

**NCAA/BCS Coalition Press Conference
February 29, 2004
6:00 p.m. EST**

Operator: Thank you for standing by and welcome to this BCS Coalition call. This call is being recorded.

At this time, we will now go live to the Fontainebleau Hilton Resort where the presentation will begin shortly.

Moderator: We're about two minutes away. There's significant interest in this call, so we may delay long enough to make sure that we have as many phone lines answered as possible. Right now, the count is up to around 30 on the telephone calling in for the press conference.

Moderator: Good evening and welcome to this press conference. We'll begin with opening statements from President David Frohnmayr, University of Oregon; President Scott Cowen, Tulane University and Myles Brand, NCAA President. And then we will go to questions-and-answers, first from those reporters here, and then from those on the telephone.

I'd like to remind you that you will get a copy of the statement that is going to be read in a few moments available as soon after this call as we can possibly get it delivered. It will also be available on the Web sites for the NCAA, for the BCS and for the Coalition.

You can also get a replay of this press conference immediately afterwards by dialing 888-203-1112 or 719-451-0820 and use the same access code as you used for today's press conference.

We'll begin now with the opening statements, first from President David Frohnmayr

David Frohnmayer: Thank you very much. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Dave Frohnmayer. I'm President of the University of Oregon and Chair of the BCS Oversight Committee. We'd first like to thank everyone for your interest in today's meeting, allowing also first to thank NCAA President Myles Brand for facilitating this meeting, as he has on prior occasions.

Today, after substantial discussions, we have an agreement on a framework for significant positive change in Division I-A post season play. We're extremely pleased with the level of collegiality and accommodation that has led to the conclusions that we announced today. We have substantially increased the opportunities for Division I-A colleges to participate in BCS bowl games.

We have adjusted revenue distribution formulas to recognize the participation of those institutions not presently in the BCS conferences. We have agreement in principle to eliminate any adverse consequences of branding that may have unintentionally resulted from the present contractual arrangements. And we have agreed in principle to broaden significantly the involvement of all Division I-A conferences in the design and administration of the BCS.

There will be the addition of the fifth bowl game if the market supports it. There was no active discussion of a championship playoff. And we are convinced that this set of arrangements will lead to greater participation of a larger number of student athletes in the BCS bowls and will help all Division I-A institutions.

Details of the plan are being worked out and will be released after the full concurrence of the conferences. But we are confident that we have created a framework for discussion that will

benefit all of the institutions and their students. This arrangement will begin at the conclusion of the current BCS contracts.

If I may, let me identify the following Presidents and Chancellors who participated in today's meeting. Representing the Bowl of Championship Series Presidential Oversight Committee were President David Frohnmayer, University of Oregon; Chancellor Harvey Perlman, University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Chancellor Marye Anne Fox, North Carolina State University; President Graham Spanier, Pennsylvania State University; President David Hardesty, West Virginia University; Chancellor Robert Khayat, University of Mississippi and Father Edward Malloy, Notre Dame President.

Representing the coalition presidents were Scott S. Cowen, President of Tulane University; Kermit Hall, President of Utah State University; Stephen Weber, President of San Diego State University; John Welty, President of Fresno State University; John Peters, President of Northern Illinois University; and Gerald Turner, President of Southern Methodist University. And of course, as I mentioned NCAA President Myles Brand is the facilitator. I'd now be happy to turn to my colleague Scott Cowen for his comments.

Scott Cowen: Thank you. Today is a very good day intercollegiate athletics and higher education. Our agreement is a positive and important step forward in developing an inclusive, fair system to govern post season play in football.

From the perspective of the coalition, I can tell you we are very pleased because the agreement provides significant improvement on all of the issues we have been discussing for months, access, revenue distribution, branding, and the administration of bowl championship series.

I want to join President Frohnmayer in thanking Dr. Brand for his role as a facilitator in the last nine months. It has been a very useful role that he has played. Likewise, I would like to thank President Frohnmayer and my colleagues from the bowl championship series.

As you all know, this has been a difficult and contentious issue to deal with for the last five months, but we came together as a group of presidents today, and I think, did something that was incredibly positive for higher education and for our student athletes in all Division I-A schools.

David Frohnmayer: Myles, would you like to comment?

