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Perception

VS.

= Southeast Wisconsin Professional Baseball Park District
How the Deal Gets Done
County Stadium

- Built 1952 by County for $7.7 M
  - To attract Boston Braves

- Problems ➔
  - 1. lack of skyboxes other revenue sources
    - part of the reason the Packers stopped playing in Milwaukee
    - too few concession areas
  - 2. number of obstructed view seats
  - 3. industry shift to smaller capacity in late 80s and early 90s

Milwaukee Brewers New Stadium

- **1987 →** GMC task force studies renovating County Stadium or building new ballpark
- **1988 →** task force recommends new stadium to be completed in 1992
  - renovation = $100 M while new stadium $120 M ($179 M in 2001)
- **1990 →** Brewers approve site for new stadium, construction moved to 1994
- **1994 →**
  - Brewers say they need convertible roof and public assistance for new stadium
  - State Senate and Assembly vote to amend state constitution to allow new lottery games to finance sport facilities
  - Brewers commit $60-90 M toward stadium
Requested by the Greater Milwaukee Committee on behalf of Wisconsin Governor's Stadium Commission (not for or by the team). Prepared by Arthur Andersen in January 1995.

**Impacts**
- **Direct (economic)**
  1. focus on direct not multiplier effects
  2. annual spending $105.2 M
  3. 4-year construction related spending $540.5 M
  4. state and local tax annual increases $3.4 M
  - TOTAL = @ $650 M (2011 $964 M)
- **Indirect**
  1. national image
  2. showcase for WI technology
  3. anchor redevelopment
1995 →
- January → voters reject lottery to finance stadium
- April → Governor, Milwaukee County Executive & Mayor announce MOU for 30 year lease and $90 M commitment from team for new facility. Public financing includes one-tenth of one percent sales tax and 1% hotel tax for other $160 M → expected completion 1999
- State Assembly approves plan 52-47
- October 6 → State Senate approves 16-15 (deciding Senator Petak recalled June 4, 1996)

1996 → stadium tax takes effect and District Board approves financing and site plan (digging begins on October 21)

1999 → 3 workmen killed in Big Blue accident (damage estimate $100 M)

2001 → completion of Miller Park
Final Cost ↠ $392 M ($100 M+ due to accident)

- Brewers contributed $90 M
- $72 M of infrastructure costs were split by the city, county and state.
- A five-county stadium district was created to cover the remaining costs. A 0.1% of a cent sales-tax increase was levied in this stadium district to pay for Miller Park ↠ could expire by 2017
Renovation of Lambeau Field

- Soon after won Super Bowl in 1997 projections by team and NFL showed that without a refurbished stadium, and because Green Bay is the smallest market in the NFL, team would lose money starting in 2000
- Could not compete with larger market teams
Economic Impact Report

- Packers commissioned study done by PricewaterhouseCoopers and CSL International (2000) → Annual Impact of Team in Green Bay

- $9.6 million in tax revenue
- $144 million in annual spending
- 1,620 jobs
In September 2000, Brown County voters approved a 0.5 cent sales tax to help fund renovation of the stadium. The tax proceeds are being used to pay off $160 M of the renovation costs. At the time the Brown County voters approved the sales tax increase in 2000, 53 Wisconsin counties already had the 0.5 cent sales tax.

The Packers paid $135 M towards the renovation. The Packers got this money from a combination of an NFL loan, $20 M in stock proceeds, and a one time user fee on season tickets.

Total = @ $295 million
• The Packers have elected to pay for the entire $143 million project ($67 M from recent stock sale)
• The renovation will create over 1,600 construction jobs over the next two years.
AMENDED AND RESTATED

MILLER PARK
LEASE AGREEMENT

By and Between

SOUTHEAST WISCONSIN PROFESSIONAL
BASEBALL PARK DISTRICT

and

MILWAUKEE BREWERS BASEBALL
CLUB, LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

Dated as of June 30, 2004

LAMBEAU FIELD
LEASE AGREEMENT

By and Among

GREEN BAY – BROWN COUNTY PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL
STADIUM DISTRICT,

CITY OF GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN

and

GREEN BAY PACKERS, INC.

Dated as of January 1, 2001
The Agreement

• Often First Letter Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding

• “Lease” – Generic Term

• Names
  ◦ Lease / License / Sub-Lease / Management, Development, Use, Operating Agreement
  ◦ All these together can become the lease agreement

• Length
  ◦ Currently ➔ @100 pages per document
(1) Started with 20 page lease in April of 1970

(2) Memorandum of Understanding, 8/19/95 (11 pgs. + 16 pgs. of exhibits)

(3) All the CURRENT LEASE
1. Interim Lease Agreement, 12/31/96 (11 pgs. + 17 pgs. of exhibits)
2. Construction Administration Agreement, 12/31/96 (28 pgs.)
3. Shared Ownership Agreement, 12/31/96 (20 pgs.)
4. Ground Lease, 10/21/96 (18 pgs. + 30 pgs. of exhibits)
5. Non-Relocation Agreement, 12/31/96 (7 pgs.) → Amended and Restated, 1/1/04 (7 pgs.)
6. Lease Agreement, 12/31/96 (56 pgs. + 40 pgs. of exhibits) → Amended and Restated, 6/30/04 (53 pgs. + 50 pgs. of exhibits)

TOTAL = 364 pages
Keep in mind virtually no team owns the facility

They are the lessor → Community is the landlord

- New Cowboys Stadium =
  - City → $325 M +
  - NFL → $150 M +
  - Jerry Jones → more than $500 M
- TOTAL = $1.3 billion (70% private)
  - Still → City owns the facility
C. The State currently owns a portion of land legally described or depicted on Exhibit A attached hereto (the “Site”). The State has leased the entirety of the Site, together with all rights appurtenant to the Site, to the District pursuant to a 99-year ground lease (the “Ground Lease”) dated October 21, 1996.

