## PLANNING A SOUND FOUNDATION FOR MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL IN LOS ANGELES Compiled by the Los Angeles Baseball Club December 1, 1953 2nd Revised Edition

## The Questions That Must be Answered

What follows is in the form of a list of questions for which the answers must be found in order to do an intelligent job of getting major league baseball into Los Angeles, and on a permanent basis.

There are two possible methods of reaching the goal:

- (1) Los Angeles can join with some other city in entering the American League or the National League as the ninth and tenth clubs. The way was paved for expanding from eight to ten clubs by the National League in a provision adopted in 1947. The American League took similar action in September of 1953.
- (2) Los Angeles can buy an existing franchise in either the American or National League and move it here.

On the surface, the job looks simple, because of the recent examples of Milwaukee and Baltimore in becoming major league cities. Actually, however, there were circumstances in both cases that do not apply to the current situation in general or to Los Angeles in particular. Some of these will be pointed out in the following pages.

Naturally, the preference of the respective leagues will play an important part in the question of which of the two methods may

be followed. The consent of the other clubs in each league is involved. In the National League, a unanimous vote of all eight clubs is required to move a franchise to another city. In the American League, it takes the favorable vote of six clubs.

It would be unrealistic to assume that either of these two leagues as a league is necessarily eager to take in one or more Pacific Coast cities. The move would be a drastic one in any case. It would impose considerable complications in scheduling games, and a very substantial element of added traveling costs. It is true that in connection with the moving of the St. Louis Browns to Baltimore there was at one point a favorable vote of the American League clubs to permit a move to Los Angeles. The particular conditions that made this possible, however, may not necessarily be repeated.

It should be obvious, too, that the matter is not as easy as merely issuing an invitation to some one of the 16 clubs in the National or American League to move to Los Angeles, lock, stock and barrel. Some of the people who have been promoting the idea of major league baseball for Los Angeles seem to think that that's all there is to it. In reality, these clubs -- the good ones anyway -- are pretty well satisfied where they are. They are primarily owned locally by people who have their roots in their respective cities and want to stay where they are. What is more important, nearly all of them have a substantial investment in their communities, including physical assets, which cannot be simply thrown away.

The point is that there is a selling job that must be done with either the American or National League before Los Angeles can obtain a franchise, either as part of an expanded ten-club league, or as a new location for one of the eight existing franchises in either league. Except possibly under circumstances of extreme desperation for a place to locate a losing franchise, this selling must be based on hard facts as to the ability of Los Angeles to deliver: (a) playing facilities that are not makeshift, but definitely up to major league standards; and (b) a firm prospect of lasting success, both from the standpoint of the new Los Angeles club and the league as a whole.

As indicated, it is going to take the investment of important money to get started and to maintain the kind of baseball that Los Angeles feels it wants. Such an investment cannot be wished into existence. It will be made only if there is a sound foundation for some sort of return for those who make it -- whether in the form of a direct cash return on the investment, indirect returns to the community at large, or civic pride. None of these benefits can be realized, needless to say, unless the team wins and the business end of the organization functions properly.

Here are some of the questions for which the answers must be dug up as far as Los Angeles is concerned.

(1) What attendance capacity would be needed in the Los Angeles ball park?

A Los Angeles professional sports official has been quoted as saying that you not only have to have a winner but the winner must

be playing a winner in order to draw any sort of a crowd in Los Angeles. It has been stated by some of the most articulate proponents of a major league baseball club in Los Angeles that, "we want to see the Yankees or the Dodgers." Has anybody given consideration to the fact that if Los Angeles were in the American League with seven other clubs, they would play a total of 11 home games with the Yankees in an entire season? In a ten-club league, the Yankees would come to town for nine games. So if the people are going to come out in large numbers only for the front-runner teams, how big a park would you need to take maximum advantage of the potential when the key opponent is here, so as to offset the low attendance when all the non-glamour teams are playing the home club?

An off-the-cuff estimate is that 45,000 to 50,000 would be about the right-sized seating capacity for Los Angeles. In most major league parks, the seating capacity runs between 30,000 and 40,000.

