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Abstract

Ever since the success of the Calgary Winter Olympics in 1988, the concept of “legacy” has grown in importance as a justification and a validation used for hosting Winter Olympic Games in North America. While the term has increasingly been used to denote a positive outcome and to support hosting such Hallmark events, little has been done in terms of researching how these “legacies” are best planned and implemented.

This capstone analyses a number of legacy programs using the 1988 Calgary, 2002 Salt Lake City and upcoming 2010 Vancouver Games as case studies, combined with a series of in-depth interviews with specialists in the field. The study generates a list of important criteria for creating successful legacies that must be considered during the initial planning process. These criteria are then used to formulate a number of options in terms of how future Olympic legacies might be structured that stress the importance of engaging the community in a meaningful way.

Keywords: Olympics; legacy; Hallmark events; Vancouver 2010
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Executive Summary

The concept of “legacy” has become increasingly important as a validation used while bidding for the Winter Olympic Games in North America ever since the success of the Calgary Winter Olympics in 1988. While the term has increasingly been used to denote a positive outcome and to justify the hosting of such Hallmark events, little has been done to analyse how these “legacies” are best planned and implemented. This study attempts to address this gap in the existing literature concerning the creation of sustainable legacies that benefit the communities that house the Hallmark events. The study first looks at a number of legacy programs implemented during the 1988 Calgary, 2002 Salt Lake City and upcoming 2010 Vancouver Games as case studies combined with a series of in-depth interviews. The study generates a list of important criteria that must be considered during the initial planning process if the legacies are to be successful.

The study addresses the issue that the Olympics are too often perceived as being elitist events benefiting a limited community, by looking at how the same processes used to establish sporting legacies might be able to address the various needs of the wider community. The criteria generated are then used to formulate a number of options in terms of how future Olympic legacies might be structured, stressing the importance of engaging the community in a meaningful way at the early planning stage of the event.
The main finding of the study is that successful legacy planning for future Hallmark events, whether they are Olympic Games or other major events, will depend on a number of factors:

- A need for greater best practices literature on planning and policy options for enduring legacies.

- The explicit need for the organizers and host community to give equal priority to the creation of lasting legacies that they do to a successful hosting of the event. Attempts to give lip service to the issue of legacies or to fit legacies into the more important planning of the event itself will ensure unsuccessful or underutilized legacy creations.

- There must be a full and real commitment to involving communities and social stakeholders in the planning process right from the start. Lasting legacies are only possible if large parts of the host communities agree with the social importance and benefits of this planning.

- Legacy planning must be a part of the very early bid planning and an integral part of all subsequent planning.

- There is no simple blueprint for a successful legacy plan. Any successful legacy plan will work only if it is sensitive to the values, priorities, and need of the particular social environment.

These factors need to be taken into consideration regardless of the style of legacy option chosen. The paper’s final recommendation is to suggest that there be open stakeholder engagements as early on as the initial bidding for the Games, to allow for all parties to make proposals for legacy types. This could require a coordinated community engagement, but is also more likely to create legacies that meet the host communities’ unique needs and priorities.
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1: The Context of Hallmark Event Legacies

1.1 Introduction

Vancouver is poised to host the twenty-first Winter Olympic Games. While some of the world's international sporting elite will stay for just two week, the city will be left with a variety of legacies that will last for years, some positive, some potentially negative. As has become the norm in cities bidding for Olympic Games, Vancouver's decision to bid for the games generated a wide ranging public debate about the validity of spending large sums of money to host such a marquee event. Many critics argue that the money could be better spent addressing some of the city's pressing social problems in the downtown eastside or express fear that the greatest consequence of the games will be a city left debt ridden in the wake of the event. Both critics and proponents of the Games have drawn on comparisons between Vancouver and other Olympic Games that have been ill-fitting or inappropriate, often distorting or clouding the debate.¹

The Vancouver bid was just one example of the on-going attempts of large urban centres to host large international gatherings of various natures. Most bids are defended on the basis of the long-term benefits, some tangible and some intangible, to the urban centre. This capstone paper looks at one type of Hallmark event, the Winter Olympics, to assess what we have learned about successful legacy planning, and to recommend a series of policy guidelines to ensure that optimum benefits will be derived from the Hallmark event to the wider community. Given the increasing costs of staging these events, and the growing public demands for accountability and an equitable sharing of both burdens and benefits, the success of any future Hallmark event will be measured by the public perceptions that this target has been met.

¹ For example, comparisons to Montreal mislead the public, since the 1976 games pre-date access to television royalties which forever changed the financing of Olympic Games.
This paper uses the case of Vancouver and two past North American Olympic Winter Games host cities, Salt Lake City (2002) and Calgary (1988), to examine the planning, implementation and benefits of Hallmark legacies. Both Calgary and Salt Lake City have existing legacies, and Calgary in particular has been a trail-blazer in establishing lasting legacies. By examining what has made these legacies successful, the goal of the paper is to suggest how Olympic legacies can be the result of a systematic policy process that engages the host community, with clear goals and outcomes, rather than simply a largely unplanned and ad hoc add-one to the major event. This analysis has important implications to the debate on hosting Olympic Games. The number of cities bidding for each Games has increased continuously since 1984 and the costs have escalated. The paper seeks to identify key elements and guidelines that planners can use to maximise the outcomes of Hallmark events in ways that are both lasting and meaningful to the host communities as well as to examine the importance of volunteerism within the communities that host Hallmark events. Such legacies help mitigate the concern that events such as the Olympic Games are merely expensive elitist events that ignore and fail to engage important social problems. The paper seeks to establish policy options and recommendations for regional organizers seeking to host future Olympic Winter Games (or Hallmark Events in general. Of critical importance, this paper recognises that many of the potential legacies that can be gained from Olympic Games are not sport oriented and suggests options that are “outside the box” of traditional elite sport oriented Olympic legacies.

While this paper focuses heavily of sporting legacies that have been incorporated into the Winter Games, because that had been the priority in the past Olympics, this does not mean that future legacy planning cannot be more diverse. However, it is critically important that future Hallmark event bids need to establish a sense of what their own communities’ priorities are towards legacy so that they can capitalize on these values. If the host communities place a high value on other, non-athletic, priorities, they could be incorporated into Hallmark events.
Maximizing the benefits of a Hallmark event, this paper will argue, depends on both advanced planning and on-going community engagement. In addition, planners must be sensitive to the importance of "location", the need to tie the legacy into a congruent policy window, and to establish independent financing for their projects. The legacies of Winter Olympics need not necessarily be constrained to elite sport endeavours. This paper contends that the framework outlined for legacy planning can be applied to a variety of policy options, from grassroots recreation or social housing to the establishment of permanent cultural events as long as those endeavours fit the needs of the host community.

If event organizers do not construct a careful and well thought-out plan that includes both the development of the venue as a future destination beyond its immediate and long-term use during the games and its impact on the community as key goals, then justifying the huge costs of such events is extremely difficult (Ritchie, 2000). Planning successful legacies needs to be done long before the actual Hallmark event takes place if the legacies are to live up to their potential and fully benefit the host community. This requires a balancing of priorities between the immediate needs of hosting an Olympic Games and the long term needs of legacy planning. The very nature of Olympic events require the complete attention of the organizing committee to immediate, short-term logistical problems that constantly arise in the process of organising an event the scale of the Olympics. This focus on the short-term success of the Games often detracts from the ability to allocate resources to long term planning (Ritchie, 2000).

1.2 Defining Hallmark Events and Legacies

The motives behind Vancouver’s attempt to stage the Winter Games is similar to that of many cities trying to win Hallmark events. Many of the justifications of the Vancouver bid have centred on the lasting legacies that the Games could provide to the city in terms of tourism,
economic benefits and increasing both elite sport and active lifestyles. These potential benefits are most often ill defined, despite being held up to the public as examples of what the games can offer. Vast amounts of public money are spent staging Olympic Games, and while the concept of legacy has become increasingly central in the debate over hosting them, there is a dearth of formal research into what makes for successful legacies. In the words of John Aalberg, designer of both Salt Lake and Whistler’s cross-country ski trails; “there is no manual for this.” A side effect of the shortage of formal research and theoretical knowledge has been that organising committees tend to rely heavily on the same people with first hand experience, creating the potential for a future disconnect should key personnel retire. Aalberg is the embodiment of practise, having designed two of the last three Olympic Nordic skiing courses.

Moreover, despite the considerable weight placed on the concept of legacies in the discourse around the Olympics, the term is frequently used in a nebulous and ill defined fashion. This was evident even in the words of International Olympic Committee (IOC) president Jacques Rogge when he spoke to the Vancouver Board of Trade claiming, “The most important legacy is a new frame of mind. A new way of looking at your city, a new way of looking at your province.” (Metro, Feb 28, 2008) While Rogge, who is a strong believer in the Olympics as an agent of change, pointed to a concrete environmental legacy for Beijing (where organizers are working to improve air and water quality in the city), he was far less specific about Vancouver’s Olympic legacy. While it would be unrealistic to expect Rogge to define what Vancouver’s legacies should be, he is indicative of how the term legacy is used without a concrete context. As in all public policy exercises, precision in language ensures precision in planning.

In the context of this capstone paper, the terms “Hallmark events” and “legacy” will be used precisely. The standard definition of hallmark events is that of Brent Ritchie (1984) who defined such events as:
Major one-time or recurring events of limited duration, developed primarily to enhance the awareness, appeal and profitability of a tourism destination in the short and/or long term. Such events rely for their success on the uniqueness, status, or timely significance to create interest and attract attention (Hall, 1989).

