



**Sports Facilities:  
From Multipurpose Stadia to Mixed Use Developments**

presented at

American Real Estate Society Conference  
San Francisco, CA  
April 14, 2007

by

Susan Logan Nelson, Ph.D.  
Professor and Director of Sport Business  
Department of Finance  
Box 7096  
University of North Dakota  
Grand Forks, ND 58202  
701-777-4213  
[susan.nelson@mail.business.und.edu](mailto:susan.nelson@mail.business.und.edu)

Please do not quote without permission.



# Sports Facilities: From Multipurpose Stadia to Mixed-Use Developments

## INTRODUCTION

Distribution decisions have the most long-term, far-reaching implications of all marketing related business decisions. (Stern & Sturdivant, 1987) Once commitments are made, changes are difficult to implement. Distribution decisions made in a sports context, particularly those related to facility location, design, and financing, are no different from other enterprises more traditionally considered business endeavors. These decisions have long-term implications not only for the viability of the facility itself, but also the resident team's success. This study first reviews the historical evolution of these highly integrated facets of facilities built for Major League Baseball (MLB) as presented in *Baseball in America: From "The House That Ruth Built" to "The House That Ted Built"* (Nelson, 1997). That paper concentrated on historical developments and trends in MLB parks with a focus on factors that have had an impact on where MLB stadia were constructed and how their construction was financed. The balance of power and responsibility in financing arrangements for MLB ballparks has shifted over the years among three major stakeholder groups: baseball owners, municipalities, and, to a lesser extent, corporate sponsors.

Recently, however, a new participant group has entered the mix. Real estate developers have recognized the opportunities inherent in having a sports facility integrated into a mixed-use development. These developments, either initially or retroactively, incorporate properties such as retail, office, and housing options into a sports facility complex. This trend involves all manner of sports facility, not just baseball parks, and reflects ever-growing expectations of fans with regard to the amenities incorporated into the facilities where sporting events are held. One explanation of this evolution can be traced to increased competition for the public's discretionary time and money. Also, fans have more viewing options for sporting events via television and Internet broadcasts, so there are increased demands on the live event to provide entertainment options that make attendance, with its attendant cost, preferable to broadcast options.

Once a commitment to a sport facility is made, changes are difficult to implement. Understanding cultural changes which influence the way people live and play is necessary in making sound facility design, location, and financing decisions. During the super stadium era of baseball park construction in the 1960s and 1970s, multipurpose stadia, which housed football and baseball teams, were built in the suburbs with a surrounding sea of parking. The intent was to contain the overall cost of construction by building one facility for two sports and by buying cheap land on the outskirts of town, which was easily accessed by car. This was justified by the massive relocation of the typical American city's population to the suburbs. In retrospect, however, this decision was found to be myopic.

Historically, team owners and municipalities have bargained with each other over these decisions. However, the mindsets of corporate sponsors and real estate developers have imbued these decisions with a better understanding of the public's perception of sports in relation to other forms of entertainment and lifestyle decisions. In the relatively new regenerated classic baseball parks, old-fashioned facades house baseball-only playing fields with numerous technological and entertainment amenities. These regenerated classic parks can be considered multipurpose as well, but not in the same sense as the super stadiums. The emphasis in these parks is on entertainment rather than accommodating multiple sports franchises.

Many studies prepared by teams, their consultants, and government agencies show that the economic development benefits enjoyed by cities that build new stadiums, or allow their construction, are in the millions annually. These new stadia are supposed to provide revitalization in downtown areas and spur development in more rural and suburban settings. As the mass exodus of stadia to the suburbs paralleled a movement in retail operations from downtown areas to suburbs in the 1960s and 1970s, recent sport facility location parallels the urban renewal trend. However, there is growing disagreement and dissent regarding whether new stadia actually achieve economic development goals. Arguments over whether public money should be used to achieve these nebulous goals are becoming somewhat abated by the influx of private money to develop mixed use complexes which, if successful, will accomplish what detractors believe public money should not be used to do.

