

OAK VIEW GROUP

Responses to City of Seattle's April 25, 2017 Request for Clarification

Financial Team Questions/Requests

Facility Questions

1. The Capital Reserve Fund can be capped at \$5 million. Please provide a spending plan for these funds. What is the anticipated annual spending? Over 10 years? Over 25 years? Under what conditions would the fund be more than of \$5 million?

OVG Response:

OVG's plan would be to utilize these funds for major maintenance and modernization pursuant to a schedule to be developed. These activities will be completed before opening of the building. We cannot estimate what the annual spending will be until we have a better understanding of the fixtures, finishes, and materials to be used in the process. OVG understands that it will be obligated to fund any project modernization that exceeds \$5 million from OVG's other sources, and that such funding will be at OVG's sole cost and expense. OVG welcomes a conversation to review with the City common industry practices in the arena space based on OVG's extensive experience, including how capital improvement funds are established and utilized.

2. What is the "public agency" that would fund \$25 million for the garage? How or will the funding be repaid? What happens if the public agency does not provide funding? Will that contribution be made in a lump sum?

OVG Response:

As noted in OVG's previous responses, OVG would like to engage with the City to explore the Port of Seattle's willingness to contribute funding to the proposed parking garage as part of a regional transportation solution. OVG believes that this could be a joint venture opportunity resulting in a revenue sharing relationship with the Port (e.g., to provide the Port with a portion of the revenue stream from the garage). OVG looks forward to discussing with the City how this opportunity could be pursued and the timing of such funding and development.

3. Please provide a more detailed project budget and break out the construction budget by building (i.e. Arena, garage, south site, etc.).

OVG Response:

*The full budget itemization that includes the requested detail relating to the arena, garage, and south site is attached as **EXHIBIT A**.*

4. On page 100, OVG indicates it would "support expansion of the platforms" for the monorail. In what ways would OVG support the expansion?

OVG Response:

OVG has been a vocal proponent of the Monorail throughout the KeyArena RFP process. OVG has met with Seattle Monorail Services multiple times, as well as the King County Executive, the CEO of Visit Seattle, the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, and the developer of the Convention Center expansion. In each of those conversations OVG has advocated for funding and support of an expanded Westlake Monorail station to better leverage the exiting asset. OVG also has been a strong voice in support of the Monorail and its value with the local media. We believe it is our role to champion support for this idea among the constituent groups.

As noted in OVG's previous responses, OVG will have a robust communication plan with its customers about public transit (including the Monorail) and its convenience and benefits. We will financially incentivize public transit ridership to and from our events, which might take the form of ticket bundling. We will work with the Monorail to integrate its ticketing into OVG's system for a seamless buying process. OVG will also investigate the potential of adding covered walkways along the south side of Fisher Pavilion to offer additional rain protection for riders to the arena.

OVG is also prepared to subsidize the cost of Monorail rides to arena events by bundling event tickets with Monorail tickets to encourage use of the Monorail. Moreover, OVG is prepared to work with the City to contribute up to \$2 million towards expansion of the Monorail system, including new station construction.

5. What are the ideas regarding development of the "South Site?" Is development of this site included in the pro-forma or construction budget? What is envisioned as the potential development and how would it relate to the new arena? How long would this option continue? If it's not needed to operate or finance the arena, what benefit would the City receive from considering another use?

OVG Response:

Please see OVG's response to question 15 under "Design and Constructability Team Questions/Requests," above. OVG has included the ramp and the Transit Mobility Hub in its budget for the South Site, but has not included the structure on the NE corner in the budget. OVG anticipates a complementary use of that site for the Arena. The benefits to the City could be wide-ranging, from potential re-location of existing non-profit tenants to some type of rent or revenue sharing opportunity. We look forward to working with the Seattle Center and the surrounding neighborhoods to develop the best use for this property.

6. How does the City establish a guaranty of performance from such a new entity as OVG? What other parties may offer their guaranty?

OVG Response:

The newly-formed ArenaCo's obligations will be guaranteed by an affiliate of the Madison Square Garden Company (NYSE: MSG). OVG is prepared to cause any guarantor to provide

to the City satisfactory evidence of such entity's credit worthiness, with the understanding that OVG and City might need to agree upon reasonable measures to protect the confidentiality of any non-public financial information.

7. What funding will be committed to transportation issues, both capital and ongoing efforts?

OVG Response:

See response to question 6 under "Design and Constructability Team Questions/Requests," above.