Hallmark events, a category that includes Olympic Games, World Fairs, Expositions and other international sporting games, leave behind in the host community a series of positive and/or negative physical, social and economic legacies that far outlive the short duration of the events themselves. These events are often associated with large-scale expenditures from the public sector, construction of infrastructure and sporting facilities, and urban development that potentially carries with it detrimental or beneficial long term consequences for the residents of the host city and surrounding region. Summer and Winter Olympic games fit into this framework “given their traditions, their status, their relative infrequency and their dedication to excellence” (Ritchie, 1984).

The term “legacy”, as used in this paper, is also used in a specific way. Ritchie and others have defined “legacies” as being the long-term benefits or residual effects resulting from the hosting of a Hallmark event (Ritchie, 2000; Dimanche, 1996; Utah Division of Travel Development [UDTD], 1996). Ritchie notes that these legacies can take many forms; economic, social, physical, cultural, technical or psychological in nature. While Ritchie contends that in the case of Calgary “the enhanced international awareness/image of the city and the strengthening of community volunteerism were regarded by many as perhaps the most valuable of all the legacies left behind” this paper will focus on those tangible legacies that were specifically planned and implemented to be legacies. These consist both of infrastructure and programming designed and financed to operate in perpetuity. Furthermore, for a legacy to be considered “positive” this paper contends that it must be:

- Financially sustainable (or self-sustaining)

² See Appendix A
• Fulfil a clear mandate

• Be congruent with the needs or desires of the host community.

Negative “legacies”, such as the tax burden imposed on Montreal after its Olympics or negative international opinion generated by the Mexico Olympics, will be considered outside the scope of this paper.

There is a considerable need to further research the area of how legacies are created and what their impacts are, as the debate focuses increasingly on just how much such legacies benefit the host communities. In the words of Evangelia Kasimati:

Although economic impact analysis prepared by or on behalf of Olympic advocates have demonstrated economic advantages from hosting the Games, potential host communities pose the question of whether, in fact, the economic benefits of the Olympics are pragmatic and, if they are, the extent to which such benefits offset the costs. (Kasimati, 2003)

The chief objective of legacy creation is to produce something of substance and quality that “will enhance the long-term well-being or lifestyle of destination residents in a very substantial manner - preferably in a way that reflects the values of the local population” (Ritchie, 2000). Craig Lehto, director of the Whistler Sliding Centre, and past employee of both the Calgary Olympic Development Association (CODA) and Salt Lake City, commented that when he began his Olympic involvement in Calgary, the concept of creating lasting legacies was entirely new to Olympic planners, while in the last twenty years it has become one of the dominant themes of modern bids.
1.3 Literature Review and Historical Background

1.3.1 Literature Review

The Olympics have generated a vast body of literature, both popular and technical in nature, but very little of it has addressed the topic of legacy creation (Haxton, 2005, Kasimati 2003). The cost to cities and nations to host hallmark events such as Olympic Games continues to rise, and there is no indication that this will change in the near future. The justification for the capital spending to host these events has traditionally centred on the economic stimulus which hosting the event will produce. The chief benefit is usually presented as deriving from tourism, though this notion that is heavily debated in the literature (Mules, 1998) and the justification itself continues to evolve. This author contends that the justification of these events will increasingly reside in the social as well as economic benefits they confer on the host community.

There is little doubt that economic considerations weigh heavily on the citizens of host cities. When Victoria residents were asked in a reader’s poll what would be the “most likely legacy” of the 1994 Victoria Commonwealth Games, readers ranked debt, new pool, higher taxes, increased tourism, and higher real estate prices as being the Game’s most probable legacies (Hall, 2006). Of these five topics raised by the readership only one is in fact a positive legacy foundation – the Commonwealth Pool in Victoria houses the Pacific Sport National Training centre, a multi-sport training centre that houses national sports programmes for swimming, rugby, rowing, cycling and triathlon.

A pool such as Victoria’s is the most commonly recognized type of legacies foundation. It includes physical infrastructure, financial resources, and on-going community programs.
However, Brent Ritchie has argued that some of the most valuable legacies left by Hallmark events may be physiological or social in nature. He contends that:

In the case of the 1988 Calgary Winter Olympics in Calgary, the enhanced international awareness/image of the city and the strengthened social structure related to the strengthening of community volunteerism were regarded by many as perhaps the most valuable of all the legacies left behind by this highly successful event. (Ritchie, 2000)

It is believed that these two aspects are heavily interconnected in successful legacy establishment, linking such volunteerism with the physical attributes of legacy. This paper will focus heavily on the manner in which key stakeholders are engaged in the initial planning of the games and on what are the most important considerations for legacy planners in this period. This study focuses on the early period because this is a decisive point in the outcomes of legacies (Owen, 2001). During this initial phase that planners are best able to capitalize on the policy windows that Olympics provide. They are able to integrate their legacy visions with the momentum around the Games (in his interview Dr. Brent Ritchie supported this belief, commenting, “it's critical to set it in play before the games are over; because once they're done it gets increasingly difficult”). As a result early and effective planning is crucially important to the outcomes of the legacies. As Kerry Owen has noted, “the deadlines to which hallmark events are typically subject further limits opportunities for comprehensive community consultation” (Owen, 2001).

Because the hosting of a Hallmark event are huge expenditures from the public sector, often born out at the municipal or state level, organizers have to find ways to justify the expenditures to the taxpayers. In the case of Sydney Olympics, the public sector, specifically the Government of New South Wales, funded two-thirds of the construction cost of Olympic venues and related facilities, a total of some $3.5 billion, (Owen, 2001). In return, the Government of New South Wales promised that the people of New South Wales would receive a meaningful and
lasting legacy, including “world-class sporting facilities, environmental improvements, pride in
showcasing Sydney to the world and additional economic benefits” (Owen, 2001).

However, the organisations that run these legacy facilities are often entirely separate from
both the organising committee’s and the initial bid committees (Craig Lehto interview) and the
interaction of the Bid Committee, Organizing Committee and Legacy Societies has not been
written about in the formal literature. Hallmark events such as Olympic Games generally involve
the creation of special planning agencies to attempt to ensure the efficient organization of the
event. These agencies are often private-sector-led coalitions of local business elites or crown
corporations with statutory authority (Owen, 2001). The nature by which these agencies conduct
their stakeholder engagements, and the extent to which the resulting plans address local issues
and concerns, are of paramount interest to those groups and individuals concerned about the
lasting viability of the venue sites for numerous reasons. That Hallmark events operate under
strict deadlines, and the common occurrence of budget extensions for specific projects for such
events are two of the most significant reasons why engagements are often rushed (Owen, 2001).

Experience suggests such rigid deadlines limit organized resistance to the developments
because the usual system that allows for delays in approval is not possible within the time frame.
This in turn serves to limit public involvement (Imrie and Thomas, 1995). The second issue of
budget extensions is double pronged as it allows for venue costs to potentially escalate as well as
for the event committee to use large financial assets to “manufacture consent and satisfaction
amongst communities that are impacted by hallmark event,” potentially impacting the legacy of
the event as the community’s direct involvement is potentially drastically curtailed (Owen, 2001).
A number of researchers have focused on the ways in which the organizing bodies’ interactions with the communities have affected the outcomes of various venues, both in the level of volunteer support and in post-event satisfaction within the local stakeholder. In particular, Kristy Owen has looked at how variations in urban governance affected the outcome of the legacies of Sydney venues. Owen concludes, “local community activism was imperative to achieving civic participation and ensuring commitment by local government to these managerial and democratic concerns.” Owen additionally notes, “activism also enabled some local communities to secure significant benefits from the Olympic Games” (2001). This would seem to suggest that local activism at this point leads governments to establish and support legacy venues after the Games are over.

This process of community interaction needs to be accomplished before infrastructure construction is underway. This is in order to minimise the sort of financial and political risks that can both derail bid attempts and lead to costly financial burdens after the completion of the event. In the London Olympic bid the organising committee focused on establishing the planning: “(a) for a credible bid; (b) for staging the Games if the bid is successful; (c) for managing costs and risks; and (d) for securing the wider benefits” (London Olympics 2012 Summary, 2002).

While the literature looking at the structuring of venues for Hallmark events is not extensive, nevertheless there has been some quality analysis undertaken to date, especially on recent events. Some of this literature, and the increased public debate, reflect growing demands that governments be accountable, transparent, and responsive to local concerns. Gursey and Kendall studied residents’ perceptions of the impacts of the 2002 Winter Olympics and found that support for the event relied heavily on the perceived benefits of hosting the Games rather than the
perceived costs (Gursey and Kendall, 2006). Much of the work on community support comes out of Australia following the success of the Sydney Olympics.

The literature contends that there is a shift underway towards a more democratic approach to mega-event planning, that is also mirrored in changing attitude towards legacy planning. The traditional plan has been to proceed with a project first and then to attempt to justify it after the fact (Gursey and Kendall, 2006). This approach is being displaced by one in which the host community is far more involved, allowing for far more democratic participation. However, Peter Haxton and others have argued that although there has been a shift towards a more democratic approach to hallmark event planning, this approach is also more difficult to implement and as a result is less frequently adopted than would be ideal, or is adopted in name only (Gursey and Kendall, 2006). Haxton has noted in a 2005 review of research related to community involvement and the Olympics Games that there are two dominant theories that inform the planning of Hallmark events. The first of these theories holds that “community involvement should be limited to the selection of representatives who in turn appoint professional and administrative staff to execute democratically derived decisions” (Haxton, 2005). The second, and in Haxton’s belief more contemporary school of thought, advocates that as “modern society has become more culturally and technologically sophisticated, there has developed an increased desire for the simultaneous growth of participatory democracy and expertise in the decision-making process” (Haxton, 2005). In Haxton’s analysis, there has been a marked shift towards a desire to increase the level of involvement on behalf of the community than has traditionally been shown in the planning of Hallmark events. The traditional approach allows for little input from the community and is exemplified by the adoption of “hallmark decision making” (a term coined by Veal, 1994). According to Haxton and Veal in “hallmark decision making” the decision to proceed with a project is made first, and attempts to justify it are made
later on (Haxton, 2005). Haxton hypothesises that the recent shift to more involved planning is a response of potential host cities that are questioning the potential benefits and whether those benefits outweigh the potential negative consequences. This tendency is exacerbated even further in the case of Olympic Games which, according to Haxton, “inevitably leads to a diversion of funds from other areas” as resources are shuffled to meet the strict timelines of the Games (Haxton, 2005).

