

Outside the Lines

Vol. II, No. 1

SABR Business of Baseball Committee Newsletter

Winter 1996

Copyright © 1996 Society for American Baseball Research

Editor: Doug Pappas, 100 E. Hartsdale Ave., #6EE, Hartsdale, NY 10530-3244, 914-472-7954.
E-mail: 76615.662@compuserve.com or DougP001@aol.com.

Have You Renewed Yet?

1996 SABR membership renewals are due at the SABR office: P.O. Box 93183, Cleveland, OH 44101. If you haven't renewed by April, this will be your last Business of Baseball newsletter -- and of course you'll miss out on *The National Pastime*, the *Baseball Research Journal*, other special publications, the *SABR Bulletin*, notice of regional meetings and the annual convention, and access to the work of SABR's other committees.

Business of Baseball Debate at the Kansas City Convention

The Business of Baseball Committee has been asked to sponsor a debate on public financing of sports stadiums at the 1996 SABR Convention, to be held in Kansas City from June 6-9. The format calls for two advocates and two opponents of public financing, with each side stating its case and fielding questions from the audience. The debate is tentatively scheduled for Saturday morning, June 8. If you're interested in participating, please let me know -- based on an informal E-mail survey of Committee members, we're especially short of members willing to defend public financing.

Oops...

As **John Matthew** points out, the summary of ownership changes in the last issue of *OTL* omitted the change affecting the Toronto Blue Jays. John writes: "The Jays are owned by two corporations: John Labatt Limited (a brewery) owns 90% and the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce owns 10%. Over the summer past, Interbrew of Belgium purchased all of John Labatt. Labatt owned several things besides the brewery and Interbrew wanted to sell everything else. Subsequently, Labatt, which owns 41.6% of Skydome, announced its intention to reduce its ownership level from 90% to the same 41.6%. However, no one is lining up to buy the Blue Jays."

News Briefs

In other franchise news, the American League approved Disney's acquisition of 25% of the California Angels, with the right to buy the remainder upon the death of owner Gene Autry. Disney, which immediately assumed operating control of the Angels, notified the city of Anaheim that it could back out of the deal unless an agreement to renovate Anaheim Stadium was signed within 60 days. Disney is demanding \$110 million in renovations, including the elimination of about 20,000 outfield seats to turn The Big A into The Littler A. After repeated expressions of concern over his financing, Kevin McClatchy's bid for the Pittsburgh Pirates is on the verge of final approval, while in Detroit, the future of a plan to replace Tiger Stadium could be decided on March 19 by local voters. Meanwhile in Baltimore, Peter Angelos has informed the city that if its deal-so-good-even-Art-Modell-can't-lose-money is accepted by the Browns, his lease on Camden Yards gives him the right to equivalent terms for the Orioles.

Meanwhile, Major League Baseball is *still* seeking to hire a Director of Marketing -- a position which Arlen Kantarian of Radio City Music Hall was expected to fill a year ago. A *Wall Street Journal* article by **Stefan Fatsis** reported that Acting Commissioner for Life Bud Selig gave Kantarian a take-it-or-leave-it ultimatum prior to the recent owners' meeting but was turned down; the article also quotes a source close to Kantarian as saying he's still interested, but that MLB refuses to give him the authority he believes necessary to do the job well. But why should the owners delegate authority to professional managers when they did so well for them-selves in 1994-95? Speaking of which, Selig recently passed Fay Vincent and Spike Eckert for sixth place on the Commissioners' tenure list. Happy Chandler and Peter Ueberroth are less than two years ahead...

ahead...

Committee Survey on Interleague Play

One week after the owners voted unanimously to experiment with interleague play for 1997, I surveyed all Committee members with E-mail addresses to get their comments. Thanks to all who contributed, and to Bill Gilbert for passing along Tal Smith's sentiments. If you have an E-mail address but didn't receive the survey, please let me know. (I wish the survey could have been extended to Committee members without E-mail addresses, but time and Committee funds didn't allow it.) Here's what more than two dozen of you had to say:

Question 1: Do you personally favor interleague play?

