



Number 15

December 1986

---

— Special Bidding Finances Issue —

---

**ARTICLES**

- 2 History of the Boston in '89 Bid
- 8 Boston in '89 Bid Finances
- 8 St. Louis in '88 Bid Finances. *by Rich Zellich*
- 11 New Orleans in '88 Bid Finances
- 11 Cincinnati in '88 Bid Finances. *by Robert L. Hillis*
- 12 Bermuda Triangle in '88 Bid Finances. *by Neil Rest*
- 12 Comparison of Bid Finances
- 14 Where Do We Go From Here?

**COMMITTEE CHRONICLE**

- 15 APA:89 / October 8  
*Items with Long Lead Times, Committee Organization*

**LETTERS**

- 18 *Worldcon bids*
- 19 *Noreascon 3 Planning*
- 20 *ConFederation*
- 22 *The Mad 3 Party, Fan Hugos, and Corrections*

---

*The Mad 3 Party* — more than you ever wanted to know about running a Worldcon — is published by Noreascon 3, Box 46, MIT Branch PO, Cambridge MA 02139. Editor and source of all uncredited writing: Leslie Turek. Meeting summaries from minutes written by Jim Mann. Copying by Al Kent. Logo by Wendy Snow-Lang.

The subscription price is \$1 per issue or \$6 per year (6 issues). The regular subscription price covers surface shipment outside North America; if air mail is desired, please add \$1 per issue. Free copies go to newszines, Worldcon bids and committees, the committee and staff of Noreascon 3, and significant contributors.

Upcoming deadlines are January 15 (for the February issue) and March 15 (for the April issue). The February issue will feature a report on Smofcon 3.

Copyright © 1986 by Massachusetts Convention Fandom, Inc. (MCFI); all rights revert to the authors/artists. "Noreascon" is a service mark of MCFI. "Boskone" is a service mark of the New England Science Fiction Association, Inc. "Worldcon", "World Science Fiction Convention", "WSFS", "World Science Fiction Society", "Hugo Award", and "NASFiC" are service marks of the World Science Fiction Society.

We are pleased to announce the Professional Guests of Honor for Noreascon 3:

**Ian and Betty Ballantine  
Andre Norton**

Information about our Pro and Fan Guests of Honor will be included in Progress Report 1, which is scheduled to be mailed out in January. I might take this occasion to remind you that the Attending Membership rates will be going up on Feb. 15, so those of you who haven't joined or converted yet might consider doing so. The current rates are \$40 for new Attending Memberships, \$20 for new Supporting Memberships, and \$15 for voter conversion to Attending Membership.

In this issue of *The Mad 3 Party*, we are featuring a series of articles on bid finances. We are extremely pleased to have the cooperation of all of the 1988 bidders, who were willing to share their bid financial statements and their thoughts about bidding with us. Since Boston was unopposed in the '89 race, we felt that seeing the '88 bidders' figures would be essential to get a full understanding of the high cost of bidding. And they certainly were an eye-opener. My personal thanks to Rich Zellich, Bob Hillis, Neil Rest, and the members of the Nolacon committee who assisted with this project.

From APA:89 this time, we've extracted fairly lengthy segments from a discussion on committee organization. This is something that needs to be decided early, and which will have a big influence on how smoothly the convention runs. I thought it might be interesting to focus on one topic to show how we use the apa to air views and try to arrive at a consensus. I also invite those of you who might be working on Noreascon 3 to send your comments on these proposals. That's what this zine is for.

With the help of Sharon Sbarsky, we have merged *The Mad 3 Party* mailing list with the general Noreascon 3 membership list. (That's how we discovered how many of our subscribers are not yet members!) This has many good points and one potential problem. The problem is that some of you gave us different addresses for your convention membership and for *The Mad 3 Party*. We have merged the two addresses into one — usually the one your membership was under. If this is a problem for anyone, please let us know and we will fix it. The good news is that if you send in a change of address, it will automatically be applied to both lists. It also means that now we have these nice computer-printed labels with these new spiffy semi-secret codes. The letter code on your label is the reason you are receiving *The Mad 3 Party*, and is selected from the following list:

- A Art contributor
- C Convention committee, agent, etc.
- G Guest of convention
- L Letter or article contributor
- M MCFI member
- O Overseas subscriber — paid air mail rate
- P Potential convention staff
- S Subscriber
- W Worldcon committee or bid
- X Second name on single subscription
- Z Club or news zine

The number on the label, if any, indicates the last issue you will receive unless you renew or contribute.

Finally, I would like to apologize for the short interval between the last issue's mailing date and the deadline for the this issue. Although last issue's text was completed in early October, actual publication was delayed by various problems until early November. Since we are trying to publish this zine at two-month intervals, there isn't much time between finishing one issue and starting the next one, even when they do come out on time. And when one issue is late, then the time interval is even shorter. We hope that the short turnaround time doesn't discourage anyone from writing. I plan to start listing the deadlines for the next two issues as a reminder that if a letter doesn't make one issue, it can always be printed in the following one.

— LT

## History of the Boston in '89 Bid

### First References (1978)

The first recorded references to a Worldcon in Boston in 1989 appear to have been made at Boston in 1980 bid committee meetings. On February 24, 1978:

*Jim Hudson: When do we start publicity for 1989?  
(Hilarity.)*

and on May 11, 1978:

*Don Eastlake: Bill Bowman of the Sheraton said  
Hynes expansion won't happen while we're alive  
(Jim: But we'll need it for 1989!)*

### Post-Noreascon Two Doldrums (1981-1982)

After Noreascon Two, in 1980, we may have had vague ideas about bidding at some future date, but most of the Noreascon Two principals were just too tired to even think about it. The only concrete plans anyone made, and these weren't very concrete, were to get pencilled into the 1989 and 1998 books of the Hynes Auditorium and Sheraton-Boston Hotel, "just in case". MCFI continued as an organization, but we weren't highly active, and only held quarterly meetings.

Activities during this period included refunds to helpers and program participants of Noreascon Two; negotiating a final settlement with our decorating company, Exhibit Aids; getting our final financial report into shape; and running helper parties at Denvention and Chicon. We also cherished fond hopes of publishing a post-con report, but nobody had the energy to get much done on it.

Treasurer Jill Eastlake resigned in April, 1981, to be replaced by Linda Kent. Leslie Turek and George Flynn stayed on as Chairman and Secretary, respectively, until the fall of 1982. In October, 1982, we elected a new slate of officers that were understood to be interim officers not responsible for any future bid. They were Chairman Tony Lewis, Secretary Mark Olson, and Treasurer Linda Kent.

### Deciding to Bid (Early 1983)

In early 1983, some green T-shirts were produced by a member of the committee. They had the slogan, *Noreascon n in 1962 + 9n*, implying the sequence 1971, 1980, 1989, . . . . There was some tension at this point, as a number of us felt that this was essentially an announcement of intention to bid, and we felt that such an announcement should not be made until the group as a whole consciously made that decision. We also felt it was unfair to the other groups that might be considering a bid for us to semi-bid. We should either declare ourselves or withdraw decisively.

[There is an amusing sidelight to the "formula" T-shirts. Someone else noticed another formula that fit the two data points (1971 and 1980). It was  $1968 + 3n^2$ , which led to the progression 1971, 1980, 1995, 2016 . . . ! Buttons with the alternate formula appeared. The most recent twist was seen at ConFederation: a button with the slogan "Keep Noreascon linear!" ]

Around the same time, Mark Olson brought up the bidding question in the committee ap. He pointed out that a New York bid had already announced for '89, and we might expect that the losers in the '86 race would choose to bid again for '89. Thus it would be to our advantage to let our bid be known soon. We should start thinking about our organization and what type of bid we want to run. Another question facing us is whether to use our Noreascon Two profits toward bidding. Mark described a number of reasons why this might not be a good thing, including the fact that it might well be improper under the WSFS Constitution requirement to use Worldcon profits for the good of WSFS as a whole.

Jill Eastlake led an effort to send out a questionnaire to MCFI members and others to determine the level of interest in an '89 Worldcon bid. The results of the questionnaire were presented at the March '83 meeting and showed an overwhelming sentiment for bidding for '89.

There never was a formal motion to bid for the '89 Worldcon. The actual motion passed at the March '83 meeting was to form a committee to place an ad in ConStellation's Progress Report Three. But we all knew what that meant. The motion passed 14-1 (with George Flynn, "the lone voice of sanity," voting against). Rick Katze pointed out that the decision had taken 4 minutes and 56 seconds of debate.

### Policy Decisions (Spring 1983)

At the March meeting, a committee was appointed to look into questions of bid structure and financing. We also renamed the committee ap. to APA:89, and kicked around some bidding themes. The idea of Tea and Tea Parties (in reference to the Boston Tea Party) was suggested, and Suford Lewis proposed the line "Still Crazy After All These Years." George pointed out that we had 4 years and 5 months to go until the site-selection vote.

(This was before the 3-year lead time had been established.)

The structure committee prepared a comprehensive report for the April meeting. They recommended that we remain a single group with full authority over all aspects of MCFI's business, including Noreascon Two affairs as well as the '89 bid, but that we carefully separate the funds and not use Noreascon Two profits for the bid. They suggested that we use the same method of committee assessments as we did for the Boston in '80 bid: Assessments were charged equally to all committee members, payable quarterly, and were intended to be refunded if we won the bid. New members joining the committee would be asked to match what current members had already contributed. The structure committee recommended an initial rate of \$10 per quarter.

The report also addressed committee membership policies. Our experience with Noreascon Two indicated that a committee can become unwieldy with much more than a couple of dozen members. On the other hand, there were many people in the local area who had gotten active in fandom, or moved to the area, since Noreascon Two. The report recommended that the committee should never be completely closed to new members, but the addition of new members should be gradual, in order to assure continuity.

Some thought was given to membership criteria. They included:

- demonstrated ability to take responsibility
- willingness to make a substantial commitment
- availability
- compatibility with the existing committee
- and, finally, an appropriate degree of insanity

The report recognized that, due to size constraints, not everyone who had expressed an interest could become a member of MCFI. It suggested that we consider dropping old members who had not attended a meeting for 6 months, to make more room for newcomers. (This was adopted with a time interval of 18 months, and 15 old members were eventually dropped due to this provision.)

(It is interesting to note that, of our current officers and appointees, both our Secretary, Jim Mann, and our Pre-Registration person, Sharon Sbarsky, two of the hardest-working people on the committee, were both admitted to the committee after this decision to open membership was made.)

The report further suggested that we think about whether we wanted to have pre-supporters, and perhaps a new category for people with a high level of interest that we had not accepted as members. Finally, they recommended that we change the title of the office of Chairman to President, until such time as we were ready to select our actual convention Chairman.

At the April 20 meeting, this report was presented and accepted essentially unanimously. The requirement that we segregate bidding funds from Noreascon Two profits was adopted in the form of an amendment to our bylaws.

There was a discussion of categories of supporters. We finally decided to have the usual category of pre-supporter, available to anyone for a payment of \$3. It was agreed that pre-supporters would get something nice done

for them, but perhaps not lower convention membership rates. (Both Leslie and George spoke strongly about all the problems the special pre-supporter membership rates had caused for Noreascon Two.) And, in spite of some of the confusion it caused, we decided we would continue to offer "pre-opposing" memberships.

We also decided to have a new category called "Friend of Boston in 1989." This was a category for people who strongly supported us and wanted to be identified with us, and whom we also trusted to represent us throughout fandom. Although it involved the payment of dues (\$12/year or \$19.89 for two years), Friends also had to be approved by the committee. In the early years we built up a large number of local Friends, from local supporters who were not actual committee members for one reason or another. It wasn't until the last year of the bid that, motivated by Mark, we really went out and made an effort to recruit Friends from across the country. In retrospect, we really should have done that earlier.

In spite of the confusion, though, having Friends really worked out well. Many of them contributed a lot to the bid, both in terms of moral and financial support, and also in holding bid parties for us at conventions that we weren't able to get to.

Around this time, Laurie Mann suggested that we expand the tea party theme from the Boston tea party to include the Mad Tea Party from *Alice in Wonderland*. George then suggested *The Mad 3 Party* as the name for our bidzine, which Laurie volunteered to edit. (She was later succeeded by Pat Vandenberg, who produced it for most of the bidding period.) We also started to think about bidding parties.

