

#2

H.V. Porter  
Chicago, Ill.

thought that it might be permissible to build these special, small size backboards, out from the pipe supports about a foot so that the stringer would not be so prominent, as was the case in Chicago and in New York, as you will remember. Of course this would result in the length of the playing court being shortened at both ends, and I am wondering what your opinion of this change is, as far as tests this Summer in the coaching schools are concerned. In other words, do you think it would make a great deal of difference to the coaches if the playing floor was reduced by this construction of the test backboard to the existing pipe supports. We are of the opinion that in order to give the special backboard a fair test, without the hindrance of the necessary wood stringer being immediately behind the board, this suggested extension of the board a foot from the stringer would be the lesser of two evils. Would you care to give us your opinion, Mr. Porter?

Further, in connection with the coaching schools, it would be our intentions to supply a pair of the special size backboard - one of them with a flat surface and the other with a convex surface. We lean toward the convex surface as a result of the expressions we have had from a number of interested basketball authorities, including those who were in New York, even though, as you say, the transition from a flat surface to a convex surface may offer some obstacles. By following this thought we, of course, could thus enable the coaches to gain an appreciation of not only the flat surface backboard of the modified size but also of the possibilities of the convex board, against the day when one or the other are presented for the consideration of your national membership.

It is the opinion of our Engineering Department that a smaller board, in new installations, could be supported by a single pipe drop, but that in the case of existing installations, there would be considerable expense involved in rearranging present pipe supports designed to support a 4'x6' backboard, to accommodate this smaller size as is now being considered. It is respectfully suggested that this thought be given serious consideration because the cost of moving the existing pipe supports would undoubtedly be considerably more than the cost of the new backboard.

We are very much interested in your suggestion concerning Mr. A. A. Schabinger, and shall keep him in mind as soon as the question of size of the backboard is determined. Incidentally, would you mind telling us who he represents? We note you advised that he covers the central states for a group of sporting goods manufacturers, and I am wondering how we may work together with him to best advantage. I assume he is a salesman for these sporting goods manufacturers.

A review of the foregoing indicates that we have about covered our position and until we hear further from you regarding sizes we are at a loss to proceed. We appreciate your offer to keep us posted on the returns from the members of your Committee.

Kindest personal regards.

Cordially yours,  
FRED MEDART MANUFACTURING CO.

R.E. Weinzettel/AC

Sales Promotion Manager