ARTICLE 3

OWNERSHIP OF STADIUM PROJECT

3.1 Ownership Interests. It is acknowledged by the parties hereto that the Team, both during and subsequent to the Term of this Lease, will own an undivided twenty-nine and seven one-hundredths percent (29.07%) interest in the Stadium Project (the “Team’s Ownership Interest”), and the District, both during and subsequent to the Term of this Lease, will own an undivided seventy and ninety-three hundredths percent (70.93%) interest in the Stadium Project (the “District’s Ownership Interest”), all subject to and in accordance with the Shared Ownership Agreement. The Team agrees that (a) the Team’s Ownership Interest shall be held and owned by the Team subject to the terms and conditions of this Lease and the Shared Ownership Agreement; (b) all Rent and other payments required to be made by the Team hereunder shall be made solely to the District and shall constitute property of the District; and (c) the District, except as otherwise expressly set forth in this Lease or the Shared Ownership Agreement, shall have the right, at all times during the Term, and notwithstanding the Team’s Ownership Interest, to grant all consents and enforce any and all rights and interests of the District set forth in this Lease or the Shared Ownership Agreement, all such authority to act hereunder being hereby irrevocably granted to the District by virtue of the full execution by all parties of this Lease and the Shared Ownership Agreement.
Who Owns the Team?

- Corporation / Single Owner / Partnership
- Often hard to tell

Examples

- Packers, Party Statement & Recital D, pg. 1 → CORP (Brewers Limited Partnership)

D. The Team is the holder of a professional football franchise issued by the National Football League (the “NFL”) and is the owner of the Green Bay Packers professional football team (the “Green Bay Packers”).
Costs for new facilities have gone up but not as much in real dollars
- **AVERAGE COST | Stadiums $450 M \ Arenas $250 M**
  - Average Costs of New Facilities *(converted to 2012 dollars)*
    - 1950s: $33.75 M
    - 1960s: $179 M
    - 1970s: $320 M
    - 1980s: $214 M
    - 1990s: $314 M
    - 2000s: $446 M
      - *(recent increase due to Cowboys $1.3 B, Yankees $1.5 B, Mets $860 M)*
- **Stadiums 2012 = $750 M (projects involved more than just stadium)**

- **Sources:** Keating, R.J. (1999); NSLI, *Sports Facility Reports.*
Team: Milwaukee Brewers

Principal Owner: Mark Attanasio
Year Established: 1970
Team Website

Most Recent Purchase Price ($/Mil): $223 (2005)
Current Value ($/Mil): $376 (#22)
Percent Change From Last Year: +7%

Stadium: Miller Park
Date Built: 2001
Facility Cost ($/Mil): $414
Percentage of Stadium Publicly Financed: 71%
Facility Financing: The Brewers contributed $90 million for the stadium, while the public contributed $310 million through a five-county, 0.10% sales tax increase. The $72 million infrastructure costs were split as follows: $18 million from the city, $18 million from Milwaukee County, and $36 million from the state.
Statutory Authority for Funding


CHAPTER 229
PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

SUBCHAPTER I
PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

SUBCHAPTER II
LOCAL EXPOSITION DISTRICTS

SUBCHAPTER III
LOCAL PROFESSIONAL BASEBALL PARK DISTRICTS

SUBCHAPTER IV
LOCAL PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL STADIUM DISTRICTS

SUBCHAPTER V
LOCAL CULTURAL ARTS DISTRICTS

229.11 First class city museums.
229.12 Board of trustees, composition.
229.13 Board of trustees; annual meeting and general functions.
229.14 Director and employees; curators.
229.15 Museum funds; expenditures.
229.16 Creations and incidental expenses.
229.17 Site, buildings and equipment.
229.18 Accountability; reports.
229.19 Applicability of sections 229.11 to 229.18.
229.21 First class city auditoriums and music halls.
229.22 Auditorium board.
229.23 Popularity and finance.
229.24 Operation.
229.25 Annual report.
229.26 Exposition center.
229.27 Municipal theater.

229.41 Definitions.
229.42 Creation and organization.
229.43 Introduction.
229.44 Certification of board members.
229.45 Powers of a district.
229.46 Powers granted to sponsoring municipality.
229.47 Certain contracting requirements.
229.48 Bond security.
229.49 Issuance of bonds.
229.50 Special debt service reserve funds.
229.51 Bonds not public debt.
229.52 Sale and pledge.
229.53 Trust funds.
229.54 Funding/refunding bonds.
229.55 Bond security.
229.56 Bond rates and charges; audit.