However, there have been some notable examples of democratic planning being successfully implemented, such as Toronto’s 1996 Summer Olympic bid, and the Calgary Olympics which suggest “that community involvement and support may transform such occasions more into urban festivals likely to become significant urban experiences for hosts and guests (Hiller, 1990). It is also possible, however, that active opposition to hosting a Hallmark event might lead to delays, legal action and abandonment of projects (Gursey and Kendall, 2006). Gursey and Kendall further note that “since community involvement in planning is a relatively recent phenomenon, it is to be expected that research into locals’ support for hosting these venues is quite limited.”

1.3.2 Past History of Games and Legacies

International cities that host Olympic Games tend to emphasize the strengthening of their global status and the opportunity to undertake large-scale construction projects in their justification to host Olympics. Vancouver has certainly used both of these justifications so far in their preparations for 2010, using it as an opportunity to both expand the Sky Train system and for the Sea-to-Sky highway projects. In crafting their bids, organizers have studied the recent history of the Games. They are well aware that they must balance their ambitions carefully and
use rigorous financial planning to avoid the extreme case of Montreal, whose residents still pay a special tax to pay the debts left from hosting the 1976 Olympics as a result of the city’s miscalculation of its infrastructure projects (Shoval, 2002). On the other hand, Calgary was able to increase international awareness dramatically as a result of hosting the Winter Games. The city even emerged with a surplus. Studies indicate that unaided top-of-mind awareness of Calgary increased from 19% to 43% in the United States and from 10% to 40% in Europe. It was a huge gain in international recognition that helped establish Calgary’s international image (Ritchie, 1984)\(^3\).

The period from the 1984 Los Angeles Games onwards has been marked by ever increasing competition amongst cities wishing to stage the Olympic Games. Those Games were turning point in the modern Olympics. Following the financial woes of the Montreal (1976) and Mexico City (1968) Games was the withdrawal of Tehran’s bid for the 1984 Games that left Los Angeles as the only city to bid for those Games. To the surprise of much of the world, it became an exceptionally profitable endeavour (Shoval, 2002), spearheaded almost entirely by the private sector. It established a model for careful planning. The success of the Los Angeles Games resulted in a steady increase in the number of cities that have bid for each successive games with major world cities increasingly bidding in recent years (Shoval, 2002).

As the competition for bids has increased, so has the scale of the Games themselves. This increase in size, scope and costs has been accompanied by increasingly complicated and detailed planning. As the organization of Olympic Games continues to evolve, the standard rationalizations for holding them is being critiqued and the dynamics associated with such

\(^3\) Ritchie noted in his interview that he felt that Vancouver was far less likely to reap these sorts of gains in international prestige as the city is far better established that Calgary had been.
Hallmark events are being reassessed. Authors such as Trevor Mules are increasingly critical of the traditional justification for hosting an event in terms of the potential of the event to attract tourism, the revenues from which have been the traditional justification for hosting hallmark events. Mules concluded in his analysis that “if the tourism industry is the major beneficiary of hosting such events, then more emphasis should be placed upon finding ways in which the costs are borne by the industry” (Mules, 1998). Some of his concerns are illustrated by the following table that lays out what are commonly seen as some of the positive and negative impacts of hosting Olympic Games.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Benefit</th>
<th>Negative Consequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long term benefit of event facilities and infrastructure</td>
<td>High construction costs for facilities and infrastructure (long term debt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering community development and cultural traditions</td>
<td>Temporary congestion problems in host city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater participation in Olympic sports</td>
<td>General price and rental increases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased employment and business opportunities</td>
<td>Environmental concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence on International Opinion</td>
<td>General Inconvenience to host community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact of Homeless situation- potential displacement as result of games (key element of Toronto 1996 bid and Vancouver 2010 bid)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the financial risks of staging an Olympic Games, it is not surprising that communities often question the long-term benefits of such undertakings. Peter Haxton contends that the result has been an increased “public ownership” expressed as a desire to ensure that the image the event portrays to the world is one that the community is comfortable with and even more importantly that “a white elephant is not the only legacy left after hosting an Olympic Games” (Haxton, 2005).
The most obvious and visible legacies of Olympic Games are the physical infrastructure left behind. However, most construction projects, of necessity, operate on a very tight deadline. Some of the biggest concerns over how venues are structured are the result of the strict timeline inherent in most Hallmark events. Montreal remains in the minds of many as an example of the dangers of inadequate planning, inefficiencies of resources or misuse of funding. As mentioned in the introduction, time constraints often lead to significant budget extensions as well as the passing of enabling legislation that would not be acceptable under normal circumstances. As a result of these pressures and constraints, public space is frequently heavily regulated during Hallmark events. Organizers often lobbying for the passing of specific government legislation to help them fast track their projects. In addition, they also seek to regulate the activities and behaviours of visitors to the venue sites. Some examples include the granting exclusive food and beverage rights to some companies that limit the scope of consumer choices (Hall, 2006). Such issues are minor compared to other legislative powers sought by organisers. Prior to the Sydney Olympics, for example, the government of New South Wales passed legislation in 1995 that removed the right to lodge court appeals against proposed Olympic projects under the environment and planning legislation. Following this legislation, the *Olympic Coordination Authority Act* (1996) stipulated for all projects associated with the Games did not have to conform to the usual Environmental Impact Statements requirements (Hall, 2006).

Ironically, while organizers often cite broad notions of community wellbeing as justification for hosting Hallmark events, the success of the event is almost inevitably measured in terms of the economic impact of the event and the media exposure garnished. This has been reflected in the nature of post-Olympic assessments over the last 20 years (Hall, 2006). Hall notes that despite the rhetoric, there has been little real research “on the actual regenerative potential of investment in sport, or the long-term benefits to local communities of sports events-led investment strategies”
(Hall, 2006). Despite the lack of concrete evidence, cities have continued to embark on large-scale sporting developments as part of regeneration strategies tied into Hallmark events, including Olympic Games (Sydney, Barcelona, London), Commonwealth Games (Manchester, Melbourne) and even with World Student Games (Sheffield) (Hall, 2006).

Not all cities that have hosted Olympics view their legacies in a positive manner and some cities that initially considered entering an Olympic bid ultimately decided against it. Local communities have not always seen the Games as a positive experience. Follow up research has shown that while residents of Lillehammer see themselves as having strong positive Olympic legacies, residents of Atlanta are more sceptical of the benefits of hosting the Olympic Games. Perhaps the most sceptical residents of all were those of Denver who rejected the Olympics in 1976. On the other hand, both Innsbruck and Lake Placid have returned to host the event a second time, indicating a level of local satisfaction. (Ritchie, 2000)

Hiller has argued that Hallmark events are more likely to be controversial if the residents of the host community perceive them as being primarily elitist events (Hiller, 1990). This perception is most frequently created when the public believes that organizers are ignoring the local human dimension and are unconcerned with the wishes and reaction of the residents and the impact of the event on their lives. Residents in the host city can be left facing a range of negative outcomes such as increased housing costs, noise, traffic and general changes in lifestyle and standards of living. (Haxton, 2006) Brent Ritchie also noted in interviews that it was important for citizens to be able to engage with the event. If residence felt that they were a part of the activities, either in a volunteer capacity or by having access to cheap tickets, they were much more likely to have a positive image of the event.
2: Research Design and Methodology

The goal of this capstone is to develop guidelines to best structure the establishment of legacy foundations and infrastructure by organising committees (or legacy societies which take over operations after the games are over) in a manner that is most beneficial to the host communities. The key aims of the research are threefold:

- To identify crucial issues that need to be identified early on in the engagement process (ideally well before the Games themselves, and potentially as early as the bid process) to enhance the chances of positive lasting legacies - an area traditionally overlooked in the literature surrounding Olympic Games.
- To create criteria that need to be incorporated in successful legacy planning
- Use those criteria to develop avenues of policy options that can be employed and that each utilize the criteria in ensuring that the engagements are successful. The criteria can be in turn used as a litmus test to analyse the options and create recommendations derived from the criteria.

2.1 Methodology

Qualitative research methods were best suited to this project, as the literature around the legacies of Hallmark events is limited and further research is needed to learn more about the nuances of effectively planning. A case study research approach was adopted to identify the effectiveness of certain policy options and that was amalgamated with in-depth interview data
from specialists in legacy planning and implementation. Given the limited formal research and existing literature in the subject area, it was felt that direct interviews with individuals who have been directly involved in several stages of the legacy process was the single most valuable source of information. This was especially useful given the tendency of organizing committees to hire personal with previous Games experience. All of the people interviewed had been involved in multiple Hallmark events, in both the planning and implementation stages.

The research conducted for this report contained four main elements. Firstly, available literature on hallmark events was thoroughly analyzed. Available academic sources and reports produced by past or present organizing committees as well as information generated by the private sector were examined. Second, the study selected three specific hallmark events, the 1988 Calgary Winter Games, the 2002 Salt Lake City Winter Games and the impending 2010 Vancouver Winter Games that were particularly useful in assessing legacy creation. During the process, working definitions of “hallmark event, and legacy” were adopted as well as conceptualizing what key factors contributed positively or negatively towards the success of legacy endeavours. The third part of the research protocol consisted of developing a broad interview questionnaire and conducting interviews with people involved with either the engagement process or establishment of legacies directly or involved in subsequent research and appraisal of them. In one case, the individual worked as an assistant director at a current legacy site.