8. If the arena gets an NBA or NHL team, debt capacity could increase by \$100-\$150 million. What would this increased debt be used for?

OVG Response:

This debt would be used to reduce OVG's equity investment.

9. What are the restrictions on City property during the lease/financing?

OVG Response:

Because OVG's mortgage will only encumber OVG's leasehold interest in the property (and not the fee interest owned by the City), and further because the fee interest is City-owned and thus unlikely to be the subject of a sale to a third-party or bank mortgage, OVG anticipates that the Lease Agreement would impose few if any restrictions on the City with respect to the demised premises other than customary non-interference provisions for a long-term ground lease of this type. As a general matter, OVG would like to dialogue with the City about appropriate provisions in the Lease Agreement regarding how OVG can be kept informed about, and have a meaningful role in any conversations regarding the City's activities elsewhere on Seattle Center that might materially affect arena operations, including construction projects or other events that might impact pedestrian and traffic flow.

Financial Questions

10. Please provide Excel files for the financial exhibits and projections (e.g. Cash Flows Base Case Assumptions). Please provide assumptions and any supporting data or worksheets that will help us understand your projections.

OVG Response:

*Please see **EXHIBIT B** attached.*

11. How will the financing be structured? On this project proposal, is Goldman Sachs your construction lender, long-term lender, or both? If not both, what is your construction financing proposal and long-term lending proposal?

OVG Response:

Goldman Sachs is engaged as structuring agent for the arena financing. The financing is anticipated to take place in two steps – a construction loan followed by a long-term financing. The construction loan is structured differently from real estate construction loans as it is a 5-year facility and able to remain in place during the first couple of years of arena operation. While the loan is able to remain outstanding for 5 years, we expect it will be refinanced early - soon after arena opening - in the private placement bond market once construction and sales risk has passed.

Goldman Sachs will not only serve as lead arranger in the construction loan, but will also participate in the loan as a lender. Goldman Sachs will syndicate the balance of the loan to commercial banks, who are active in the stadium and arena project finance space. Goldman Sachs recently led construction loans for the Sacramento Kings and Milwaukee Bucks arena projects and has substantial experience in this space. On the Sacramento Kings arena construction loan, Goldman Sachs committed, closed and began funding the \$265 million construction loan six months before syndication took place. Following syndication, Goldman Sachs portion of the loan was reduced from \$265 million to \$60 million. On the Milwaukee Bucks arena construction loan, Goldman Sachs committed, closed and began funding the \$250 million construction loan three months before syndication took place. Following syndication, Goldman Sachs portion of the loan was reduced from \$250 million to \$50 million. The Construction Loan is expected be structured to allow Oak View to draw on the Loan on a monthly basis throughout the construction period, which reduces interest costs during construction. The Construction Loan is expected to be interest only (with interest fully capitalized) during construction and will accrue interest at a rate that is based on LIBOR plus a credit spread. The loan is expected to have a final maturity that is 5 years from closing and to be pre-payable at any-time without penalty.

At or directly prior to opening of the renovated arena, we expect the construction loan to be refinanced in the private placement bond market (“Takeout Financing”). The Takeout Financing is expected to be 25-year, taxable, fixed-rate bonds with mortgage style amortization. The Takeout Financing is expected to price with a single interest rate that is based on the Treasury Yield interpolated for the weighted average life of the bonds plus a credit spread. It is expected that these bonds will be sold to private placement bond investors (typically term and life insurance companies such as NY Life and MetLife) who are regular participants in the Stadium and Arena financing market.

12. For what other projects has OVG used Goldman Sachs for construction or long-term financing?

OVG Response:

OVG and Goldman Sachs have a close working relationship and are currently working together on number of ongoing non-public projects. OVG has chosen to work with Goldman Sachs as a result of their industry-leading sports facility financing practice, which has provided them first-hand experience with a majority of significant sports transactions across the globe. This experience ranges from team mergers and acquisitions and league-wide financings, to structuring and financing both public and private contributions to new sports facilities across the globe.

Goldman Sachs personnel have worked on the financing of over 35 sports facilities worldwide, including the four most recently financed NBA arenas – the New Milwaukee Bucks Arena, the Golden 1 Center in Sacramento (Sacramento Kings), Barclays Center in Brooklyn (Brooklyn Nets / New York Islanders) and the Amway Center in Orlando (Orlando Magic). Additional experience includes the financing for Banc of California Stadium (Los Angeles Football Club), New White Hart Lane Stadium (Tottenham Hotspur), Yankee Stadium (New York Yankees), Levi’s Stadium (San Francisco 49ers) and MetLife Stadium (New York Giants). The below table outlines Goldman Sachs’ stadium and arena financing experience since 2014.