229.68 Legislative declaration.
229.69 Definitions.
229.70 Creation and organization.
229.71 Powers of a district.
229.72 Special provisions.
229.73 Powers granted to a city or a county in a district.
229.74 Minority contracting goals; disabled veteran-owned business contracting goals.

229.88 Legislative declaration.
229.89 Definitions.
229.90 Creation and organization.
229.91 Powers of a district.
229.92 Special provisions.
229.93 Powers granted to a city or a county in a district.
229.94 Minority contracting goals; disabled veteran-owned business contracting goals.

REFERENCES
229.86 Legislative declaration.
229.87 Definitions.
229.88 Creation and organization.
229.89 Powers of a district.
229.90 Special provisions.
229.91 Powers granted to a city or a county in a district.
229.92 Minority contracting goals; disabled veteran-owned business contracting goals.

229.111 District bond and debt not public debt.
229.112 Special fund for payment of principal and interest costs on certain bonds.
229.113 Pledge of revenues.
229.114 Funding/refunding bonds.
229.115 Bond security.
229.116 Bond rates and charges; audit.
229.117 Legislative declaration.
229.118 Definitions.
229.119 Creation and organization.
229.120 Powers of a district.
229.121 Special provisions.
229.122 Powers granted to a city or a county in a district.
229.123 Minority contracting goals; disabled veteran-owned business contracting goals.
Baseball Park District Legislation (Wis. Stat. § 229.64, et. seq. (2012))
- Southeast Wisconsin Professional Baseball Park District
  - (1) The legislature determines that the provision of assistance by state agencies to a district under this subchapter, any appropriation of funds to a district under this subchapter and the moral obligation pledge under s. 229.74 (7) serve a statewide public purpose by assisting the development of a professional baseball park in the state for providing recreation, by encouraging economic development and tourism, by reducing unemployment and by bringing needed capital into the state for the benefit and welfare of people throughout the state. The legislature determines that the taxes that may be imposed by a district under subch. V of ch. 77 are special taxes that are generated apart from any direct annual tax on taxable property.

  (2) The legislature determines that a district including a county with a population of more than 600,000 serves a public purpose in that county and all counties that are contiguous to that county by providing recreation, by encouraging economic development and tourism, by reducing unemployment and by bringing needed capital into the multicounty area for the benefit of people in the multicounty area.

SAME FOR PACKERS
- Green Bay/Brown County Professional Football Stadium District
Legality of Funding

Plans for public funding of sports facilities often face legal challenges

- Libertarian Party v. State, 199 Wis.2d 790 (1996)
  - Political Part sued over Wisconsin Stadium Act providing for the formation of local baseball park districts and empowering those districts to build and maintain professional baseball park facilities
  - Legislature stated the act would "serve a statewide public purpose" by assisting the development of a professional baseball park in the state for providing recreation, by encouraging economic development and tourism, by reducing unemployment and by bringing needed capital into the state for the benefit and welfare of people throughout the state."
  - Court → “While some private benefit will result, the project is sufficiently public in nature to withstand constitutional challenge. Therefore, we conclude that the Stadium Act authorizes constitutionally permissible expenditures for a public purpose” (812-813)
In their lawsuit against the Sonics the City of Seattle argued

- presence of the Sonics in Seattle creates large financial benefits for the City and for local businesses, including...
  - income generated from lease payments;
  - ticket sales;
  - concessions and novelty sales;
  - spending at local restaurants and hotels.
  - parking;
  - spending on advertising and merchandising;
  - taxes paid by the team;
  - revenues associated with Sonics players living in the Seattle area;
  - revenues from media covering the team's games.
  - numerous non-quantifiable benefits, including enhanced economic growth and ancillary private sector development spurred by the operation of a professional sports facility; convenient entertainment options for local families; facilities for youth activities; charitable events sponsored by the team and by individual players; advertising opportunities for local businesses; increased inducements for businesses to locate in Seattle, and for existing businesses to remain; and enhanced community pride, self-image, exposure, reputation, and prestige.

- City of Seattle, Complaint for Declaratory Relief, 2007 WL 5262606
PUBLIC PURPOSE AND ECONOMIC IMPACT

RECEITALS:

A. The presence and conduct of professional baseball in the State of Wisconsin (the "State") stimulates economic activity in the State and, therefore, the creation of a modern state-of-the-art baseball stadium facility for the playing of professional baseball will be beneficial to the State.

RECEITALS:

A. The presence and conduct of professional football in the City, Brown County, Wisconsin (the "County"), and the State of Wisconsin (the "State") stimulates economic activity in the City, County and State and, therefore, the expansion and redevelopment of Lambeau Field into a modern, state-of-the-art football stadium facility for the playing of professional football will be beneficial to the City, County and State.
Before renovations

After renovations
Economic Impact of Redeveloped Lambeau Field

Commissioned by the Green Bay/Brown County Professional Football Stadium District (9/22/10) (not by the team). Prepared by AECOM Technical Services.