Myles Brand: Let me add briefly, this agreement that's been reached today is a significant victory for college sports and higher education. It will benefit the institutions of both groups, and most especially the student athletes. I compliment in the strongest way possible the presidents and chancellors who have worked on these issues over the last nine months.

Their discussions were serious. They were always pointed in the direction, to the advantage of higher education and their student and their student athletes in particular. And again, I cannot say enough in terms of complimenting them for their good, hard, and thoughtful work.

Moderator: We will now take questions first from the reporters here. Please raise your hand. Wait for a microphone to get to you so that all can hear the question. And then please identify yourself and your affiliation.

Mark Long: (Mark Long) with the Associated Press. And I'm just trying to figure out what the market supporting the fifth game, what does that mean? And how will that be determined?

David Frohnmayer: Well it will be determined in significant part by people with whom we've not had discussions. Bear in mind that we have a partner already, that's ABC television. And if it should choose, or it should be awarded the contracts, that's obviously once of the first issues that would be discussed is the potential expansion, at least as we envision it.

And of course, there is an existing bowl system in place, as there has been for many years. In fact, has been a growing system of bowls. And so under those circumstances, obviously the fact that we have this agreement today, does not conclude the discussions that need to be had with those various persons and entities who are vital to making sure that there's a vibrant and market responsive, and hopefully healthy response to this initiative.

Moderator: Next question please.

Craig Barns: (Craig Barns), Sun Sentinel, Largo, Florida. For any of you, fifth bowl game if the market does warrant it and support it, would that come from bowl games that currently exist? And would that game be moved in to a higher level of payment, in other words, out pay? Or would it be a game that does not currently exist? And a game that would be started from the beginning?

David Frohnmayer: That's a good question. And I think we're not in a position, unfortunately to answer it. Because we are envisioning a bowl of equal stature in terms of its command of television audiences, and its desirability from the standpoint of teams. And whether that would come from the volunteering of an existing bowl system and its own structure or the creation of – by some community of a new bowl, I think, it's simply – we simply can't determine at this point. Not because we wouldn't like to answer your question but because it's unknown.

Moderator: Any other questions from Miami? A follow question from Mr. Barns?

Craig Barns: Could you – could someone explain to me, just briefly without getting in to a great deal of detail, when you talk about revenue distribution formulas, are they yet to be put together? Or is that something that has just been agreed to in principle?

David Frohnmayr: We've agreed to them in principal. We know what the approximate percentage increase is likely to be. What we don't know is the overall financial yield per institution or per conference. And I think, again, you can understand since this all has to be evaluated by the market, we have yet to be able to put any precise figure.

I think it is fair to say that the share of those conferences currently not in the BCS has been increased. And that if this is, as we all hope, a system which will increase the overall revenues of the system itself, that those will be shared in by all of the institutions in the 11 conferences involved, plus Notre Dame.

Mark Long: (Mark Long) again with AP. What are the exact changes to the format that would allow non-BCS schools a better chance at playing in a BCS bowl?

David Frohnmayr: Well certainly – this is David Frohnmayr, for those of you who are offsite. One of the first things, I think, that needs to be said is that if you increase the number of bowls, then you increase the number of access points at which people can be included, institutions can be included.

So that is a key to the decision to move from four to five. Obviously, increasing the number of at large institutions. We've developed a formula to complex to try to be represented that would determine when it is that a conference champion not otherwise picked for the BCS might be eligible.

That will be – the details in that will be forth coming as we memorialize this agreement. But the consequence of it is that there is a significant increase, probably doubling the opportunities, perhaps even tripling the opportunities based upon historic performance of institutions that are not on the BCS to participate in a BCS game.

Scott Cowen: I would like to just underscore that because, as many of you know, the single most important issue for the coalition has been improved access. And there is no question, as President Frohnmayer said that under the agreement we reach today we will have significantly improved access over what we have had in the past.

Moderator: We'll take one more question from Miami before we go to the phones.

Welch Suggs: (Welch Suggs) for the Chronicle of Higher Education. How many automatic (berths) and how many at-large slots will there be in the five bowls?

David Frohnmayer: Again, this is David Frohnmayer and that's still subject to some finalization. Every one of the BCS conferences will have an automatically qualifier. Yes. And there's provision basically based upon national ranking of 12 or better that will include potentially a significantly greater number of institutions. So you can't actually put a number on it from year-to-year. It will – this is still a merit based system.