Finally, this study incorporates some of the existing public debates around the Olympics and homelessness, as part of the hypothesis that legacy planning need not be elite sport specific and that it must address a spectrum of public concerns if it is to be effective. In doing so, the capstone explored how organizers might have structured the Games to provide anti-homelessness initiatives. The capstone briefly looks at how VANOC is dealing with their stakeholder engagements, as this is one of the first steps in involving the community with VANOC’s future
legacy projects. Finally, a series of criteria and measures were developed, based on the case studies and the interviews, to best analyse the elements that significantly impacted legacy effectiveness and to craft future policy recommendations.

2.1.1 Selection of Hallmark Events

The current Vancouver 2010 Games gave the paper a starting point, to which the two most recent North American Winter Olympics, at Salt Lake City and Calgary, served to round out the study with an exclusively North American focus. The current Vancouver 2010 Games being organised by the Vancouver Olympic Committee (VANOC) was an obvious starting point given its relevance in terms of both contemporary concerns and geography for a project based out of Simon Fraser University. In addition, the project wanted to include the unique efforts that VANOC has made to plan their legacies from the onset of winning the bid. This capstone focuses on three North American Winter Games legacies for a variety of reasons. A capstone paper is too short to cover more than a few case studies in a thoughtful and analytical fashion. Moreover, a comparative research methodology is most instructive when there are at least as many similarities as differences. European Games have not been included, in part because of key structural differences between how European and other nations tend to plan for their games, including a lack of legacy planning in Europe as well as a decreased reliance on volunteer labour. Volunteers

4 See Appendix C.
are used extensively in North American organizing committees while paid employees fill those roles in European organizing bodies (Bill France interview). More importantly, European and Asian planners have put little priority on legacy endowments. Significantly while discussing the aftermath of Nagano Japan’s 1998 Games, interviewee Sean Ireland noted that “Nagano’s facility gets used maybe two months of the year, and Hamar (the skating oval for the 1994 Winter Games in Norway) is a similar story.” Similarly, the 1992 Olympics in Albertville France did little to create Olympic legacies, as the Games were the last use of those Nordic facilities for competition (John Aalberg interview).

Because the success of legacy planning and implementation is so closely tied to the social environment and values of the supporting community, selecting Olympic cities with many common features and temporally close was methodologically important for this study. Including a Winter Games from a significantly different national culture or geographic region would create too many additional variables and make inferred comparative analysis from the deviant case problematic. Subsequent interviewing supported the decision to focus on North American legacy planning. When asked if there were games or facilities that served as a blueprint in planning Vancouver’s legacies, Bill France, the CEO of the Whistler Legacies Society and VP of Sport for CODA commented that:

_They’ve done a good job in Salt Lake and mostly in North America. A lot of the other Winter Olympic legacies are not in existence or haven’t been maintained. For instance, there is nothing left in Sarajevo from the ’84 Olympics and there are many other Olympics that have let them deteriorate or haven’t kept them up. So Salt Lake has done a good job and Lake Placid has done a good job. We work very closely with those two places as we will with Whistler then they come on board to share programs and host events._ (Bill France)

---

5 John Aalberg noted that non-North American events still rely heavily on volunteers to run the events (citing a recent cross country skiing World Championships in Japan as an example), however North Americans tend to make greater use of volunteers in more managerial roles with greater responsibility.

6 Brent Ritchie however made note of a large highway project as Albertville’s more significant legacy. (Brent Ritchie interview)
The 1988 Calgary Winter Games remains the best example of lasting, sustainable and highly-successful Olympic Legacies. The Calgary Olympic Development Association (CODA) was groundbreaking in its legacy work and is used as a model by various Hallmark organizers. Moreover, it provided the study with a second comparison with a Canadian context. Calgary remains one of the most noted examples of a highly successful Olympic Games that continues to provide Calgarians with financially sustainable legacy endowments. Salt Lake City, for several reasons, presented itself as a useful third location of study. The broad political, social, and sporting cultures, the nature of public and private involvement, and the increasing public demands for transparency and the accountability present in the Salt Lake City situation is very similar to the conditions facing Vancouver. Moreover, both those Games occurred within a decade of the start Vancouver’s event planning and therefore reflect the financial dynamics of the present Winter Olympic Games. Additionally, there are numerous physical similarities between the venues and facilities of the three Games locations and a sharing of expertise. Both the Calgary Oval and the Salt Lake Oval are at altitude and are considered the two fastest tracks in the world, while the Soldier Hollow Nordic venue and the Whistler cross country ski courses were both designed by John Aalberg.

For methodological reasons it was decided to exclude a case from of a failed or unsuccessful legacy foundation that would showcase a contrasting situation from the analysis in order to keep the case study selection as close as possible in other respects, given the lack of a “well-formulated theory” around legacy creation (Yin, 2003). Lijphart describes the deviant case as “studies of single cases that are known to deviate from established generalizations” which in this cause would have required from a poorly implemented North American legacy (Lijphart, 1971). There was no example of a North American Games legacy that provided an adequate fit for such an approach. Comparing relatively recent North American winter games with competent
legacy planning had more academic rigour. The exclusion of Victoria’s 1994 Commonwealth Games legacy Pacific Sport is worth mentioning as it is a notable legacy endowment that already exists in British Columbia. Established after the 1994 Commonwealth Games in Victoria and based out of the Commonwealth Pool, Pacific Sport houses national training centres for a variety of sports including swimming, rowing, rugby and cycling, as well as acting as a regional centre for several others. While it is an interesting case study with a regional context that operates on the interest of an endowment similar to CODA, it was deemed to be too far outside of the scope of this project and is of a different scale compared to an Olympic Games.

Because of the importance of the social environment of legacy planning and in order to provide background and context to the discussions of the various case studies, a table of pertinent information was generated to allow easier comparisons of the three host communities and their physical environment. The table also highlights some of the key factors that influenced the planning of the Games and impacted the outcomes of legacy planning.
Table 2: Case Study Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Calgary</th>
<th>Salt Lake City</th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>657 118 (1988),</td>
<td>178 858 (City)</td>
<td>578 041 (City)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 019 943 (2006)</td>
<td>1 018 826 (Metro)</td>
<td>2 187 721 (Metro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geography</strong></td>
<td>Plateau at Altitude,</td>
<td>At altitude, near</td>
<td>Coastal climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>near Rocky Mountain</td>
<td>Rocky Mountains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>foothills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Altitude (m)</strong></td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>1288</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volunteer Rate</strong></td>
<td>44.6% (2006)7</td>
<td>45.9% (2006)8</td>
<td>42.6% (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost of Games</strong></td>
<td>$933 million Can</td>
<td>$1.45 billion US</td>
<td>$1.45 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Shaffer, Greer 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legacy Funding</strong></td>
<td>$90-150 million Can</td>
<td>$40 million US</td>
<td>$110 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($260 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>financial legacy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Olympic Referendum/ Polling</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1989 referendum</td>
<td>64 % (50 percent voter turnout) on 22 Feb 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supported 1/16th of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>one percent tax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>revenue towards bid,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1993 survey showed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73% if Utah residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supported the bid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.2 Key Stakeholder Interviews and Analysis

While the three case studies provide the core of research for this capstone, an important additional part of the research process was to engage specific planning specialists who had detailed knowledge on how past experiences have led to current best-practices in legacy creation.

---

7 The Canadian national average was 45.3% http://www.vitalsignscanada.ca/rpt2007/
Though else where Volunteer Calgary claims a rate as 71.3% based on an Ipsos Reid study http://www.volunteercalgary.ab.ca/admin/images/2006/ipsos2005.pdf
8 During this period the national average in the US was 26.7%
http://deseretnews.com/dn/view/0,1249,660212180,00.html
As a result, the paper relied on a relatively limited set of five stakeholder interviews; this, in part, reflects the reality that there is a great deal of overlap amongst the people involved in the legacy process and in Olympic planning in general. The advantage in this selection of individuals is that most had multiple Olympic experiences, had been involved in planning and implementation, and could speak in depth to all three events from a comparative perspective.

The interviews were conducted either at the Olympic Oval and University of Calgary (whose buildings are connected via the kinesiology department) or at VANOC's offices in Vancouver. These interviews and the personal insights offered by the individuals were of vital importance given the limited amount of formal literature around the topic. Their input proved, once again, that interviews are one of the most important sources of case study information (Yin, 2003). Yin notes that in this format “the interview will appear to be guided by conversations rather than structured queries” in which the researcher pursues a consistent line of inquiry even though the actual stream of questions is likely to be fluid (Yin, 2003). As per Yin’s recommendations, the interviews were “open-ended” in nature. The interviewer made sure to frame questions that addressed both the facts and details of legacy issues as well as the respondent’s personal opinions. The interviewer then used the respondents’ answers and propositions as the basis for further inquiry (Yin, 2003). The interviewees selected share considerable overlap in terms of their involvement and consultation and have been involved with the legacies of two or more of these events. This provided an interesting and informed set of perspectives about the nature of legacy planning and which lessons learned from the previous experience could be used in setting up the legacies of subsequent games. The experience of the interviewees also meant that although the total number of interviews was limited, each of the interviewees were able to provide information on multiple events. Craig Lehto for example worked for the bobsleigh facilities at each of the three case studies examined. By using people
who has become leaders in the field of Hallmark events and who were recognized internationally, the capstone could incorporate the latest assessment of best practice policies. As Bill France notes, the tight time constraints mean that Olympic organizing committees hire personnel with past game experience “whenever possible, you just don’t have time to train someone for a role, you need them to come in and perform right away” (Bill France interview).