Also to be borne in mind is the question of what the maximum size of the park should be, for a baseball park can be too large, as well as too small. In evaluating the fact that crowds of 70,000 to 90,000 have turned out for pro football in Los Angeles, it is to be remembered that a football team plays about a half a dozen home games a year, at a frequency of no greater than once a week. A major league baseball club plays around 70 home dates over a period of five and a half months. During a home stand the team generally plays six days a week for three weeks. An overly big

park with a few thousand people lost in it when the weaker teams are furnishing the opposition could present an unsuccessful atmosphere harmful to the future of the club, much as a big restaurant with too many empty tables in it gives a defeated impression that keeps people away.

(2) What is the best available location for a baseball park?
Any baseball park location must naturally be a compromise, in
that it of course can't possibly be handy to every section of the
city. Availability of open ground sufficient for the park itself
and reasonable parking facilities are also limiting factors.

The problem is an especially peculiar one in Los Angeles because the city is greatly decentralized and has probably the lowest population density of any metropolitan city in the world. Just to give a few pertinent comparisons with various major league cities,

New York City has a population density of 24,950 persons per square mile; Chicago -- 17,335; Detroit -- 13,320; Cleveland -- 12,075;

Milwaukee -- 12,700; Baltimore -- 11,900. The population density of Los Angeles is 4,350 persons per square mile.

The problem can best be worked out in terms of choosing that location which has the greatest accessibility to the average patrons, rather than to any particular group. Baseball draws a certain amount of attendance from every walk of life, but the backbone of its patronage is the good plain folks of modest means. The country club set, the college graduates, the so-called sporting

element, and the people of the entertainment world turn out at times. Mostly, however, they come only to the key games when it's the thing to do to be seen. It is the workingman and his family -- the factory workers, office clerks, salesmen, truck drivers, mechanics, building tradesmen and the like -- who supply the big bulk of the steady audience.

A further qualification is that the best potential source of attendance today is among the older people. Due to current population trends, the military draft, and today's earlier marrying age, the single young men who were once the best customer group for baseball and other forms of low-cost entertainment, are relatively few in number. The young marrieds of course are tied down financially by the burdens of furnishing and paying for their homes, and by the little children to be looked after. This leaves those in the middle-age groups and older -- a fast-growing proportion of the over-all population -- as a very important customer group for baseball. They are more apt to have the time, the cash, and the freedom from being tied down at home.

It would seem that the best location for a baseball park is one that is reasonably accessible to the factory and office workers of the middle income groups and lower, rather than to sections largely populated by the wealthier groups or by young married people just getting started in family life. It should also be close to the center of population and the main stream of population growth. Both Wrigley Field and the Los Angeles Coliseum qualify

well on this point, as both are about seven blocks from the center of population of Los Angeles County. The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce has determined that the trend of population growth in the future is in a continued southerly and easterly direction from the downtown section. This has been the direction of the greatest increase ever since 1950.

(3) Could Wrigley Field be sufficiently increased in capacity by condemnation of adjoining property? If so, how much capital would be needed to acquire the property and enlarge the stands? How could it be supplied?

As it now stands, Wrigley Field in Los Angeles is one of the two or three best baseball parks outside the major leagues. Except for smaller capacity (21,000 seats), it is superior in design, attractiveness and general layout to many major league parks. It was designed and built by the same architects and contractors who remodeled Wrigley Field in Chicago to its present size and seating capacity (36,755). Engineers and architects have determined that the Los Angeles Wrigley Field can readily be enlarged to 45,000 to 50,000 seating capacity, and preliminary plans have already been drawn up. The cost will depend on building costs at the time the job is done, and the method and expense of acquiring the added land.

It is worth noting that good facilities specifically tailored for watching baseball are a tremendously valuable asset to a baseball operation. The so-called fan can be content in almost any surroundings, so long as the baseball field is laid out in regulation size. But the rabid fans are a very small proportion of

total baseball attendance. For the big bulk of it you must count om the casual customers who come out to see the spectacle and be a part of the crowd, and who may barely know the score of the game, much less the batting averages of the players and the intricacies of the infield fly rule.

For this reason a pleasant, attractive park, with stands that provide comfortable, well-located and well-protected seats is at least as important as the game on the field. The baseball park can and should be an attraction in itself -- one that the local people can be proud of as an outstanding baseball park and which will be a "must" on the list of visitors to the city. Wrigley Field in Chicago was specifically designed to be the world's most beautiful baseball park, and has gained recognition as such. As a result, it owes a large part of its annual audience to customers who come out because it's something to see and a place where baseball can be watched to unusually good advantage.