Selected GS Sports Facility Since 2014			
Date	Stadium/Arena	Issue	Par (\$mm)
2017	New Whitehart Lane (Tottenham, England)	Bank Loan	\$520
2016	Barclay’s Center	PILOT / Taxable Bonds	494
2016	LAFC Stadium	StadCo Team / Bank Loan	180
2016	New Milwaukee Bucks	Bank Loan	250
2015	Golden 1 Center (Sacramento, CA)	FRNs / Fixed Rate PP	280
2015	New Whitehart Lane (Tottenham, England)	Bridge Facility	220
2015	Yankee Stadium (New York, NY)	Derivative Unwind	300
2015	Spring Training Complex (Astros / Nationals)	Tax-Exempt / Taxable Bonds	122
2015	Golden 1 Center (Sacramento, CA)	Taxable Bonds	300
2015	Joker Merchant Stadium (Lakeland, FL)	Tax Exempt Bonds	51
2015	Lucas Oil Stadium (Indianapolis, IN)	Tax Exempt Bonds	341

2015	Metlife Stadium (East Rutherford, NJ)	Refinancing of Bank Loan	146
2015	AS Roma MediaCo	CLO	200
2014	Golden 1 Center (Sacramento, CA)	Bank Loan	265
2014	Golden 1 Center, Land Purchase Loan (Sacramento, CA)	Bank Loan	35
2014	Inter Milan MediaCo	CLO	313
2014	Target Field (Minneapolis, MN)	Hedge Restructure	150
Total			\$4,167

13. What type of financial support are you assuming from the Madison Square Garden Company? Their support letter states “MSG is confident it could provide financial support for the project.” What type of support are you/they envisioning?

OVG Response:

In addition to the guaranty described in question 6, above, MSG will provide operational support to the project through its partnership with OVG, including advising OVG on best practices and providing back-of-house staffing resources, such as access to MSG’s deep bench of marketing and sponsorship professionals. We are happy to meet with City staff in person to answer any additional questions that the City might have about the synergistic relationship of MSG and OVG.

14. How are the historic tax credit or any other tax credits capitalized? What is the expected source for the \$50 million historic tax credit? Provide your assumptions for the amount of historic tax credits proposed. What is OVG’s experience in securing and selling historic tax credits?

OVG Response:

See response to question 5 under “Legal Team Questions/Requests,” below.

15. What is OVG’s plan if the site’s landmark status is not achieved and you are unable to secure the \$50 million tax credit?

OVG Response:

See response to question 5 under “Legal Team Questions/Requests,” below.

16. Item 6 in the Development Agreement and Lease Agreement Terms section states that “OVG wishes to explore development financing incentives”. We interpret OVG’s proposal to be what is described in this item, i.e. that all incremental revenues from admissions tax, construction sales tax, etc. will be used first as credit against base rent and then deposited into a City Arena Fund. Is this correct? Is the sole use of this fund to offset maintenance costs? Are these costs capital reinvestment, routine maintenance, or both? Who controls and prioritizes the City Arena Fund and determines what is funded out of it?

OVG Response:

As the fund sources materials indicate, OVG proposes that a total of \$40 million of the incremental revenues directly derived from redevelopment of the arena be reinvested into the Property during the initial term of the lease. For incremental revenues above this \$40 million threshold, we would propose a revenue share waterfall whereby OVG and the City share in the economic upside, with the City’s share increasing as higher revenue targets are achieved. The more successful the arena is, the higher the return will be to the City. This is only a portion of the City revenues produced by the tax streams and fees identified in the proposal. OVG would like to discuss the choice of funding streams with the City. We look forward to engaging in a dialogue with the City about the most efficient means of achieving that public reinvestment in the site. The City and OVG should discuss the logistics, e.g., creation of the fund, mechanics of the transfers (whether through rent credit or funds exchanges; timing; disbursement process), options to provide for restrictions on use of the funds (whether the funds are restricted to capital or operating expenses over the lease term), accounting for the fund and its uses, and prioritization of the expenditures.

17. Has OVG estimated the amount of annual incremental tax revenues from the operations of the redeveloped Arena? If so, can you provide us with these estimates?