The practical result of having all of the interviewees in this study with experience working with multiple Olympic organizing committees was to provide a more balanced and informed view. Each of the five interviews could speak to two or three of the case studies. Moreover, each interviewee was able to analyze and contrast the differences and similarities of planning, implementation, and legacies in ways that would be impossible for people without their extended involvement or who had been marginally involved on only one event.

The actual interview questions varied somewhat from interview to interview depending on the nature of the interviewee’s past involvement in planning and running legacy facilities. While there was a standard interview questionnaire, respondents were also asked follow up questions as warranted by each interviewee’s responses and past experiences, in a nature that is consistent with qualitative research. All interviewees were questioned about planning for legacies and community involvement, as well as some general questions about the financing of the venues and what they felt were the key factors explaining legacies strengths or weaknesses.

Based on the results of the interviews, a list of key criteria was generated. These criteria were then compared and contrasted with the case study research and used to structure policy options and recommendations. The criteria were composed of elements that were nearly universally identified by the respondents as being important factors. These elements were later weighted in accordance to what the respondents felt were the most important elements required to successfully plan legacies.

---

9 See Appendix E.
The Interviewees were as follows:

- Bill France, Vice President of Sport for CODA, acting CEO of the Whistler Legacies foundations and former Vice President of Sport to the Calgary Olympic Committee (OCO '88).

- John Aalberg, Director Whistler Olympic Park, course designer and Chief of Competition for the 2002 Olympic Games, two time US Olympian

- Craig Lehto; Director Whistler Sliding Centre, former General Manager of the Utah Olympic Park that housed the sliding events in 2002, and previously worked for CODA and OCO’88. Also involved with the Nagano 1998 Games.

- Dr. Brent Ritchie, Ph.D. Specializes in tourism management, involved with both 1988 and 2002 Olympic Winter Games.

- Sean Ireland, Associate Director Sport Development at the Calgary Olympic Oval. National team long-track coach (4 time recipient of the Petro-Canada Excellence Award) and former Olympian.

These individuals combined a set of varied experiences that helped create a more diversified insight into Calgary’s legacy efforts. Ireland offered a perspective from the elite sport community working towards achieving CODA’s mandate of Olympic success, while Bill France provided insight into the behind the scenes planning that goes into allowing programs such as the Olympic Oval to flourish. Brent Ritchie on the other hand, has little or no interest in elite sports development, but has been involved with two Olympic Games because of his research in tourism and the impacts of Hallmark events on the host cities.
3: The Cases: Calgary, Salt Lake City and Vancouver

3.1 The Case of Calgary

The 1988 Winter Olympic Games in Calgary provide what is likely the most important case in this study. Not only are these Games a relatively recent example in a uniquely Canadian context but Calgary is also the single most significant precedent in terms of structuring Winter Olympic legacies in North America. The Calgary Olympic Development Association (CODA) has successfully operated for the last twenty years funded by the interest of its initial endowment. At the same time, CODA generated sufficient profit to add to the original endowment over the years while continuing to expand their operations. CODA was entirely self sufficient until recently in 2006 when the provincial government helped partially finance a 300 million dollar expansion to Canada Olympic Park that included the creation of the new Athlete and Ice House facility (AIC), an expenditure that they were likely more willing to finance given CODA's track record of self-sufficiency. This was the first time in twenty years that any level of government had contributed additional money to CODA.

CODA's mandate was to assist in the development of elite athletes, and to function as a financially independent entity in perpetuity. The last twenty years have seen them excel on both counts, with the Canadian medal count growing at each successive winter Olympics. In 2006 in Torino, Canadians brought home a record 24 medals, and three quarters of those medallists were either from Alberta or from athletes who had trained at facilities managed by CODA. CODA's success in achieving its mandate stands as a clear message to Canadians of the benefits of a well run legacy program.

10 See Appendix D.
3.1.1 Background on Calgary’s Bid

Much like Salt Lake City, Calgary made several unsuccessful bid attempts (for the 1964 and 1968 Winter Games) prior to being awarded the Games in 1981. In the words of the New York Times, “the right to play the host to the Winter Olympic Games required four bids and nearly 30 years on the part of enthusiasts in this oil, grain and cattle city hard by the Rocky Mountains.” (The New York Times, 1987) The Calgary Olympic Committee (OCO’88) chairman Frank King was inspired to organise a bid for the Winter Olympics after he witnessed the spirit of the Montreal Games and then saw the prudent financial management of the 1978 Edmonton Commonwealth Games. King said that, “The Montreal Games had the high emotional impact always associated with the Olympics and the Edmonton Games demonstrated that good Games could entertain and inspire as well as be well-managed financially. With those two events as background, I soon became obsessed with the idea that Calgary should assume a place in the top echelon of international sporting cities.” (Zimmerman, 2007)

The Calgary Games were successfully able to combine the emotional impact that King witnessed in Montreal with the financial management of Edmonton and the result was the Calgary community benefited substantially. As planned, in the aftermath of the Games, the Calgary Olympic legacies took three main forms. There were multiple facilities built for the games that remain valuable to the city’s residents even today. These include university dormitories, a world leading speed skating facility, the Nakiska ski area which is in close proximity to the urban centre, the Nordic facilities at Canmore (itself a booming community), and the Calgary Olympic Park (COP). (Ritchie, 2000) The second set of legacies that emerged from the Games consist of significant financial endowments that finance the operation of the aforementioned facilities “in perpetuity”- a marked change from some previous Olympic Games, such as Montreal, which incurred significant long-term debts.
Ritchie claims that the third and most profound legacy was a feeling of civic pride and social cohesion created by the experience of hosting the successful Games. While he acknowledges that it is highly unlikely that Calgary will ever be a leading world city, the Olympics allowed for the urban centre to achieve a level of international recognition that would likely have been impossible via any other method. Ninety percent of residents continue to view the 1988 games as a positive experience for the city as a whole and for themselves on personal levels. Ritchie argues that at least some of the city's significant growth in economic, social and cultural terms since 1988 is attributable to hosting the Winter Olympics. (Ritchie, 2000) Ritchie contends that the failure of Edmonton, at one point the province's leading metropolitan centre, to grow at the same rate suggests that the Olympics were an important "trigger" to urban and regional development. (Ritchie, 2000)

3.1.1.1 Public Perception and Concerns at the Time

Although the Calgary Games are now held up as a grand success on a sweeping scale, it is important to note that at the time, and in the years prior to the Games, there were public predictions about a more pessimistic outcome. A New York Times article a year before the games notes that:

Since the city was awarded the Games in 1981, organizers have been subjected to heavy criticism inside Canada, particularly by Albertans concerned that Olympic crowds would damage the environment in the Rocky Mountain skiing venues, or would leave the city of Calgary, like Montreal, host for the 1976 Summer Olympics, with a crippling debt. Aside from these concerns, there has been a series of management crises and a heavy turnover in top Games personnel. (The New York Times, 1987)

Calgary also had to deal with a scandal, much as Salt Lake City would later face. In the fall of 1986 the OCO '88 weathered allegations of a ticket-skimming scheme that lead to the dismissal of their ticketing chief James McGregor, who was charged with five felony counts of fraud, theft
and public mischief to which he plead not guilty. (New York Times, 1987) It raised concerns for some about the financial management in the run-up to the actual event.

The weather was also a chief concern with the Calgary Games and it reflected the need to function physical topography and weather into event planning. During the winter of 1987, Calgarians experiencing an 80-day warm streak in what was the mildest winter since 1875. (New York Times, 1987) Ensuing discussions on how to deal with these concerns opened the door for the building of the Olympic Oval, the most expensive venue for the games. The debate also led to the purchase of millions of dollars worth of innovative snowmaking machinery for the Nordic events. Frank King, the chairman of the OCO '88, commented at the time, "It seems that we're weather-proof, at least on the warm side." King noted that organisers had installed refrigeration and snowmaking equipment in every venue that might need them as part of a $370 million dollar capital spending program that was jointly covered by the local, provincial and national governments. (New York Times, 1987)

It is worthwhile to note these contemporary concerns, since they are easy enough to overlook with the benefit of hindsight. One must remember, however, that no planning ever takes place in an environment of absolute optimism, and indeed any complex organization would be in trouble if it operated on that basis. In the case of Calgary, part of COC’88’s success was their ability to adapt to problems presented by the Alberta’s geography and environment. In adopting refrigerated and indoor facilities, they not only helped guarantee their own success, but they set the accepted standards for future games.
3.1.2 Stakeholder Engagements: 1986 Workshop on Enhancing the Long Term Impacts

Prior to the Calgary Winter Olympic Games, there was an attempt made in 1986 to determine mechanisms for enhancing the impact and success of the Olympics legacies. University of Calgary Professor Brent Ritchie organised and persevered with this research despite the fact that at the time it was unfunded by the OCO ’88. (Ritchie interview) The Calgary Tourist and Convention Bureau (CTCB) and CODA sponsored a workshop titled “A Workshop on Enhancing the Long Term Impacts of the XV Olympic Winter Games in Calgary.” The purpose of the workshop was “to bring together knowledgeable, experienced individuals and to systematically solicit their inputs concerning actions, initiatives programs, and facilities where development might be encouraged... to enhance the long-term tourism impacts of the 1988 Olympic Winter Games” (Ritchie, 2000). His was a critically important event and the actions of this broadly selected stakeholder engagement was a very important component in the successful implementation of many of the legacies of the Calgary games. Members of the workshop made every effort to differentiate between actions that should be put in place prior to the Games from those that would be implemented afterwards. It was the latter activities that were of paramount interest to CODA as that would be part of their jurisdiction (Ritchie, 2000).