With government entities becoming increasingly hesitant to fund sports facilities, the role of corporate America is likely to expand. Corporate sponsors and advertisers were the first to enter the mix, not surprisingly given the virtual playgrounds that the regenerated classic ballparks have become. More recently, and rather quietly, real estate developers have also stepped into the fray. Financial and design assistance from these entities, who are positioned to understand the consumer mindset better than team owners and local politicians do, seems to be a step in the right direction.

Therefore, the evolution of the of baseball parks is reviewed and the more recent influx of mixed-use developments incorporating all manner of sports facilities is further explored in this paper. Conclusions, including projections of future directions, are also offered.

## MLB STADIUM ERAS

According to Dale Swearingen, the new and different wants of baseball fans can be traced through three stadium eras: the classic ballpark, the super stadium, and the regenerated classic ballpark. (Lowry, 1992, p. xi) These three eras are delineated in Table 1. Table 1 also provides a summary of cost and baseball seating capacity for existing and proposed MLB ballparks.

The total integration of classic ballparks into their neighborhoods created a little known but crucial design benefit, the asymmetrical form dictated by the property lines of the site. (Lowry, 1992, p. xiii) Land constraints were not the only contributing factor to these decisions. As the story goes, Jacob Ruppert, one of the New York Yankee owners in 1920, wanted a short right field fence to accommodate his newly acquired slugger, Babe Ruth. (Lowry, 1992, p. xiii) Apparently, *The House that Ruth Built* is in reference to more than the Babe's popularity with fans.

The charming, quirky character of these ballparks contributed to, rather than detracted from, their popularity. Only three ballparks from the **classic ballparks era** remain and two of these are seriously being considered for replacement. Nevertheless, the influence of these four ballparks on the regenerated classic era is unmistakable. For example, asymmetry is replicated in the **regenerated classic ballparks**, regardless of whether the site demands it.

The massive relocation of the typical American city's population to the suburbs helped usher in the **super stadium era**. It no longer made sense to nestle a stadium amidst an urban neighborhood. A greater dependence on the automobile and its attendant parking requirements fostered the *stand-alone* stadium concept. Also, given the popular modernist school's

dictate that form followed function, and function was symmetry, playing fields became symmetrical. (Lowry, 1992, p. xiv)

The **regenerated classic ballpark era** arrived in response to all that was considered wrong with the super stadiums. While more charitable critics liken them to Acookie cutters@ (Munsey & Suppes, 1997), Aconcrete donuts,@ and Adrab multi-use bowls@ (McGraw, 1996, p. 46), others (Lowry, 1992, p. 2) refer to the stadiums built during the sixties and seventies as Asterile ugly ashtrays.@ Even the word *stadium* has been abandoned in the new ballparks, giving way to quainter, traditional terms such as *park* or *field*.

In the regenerated classic parks, old-fashioned facades house baseball-only, natural grass, asymmetrical playing fields. These facility designs harken back to the classic ballpark era while masking a multitude of technological wonders, modern day amenities, and entertainment options. Regenerated classic parks can be considered multipurpose as well, but not in the same sense as the super stadiums. The emphasis is now on entertainment rather than accommodating two, or more, sports franchises. Furthermore, some of these parks are taking on mythological characteristics of their own. For example, archaeologists at the 85-acre site of Oriole Park at Camden Yards in downtown Baltimore claim to have unearthed the remains of the George Ruth, Sr. saloon, the enterprise of Babe Ruth=s father. (Lowry, 1992, p. 21)