The shift of the Braves to Milwaukee depended in large part on the fact that the County had made available a roofed park tailored for baseball, financed by the taxpayers, and provided at a very low rental. Similar facilities were supplied in Baltimore, with the city footing the bill. In fact, Baltimore's bid for the Browns a year earlier had failed because the park was too small, stands were not roofed, individual box seats were missing and lighting was inadequate.

(4) If it should be decided that an entirely new park is needed, how much would it cost, where would it be located, and who would provide the money?

It has been estimated that it would cost approximately \$6,500,000 to build a new ball park with 40,000 seating capacity, not counting the cost of the land or surrounding parking space. Nobody seems to feel that private capital could be induced to make the necessary investment at current building costs. Would the taxpayers, or the city or county officials, be agreeable to making such an outlay from public funds in relation to the other municipal needs of the area? How soon would they be willing to take on a project like a ball park and when could it be completed? Would there have to be public action to approve it and vote a bond issue? What interest rate would be required to sell the bonds? What locations are available which are reasonably accessible not merely to a large volume of population or a growing section, but to the type of people who are baseball's best prospective customers?

(5) Can the Los Angeles Coliseum be suitably converted into a baseball park of major league caliber?

It is one thing to lay out a playing field in a given area that has outfield foul lines that are no worse than one or more major league parks. It is another to assure seating facilities which will satisfy the people attending a baseball game. Under major league standards this includes roofing over a substantial section of the stands for those who don't want to be in the direct sun and

also for protection against chilly night-time temperatures. It also includes adequate lighting for night games and reasonable temperatures on hot days on the playing field and for the box seats at playing-field level.

(6) What can be done to insure the best possible transportation to and from the ball park?

All possible measures must be taken to make sure that it isn't going to be too much of a chore getting to the games and getting home again. Inconvenient transportation and time-consuming traffic jams can be a tremendous handicap to a baseball operation. People may be willing to put up with such difficulties for a special or occasional event like a track meet or a football game. A baseball club, however, must have steady patronage, with fair-sized crowds six or seven times a week during its home stands.

In the Eastern and Midwest cities, a large part of the problem is taken care of by mass transportation facilities -- bus, street car, and elevated and subway lines. In Los Angeles, public transportation service is relatively very limited, but nevertheless is not to be overlooked as a factor in helping bring people from some areas. Studies are needed as to the amount and nature of public transportation serving the available sites, and also as to the prospects for improvement in service.

Aside from the unavailability of good public transportation to and from a number of areas of the city, driving in their own cars is a natural function of the recreation habits of a very large percentage of Los Angeles people. Therefore, it will be necessary to plan good accommodations for arrival and departure by private automobile for a much larger proportion of the crowds than in other major league cities.

Parking facilities must be ample and convenient, an aim which can probably be accomplished only through a civic body with the power to change streets and otherwise provide adequate parking areas.

Studies of traffic flow patterns are also needed, including entry and exit time studies at available park locations, and the possibility of freeway extensions to the site or other improvements in accessibility of routes.

(7) How much annual attendance can be expected -- not just in the first flush season, but on the average?

There is no question whatever that in its first season or two, a new major league club could draw well in any large city. What happens when the novelty wears off, and the initial burst of civic enthusiasm has faded out, is the crucial point.

The minimum year in and year out break-even point on attendance today for a club paying player salaries and other expenses at the major league level is estimated at 900,000 persons.

Needless to say, sheer numbers of people are not enough. They must be drawn at an admission price per person that will yield \$1,000,000 or more over the season.

(8) What is the entertainment competition which baseball must meet in Los Angeles?

This includes not only sports but all forms of recreational and leisure-time activities which compete for the public's attention, time and money.

As far as sports events with paid admissions are concerned, the competition is about the same as in most of the larger major league cities -- boxing, wrestling, bowling, stock car races, golf and horse racing. The latter is evidently the strongest competition, with Hollywood Park drawing 1,457,544 people in its 1952 summer meeting.