The workshop participants first generated a list of potential actions that they thought were necessary to enhance the positive impacts of the Games on Calgary in a wide variety of sectors (tourism, sporting, education, commerce/industry, etc.). The participants then took this list and selected the ten actions that they believed likely to have the greatest potential for generating long-term positive legacies. Using this list, the participants ranked the ten actions from highest to lowest priority and made suggestions for the implementation of the top five.
Table 2: Calgary Legacy Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Ten Priorities accorded by Participants to Actions to Enhance Long-Term Impacts of the 1988 Olympic Winter Games</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action/Initiative/Programs/Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to formulate and coordinate implementation of an overall strategy for developing a Calgary image e.g. Western Heritage/ need to “recharge” the famous “western hospitality” in Calgary. Population must feel good about Games to be good hosts (impact of word of mouth).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action should be taken to establish a winter festival committee to put in place an annual event (culture, sports) that will use snowflake symbol, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must work harder at increasing objectivity and pride of service industry staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 10 (Calgary) should be expanded to include Banff/Lake Louis (and Drumheller) in order to facilitate marketing as a destination to the international market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More package tours of Calgary attractions (e.g. Olympic site tours) that are consumer oriented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish industry program (promotion) that take advantage of the Olympic “window” [broad coordinated message] [ensure tourism industry input to vignettes for TV coverage].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further enhance efforts to inform Calgarians and all Canadians of events/activities available to city residents and their visitors [know your city and share it], [ambassador program], [Calgary Way].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance programs to inform visitors of what there is to do and see upon arrival in Calgary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality code to minimize the perception of “rip-offs” or gouging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get information concerning hospitality into schools so as to influence youth (e.g. field trips, drama themes, visits to Olympics), (CTCB pick up on OCO curriculum program), (Alberta Department of Education).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the organizers did not formally publish the results of the workshop at the time, the author, Brent Ritchie later provided assistance to the organizers of the Salk Lake City Olympics at their request and he drew on this workshop in his later work. (Ritchie, 2000) That this document remained unpublished is in keeping with the limited amount of official follow-up on the effects of the Calgary Games and the limited interest in legacy literature. Zimmerman notes that while OCO ‘88 wrote an official report at the conclusion of the Games, the City of Calgary, the Government of Alberta and the Federal Government all appear not to have done so. This led to Zimmerman recommending that subsequent Games should produce follow-up reports
from these various agencies. (Zimmerman, 2007) Such follow up work would have been beneficial in tracking the relationship between the success of the Games themselves and their following legacies and would serve as a guide for future Hallmark events.

Upon reviewing these findings and modernizing, with further research, the conclusions, Ritchie generated 10 main principles to assist mega-event legacy enhancement. The first two of these principles form one of the major recommendations of this project in terms of community involvement. The principles are:

• “Most critical (and perhaps more obvious) is the fact that legacy planning must involve all important stakeholders who will be affected by – and benefit from – the event.”

• “Legacy planning must understand and build upon the values of local residents and stakeholders.” (Ritchie, 2000)\(^{11}\)

When interviewed, Ritchie noted that the workshop project was something that, since he had considerable design input, he had wanted to take further but that “we never took it as far as I really would have liked to.” (Brent Ritchie interview) He commented further that it is important to do these kinds of engagements and market research prior to the games themselves since interest drops rapidly after the event is concluded;

*Be aware, get any data you want before the Olympics, because once they are over the drop in people’s interest level is just incredible. And in particular, if after your study the Games lost money, nobody will want to talk about it at all. We were ok. We made money and Calgary had a legacy fund, so people were a little bit cocky, saying how wonderful we are.* (Brent Ritchie interview)

Ritchie also pointed out that while he had little success getting the Alberta government to fund his research prior to the games, they subsequently purchased his research on the impact of the Games

\(^{11}\) See Appendix B for a complete list of recommendations.
(possibly because the Games were such a success). Ritchie’s research is unique in that it is the only systematic effort that this capstone was able to find that looks at the possibilities of establishing Olympic legacies that are not sport oriented (Ritchie’s research interests were and remain on the tourism impact of such events). This remained his focus when he worked with the Salt Lake City Games as a consultant, and when he subsequently tracked some of the impacts of the Games on tourism in the area.

*Most people do not look at the event from a tourism standpoint. The people who are involved in it are all jocks, and they are all athletic - and that is fair enough, that is what the Olympics are all about. Except the spin-off is the tourism impact. And that’s what I was interested in. But nobody in the Olympic committee or anything was interested in tourism.* (Brent Ritchie interview)

Ritchie’s research is of note for the planning of legacy since it tries to develop the idea of community involvement as a critical factor in the expansion of tourism. Moreover, it examines “the relationship and the integration between tourism development and the development of these community events.” One of the most resonating comments Ritchie made during the interview process was about the need to make the concept of legacy itself something concrete and important to the host city. Thus, he saw one of the key benefits of a stakeholder engagement, its ability to assess and identify what is meaningful to the community. Therefore, while the legacy need not be sporting, it must reflect the community’s interests: “it can’t just be legacy in the neutral; it’s got to be tied into something like tourism, the arts or something, all these different dimensions of the community” (Brent Ritchie interview). In Ritchie’s case, his perspective was from the standpoint of tourism. However, one can easily extend his arguments to other community interests not directly associated with either athletics or tourism.

3.1.3 Calgary Olympic Development Association

Since the Calgary games, CODA has emerged as the leader in developing elite winter sport in Canada, and indeed it has become a global leader in the field. CODA describes itself as
being “a leader in creating Canadian Olympic winter sport excellence, from the grassroots level to the country’s Olympic best. Through direct financial assistance to national sport organizations and operational support of facilities shared by the public and our nation’s top athletes, CODA is Canada’s largest private funder of Olympic winter sport.” (www.canadaolympicpark.ca)

Calgarians have long demonstrated a commitment to both hosting the Olympics and sustaining Olympic legacies afterwards. CODA was initially founded in 1956 as part of Calgary’s earliest bid attempt. Its earliest mandate was to ensure the continuing use of Olympic facilities long after the Games were over, and to develop elite winter sport in Canada. Bill France, the former vice president of sport at the 1988 games, and CODA’s current vice president of sport (as well as acting CEO of the Whistler Legacies Society) commented on the origins of the financial successes and strengths of CODA:

*In terms of CODA’s funding post ’88, there was a surplus left after the games, and that was put into a trust fund and CODA has lived off the interest of that trust fund, which is controlled by policy. We’ve lived off that trust fund for the last twenty years, and we have never gone back to the province, the city, or the federal government for any handouts or money whatsoever. We’ve lived off number one our interest and number two, developing other programs that would make CODA and our Olympic Park sustainable. The only time we’ve gone back to the government and we’ve done that in the last 6 months is because we’re planning on a large expansion at Can Olympic Park, which is going to be a large expansion about 300 million dollars. So we’ve gone back to the three levels of government and said, number 1 we’ve got to maintain the facilities that we’ve got and number two we’ve have to build new facilities for expanding winter sports and will you help us out. So they’ve come in with some capital money and we’re going to raise some capital money and build all these facilities in addition to what we already have, but for the last twenty years we’ve never had a handout for anyone. (Bill France interview)*

France stressed that while CODA’s mandate has always been high performance sport, it was a mandate that has necessitated innovative thinking in order to successfully financing its operations. As France put it; “High performance winter sport – and they’ll find this out in Whistler – will not pay the bills, because you just can’t make money running World Cups or high-performance sport, be it competition or training.” In order for CODA to meet its mandate then, it has needed to generate additional funds through programming that were not directly
linked to its mandate. France pointed to the Canada Olympic Park (COP) as an excellent example of this. COP has now become the second ranked tourist attraction to Alberta behind the Rocky Mountains. CODA has done an innovative job of developing such programs as “mountain bike programs, summer camps, zip lines, the banquet business, a meeting centre” to cite some of France’s examples. The result in France’s opinion has been to diversify the Park with “a whole series of things for the public to come in and enjoy; they can take public bobsleigh rides, learn how to bobsleigh, learn how to luge or skeleton.” Besides entertaining the broader community, all of these public activities generate funds for CODA’s primary mandate.

3.1.3.1 Community Involvement and Volunteerism

France also noted that such activities help foster a sense of community involvement with CODA’s other programming:

>You see that happening when they come out and take a ride on the luge or want to skeleton or something. You see those people coming when we have a World Cup or a world championship to see the elites in those events. (Bill France)

Similar to community involvement, volunteerism was a factor that France cited to as being critical in successfully establishing a lasting legacy for Olympic facilities. “There is no question that CODA, or any other Winter Olympic Organisation in North America (in Europe there is a lot of paid labour) depends very heavily on volunteers. In Calgary we had 12 or 15 thousand volunteers,” France remembered and he predicts that the number will have to be upwards of 25 000 in Vancouver, noting “if you didn’t have that contingent you just couldn’t afford to run a games.”