### New Projects (Summer-Fall 1983)

During the summer of 1983, we started to hold bidding parties. Ten-pound chocolate bars made their first appearances at Disclave and Westercon, and we started to think about a small party at ConStellation.

We continued to disburse Noreascon Two profits separately from the bidding, giving grants to Spider and Jeanne Robinson to enable them to attend ConStellation, and providing partial funding for the ConStellation harbor boat trips.

We arranged to print flyers and stickers, and set the price and schedule for *The Mad 3 Party*. We decided to start work on registering "Noreascon" as a service mark.

At Constellation, we introduced *The Mad 3 Party* and collected 70 pre-supporters. And we encountered the beginnings of three major new projects.

First, the Austin people who had just been awarded the 1985 NASFiC asked us if we might be willing to run their Art Show for them. We settled on a 4-person group, familiarly known as "The Gang of Four," to run it under the auspices of MCFI.

Second, Jill Eastlake and Sharon Sbarsky came up with the idea of doing a group costume for next year's L.A.con II, to help kick off the bid with a bang.

And finally, there was the ConStellation deficit. We put together a committee to work with the ConStellation folks to try to figure out how the situation could be salvaged. In the end, we contributed \$10,000 of our remaining Noreascon Two profits, and helped to convince other

groups to pitch in and help out.

All of these activities took a major chunk of our energies for the next year or two.

At the same time, it was becoming clear to a number of us that we had to have a better plan for bidding — that we couldn't just go on just having parties and printing flyers as the spirit moved us. We needed to think about just how much this bid was going to cost and how we were going to pay for it.

### **The Party Debate (Winter 1983 - Spring 1984)**

Having a plan was easier said than done, especially since we were only meeting quarterly at this point and spending a lot of time on the projects mentioned above. In addition, we started to think seriously about getting the Noreascon Two Memory Book published. We had been holding on to about \$10,000 of Noreascon Two profits for that purpose, but it seemed that if we didn't get it published soon, there was no point in continuing to reserve the funds. Suford Lewis agreed to take a shot at getting the book produced.

A committee was appointed to develop a bid strategy. A number of things were agreed to, pretty much unanimously. If the 3-year bidding lead time proposal were to pass at L.A.con and Aussiecon, then we would be voted on at the '86 Worldcon, which had a good chance of being in Atlanta. If that were the case, we should try to target more southern conventions.

We decided to produce a bid T-shirt by L.A.con, and to set a low price to get wide distribution. In general, L.A.con was seen as the place that we should kick off the bid with the group costume, a big party, T-shirts, etc.

When Boskone rolled around in February of 1984, we were still a bit disorganized. Because everyone had commitments to work on the con, we did not try to hold a bid party. And we found that we did not have very good procedures of collecting and keeping track of pre-supporting memberships. A party at Lunacon in March also had problems, as we were put on a quiet floor of the hotel. There was also a memorable attempt at making guacamole that involved an avocado and a blender and ended up with a bathroom decorated in avocado green. (The phrase "never again" was heard frequently after that episode.)

By the March MCFI meeting, it was obvious that it was time to get it together. The bid strategy committee was asked to work out a detailed bidding plan, including a bid budget. And since one of the main expenses of most bids is the party budget, there was some philosophical discussion of the role of parties in the Boston '89 bid. It was pointed out that although parties are expensive, they are expected. Although they are supposedly held to get people familiar with the bid, most people coming to the parties don't really want to talk about the bid. They do generate good will for the bid, however. And we were in an awkward position. Because of our strong lead, based on Noreascon Two's reputation, we were afraid that if we did not run a traditional bid, with parties, we would be perceived as arrogant and acting as if we had the bid sewed up. The consensus was that we had no alternative but to hold parties, but that we should try to keep them unextravagant (under \$100 for the typical non-Worldcon

party).

The strategy committee took these ideas and put a party policy in writing. It stated that the goals of our parties would be to inform people about site-selection voting, present our committee, establish a continued presence, and establish an easily-recognized identity (theme) for the bid. We would not attempt to provide alcohol or lots of food. We would kick off the "Alice" concept at L.A.con, and the committee then recommended a list of 30 conventions to target for parties over the 2-year expected bidding period. This included all Worldcons and NASFiCs and major regionals, and attempted an even distribution geographically and by time of year. There was a second list of conventions that it would be nice to have parties at, but which we didn't feel we could afford. The party policy statement then went on to give specific suggestions for what should be purchased for each party, how they should be set up, etc. It also recommended that we should try to get to conventions that we don't normally attend, but that we could also try to draw on our Friends to hold parties for us at conventions that we couldn't get to.

### **Facing Up to the Budget (Summer 1984)**

Now that we had a bid strategy, the time had come to figure out how much it would cost. Independently, Leslie Turek and Jim Hudson had drawn up estimated bid budgets based on the strategy developed. The main point that they made was that parties nearly doubled the total cost of the bid and would not be covered by the current level of committee assessments. Another point made was that we really should have a budget to ensure that we wouldn't run out of money at the climax of the bid, and also to ensure that our spending would be allocated among the various items with the right relative priorities.

Although no one item in the budget seemed high, people were generally shocked by how much it added up to. There was much discussion of what really influences voters and what areas we should emphasize. Shortly after this meeting, Mark Olson did his own more elaborate version of a possible budget, giving three levels of spending for each item — low, medium, and high. Mark's budget, with modifications, eventually evolved into our actual bid budget.

In addition to this long-term budget process, we also decided to set up a separate short-term interim budget that would take us through L.A.con. The short-term budget totalled about \$1000 for such things as the L.A.con party, advertising in upcoming L.A.con and Aussiecon publications, flyers, buttons, stickers, an issue of *The Mad 3 Party*, and a \$250 costume subsidy.

### **L.A.con II and the Masquerade (Labor Day 1984)**

L.A.con II saw the major kickoff of our bidding campaign. We held two parties—one on Thursday night and one on Sunday night. We had planned for the Thursday night party to be a small one, but had underestimated how many fans are really at the Worldcon by then, and ran out of supplies early. Then we overbought for Sunday. So it goes. We did not rent a suite for the parties. Instead, we just made sure that all the committee rooms were blocked together so that we could open a number of rooms each night to hold the party in. Although more of a nuisance for the room's occupants, this was a lot cheaper

than paying for a suite.

We took in 120 pre-supporting memberships at the parties, and completely sold out our 10-dozen initial order of green Cheshire Cat T-shirts.

Our biggest success at L.A.con II was the appearance of the "Alice" group costume in the Masquerade. Work on the costumes and presentation had been in progress for seven months. There were weekly sewing sessions, a recording session, and then weekly rehearsals, with the group drilling over and over to get the physical movements to smoothly match the pre-recorded voices introducing each costume. Next there were the problems of packing and shipping the costumes, and of rehearsing again at L.A.con to adjust for the size of the stage. Finally there were the hours of applying makeup and dressing, and then waiting backstage until it was time to go on.

Because it was such a large group, we were able to get permission to extend the standard presentation limit of 90 seconds to 3 minutes. (We actually ended up taking only slightly over 2 minutes, but because there was so much activity on stage, most observers thought it was much shorter than that.) The presentation began with the Caterpillar and the Cheshire Cat alone on stage talking about rumors of a party. One by one, the rest of the characters entered, each with their own comment about the party, leading up to the White Rabbit and Alice. Finally the four cards marched onstage to lead the group to the party, and as they turned, the audience found that their backs read "Boston in 1989." The roar of laughter and applause that greeted this drowned out the rest of the dialogue as the characters all happily trooped off to the party. The costume won a "Best Bid" award at the Masquerade. Some of the characters also appeared in costume at the Sunday night party, while the cards served as wall hangings.

#### **Establishing a Budget (Fall 1984)**

Returning from L.A.con, we finally buckled down and voted in a bid budget. Now that the 3-year-lead-time amendment had actually passed, we knew how many years we had to plan for. We went over Mark's budget proposal line by line, item by item in great detail, discussing such things as how many flyers to print and what size ads we should place in each Worldcon publication up through ConFederation. It was a *long* meeting.

The budget we arrived at was remarkably close to our final spending total, as given in the following article. The party budget was set to \$2900, for 23 small parties at \$60, 6 medium parties at \$100, and 6 large parties at \$150. (The party budget was later increased to allow for a suite at ConFederation. This was just before ConFederation, when it was clear that our pre-supporting income was greater than the estimates we made back in 1984.) Our ad budget was aimed mostly at Worldcon and NASFiC publications, gradually increasing from small 1/2-page ads to 3 pages in ConFederation Progress Report 4. We planned to print 11,000 flyers each year: a 2-page flyer the first year and a 4-page flyer the second year. We also allotted \$250 to make a videotape of the "Alice" characters touring Boston and visiting our facilities (see below).

To finance the new budget, the committee assessment was raised to \$18.50 per quarter.

At the October meeting, new interim officers were elected: President Rick Katze, Treasurer Al Kent, and Secretary Sue Hammond.

#### **The Videotape (Fall 1984)**

James Turner had the idea of producing a bid videotape using some of the costumes made for the L.A.con Masquerade. James, Sue Lichauco (playing Alice), and Sue Hammond (playing the White Rabbit) spent a long day filming at various sites in Boston. The story showed the characters landing at Logan Airport, getting on the "T" at Wonderland Station (which really exists — it's on the Blue Line), and then visiting such locations as the Aquarium, the Boston Tea Party ship, Quincy Market, MIT, and the banks of the Charles River. They then toured the Sheraton-Boston and Marriott Hotels and interviewed some of the hotel staff.

Some of the filming took longer than one might expect due to the reactions of the people around them at seeing Alice and the White Rabbit come skipping by. The greatest problem was encountered with the hordes of school children at the Aquarium, who persisted in trying to pull the rabbit's tail. Other sites were very hospitable, with the Tea Party ship allowing them free admission and letting them pose as if they were throwing a crate of tea over the side. At the end of the long day, tired and thirsty, they ended up at the Sheraton's lobby bar, where the pianist serenaded them with the "Bunny Hop."

Due to James' access to borrowed equipment, the videotape turned out to cost much less than had been budgeted for it. However, the many environments he filmed in meant that the technical quality of the first cut was rather poor. James made a second pass which improved it greatly, but we ultimately decided not to invest additional work. The main problem was that there really wasn't a very good place to show it. We had planned two places: con video programs (by mailing a cassette and asking them to show it), and our own bid parties (by bringing a VCR and cassette). We discovered that (1) people who watch video aren't voters for the most part, (2) they resent advertising (thus, if it weren't for (1), we'd have *hurt* ourselves), (3) it's a real pain to get cassettes to and from cons, and (4) it's even more of a pain to bring a VCR to a party and to have a TV blaring in the background of a bid party (and if it didn't blare, it was ignored).

#### **Use of Surplus Funds (Winter 1984)**

Shortly after L.A.con, rumors were circulating around fandom about the size of the L.A.con profits and the use of some of those profits for the benefit of LASFS. Noreascon Two had felt that expenditures of this sort were prohibited by the WSFS Constitution and resolutions of the WSFS Business Meeting, and some people felt resentment that we were being so scrupulous while other groups appeared not to be. However, they did feel that if we were to make such a donation, we should be up-front about it and announce the fact before the voting, so that fans could make their site-selection decision with full information.

The first motion made was that we simply commit to donating some percentage of Noreascon 3 profits, if any, to NESFA (the percentage to be decided in advance).

After much discussion, this motion was defeated. (The maker later stated that she expected it to be defeated, but just wanted to get people thinking about the question.)

In the discussion, however, the argument was made that a Worldcon in Boston does have a negative impact on NESFA's income. For several years, Noreascon Two essentially gobbled up all fannish energies in the area. NESFA publication projects were put on hold for the duration, and the Boskone held the year of Noreascon Two was a smaller "BoskLone" than normal, which nearly lost money.

In the following APA:89, a number of people addressed this question, attempting to analyze the Worldcon's impact on local fandom, explaining why a surplus was probably inevitable, discussing other uses for a potential surplus, and even discussing the question of whether it was desirable to decide this now.