Yes: 10 (Marshall Adesman, John Benson, Scott Davis, Robb Dunn, Bill Gilbert, Larry Hadley, Mike Hauptert, Albert Marshall, Mark Pankin, John Pastier)

No: 17 (Pat Burroughs, Gene Carney, Scott Fischthal, Larry Gerlach, Jahn Hakes, Michael Hazen, John McMurray, David Nieporent, Doug Pappas, Rodger Payne, David Pietrusza, David Smith, Tal Smith, Greg Spira, Neal Traven, Ted Turocy, Keith Woolner)

Selected Comments

John Benson: "After the changes brought on my expansion and then the LCS and now the six championships plus two wild cards, a world in which I must just try to get used to the phrase 'clinched a playoff berth' when talking about baseball (ugh!), some interleague games can't do any harm to the ancient integrity that has ceased to exist anyway."

Scott Fischthal: "I think the uniqueness of having two separate leagues that don't play each other is one of the charms of baseball, and one of the things that makes the World Series so much more interesting."

Larry Hadley: "I favor inter-league play, but there must be one set of rules. The DH must be deleted from the AL or extended to the NL."

Jahn Hakes: "For the gain of a handful of interesting matchups, a lot of intraleague rivalry is lost. Teams playing each other doesn't necessarily generate a rivalry. But teams who play each other a *lot* usually end up with something to remember each other for. I foresee the existing rivalries becoming even weaker than before."

Mark Pankin: "I grew up in the Detroit area, so naturally I saw AL teams. When I went to graduate school in Chicago, I realized what I had been missing by not being able to see the NL live. I don't think a player like Clemente, who did not get the publicity of Mays, Aaron, Musial, etc., can be appreciated without seeing him play in person several times."

Neal Traven: "My reason [for opposing interleague play] is largely statistical -- are stats compiled by NL players in interleague games NL or AL stats? Or neither? Or will there now be simply MLB stats? Eddie Murray would have liked that a few years ago, but McGee and Honeycutt wouldn't."

Question 2: Assuming that some form of interleague play was desired, is the system adopted by MLB -- each team in an AL division playing all the teams in one NL division three times (East and Central) or four times (West), with annual rotation of divisional matchups -- the best way to implement it? If not, what system would you prefer?

All teams play all others each year: 7 (Carney, Davis, Dunn, Gilbert, Hazen, Nieporent, Pappas)

Favor this system or think it's "as good as any": 6 (Adesman, Burroughs, Fischthal, Hauptert, Payne, Pietrusza)

Should emphasize geographic rivalries: 5 (Dunn, Hadley, Marshall, Spira, Woolner)

System doesn't matter: 3 (Benson, Fischthal, Traven)

No good system, interleague play irretrievably flawed: 2 (Gerlach, D. Smith)

Go all the way -- reorganize leagues geographically: 2 (Adesman, Pankin)

Should take past year's standings into account: 1 (Hakes)

Shorten the rotation from 3 years to 2 with more interleague games: 1 (Pastier)

Most important to finish interleague play early: 1 (McMurray)

Ensure that all teams play same schedule as those against which they're competing: 1 (Turocy)

Selected Comments

Marshall Adesman: "I would personally like to see 32 teams, followed by a total geographic realignment that includes interleague play, but until then, I guess this will have to do."

Robb Dunn: "I would prefer a system that would at least keep the interregional games (i.e., AL West vs. NL West) every season. The best case scenario would bring every team to town for at least one series."

Larry Gerlach: "I cannot propose a better system because I reject the concept."

Bill Gilbert: "My idea would be to have each team play a 3-game series against all 14 teams in the other league (total of 42) games), 12 teams against each team in the division (48 games) and 8 games against the other 9 teams (72 games), for a total of 162 games. The breakdown would be slightly different for the 4-team divisions. With this proposal, each AL team would play in each NL park every other year. It also gets away from the balanced schedule and restores some rivalry within the divisions."