We have done our level best not to dilute the quality of play that will be accessible in post season BCS games. So based upon merit, national rankings, however, calculated, there is likely to be greater opportunity. But there will be at a minimum, of course, the six guaranteed slots for the current members of the BCS.

Scott Cowen: There's a point also, I'd like to underscore what Dave just said. Under the agreement we reached today about the access rules, and assuming we go to a fifth bowl, that the average ranking of the school's playing in the bowls, will actually be improved over what has been the case under the current BCS system. This underscores the fact that there will be absolutely no dilution of the quality of the teams that will be playing, even though more of our teams will be able to eligible for it.

Moderator: We'll take questions now from those on the telephone. Again, please identify yourself, and your affiliation. First question, please.

Operator: Our first question comes from Dennis Dodd with CBS Sports Lines.

Dennis Dodd: It's Dennis Dodd. Dr. Frohnmayr, and I'll go from there, the fifth bowl would include two non-BCS schools, one BCS school, on non-BCS school? Sorry for the branding, but who would be eligible for that?

David Frohnmayr: Well, any one of the eligible institutions could be in any one of the bowls. Because the point is really parity of access was once a bowl eligible team is selected. So it's impossible to say (a priory) who would be in the bowls.

Now I will add this qualification, that of course, there are traditional bowl alignments. And being the representative of the PAC 10 in addition to the CEO of the President's and Chancellors I will tell you that the Big 10, PAC 10 Rose Bowl Affiliation is time honored over 50 years. And has been a special circumstance even within the BCS itself.

Other traditional conference alignments do exist. So the choices will undoubtedly not be random, but there will be obviously no prior decision that a BCS or non-BCS team must be in a given bowl.

That will be based on merit, and on the basis of this selection process after the eligibility for the bowl has been determined.

Dennis Dodd: And I'm assuming, just you've made it sound like this would be open for bidding for any TV carrier. Will ABC get first shot or what?

David Frohnmayr: Well we have a contractual arrangement with ABC that requires us to reopen discussions with them. And so it's obviously pre mature for me to say that there will be or how many other potential media outlets will be involved. We have contractual obligations that we certainly intend to honor, but obviously are legally required to honor.

Dennis Dodd: Can you give us some idea of what the cut will be? I mean I know it sounds like you don't know for sure, but, you know, right now it's number 12 or higher to quality, you know, number six or higher automatic. How is that going to change? Can you give us some kind of idea of how that's going to be?

David Frohnmayr: I don't believe that it's – I know it would be helpful, but I don't know that it would be accurate to respond to your question now until we have really developed the specifications. I do think that you can depend on the fact that we will have, as Dr. Cowen indicated, top quality teams. And perhaps a higher overall average ranking of teams playing as a consequence of these arrangements.

Scott Cowen: I think Dave is right. It's – at this moment it's not appropriate to talk about the specifics. But I think we can say that if the rules that we have agreed to were in place over the last six years, coalition teams would have participated multiple times in the BCS bowls.

Moderator: Next question, please.

Operator: And our next question comes from Mark Anderson with Las Vegas Review.

Mark Anderson: Yes, hi, this is for David Frohnmayer. Is there a chance of adding conferences to the current BCS climate or changing conferences out given all of the shake up around the country?

David Frohnmayer: Well I think that the performance of all of the conferences is going to be evaluated through the course of this next contractual arrangement, to the extent institutions change conferences, obviously that throws some unknowns in to the system. But we'll face those as we go just as face them under the present system.

Mark Anderson: OK. And I just want to be sure I'm clear on this, that even with the fifth bowl non-BCS conferences are not guaranteed to getting a team in.

David Frohnmayer: That's correct.

Moderator: Next question, please.

Operator: Our next question comes from Mark Blaudschun with Boston Globe.

Mark Blaudschun: Yes, this question is for anybody. I wanted to get one thing straight about the Big East's performance – position in this. Does that mean that the Big East is guaranteed a spot as one of the six original BCS conferences?

David Frohnmayer: The BCS will continue to be a member of the BCS subject to the same kind of periodic review that is provided for in our internal guidelines.

Mark Blaudschun: So if they maintain a rank team, what it – under the current rules then they're guaranteed a spot then?

David Frohnmayer: Yes, they are currently a member of the BCS. They will, under the new arrangements, continue to be a member of the BCS. And as all of the rest of us subject to the periodic review of their overall record and performance.

