

From: [Chandhok, Rahul](#)
To: [Rajeev Batra](#)
Subject: Field Seats
Date: Thursday, June 16, 2022 3:06:23 PM
Attachments: [Field Seat - \\$10k Model \(6.14.22 Update\).pdf](#)
[Field Seat - \\$17.5k Model \(6.14.22 Update\) \(2\).pdf](#)

Executive Director Batra,

Please find attached two alternative revenue scenarios Field Seat SBLs. The attached revenue scenario for the \$10k price point is similar to the proposal we sent you a few weeks ago, with a minor adjustment to the ticket surcharge calculation.

Based on our current design, we anticipate there will be 70 seats in total, with 44 seats in the north endzone, and 26 seats in the south endzone. The positioning of a tunnel in the south endzone prevents us from locating more seats on that side.

Included in that 70-seat count are 3 ADA wheelchair positions, and 3 ADA companion seats. Because ADA seats tend to have significantly diminished demand for SBLs, we do not anticipate we'll sell SBLs on those 6 seats in any pricing scenario, bringing our total sellable seats to 64.

Comparing the two alternatives it is clear that the \$17.5k alternative shows a better economic outcome for the SCSA . The \$17.5k alternative shows lifetime revenue to the SCSA of \$1,651,953 compared to \$1,154,031 in the \$10k scenario. Although the higher price results in slower sales (three years versus two years) that is more than offset by the higher price.

As you and the Board evaluate these two alternative pricing scenarios it is worth considering the risk profile of each scenario. The higher the price the longer it will take to sell the product, and that additional time introduces additional risks such as changes in consumer attitudes, changes in discretionary spending, and broader concerns on the economy. Nobody has a crystal ball.

I would also note that all these comparisons are in nominal dollars (i.e. they are not discounted for present value). It is our view that this is the simplest way to compare these alternatives because the cadence of the cash flows is similar under both scenarios.

Because we are late in our sales cycle for the upcoming 2022 season, and recent concerns over the economy, we would strongly encourage yourself and the Board to give us definitive approval on these SBLs as quickly as possible. The more time our sales team has to sell these before the season begins in August, the more successful they will be on behalf of the SCSA, which receives all SBL revenues. If possible, we would like to have this on the agenda for the upcoming June 21st Stadium Authority Board meeting.

Thank you and please reach out to me if you have any questions or concerns.

Rahul Chandhok

Executive Vice President, Communications & Public Affairs

San Francisco 49ers

T 408.673.2018 | M 408.497.4074

SAP Performance Facility

4949 Marie P. DeBartolo Way

Santa Clara, CA 95054