## LOCATION DECISIONS DURING THE MLB STADIUM ERAS

One key factor in the location decision is access. Thus, urban infrastructure has always played an integral part in ballpark location decisions. When the classic ballparks were built, traffic jams and long delays were unheard of because most fans could walk or trolley to the ballpark. (Lowry, 1992, p. xiii). Quite logically, Comiskey Park, Fenway Park, and Ebbetts Field were all linked to the paths of the new trolley lines in their respective cities. (Lipsitz, 1984; Riess, 1980) In the early years of professional baseball, it was not uncommon for streetcar companies (traction firms) to own baseball fields and amusement parks so these facilities could be located near their routes. In fact, some companies supported sports franchises at a loss because of anticipated profits from the increased use of their streetcars. (Riess, 1980, p. 51)

So-called traction magnates either owned or had significant financial interests in early teams both in Atlanta and New York. (Riess, 1980, pp. 71,88,91,92) The naming of the Brooklyn ATrolley@ Dodgers was no accident. Furthermore, Turner Field has a mural of Ponce De Leon Park, a wooden baseball park with an eventual capacity of 8,000. Ponce De Leon Park was built in 1907, at a cost of \$60,000, for the Georgia Crackers by its team owner, the Georgia Railway and Electric Company. It was destroyed by fire in 1923. (Riess, 1980, p. 92) Apparently, Ted Turner appreciates the ingenuity shown by the early transportation barons with their support of professional baseball.

However, for the last five decades, fans have demanded auto access, causing problems in the 1980s for urban parks that are located amid decaying infrastructures. (Mullin, Hardy, & Sutton, 2000, p. 285) Therefore, convenient highway access has become a crucial component of the ballpark location decision.

Although Walter O=Malley, owner of the Dodgers, characterized the eventual location for Dodger Stadium in Chavez Ravine as Atwo hundred and ten taxable acres of hill ground that would be of interest only to goats,@ it was, in fact, a choice location near downtown and at the

intersection of three major freeways. (Lipsitz, 1984, pp. 8-9) During the Super Stadium era, ballparks were built in the suburbs surrounded by a sea of parking.

## DESIGN AMENITIES IN THE NEW BALLPARKS

The designs of the regenerated classic ballparks reflect the understanding that, while access is important, it is not the only consideration for fans attending games. The experience while at the ballpark was also of critical importance. Not only are these ballparks more inviting architecturally, they also incorporate many technological and entertainment amenities.

Examples abound of the efforts made in the design of the new ballparks to ensure a more entertaining and pleasurable experience for the fans --- and more revenue generated for the team. Concession stands in the concourse of Coors Field are laid out so that fans can walk completely around the stadium and never lose sight of the field. The Rangers Ballpark in Arlington has a 17,000 square-foot baseball museum and a children=s learning center, open year-round. Toronto=s Rogers Centre offers dinner views of the park, hotel rooms with views of the diamond, and a Hard Rock Cafe in right field. (Munsey & Suppes, 1997) Turner Field houses interactive games in Scout=s Alley to test fans= hitting and pitching skills as well as baseball trivia, electronic kiosks with touch screens and data banks with scouting reports on 300 past and present Braves, and a Braves Museum and Hall of Fame with more than 200 artifacts. Furthermore, Tooner Field is an indoor romper room for kids, with Cartoon Network characters, picnic tables and television monitors. (Lieber, 1997) Jacobs Field has many amenities including the Davey Tree Backyard Picnic Area beyond centerfield, the Miller Lite Patio Area, an Indians Team Store, Wahoo World where fans can challenge their Major League arm at the Speed Pitch Machine, swing for the fences at the virtual Home Run Derby or use the bats at the Bat Attack cage. (ballparksofbaseball.com)

Innovations in the design of ballparks make them multipurpose, as opposed to dual sport, facilities, because they have integrated the notion that a ballgame experience is part of a full entertainment package. This phase of ballpark evolution appears to be considering the fan experience as part of the design and development for the first time. Today=s ballparks have ATM machines, virtual shopping malls, amusement parks, museums, restaurant, and hotels. Interest from corporate sponsors and advertisers is not surprising given the virtual playgrounds that the regenerated classic ballparks have become. This marketing perspective led to selling ballpark naming rights to corporate sponsors who wanted to appeal to their customers. This trend has met with mixed success and is covered in the next section.