Moderator: I know we have lots of questions. I'm going to limit you to one question, one follow up. And then we'll move on to the next one. Next question, please.

Operator: We're now moved to Liz Clarke with Washington Post.

Liz Clarke: Yes, I just wanted to make sure on the payment of this fifth bowl, assuming it's elevated to – assuming, you know, you go ahead with this idea, will be it be exactly the same as the other four, the existing four, or will it be sort of a percentage of that?

David Frohnmayer: It's our hope that it will be the same. It's our hope, in fact, that the interest in the series will be heightened by the availability of one more game. So it's our hope that actually this hole process, this whole new system will generate more revenue. We would now propose to have anyone of the bowls be a junior bowl. We consider them all, if this system is successful to be of equal stature in terms of their BCS desirability.

Bearing in mind, of course, the special conditions and circumstances that I've mentioned previously including the special status of the Rose Bowl and its relationship to the Big 10 and the PAC 10 which has resulted in, as you know, a separate contractual set of relationships between Tournament of Roses, and ABC that's currently in force.

Moderator: Next question, please.

Operator: Moving on, we'll take our next question from Wendell Barnhouse with Fort Worth Star.

Wendell Barnhouse: Yes, I'd like to get two questions in. First of all, what is the marketplace doesn't support a fifth bowl in the BCS?

David Frohnmayer: I think we sit down and talk some more.

Scott Cowen: Yes.

Wendell Barnhouse: OK. Now assuming that the marketplace does support a fifth bowl, it sounds like the devil, basically is in the details. Will the commissioners of the BCS with the Presidential oversight committee be charged with deciding OK where the cut off is? Or what the, you know, how things will work as far as the qualifications for quote-unquote the non-BCS conferences? I mean in other words, will the commissioners work out the details to make this work?

Scott Cowen: We actually – that was part of the discussion agreement we have today. We have decided on a set of access rules that will define what coalition teams or conference champions will play in those bowls. So that was part of the agreement today, that at some later date we will share with everyone.

Moderator: Next question, please.

Operator: We'll take our next one from Stewart Mandel with SportsIllustrated.com.

Stewart Mandel: Yes, for whoever wants to answer it, would you say that the model that you agreed on today was based primarily on discussions that were held by the two presidential groups? Or were they – or was that particular model a recommendation by the conference commissioners?

David Frohnmayer: I think it would be this juncture very difficult to unravel the tapestry and decide which idea came from where. This has been a collaborative process that actually started a year ago in April with the discussions among the 11 commissioners the dependency of the expiration of the contracts become available.

As you know, the commissioners met intensively for two days in Atlanta, the 12th and 13th of February. They've been in communication informally since we, the presidents and chancellors, have had a long series of discussions. We put proposals out for reactions.

And I think, what we have today is – works from the framework that had developed through our mutual discussions. So I don't think it's fair to say that this is any – that the template is owned by any single participant. I think it was really a joint collaborative effort.

Myles Brand: Let me add something to this in my own personal perspective. I think the commissioners input, all 11 commissioners has been absolutely invaluable. But the decision makers on this were the university president's. And the university presidents have exercised clear control in to collegiate athletics and doing so.

Moderator: Next question, please.

Operator: Tony Barnhart with the Atlanta Journal Constitution.

Tony Barnhart: This is for Dr. Cowen. Dr. Cowen, you've given us the specific ideas in terms of increasing access and things of that issue. But the branding issue seems to be a little more vague. What have you agreed to today that's going to improve the branding concerns that you've had?

Scott Cowen: There's several different strategies we're talking about that would eliminate the branding. But remember, part of the branding issue was because of access. And if we got the access improved significantly, that in and of itself would take care of some of the branding issues.

However, there is general philosophic agreement, it would have probably have been an agreement on this point for a longer period of time than any other is that we have to minimize, if not eliminate all of the branding differences between all of the schools that are in Division I-A. And there's several ways to go about doing that. And we're going to explore those various strategies in the months and weeks ahead.

David Frohnmayer: I think it would – while I have this forum, let me just add that it would be helpful to have the assistance of all of the members of the working media who are on this call, of their colleagues, to assist us in recognizing that under the system to which we are moving every Division I-A institution is a BCS institution, in the sense, and a very real sense that it will be have an equal opportunity based upon it's merit and its competitiveness to participate at the highest level in one of the BCS games.