• District committed $160 M to the project

In 2009

- Total economic impacts attributed to the Packers and Lambeau Field are approximately $141 million, in addition to 760 jobs and $80.6 million in wages
- Total tax revenues estimated at $5.7 million
- Impacts from off-site spending by visitors to training camp and regular and pre-season games estimated at $131 million, and 1,670 jobs.

- Total = @$277 M in 2009 ➔ cost of improvements = $295 M
County Stadium

Miller Park
26. From 2001 to the present, the South 43rd Street Corridor, which is comprised of Miller Park Way, Electric Avenue, Burnham Street, and Greenfield Avenue (hereinafter collectively referred to as Miller Park Way) has experienced a renaissance and has been transformed from a vacant, blighted eyesore to a center of commerce and business corridor.

28. The development of Miller Park Way from National Avenue to Lincoln Avenue, with adjacent development on Electric Avenue, Burnham Street, and Greenfield Avenue, has added significant assessed valuation to the Village of West Milwaukee, which has increased its real estate tax base and population base, as well as created new jobs.

42. Since the opening of Miller Park, the west end of the Menomonee Valley has experienced a rapid growth in construction and development, resulting in increased assessed valuation as a result of said construction, the creation of new real estate taxes for the City of Milwaukee and, of course, the creation of industrial real estate development also creates new jobs.

The Report concludes that “MLB stadiums can be valuable anchor tenants for development districts.”
Economic Impact of Miller Park

Study by the Institute for Survey and Policy Research at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (2007)

- The direct and indirect economic impact by visitors from outside the area, a majority of whom came from outside the state, resulted in $327.3 million in increased spending and the creation of 4,683 additional full- and part-time jobs
  - direct economic effects of the ballpark and the Brewers included the total yearly spending of those attending games at Miller Park from outside the five-county area, as well as the resulting local employment and earnings. The study says that figure is $292.5 million.
  - indirect effects included the total operating expenses of the Brewers, including administrative expenses, as well as the earnings of club employees. That figure is estimated at $34.8 million yearly.

- Spectators from outside the five-county area also contributed $10.2 million in added sales tax revenue and $3.9 million in added income tax revenue.

- Updating now for Major League Baseball
NAIA College Football Championship MATH

$75K Public spending improvements to Barron Stadium generates $1 million in added sales adds $30K to public coffers

*Plus intangibles (intangibles = in the sun)

You just can't get kids interested in math anymore...
Confusing Economics

MAJOR LEAGUE LOSERS
The Real Cost of Sports and Who’s Paying For It
What Governments and Taxpayers Need to Know

MAJOR LEAGUE WINNERS
Using Sports and Cultural Centers as Tools for Economic Development

Mark S. Rosentraub
Public Approval of Funding

- Since 1995 ➔ 79% of public referenda for stadium/arena funding have been successful
  - 32 communities with 38 referendums
  - 30 who passed ➔ approval range from 51-80-%
  - 8 who denied ➔ from 40-46%

OR
Public Funding Portion

- Percentage of facility costs contributed by public funds
  - 1950s = 100% #1
  - 1960s = 61.8%
  - 1970s = 95.6% #2
  - 1980s = 80.7% #3
  - 1990s = 57.2%
  - 2000s = 60.2%

- Total $ amount may be increasing but percentage is not
Every sports facility project is a public/private partnership

- **1999-2010**
  - Public Sector often pays most for the individual facility
    - Total Public in put in NFL 1990 → 2009 = @$4.46 Billion
  - Private Sector (owner) always contributes
    - Total Private Input in NFL since 1990 (as of 2009) =@$5.14 Billion

- **Currently**
  - NBA/NHL arena = 65% public / 35% private
  - NFL/MLB stadium = 55% public / 45% private
1. Public portion not often reflected in lease agreement
2. Could be separate development agreement/ debt management agreement / statutory provision
3. Difficult to tie team to public funding
**Bengals Lease Example**

- Recital A. By public vote on March 19, 1996, the citizens of Hamilton County passed a one-half percent increase in the Hamilton County general sales tax to *keep competitive and viable major league football and baseball teams in Cincinnati*, Ohio by, among other things, the construction of a new football stadium in Hamilton County.

**Performance lawsuit (2003)**

- $458 m stadium (95% public funding)
- 13 seasons never a winning record
- Suit claiming team is not fulfilling its end of the bargain
- Claim dismissed → City does not own team and "competitive" cannot be defined by a court
Public / Private Partnership Funding Facility

Example

- Packers
  - Article IV, pgs. 11→ 13
Section 4.2  Funding of the Construction of the Project.

(a)  Commitment by the City.

(i)  Existing Lambeau Field. The City hereby agrees that the Site and the City’s Ownership Interest in all property located thereon on the date of this Lease shall be part of the Lambeau Field Complex, for all of which the City shall be credited with an Equity Contribution of $100 million.

(ii)  User Fee. The City, with the consent of the District and the Team, hereby imposes the User Fee described in Exhibit F. The Team agrees to administer the User Fee as provided in Exhibit F. The first $10 million of net proceeds from the User Fee shall be deposited into the Construction Reserve Fund and all remaining net proceeds from the User Fee shall be deposited into the User Fee Subaccount of the Project Construction Fund. The City reserves the right to impose additional user fees pursuant to Section 229.826(5) of the Act, but may do so only with the prior written consent of the District and the Team; provided, however, that the consent of the Team shall not be required during the continuance of a Major Default.