## BALLPARK NAMES

Table 2 identifies the various name changes for MLB's current ballparks. The trend of selling naming rights to generate revenue has caused several ballparks to change names more than once. BankOne bought the naming rights to the Arizona Diamondbacks ballpark for \$2.2 million per year through 2028. However, the park's name was changed to Chase Field in 2006 as a result of bank mergers. Naming rights for the ballpark built for the San Francisco Giants were sold to Pacific Bell for \$2.1 million per year through 2024. After the 2003 season, Pacific Bell Park was renamed SBC Park after SBC Communications Inc. acquired Pacific Bell. Then, in 2006, the ballpark was renamed once again after SBC Communications changed its name after being acquired by AT&T. Perhaps the most notorious name change is Enron Field built for the Houston Astros in 2000. After Enron's fall, the ballpark briefly reverted to Astros Field in 2001 before Coca Cola agreed to pay \$6 million per year through 2030 for the name Minute Maid Park. One example of a corporate ballpark name that has been maintained since the ballpark was built is Miller Park. Miller Brewing Company is paying \$2.1 million per year through

2020 for the naming rights for Milwaukee Brewers ballpark.<sup>1</sup> (www.ballparksofbaseball.com, 2007)

Problems associated with the lack of consistency and, as a result, fan confusion and annoyance, are a growing concern. In 2003, the Los Angeles Angels of Anaheim renamed its facility Angel Stadium after seven years as Edison International Field of Anaheim. (Sullivan, 2007) More recently, even though Ameriquest Mortgage Company bought the naming rights to the Texas Rangers ballpark in May 2004 for \$75 million over 30 years, the team recently negotiated its way out of the deal. In March 2007, the team announced that effective immediately, the ballpark will be called Rangers Ballpark in Arlington. "I feel great," Rangers owner Tom Hicks said. "We're getting our brand back. Based on our research with our fans, the prevailing feeling is that our ballpark is our biggest asset and we needed to have our brand on it." (Sullivan, 2007)

This development in the naming rights debate seems to validate the long-standing positions of detractors who adamantly argue that corporate names do not belong in sports--that the best stadium names involve a personality. Yankee Stadium is known as The House That Ruth Built. Shea Stadium inspires the memory of the attorney whose crusade returned National League baseball to New York after the Dodgers and Giants departed for California. (Anderson, 1997) Many feel that this is the way ballparks should be named c that the corporate world has no legitimate claim to being identified with ballparks.

The prospect of ballparks contributing to economic development, in conjunction with this recognition of the importance of the spectator experience to financial success, logically lead to the next step in the evolution of ballparks. The role of ballparks in economic development and the realization that a sport facility can contribute to mixed-use real estate development in general are addressed in the following sections.

## **BALLPARKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

Extensive studies prepared by teams, their consultants, and government agencies show that the economic development benefits enjoyed by cities that build new stadiums, or allow their construction, are in the millions annually. Stadiums are supposed to provide revitalization in downtown areas and spur development in more rural and suburban settings. Early examples of successful regenerated classic ballparks that are living up to these claims include the following:

- a. Oriole Park at Camden Yards, built in 1992, was financed by lotteries and a bond issue. Just a short walk from the waterfront, this facility is a classic addition to a game and a city that have a century-old relationship. Baltimore=s downtown renaissance continues with this facility. (Lowry, 1992, p. 21) The ballpark is nestled on the edge of downtown Baltimore. The Eutaw Street entrance is now a bustling place at the ballpark between the seating areas and the B&O Warehouse. It is a place where fans can enjoy ribs and barbeques, see plaques of great Oriole Hall of Famers, shop, and enjoy the sights and sounds of the ballpark. From Eutaw Street fans see a sea of green seats in