Milwaukee, incidentally, has no horse racing and extremely limited competition of other sports. Bowling is the main sports attraction besides baseball in Milwaukee and it is virtually closed down in the summertime. Consequently, baseball had an exceptional opportunity to take the limelight as that city's No. 1 recreational attraction. As a matter of fact, Milwaukee was already a very baseball-minded city, and it might be noted that if Los Angeles currently supported baseball in the same proportion to population that Milwaukee supported the Brewers, a minor league club in the American Association, which played its games in an ancient, ramshackle park, the Angels would have an annual attendance in the neighborhood of 1,500,000.

The chief competition for baseball in Los Angeles lies in the unique way of life in Southern California, which is entirely different from the Eastern and Midwest cities. To begin with, Los

Angeles and the surrounding areas are horizontal communities. They are spread out, with a high percentage of single family dwellings and very few apartment buildings. This, together with the favorable climate, permits people to spend much of their time outdoors all year long. In the East and Midwest, the opportunities for being outdoors are limited to several months of the year. For the dwellers in the closely crowded areas, watching a baseball game is one of the principal ways of getting outdoor recreation.

In Los Angeles, home amusement in the outdoors is probably one of baseball's heaviest rivals. The prevalence of patios even in small sub-division homes is evidence of that. Home barbecues are a principal form of entertainment. Gardening likewise occupies a great part of the time and attention of a large percentage of the residents.

Many Southern Californians are not too inclined to pay for entertainment, because there are so many interesting things they can do at no cost. In addition to home entertainment, there is a wide range of attractions within an easily reached distance from Los Angeles that are competitive to baseball. The Southern Californian thinks nothing of driving 50 miles or more to the beach or into the mountains. While this costs money in terms of gasoline, most folks never think of that as an expense.

Just as an indication of the popularity of some of this free entertainment, the 22 miles of beach in Los Angeles County are visited by more than 20,000,000 people annually. And there are more

than 100 miles of additional beaches that Los Angeles County people drive out to. (By way of comparison, the beach facilities in and near Milwaukee are relatively undeveloped and attracted 596,000 people in 1953.) Nearly 1,000,000 use the public park and play facilities in the mountains near Los Angeles, exclusive of winter months. There are many municipal picnic sites throughout the area that are heavily patronized. Knott's Berry Farm, which offers numerous free entertainment attractions in addition to its restaurants, drew 1,066,000 people in the 26 weeks from April through September of 1953. Sports fishing and boating (there are some 9,000 privately owned pleasure craft in Southern California) occupy the leisure time of many thousands of people.

Another free attraction that is a rather sizable factor is the studio audiences of the television and radio stations and networks in Hollywood. The total attendance for the four network studios during the summer months is approximately 1,300,000.

Watching television in the home is probably much more of a competitive entertainment factor in Los Angeles than any other city. Los Angeles has seven television channels in operation, whereas Chicago has four and Milwaukee has two. This means that the people of Los Angeles have a full selection of all the top network programs to choose from, plus numerous local programs. Consequently, there is greater likelihood that they may have a favorite program to stay home and watch rather than go to a ball game or some other form of paid entertainment.

(9) What kind of promotion, and how much, will be needed to meet the competition of other sports and forms of recreation? How can the job be done at a reasonable cost and in a reasonable time to assure the necessary year in and year out volume of attendance?

The major league clubs that consistently do well at the gate are those in cities where through circumstances or as a result of a steady promotional program over a long period of years, baseball has been established as a top recreation attraction in that city.

In Los Angeles, baseball must be aggressively sold as something that is more enjoyable than all the many things in the area that people can do for nothing, and also more enjoyable than outdoor recreation around the home.

It seems to be agreed, moreover, that Los Angeles is a difficult area in which to promote. This is due to the extensive development and long use of flamboyant Hollywood techniques in promoting everything from the opening of a super-market to special entertainment attractions. What would be startling and make a big splash in Cleveland would get yawns in Los Angeles.

In addition, the psychology of the Los Angeles public is that the people are generally stirred into action only for the "now or never" type of paid attraction -- the big special event that you can't put off going to, like a special all-star performance in the Hollywood Bowl or a football game between hot rivals. Baseball, on the other hand, has a long season, with 70 playing dates for which

attendance must be promoted.

There is no question of course that the right promotional techniques can be found and developed. But it is obviously a job that is going to require plenty of advance planning to assure continuity of an adequate attendance after the novelty of the first season or two has gone.