Moreover, France noted that the development of a pool of volunteers is in itself a potential Olympic legacy, and pointed to Calgary’s continued use of volunteers to host events - many of whom were initially trained at the 1988 Games. While many, if not most, of these events are sporting in nature, there is no reason such a pool of human capital can not be utilized
for non-sporting events as well. In an article in *Calgary Commerce* magazine entitled “One Year Later – A look at the expected and unexpected legacy of the ’88 Games,” author Bill Corbett noted that prior to the games, local Nordic skiing event organisers needed extensive lead time to host major Nordic events, often as much as one or two years in advance. This time was dramatically reduced after 1988. Indeed, Corbett claims “Shortly after the Olympics, experienced cross-country ski volunteers organized the Canadian championships within days of the race.” According to the Game’s Nordic events chairman Alf Fisher “People showed up on Saturday morning and in two hours they were running the race, on time and on schedule. Because of the polish and professionalism gained from the Olympics, they were able to orchestrate in hours what is commonly an organizational nightmare.” (The article and Fisher’s comments as cited in Zimmerman, 2006). France expects the Whistler facilities to generate and rely upon a similar pool of trained volunteers:

> That is a very good legacy to have, right now volunteers are being trained, whether it’s on the technical aspect or some other aspect of running the event. And that’s a great legacy to have after the games, because when we have events in Whistler we expect the same people to come back and run events for us. If not for them we couldn’t afford to run events. (Bill France)

### 3.1.3.2 Importance of Lasting Legacies

Lasting legacies are important to Olympic bids in the sense that they help validate the large capital expenditures required to put on such events. It is important to demonstrate to the local communities that they will benefit from such legacies for years to come and that there will be an engagement between the community and the facilities. Bill France commented on just how important developing such a meaningful engagement between venue and the community is:

> I think the average person and the average population asks first when you apply for a games; “what’s it going to do for us after the games.” That is obviously the legacy. I think its really important when you’re talking to the community and when you’re bidding for a games - because they are expensive. There is no
question about that - you show that after the 17 days of glory there's a plan. So that you have something to direct to the people that this is going to be great for generations to come, and that there is going to be a future here, that there is life after the games, it just doesn't come and go and you've spent millions of dollars and its going to die. I think that it is important that you get that message across to the communities. To say; “yes we're going to have great facilities, we're going to have great programs, and that we're going to continue to grow.” I think that you should be showing them some plans like those that we have with the Nordic centres at Whistler. So that it is not just all about cross country skiing and ski jumping, biathlon and combined. To show that there are going to be programs there first of all for the kids to learn to ski. That there are going to be programs for kids in the summer to go mountain biking, there's going to be some tours, there's going to be a whole series of things happening that just aren't Olympic related, that the facilities are there and there's going to be a benefit for many years to come. (Bill France)

One such example of a legacy facility that has survived and thrived for twenty years and remains interconnected with the local Calgary community is the Olympic Oval located at the University of Calgary.

3.1.4 The Olympic Oval

There is pouring some concrete, but then you need people and programs to make it work and I think the oval has done a great job of having and developing programs where we have professional coaches hired on a year round basis coaching athletes from a provincial team level up to Olympic medallists. Having that structure in place and having all those stepping stones in place has created the Olympic successes that we've had. (Sean Ireland, Associate Director of Sport Development)

Twenty years after the games, the Olympic Oval in Calgary remains a vibrantly active hub, not just for speed skating, but also for Calgary's wider sporting community. The Oval is interconnected to the University of Calgary's excellent kinesiology program and hosts multiple national training centres, in areas as diverse as cycling and women's hockey (which was not an Olympic event in 1988). The venue is currently home to seventeen of thirty world long track skating records. (Zimmerman, 2007)
The 1988 Calgary Olympic Games were the first time that the speed skating events took place in an indoor facility. The 4,000-seat facility at the University of Calgary opened in May, months prior to the games. (New York Times, 1987) A year round facility that cost $40 million to build, the Oval was the first fully enclosed speed skating oval constructed in North America. The building, built by the Canadian Government, was the recipient of four international awards for its architecture, construction and structural engineering. (Zimmerman, 2007) The venue features the 400m long track oval, a permanent two-lane 450-metre running track, 2000 permanent seats plus an additional 2000 retractable ones. (Zimmerman, 2007) The facility also houses two international ice surfaces (30mx 60m), a 110m 8-lane sprint track, a long jump pit and a pole vault box. (http://oval.sunergon.com/). Additionally the facility works with the University of Calgary’s kinesiology department to coordinate research projects.

Sean Ireland, who is the Olympic Oval’s associate director of sport development, was interviewed to get his perspective on what the Olympic Oval’s legacy means to elite Canadian athletes as well as the Calgary community as a whole. He was also asked to assess what he felt were the keys to its success and how the facility has managed to remain relevant twenty years after it was built. A former international level speed skater with the national team for seven years, Ireland represented Canada at the 1992 Albertville Olympics (to date the last Games to use outdoor ice), and subsequently coached the national team. He also received a Petro-Canada Coaching Excellence Award recipient. Currently Ireland’s work focuses on development level programming while the director of sport development works with the elite international programming. Ireland is responsible for eight coaches at the development level of the Olympic Oval. He is also involved with a broader assortment of “policy development and other committees at the Oval” (Ireland interview).

The interview with Ireland was constructed around three themes. The themes included the ways in which the Oval benefits Canada’s elite sporting community, how the community
benefits from and engages with the Oval and what he felt were the keys to the Oval remaining a relevant hub in Canadian sport.

3.1.4.1 Impact on High Performance Sport

Since its inception, the Olympic Oval has become the hub of long track skating in Canada, an important facility for athletes in other disciplines, and a training destination for elite international athletes. This fact was apparent even in the lobby of the Olympic Oval on a Wednesday morning in early February this year. In the period between this researcher arriving at the Oval and Ireland coming down to greet him, several European skaters arrived to pick up new ID tags. At the same time, a group of young national team cyclists were arriving to do a workout at the Oval’s other facilities as well, under the supervision of coach and former world champion track cyclist Tanya Dubnicoff. With this as background, Ireland spoke about what a boon the centre had been for Canadian skaters:

_For speed skating, it has been a huge asset for Canadian long track. Any province west of Quebec comes here and uses this as a national training center. So usually, we have provincial team level athletes move here from last bit of high school or first bit of university and they come out joining our oval program and use it as a stepping-stone to make the national team. We have our national team based here as well as at Quebec City, though this has become the largest training centre by far in terms of national team training here, and producing athletes on the national team and development team._ (Sean Ireland interview)

Ireland pointed to a number of important factors at the Oval that contributed to the quality of the training facility in Calgary. These include; the quality of the ice, the training environment, the excellent weight room, and the quality of athlete support (especially with the sports medicine opportunities tied into the University of Calgary, who in turn benefit from having a pool of elite athletes on whom to conduct research) Projects undertaken in cooperation include, training methods, analysis techniques and research into safety measures and equipment (http://oval.sunergon.com ). And as Ireland was quick to note, the program has paid off in terms of results:
If you look at the number of medals speed skating has produced since '88, it has so far increased every Olympics. And if you look at the size of the team now versus '88 our team has grown three fold in terms of number athletes on the team and the number of athletes competing at world cups has tripled what it used to be. (Sean Ireland interview)

Another key factor in terms of the Oval’s success as a training ground for Canadian skaters, is that is has been able to attract the highest calibre international skaters to train at the Oval’s facilities. These athletes stay in Calgary for anywhere from a couple of weeks to entire seasons, and they provide local development athletes with an invaluable opportunity to train and compete against international level competition in a supportive domestic setting. In addition, they give the centres’ coaches the chance to see what coaches from competing nations are having their athletes do in terms of training. Weekly racing gives young Canadians the chance to race at an international level without ever leaving their home base. As Ireland pointed out “it raises the bar for anyone training here, because you see what other people are doing.”

3.1.4.2 Community Involvement with the Olympic Oval

The Olympic Oval continues to draw heavily upon volunteers to run many of its events and many of these volunteers received their initial training for the 1988 games. The interviewer questioned Ireland about the degree to which the interactions between the Oval and the Calgary community were reciprocal. Despite being an elite facility, CODA has mandated a quarter of the Oval’s ice time for community skating and programming. Ireland confirmed that these public skating nights are hugely popular, and that over the years, the track has seen increasingly larger crowds attend events, to the point that numerous World Cup and World Championships have seen standing room only.

While Ireland thought that the Olympics Oval’s heritage of having been an Olympic venue probably fostered its success in terms of community support, he did not feel it was “the be all and end all” in terms of the centre’s success. Many skating centres from other Olympics have
been underused while some non-Olympic centres have been successful. In some detail, Ireland discussed other Ovals that have not built upon their Olympic experience. He also pointed out that the other major international skating centre that competes with Calgary as an international hub for elite athletes was a non-Olympic track in Erfurt Germany which was constructed in 1996. (http://www.gunda-niemann-stirnemann-halle.de/englisch/geschichte.php) Ireland felt that at least part of what made the difference between successful facilities and those that were less used was how interconnected the facility was with the wider community. This involved the easy access for the athletes and the general public, as well as the proximity to housing for international visitors.

3.1.4.3 Factors Contributing to the Olympic Oval’s Ongoing Success

In Ireland’s analysis;

*The overall success of the building and speed skating here has been because the facility was well thought out. Being one of the first of its kind, there was a lot of forethought. I think there were a couple of things they could have done better, but with CODA and the funds they were able to put aside from the Olympics it has obviously allowed it to continue to exist and foster the other components to our success.* (Sean Ireland interview)

The coordinated nature of Calgary’s facilities have contributed to it remaining a vital centre internationally, and the venues have continued to thrive despite initial concerns that Salt Lake City would pull much of the focus away from Calgary. While one or two international teams have relocated there (such as the US team who formerly trained in Calgary), it has not been the exodus that many had predicted, in part, because the rival facility lacks many of the benefits of Calgary’s central location. Ireland noted that:

*There are a number of problems with Salt Lake’s Oval in terms of the way they’ve done things. For one, it is kind of out of town in terms of location. One of the strengths here is we’re associated with the university. We have all of the support of the university, as well as the support of the sport centre with on site sports medicine. We have access to all of the academic people that can help sports in terms of physiologists, and biomechanists. Salt Lake is out in the boonies with no motels close by, here there are motels just around the corner.*
makes it a really attractive place for people to come and train.(Sean Ireland interview)

Ireland also noted that the Erfurt oval had benefited from being “a well designed building in terms of cost effectiveness and maintenance” and that the designers kept in mind its use as a training facility for athletes and providing access to other facilities. In Ireland’s estimation, Erfurt has probably drawn more international teams away from Calgary than any competing Olympic facility because of its well implemented design.