The feeling of most of the members seemed to be that we should attempt to recompense NESFA, or any other organization, for any legitimate costs that that Worldcon imposed on it, but that we should not go any farther than that. The final motion that was passed was: *MCFI recognizes a moral obligation to reimburse fan organizations for indirect costs incurred in support of an MCFI-run convention.*

#### Timeline Committee (1985-)

Now that most of the bid strategy questions had been decided, we felt ourselves free to start thinking about the convention we were bidding for. What sort of convention did we want it to be? A Timeline Committee, headed by Jim Hudson, was established to think about what sort of decisions needed to be made when. This included setting initial arrangements with our facilities, establishing GoH criteria, and starting to decide our policies and organizational structure. The Timeline Committee prepared a list of suggested policy statements and presented a few at each meeting, as time permitted, for the membership to discuss and either approve, modify, or return to the committee. This activity has continued through the present date.

(Shortly after being appointed, the Timeline Committee was nicknamed the "Gulp Committee." This is purportedly because "Gulp" is the reaction of a sensible person when contemplating running a Worldcon.)

Since these policies have all been included in past issues of *The Mad 3 Party* and in our bid advertising, I won't repeat all of them here. But just to give an idea of the types of things we discussed, here are some examples:

- The focus of the convention will be written SF and we will have a rich and varied program that will include all aspects of science fiction and fantasy.
- We will not attempt to limit Worldcon attendance through exclusionary policies, but neither will we actively encourage the general public to attend the convention.
- The convention will be fiscally responsible. We will be careful not to lose money, but will not have a large surplus as one of our goals.

- To the extent possible membership refunds will be provided to program participants and workers after the convention.
- We will hire secretarial staff to assist in paperwork during the year of the convention.

In addition to setting up policies, the Timeline Committee explored other topics, such as the use of computers at the convention, how we should select our GoHs, space and time allocation at the convention, etc.

#### Finishing Other Projects (Summer 1985)

During 1985, the non-bidding projects that we started in 1983 were finishing up.

The Memory Book had been completed in January, and was then distributed to as many Noreascon Two members as we could find by handing them out at various conventions and sifting through recent Worldcon mailing lists. After we made our best effort to distribute them, we turned the remainder over to NESFA to sell. (The Memory Book is still available free to any Noreascon Two member who has not received one.)

The ConStellation deficit situation was successfully concluded by combining our donation with those from L.A.con, Chicon, and other groups and individuals, and using these funds to buy out all of the remaining creditors. A press release announcing the bailout completion was issued on April 15.

During the summer of 1985, we did the major planning work for the Lone Star Con Art Show. This involved budgeting, writing and printing mailings to artists, and keeping track of incoming artist reservations. Later in the summer, we assembled and packed the various equipment and forms we would need in Austin. The actual art show took up most of our members and many volunteers from other areas for the duration of the convention. And then there was the reconciliation of the paperwork and the mailing out of the artist checks after the convention.

But once all of these various projects were completed, we were able to put our full efforts into keeping up the schedule of parties, flyers, and advertising that we had decided on back in 1984, and to continue the Timeline Committee's work of planning for the Worldcon.

#### Worldcon and NASFiC (Fall 1985)

Four of our members attended Aussiecon and held a bid party there. Shopping for the party was difficult, and Greg Thokar has stories to tell about trying to carry the party supplies, including 300 pounds of ice, in an under-sized Datsun. More people made it to the NASFiC (particularly because we were running the Art Show there). The committee roomed in the Hyatt, because of its proximity to the convention center, but the Sheraton-Boston helped us to get a suite in the Sheraton in Austin (the party hotel) for Friday night. We gained 127 pre-supporters and sold 80 T-shirts at the NASFiC, for a total of 579 pre-supporters and 36 pre-opposers.

#### Elections (Fall 1985 and Spring 1986)

Several months earlier, we had given some thought to when we wanted to choose our permanent bid officers. Our elections are normally in October, but people felt that choosing the officers in October 1985 would leave them with too long a term (4 years) until the convention. Wait-



ing until October 1986, however, would put the elections after the Worldcon at which we would be voted on, and we felt that our officers should be announced before the vote. The solution was to modify the bylaws to hold a special election in April 1986, and to recognize that the officers elected in October 1985 would be interim officers who would hold office for only six months.

Under these terms, in October 1985, Chip Hitchcock was elected President, Al Kent was elected Treasurer, and Sue Hammond was elected Secretary.

In January, George Flynn distributed a poll to the members asking them to check off which members were "acceptable" to them for each of the permanent offices. (George asked people not to consider whether the victims would be willing to serve, but some voters did not follow this guideline.) The result of the poll, based on 24 ballots received, showed 5 people whom more than half of the members would consider for Chairman, 6 for Secretary, and 7 for Treasurer. Of these, many people had been clearly stating that they weren't interested in running, so the field was really much narrower. It was useful, though, to show people whether they had enough support to even consider the idea.

By the time of the elections (which were held on April 1 due to the obvious significance of that date), we had two serious candidates for the offices of Chairman and Treasurer, and one for Secretary. Those elected were Mark Olson (Chairman), Jim Mann (Secretary), and Ann Broomhead (Treasurer).

#### **More Decisions (1986)**

While all of the above was happening, more topics were passing through the Timeline Committee and being discussed by the membership. We decided on a publications schedule and initial convention membership rates. We revised our children's membership policy to provide for reduced rates for kids. We registered the word "Noreascon" as a service mark of MCFI. In response to popular demand, we produced a small number of pre-opposer T-shirts by overprinting a red circle and slash over the "Boston in 1989" legend. We decided to volunteer/bid to hold Smofcon 3 in 1986. We planned to give our pre-supporters coupons good for \$5 off the Attending Membership rate. We decided to try to recruit more out-of-town Friends. We began to recruit foreign agents. And on May 21, we issued our first news release giving our officers, planned rates, facilities, etc.

During the summer, a Computer Committee was appointed to work out a plan for our computer needs. They proposed that for the first few years we should have three small computers (two IBM PC clones and a Macintosh), and proposed that we purchase one of the PC clones before ConFederation so that we would be ready to start entering memberships upon our return.

#### **Choosing our Guests of Honor (Summer 1986)**

Various discussions about Guest of Honor criteria had been held in the apa and at meetings for some time. Much like the initial officer poll, we began the selection by distributing a long list of just about any name that had come up in discussion, for people to mark which ones they felt were good choices, which they were neutral about, and which they didn't think were good choices.

The results were tabulated, and names above a cutoff point (which was established more-or-less arbitrarily) were selected for more detailed discussion. The Timeline Committee collected information about the various candidates and ran it through the apa, and each member was encouraged to write what they knew about the individuals. In addition, we sent a letter to our Friends asking them for their suggestions and comments. About eight replies were received, and these were also run through the apa.

Because two Worldcons were to be selected in the same year, we decided that we would give first preference in Guest of Honor choices to the 1988 bidders. But we did work out an agreement with each of them that they would tell one of us (George Flynn) their choices in confidence. Then we could attempt to make a choice, and if our choice did not conflict with any of theirs we would know that we could ask, and later announce, our guest. If there was a conflict, then we would have to wait until after the site-selection voting decided the 1988 winner.

After much discussion and debate, we voted for our GoH choices in June. Not surprisingly, there was a conflict with the Professional GoH, so we were not able to announce a Pro GoH in our PR 0. But we *were* able to announce our Fan GoH, the Stranger Club.

Also, as part of our GoH discussion, we decided that we would not have a Toastmaster in the traditional sense, but would simply appoint people who were appropriate for the needs of the various functions as those functions were planned.

#### **Preparation for ConFederation (Summer 1986)**

Most of our remaining work involved preparation for the site-selection voting at ConFederation. This included party preparations, as well as more decisions relating to information to be included in our Progress Report 0. One debate, for example, was over the issue of hucksters' deposits. Some recent Worldcons had accepted deposits well in advance of the convention to hold table space for hucksters. We were considering doing this, but arguments were made that three years was too long a lead time, and that our cash flow would not really require this income. Ultimately, we decided not to accept hucksters' deposits.

We put together a mailing to our pre-supporters and friends, reminding them to vote in the site selection and including a neat discount coupon, drawn by Merle Insinga to look like a fannish dollar bill.

We took a look at the budget and concluded that we were running ahead of plan, mostly because we had many more pre-supporters, friends, and T-shirt sales than we had expected (823 pre-supporters as of July 23). So we waived the last quarter's committee assessment.

#### **Essential Worldcon Planning (Summer 1986)**

Although the race was not yet won, our last steps before ConFederation were to put in place the essentials we would need if we came back as a Worldcon committee. Mark appointed Greg Thokar to do PR 0 and PR 1, and Sharon Sbarksky to handle membership records. We ordered stationery and a computer (as mentioned above) for processing memberships. And we set up a rental agreement with NESFA for use of the NESFA clubhouse for

storage and meetings.

Finally, Jim H. and Leslie warned the committee members, from previous experience, that it was important to keep accurate records of any discussions they might have at ConFederation or other conventions, and Mark handed out the famous little green notebooks to aid in this task.

Then it was on to ConFederation and the site-selection vote.

## Boston in '89 Bid Finances

by Ann Broomhead, Treasurer, and Leslie Turek

Date: November 12, 1986

### Income

Committee Assessments	\$ 6093.50 (a)
Friends Dues	1165.03 (b)
Pre-supporting and Pre-opposing	3212.84 (c)
Hotel Contributions	669.60 (d)
T-shirt sales, net	624.03 (e)
Sales income	4398.04
Cost of shirts	-3774.01
Miscellaneous Donations	115.05
Miscellaneous Income	174.39
Total	\$ 12054.44

### Official Expenses

Party Expenses	3555.18 (f)
Advertising	2094.65 (g)
Flyer Printing	1053.00
Flyer Mailing	166.75
Masquerade Costume Subsidy	141.89 (h)
Voting Expenses	666.49 (i)
Administrative	642.18
Stickers	366.04
Buttons	227.55
Mad 3 Party, net	13.76 (j)
Subscription income	852.64
Mad 3 Party expenses	866.40
Total	\$ 8927.49

### Unofficial Expenses

Party Donations	776.53 (k)
Masquerade Costume	780.00 (l)
Total	\$ 1556.53

- (c) Pre-supporting memberships cost \$3 each, and pre-opposing memberships were \$6. Over 1000 were sold. Pre-supporters' payments were not refunded directly, but pre-supporters were sent a coupon good for \$5 off their Attending membership in Noreascon 3.
- (d) These funds were donated by the Sheraton-Boston Hotel to assist with our parties.
- (e) T-shirt prices were set low to encourage purchase and wearing of the bid T-shirt for further advertising. We were successful, selling approximately 600 shirts at a small profit.
- (f) The party cost given here was mostly refreshment costs. About \$1400 of the total was spent for 3 nights of bid parties at ConFederation; about \$500 on refreshments and \$900 on a 1-bedroom suite for 3 nights. The only other room cost was \$247 for a suite at Lone Star Con; \$553 was spent in total on parties there.
- (g) Our advertising was concentrated on Worldcon and NASFiC publications.
- (h) The bid committee contributed \$141.89 towards the cost of a group costume advertising the bid which was presented at L.A.con II; the remainder, \$780.00, was funded by individual contributions (see below).
- (i) This category included printing and mailing expenses relating to the site-selection voting. It included the pre-supporter coupons and a letter sent to all pre-supporters and friends, plus multi-part forms and other supplies for running the site-selection table at ConFederation.
- (j) This item includes all *Mad 3 Party* income collected up to the end of ConFederation. This includes payment for copies not yet published, but there's no easy way to break this out.
- (k) Party contributions were collected in the early years, when the bid committee was not yet organized and was not yet officially sponsoring parties. Records have been kept of these contributions, and they may be refunded after Noreascon 3, but only if there is a surplus.
- (l) Masquerade contributions were used to fund the bid group masquerade costume presented at L.A.con II. These contributions may be refunded after Noreascon 3, if there is a surplus.

## St. Louis in '88 Bid Finances

by Richard W. Zellich

[The financial statement accompanying this report is reproduced on Page 10.]