(10) What will be involved in building a major league team that can consistently finish at or near the top?

It is a foregone conclusion that regardless of the method by which major league baseball is brought to Los Angeles, the team at the outset is going to be a mediocre one at best. And at the same time it seems certain that over the long run the people of Los Angeles, with their liking for star attractions, would give disastrously less support to a second-division team than other major league cities.

Any present major league franchise that might be available for moving to Los Angeles would undoubtedly involve a club that has run out of gas in its own city. It would have a weak team that has been finishing deep in the second division of its league, with dim prospects for doing better in the reasonably near future. There is little likelihood of a repetition of Milwaukee's experience, as the Braves had just begun to cash in on a well-organized farm system, and were aided by the return of two key players from military service.

If Los Angeles goes major league by entering a ten-club set-up in the American or National League, the existing Pacific Coast League

team in Los Angeles could at the most provide a limited nucleus of players of possible major league grade. And of course you couldn't expect to take off the Open Classification label and turn the players into major leaguers simply by virtue of the fact that the city had acquired a major league franchise.

In addition to the fact that the ability of many of the players would be bound to be below major league standards, you cannot move up a team en masse without taking into consideration certain other elements in the picture. The contracts of any Los Angeles players who were to be moved up to a major league club would naturally be subject to sale at competitive prices to any major league clubs that might want to buy such contracts.

The process of building up from the nucleus of players that might be provided either through the purchase of a major league franchise, or through such players as might be acquired from the Los Angeles Pacific Coast League Club, will take a lot of money and time. Contrary to the common opinion, it is just about impossible to buy established major league players for cash today. As a general rule, only fill-ins and second or third line players can be obtained by cash or trade. The big front line stars can't be bought for any price, unless they are on the downgrade or the club concerned is about to go broke. Even in the latter instance, the competition among other well-heeled clubs to buy any such available players would bid up the price to a very high level.

Consequently, the Los Angeles major league club is going to have to start out mostly with culls, mediocre players and undeveloped

youngsters. Barring a miracle that can't be counted on, it is going to take several years to produce a first-class team. The main strength must come through the long, laborious and costly process of developing the young players up through the club's minor league farm system.

All this adds up to the fact that the organization must be sufficiently well financed not only to do the job of finding and developing player personnel, but to tide the club over some lean years at the gate while the winner is being built. Granted that the first year's attendance is sure to be big, the disposition of the people of Los Angeles to demand a star attraction may bring a pronounced drop-off in attendance after that, until the team can be built up as a pennant contender.

In short, the financing cannot be based on the assumption that a major league franchise in Los Angeles is going to be an overnight bonanza that will carry itself, but rather on the hard fact that there is going to have to be enough capital to finance the building of a winner. The prosperous clubs in the East and Midwest are going to be in there battling to get the best of the up-coming talent. The job of bidding against them can't be done on a shoestring.

(11) What can be done to insure quick establishment of an effective scouting organization and system of minor league clubs for developing young players?

A steady supply of replacements is necessary to insure a continued winner. It takes about five years to develop a young player

to the point where he can be brought up and play with the best. And about 24 out of every 25 young players signed fall by the wayside and never make it. The major league clubs control the contracts of anywhere from 200 to 700 young players who are in the process of seasoning in the minor leagues. An expenditure of at least \$550,000 a year is needed to finance this team replacement activity.

Chances are that the player development organization of any existing club that could be transferred to Los Angeles would be badly in need of major overhaul and expansion. In the event of a ten-club major league set-up, a new organization would have to be built up.

(12) Is the working capital available to finance the annual expenditures of a club operating on the estimated break-even basis of 900,000 paid attendance?

As a general estimate, based on average experience for a firstclass major league club, the annual outgo would be about as follows:

Team salaries and expenses (in- cluding manager, coaches, train- ers, etc.)	\$540,000.00
Team replacement expense (scouts salaries and expenses, payments to free agents, deficits of owned minor league clubs, costs of work-	in addition to
ing agreements, supervision)	550,000.00
Grounds and park maintenance	260,000.00
Games expense (ticket selling, ushers, etc.)	150,000.00
Advertising and publicity	75,000.00
Administrative salaries and expense; general overhead	125,000.00
	\$1,700,000.00

It is to be borne in mind that the above figures are a minimum average with no frills. Moreover, they are for a club that is a going concern in its city. In a new major league city, of course, some of these items would be vastly more expensive. Player personnel costs would undoubtedly be a good deal higher for the first several years. Promotional costs would also be a lot higher than the above average figure, which is based on a backlog of some years of building up baseball as a leading attraction in the community.

