

**NFL COMMISSIONER ROGER GOODELL & EVP OF NFL VENTURES AND BUSINESS
OPERATIONS ERIC GRUBMAN**

PRESS CONFERENCE FROM SPECIAL LEAGUE MEETING ON LOS ANGELES IN ILLINOIS

8-11-15

Goodell: Good afternoon. You know that today's session was scheduled to focus entirely on L.A. and the current markets, the three markets that we've been focused on. We had a full discussion with the membership for several hours. That was the only issue that was discussed. There were no voting matters today, so we did not take any votes or any show of hands, we simply had a discussion. Our objective coming into it was to make sure that every club understood exactly what was going on with the Los Angeles proposals, as we understand them, what was going on in each of those three markets – Oakland, San Diego and St. Louis. And also to give them a little bit of an understanding of how we're thinking about the process, the timeline from here, including, particularly getting feedback from the clubs with respect to their views of what information they need to make the right kinds of decisions consistent with our relocation policy. Eric Grubman has been our senior executive in charge of it so I'm going to ask Eric to come up – he'll talk about some of the key issues, and specific issues that we discussed today and then we'll take questions – or, I'll take questions.

Grubman: Thank you, Commissioner. Good afternoon everyone. Just to round out a couple of more specifics that we dealt with in the agenda, one was – and these are in no particular order – we talked to membership about the work that we've been doing on a potential seat deposit campaign for the Los Angeles market, we talked about the early stages of relocation fee analysis, we did not discuss specific fees or specific amounts, but the approach to it and how the risk-sharing might be looked at, and then, last but not least, we gave a very short update on our work and thinking on temporary facilities. Of course there was a lot of other discussion, a lot of other questions, but all of those questions and all of that discussion related in one way or another back to these topics.

The league really prides itself in the way that it shares revenues, TV money, salary cap. We're in a situation now where you have owners competing against other owners for a prize. What has the league done, what does it have in place to address this sensitive situation where you have owners competing with owners in an unnatural way for a 'prize'?

Goodell: I think the foundation of it is our relocation policies. We have policies that have been in place for decades, they were modified in the '80s and they're meant to address our responsibility to each of our home markets, what needs to be done if you seek to relocate your franchise and we're making sure that those are applied consistently and fairly. We're doing everything, working with the communities to make sure that we understand exactly what they're proposing. We're working with the teams to make sure we understand the circumstances and then, as it relates to Los Angeles, you're right; it's a relatively unique circumstance where you have multiple teams interested in relocating to a market where there are two different solutions. And our focus on that is, if they meet the relocation policy, is to make sure we have a solution that is going to work for the long-term in Los Angeles. That's the key issue for us, making sure that whatever we ultimately decide as a membership, that we have the ability to be successful in Los Angeles for the long-term. That's why we spent the last two decades trying to come up with a solution that we thought would provide that kind of a foundation.

How do you make sure that you're not sending one team home a 'loser' in this round of L.A.?

Goodell: Those are the circumstances as they are. You take a risk if you file for relocation of whether it'll be approved. And those are decisions that I think each club understands.

Where are you in the process of determining what the relocation fee will be and when do you expect that number to be settled on?

Goodell: We had quite a bit of discussion with the committee yesterday on that. We had some more discussion on the floor today, making sure that all 32 clubs are up-to-speed in the process or thinking on that. I would expect sometime this fall, that would be determined.

I know we're here to talk about Los Angeles today, but there is this other matter with Tom Brady going on. I have many questions to ask you, but I only get one, so here is my question. The NFL consistently corrects misinformation and corrects wrong reports that are out there, so I'm just curious, why did the NFL not correct the report from the first week of that issue that 11 of the 12 balls were underinflated by two pounds, especially when in theory the NFL had that data from the footballs from that night?

Goodell: As you know, first and foremost, we went to an independent investigation that week following the AFC Championship Game. All of that focus was put to Ted Wells at that point in time, in supporting him, cooperating with him fully and making sure he had any information we had. And there was no more public discussion about anything – it was Ted Wells' investigation. He had complete discretion on the timing, the scope, the amount of time that was necessary for him, who he spoke to and we fully supported that. So we went along with that and that was ultimately the decision that he gave in May and we issued our discipline shortly thereafter and we're in the middle of a CBA process now and now litigation.

If in fact you gave St. Louis basically a list of things to get accomplished and they are getting everything accomplished, how in fact could you say no to a city if you're saying, "Get this done" and they've done everything? How could you say no to St. Louis?

Goodell: You know, you're asking a hypothetical which is always dangerous. Our relocation policies – I'm sure you read them and I'm sure you have a general understanding of what needs to be addressed in that – it's over a long period of time, what's happened in the marketplace that we evaluate, where the community is in that point in time. So, we will take all of that into consideration and that's a part of meeting either the relocation policy or not and so the membership makes that determination eventually.