OVG Response:

OVG has engaged ECONorthwest, an economics firm with deep expertise in municipal finance, to prepare an independent analysis of the incremental tax impacts to the city of Seattle from the construction and operation of a renovated Key Arena. OVG is reviewing a first cut of this calculation, based on conservative modeling assumptions. Such conservative estimates show incremental City revenues during construction and operations well in excess of \$40 million during the lease term. Before these numbers are publicly released, we would like the opportunity to dialogue with the City about our methodology and base assumptions, as well as the mix of revenue sources to achieve the \$40 million reinvestment. As noted in our response to question 16, above, for incremental revenues above this \$40 million threshold, we would propose a revenue share waterfall whereby OVG and the City share in the economic upside, with the City’s share increasing as higher revenue targets are achieved.

18. Are there any inflationary adjustments to the rent during the initial term?

OVG Response:

OVG is willing to make inflationary adjustments by an escalator such as CPI.

19. How much do you plan on charging for a facility fee? Is it a flat number or based on type of event?

OVG Response:

The facility fee in the first year of operations is currently set at \$3, and will increase by three percent (3%) annually. We envision that certain ticketed community events would be exempt from such facility fee.

20. Please provide a more detailed operational pro-forma that breaks out type of event rent, reimbursable labor, concessions, ticketing, facility fee, merchandise, and any other revenue categories. Similarly, please provide a more detailed description of the projected expense categories such as event labor, utilities, taxes, maintenance (routine and major), etc.

OVG Response:

OVG and MSG are some of the most experienced operators in the world and developed the pro-forma and operating assumptions together. OVG would welcome the opportunity to meet with City staff to discuss and walk through the operational details behind the Pro-Forma presented on page 77 of the RFP and attached in response to Question 10 of this section. OVG believes this is the best approach for two reasons. First, for competitive reasons OVG would prefer not to disclose operational assumptions behind the pro forma. Second, the cash flows are based off a number of assumptions and variables and in order to most easily understand the mechanics behind the Arena's projected performance, an in-person meeting would be most effective, productive, and helpful for all parties involved.

21. Please provide a more robust description of the intended incentive thresholds (described in Item 1, page 32). As they aren't specified, please provide some outline of what these might include.

OVG Response:

We are prepared to work with the City on base and incentive rent terms in the context of our proposal as a whole, to negotiate an overall package of financial and non-financial obligations that provide a substantial net benefit and limited risk to the City.

22. Please provide a detailed set of event projections by type of event and assumed attendance per event by type.

OVG Response:

OVG and MSG are some of the most experienced operators in the world and developed the pro-forma and operating assumptions together. OVG would welcome the opportunity to meet with City staff to discuss and walk through the operational details behind the Pro-Forma presented on page 77 of the RFP and attached in response to Question 10 of this section. OVG believes this is the best approach for two reasons. First, for competitive reasons OVG would prefer not to disclose operational assumptions behind the pro forma. Second, the cash flows are based off a number of assumptions and variables and in order to most easily understand the mechanics behind the Arena's projected performance, an in-person meeting would be most effective, productive, and helpful for all parties involved.

23. Why is Admissions Tax included as a revenue since it is also being used to fund the City Arena Fund which is shown as an expense, offsetting the arena maintenance costs (p 77 and 32).

OVG Response:

OVG would like additional clarification on this question.

24. The proposal assumes OVG operation of all three Seattle Center garages. Are these revenues included in the pro-forma? Please provide a pro-forma for the operation of the garages. How would they be managed? What about maintenance and daily operations or utility costs? What are your revenue-sharing assumptions?

OVG Response:

Yes, these revenues are included in OVG's pro forma. OVG has not yet developed a complete pro-forma for garage operations at this time. OVG would most likely contract with a third-party parking operator for garage management and daily operations. We look forward to further discussion with the City to better understand the City's current economic assumptions regarding the garage. OVG has committed to guarantying the City's current revenue stream from these garages.

25. The pro-forma includes \$1 million in parking revenue. What is this based on?

OVG Response:

This projection is based on OVG's assumption of the additional parking revenue that can be generated from the existing controlled garages due to increased event activities at Seattle Center.

26. Did you consider a public financing approach, and if so what lead you to decide on private financing?

OVG Response:

OVG followed the clear objective in the RFP of the City's desire to have minimal financial participation, which caused us to focus our efforts on private financing.