Jahn Hakes: "If you absolutely must have interleague play, and limit it to 15 games, and if one expansion team is assigned to each league, I'd like to see nine of the games be 'position nights' where the Nth place in a division for the previous season plays the Nth place team in each of the opposite league's three divisions. The other six games should be left up to individual owners to negotiate. If a team that figures to contend wants to pad its record, it can try scheduling the Twins and Mets of the world. If a team wants to draw large crowds, they can go after the Braves and the Indians. I hate interleague play in principle, but this might make it less unpalatable."

Michael Hazen: "I would rather that each team plays each other team at least once. If we're going to have interleague play, I want it done whole-hog, not half-assed. The idea in place is too football-esque for my tastes."

Albert Marshall: "There are at least three goals a scheduling system needs to meet: (1) Most important, create regional rivalries. (2) Allow enough games within 'the division' to create late season head-to-head series between play off contenders. (3) Allow fans to see all the players/teams play. These three competing pressures make scheduling a real chore, to put it mildly. If we ultimately have 4 eight-team 'conferences,' then we could have 12 games vs. conference opponents, and 3-4 games vs. teams from the other 3 conferences. If we reorganize regionally, we would essentially destroy the National and American Leagues as we know it. Would people be willing to accept this tradeoff?"

Mark Pankin: "What I would like to see is expansion to 32 teams organized into 4 leagues on a geographical basis. One of the attractions of interleague play is to see the Yanks vs. Mets, Cubs vs. White Sox, etc., so why not make it standard. The leagues would be paired off on a rotating basis. Each team could play 16 games against the teams in its league and 6 against the teams in the paired league, for a total of 160 games."

David Smith: "I see huge disadvantages to any proposed system. If they play only a few games against their 'sister' divisions, then there is gross inequity in the luck of the draw that will befall different teams. On the other hand, if they play more games to balance out this problem, then the basis for the division titles (already seriously weakened by balanced schedules) becomes worse. This dilemma is only one of the reasons I think interleague play is bad news."

Ted Turocy: "I think this solution is particularly bad. If we're assuming that the purpose of the championship schedule is to determine the most worthy teams as accurately as possible, then the goal should be for each team to play the 'same' schedule as all the teams against which it is directly competing."

Question 3: Regardless of your personal opinion regarding interleague play, do you believe it will produce a net revenue gain for Major League Baseball?

Yes: 6 (Adesman, Benson, Gilbert, Hazen, Marshall, D. Smith)

Yes, if scheduled geographically: 2 (Hadley, Pankin)

At least in the short term: 4 (Burroughs, Davis, Hauptert, Pastier)

Short term, but not long term: 7 (Dunn, Fischthal, Gerlach, McMurray, Pietrusza, Traven, Turocy)

No: 6 (Hakes, Nieporent, Pappas, Payne, T. Smith, Woolner)

Can't predict: 2 (Carney, Spira)

Selected Comments

Marshall Adesman: "This will definitely bring some revenue back to the owners -- it's new, it's different, and it'll be talked and hyped for the next year."

Scott Fischthal: "In the short run, the novelty of the idea is likely to bring out some curiosity-seekers, but once it becomes humdrum, for every Yankee-Met matchup that replaces, say, a Met-Padre matchup, there will be a Milwaukee-Los Angeles matchup replacing a Dodger-Giant game."

Larry Gerlach: "Let's be honest: a Rangers vs. Pirates game ain't gonna draw flies, interleague or no. Interleague games will soon become, well, just another game to judged on the quality of the competition and nothing more."

David Nieporent: "While I hear people liking the concept in the abstract, I don't think people choose to watch or go to games based mainly on who the other team is. I don't think people will go to more games, even if they do like the matchup. They will go to different games. And I don't think there are enough marquee matchups for a national TV deal."

Mark Pankin: "I think it will, at least at first. There will be the novelty. Also, with all the mobility in today's society, there are fans of a team in one league who find themselves in a city in the other league."

Question 4: Whether or not you support interleague play, do you believe the owners' decision to adopt it was made impulsively, or as the result of reasoned weighing of the pluses and minuses?