(13) What would be the transportation costs when the team is on the road, and when the teams from the East and Midwest come to Los Angeles?

This is a sizable item in baseball economics, and it is to be remembered that the new major league clubs in Milwaukee and Baltimore are less than 100 miles from the regular major league travel circuits. To move a team from Los Angeles to Chicago and back by air facilities would cost \$7,200 to \$10,050. Using fast trains at first-class fares, the cost would be \$10,032.80 per round trip.

As a visiting club gets  $27\frac{1}{2}\phi$  or  $28\phi$  for each paid admission, this heavy transportation expense means a substantial addition to established costs. It would take about 35,000 paid admissions for each series in Los Angeles just to meet the travel cost of each visiting team.

(14) Tying in directly with the above is the fact that the simultaneous location of clubs in two Pacific Coast cities in the same league would reduce the transportation cost and scheduling

problems. If the Midwest and Eastern teams played in two cities on each trip to the Coast, the added transportation costs could be spread over two series of games instead of one.

For this reason, the fortunes of Los Angeles are probably closely related to the situation at San Francisco. Therefore, somebody has to explore the problem of San Francisco at the same time and in the same manner as Los Angeles, so as to insure that that city will likewise be ready for entry into major league baseball on a sound basis. If the major league project at San Francisco is delayed or mishandled, Los Angeles would undoubtedly suffer, as would the league it goes into.

(15) What would be the cost for the franchise and of damages to the Pacific Coast League clubs, and also the cost of re-locating the Los Angeles PCL franchise elsewhere?

The entry of Los Angeles and possibly San Francisco in the major leagues will of course cause a severe dislocation of the Pacific Coast League. Handling the move on an orderly basis naturally calls for all concerned to take an interest in preserving the over-all interests of baseball. Therefore, the project should include some planning as to a new set-up for the Pacific Coast League. This would include consideration of the cities to which the present Los Angeles and Hollywood franchises could be moved, and possibly also San Francisco, with provision of territorial rights for the new cities.

Also to be considered is the possible necessity of reduction in classification of the Pacific Coast League. This would involve

problems of player status and rights of the members of the teams remaining in the league. You can't move a ball club en masse downward in classification, any more than you can move it upwards, and the rules of baseball must be followed in getting waivers from other leagues and otherwise protecting the rights of these players before they can be moved. Also involved would be the question of re-alignment of other leagues, such as the California State, which would be disturbed by the change.

(16) Can the incoming club develop other sources of revenue to make up for the fact that the admissions at the gate pay only a part of the total income needed to run a first-class baseball club?

In average circumstances, the money paid in by the fans at the gate -- after you have subtracted the shares of Uncle Sam, the league and the visiting club -- pays for something less than two-thirds (60 to 65%) of the total operating expenses. This means that efficient, hard-working management is essential in developing revenue from concessions, selling radio and television rights, and developing field rentals to make up the deficit.

\* \* \* \* \* \*

The foregoing does not pretend to be a complete list of the questions to be answered and the problems to be solved. Others will come up as the fact-finding and preliminary development work progresses. But it does serve to indicate the general scope of the job ahead and the amount of down-to-earth planning that is going to be

needed to reach the goal of bringing major league baseball to Los Angeles on an orderly, sound and permanent basis.

In some respects the points which have been brought up in this outline may seem to paint a rather dark picture. The purpose, however, is not in any way to discourage the project for bringing major league baseball to Los Angeles. It is rather to encourage the kind of thinking and intelligent effort that will give Los Angeles a baseball club that will be in line with the great achievements and high standards of Los Angeles in other fields, as well as to guard against any possibility of a fiasco that would give the community a black eye.

As stated earlier, the problems are difficult, but they are by no means insurmountable. If tackled with the foresight, courage, patience and wisdom that have gone into building Los Angeles as one of the world's great metropolitan centers, these problems can and will be solved in a way that will give Los Angeles a top-notch major league club that it can always be proud of.