(iii)  City’s Equity Contribution. At any point in time the City’s Equity Contribution shall be the sum of (A) the amount specified in Section 4.2(a)(i) above, plus (B) the aggregate amount disbursed from the Construction Reserve Fund to pay Project Costs, plus (C) the aggregate amount disbursed from the User Fee Subaccount of the Project Construction Fund to pay Project Costs.
Commitment by the District.

(i) **Issuance of Stadium Revenue Bonds.** The District agrees that it shall issue and sell Stadium Revenue Bonds in an amount sufficient to deposit $160 million of proceeds thereof into the Bond Proceeds Subaccount of the Project Construction Fund. The District shall use good faith efforts to cause such deposit to be made on or before May 1, 2001. The District shall use commercially reasonable efforts to sell the Stadium Revenue Bonds as expeditiously as possible and with terms that will enable the maximum permitted contribution in each year to the Operations and Maintenance Fund pursuant to Section 229.825(2)(b) of the Act. The District shall not be liable to the City or the Team for a failure to sell the Stadium Revenue Bonds by the stated deadline if the failure is attributable to events beyond the control of the District.

(ii) **District’s Equity Contribution.** At any point in time the District’s Equity Contribution shall be the aggregate amount disbursed from the Bond Proceeds Subaccount of the Project Construction Fund to pay Project Costs.
(c) **Commitment by the Team.**

(i) **Stock Proceeds.** The Team agrees that on or before the date on which the District makes the deposit described in Section 4.2(b)(i), the Team shall deposit at least $20.6 million from the 1997 sale of the Team’s common stock into the Team Subaccount of the Project Construction Fund.

(ii) **NFL Loan.** The Team agrees that it shall deposit at least $13.0 million into the Team Subaccount of the Project Construction Fund from the proceeds of a loan from the National Football League made pursuant to its “G-3 Loan Program”. Such deposit shall be made as soon as practicable consistent with the National Football League Rules and Regulations applicable to such program.

(iii) **Other Funds.** Subject to the fulfillment of the City’s and the District’s funding commitments as set forth in Sections 4.2(a) and 4.2(b), respectively, the Team agrees that it shall deposit such additional funds into the Team Subaccount of the Project Construction Fund from available sources as shall be necessary to complete the Project in the event the funds otherwise available in the Project Construction Fund and the Construction Reserve Fund are insufficient for such purpose.

(d) **Project Cost Overruns.**

The Construction Administration Agreement contains provisions dealing with the cost of the Project in relation to budget. If, in accordance with the Construction Administration Agreement, the actual cost of the design and construction of the Project (which for purposes hereof shall mean all costs paid or incurred until completion of the Project) exceeds $295.2 million and there are insufficient funds in the Project Construction Fund to pay the difference, the Team shall fund the short-fall.
### History of new facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>New Facilities</th>
<th>Renovated Facilities</th>
<th>Total Number of Teams</th>
<th>% of Teams Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950s</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 – 2010</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 - 2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: @90% of current teams are in new or renovated facilities since 1990*
Team Obligations/Payments

- **Types of Rent**
  - No Rent
  - Minimal Rent ($1)
  - Fixed Rent
  - Per Game/ Ticket/Attendance Dependant
  - Percentage Rent
  - Fixed Plus Percentage
  - Fixed or Percentage
  - Fixed With Deductions or Offsets
  - Rent Credits

- **Merely is Part of Total Allocation of Payments**
  - Examples
    - **Brewers, Schedule 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lease Year</th>
<th>Annual Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>$ 900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>$1,208,401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expenses

Typical Categories
1. Equipment
2. Operational Expenses
   • Staffing / maintenance / security / medical services
3. Revenue Streams
4. Taxes

Brewers lease

MAINTENANCE AND MAJOR REPAIRS; IMPROVEMENTS

14.1 Maintenance Obligations.

(a) **Obligations of the Team.** The Team shall, at its sole cost and expense, make and perform any and all Maintenance on the Stadium Complex. Such Maintenance shall be performed in accordance with the provisions of *Exhibit B* attached hereto and made a part hereof and the provisions of this Article 14.

(b) **Obligations of the Team and the District.** Representatives of the Team and the District shall:

(i) Not more often than once each calendar quarter (except in the event of an emergency), (1) inspect the Stadium Complex to identify and evaluate any Maintenance that may be required under this Lease or proposed by the Team or the District, and (2) discuss and address any other issues relating to Maintenance.

(ii) On or before thirty (30) days prior to the commencement of each Lease Year, review and address the Maintenance standards and procedures employed by the Team during such Lease Year, and any changes that may be needed thereto, in order to avoid a material adverse impact upon future Major Capital Repairs.
(a) **Major Capital Repairs.**

(i) **General.** Subject to the provisions of Section 14.2(a)(ii), the District shall make and perform all Major Capital Repairs in accordance with the provisions of *Exhibit C* attached hereto and made a part hereof and the provisions of this Article 14.