27. Regarding City Use days, the proposal states they would be made available when the arena is available. How will this work when Bumbershoot takes place over a specific weekend every year?

OVG Response:

OVG recognizes the importance of this Summer event to the Seattle community. OVG will reserve the Bumbershoot weekend each year for this use, as to avoid any conflicts with other events.

28. Would Pottery NW be able to remain at their current location in the South Site if it's not developed or until it is developed? Will construction of the below grade access make this possible? What would the source of the funding to relocate Pottery NW be?

OVG Response:

See responses to question 15 under "Design/Constructability Questions/Requests" and question 17 under "Operations Team Questions/Requests," above.

29. Please describe the plan for relocating short and long term tenants? Is assistance only financial or will you help in identifying new spaces?

OVG Response:

See response to question 15 under "Design/Constructability Questions/Requests," above.

30. What is the intention for working with the City to identify transition plans for the Skateboard Park, Gardener's complex and restroom pavilion? Does this include funding?

OVG Response:

With respect to the Skatepark, please see response to question 15 under "Operations Team Questions/Requests," above. OVG plans to incorporate the new restroom pavilion into the new design. With respect to the Gardener's complex, OVG would like to work collaboratively with the City on the relocation plan for this facility elsewhere on the Seattle Center campus.

31. How would the pro-forma change with the addition of an NBA team? An NHL team? Both?

OVG Response:

As discussed at the in-person meetings with City staff on April 26-27, OVG believes that the pro forma would improve with the addition of an NBA or NHL team, or both. OVG is prepared to have further detailed discussion on this point in person with City staff.

32. Please provide more details on the commitment of the \$20 million to assist non-profit ventures, causes and enterprises.

a. What is the funding source?

OVG Response:

OVG's commitment is to guaranty funding of \$1,000,000 per year for 20 years toward the non-profit ventures we identify. OVG will establish and endow a separate not-for-profit organization and activate this organization to engage in ongoing annual fundraising and philanthropic efforts throughout the City.

b. If funded through arena revenues, is this included in the pro-forma?

OVG Response:

It is not included in our cash flow projections, as we see these community contributions to be below the line investments made by OVG in the community.

c. What is the distribution plan over the 20 years?

OVG Response:

OVG will cause the independent not-for-profit organization described above to distribute \$1,000,000 each year for 20 years during the course of each fiscal year.

d. Are any of these funds being committed towards relocation costs for the Blue Spruce building tenants or for Pottery NW?

OVG Response:

See responses to question 15 under "Design/Constructability Questions/Requests" and question 17 under "Operations Team Questions/Requests," above.

33. Half of it has been committed, is there any City role in distribution of the remaining \$10 million?

OVG Response:

See response to question 3 under "Operations Team Questions/Requests," above.

34. Of the other arenas you operate, especially those in similar markets to Seattle, what has been the number of events (by type, if possible) hosted each year for the past 3-4 years? How much revenue was generated from events? How much other revenue have the arenas generated (by type, if possible).

OVG Response:

*For event information for peer venues, please see **EXHIBIT C** attached. Revenue information for these venues is not public information that we can disclose in this response, but we are happy to have in-person conversations with City staff on this topic.*

35. Does your projected sponsorship revenue number include the entire Seattle Center campus or just the Arena? How is the city compensated for sponsorship sales?

OVG Response:

OVG's projections do not include the entire Seattle Center campus. At this time we are assuming that the City will continue to sell sponsorships for its campus; however, we are willing to discuss taking on that responsibility with the City in exchange for a revenue sharing arrangement that will be at least as favorable to the City as currently exists.

General Question

36. When you built Sprint Center in Kansas City, it was with a similar goal of trying to bring a professional sports team to the city. Why was a team not able to be secured and why is this situation different?

OVG Response:

AEG built the Sprint Center while Tim Leiweke was its President and CEO. The Sprint Center is a public-private partnership where the City put significant equity into the development of the facility and is recognized as a success story. It has been a significant benefit to Kansas City as a music, sports, and entertainment venue, including being a home for many NCAA basketball marquee events and home to the basketball hall of fame. It is recognized as one of the busiest venues without an anchor tenant in the industry. It is profitable and a project that Tim is proud to have played a role in building. It is not appropriate for OVG to comment on why the Sprint Center was not able to secure a team to date. OVG would note that Seattle is a larger and more attractive market to the NBA and NHL than Kansas City. In addition, the NHL was not an uneven league at the time; it now has 31 teams with Las Vegas' inaugural season this Fall. We believe that the NHL will want to balance its league with a 32nd team for scheduling purposes, and Seattle is an obvious location for that franchise due to the fact that the Western Conference is currently short at 15 teams (versus 16 teams in the Eastern Conference). OVG does not make any assumptions on behalf of the League and hold these opinions uniquely from its perspective.

