK Architects (Las Vegas)</td>
<td>TSK Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson Coulter Studio (Las Vegas)</td>
<td>Simpson Coulter Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter Sellers Del Gatto Architects (Las Vegas)</td>
<td>CSD Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KME Architects (Las Vegas)</td>
<td>Keolis- Transportation Consultants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TVS Design/Design Las Vegas presented their design for the LVCCD.

Mr. Miller facilitated questions from the Panel, LVCCD Committee, and LVCVA staff.

Committee Member Ricki Barlow asked about the autonomous vehicle travel time, to which Francis Julien described the mobility of the autonomous vehicle. Committee Member Barlow also discussed natural light inhibiting exhibitors and inquired about the potential for blackout curtains. Rob Svedberg and Kevin Gordon elaborated on the demand for natural light, as well as the disadvantages, and explained that the use of blackout curtains were incorporated in the design.

Vice Chair Tom Thomas inquired about the engineering accountability for the opportunity to incorporate solar panels, to which Mr. Svedberg explained the ability to incorporate solar panels in the presented design.
Committee Member Kristin McMillan asked how flexibility was taken into consideration in relation to technological advances of the building in the future. Mr. Svedberg described the importance of accessibility built within the infrastructure of the building in order to allow for future advances.

Chair Bill Ham inquired about the consideration of site security, to which Mr. Svedberg and Mr. Gordon elaborated on the incorporation on building security in the design of the building and discussed past experience working on security concerns in convention centers.

Committee Member Carolyn Goodman asked about LEED certification, to which Mr. Svedberg elaborated on the importance of LEED certification and stated, “The building has to respect what your community ambitions are.” Committee Member Goodman also inquired about connectivity within the building in relation to budget, to which Mr. Svedberg outlined mobility in the future phases of the project. Mr. Gordon clarified that connectivity presented in the design was within the cost estimate, with the exception of the autonomous vehicles.

Committee Chair Chuck Bowling expressed his appreciation of customer input and inquired about video components within the design, to which Mr. Svedberg confirmed that it was incorporated.

Mr. Jicinsky asked about potential issues in relation to timeline and budget and how those issues would be addressed. Robert Bielamowicz and Mr. Gordon discussed the issues related to the speed of receiving the steel needed for the project and Mr. Svedberg discussed how the firm’s knowledge and preparation would overcome any obstacles.

Cathy Tull, LVCVA Senior Vice President of Marketing, inquired about columns in the proposed exhibition space, to which Mr. Svedberg and Mr. Gordon discussed the budgetary tradeoff of column free spaces.

Mr. Ralenkotter acknowledged necessary discussions in relation to the Monorail, as well as the budget flexibility of the project. Mr. Ralenkotter requested clarification on the blackout mechanism to which Mr. Svedberg explained that it would be a rope system. Mr. Ralenkotter also inquired about the number of autonomous vehicles that would be needed, their flexibility throughout the building, and the building model’s incorporated track. Mr. Julien suggested the potential demand in quantity of the vehicles and described their flexible mobility throughout the campus, as well as the track being “agnostic” to different types of vehicles. Mr. Ralenkotter asked if parking spaces would be lost to make room for the track, to which Mr. Svedberg explained that the track would be elevated and would not impact parking.

Mr. Ralenkotter asked about the efficiency of the proposed exhibition halls in relation to columns, to which Mr. Svedberg stated “that the columns that are in there are not going to impact the utilization or efficiency of the space” and elaborated on the size of the space. Mr. Ralenkotter also inquired about the food court and meeting rooms, to which Mr. Svedberg elaborated on the centralized food court, mobile concessions, and meeting room configurations.
Mr. Ralenkotter asked about the inspiration for the design in relation to the Las Vegas brand. Mr. Svedberg described the vision of the building and how it related to the history of the community. Mr. Gordon added that iconography of the building could become more “vibrant” through collaboration with staff.

**Presentation by Populous/Klai Juba Wald/LGA/ZimmerRay**

Mr. Miller introduced the third design competition presentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTENDEES</th>
<th>FIRM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Lockwood</td>
<td>Populous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Capstack</td>
<td>Populous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyle Miller</td>
<td>Populous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Klai</td>
<td>Klai Juba Wald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Galati</td>
<td>LGA Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Ray</td>
<td>ZimmerRay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Van Eyck</td>
<td>!melk Landscape Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Beaman</td>
<td>MKA Structural Engineers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Populous/Klai Juba Wald/LGA/ZimmerRay presented their design for the LVCCD.

Mr. Miller facilitated questions from the Panel, LVCCD Committee, and LVCVA staff.

Committee Chair Chuck Bowling expressed his appreciation for the incorporation of customer input in the motivation of the design. Committee Chair Bowling discussed the expansion and renovation components of the project in relation to the importance of minimizing the amount of disruption for clients utilizing the facility and questioned the firm’s understanding of the separation between Phase Two and Phase Three of the project. Michael Lockwood elaborated on the workshops with convention center customers and detailed the potential of incorporating aspects of Phase Three into Phase Two in order to benefit the customers.

