



KENNETH E. STINSON
Chairman of the Board

January 23, 2008

Mr. David Sokol
Chairman
Metropolitan Entertainment and Convention Authority
1111 South 103rd Street
Omaha, Nebraska 68124-1000

Dear David:

This is in response to your letters of January 16 and January 21, 2008.

Your January 16 letter explained your reasons for withdrawing from the CWS Stadium Oversight Committee. Your reasoning was primarily based on your perception of the Oversight Committee process and the role and actions of the "Working Group". In that regard, there are a number of important misperceptions and/or misstatements that need to be addressed.

First, Mayor Fahey appointed a CWS Stadium Oversight Committee to do an objective and impartial evaluation for the benefit of the community of the alternatives to serve the College World Series that would achieve a long term agreement with the NCAA.

The Oversight Committee in turn hired (utilizing private funds) the Architect/Engineer joint venture of HDR and HOK and their various subconsultants to perform the technical aspects of the study. Volunteers from local firms with different areas of expertise were added to the team to form what we have referred to as the "Working Group". I have chaired the Working Group and have been personally and actively engaged in the process.

This is a group of professionals who have objectively defined alternatives, gathered facts, performed studies, and effectively organized and presented to the Oversight Committee the progress they are making.

They have been given no direction, either subtle or overt, as to any predetermined conclusion to their evaluation process.

They have worked long hours and done an exceptionally fine job given the very tight time constraints of their assignment.

In short, they have performed as professionals and will continue to do so until their assignment is complete.

Second. there has been no attempt by the Working Group to withhold any information from the Oversight Committee. Nor do I see any logic for doing so.

Much work was done by the Working Group between Oversight Committee meetings and agendas were set and presentations made to focus on the important relevant points of analysis and progress. To my recollection, all questions or comments from the Oversight Committee members were addressed.

I recall only two areas of discussion where answers to questions were deferred to a more private forum.

One was with regard to preliminary discussions with private donors and the other was with regard to prospective real estate development in the north downtown area. In both cases, given the desire to avoid any unauthorized disclosure of the specific parties involved, the offer was made to speak privately and individually with any Oversight Committee member who wanted further information. No such follow-up calls were made by any Oversight Committee member. At our Oversight Committee meeting on January 10, I specifically stated to you and other members of the Oversight Committee that all members of the Working Group were available to meet with and discuss any issues in detail with any and all members of the Oversight Committee. In fact, other members of the Oversight Committee have met with various members of the Working Group extensively.

As I expressed to you in my phone call on January 14, the main purpose of my call was to reinforce to you that all members of the Working Group were available to review their work in detail and answer any questions you might have. This is the call in which you withdrew from the Oversight Committee.

Third, the Oversight Committee has met four times at dates and times and for durations agreed to by all members; you attended all meetings in person or by phone. The Oversight Committee was fully informed and agreed with the timeline for reaching the conclusion. If more frequent or longer meetings were desired by Oversight Committee members to be more fully engaged in the details, no such suggestion was made.

Fourth, neither the Working Group nor, as you are aware, the Oversight Committee have arrived at a recommended alternative for meeting the CWS Stadium needs. In fact, analysis continues on the remaining alternatives discussed at our meeting on January 10:

- . Renovation of Rosenblatt.
- . New Stadium at Rosenblatt location.
- . New downtown stadium at MECA parking lots C & E. (The Oversight Committee generally agreed that, at this point, this was the preferred downtown location.)
- . New downtown stadium at the site of the existing Civic Auditorium and Music Hall.

The Working Group will be prepared to discuss all aspects of these alternatives at our all day Oversight Committee Meeting on February 18, including the concerns of MECA, as we understand them, with regard to parking and traffic issues related to the Lot C & E alternative.

While work is not complete at this time, it appears that the Oversight Committee will have at least two options that are economically viable:

- . A relatively extensive renovation of the existing Rosenblatt; and
- . A new downtown stadium which would cost considerably more than the renovation, but would also have substantially greater sources of funding.

The recommendation of the best alternative for the community may, therefore, come down to a number of significant issues beyond the issue of affordability.

The Working Group stands fully prepared to meet with MECA staff and members of the MECA Board, individually or collectively to brief them on the process and progress of their work. They will also be prepared to address concerns about parking and traffic issues with

Mr. David Sokol
January 23, 2008
Page | 4

regard to Lots C & E. The Working Group will be prepared to respond to the questions raised in your letter of January 21.

I appreciate your attempt, as committed, to convince the other members of the MECA Board that such discussions should be held in executive session. I am disappointed that they were not willing to do so. I am further disappointed that your January 21 invitation to present to the MECA Board in an open hearing on February 6 was mischaracterized as being at our request, and was announced to the media as if we had already agreed to attend. As you are aware, it has been our intent all along to hold a series of public presentations and forums only after the Working Group has completed its work, the Oversight Committee has deliberated and made its recommendation to the Mayor, the Mayor has made his decision, and the NCAA has been fully informed as to that decision. Clearly, this process precludes an open hearing presentation to the MECA Board on February 6.

In the meantime, given our common goal with the MECA Board to achieve an answer in the best interest of the community that would result in a long term commitment from the NCAA, it would seem entirely reasonable to address the concerns of the MECA Board members individually or collectively in private meetings.

Sincerely,



Kenneth E. Stinson

KES/cmb

cc: MECA Board
CWS Stadium Oversight
Committee