The grand totals in the financial statement are somewhat misleading, in that income and expenses are essentially reported twice in some cases. The most prominent example is personal loans to the committee: the original loan is shown as an item of income, the expense for which the loan was made is shown as an item of expense, and later the income which will go toward repayment of the loan is also shown as income, and finally the loan repayment is itself shown as an expense; thus a \$200 expendi-

- (a) Committee assessments came to about \$200 per member for 30 members, plus a few dollars from members who dropped out during the 3-year bidding period. (This was actually more than we ended up needing.) Assessments were intended to be refunded to the members shortly after we won the bid, and have been so refunded.
- (b) Friends formed a sort of associate bid committee. Friends dues (\$12/year) also were intended to be refunded to the Friends shortly after we won the bid, and have been so refunded.



ture for which funds were not immediately available will have been reflected in the statement as \$400 income and \$400 expenses instead of \$200 income and \$200 expenses. Our detailed records show this clearly, of course, but the summarized figures presented here do not (except as implied by the separate Income and Expense categories of Loans and Loan Repayments).

It should also be understood that the individual expenses incurred by committee members and others who threw bid parties for us are *not* included in the recorded expenses. These additional expenses include transportation, hotel rooms, food, and convention memberships (where a suite was used at major conventions, however, the difference between the regular double-room rate and the suite rate *was* charged to the committee and is reflected in the financial statement); these additional expenses have been roughly estimated at \$16,000. Added to these personal expenditures is the cost of the official car of the St. Louis in '88 Worldcon Bid (a 1966 Cadillac Flower Car — sort of a limousine pickup truck), plus maintenance and insurance; this cost one of the committee members approximately \$5500. These personal expenses, added to the officially-recorded expenses shown on the financial statement, bring the total expenses to an astonishing \$43,850.

Our expenses were skewed fairly heavily toward printing, postage, and program book (and progress reports of major conventions) ads rather than toward bid parties/hospitality suites, because our committee was composed largely of people who did not attend many out-of-town conventions. Those who did attend out-of-town cons also dropped out of con-going very early in the bid, for various reasons (2 marriages, joining the armed forces and getting stationed in the Philippines, buying a house and other forms of sudden cash-flow problems, etc.). The advertising strategy seems to have worked well in some ways, bringing us much support from the convention committees who were happy to see someone paying attention to their cons and to have the extra financial support. The supporters gained this way are widely scattered, but are presumed to be somewhat influential in their local SF communities; hopefully, we also established a strong presence in the minds of those who saw our ads in all those program books. On the other hand, although we threw bid parties at 12-16 cons per year, many heavy con-goers seemed to expect us to be at *every* con they attended, and expressed surprise that we weren't more visible (maybe they never read their program books or pick up flyers from freebie tables?). Since we attended mostly central-zone conventions, we were apparently invisible to the east- and west-coast convention-party fans. We sent packages of flyers and world-wide con listings to hundreds of conventions each year, but the flyers seem to have attracted relatively little attention; most fans are interested in convention information, but not in information about bids, and the flyers just don't get much attention at most cons (but there were a few exceptions where we couldn't provide flyers fast enough to keep them on the table; these were not usually the cons at which you would expect this to happen).

Because of the heavy drain on man-hour and financial resources of bid committees with no regular source of income, there has been much discussion about ways to change the Worldcon bidding process. Two possibilities seem workable: eliminate informal bidding entirely and change to a single formal presentation to a WSFS site-selection committee; or limit bidding to the year between filing and voting.

The first approach is used by most professional and hobby organizations, and works well. There are only 2 real arguments against using this for Worldcon site selection: first, that the bid parties are a major part of the evening programming at conventions and the fans would be the poorer for the loss of parties; second, that the ability to put on a protracted campaign may in some ways show how well a prospective committee can organize and therefore how well they might run the actual convention. The "organization" argument is largely an illusion, since the bid committee and convention committee are not necessarily the same except perhaps for one or two key players, and it has been shown more than once that a winning bid committee is not necessarily capable of properly running a convention of Worldcon size. Also, with the change to site selection 3 years in advance, keeping a committee together for up to 3 preceding years (or even longer, with the current examples of the 1992 and 1994 bid committees) is likely to be a serious problem in itself.

The second approach, limiting the bid campaigning "window," seems to be a viable approach and has worked relatively well in some political arenas. The actual proposal here is to amend the WSFS constitution to disallow overt bidding (no announcements of intent to bid in 'zines, no flyers, no program book ads, no parties, etc.) prior to 1 year in advance of the vote; the bid campaigning could officially start at the Worldcon or NASFiC, whichever is first, held the year before the one at which site selection would take place. For a 1995 bidder, for example, this would mean active bidding from the 1991 Worldcon or NASFiC through the 1992 Worldcon (or NASFiC, to cover NASFiC bidders and NASFiC site selection at a NASFiC rather than that year's Worldcon). Evidence of early campaigning would require the Worldcon committee administering the site-selection voting to declare the bid filing void, and leave the offending bid off the site-selection ballot. An interesting possibility comes to mind here, where a rival bid may learn of competitors during the pre-filing organization phase, and torpedo a competitor by putting out forged advertising! If such a dirty trick were actually to be perpetrated, it might be difficult for the administering committee to discover the truth, but it doesn't seem to be a sufficiently serious flaw to drop the time-limitation approach from consideration.

One other very interesting approach has been proposed: don't bother to advertise or throw any bid parties at all, and bribe site-selection voters to vote for you. At either \$10 or \$20 per voter, it could be cost-effective and would require a lot less work!

## St. Louis in '88 Worldcon Bid Committee Financial Statement A/O 2 Sep 86

INCOME	CY83-84	CY85	CY86	TOTAL
LOANS.....	\$ 729.21	\$1095.00	\$ 610.00	\$ 2434.21
SALES				
Candy Bars.....	\$ .00	\$3277.00	\$1331.00	\$ 4608.00
T-Shirts, buttons, con lists, etc....	\$ 344.00	\$ 726.61	\$ 610.50	\$ 1681.11
Misc.....	\$ .00	\$ .00	\$ 15.00	\$ 15.00
AUCTIONS.....	\$ 360.00	\$ 17.00	\$ .00	\$ 377.00
RAFFLES.....	\$ 220.00	\$ .00	\$ .00	\$ 220.00
DONATIONS				
Committee.....	\$1739.33	\$1950.31	\$1896.55	\$ 5586.19
Attendees at various cons.....	\$ 94.00	\$ 75.50	\$ 500.67	\$ 670.17
Misc.....	\$ 80.00	\$ 37.67	\$ 21.00	\$ 138.67
PRE-SUPPORTING				
MEMBERSHIPS.....	\$ 515.00	\$ 766.00	\$ 590.00	\$ 1871.00
MISC.....	\$ 314.11	\$ 330.63	\$1400.78	\$ 2045.52
TOTAL INCOME.....	\$ 4395.65	\$ 8275.72	\$ 6975.50	\$19646.87
EXPENSES				
PROGRAM BOOK ADS.....	\$1418.75	\$2054.58	\$1293.12	\$ 4766.45
BID PARTIES				
Beer, Soda, & Ice..	\$ 288.41	\$ 747.00	\$1543.43	\$ 2578.84
Food.....	\$ 4.41	\$ 335.60	\$ 339.56	\$ 679.57
Suites & Misc.....	\$ 180.31	\$ 785.23	\$3306.12	\$ 4271.66
PRINTING				
Flyers.....	\$ 176.83	\$ 442.85	\$ 215.33	\$ 835.01
Progress Rpts.....	\$ 7.61	\$ 71.02	\$ 85.64	\$ 164.32
Con Listings.....	\$ 108.66	\$ 150.05	\$ 28.62	\$ 287.33
Misc.....	\$ 203.77	\$ 121.98	\$ 31.35	\$ 357.10
POSTAGE				
Flyer Pkgs				
sent to cons.....	\$ 233.07	\$ 280.74	\$ 222.93	\$ 731.59
Progress Rpts.....	\$ 37.20	\$ 56.31	\$ 70.74	\$ 164.25
Misc.....	\$ 80.75	\$ 120.10	\$ 46.71	\$ 247.56
T-SHIRTS.....	\$ 531.20	\$ 282.25	\$ 274.42	\$ 1087.87
BUTTONS.....	\$ 464.28	\$ .00	\$ .00	\$ 464.28
STICKERS.....	\$ .00	\$ 162.87	\$ .00	\$ 162.87
CANDY BARS.....	\$ .00	\$2021.70	\$ 636.60	\$ 2658.30
LOAN REPAYMENTS.....	\$ 196.79	\$ 470.00	\$ 660.00	\$ 1326.79
MISC.....	\$ 440.88	\$ 66.65	\$ 78.97	\$ 586.50
TOTAL EXPENSES.....	\$ 4371.92	\$ 8168.93	\$ 9810.59	\$22351.44
DUE IN				
CANDY BAR SALES.....			\$ 422.50	
MISC.....			\$ 536.00	
TOTAL DUE IN.....			\$ 958.50	
DUE OUT				
LOAN REPAYMENTS.....			\$1284.10	
CREDIT CARD CHARGES.....			\$4466.00	
MISC.....			\$ 150.00	
TOTAL DUE OUT.....			\$5900.10	

## New Orleans in '88 Bid Finances

(as told to Leslie Turek)

[The following report is based on my notes of two telephone conversations with a member of the Nolacon II committee. The figures were the best estimates available at the time this article was produced (early November).]

### Expenses

1. Transportation	\$ 9,600.50
2. Hotel/Food/Memberships	19,795.98
3. Party Supplies	8,990.75
4. Postage/Printing/Advertising	5,418.55
5. Capital Expenses	1,287.00
	-----
Total expenses	\$42,092.78

**Transportation** included the costs of transportation of committee members to conventions at which bid parties were held. This figure does not include approximately \$3470 in free airline fares that were available to two of the committee members due to one member's employment in the travel industry. The five most active committee members attended 15-22 conventions each over an 18-month period; others went to 6-10 conventions each. The New Orleans committee felt that a strong presence at as many conventions as possible was essential because they were not well-known outside of the South.

**Hotel/Food/Memberships** includes hotel room costs, personal food, and convention memberships for the committee members attending conventions as noted above. The suite used for the ConFederation bid parties at the Atlanta Marriott was partially complimentary, since the bid is planning to use a Marriott in New Orleans. The committee did pay at least \$75/night to upgrade a 1-bedroom suite to a 2-bedroom suite.

**Party Supplies.** The committee tried to be frugal in their purchase of party supplies. Although liquor was usually served, it was limited to pre-mixed "Hurricanes," rather than offering a full bar. \$3400 of this total was spent at ConFederation. The spending at the Worldcon was based to some extent on how much came in at the parties from pre-supporting memberships.

Mardi Gras colored bead necklaces were used heavily as a bid identification device. These were inexpensive, as most were picked up off the streets "by fighting off children and old ladies during two wet and nasty Mardi Gras," or donated by people who had been collecting them for years.

**Postage/Printing/Advertising** does not include \$850 worth of paper which was donated, plus a large amount of free printing that was supplied by a member of the committee.

**Capital expenses.** Some of these expenses may not be charged to the convention.

### Income

There were two types of income. Income which came into the group from pre-supporting memberships, "Saints" fees, and board dues, was used to pay for postage, printing, and advertising, as well as some party sup-

plies and capital expenses. This corporate income broke down approximately as follows:

Pre-supporting memberships	\$3700
"Saints" fees	3300
Board dues	2300
T-shirt sales	200
	-----
Total corporate income:	\$9500

Pre-supporting members paid \$5 each to support the bid. In return, when New Orleans won, they received free Attending memberships for their voting fees, rather than having to pay the \$15 conversion fee. "Saints" fees represented 33 people who paid \$100 each for certain privileges at Nolacon II. Board members paid dues of \$100 per year for up to two years of bidding. They were also requested to advance \$50 of next year's fees just before ConFederation. The dues will not be reimbursed, and will continue through the convention planning period.

The second type of income consisted of out-of-pocket expenses by committee members for their travel to conventions to hold bidding parties. Conventions to be targeted were decided informally and each member decided independently how much traveling they would do for the bid. Records were kept by the individuals during the bidding period, and the totals are just now being tallied. Individuals are determining which of these conventions they would probably have attended anyway; these will not be reimbursed. It is expected that about 90% of these personal travel expenses will be reimbursed. The total spent per person ranged from \$3800 to \$6000 for the people most active on the campaign trail, with several others spending \$1000 or less.