(d) **Roof Maintenance.**

(i) **General.** Subject to the provisions of Section 14.2(d)(ii), the District shall (except for such actual periodic, routine maintenance of the Convertible Roof performed by personnel employed by the Team) make and perform all Roof Maintenance to the Convertible Roof and all Components relating to the Convertible Roof (including pre-season, mid-season and post-season Roof Maintenance and for the purchase of all necessary spare parts with respect thereto), all in accordance with the provisions of *Exhibit B-1* attached hereto and hereby made a part hereof and the provisions of this Article 14.
Force Majeure \ Acts of God
New Orleans Saints and the Superdome

- Article 15 – Force Majeure
  - “In the event that the Superdome or any portion thereof to be used by Club. . .is damaged or destroyed in whole or in part, Manager (Facility Management of Louisiana) agrees to commence the repair or reconstruction of the Superdome. . .promptly after such damage or destruction occurs"
  - Hurricane Katrina
    - $134.6 M in repairs needed
      - FEMA paid 90%
    - $51 M in improvements
      - NFL and Louisiana Stadium & Exposition District paid
Damage or Destruction

Roof Debris

Cables

Boom

7/19/1999
Damage or Destruction

Damage or Destruction Clauses

- Brewers, Article 17, pgs. 37-38
  - $100 M in damages with 1999 accident

17.1 Damage or Destruction by Casualty. If the Stadium Complex shall be damaged by fire or other casualty, then the Team and the District shall, but only to the extent of actual insurance proceeds received, proceed to repair and restore the same pursuant to the procedures set forth in the Construction Administration Agreement with all reasonable promptness, subject only to reasonable delays for insurance adjustments and the provisions of Section 29.9 hereof. During the period (the “Intenableity Period”) commencing on the date that the Stadium Complex cannot be reasonably used for Baseball Use and ending on the date that the Stadium Complex can reasonably be used for Baseball Use, the Team shall be permitted to use locations other than the Stadium Complex to conduct Baseball Home Games in the Metropolitan Milwaukee Area if the same are reasonably available to the Team, or, if a reasonably acceptable location is then unavailable in the Metropolitan Milwaukee Area, locations outside the Metropolitan Milwaukee Area, in both events as determined in the reasonable joint determination of the Team and the National League and subject in all events to the Baseball Rules and Regulations.
Other Revenue Streams

- Many Leases do not specifically define revenue streams
  - Focus on Allocation and Payment

- Streams
  1. Tickets – often not large revenue stream
  2. Parking – large
  3. Premium Seating – large
  4. Concessions, Novelties, Retail – often split
  5. Media Revenues – driven by league
  6. Advertising – often for facility owner
  7. Sponsorships – facility owner and team
  8. Seat Licenses – facility owner and team
    - Seat deposits
    - Permanent seat licenses
The City, in consultation with the Team, shall determine whether or not and when to proceed with a request for proposal ("RFP") for a sale of Naming Rights. If the City determines to proceed, the RFP shall first be distributed subsequent to January 1, 2002, and the RFP process shall be conducted in a manner mutually acceptable to the City and the Team which shall be designed to maximize price and assure a proper accounting to the City. The highest responsible bidder shall be awarded the Naming Rights, except that the bid shall be rejected if (i) the value of the contract, determined on a present value basis (using the prime rate of the Qualified Bank on the date of the RFP as the discount rate) in accordance with GAAP to the extent applicable, is less than $120 million, (ii) the name is determined to be offensive by the City or the Team, (iii) the contract would violate the National Football League Rules and Regulations relating to the public image presented by the name of an NFL stadium, or (iv) the name would be inconsistent or incompatible with commercially reasonable contracts entered into by the Team in good faith such as, but not limited to, contracts which allow first refusal on Naming Rights if the highest offer is matched or exceeded, provided the Team does not enter into any contract that will materially diminish the value of the Naming Rights. If no sale results from the RFP, the City may repeat the process commencing on or after May 1, 2003, except that the minimum value of the contract, as determined on the aforesaid present value basis, shall be $100 million. If no sale then results, the City and the Team may nevertheless mutually determine at any time during the Term of this Lease to accept the best available offer or to decide upon another method of soliciting proposals for the purchase of the Naming Rights in order to maximize the proceeds.
Naming Rights
Seattle Sues SuperSonics
CITY TRIES TO STOP NBA TEAM'S OWNERS FROM BREAKING ARENA LEASE AND FLEEING TOWN

By Caroline Miller, Newser Staff
Posted Sep 25, 2007 5:59 PM CDT

(NEWSER) – In the latest struggle between local governments and pro sports teams over who foots the bill for the places they play, the city of Seattle has filed suit to try to stop the SuperSonics from breaking their lease at the city's Key Arena before 2010 and moving elsewhere. The NBA franchise's Oklahoma-based owners claim they're losing money under the deal.

"Too often, pro sports teams just run over local governments," the Seattle city attorney said at a press conference announcing the suit. "Today we're standing up and saying no, we have an agreement and we want to enforce that agreement and we want you to honor your promises."