Impulsive: 13 (Benson, , Burroughs, Dunn, Fischthal, Gerlach, Hazen, Nieporent, Pankin, Pappas, Pastier, Payne, T. Smith, Spira)

In between: 7 (Carney, Davis, Gilbert, Marshall, D. Smith, Traven, Turocy)

Reasoned: 2 (Hadley, Woolner)

Can't tell: 3 (Adesman, McMurray, Pietrusza)

"More out of desperation": 1 (Hauptert)

Selected Comments

John Benson: "If they have time to work on planning, a labor agreement would have been a worthwhile project."

Larry Gerlach: "Once again they acted impulsively in a desperate attempt to curry favor with fans. The polls I have seen show decided opposition to interleague play on the part of what we would term serious baseball fans. But then, the Lords don't give a damn about us."

Bill Gilbert: "I believe the decision was made somewhat impulsively but I think it was the right thing to do and the right time to do it."

Larry Hadley: "I believe the owners always act to increase (maximize) their profits. If the decision was hasty, it is only because the owners are very confident that this will be a winner at the gate and on TV."

Jahn Hakes: "I think Keith Olbermann of ESPN said it best when he stated that the Lords of the Realm were 'not just businessmen. They are mediocre businessmen.' I am sure that those who favor the plan most strongly were thinking of the markets it would open for their teams, and not of the opportunity costs in lost games against league rivals."

Mike Hauptert: "They have been rejecting this idea for years, but I believe they now see it as a necessary change to try to win back customer satisfaction."

Albert Marshall: "They've known the pros and cons for a very long time, but the public's bitterness over the strike and MLB's lack of progress on labor issues has created a climate where 'desperate times call for desperate measures.'"

David Nieporent: "This reminds me a lot of the 'flat tax' debate. Nobody even knows what they're supporting. They just want a change. They're trying to fix a problem that they haven't even established exists, with a solution that they haven't shown would solve it, even if it did exist."

Mark Pankin: "I think they weighed one potential plus: will it make us more money? With this set of owners nothing else really matters. Given what they have done to the game recently, I don't see how interleague play can hurt."

Doug Pappas: "If the owners had thought rationally about this issue, they would have adopted inter-league play *before* signing the new TV contracts. Now even if they're right about public demand for interleague play, they can't capitalize on it before the novelty wears off."

Neal Traven: "Giles has talked about it for ages. On the other hand, it is clearly evident that the owners are completely without the capacity for reasoning."

Question 5: What steps would you take to increase Major League Baseball's net revenues?

Labor settlement: 9 (Burroughs, Dunn, Fischthal, Nieporent, Pappas, Payne, Spira, Traven, Woolner)

Broader revenue sharing among owners: 6 (Carney, Gerlach, Hakes, Pappas, Pastier, Woolner)

Better marketing of top players: 5 (Burroughs, Nieporent, Pappas, Payne, Woolner)

Broaden game's international appeal: 4 (Benson, Gerlach, Pappas, Woolner)

Greater emphasis on players' community relations: 4 (Davis, Hazen, Nieporent, Pankin)

Emphasize regional matchups: 3 (Dunn, Pankin, Woolner)

More fan-friendly TV package: 2 (Dunn, Hakes)

Elect a Commissioner: 2 (Dunn, Woolner)

Speed up the game: 2 (Pankin, Woolner)

No rules changes to depress offense: 1 (Fischthal)

Enlarge the strike zone: 1 (Hakes)

Lower ticket prices of least desirable seats to attract fans: 1 (Gilbert)

Ease restrictions on franchise moves to better markets: 1 (Hadley)

Encourage owners to become more "capitalistic": 1 (Marshall)

Better overall marketing: 1 (D. Smith)

Selected Comments

Gene Carney: "I think revenues would go *up* for baseball collectively if they were shared more equitably by all -- especially TV and cable revenues. As long as the Haves vs. Have-Not owners are at war, baseball and its fans lose."

Larry Gerlach: "Not sure there is an acute need to increase revenues substantially. Restraint in tendering contracts and sharing revenue among the clubs would resolve short-term economic problems."

Bill Gilbert: "I believe that revenues could be increased both short and long range by lowering the price of the least desirable seats, which are the ones that are usually empty. The clubs could practically give them away and come out ahead with the concession revenues that would be generated. Also, since they would probably be used primarily by fans with children, it would help attract new fans for the future."