In light of, you know, the Adrian Peterson case and Ray Rice, Deflategate – what it's turned into – is it still important for you to have that final say so on discipline? I mean, is it still important to you and do you think it's something you want to hold on to?

Goodell: Well Bart, I think first off, it's important to the ownership. When the ownership instills in the commissioner, and he negotiated that with the union and the collective bargaining agreement, the authority of the commissioner is to protect the integrity of the game and in particular the personal conduct policy outside of that. So those are very important initiatives. That's my job, it's my responsibility. I take it seriously, the ownership knows that. We have rules in place to protect the integrity of the game and all 32 teams and we enforce those.

So you still fight to keep that responsibility?

Goodell: There's been no discussion of changing that. The ownership has no inclination.

You mentioned the home markets, focusing on Oakland can you address on the NFL's perspective the city of Oakland and county of Alameda's attempt to retain the Raiders in Oakland?

Grubman: Thanks for that question. Let me try to address that because I've been there personally several times over the course of the last couple of years. The Oakland Raiders have great fans in Oakland city and the county of Oakland and a lot broader territory, but the facts on the ground are that there's been no viable proposal that's been made to the Raiders. We've said one thing consistently to any of the markets that have been engaged in trying to put forth a proposal and it really rests on a couple of pillars. One of them is that a proposal has to be specific. The second is that it has to be attractive to a

team and the third is it has to be actionable. And so what actionable means is it can't just be an idea to the extent that there is enabling legislation or enabling financing activities or there are litigation threats or anything of that nature, anything that needs to be assembled in a time frame where a club can act on it. Thus far, those sorts of tests have not been made in Oakland so as of yet, there is no proposal for the Raiders to consider.

A quick follow-up. The city primarily is under the impression that they have until the end of the year to put something together. By your statement, is that not the case?

Grubman: Well, I go back to what we said all along and what I just said which is it has to be actionable. You've asked a hypothetical question and I don't want to give you a hypothetical answer, but if a proposal is made at any stage and it is not actionable meaning the enabling legislation, the enabling financing and all of those other things aren't in place, then it's really not something a club could act on and I leave off whether it's even attractive. So, there's no artificial deadline in place. It's all subject to whether a relocation is filed for and whether that relocation can gain the support of the rest of the member clubs. But if one can, the alternative has to be something that's actionable.

Goodell: I might just add [that] one, we need certainty to any proposal. So that's one of the things we're pretty focused on.

In the past 12 months you've gone through some of the issues that Bart was alluding to, you've gone to federal court with two of your most prominent players, and you'll be there with one of them tomorrow. Yet, here you are, talking about billion dollar stadium plans and teams vying to pay millions of dollars to move, record T.V. ratings and announcing a new deal with the draft. What impact, if any, do you feel within the past 12 months, have had on your brand and your ability to keep growing the game?

Goodell: We always set a high bar for ourselves, Tom. That's important for us and when we don't hit it, we admit it and we do better. I think what we have focused on is, "How do we continue to do better?" We've made changes to the way we operate, our personal conduct policy, brought in expertise that have helped us make better decisions, and we continue to operate our league. We try to do that with getting better, growing and trying to address matters that are important to our league. Time doesn't stand still on us. I think people expect an awful lot from us and we want to deliver that. The most important thing is the fans want to see football. That's the best news about the time period we're in right now. It's all in front of us.

Eric, using that test, where would the San Diego offer of yesterday be as far as actionable considering a vote could possibly be involved?

Grubman: Well, San Diego made a thorough presentation in front of the LA committee yesterday. That proposal evidenced, I'm sorry, the city of San Diego evidenced a significant amount of progress, in terms of putting together something, which is beginning to be defined. They also went through their strategy for dealing with various risks and threats. Could be a litigation threat or an environmental, permitting and certifications; there could be threats from a standpoint of the necessary public support that the mayor has called for. So forth and so on.

There were a lot of questions about that, and those questions remain open. They are working on responses and how to mitigate those risks. The role of the committee, as was mentioned by the Commissioner, is to try to bring about a scenario and a plan which achieves certainty. So I think, to the extent, the city of San Diego is also still looking at certainty. They're going to have to deal with those risks and we're going to get more information about those in the coming months.

For Commissioner, where does the cross-ownership issues stand with Stan Kroenke? Do you have a proposal? Is it something the owners have that they're considering now?

Goodell: The finance committee has been considering this over some period of time. They gave, Stan, until I believe June 15, of this year, to submit a plan. He has done so. There was a brief report from Bob McNair, the chairman of the finance committee, today that we believe the plan that he submitted be in compliance with ownership policies. It'll be taken to the finance committee probably in September.

For Eric, the certainty in St. Louis, in terms of their plan?