KeyArena, home of the NBA basketball team the Seattle SuperSonics, is shown at night in this Jan. 16, 2007 file photo in Seattle. The City of Seattle filed a lawsuit Monday, Sept. 24, 2007 against the... (Associated Press)
Team Movement

MLB
- 2005: Montreal Expos → Washington Nationals

NBA
- 2001: Vancouver Grizzlies → Memphis Grizzlies
- 2002: Charlotte Hornets → New Orleans Hornets → Charlotte Bobcats
- 2008: Seattle Sonics → Oklahoma City Thunder
Experience of areas that lost teams

- **St. Louis:**
  - Cardinals left in 1987 after city refused $120 ($138 M in 1990) toward new facility
  - → 1990 – 3 years later voters approved $280 M for new stadium for Rams (double what had refused for Cardinals)

- **Cleveland:**
  - Cleveland refused to provide sufficient public funding to keep Browns (would renovate but not assist with new stadium – capped at $125 M ($129 M in 1999))
  - → they moved to Baltimore in 1997 where city paid $220 M for their new stadium and became Ravens
  - → in 1999 Cleveland paid $285 M for stadium for expansion franchise (more than double what it would have cost to keep old Browns)
Communities desire for teams

- Nashville Example
  - Built $145 M arena (approved 1994) for NHL before even awarded a team (became Predators in 1998)
  - Built $292 M stadium (approved 1996) to lure Houston Oilers to Nashville (1999)
  - $437 M committed before even had commitment from teams
Milwaukee Baseball History

Borchert Field, Home of Milwaukee "Brewers" Baseball Club 1902 - 1952.

1953 Home of the "Brewers";
Milwaukee County Municipal Stadium
Brewers Non-Relocation Agreement

ARTICLE II

TRANSFER OF TEAM’S FRANCHISE

2. General. The Team hereby acknowledges that the State and the District will be irreparably harmed by the transfer of the Team’s Franchise to a location other than the Stadium Complex during the Initial Term of the Lease. Accordingly, during the Initial Term of the Lease, the Team hereby acknowledges and agrees as follows:

a. The State and the District do not have an adequate remedy at law for breach of this Article II.

b. The Team shall not enter into any contract or agreement of any kind to transfer the Team’s Franchise outside the City of Milwaukee to a location other than the Stadium Complex without the prior written consent of the State and the District.

c. The Team shall not make formal application to the National League for approval to transfer the Team’s Franchise to a location other than the Stadium Complex without the prior written consent of the State and the District.

d. The Team shall, from and after the Commencement Date and until the termination or expiration of the Lease, subject to Force Majeure, any Untenantability Period, and to Baseball Rules and Regulations, play all of its Baseball Home Games for each Season at the Stadium Complex.
Retention Methods

- Brewers Non-Relocation Agreement

  e. The Team agrees that, in the event of a violation of this Article II, the State and the District shall be entitled to seek and obtain, and the Team hereby consents to the entry of, a temporary restraining order, together with preliminary and permanent injunctive relief, from any court of competent jurisdiction to enjoin any violation of this Article II. The Team hereby waives any requirement that the State and/or the District post a bond in connection with such injunctive relief.

  f. The State and the District shall be given prior written notice of any negotiations regarding:

  i. Any proposed relocation of the Team’s Franchise to a location other than the Stadium Complex;

  ii. Any proposed sale or transfer that would involve relocation of the Team’s Franchise to a location other than the Stadium Complex; or

  iii. Any related sale or transfer of the Team’s Ownership Interest in the Stadium Complex.
Retention Methods

- Bexar County Community Arena Non-Relocation Agreement by and between Bexar County, Texas and San Antonio Spurs, L.L.C., d.b.a. San Antonio Spurs Basketball Team, August 22, 2000
  - "Covenant to Play,"
  - "Non-Relocation" provision,
  - "Liquidated Damages" clause that starts at $250,000,000.00 and declines to $106,000,000.00 over the term of the lease.
  - agreement allows for either party to seek specific performance to enforce any of the promises made by the other party

ISSUE: Enforceability?
Condemnation

- Process by which governmental unit takes private property for public use – refers to taking of the facility in lease agreement
  - Dictated by local laws
  - Supreme Court has recently held that governments can take virtually any private property
  - Focus would be facility not team → community already owns facility
**Arena:** Bradley Center

**Date Built:** 1988

**Facility Cost (S/Mil):** $90

**Percentage of Arena Publicly Financed:** 0%

**Facility Financing:** Money for the arena was donated by the Pettit family as a gift to the people of Wisconsin and in memory of Jane Bradley Pettit's father Harry Lynde Bradley. The team does not pay rent and gets a percentage of suite revenue and concessions.
4. Bradley Center – Milwaukee

No one will ever call Wisconsin a basketball state, but that’s still no excuse for the atrocity that is the Bradley Center in downtown Milwaukee. The oldest arena in NBA screams “whatever the opposite of ‘showtime’ is.” The outside of the Bradley Center is innocuous enough, but the inside is truly appalling.

Concrete and steel abound in both the concourses and seating areas. There seems to be zero interest in creating any sort of feel in the arena. Its architecture is utilitarian in the worst sense. I’m not saying it has to look like a museum, but NBA arenas aren’t supposed to be reminiscent of college football stadiums once you’re inside. All I’m asking for is something in the way of character, here.