Social Equity Team Questions/Requests

1. Describe the goals of OVG's diversity plan, as it relates to Seattle. Do you have any metrics and targets you will be committed to during the construction of the Arena as well as during its operations afterwards? Please describe.

OVG Response:

OVG believes that diversity of thought, background, and experience cultivate vibrant communities and thriving businesses. This project will be built and operated by persons who reflect the diverse communities of King County and the City of Seattle. OVG will prioritize hiring local minority businesses and workers to design, build, operate, and maintain the arena.

With input from the City, OVG will establish metrics and targets that define a percentage goal for inclusionary hiring practices. We are looking at both state and local benchmarks to arrive at defined percentage goals, and we hope to partner with the Race and Justice Initiative to ensure our policies and practices promote racial and socioeconomic equity. Our goals are discussed below.

As discussed below, OVG will have a full-time position dedicated to community outreach and equitable hiring. This person will work with Tabor 100, the City, and other community organizations to promote racial and socioeconomic justice, and to engage with and to inform Women and Minority Business Enterprises about contracting opportunities. OVG will provide access to bidding for WMBEs. OVG will work with the City to designate priority zip codes to define areas that the City identifies as needing additional support in hiring efforts.

OVG looks forward to working with the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, other regional chambers of commerce, Washington RoundTable, Seattle Rotary #4, the Northwest Minority Business Council, the Breakfast Group, the Urban League of Metropolitan Seattle, and other community organizations to develop a comprehensive labor agreement that creates tangible inclusion goals and policies that allow for women, minority, and LGBTQ persons to be fully represented in the workforce. Additionally, we will engage in efficient and effective outreach to priority zip codes and other underrepresented groups that will have priority access to hiring for our project both in the preconstruction, construction, and operations phases.

2. What is OVG's projection for using women and minority-owned businesses as subcontractors for the project?

OVG Response:

OVG will prioritize inclusivity and project to meet and exceed the state goals of 10% MBE and 6% WBE as established by the Office of Minority and Women's Business Enterprises. We recognize that the City of Seattle requires each office and department to set its own goals through Inclusion Plans, and OVG will coordinate with relevant City departments to ensure our metrics align. OVG sees that the City is well ahead of the state's goals, and we anticipate working with the City to set the WMBE goals for this project.

OVG will work with the City to develop an Inclusion Plan for the project that identifies specific strategies for exceeding the utilization goals for minority-owned business enterprises and women-owned business enterprises. To achieve the goals, OVG will initiate outreach strategies with input from community leaders, and will host a recruitment fair to provide information and access for WMBEs and potential employees. OVG and local partners will host “meet and greet” events that create a forum for agencies and firms to begin the process of building business relationships with our team. These relationships will span the pre-construction phase through operations and maintenance. OVG will also look to extend these opportunities to veteran-owned businesses.

OVG will partner with Tabor 100, the Urban League, the City of Seattle, and other community organizations, to support the Contractor Development and Competitiveness Center (CDCC), which helps minority construction contractors grow their firms.

OVG will collect information to track the results of its programs and initiatives. This information will help OVG tailor its outreach and programs to become more effective. This information will be reported and available to the City and the public.

3. There’s a lot of talk in your bid regarding community outreach and support. Who does this responsibility fall to on a day to day basis? There doesn’t seem to be a community liaison type position listed on your proposed organizational chart.

OVG Response:

OVG will hire a full-time community liaison who will run day-to-day outreach operations. This individual will coordinate efforts with Tabor 100, the City, and other local community organizations to ensure that OVG’s hiring practices minimize barriers to entry for WMBEs and underrepresented communities.

During design and construction, the liaison will provide information and access to prioritize hiring women and minorities. During operations, our community liaison will partner with local schools, colleges, and universities, along with community groups, to create job shadowing opportunities and mentoring connections that highlight women and minorities in leadership. OVG will also partner with community organizations to create apprenticeship opportunities. Through our liaison, OVG wishes to partner with the City’s Race and Social Justice Initiative to create and implement connections and programs that will work to achieve racial and socioeconomic equity.