Larry Hadley: "Despite tradition, some cities like Pittsburgh may not be able to support a team any more. General sharing of revenue by market size is not the optimal solution to this problem. Indeed, it is a bad solution. Much much preferred is the relocation of teams to markets that can support Major League Baseball."

Jahn Hakes: "Home runs are more exciting when they are rare. Make the strike zone bigger, so players like Frank Thomas can't get by using the exact same swing *every time* the bat leaves their shoulder. Two walks and a 450' home run each time through the lineup gets a little tiresome after 162 games."

Mike Hauptert: "The problem is not baseball's net revenues, it is the owners' misguided (or intentionally misrepresented) belief that all team owners should earn the same revenues. It's not revenue that matters, it's return on capital."

Albert Marshall: "The economics of the league have to be reconfigured to not only allow, but to encourage the professional marketing of franchise. The solution has to be as capitalistic as possible, although some better barriers need to be created between the field operations and the marketing operations. An owner should be allowed to make as much money as he is able without reason, but those profits cannot be used to give him an unfair advantage on the field."

John Pastier: "Institute a simple form of revenue sharing -- the visiting team gets 25% or 30% of game-day revenues, including all forms of the home team's regional broadcast income. This would allow low-income teams to keep more of their good players, avoid fire sales, stay competitive on the field, and earn a greater degree of fan loyalty. The better the visiting team, the more road attendance and income it collects."

David Pietrusza: "Continue already successful infiltration of NFL and keep moving their franchises around."

David Smith: "Hire the NBA and NFL marketing agencies, who out-publicize MLB at every turn."

Neal Traven: "Have Marvin Miller write a CBA and force the owners to sign it."

Why Teams Won't Build New Stadiums -- And Why Cities Shouldn't, by Don Coffin

As Major League Baseball teams insist on having new stadiums built for them--with the Milwaukee Brewers and the Seattle Mariners the most recently successful supplicants--it may be appropriate to reconsider why the owners of these teams don't simply raise the money privately and proceed to build the facilities themselves. The answer is simple enough: In conventional economic terms, baseball--indeed, possibly most professional sports--is not a profitable enterprise and, in order to continue to exist (given the current cost and revenue structures), must receive a subsidy.

The easiest way to see this is simply to consider the numbers--the costs and revenues. Consider, for example, the proposed new stadium for the Milwaukee Brewers. It has a (current) estimated cost of \$250 million and will contain (according to the most recent issue of "Outside the Lines") 75 luxury boxes. As I will argue below, the costs of building and operating the stadium, and of running the team will total about \$78.5 million per year; the revenues from the baseball part of the stadium operations will probably be around \$48.75 million. This leaves about a \$30 million gap between costs and revenues. Either the team goes broke, or the city subsidizes it.

If we assume a 40-year useful life for the stadium, and amortize the costs of the stadium over that period (using a 9% rate of interest), we discover that the annual amortization costs are \$23.24 million dollars. (From an economist's point of view, the entire \$250 million must be considered, not simply the amount financed. After all, any funds coming from the owners of the stadium are being withdrawn from other uses, in which they can earn an income. Foregoing that income is a real cost.)

In addition, simply maintaining the stadium will involve on-going costs, regardless of the use of the facility (insurance, routine maintenance and repair, etc. Assuming public ownership of the facility, no property taxes will be paid.). My best guess is that this will involve something between \$10 million and \$20 million a year. To be conservative, let's use the \$10 million figure.

So, the "nut" that must be covered simply to pay for the existence of the facility is about \$33 million per year. In addition to that are what we can call the "event costs": the costs of producing the events that take place in the stadium. At current average salaries, a major league baseball team will have about \$30 million in salaries (assuming that only 25 players per year receive major league salaries would reduce the total to about \$27.25 million). Major League Baseball teams have recently argued (in justifying their reduced support for minor league baseball) that their current player development costs average about \$7 million; the proposed changes will reduce that to about \$5.5 million.

Direct event costs--ushers, security, power, event insurance--apparently runs about \$5 million per year.