---

<sup>1</sup> When he bought the stadium from the Browns in 1953, Cardinals owner Gussie Busch wanted to name the park Budweiser Stadium, but changed the name to Busch Stadium, after his family, because of league pressure not to name a ballpark after a brand of beer. (Lowry, 1992, p. 231) Not to be outdone, Busch then proceeded to have the brewery introduce a new product, Busch Beer. (Lipsitz, 1984, p. 4) Interestingly, Miller Park, built for the Milwaukee Brewers in 2001, generated no such criticism.

the main grandstand. Large open-air concourses allow people to easily move around Camden Yards. ([www.ballparksofbaseball.com](http://www.ballparksofbaseball.com), 2007)

- b. Jacobs Field was built in 1994 in the middle of downtown Cleveland. It was financed with a combination of public and private support, including a 15-year county sin tax, tax-exempt bonds and prepaid leasing on luxury boxes. The name was sold to the Indians owner Richard E. Jacobs. (Munsey & Suppes, 1997) It was built as part of an urban renewal project that also includes Quicken Loans Arena (NBA), parking garages and landscaped plazas. Jacobs Field was built so it would blend in with downtown Cleveland; from its exposed steel design, that matches many bridges on the North coast and the vertical light towers, that match the smoke stacks of Cleveland's industrial zone and the high-rise office buildings in downtown Cleveland. ([www.ballparksofbaseball.com](http://www.ballparksofbaseball.com), 2007)
- c. Coors Field, built in 1995, has spurred what is billed as a remarkable transformation of the once derelict neighborhood that it occupies. It created a new historic district believed to have the potential to rival lower downtown. The area attracted developers who have worked in lower downtown (LoDo) and were looking for a district with similar potential. (Steers, 1995) Coors Field combines the nostalgic feel of a 1920s urban ballpark with 21st century technology and conveniences. To prevent the ballpark from being imposing on nearby neighborhood buildings, the field is located 21 feet below street level. Its old-fashioned brick facade allows the ballpark to blend into downtown Denver. ([www.ballparksofbaseball.com](http://www.ballparksofbaseball.com), 2007) Even detractors of the belief that sports stadia may spur economic development acknowledge the success of Coors Field. As Jon Talton (2006) of the Arizona Republic states ".....Coors Field became the centerpiece of the reclamation of what had been the city's skid row. Now, downtown Denver is booming, and all four of its big-league teams play downtown.

Disagreement and dissent regarding whether new stadiums actually achieve economic development goals is not new. (Schlossberg, 1996, pp. 173-4) George Lipsitz was an early critic of promises that widely dispersed benefits are associated with using public money for private profit-making MLB ventures. He concluded that stadium backers often claim their projects will bring revenues into a city, but such claims usually amount to no more than public relations attempts to attract tax dollars. (Lipsitz, 1984, p. 15) However, he did allow that the St. Louis tax abatement for Busch Stadium did revitalize part of the downtown area and, in Los Angeles, modest grants of land and capital helped create the tax generating property, Dodger Stadium. (Lipsitz, 1984, p. 12)

More recently Mark Rosentraub has said that pro sports teams are hoodwinking local governments into handing over tens of millions of dollars to get each new stadium built. Team owners inflate the economic importance of sports, underestimate the costs of their projects, and play on voters' emotional ties to favorite teams. (Leonhardt, 1997) Roger Noll, a Stanford University economist who is one of the top experts on the economics of baseball and other professional sports, almost always counsels cities to not build stadiums for the purpose of attracting sports franchises. He argues that, as job and business creators, stadiums are poor civic investments being vastly oversold by politicians. It is his contention that large stadiums should be viewed as consumption, not investment. According to Noll's estimates, stadiums can expect to lose \$20 to \$75 million a year. (Jacobson, 1996)