And so the notion that there will be within the Division a BCS versus non-BCS institutions which is an unintended consequence at best, will certainly be an artifact of history as this new system is implemented.

Moderator: Next question, please.

Operator: Tedd Lewis with New Orleans Times.

Tedd Lewis: Yes, for anyone there. If this fifth game comes about, will it be part of the championship game rotation?

David Frohnmayr: The present intention is that it would be part of the regular rotation. Now I want to give the same qualifications to that as we began this news conference. And that is that we have said today is subject to being tested in the market, that is to say the viability of the fifth bowl.

It's our present intention that the structure of that be one that would make it of equal stature in terms of those teams and student athletes playing in it to the other bowls. And exactly how that will evolve, and we have a very good question here from the live audience as to whether this would mean the creation of a new bowl, or the so called elevation of an existing bowl, that remains to be determined.

Many existing bowls are very happy with alliances that they may have with conferences or with individual institutions. So we can't tell you in advance that there will be a particular formula, by which the fifth bowl is picked. And that is one of the unknown factors as we go to this next step.

Moderator: Next question, please.

Operator: Blair Kerkhoff with Kansas City Star.

Blair Kerkhoff: Dr. Cowen, you said earlier that if the rules had been in place previously, there would have been some teams from the, you know, the non-BCS conferences involved in this. I'm

wondering if you all took some seasons from the past few years, and can provide some examples of situations where some of these teams would have been in a BCS bowl.

Scott Cowen: You know, without going in to the specific names, if the rules that we have agreed on today were in place over the last six years, I believe four out of the six years a conference championship from the coalition teams would have played in the BCS bowl.

Moderator: Next question, please.

Operator: Jerry Palm with CollegeBCS.com.

Jerry Palm: Hi, my question has already been answered, thanks.

Operator: Again, that's pound if your question has been answered. And we'll now move to John Henderson with Denver Post.

John Henderson: Yes, was there any changes or any discussions about offering the formula to determine the BCS rankings? There's a lot of controversy over some of the computer rankings? Just anybody.

David Frohmayer: Sir, I'm sorry that I could not understand your question on the audio. Could you repeat it please?

John Henderson: Yes, was there any discussions about altering the formula of the BCS ranking? There was a lot of controversy about from the computing ratings?

David Frohnmayer: Well let me answer that generically. I think the formulate for picking the champion has been changed every single year except perhaps for this year. And clearly that is on the agenda of issues that we will take on together. But it played no significant role whatever in today's discussion.

That – we recognize that as a separate issue of contract administration or of the working of the system as it's established. What we were talking about today was really the structural framework of the overall BCS conferences and bowl system. And now the specific formula, whether it's human based, computer based or hopefully not a role of the dice.

Moderator: We will take four more questions from the telephone before we take follow up questions from here in Miami. Next question, please.

Operator: Kelly Whiteside with USA Today.

Kelly Whiteside: My question is what's next in terms of when do you hope to decide on a venue? And then another question I have is, was a standalone game after the four BCS games every discussed, you know, just to eliminate the split national champion situation that we had this year?

David Frohnmayer: Well to the first question, the contract between the Tournament of Roses, and ABC is up for discussion practically immediately. In fact, the opening date for that was in January. It is hoped, at least that those discussions can begin no later than May.

The other contracts that compromise the bowl championship series need to be addressed probably no later than September or at least those negotiations need to be open. So there is a premium on speed and accuracy here at this stage.

With respect to your second question, the notion of having a four plus-one system, or that is to say the four existing BCS bowls, and then a championship playoff game, that was not discussed in any serious or extended matter today because of the number of institutions speaking to the presidents and chancellors who actively resist any intrusion on the academic calendar beyond that that's already represented by the existing bowl games. So that was not a significant matter of discussion today at all.

Scott Cowen: It's important also where people may differ on the importance of that plus-one game. From the coalition's point of view, from day one, we have always said that the important issues to us were access and revenue distribution and branding, and the administration. And those are the issues that we have seen positive and significant improvement on. And therefore, it was not a topic of conversation today to talk about the plus one possibility.

Moderator: Next question, please.

Operator: Andy Bagnato with Arizona Republic.