Other team costs (office space, administrative personnel, etc.) account for about another \$5 million. This yields total operating costs of about \$45.5 million. Combined with the stadium costs, we get an annual cost of about \$78.5 million or so to maintain both a stadium and the team that performs in it.

Set against that are potential revenues, from tickets, parking and concessions, luxury boxes, broadcast contracts, licensing, etc. If a team achieves the major league average attendance (about 2 million) with the major league average revenue from ticket sales, concessions (*net* revenue here is important, revenue after the costs of providing the concessions has been accounted for), and parking of about \$15 per attendee, tickets, concessions, and parking would yield about \$30 million in revenue.

In Milwaukee, the 75 luxury boxes, rented at an average of \$30,000 per year could yield an annual revenue stream (at 100% occupancy) of about \$2.25 million. Beginning next year, the national broad-casting contracts seem likely to yield an average of about \$11 million per team. If local broadcasting yields half that (\$5.5 million), we have a total revenue stream of \$48.75 million. The only thing that's left is licensing. I somehow doubt that it will yield \$30 million a year.

Essentially, the team's revenue stream covers the operating costs, not the stadium costs. So the team can't afford to build it. And, since the revenue stream effectively provides nothing to a city that builds a stadium, building and operating a stadium means the city provides a \$30 million subsidy to the team. Somehow, this does not seem like a terribly effective economic development strategy.

How can the gap be covered? One possibility is for attendance to be larger than the average. For example, if the Brewers were to sell out their 45,000 seat stadium every year for the next 40 years, their attendance would be around 3.6 million per year. This would generate \$54 million per year in revenue, which would close all but \$6 million of the gap between costs and revenues. This, however, seems unlikely. Another possibility is even more luxury boxes at an even higher price. Suppose they built 120 boxes and could lease them for \$50,000 per year. That would raise the luxury-box revenue to \$6 million per year (a gain of \$3.75 million). This also seems unlikely.

The only other source of funds seems to be other -- non-baseball -- events. That means building a multi-use facility, not one dedicated to baseball. In most of the U.S., that also probably means building an enclosed (or enclosable) facility. Not much takes place--or could take place, for example, in the new Comiskey Park between November 1 and March 1. Furthermore, given the complexity of an annual baseball schedule, it seems unlikely that many events could be "woven in" to the baseball schedule between April 1 and October. Yet teams resist multi-use facilities and, from their point of view, for good reason. Such facilities represent compromises in the presentation of baseball, and thus may make the new facility less attractive that it could otherwise be. So, for example, Camden Yards, Jacobs Field, and The Ballpark are all single-use facilities.

I conclude that new facilities cannot be profitably constructed by an individual team and that public construction, ownership, and operation will require a large public subsidy. Given the alternative local public programs competing for these funds, I also conclude that building a new stadium is unlikely to be a worthwhile investment of public funds.

The Majors and the Minors

With respect to the major leagues' recent expansion of their territorial rights, **Mark Pankin** writes: "I was appalled by the territorial annexation. I guess it is another instance of how out of touch with the average fan the owners have become. Where is a Veeck (to prevent more wrecks) when we need one? Worse yet, I would guess that many who attend minor league games will be motivated to attend major league games to a) see the best players and b) follow prospects they saw in the minors. If so, keeping minor league teams farther away from major league cities is another mistake. I guess the owners are afraid that if fans see that attending a game doesn't have to be expensive and is more fun when you are close to the action (it is virtually impossible for an ordinary fan to get a seat in the front half of the lower deck in most major league parks, and with the exception of a few old parks such as Tiger Stadium, the upper deck is too high and too far back), then they will decide the minor league product is a better buy and stay away. I think their fears are unfounded since most of their recent actions have already served to drive away many fans."

Research Papers Available

Larry Hadley has co-authored two more papers. "The Luxury Tax Proposal for Major League Baseball: A Partial Equilibrium Analysis" (with Elizabeth Gustafson) reviews the likely effect of the owners' March 1995 "luxury tax" proposal on payrolls and competitive balance. "Technical Efficiency in Major League Baseball" (with John Ruggiero and Elizabeth Gustafson) is a highly mathematical attempt to evaluate the quality of teams' managers over the period 1982-93. For copies of these papers, drop Larry a note: Lawrence Hadley, Economics Dept., University of Dayton, Dayton, OH 45424-2240, E-mail HadleyL@udayton.edu.