Grubman: With respect to St. Louis, they have made consistent progress in over quite a number of months. They've described this process themselves, and I know you're well aware of it, so I won't go into the detail. There is a litigation threat. They are continuing to assemble the land and the financing strategies do have to be finalized. Risks remain. They're dealing with these risks similarly to San Diego or any market that would be going through this. We ask about the risks and the mitigation strategies and we keep asking about them until they're eliminated. I don't like to try to grate things mid-stream. You've asked me that question before – it's very hard to grate these other than to say there's a lot of hard work going into it. I know they have a great deal of optimism. We're asking all of the questions to give us certainty and they're dealing with it. But, we still have some information to get and some risks to eliminate.

Eric, where are you at with the temporary facilities? For Roger, what are the chances that there is going to be an NFL in LA in 2016?

Grubman: With respect to temporary facilities, what's been very public is that fact that we engaged in an RFP process. What has also been very public is, many of the responses for potential participants in RFP, [is that] we are engaged in discussion along those lines. Separately, there are a lot of other solutions to the temporary facility question that could be nontraditional – meaning not exactly what you would imagine compared to what the RFP described. I don't want to go into those other than to say we have multiple options, discussions going on. It's our objective to make sure that we're prepared and that no one is under pressure from the stand-point of scheduling or operational details (including a host facility or host facilities.) We're trying to get as much as this work done in advanced. But, the nature of these things is that you have to keep these conversations confidential up to a point. I'll just leave it with what I said before, with multiple options available to us and we're confident we're going to have a solution, whether we have one team or two teams.

Goodell: We didn't focus on that with our membership today. What we focused on was the status update and making sure we understand the process and what it takes to be successful in Los Angeles if we decide to do that. If a team or teams qualify to relocate, making sure that we're successful in Los Angeles, and that is our number one objective. I don't think anyone is focused on a time period or frame or anything other than being successful.

What are the chances of the relocation window and filing being moved up?

Goodell: It's possible. We had a little discussion about the timeframe. It's possible, but the window now for others – January 1 to February 15 – I think the focus since we've had so much discussion on this within the membership is that we may not need that much time once the window does open so that was as much of a focus today as to when it starts and when it ends.

Two (Tom) Brady questions: One – In the couple of weeks since Judge Berman has had the case, he has encouraged both sides to come up with a settlement and as recently as today, he wrote a letter saying that he was hoping that settlement talks would continue before the hearing tomorrow. How receptive is the league to settle this case before the judge would make a ruling and come to some sort of a compromise with Brady on the discipline. Second – it's been six months since you handed him the Super Bowl MVP trophy and again, for a lack of better words, how surreal is it that tomorrow you will be facing him in a court room on the opposite side?

Goodell: Listen, that is part of the process to answer the second part of your question. Judge Berman has asked us to appear tomorrow. We will certainly do that. The first part of your question – we had discussions prior to this. Judge Berman – we got the letter today. We will certainly cooperate fully with that and we'll allow the judge to handle the process from there.

It was mentioned today that you are opening up the process to bid on the Draft for 2017. Would you rather have the Draft have a permanent home or is it something that you would rather see move around the country?

Goodell: One of the things we learned this year is by moving the Draft, a lot of good things can happen if you're not afraid of trying to make it better. I think that's what we found here is that the city of Chicago; our partners here in Chicago; the fans in this region demonstrated a great way to experience the Draft and we had over 200,000 people attend it. We want to figure out what we can do even better going forward and that is the commitment we have with the partners here in Chicago, including with the city and the Bears. How do we make it better?

We're not committed to staying in any particular market. We're not afraid of moving it around. It gives people an opportunity to experience the Draft that never have and may never will if we don't. It's been good for the Draft. It's been good for the league overall and I think it's been great for the fans.

Would those bids be for one year or multiple years?

Goodell: The details – Peter O'Reilly would have to speak to. I think the focus has been on looking at 2017 and 2018 in the process. That's my understanding of it so we'll follow that.

You've talked to the Missouri Governor. You've talked to Dave Peacock. The Rams owner has not. What would you say to a fan base, who sees the development on the stadium downtown but feels that the owner has no interest in staying and hasn't engaged in the process. What would you say to those people who feel that they have been alienated by the owner?

Goodell: I think the first thing is I am not going to speak for Stan (Kroenke). That is something that Stan needs to do, but what I've said to the Governor is we need to focus on developing a potential solution. A solution that will work for the fans of St. Louis. We recognize that we have great fans in that market and if there's a potential solution, then we want to know it and I know the membership wants to know it and that's just the focus we've kept.

Two part question: One – there is a persistent rumor that the league could delay teams going to Los Angeles for a year. Is that possible? Second – more complicated, the team that goes there and makes it a one-team market and that team would specifically allocate certain resources, money to another team to help them stay in one of their markets – San Diego, Oakland or St. Louis. Are any of those reasonable possibilities?

Goodell: I would say for us right now, there isn't a possibility, frankly, that we've taken off the table. We're going to evaluate everything that makes sense for us and that will be things that we can control and things we can't control, necessarily. We're long-term looking for the right solution in Los Angeles. We're looking to make sure our teams in their current markets are successful and we will do whatever is consistent with those relocation policies and the long-term interest of our fans and our league to make sure we do the right things.

###