Andy Bagnato: The question I have is sort of getting after what Kelly said about the fifth game, do you see this system – I mean will we still call it the BCS? And for how much longer do you want this system to be in place? And a lot of people will ask are we headed towards the playoffs after this?

David Frohnmayr: I will speak with myself but with some confidence that I speak for a great number of institutions who's presidents and chancellors I've discussed this issue with.

There is no sentiment of any significance for a national playoff based upon the academic reasons and the welfare of student athletes being the primary reasons why that is opposed and opposed

strongly. So that did not seem a fruitful avenue to pursue. I know some conferences felt this unanimously.

I do think that I can tell you there is a very wide spread belief, and this is not just one of recent creation, it's one of long-standing by presidents, chancellors, faculties of our respective institutions that football ought basically to be a one season sport.

And that's a position to which we have adhered, I think, with great success. And given the American public unparalleled opportunities for entertainment, for engagement, and for viewing some of the finest athletes in the country as it is.

We think that the BCS system as we've envisioned it will be continued with the modifications that we've discussed constructively together. And believe that that will be and continue to provide both a venue for participation by large numbers of student athletes and fans and institutions. As well as be something that stands alone as a – the best venue presently defined to find a national champion.

Scott Cowen: Let me also comment on the labeling of the BCS which was part of your question. From our perspective, whether it's called a BCS or something else is not as important as us being part of the total system. And I think, what we accomplish today through the improvements that we have made, is that we are now part of the system, in what I would say is certainly much more inclusive than it has been in the past.

As President Frohnmayer said in an earlier statement, from now on, when we talk about the BCS on a go forward basis, you should think of that as representing all 117 schools that are Division I-A. And we would espouse under the agreement today, we feel that we are part of the BCS on a go forward basis.

Myles Brand: Let me add to something that David Frohnmayer said. The schools that discussed and rejected this idea of a national playoff perhaps on the scale of the NFL, understand fully, and in particular the president's understand fully that there would be additional revenue if that were the case but have rejected that in favor of not moving towards a professional model by retaining the value and worth of the current playing opportunity both season and post season in collegiate football.

To move otherwise, is to engage in an entertainment level that's more appropriate for professional leagues than it is for college sports. So knowingly leaving money on the table to preserve the value of the game and the role of the student athletes is a decision that they have made.

Scott Cowen: I guess well to make one other comment about that, not in any way to dilute or detract from the comments of my colleagues, but I want to reiterate that was not a subject of conversation today. So there was no position taken as a collective group on that particular issue. Not to deflect the comments, but that was not a topic of conversation.

Moderator: One more question from the reporters on the telephone, before we take follow up questions from here in Miami.

Operator: Barry Mannion with WABC.

Barry Mannion: Hi. Yes, the question would be from a going forward proposition from a decision making was there going to be like a sub committee representing kind of both sides of the table here? Or is it kind of going to be a different way to make decisions going forward?

David Frohnmayer: I think the chancellors of our respective conferences were involved intimately enough in these discussions, and in fact, were present at the table for a good part of the day. And certainly understand the thrust of where we go. And much of the detail to be worked through is technical detail of extreme importance.

We don't intend to negotiate as a committee as a whole. We think we've had our last meeting of presidents and chancellors as a body on this particular subject for this particular purpose. So smaller groups or delegates of various groups will, I think, be in the implementation phase, but this is not an occasion for further summit meetings.

Scott Cowen: I would also say that, I think, from this day forward, we should no longer talk about the two sides. In the spirit of the agreement that we reached today, there is one side. We are together on it. The media could help us in doing this. We've had enough divisiveness in the past in the past as a result of this; let's not perpetuate that in to the future.

So as far as I'm concerned, the coalition has gone out of business today. And we are all now part of one side, whether we call it the BCS or the ABC or the XYZ, I don't care, but we're part of one system.

Moderator: Follow up question from (Welch Suggs), please.

Welch Suggs: Scott, how does this arrangement help address the really serious financial problems faced by Tulane and other Division I-A football teams outside ((inaudible)).

Scott Cowen: Well as we have always said, if we had improved access, improved revenue distribution that would help significantly. And the accord that we reached today will help significantly on both

of those issues. So it's not the panacea. We never saw it as the panacea. But it is improvement, a significant improvement, from where we are right now, therefore it will be a help.

Welch Suggs: Dr. Cowen, you intimated that the (patient) formula for better access has been determined, but you can't tell us that. Is there a reason why you can't tell us what that is?