Member Ron Frye asked staff, “Is this incremental approach to expanding exhibit space going to fit your program?” Mr. Jicinsky answered that the approach would need to be investigated more before staff could provide an answer. Mr. Lockwood explained how the program requirements were incorporated in the design and would allow for future growth.

Mr. Ralenkotter requested the specifics of the size of each space, to which Mr. Lockwood outlined.
Committee Member Kristin McMillan asked if anything was “left out” of Phase Three in the design, to which Mr. Lockwood answered that nothing was “left out” and elaborated on the sequencing of the design. Committee Member McMillan also inquired about arrival points and the LVCCD’s presence on the Las Vegas Strip, to which Mr. Lockwood discussed the flexibility of the multiple arrival points and suggested that the LVCCD should act as a “catalyst” to draw people away from the Strip.

Member Ron Frye stated that “it is a very intriguing design,” asked about the budget, and asked if Phase Two and Phase Three were allowed to be combined. Mr. Lockwood and Lyle Miller answered that their interpretation was that the Phase Three budget would be left “unscoped” until Phase Two had been determined. Mr. Lockwood went on to explain the advantages of their design proposal.

Mr. Jicinsky clarified that Phase Three still existed in order to renovate the existing halls, to which Mr. Lockwood agreed and elaborated on what would be renovated in Phase Three.

Committee Member Ricki Barlow requested additional information on the usability of rooftop space as it related to the outdoor temperature of Las Vegas. Mr. Lockwood detailed the flexibility of the rooftop space as well as the input from the customers during the workshops.

Chair Bill Ham said he appreciated the different approach to the design, but questioned the impact of adding onto existing buildings, to which Mr. Lockwood offered the benefits of adding to an existing building versus building a separate new building.

Committee Member Carolyn Goodman questioned the firm’s ability to meet the timeline and asked staff if LVCVA property on the Strip could be utilized for anything other than the expansion. Luke Puschnig, LVCVA Legal Counsel, answered that the LVCVA owned the property and “are not necessarily constrained to be able to have that as an expansion portion.” Committee Member Goodman inquired about potentially utilizing the Strip property for something other than the LVCCD, to which Ms. Lacer suggested that specific space was “highly critical” for clients in terms of outdoor exhibit space and parking and that the LVCVA would not look to repurpose that portion of the LVCVA property. Ms. Lacer inquired about the movement strategy incorporated in the design, to which Mr. Lockwood explained the pedestrian mobility of the design and acknowledged that there was no transportation system within the design.

Committee Chair Chuck Bowling explained the importance of attracting new customers and suggested that future customer demands would also need to be met. Mr. Lockwood commented on the renovation of the current facility.

Mr. Finger clarified the cost of the project as it related to the budget.

Randall Walker, LVCVA Consultant, asked if the budget allowed for the incorporation of all the presented design elements, to which Mr. Miller clarified that the design proposed funds being moved from Phase Three into Phase Two.
Ms. Tull inquired about removing columns in the South Hall, to which Mr. Lockwood explained that the columns would not be removed, however the hall would become additional flex space.

Hugh Sinnock, LVCVA Vice President of Customer Experience, inquired about digital assets included in the design. Mr. Lockwood discussed the incorporation of the LED veil and internal LED features.

Mr. Ralenkotter inquired about square footage and total cost of the project. Lyle Miller and Mr. Lockwood clarified the total budget and costs proposed in the design. Mr. Ralenkotter also discussed the impact of construction on existing and future customers, loss of parking spaces, and outdoor exhibits. Mr. Lockwood explained that collaboration with staff would be needed in order to communicate with customers during the construction.

This was an information item. Not an action item.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PANEL
Chair Bill Ham discussed the significance of the selection process and stated, “...ultimately, whatever comes out of this in the final selection, that we should have tremendous confidence that we’re going to wind up with a world class facility and certainly something that we can enjoy far into the future.” Chair Ham said he looked forward to the selection of the design firm.

Committee Chair Bowling expressed his enthusiasm of the future of the project and thanked Chair Ham and the Panel Members for their support and efforts. Committee Chair Bowling acknowledged his appreciation and congratulations to the design competition finalists and thanked the LVCCD Committee for their passion and commitment.

Committee Member Ricki Barlow thanked the LVCCD Committee for allowing him to participate via telephone, as well as City of Las Vegas Neighborhood Outreach Specialist Harry Williams for assisting with his participation during the meeting. Member Barlow expressed his excitement and confidence in the project.

Committee Member Larry Brown thanked Board Chair Weekly, LVCVA staff, and the Panel for their efforts.

Mr. Ralenkotter recognized the “invaluable input” from the private sector, Panel, and LVCCD Committee and expressed his excitement for the future of Las Vegas and the LVCCD.

COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR BY THE PUBLIC
There were no comments from the floor by the public.
ADJOURNMENT
Chair Bill Ham adjourned the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Courtney Lipski
Executive Assistant to the LVCVA Board of Directors

Date approved: April 9, 2018

Bill Ham
Chair