One economic rationale behind taxpayer funding of stadiums is that the public investment will spur economic growth and create jobs. Although stadiums alone do generate some investment in a community and employment, the bulk of the jobs are seasonal and low paying. Furthermore, the money fans spend on pro sports is mostly discretionary entertainment



spending, which would take place even if the teams were not around. (McGraw, 1996) John Dyson, New York's deputy mayor for finance and economic development, notes that the typical funding structure has been to get 80 percent from the public and 20 percent from the team; he thinks those numbers should be reversed. (McGraw, 1996)

With government entities becoming increasingly hesitant to fund sports facilities, the role of corporate America is likely to expand. Naming rights have not delivered the boost necessary for long-term success. Recent growth in mixed-use developments seems much more promising. Rather than simply relying on general market forces to encourage suburban development or urban renewal to follow a newly built stadium, a more organized, structured approach is necessary.

## **THE ROLE OF MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENTS IN BASEBALL AND BEYOND**

Developers and city officials are banking on new sports venues that are supported by the economic engines of mixed-use projects. It is now understood that sports and entertainment districts where people also live demand more than an impressive stadium. As the President of Nationwide Realty Investors said, "You can't plunk a sports facility down and it magically fixes an area. The sports facility has to be paired with other economic generators to work." (Game Day..., 2005)

With the decision to incorporate the team name into the stadium name, representatives of the Texas Rangers recognized that the change was made in time for major developments coming to the neighborhood. The Dallas Cowboys are building a new stadium just southwest of Rangers Ballpark, which is expected to open in 2009. Glorypark, a major retail and residential development between the two facilities, is also on the way, as well as major improvements to the surrounding highway and street infrastructure. (Sullivan, 2007) Other mixed-use developments associated with baseball parks, which are either being planned or are underway, include the following:

- a.       New Fenway Park for the Boston Red Sox: A Boston developer has been talking with local community groups about a possible mixed-use development project which includes a 200-room hotel, an apartment complex, and up to 70,000 square feet of retail space which would be situated at one end of the proposed ballpark. At the other end of the ballpark, city officials have been looking at development ideas for the five acres that would remain after Fenway Park is demolished. One idea includes a new hotel, retail space, restaurants, and office and research space. (Vaillancourt, 2000)
- b.       Busch Stadium for the St. Louis Cardinals: The Cardinals organization has hired a developer for the new "Ballpark Village," a \$300 million, mixed-use development which promises restaurants, entertainment venues, residential units and office spaces, all with a "unique flavor that is strictly St. Louis." (Norris, 2005)
- c.       Nationals Park for the Washington Nationals: The D.C. Sports Entertainment Commission is planning for a mixed-use development with condominiums, retail, and underground parking to accompany Nationals Park which is already under construction. (Neibauer, 2006)
- d.       Cisco Field for the Oakland Athletics: The owner of the Oakland A's, Lew Wolff, wants a new \$500 million, 35,000-seat ballpark for his team. He also wants to build 2,900 housing units, mostly townhomes, near the park and add a tony shopping district to the mix. Under his plan, profits from selling the housing and retail space will help cover the cost of the ballpark. (Young, 2007)

Confidence in the potential success of this trend extends not only beyond baseball, but also beyond professional sports, and even beyond the United States. Selected examples include:

- a. Wembley Stadium in North London, England: The stadium itself will contain 90,000 seats and, in terms of space, will be the largest stadium in the world. The neighboring mixed-use development contains 19 blocks in total, including 678,000 square feet of office space and 3700 homes. ([www.skyscrapernews.com](http://www.skyscrapernews.com), 2001)
- b. Arsenal's Stadium Development in London, England: Arsenal FC's decision to build a new stadium at Ashburton Grove has been a catalyst for a larger redevelopment plan that includes housing and community projects. ([www.londonmet.ac.uk](http://www.londonmet.ac.uk), 2007)
- c. Stadium for D.C. United in Washington, D.C.: A San Francisco real estate developer, a former Duke basketball star, and at least two other investors have partnered to purchase D.C. United's operating rights, build the team's stadium in Anacostia, and develop the land around it. The group is more interested in the proposed 27,000-seat soccer stadium and the mixed-use development that would surround it than it is in the team, according to unnamed sources. (Goff and Nakamura, 2007)
- d. American Airlines Center in Dallas, Texas: When Ross Perot, Jr. bought the Dallas Mavericks, he persuaded city leaders to help finance a new arena on some of the 60 acres of blighted land he had amassed on the edge of downtown. What was different about this deal was that Perot's idea involved an urban district built from scratch with the American Airlines Center as its hub. The plan includes 850 apartments and condominiums with a total of 12 million square feet of office, hotel, residential and retail space. (Herrick, 2006)
- e. Engelstad Arena in Grand Forks, North Dakota: The Bronson Property, on which the Ralph Engelstad (hockey) and Betty Engelstad (basketball) Arenas sit, continues to be developed on the University of North Dakota campus. Additions include a student Wellness Center, a townhouse complex, retail shops, a restaurant, a bank, and a gas station. (Widdel, 2004)
- f. The Renaissance Center in Fargo, North Dakota: The Renaissance Center is a multiuse arena and events center proposed for downtown Fargo, ND. The public portion of the facility would cost \$40 million, while Cityscapes Development would build a \$60 million privately funded office, retail, and condominium project on the same block. (*Renaissance Center*, 2005)
- g. The Ultimate Sports Resort in Las Vegas, Nevada: This \$5 billion project covering 17 million square feet promised to be the total sports experience. It will include 10 sports venues, a casino, a hotel, and 500 luxury condominiums. (*Ultimate Sports Entertainment*, 2007)

## CONCLUSION

Baseball has played a substantive role in the cultural history of the United States. Its rich history has taken a backseat to criticism in the last few years of players, owners, and MLB in general. This criticism has centered on an apparent preoccupation with financial matters. From its inception, professional baseball was not dominated by benevolent entrepreneurs, but, instead, was ruled by men deeply involved in urban politics, often with close ties to the big city political machines. Perhaps they were baseball fans, but their primary concern was making a profit. (Riess, 1980, p. 49) The difference seems to lie in the fact that their machinations took place in smoke filled rooms rather than in public forums. Today's team owners have been quite vocal about needing concessions from cities, including new ballparks, or they will leave, relocating in the city with the highest bid.

Fans have lost much of their strong affinity for the hometown team. The sterile atmosphere created by the super stadiums did not help. Distance from players is both emotional and physical. The construction of regenerated classic ballparks has helped create a connection between teams and their fans that had been missing. New designs bring fans closer to the field while also offering additional amenities that should attract young fans who have been lured away by other sporting and entertainment options. The facilities of the super stadium era, designed and financed primarily by team owners and municipal governments, appear to have failed miserably. Furthermore, selling naming rights to corporate sponsors has not contributed as much financially as had been hoped. Plus, this trend appears to have created problems with team branding strategies. Commitment to mixed-use developments seems to be a very positive step. However, patchwork landholdings and planning restrictions make development difficult. Therefore, more cities are experimenting with stadium-anchored urban districts built from the ground up. (Herrick, 2006) This requires the cooperation of all parties involved, including team owners, architects, real estate developers, and city planners.

## REFERENCES

Anderson, Dave. "What=s in a Name? Mostly Money," *Grand Forks Herald* (April 3, 1997), 3D.

*Arsenal's Stadium Development*, <http://www.londonmet.ac.uk/services/london-office/local-issues/>, January 16, 2007.

"Game Day—Sports Venues, Mixed-Use Development: Home Run or Foul Ball?" *Commercial Property News*, 19:17 (October 2005), 36.

Goff, Steven and David Nakamura. *United Sold; New Focus on Stadium*, [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/01/05/AR20701050075\\_pf.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/01/05/AR20701050075_pf.html), 1/05/07.