## Cincinnati in '88 Bid Finances

by Robert L. Hillis, Treasurer

Date: October 9, 1986

### Income

Committee Assessments	\$ 10 283
Presupporting and Donations	1 653
	-----
Total	\$ 11 936

### Expenses

Ads in Program Books	2 122
Printing	939
Party Supplies	4 261
Parlors	3 604
Car rentals	222
Telephone	90
Postage	486
Legal	58
Mileage	72
Bank Fees	82
	-----
Total	\$ 11 936

## Bermuda Triangle in '88 Bid Finances

by Neil Rest

There are two first things about running a bid. One, it is more expensive than you think (unless you've done a few, in which case you're probably reading this more for amusement value than for education). One, it is more work than you imagine.

Second, it goes on longer than you think. A well-run bid would take a year building personal, informal support around the country (all these comments refer to North American bids). The formal announcement needs to be 1-1/2 to 2 years before the balloting, which is now 3 years before the convention, followed by a year of winding up and closing the books. So it takes a good six years, in addition to twenty grand and two dozen hard-working friends.

The energy budget is quite as important as the financial.

We spent in excess of \$20,000 — in line with current bids. The biggest areas are parties and publications.

One of the first concrete steps in becoming a bid is becoming a not-for-profit corporation. There are various fees for filings, lawyers, a seal, and dealing with the tax people. In our case, about \$700 so far.

One of my personal aims with Bermuda Triangle in '88 was to deal practically with some of the current, currently ignored realities of Worldcon and bidding. One of the first is, of course, bidding is *expensive*. We made our pre-supporting memberships \$20, instead of the previously customary just-a-couple, partly to cover some of our expenses. I take it as a quiet compliment that by the middle of the campaign, each of our competitors had invented a more expensive variety or echelon of membership. We sold over 350 memberships, raising just over \$7000, one-third of our expenses.

The purpose of bidding is to reach voters, but it soon became clear that few people knew just who and where the voters were. There seem to be at least a couple of constituencies. Serious convention goers are the first, obviously. Over half of our total expenses went for parties: supplies, in particular: rooms, sometimes; and transportation, when unavoidable, i.e., no major committee members in the part of the country with a major con. This is where having friends *all* over counts . . . our party throwers used their own rooms.

The next largest expense was printing: over \$3500 for flyers and pre-progress reports, and \$1300 for program book ads at the very biggest cons and at some of the medium-sized ones we couldn't get to in person. I feel that we had far and away the best publications (boundless thanks to the dozen artists who gave us so much). Typesetting and postage were over \$800 each.

We sold some T-shirts, primarily as advertising: \$900 spent for T-shirts brought in \$1250, and a lot of fun and exposure.

\$750 in phone bills, \$270 for office supplies; over \$200 miscellaneous; and \$700 or so in donations. (I learned that in the Northwest, a donations container is expected

at parties.)

I don't know how close that comes to the total of \$21,000; I rounded almost everything.

A bidding committee needs deep pockets.

One last uncomfortable observation: Atlanta and New Orleans each won their bids on the first ballot, with about 800 and 900 votes, respectively. Either could have won with less. It costs as little as \$45 to vote (a \$25 supporting membership, and the \$20 voting fee). So a Worldcon can be bought outright for, say, \$27,000 (6000 votes @ \$45); what it costs to bid, anyway. L.A.con made \$160,000, without trying. The Worldcon is a real commercial plum, if someone who isn't interested in our community (communities) wants to maximize its commercial potential. . .

[Neal signed his letter, "FIJAGDH" (Fandom is Just a God Damned Hobby).]

### Approximate Bermuda Triangle in '88 Accounts

Operating Income	
Memberships	\$ 7 130
T-shirt sales	
1245	
-915	330
Cash donations	800
	-----
	\$ 8 260
Operating Expenses	
Partying	\$11 400
Printing	3 150
Ads	1 300
Typesetting	850
Postage	800
Fees	775
Phone	530
Misc. publications	530
Office supplies	270
Misc.	230
	-----
	\$20 000

### Committee Members' debts

\$5000, \$3000, \$2000, \$1400, . . .

## Comparison of Bid Finances

by Leslie Turek

In the previous five articles, we have presented the bidding finances of each of the '88 and '89 committees exactly as they were given to us. Looking at these numbers, it is hard to make direct comparisons because of the different accounting systems and categories used. In this section, I will make some attempt to recast these numbers into a common format. This is not intended to pass any sort of formal audit, but I think it will help give us a better feel for what is involved in bidding these days.

First, let's explain the ground rules.

### Comparison of '88 and '89 Bid Finances

(These figures have been adjusted for comparison purposes — please also read original reports)

Income	'88 New Orleans	'88 Bermuda Tr.	'88 St. Louis	'88 Cincinnati	'89 Boston
Pre-Supporters	3700	7130	1871	1653	3213
Sales/Auction/Raffles	200	330	2403	0	624
Outside contributions, Saints, etc.	3300	800	1586	(see above)	959
Committee Donations	2300	0	5586	0	0
Committee "Loans"	35591	11575	2831	10283	4132
Total Income	45091	19835	15545	11936	8928
<b>Official Expenses</b>					
Party Total	28787**	11400*	7530	7865	3555
Supplies	8991	---	3258	4261	2408
Party Rooms	19796**	---	4272	3604	1147
Personal travel, etc.	9601	(see above)	0	0	0
Print Total	5419	5830	6122	3061	3148
Ads/Typesetting	---	2150	4766	2122	2095
Printing/Flyers	---	3680	1356	939	1053
Free buttons, stickers	0	0	163	0	594
Postage, phone, fees, other	1287	2605	1730	1010	1631
Total Official Expenses	45094**	19835*	15545	11936	8928
<b>Unofficial Expenses and Free or Donated Services</b>					
Committee Party Donations					777
Hotel Comp. Rooms	500+				
Personal travel, etc.	3470	8000 (?)	16000 (est)	10000 (?)	10000 (?)
Printing, paper, etc.	850+				
Official car			5500		
Masquerade costume					780
Grand Total	49914+	27835 (?)	37045 (est)	21936 (?)	20485 (?)

\* Includes some personal room and travel expenses.

\*\* Includes personal food, room, and convention membership expenses.

When items were produced for sale, such as the Boston T-shirts or the St. Louis T-shirts, buttons, con lists, and candy bars, I looked at only the net income. For example, rather than saying that Boston spent \$3774 and took in \$4398 on T-shirts, I listed the net income of \$624.

When considering committee contributions, I have tried to distinguish between outright donations, which were never intended to be paid back to the individuals making them, and "loans," which were intended to be paid back if the group won the bid. In the latter category, I have included Boston Friends' dues, since those were also intended to be paid back.

On many of the original reports, total income did not match total expenses. (Boston was over, for instance, and St. Louis was under.) In these cases, I made the assumption that the committee members would end up picking up the tab, and added or subtracted the difference

between income and outgo to the committee "loan" contribution.

Most committees had non-cash donations or money spent on their behalf that did not appear on their official books. Examples of this are New Orleans' travel discounts, the St. Louis bid's official car, and the Boston bid's L.A. con II costume, etc. In general, these items were not charged to the bid and were not slated for reimbursement from convention funds if the bid won. (The two exceptions we know of are the Boston party and costume donations, which may be reimbursed after the '89 Worldcon, if there is a surplus.) Because of the fuzzy and incomplete nature of these unofficial expenses, I have listed them separately.

Finally, I have lumped together some income and expenses categories in an attempt to create categories that can be used uniformly across the committees.

The resulting table is on page 13.

One of the big differences between New Orleans and the other committees is that New Orleans considered personal travel, food, etc., expenses to be "on the books" reimbursable expenses, whereas the other committees generally did not. (Bermuda Triangle did pay for some transportation "when unavoidable.") This is not to say that these expenses are not perfectly legitimate expenses. In fact, many fans who travel on behalf of bid committees are known to list these out-of-pocket expenses on their tax returns as charitable donations. But we do see a problem with charging these expenses directly to the convention. By doing this, New Orleans is opening the door to a whole slew of similar expenses that could legitimately be charged to the convention, but which past Worldcons have not had the funds to support. These expenses include travel expenses for farflung committee members to attend central meetings, to view the facilities, to attend other conventions for ideas or recruitment, or, in fact, their travel, room, and board at the Worldcon itself. The Nolacon committee will have to give some hard thought to where it will draw the line on these sorts of expenses.

Otherwise, the numbers shown are reasonably comparable. Boston had lower party costs than the others, even if you add in the unofficial party donations, mostly because we were unopposed and did not serve liquor at our parties. New Orleans spent more on parties because they felt they needed to be better known. (Also, I believe the other committees paid only the suite upgrade portion of their members' rooms (when a suite was used), whereas it appears that New Orleans paid the entire room cost.) St. Louis spent more on print advertising, and Boston spent the most on buttons and stickers. All the bids spent between \$3000 and \$6000 on ads and flyers.

Presupporting income ranged from \$1600 (at \$3 each) to \$7000 (at \$20 each). St. Louis did the most effective job of fund-raising through sales and auctions. Committee investment varied widely, from under \$4000 for Boston to over \$35,000 for New Orleans (although, again, the New Orleans figure includes travel and hotel rooms, which were not included in the Boston figure). Another way of looking at this number is that it represents the amount of deficit the winning convention begins with after it has reimbursed bidding costs.

To make the bids more comparable, I tried to estimate travel and hotel costs for the bids that did not keep these records. If we make a conservative estimate of \$10,000 per bid (or \$8000 for Bermuda Triangle, which did pay for some travel), we arrive at total costs ranging from about \$22,000 to \$50,000 for the contested bids, and \$20,500 for the uncontested Boston bid. That comes out to an estimated grand total of about \$137,000 spent on the '88 campaign, or an average cost of \$34,500 per bid. Of this, nearly \$60,000 came directly from the fans in the form of pre-supporting memberships, donations, sales, and reimbursements from Worldcon funds. (Most of rest came out of the pockets of the losing committees.) Of course, some people may feel \$60,000 is a fair price for fandom to pay for two to three years of bid parties.

- Comment from Neil Rest of the Bermuda Triangle bid:

*The \$8,000 you added to the figures [for travel and hotel costs] may or may not be close. I truly don't know, but it is potentially misleading; the marginal cost was zero. People who were going to cons anyway used their rooms, etc. It was money which was already being spent.*

*The figures give one more twist to the vote results:*

Net \$/vote

Bermuda Triangle	\$ 27.46
New Orleans	46.38
Cincinnati	81.71
St. Louis	154.79

*As you see, if New Orleans had simply bought the election, it wouldn't have cost them any money, and they'd have saved a heck of a lot of work.*

- Comment from Robert Hillis of the Cincinnati bid:

*We have no quarrel with your report or inferences. Ten thousand dollars is a reasonable estimate of the total personal expenses of our ten most active bid committee members. However, if we had won and had a cash surplus, not all of that would have been reimbursable since in accordance with past custom we would have automatically excluded reimbursement for attending any convention within 400 highway miles of the individual bidder's home and any other convention that the individual usually attends. Even without such exclusions, we find the reported figure for New Orleans hard to believe.*

---

## Where Do We Go From Here?

by Leslie Turek

---

*[This article gives the personal opinion of the author, and does not represent the official view of the Noreascon 3 Committee.]*

In this final segment, I plan to pose a number of questions and give some partial answers for some of them. First, in the current climate, how much must a group spend on a bid in order to have a reasonable chance of winning? Second, is this high cost of bidding a bad thing? Third, if it is, what can we do to change things?

First let's look at bid cost. The Boston bid, being unopposed, decided on a policy of running what it felt to be the cheapest bid that it could, while still showing that it took the race seriously and also trying to have a little fun while doing it. We had a fair number of parties, but rarely spent more than \$60 to \$80 on any one party. We had a lot of personal travel expenses, but most of us didn't go to many more conventions than we might have gone to anyway. We targeted our advertising to Worldcon publications, and sent flyers to a lot of regional cons we couldn't get to ourselves. I suspect that it would be hard to spend less than we did in a contested race and still be taken seriously. This type of bid cost us nearly \$9000, not counting personal travel and room expenses.

The '88 bids spent more. They made a bigger effort to get to more regional conventions outside their area, and had more elaborate parties at which they generally served liquor. Even with these higher costs, there were major regional conventions that some of these bids missed, and



their absence was noted.