New Books of Note

Larry Hadley reports that the research papers from last summer's Western Economics Association's session on the business of baseball will be published later this year by Greenwood Press.

While not dealing directly with the business of baseball, two new self-published books continue the tradition of original research SABR and its members have long supported.

John E. Spalding has assembled a *Guide to Baseball Guides, Record Books and Registers, 1869-1995*: a 64-page, spiral-bound directory to the wealth of information found in the *De Witt, Spalding, Reach*, and *Sporting News Guides* and the *Sporting News Register*. While indispensable sources for serious baseball researchers, the Guides often contained inadequate -- or no -- indexes, making this directory a true timesaver.. It's available for \$14.95 postpaid (California residents add \$1 for sales tax) from John E. Spalding, 1875 Bascom Avenue, Suite 116-257, Campbell, CA 95008. Thanks to Carlos Bauer's Minor League Committee

Newsletter for tipping me off to this one.

For fans of the old Bill James *Baseball Abstracts*, a group of Internet baseball mavens has created the *Baseball Prospectus '96*: 450 pages of career data for all major and top minor-league players; 1996 projections; reports on each organization and its pitching staff; and additional material from Clay Davenport, Gary Huckabay, Rany Jazayerli, Christopher Kahrl and Joseph Sheehan. The book sells for \$23.30 postpaid through February 15 (plus \$1.46 sales tax in California) from Joseph Sheehan, P.O. Box 4295, Costa Mesa, CA 92626. The price is expected to rise after February 15 -- if ordering after that date, drop Joseph a note or E-mail Gary Huckabay at GLHuckabay@ucdavis.edu for the current price.

Great Moments in Prognostication

February 3, 1949 *TSN*: Thomas McMahon of N.W. Ayer advertising in Philadelphia, predicts that televised baseball may be a passing fancy: "After the novelty wears off, McMahon pointed out, the owner of a TV set would find it too great an eyestrain to focus on a small screen for two hours at a time to watch a ball game."

4/3/71 *TSN*: "It would appear that the ball clubs have reached the limit beyond which they cannot go without risking financial suicide." -- Lee MacPhail, speaking at a time when less than 1/4 of Major League Baseball's revenues went to player salaries. Two weeks later, *TSN* quotes Dodger player representative Wes Parker: "If I were an owner, I would permit salaries to go only so high, then get rid of my big money men and use younger players. . . . I don't think the owners have so much money that they can keep throwing it around."

Changes to the Committee Roster

New Members:

Robert Dunn, P.O. Box 4253, Ann Arbor, MI 48106, rdunn@umich.edu

Stefan Fatsis, The Wall Street Journal, 200 Liberty St., 10th Floor, New York NY 10281, sfatsis@wsj.com

Steve Gietschier, P.O. Box 56, St. Louis, MO 63166, tsnspg@aol.com

Michael Hazen, P.O. Box 9450, Santa Rosa, CA 95405, hazen@well.com

Al Marshall, 4040 Howard Avenue, Western Springs, IL 60558, marshall@mcs.com

Geoffrey D. Reynolds, 31967 Rosslyn Avenue, Garden City, MI 48135, kgreynolds@aol.com

Scott E. Schul, 665 Brighton Avenue, Portland, ME 04102

Woody Wilson, P.O. Box 160104, Sacramento, CA 95816

New Addresses:

Tim Hylan, 319 N. West St., #116, Indianapolis, IN 46202

Ted Turocy, 132 Custer #1, Evanston, IL 60202

New E-Mail Addresses:

Larry Gerlach -- Larry.Gerlach@m.cc.utah.edu

Tim Hylan -- HylanT@lilly.com

John Matthew -- John.Matthew@ArthurAndersen.com

Andy McCue -- AGMcCue@pe.net

David Pietrusza -- piet@ichange.com