Herrick, Thaddeus. *Cities Construct Sports Arenas With Neighborhoods to Match*, <http://www.realestatejournal.com/propertyroport/newsandtrends>, October 17, 2006.

<http://www.atlantabraves.com/web/ballpark/turner.field.html>.

<http://www.ballparksofbaseball.com>, (2001-2007).

<http://www.baseballballparks.com>.

HHHMetrodome. <http://www.msfc.com>.

Jacobson, Louis. "Economist Takes Us Into the Ball Game," *National Journal* (May 18, 1996), 1109.

Leonhardt, David. "Are Pro Sports Conning Our Cities?" *Business Week* (March 3, 1997), 13.

Lieber, Jill. "Braves Bank on Future," *USA Today* (April 3, 1997), 3C.

Lipsitz, G. "Sports Stadia and Urban Development: A Tale of Three Cities," *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 8 (Summer/Fall 1984), 1-18.

Lowry, Philip J. *Green Cathedrals: the Ultimate Celebration of All 271 Major League and Negro League Ballparks Past and Present*, (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1992).

McGraw, Dan. "Playing the Stadium Game," *U. S. News & World Report*, 120:22 (June 3, 1996), 46-51.

Mullin, Bernard J., Stephen Hardy and William A. Sutton. *Sport Marketing*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, (Champaign, IL: Human Kenetics, 2000).

Munsey, Paul and Cory Suppes. *Ballparks*, (1997-2007) @ <http://www.ballparks.com>.

Neibauer, Michael. *Nationals' Stadium a Work in Progress*, <http://www.examiner.com>.

- Nelson, Susan Logan. *From The House that Ruth Built to the House that Ted Built*, The annual national conference of the American Real Estate Society, Sarasota, FL, April 1997.
- Norris, Stephen. 'Ballpark Village' Developer Hired, <http://stlouis.cardinal.mlb.com>.
- Olson, Rochelle. "Lawmakers Talk Twins Stadium on Opening Day," *Grand Forks Herald* (April 2, 1997), 5A.
- Renaissance Center Q&A, *The Fargo Forum*, May 1, 2005.
- Riess, S. A. *Touching Base: Professional Baseball and American Culture in the Progressive Era*, (Westport , CT: Greenwood Press, 1980).
- Schlossberg, Howard. *Sports Marketing*, (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc., 1996).
- Steers, Stuart. Builders Hit Homers in Ballpark District,@ *Denver Business Journal*, 46:36 (May 19, 1995), 4A.
- Stern, L. W. and F. D. Sturdivant. Customer-Driven Distribution Systems,@ *Harvard Business Review*, 87 (July/August 1987), 34-41.
- Sullivan, T.R. *It's now Rangers Ballpark in Arlington: Team works out deal with Ameritrust to get its 'brand back'*, [www.MLB.com](http://www.MLB.com), 03/19/2007.
- Talton, Jon. *Cities see empty promise of arenas*, [www.azcentral.com/business/columns/articles/1128biz-talton1128new.html](http://www.azcentral.com/business/columns/articles/1128biz-talton1128new.html), 11/28/06.
- Ultimate Sports Entertainment Project Summary and Project Components*, <http://www.ultimatesportsresort.com/summary.html>, 2007.
- Vaillancourt, Meg. *Ballpark Plan Spurs Ideas for Development*. [http://www.boston.com/news/packages/fenway/ballpark\\_plans\\_011300.htm](http://www.boston.com/news/packages/fenway/ballpark_plans_011300.htm), 01/13/00.
- Wembley, <http://skyscrapernews.com/news.php?ref=163>, 11/01/2003.
- Widdel, Shawna, *Bronson continues Rapid Growth*, <http://media.www.dakotastudent.com>, August 27, 2004.
- Young, Eric. "A's Stadium Plan Calls for Massive Development." *San Francisco Business Times*. (February 2, 2007)