Is this high cost of bidding a bad thing? I believe that it is.

The more personal investment a bid committee makes in a bid, the more significance must be attached to winning. (Especially since it has been accepted tradition that the winning bidder gets to reimburse their bid expenses from the Worldcon funds, whereas the losers are out of luck.) It is entirely to the credit of the '88 bidders that they were able to work together and refrain from underhanded tactics with so much at stake. We may not be so lucky in the future.

It has always been a mystery to me that so many groups are willing and eager to undertake the trauma of running a Worldcon. That they are also required to personally risk thousands of dollars for the privilege makes me wonder what type of person this process is most likely to encourage.

I think it is obvious that high bidding costs can give an advantage to a group that is funded by the treasury of an already-established group, rather than having to raise the money from scratch. And who knows what promises might be made behind-the-scenes in order to solicit votes and support from influential individuals?

I also wonder if the cost of bidding may be one reason why fandom was not offered a choice in the '89 site-selection race. If bidding were less expensive, might some other group have been willing to give Boston some competition? As things stood, with Boston in such a strong position due to the good reputation of Noreascon Two, no group wanted to risk the high cost of bidding when they felt they had such a small chance of winning. Certainly the lack of competition in the '89 race was not in the best interest of fandom as a whole.

Finally, let's all remember that part of the cost of bidding comes out of all our pockets. Nolacon will begin its books over \$30,000 in the red due to bidding expenses (not to mention the \$15 in lost revenue for each pre-supporting member who voted and was given free conversion to attending). This must be raised from the membership fees of the remaining members.

Unfortunately, one method Nolacon used to raise these funds is to set what I think is an unreasonably high supporting membership rate. The purpose of supporting membership is to give those fans unable to attend the Worldcon a chance to participate in the business of the World Science Fiction Society. The only benefits they get are to receive the Worldcon publications and to vote in the Hugo and Site Selection. It's pretty clear that \$30 is much higher than the actual cost of servicing this type of membership, and I believe that this high rate unreasonably discourages such participation.

After saying all this, I'm forced to admit that I don't think much can be done about it. Rich Zellich gives some ideas in his article, but in the same article he also explains why they probably couldn't be made to work. The other bidders didn't even advance any suggestions. I have been thinking about this a while, and haven't come up with anything even remotely feasible.

One far-fetched fantasy I did come up with was to require each bidder, when they filed their bid, to cite some previous convention that they, as a group, had run, be it a

regional, a previous Worldcon, a NASFiC, or whatever. Let the administering committee collect reviews of the cited conventions and distribute them with the site-selection ballots. Maybe that would serve to focus the voting where it should be focussed, on the ability of the bidding committees to actually run a convention, rather than how much money they are willing to spend, or how many parties they throw.

As much as this is a fantasy, I think it does point out where the fault of the current situation lies. The bid committees are only doing what they think the voters want — what they think will improve their chances of winning. It would be interesting to see what would happen if some bid committee in the future published a statement taking a stand against the high cost of bidding, and confined their bidding to a few informative ads in the Progress Reports of the Worldcon at which they were being voted on. Suppose this were a bid committee that had a good reputation as the organizer of a well-run yearly regional. Do you think they could win the bid against a group with no experience that held highly visible parties at every major regional? I fear not, but I'd really like to see some group give it a try.

• Comment from Robert Hillis of the Cincinnati bid:

*Incidentally the proposed requirement that the bid committee as a group must have operated at least one convention would have disqualified all four 1988 bidders.*

[I had noticed that. — LT]

---

## Excerpts from APA:89

October 8, 1986

---

### Items with Long Lead Times (Jim Hudson):

*The Timeline Committee met on September 24 to discuss items with long lead times that we might want to start thinking about now. Most of these are in the category of "look at its feasibility," "price it," or "find out who does it," rather than making a definite decision at this time. [If any of the readers of TM3P have any information about any of these items, we'd appreciate it if you'd drop us a line.]*

1. *Real computerized registration. See what technologies are commercially available. Try to identify list of hardware.*
2. *Using the Cheri [a theatre across the street from the Sheraton] for films. Make initial contacts with USA [owners] and see what sort of prices we are talking about.*
3. *Changes in badge technology: holders, holograms, etc. Find some suppliers and get catalogs.*
4. *Walk-through sensors for art show security. Find some suppliers and investigate.*
5. *Video and phone connections between Sheraton and Hynes. Discuss our need for these with the Sheraton. Find out what is planned.*
6. *Active elevator management. Watch what's being done for Boskone.*

7. Outside hotels. Start making initial contacts with the full list: Hilton, Marriott, Colonnade, Lenox, Copley Square, Copley Plaza, Westin, Park Plaza, 57, Four Seasons, Ritz. See which are interested in convention business. Do this through Convention and Tourist Bureau?
8. Off-site major party and other museum connections. Initial discussion with museums, and get their rental rates: Children's, Computer, Science, Aquarium.
9. Giant inflatable propeller beanie. Find out who builds these things and price them.
10. Hugo rockets. Find out if LA has them already and get. Otherwise, discuss technologies and the pitting problem.
11. Convention sales items. Look for interesting ideas. [Okay, readers, what would you like to see here?]
12. 39 Worldcon memory book. Find out if LA is doing this. If not, see what would be involved.
13. At-Con Voice Mail. Unless we see a big change in technology, drop this one. Think about other messaging systems.
14. Masquerade. Start wide discussion of the various options. Probably start this process at Smofcon.
15. Video checkout. Mention the technology to the Sheraton and see what they think.
16. Off-site (suburban? MIT?) parking with shuttle busses to save fans money. Think about sites and how we would make it work.
17. Boston restaurant guide. Do we want to do that effort? (One idea that did come up: get and compile fan graffiti reviews on area restaurants at '89 Boskone for posting/distribution/PR publication/whatever before the Worldcon.)
18. Fanhistory or other publications. Discuss with those who might do it.

#### Organizing the Convention (Jim Hudson):

I've been developing, over the past several weeks, a slightly-different-than-the-usual picture of how we might organize the ConCom. It comes from a lot of roots: the things traditional C&C does and doesn't do, the various strengths of our committee (and our weaknesses), some things New Orleans may do, Boskone services, the three-year planning horizon, the basic problem of fall-through-the-cracks, and general musings.

N2 was, in theory, a strict hierarchical organization: Chairman to Division Heads to Area Heads to Staff to Gophers. It had relatively clear lines of authority, limited amounts of reporting (except for me: I had 14 areas with direct report), and a number of divisions which fit the number of people we believed at the time were capable of running divisions. It worked. If we'd had the quality and quantity of staff and gophers available for recent Worldcons, it would have worked even better. But the main planning group included only the division heads and the officers (and Suford, to some degree), and that showed.

Currently, I believe that we have fewer clearly-qualified division directors willing to do that level of work than we did at N2. We also have a lot more people who are better qualified than the "area heads" we had then. And our group mind knows a lot more about planning and how to minimize problems before they occur, rather than being reactive in the traditional Worldcon mode. Overall, we're

in a lot better shape for management than we were then. Here is a plan on how to use our skills:

#### 1. More, smaller divisions.

In the planning phase, the number of direct reports to the chairman can be increased, perhaps up to 10-12. This is not critical because there is time to assimilate the material (Leslie, as you may remember, was involved in everything). Each of these would be a "division," and we easily have the people to handle them. The sizes and contents would depend on the people and their interests.

#### 2. Chairman's staff, in planning.

I see this as being a set of people, probably not just local, who would act almost like the Visiting Committee for academic departments: their job would be to review and poke holes in the plans for each of the divisions/areas. This is one way to identify cracks and fill them. It also should improve the areas, and — on balance — give them more confidence. Consider this to be a way to use the voices of experience: scary, but valuable. These people would be pretty busy at Boskone 89 and certain other times, when major review meetings happen.

#### 3. Chairman's staff, at con.

Of course, these people will have a pretty good idea of how the whole convention is supposed to work after going through all the reviews. They will also have a good understanding of how Mark [Olson] thinks. So, at con, we use them as the troubleshooters. While they will have no power of their own, they will be encouraged to "make the decisions Mark would" and can speak for the Chairman. This transferred power can be used to back up the division heads and area heads, to give them a way to confirm they are making the right decision, and to essentially provide more "chairmen" to handle the larger number of direct reports. They probably have the power to mobilize resources when a division or area isn't getting the support it needs. The transferred power may also mean that the division and area heads can be briefed 1-on-1 with important news, rather than having to go to interminable meetings at the wrong times. The "Chairmen," of course, would have to dump their actions to each other from time to time. Knowing Mark, they would also be very reluctant to overrule an area or division head, but free to describe why an action does not make sense in the overall context of the convention. Whether they have the power to "order" or just have the power to say "well, we can't agree on this, so let's take it to Mark" is open, and may depend on the time of day and whether he is awake.

#### 4. Nontraditional C&C

Given these available "Chairmen" (1-3 on each shift), C&C goes back to its design role of message center. The "Chairmen" probably have beepers when on duty (I'd give them text beepers, for messages on where to go next), and probably rove to observe problems and see things in action, but there may not be much need for the corps of rovers, radio operators, shift supervisors, and the like. That depends a lot on our views about, particularly, nighttime troubleshooting, our involvement in medical problems, and so forth. A C&C run by our paid secretary would be very different than one run by, for example, me.

Taking "troubleshooting" as a separate area, just as dealing with guards and locks (security) is a separate area. C&C's role is probably to take the information provided by the areas and distribute it. Now if we can find a way to give the areas an incentive to actually provide the information, we have a consistent schema.

This is a fairly radical departure from both recent Boskone practice and typical Worldcon practice. It greatly limits the on-site power of people who are not involved heavily in the planning phases. Essentially, it tries to give us every incentive to plan, and to make use of the plans, while still providing some good, quick flexibility to change those plans.

Of course, we'll have a dozen other approaches to organization, but this one feels right to me at the moment. Until the next one.

### Organizing the Convention (Leslie Turek):

#### Possible N3 Division List — (See discussion below)

##### Administrative Group:

**Treasury** — Includes convention sales and liaison to registration and art show sales

##### Registration

**WSFS** — Site selection, Hugo voting, business meeting

##### Services Group:

**Information Services** — Committee message center, hotel liaison, pocket program, member information, daily newsletter, press relations?, sign deployment, room allocation.

**Member Services** — Con suite, party coordination, handicapped, babysitting, VIP relations, SFWA/ASFA liaison?

**Area Support** — People mover, committee den and gopher hole, office supplies and copying, sign production, keys and guard coordination, equipment distribution and storage?

**Tech Services** — Sound, light, construction, computers, projectors, photography, videotaping, logistics.

##### Program Group:

**Traditional Program** — Regular, fannish, science, children's, readings, autographs, program ops and green room.

**Media Program** — Film, video, premieres and previews.

**Special Interest Programming** — Filking, SIGs, trivia bowl, gaming, Regency dance, fan lounge, etc.

##### Functions Group:

**Awards Ceremony**

**Masquerade**

**Other events and house manager**

##### Exhibits Group:

**Art Show**

**Hucksters' Room**

**Special Exhibits**

The above chart and the following comments are inspired by a writeup that Jim H. sent me in advance of this

apa, which should appear in here somewhere.

One of his comments is that perhaps we should be considering setting up smaller divisions for Noreascon 3 than we used for Noreascon 2. This would make things easier for the division heads, giving them a somewhat more manageable division. I started to wonder what these smaller divisions might look like, and came up with the above list as one of many possibilities. The purpose of the groups I have shown is not to be a separate level of management. It is just to provide a convenient way of thinking about the divisions.

I think this list has probably too many divisions (16), but some of these could be merged into larger ones. For example, Registration could be combined with Treasury into one division. Dealers and Special Exhibits are both small and probably should be combined, since they will probably be in the same physical space anyway. Finally, I think the three divisions listed under the Functions group should be combined, if someone can be found to take the job. If all of these combinations are made, we get the list down to 12 divisions, which might be manageable.

In some cases, I couldn't decide what division to put certain areas under. Logistics might well go under Tech. Services, since it deals largely with technical equipment and attracts similar types of people. Then again, it could go under Area Support. Even if the move-in part of logistics goes under Tech. Services, it might be useful to have the storage and allocation function go under Area Support. The member information item might also go under Member Services; I put it with Information Services since it would put them in the main information flow path.