Scott Cowen: We're in the process right now of making sure we memorialize everything that we agreed on today, and has the opportunity to talk to our respective conferences about it. And we think we owe the courtesy to our colleagues to make sure we have those conversations, so they're fully knowledgeable of all of the details before we begin to talk about them publicly.

Moderator: It is my understanding that there are still some questions from reporters on the phone. We'll take five more questions from there and then conclude the press conference. First question, please. First question from telephone.

Operator: Keith Whitmeyer with Dallas Morning News.

Keith Whitmeyer: Other than increasing access to the bowl games, ho will the coalition schools have more involvement. You said you would broaden the involvement.

David Frohmayer: Well, I think, at least in three respects. First of all, in addition, of course, to increasing the overall accessibility or opportunity to play, maybe we'll use a different term for it to greater numbers of schools within conferences that have not traditionally been represented in BCS games results to an increased revenue share that will play a role, perhaps in the overall athletic budgets of these institutions.

We have said that we will work together to eliminate any potential stigma based upon inadvertent branding. And we have said specifically that without having precise details, because the present administration actually has been very lean and unbureaucratic, that there would be processes for consultation with the former coalition members as we go forward on a variety of details in the design and implementation in key decision points of the new BCS series.

I can give you a practical example, if you wish, and I haven't cleared this with my colleagues, but I'm sure it's true, the much maligned, and extremely difficult issue of trying to decide what human polls are better, and what computer polls are better, and how one weights these.

That's the kind of decision in which we would expect – because it is so important for the overall ratings that may determine access to the bowls I'm sure that's a matter in which there will be increased consultation with our colleagues.

Moderator: Next question, please.

Operator: Michael Lewis with Salt Lake Tribune.

Michael Lewis: Hello. For anyone there. I wondered if in a particular year, one of the former non-BCS conferences does not qualify a team to play in one of the five bowl games, would it still see an increased share of revenue from what it has reaped in the past under this system.

Scott Cowen: Yes, under the agreement we did today the answer is yes it would.

Moderator: Next question, please.

Operator: Mark Blaudschun with Boston Globe.

Mark Blaudschun: Yes, one question about the length of the new contract, has that been discussed in terms of the number of years? Or is that still open for negotiation?

David Frohnmayer: I think it would be really premature to talk about contract duration. That's going to depend upon parties who are not here at this table. And I don't want to be presumptuous and say what they'd agree to.

Moderator: Next question.

Operator: Dennis Dodd with CDS Sports Line.

Dennis Dodd: Just to make sure, this fifth bowl would be in the championship rotation and subject to the same, I guess, rules and teams available as all of the other bowls, except the Rose Bowl?

David Frohnmayer: That is our present intention.

Moderator: And a final question from a reporter on the telephone.

Operator: Tedd Lewis with New Orleans Times.

Tedd Lewis: The president of ABC Sports recently told, I think the (Knight Commission) that ABC is losing money on the current BCS system. Why do you have optimism then that a fifth bowl that would involve teams that, because they're not currently the BCS system, would be looked on as (creating) fewer viewers, fewer potential buyers? Why would this be an attractive option?

David Frohnmayr: Well, you know, I'm going to let my colleague Dr. Cowen respond to that as well. But I think that what, if anything, college football has shown that it has a tremendous capacity to attract viewers. In fact, the overall viewership of collegiate post season football has increased quite significantly over the last few years. I am not aware of a network that is losing money over this particular asset.

I think if you look at the overall picture, this has to be a very attractive media package. And I'm just assuming that based upon its desire to reopen contractual discussions, that we will find at least one network that is interested in talking about a healthy way to support this important form of athletic competition.

Scott Cowen: I would add two other observations. One is we always have to be very cautionary when we hear a statement like we are losing money on a product, because that product can be defined very narrowly or very broadly, especially when it comes to media rights. So I would not assume that ABC is losing money on just the BCS component of their package.

The second thing is there has been enough, what I would call, very preliminary market analysis about the attractiveness of the fifth bowl that leads us to believe that there is a market out there. That of course, will be tested. But we go into this with a high degree of confidence that there is a market for this.

Moderator: That concludes this press conference. I'll remind you that a replay is available immediately at 888-203-1112 or 719-451-0820. The pass code is 689461. Thank you for joining us.

END