The most curious aspect of the Bradley Center’s design is that it doesn’t seem to be sunken in to the ground at all. You enter most arenas at a level that’s about two or three sections up from the court. But not in Milwaukee, you don’t. As best one could tell, the court is on street level, which means that immediately after entering, you have to hike UP to your seats, which a) sucks because walking up stairs is hard and b) sucks because you don’t seem to get that inspirational moment where you walk off the concourse and look out over the arena.

The county has flat-out rejected any possibility of a new arena, and has proven to be pretty stingy when it comes to any sort of large-scale renovation, so you can expect to see the home of the Milwaukee Bucks on this list for years to come.
New Arena?

- Call for new arena began in 1999
- Main discussion within business community
- May 4, 2012

Kohl said he would make a personal financial commitment toward a new arena but said it would ultimately take a public and private combination to build it. The public seems have a mixed opinion.
Concerns with Bradley Center

1. Seriously outdated mechanical and HVAC systems requiring major upgrades.
2. An aging roof and exterior façade that requires ongoing maintenance.
3. A severely outdated scoreboard that will need to be replaced to ensure the Bradley Center can continue to produce sports and special events while sustaining vital sponsorship revenue (replaced 2010 for $3.2M).
4. Significant and increasing elevator and escalator maintenance.
5. An obsolete hockey rink system that must be replaced.
6. Parking structure repairs and structural maintenance.
7. Substantial exterior grounds repair and maintenance.
8. Outdated event production technology required to produce live sports and special events.
9. Aging and energy inefficient lighting, and worn out electrical and electronics components.
10. Infrastructure of various types including an aging plumbing system.
11. Replacement or refurbishing a substantial portion of 18,000 Bradley Center seats.
13. Lack of Revenue Potential
   - Lack of signage / Facility not conducive to new technology / Attendance 26th out of 30
   - Non-exclusive use of facility
Outdated Facility?

63% NBA arenas new or significantly renovated since 1999
## Milwaukee Bucks

### Team Value

**$268 M**

Team Value calculated January 2012

---

### Forbes Lists

#### #30 NBA Team Valuations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Current Value ($mil)</th>
<th>1-Yr Value Change (%)</th>
<th>Debt/Value (%)</th>
<th>Revenue ($mil)</th>
<th>Operating Income ($mil)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Denver Nuggets</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Philadelphia 76ers</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>-10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sacramento Kings</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Indiana Pacers</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Charlotte Bobcats</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Minnesota Timberwolves</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Atlanta Hawks</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>-14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Memphis Grizzlies</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>-24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Milwaukee Bucks</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### At a Glance

- **Owner:** Herbert Kohl
- **Championships:** 1
- **Price Paid:** $18 M
- **Year Purchased:** 1985
- **Revenue:** $92 M
- **Operating Income:** $-7.6 M
- **Debt/Value:** 21%
- **Player Expenses:** $66 M
- **Gate Receipts:** $19 M
- **Revenue per Fan:** $27
- **Metro Area Population:** 1.6 M

---

### Numbers

#### Valuation Breakdown

- Sport: $144 M
- Market: $64 M
- Stadium: $41 M
- Brand: $20 M

---

9. Portion of franchise's value attributable to revenue shared among all teams.
10. Portion of franchise's value attributable to its city and market size.
11. Portion of franchise's value attributable to its stadium.
12. Portion of franchise's value attributable to its brand.
13. Current team value compared with latest transaction price.
15. Average Nielsen rating in local market for regular season games.
Study prepared by the Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce, March 2012 (team not part of it)

- one out of three Bradley Center event attendees comes from outside the metro Milwaukee area of Milwaukee, Ozaukee, Washington and Waukesha counties and that these non-local residents generate $41.6 million of new spending in the metro area every year

- supports 1,068 jobs with an annual payroll of more than $29 million

- generates more than $95 million in direct revenue every year,

- $8.8 million in state and local tax revenues are generated annually by the Bradley Center’s overall economic impact
the city made clear that it sought to enforce the lease “to obtain the benefits, economic and intangible, that it bargained for when deciding to pledge taxpayer dollars in a completely renovated basketball arena. Those benefits are unique in nature and cannot be measured in monetary terms.”

o as to **tangible benefits**, the City alleged that the team spent $30 million annually in Seattle, that this spending created approximately 150 jobs, that the team brought in substantial game-related spending from outside the city, and that it made substantial contributions to charitable organizations.

o As to **intangible benefits**, the city argued that the team “create[d] civic pride, a sense of community, greater visibility to the country and world, and attract[ed] new businesses and residents
Most likely to move?

**Milwaukee Bucks**

Odds of moving in next five years: 10-1  
**Arena:** Bradley Center (18,717).

**Lease:** Year-to-year.

**Record:** 15-24.

**Average attendance:** 14,594 (78 percent capacity).

**Comment:** Their lease situation makes the Bucks maybe the easiest team to actually relocate quickly, and the team has an aging arena (built in 1988) and recently was judged by Forbes to be the least valuable team in the NBA. But owner Herb Kohl, a Milwaukee native who has owned the team since 1985 and bought it to ensure it would stay put, says he won't sell to anyone who would move the team.
Bucks?

1951 - 1954

ST. LOUIS HAWKS

1955 - 1968

ATLANTA HAWKS

1968 - present