In case it isn't obvious, I have intentionally done away with the traditional "Ops" area. More on how that might be handled later.

The division breakdown I've given includes only at-con activities and the immediate planning for those activities. One question I haven't addressed is the pre-con work — how should that be organized and how should that be blended into the at-con divisions? One pre-con job is Publications, which needs input from all the Divisions. Another is Pre-Registration, which is obviously intimately connected with Registration at-con. Volunteer tracking fades into People Mover at some point, and so on. . .

\* \* \*

I'd like to talk about how we made appointments last time, in response to Jill's motion at the last meeting about taking a committee vote on each division-head appointment.

One point that should be made is that rather than appointing people one at a time, leaving gaps that needed to be filled later, we considered the over-all structure and the available people together, and came up with an over-all plan at one time. (I'm talking about just division heads here — area heads and staff were appointed at various other times.)

Certain people had, of course, their ideas about what they wanted to do, and we did have a rough organizational chart. But sometimes two people wanted the same job, and sometimes no one wanted a particular job. To some extent, therefore, the organizational chart was molded by who was available, what they wanted, and what they were

good at.

For example, both Jim H. and Don were interested in "Operations." To solve this situation, we created a large Member Services division that contained a lot of Ops-type functions. Since Jim was already showing unmistakable signs that he was concerned with how our members felt about the convention, I felt it would be perfect to have him in charge of a division that had that main responsibility. If he was disappointed by not getting Ops, he never let on, and did a bang-up job running Member Services. Without Jim, though, Member Services would probably not have existed in that form.

Of course, once you laboriously piece together (like a jigsaw puzzle) what the best fit of people and divisions is, and convince each appointee to "buy into" the job, it becomes almost anticlimactic to talk about voting on the separate appointments. If one were rejected, the whole package would have to be reshuffled.

\*\*\*

Jim goes on to talk about the role of a Chairman's staff. Here I agree with the basic idea, but disagree a little with the at-con role he describes.

At the con, I think of the staff in the role of a support staff, rather than as clones of the chairman. The chairman can use them to 1) collect information about what's really happening, 2) filter people wanting to talk to the Chairman, solving or re-directing the simple problems, and letting only the more serious ones pass through, and 3) provide a way for the Chairman to do more than one thing at a time, by delegating specific tasks to the staff, leaving the Chairman free to be elsewhere.

In a sense, the Chairman's staff I envision would take over the high-level portion of problem-solving that has frequently been done by "Ops." They could be a place that lower levels can turn to for help with cross-divisional or unanticipated problems, without feeling like they're hassling the Chairman. This would be especially useful if we go the route of more, smaller divisions.

The advantage of this way of doing it is that the staff would have been intimately involved in the advance planning and would know what is supposed to be happening, the people involved, etc., and would be in good communication with the Chairman and each other.

Whether or not there is a chairman's staff, and how it will function, is ultimately Mark's decision, of course.

#### Organizing the Convention (Mark Olson):

Leslie made the point recently that the higher-level staff appointments for N2 resembled a jigsaw puzzle much more than they did a simple series of appointments.

[People seem to have the notion] that we have so many competent people that there are lots of qualified candidates for each job and the Chairman's problem is to select among many choices. Not so. Anyone who has been a Boskone chairman recently can tell you that even at Boskone there is a real shortage of people both able and willing to do any particular job. I expect this to be a bigger problem at N3, which will be a 4-times-larger convention.

What I expect to happen is something like this:

Over the next 6-9 months we'll continue talking about staffing and structure (I understand that Leslie and Jim H. both have comments in this apa). During that same period, we'll be talking about who wants to do what and who's able to do what. (Incidentally, people should think about making it clear to me and to other people what sorts of areas they are interested in.)

With a little bit of luck, a consensus will develop as to who should do what areas and, conversely, what the areas should be. Note carefully, the people who are available to run the areas will define the areas every bit as much as the available areas will select for people interested in running them.

Inevitably, this approach will result in a batch of appointments coming together at one time — appointing a few people here and a few people there makes the interactive development of the organization impossible.

I don't think that it will be desirable for us to discuss personalities in APA:89, but it will definitely be appropriate to discuss convention organization — indeed, I see this as one of the main topics of the next 9 months.

I would like to see the major appointments (i.e., divisional) made in the summer of '87. This appears to give us adequate time to think things through, and still result in at least the top levels of our staff being in place at Conspiracy in Brighton. Failing to have major staff appointments in place by the '87 Worldcon costs us a real chance for the appropriate people to start looking at how a Worldcon operates and to recruit. Additionally, I suspect that people will start to wonder if we've got our act together if a full year after we were picked we still haven't any staff appointments.

Problems I see include how to prevent runaway staffing where one area engorges itself on staff at the expense of others, how we should try to coordinate lower-level staff appointments, and the question of [whether we can work smoothly with] out-of-town staff in high positions.

---

#### Letters

---

#### Worldcon Bids

• DC-area fans have announced a Worldcon bid for 1992, under the sponsorship of the Washington Science Fiction Association. Proposed facilities are the Sheraton Washington (former Sheraton Park), Omni Shoreham, and Washington Hilton, with a combined total of 3425 guest rooms and 103 meeting rooms. The group plans to form a corporation under the name DISCON, INC. Present at the first meeting of the formation committee were Jack Heneghan, Kent Bloom, Joe Mayhew, Naomi Ronis, Dan Hoey, Kate Terrell, Alan Huff, Vicki Smith, Mark and Jul Owings, Eva Whitley, Barry Newton, Mike Walsh, and Lee Smoire. Pre-supporting memberships will be \$5, and the first bid parties are planned for the 1987 Worldcon and NASFiC. For more information, write to Discon II Worldcon Bid Committee, PO Box 971, College Park MD 20740.

• On a lighter note, we received a flyer from Rich Zellich announcing the "Airplane Bid," TransWorldCon in 1991! "The flight crew of TransWorldCon proposes to charter a TWA stretch jumbo jet and fly it around the world, for a true 'world' convention. . . . We have the entire baggage hold for the dealer's room; the upstairs first-class lounge for the around-the-clock/world con suite; and the plane is already set up for in-flight movies. . . . The art show will consist of a constant showing of all works on an auto-advance carousel slide projector on one of the in-flight movie screens. . . . there will probably not be a masquerade (although aisle costumes will be encouraged)." The bid officers include Pilot John Novak, Co-Pilot Rich Zellich, and Navigator Neil Rest.

[It gives one pause, though, to remember that the Bermuda Triangle bid started out as a joke bid, and was transformed into a serious contender for the 1988 Worldcon. Can TransWorldCon be far behind? — LT]

• Lloyd Penney, Toronto, Ontario:

*The Myles' House in '89 bid fought the good fight, and nine official votes isn't bad for a bid, especially a hoaxbid. The fields by the Bos' farm weren't big enough for 8000 people, and the garage wasn't big enough for the SFWA party. . . .*

*The article on bidding expenses should be an interesting one, and I think it would be worthwhile if it could not only appear in TM3P, but also appear as an independent publication available to fandom at large. I can think of a couple of groups who could use a jolt of reality in the form of a Worldcon bid expense estimate, or actual financial statement from a past Worldcon. First of all, there have been people from Toronto (myself included) who have explored the feasibility of a Worldcon. We received a lot of support in Atlanta from many American and Canadian fans; we have not received much support from Toronto fans in particular. Also, when you consider the devalued Canadian dollar (US\$1 = C\$1.40, C\$1 = US\$.72) and higher prices here too, we could add 50% to your own financial numbers, and take into account lower salaries in devalued dollars, and a bid from Toronto is almost financially impossible. Add the fact there is no organized sf club in Toronto, and a bid is not too likely. We are not discounting a bid in the future, but the present doesn't look good. We look at our own situation, and look at Winnipeg. . . . Winnipeg is a major city in Central Canada, approximately 400 miles NNW of Minneapolis, and they are looking at a Worldcon bid for 1994, competing against Cleveland and the Australian bid for that year. We don't believe they know what's involved, or how much time and money is involved, or how much experience one should have before thinking of bidding, and we would advise them to avoid heartbreak, disappointment and financial ruin by bidding with little experience and many people not knowing where Winnipeg is, or even what a Winnipeg is. Your article on bidding expenses would open their eyes, I'm sure. We don't mean to throw water on their fire; we just want them to know all about bidding. We don't feel they do.*

*In the [Eastlake] article, there is some mention about the financing behind the Holland in 1990 bid. Many people had thought that the bid had the backing of several groups, including KLM Royal Dutch Airlines, the Netherlands Congresgebouw (the potential site of a Dutch*

*Worldcon) and the Dutch government. According to members of the bid, there is support for the bid from the above groups, but nothing much in the way of financial support. The Holland in 1990 flyers with KLM on the front were printed by the airline, and the Grolsch beer at the bid party was shipped down to Atlanta by the brewery. All other expenses, and they have been staggering, have been borne by the bidcom. I'm sure a letter to chairman Kees van Toorn would settle a lot of questions about the bid's funding, and would lay many rumours to a final rest. As Kees stated at a later part of the article, funding was at a minimum from outside sources. What damage does Mr. Eastlake refer to on page 8?*

[The "damage" Don referred to in his article was the fact that the false information about the Holland bid having government funding was used to support the argument against the amendment to forbid the use of Worldcon profits for bid funding. The argument was made that there is nothing intrinsically unfair about bids being funded from previous Worldcons, since they are currently being funded by other large money sources. Holland was used as an example of a bid that was funded by a government. This was later found to be untrue, but only after the vote on the bid-funding amendment had failed. — LT]

*I admit bias, but I really do believe that Holland has a slightly better chance of winning 1990. While this is the first chance for a Worldcon to be in Holland, Los Angeles has announced that should they win 1990, it will be held in the same facilities they were in in 1984. Not often has a foreign Worldcon been refused, and I would choose a chance to travel to someplace new to me, rather than go to what looks to be a carbon copy of a previous Worldcon. Many people I have talked to share this feeling, and they also say that while they had a good time in L.A., they had a better time at other Worldcons. Another reason for the thought that Holland will win is geography. The site for the vote on 1990 is Brighton, and many European fans will come and vote for a nearby site, rather than one on the other side of the planet. I'm sure there are reasons I'm not yet aware of, but Holland, while they may not have the money L.A. does, have factors going for them that may outweigh money.*

### Noreascon 3 Planning

• Tom Endry, Flushing NY:

*In regard to a few ideas mentioned in the latest TM3P, let me add my enthusiastic support to the following:*

- a) *Dividing the Toastmaster's duties among various Con officials and pros.*
- b) *Museum party in Computer Museum.*
- c) *Running a film (how about Star Wars trilogy?) or some major item against the Masquerade to relieve the pressure.*

• From the Boston Globe sometime in November:

*Construction on an expanded John B. Hynes convention center in the Back Bay will be half completed within four months, according to a newsletter published by the Mass. Convention Center Authority, which is handling the development program.*

"Every aspect of the project is on or ahead of schedule," according to project engineering director Ken Leach.

The newsletter says that all major support piles are now in place and the building foundation is complete, that 75 percent of the project's structural steel has been fabricated and about 40 percent of it placed on site.

### ConFederation

#### • Tom Endry, Flushing NY:

Regarding Smofcon, you people, who can put on such excellent Boskones, need very little to learn to have a good Worldcon. (Maybe in the Masquerade?) Therefore I thought as my contribution, I would supply a list of items I enjoyed in recent cons, especially in Atlanta, for your kind consideration:

- a) Guided tour of the Art Show by "name" artists. It was very educational and helped me to learn about various styles, medias, etc.
- b) The case, when Mike Whelan's slide show ran into overtime, the Concom provided another room, where we had another hour of talk and a question-answer session with him.
- c) A retrospective art exhibit, somewhat better organized than in ConFederation. (Ken Moore admitted he put it together in 3 weeks.)
- d) A print table for ASFA.
- e) Close encounter with your favorite pro, with the pro reading from his/her work, or giving a slide show and giving a talk.

On the negative side, let me tell you about the following:

- a) Having the head of the Art Show running around like a headless chicken, now for screws, now for new drills, now for replacement batteries for the same drills and not being around most of the time to handle problems and answer questions.
- b) 12-2 programming. Somehow I always seem to miss a lot of good panels, because they are scheduled between 12 and 2. Don't these people eat? Don't the Concom realize that having a lunch, getting there and getting served takes at least an hour?
- c) 5-6 programming. It's not dinner time yet, but there is very little programming or none at all. Maybe this is the time, when the same people take their late lunches?

I may have some more thoughts later, but right now I got a lot of free stuff at World Fantasy Con and am trying to catch up on my reading. But let me tell you again that I enjoy very much this "behind the curtain" tour of the Worldcon with TM3P.

[These are all good suggestions, Tom, and we will be trying to do nearly all of them. The "guided tour" of the art show is something new to me, and sounds like a neat idea! We'd like to hear more information about that — how it was set up, which artists participated, etc. We had overflow rooms at Noreascon Two and will try to have them at N3, space permitting. Special art exhibits and a print table are certainly something we'd like to have. Close encounters with pros fits right into our goal of trying to make a big con feel small.

In regard to the lunch breaks, let me point out a problem. If all programming were to pause allowing everyone to go to lunch at the same time, the hotel and other nearby restaurants would likely get mobbed by the crowd, especially at a Worldcon-size convention. By continuing programming through lunch, people tend to eat when they are hungry, or when they are least interested in the programming, and are spread out through the day, making it possible for the hotel to handle. For example, I sometimes eat a big breakfast and then don't eat again until dinner. Other people take advantage of the quick snack stands, and don't really miss any programming. Then there are people who don't want us to schedule anything before noon, since they stay up late to party. We sympathize with your desire to be able to attend all of the program, but there just doesn't seem to be any one schedule that will please everyone. — LT]

#### • Tom Whitmore, Oakland CA:

I'd probably get to more business meetings if I weren't too busy working on the convention, so there's one piece of evidence for Don. Sounds like maybe I should exert some effort. There is a real paradox that many of the people who do the work of putting on the convention don't give the business meeting a very high priority on their personal lists.

I'm both surprised and pleased that you said nothing about Operations per se in your debriefing section. That means we did do our job well and generally unobtrusively. Thanks for the implicit compliment. Other comments on your debriefing:

In regard to Information, I would like to say that it was put together at almost the last minute by Katie Fillipowicz with almost no help from the Atlanta committee. Ben Yalow and I had to answer most of her questions because nobody in Atlanta responded. They all thought it was someone else's job, I guess. Indeed, all the points you raise about Info are true, and we would have done some of them if we could (the second info desk in the Hilton was dropped for lack of staff).

The caste system of different colored badges (or something similar) is useful for the attendees who don't know who everyone is. Perhaps a re-thinking of the system, with special colors for those with on-site responsibilities, is in order, but I don't think it should be thrown out. I agree that there was too much paperwork on upgrading, but the committee didn't keep timesheets on Staff and wanted to be able to keep track of who would get reimbursed. In effect, gophers were hourly; staff were salaried. It could have been handled better.

The comment on the Elevator Party Hosts in the debriefing says "This was labor-intensive." To some extent yes; but it involved a total of about 16 people. Given 4 banks of 3 elevators, 4 major floors on which all banks stopped, and an additional 36 floors with an unknown number of parties, it was much less labor-intensive than putting someone on each lobby (the first suggestion). And remember that it's only labor-intensive for a part of each day; the highest-density traffic times. You don't need it 24 hours. In fact, the only reason I thought it was labor-intensive at the time is that it had to be done on an ad hoc basis; if you can plan for it in advance, it's less labor-intensive than most of the functions of a Worldcon.



Four further comments on the elevator parties: we really worked very hard to make it feel like a group effort. The person (Rebekah ?? from Chicago, a friend of Smoke) who was on 10 making sure we could get drinks if needed was a great help in this. Two, it seemed to us that people actually got to where they were going faster than if the elevators had been allowed to crowd up. Three, I wouldn't try this without the active knowledge and consent of the hotel. We asked the Marriott before doing it, and they sent a man from their Loss Prevention department over to listen to our planning session. We didn't know what to expect; he just listened, and said "Fine" when we were done. And four, I really think that it worked because I gave people good instructions on what we expected. The doing of it was Jane Hawkins' decision, and she deserves full credit for that. But I spent a good part of both meetings with the crew telling them that we expected them to be calm, friendly, and firm, and they were. I think we all underestimate the power of explaining a stylistic approach to people.

George Flynn's comment on how Ops has made the convention feel small for the convention runners, and the importance of this, is very true. In fact, I've tried to make that explicit: when I run Ops, I try to make the room a friendly place for the entire committee, one where people will just drop in to see what's happening. This keeps the information flowing through Ops, and information flow is the main reason we're there. Note that I don't want to make a small convention just for Ops: that way lies major trouble! We need the rest of the committee, and are there to help them, not replace them (no matter what Zukowski says). Aside: the gamers and filkers already make their own small convention wherever they go. A costume display and discussion area might do this for masqueraders.

In regard to registration, opening earlier won't make any difference in the lines, unless you open at 7 am or earlier. What probably will work to minimize them is to announce an opening time and plan to open an hour earlier. This gives you a half-hour slippage without interfering with cutting the lines down, and an hour slippage without. And nobody objects when registration is open extra hours!

[Thanks, Tom, for sending us all this inside information on some of the operations-related areas. Your comments about Information actually focus on one problem with ConFederation that was never explicitly stated in the debriefing notes, which was that there was a big problem with communications between the separate divisions. We are hoping to do better in keeping our committee and staff informed about what's happening. I think we agree that some sort of identification system needs to be used for convention staff; we'd just like to find a way to streamline it if possible. You make a good point on the importance of briefing convention staff on the style of their interactions with the members. Many times, in the press of events, people just don't take the time to do this. Of course it helps when you have a highly motivated and dedicated crew, as ops tends to have. I think opening earlier than advertised is what we meant for registration; I just abbreviated a bit too much. — LT]

• Lloyd Penney, Toronto Ontario:

Some comments I could make on the Atlanta Worldcon myself . . . I had a marvellous time there, but these are meant as constructive criticisms for future Worldcons to think about. . .

The varied registration areas were poorly marked, and were hard to find. I had to go to the staff registration area, which was down a side passage at the Marriott. Not too hard to find, but it took 10 minutes before I could get to it.

The list of program items sorted by participants' names would be difficult to produce, especially seeing what happened in Atlanta . . . many, many, panels in Atlanta had to have new times, or new locations, or new panelists, and it was difficult to keep track of all the changes. I believe one issue of the newsletter (Articles of ConFederation) had one full side of the sheet with nothing but room/time/panelist changes for panels. I know that this is often beyond the control of the concom, but I hope that panel changes like this can be cut down to a minimum. There was often not enough notice about these changes, and it was difficult to find the rooms the panels were moved to. I believe we need not just better maps of the convention areas, but large-type (for visually handicapped as well as those of us in a hurry to get to a panel) signs listing room names on the first, second, third, etc., floors. This sign would sit in the foyer or main floor near main entry doors in the hotel or convention centre used.

[I spoke to a friend who worked in the ConFederation Program Division, and he sighed when he heard your comment. "You have no idea," he said, "how hard we tried to limit program changes." It seems that even trying very hard doesn't solve the problem. For one thing, the speakers are not getting paid to appear, so many of them do not take their commitments to the convention very seriously. Or, even if they do, they may find at the last minute that they cannot attend the convention at all, due to financial problems or conflicting responsibilities. Originally, the program staff decided that they would consider dropping or adding people to fixed items as appropriate, but would not allow any actual schedule changes (i.e., changing the time or location of an item). Then they found that two program rooms they had scheduled independently turned out to share one lighting and sound system. Thus one set of program items had to be moved elsewhere. Sometimes you just can't win. — LT]

Flyer/leaflet control was good in Atlanta, but the volume continues to increase. Separate sections could be used for con flyers, publication flyers, party flyers, etc.

The video feed into the hotels was great. I was able to watch the Hugos being given out on TV while setting up for a party starting immediately afterwards. I hope that this can be done in future years.

Re MCFI meeting minutes of September 17: Membership numbers and how they were assigned were mentioned. This reminds me of some dissension on the part of Canadian members of ConFederation. Everyone, of course, likes low membership numbers; this seems to signify some mysterious mark of fannishness, and how close you are to the concom, and to being a SMOF. I guess . . . we did notice that the first batch of Canadian

memberships were not entered as they were received, but were deposited in the 2000-plus numbering bracket. Canadian memberships seemed to be kept separate from American memberships, as were memberships from other countries, saving these low numbers for American fan. I know from a printout sent to me by the Atlanta concom that 108 Canadian fans (at least) had pre-registered by the end of April 1986, and that many of the membership numbers were consecutive, starting at 2018. Canadians would like to be a part of things, too. Were non-American fans put together for a special mailout, or for postage purposes? We don't know, but we would like to be included with everyone else in the order in which we buy our memberships, not pushed aside for convenience.

### The Mad 3 Party

- Lloyd Penney, Toronto Ontario:

*The new logo is a good one. Let's all conga to Boston. . .*

### Fan Hugos

- Lloyd Penney, Toronto Ontario:

*I would like to know more about the discussion over the years about the elimination of Fan Hugos. Are we that reluctant to give a little egoboo? Didn't know there was a shortage. . . Does it hurt so much to see someone happy, or to give an award for a good effort? Strange. . .*

[Well, the complete story about what has happened with the Fan Hugos over the years would take more space than we have available. The problem stems from the fact that most fanzines have small circulations — on the order of 200-400 subscribers. Because the number of Hugo voters generally ranges between 1000 and 1500, it's pretty clear that most of the voters haven't seen most of the candidates for the award. However, there are some zines that do have larger circulations, or a particularly devoted fan following, so those zines tend to dominate the awards. (You might think that people wouldn't nominate or vote in a particular category if they didn't feel qualified, but experience shows this isn't the way it works.) Many people feel that these demographics make the fan Hugos, as they are currently administered, essentially meaningless, since even an excellent small-circulation zine just doesn't have a chance. The recent split of the fanzine award into the "fan" and "semi-pro" categories was an attempt to address this problem. (Of course, in this rational discus-

sion, I have omitted all mention of the theological questions involved, such as what constitutes a "true fanzine.") — LT]

### Corrections

- Tom Whitmore, Oakland CA:

*DUFF nominations closed at the end of ConFederation, and TAFF nominations shortly after you released this issue [early November]. And DUFF voting will probably be over by the time this gets printed (12/31/86 is the closing date). So it's not quite accurate for you to have said nominations were being considered. . .*

[I stand corrected. But there's still time to vote for TAFF: ballots are due on 14 March. Nominees are: Bill Bowers, Brian Earl Brown, Mike Glicksohn, Jeanne Gomoll, and Robert Lichtman. In case you don't have the last issue handy, the TAFF administrators are Patrick and Teresa Nielsen Hayden, 75 Fairview 2D, New York, NY 10040, and Greg Pickersgill, 7A Lawrence Rd., South Ealing, London W5 4XJ. — LT]

- Additions to and Clarifications of *A Protracted View of the 1986 WSFS Business Meeting and Ancillary Events*, by Donald E. Eastlake, III:

1. I did not record any votes taken during the 1986 WSFS Business Meeting and so these were not mentioned in my article. You may be interested that the ratification of the amendment to the WSFS Constitution generally prohibiting the use of Worldcon profits by a committee to get themselves another Worldcon failed by a vote of 40-88, the amendment to provide geographic quotas for elected members to the Mark Registration and Protection Committee was ratified by a vote of 73-42, and the motion to reconsider assignment of the Business Meeting resolution compilation task to the Mark Registration and Protection Committee was ratified by a vote of 73-49. Since a quarter of the main seating area at the Business Meeting was about 30 people, you will note a shift of that many votes would have been enough to change the outcome of any of these votes.

2. In the discussion of "funding" for the Holland in 1990 bid by the Dutch government, I was referring to cash funding only. It is very common for hotels, tourist bureaus, and the like to offer to provide flyers, brochures, and even the services of a representative, to assist in obtaining events for their facilities. Some of such non-cash assistance is accepted by most bidding committees.

### The Mad 3 Party #15

Massachusetts Convention Fandom, Inc.  
Box 46, MIT Branch PO  
Cambridge MA 02139

FIRST CLASS MAIL