3.2 Salt Lake City

Salt Lake City, like Calgary, had to go through several Olympic bids before the city was finally awarded the 2002 Winter Games. As early as 1989, Salt Lake City had received the approval of the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) to bid on the 1998 Games. The city was successful in its second bid attempt. (Zimmerman, 2007) Although the first bid had been unsuccessful, it had an important consequence. In 1989, the state government agreed to set aside one sixteenth of one percent of all sales tax towards developing winter sports facilities. This revenue base helped lay the groundwork for the successful bid.

One of the guiding principles that the Salt Lake Olympic Committee (SLOC) articulated early on was “to leave a lasting legacy to the youth of our community, not only through sports, but through the ideals of the Olympic Movement” (Zimmerman, 2007). This youth oriented focus was a logical one given Utah’s young population with an average age of 26 to 27 and that they were already an active demographic. Moreover, Utah had the highest participation rate in the United States in both soccer and volleyball. The pre-existing, extremely active demographic was a major factor in structuring SLOC’s official operating budget, announced in September 1998. SLOC built into the $1.45 billion overall budget a $40 million reserve dedicated to a legacy foundation (Zimmerman, 2007).
3.2.1 The Five Point Olympic Legacy Plan

As early as 1998, The Salt Lake City Games organizers formulated a specific “Five Point Olympic Legacy Plan.” It reflected a progression in the manner in which legacies have been dealt with. While this legacy planning was not as early or extensive as that being undertaken by VANOC, it was earlier and more systematic than had been the case with Calgary and it indicated the growing role played by legacy projects in Olympic planning. The SLOC plan sought to “take advantage of the state’s unique opportunity to leverage the 2002 Olympic Games and create an economic legacy that will benefit all areas of the state and remain long after the games are over” (Five Point Olympic Legacy Plan Summary, 2002). Not only did the Salt Lake organizers formalize their legacy plans much sooner than Calgary, but they were far more explicit in terms of the goals. They agreed that those legacies should serve a broader range of interests than just athletic excellence. Moreover, the legacies were tied to an economic decree to increase the attraction of Utah as a destination location. (Ritchie, 2000)

The five key points were (in summary):

1. Contribute to, and to the extent possible, manage the Utah! Brand image through paid and earned media.
2. Promote hospitality values training into everyday usage for citizens, service sector employees, and operations volunteers.
3. Collaborate with other entities to increase the level of visitor information services.
4. Conduct Olympics-related research.
5. Leverage the ability of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games to attract capital to needed destination development. (Five Point Olympic Legacy Plan Summary, 2002)
If the plan seemed to focus on financial benefits to the state to the exclusion of possible sporting infrastructure legacies, it was, in part, because there was a pre-existing criteria for potential US host cities. Following disappointing performances at the 1988 Games in which US athletes won only six medals, a U.S. congressional committee opened an investigation that resulted in the changing of USOC selection criteria to require “sports-training facilities and create legacy venues as part of their bid, which would help develop future generations of U.S. athletes” (Zimmerman, 2007). Nevertheless, the five points did reflect the financial priorities of the Salt Lake City organizers.

3.2.2 Salt Lake Facilities

Perhaps because the organizers’ focus was on finance and tourism, the legacy facilities from Salt Lake’s Winter Games have never received the same degree of financial support as the CODA operations. However, there are a number of venues that fall into the legacy category and that bear examination.

3.2.2.1 Soldier Hollow

The Soldier Hollow venue has become one of the feature attractions of Wasatch Mountain State Park, which itself, with 900,000 annual visitors, was one of the state’s most visited destinations prior to the games. The venue featured 28-km of cross country-country trails that contained numerous innovative environmental safeguards. John Aalberg, the director of the cross country and Nordic venue at Salt Lake City (the jump facilities were held in a separate location) commented in his interview that despite the acclaim that the facility has gained in the Nordic community, he was not able to do as much with it as he would have liked. The creation of Soldier Hollow was constrained by the private, rather than public nature of its financing (John Aalberg interview). He explains:
In Salt Lake there was zero government money for venue construction. So all we did there was to build what was needed for the Olympic Games. We could not afford to do anything with legacy. (John Aalberg)

Aalberg noted that he stayed for 6 months following the games in order to implement the post games legacy efforts at establishing a lasting presence at Soldier Hollow. Actions were taken to diversify the facility so that it could cater to a wider cross section of the community. This included building the longest tubing lanes in Utah, adding additional novice ski trails and running a summer and winter “Olympic Biathlon Experience” program (www.soldierhollow.com). The facility has also continued to offer training facilities and opportunities for elite sport as well. Soldier Hollow hosted the U23 World Championships in 2003 in addition to the US National Championships in 2004 and 2005 (www.soldierhollow.com).

3.2.2.2 Utah Olympic Oval

The Utah skating track has become arguably the fastest track in the world (it shares a healthy rivalry with Calgary), due to the quality of its design as well as an ideal combination of environmental factors - primarily dry air and altitude. Upon its construction, the venue was one of only 6 indoor ovals, and housed two full size international ice sheets along with the 400m oval, as well as a weight room, sports medicine facilities and other amenities. Despite these international calibre facilities, Sean Ireland (who admittedly is an employee of the Calgary Olympic Oval) believed that the Salt Lake track suffered from being relatively remote and away from an urban centre (the venue is 15 miles outside of town).

3.2.2.3 Utah Olympic Park

The 386 acre complex which is located in Snyderville Utah (30 miles from downtown) houses the regulation luge and bobsleigh track as well as five regulation ski jumps. It is one of only four bobsleigh courses in North America, including the Whistler track, and one of only two
Olympic calibre ski jump facilities in the US. (2002 Winter Olympic Games- Impacts, Images and Legacies, 2001)

Craig Lehto, now the director of the Whistler sliding centre, was the general manager of the Utah Olympic Park. Before that he had worked for 10 years with the sliding facilities operated by CODA. He was asked to compare the Salt Lake City legacy facilities to the Calgary ones and he made the following comments:

*Salt Lake is a lot younger of an organization, but I think they were able to learn a lot from Calgary. You have to take a North American approach to how you are going to operate some of these more European-type sports and facilities. And, I think they’re doing equally well, if not better, because they were able to establish a better base in using lessons learnt in Calgary. I think it’s substantially easier if you’ve got good communications and good transfer of knowledge from one facility or one legacy organization to the next.* (Craig Lehto interview)

When asked to expand on what he thought some of these lessons were, Lehto emphasised that what was important to keep in mind was the basic principles of why the legacies were established in the first place.

*It is very fundamental things. The base fundamentals of why the facilities exist and why they are operated, and what their goals are. Is it like a library that you want to make sure has funding forever? Is it more that you take a period of twenty or thirty years and say ‘we want to produce more athletes? Or do you try to take the facilities and try to turn them into a different philosophy just run for business and not so importantly for sport.* (Craig Lehto interview)

In Lehto’s experience “you always learn that they’re built at the impetus to be sports high-performance facilities – the ones I’ve been involved with anyways.” He emphasised that it is important for the legacy to understand what its product is, be that producing elite athletes or running a money-making business. The planners need to be cognizant of these choices and how they affect each other through the history of the facility.

*Hopefully at the end of the day you apply all of the principals to make sure you know why the facilities exist at a very primary level, or at a very simple philosophical level. And that gets affected from the first time the big community starts saying, “Should we bid on these games?” And those threads – the stronger
the threads, the more the philosophy is there ten years after, the better you've done at creating you legacy. (Craig Lehto interview)

3.2.3 1989 Referendum and Sales Tax Revenue

Building extensive infrastructure for an Olympic Games is extremely expensive and normally involves a mixture of public and private funds. Salt Lake City was able to capitalise on new opportunities to partially fund their venue construction. Although Salt Lake City lost their 1991 bid to host the 1998 Winter Games by a slim four votes to Nagano (in part because the 1996 Summer Games had already been allocated to Atlanta), their subsequent bid for the 2002 Games benefited greatly from some of the planning and financial decisions that had already been put in place (New York Times, 1995). Most significant in this planning was a 1989 referendum that provided the bid with revenues from sales-tax, equalling one sixteenth of a percentage of the state’s total sales tax (New York Times, 1995 and Zimmerman, 2007). By June of 1995 this revenue stream had generated some $59 million dollars in public funds. This funding, along with the USOC policy towards building elite and training venues, meant that even without the guarantee of hosting the Olympics, Salt Lake City was able to construct international calibre facilities that included a speed skate oval and ski jumps (minus the largest K-120 jump). In the words of Anita DeFrantz, a member of the I.O.C. and the Salt Lake City bid committee, “We’re open for business; the world’s athletes can come and start training right now” (New York Times, 1995). The early opening of these venues helped to popularize the new facilities as various national federations sought valuable practice at the future Olympic venues. With these venues in place, Salt Lake was able to proceed without relying heavily on additional government funds with the bulk of its $798 million dollar operating budget coming from sponsorships, television rights, the sale of licensed products and other private-sector projects (New York Times, 1995).
3.3 Into the Future: Vancouver 2010

Vancouver is currently poised to be the third Canadian city to play host to an Olympic Games, and the second to host a Winter Games. Although the actual Games are still two years away, the most important decisions involving legacy projects have already been made. This section will examine the current state of the legacy planning specifically in regards to the largest legacy project; the Whistler Legacy Society. The Vancouver’s other major legacy establishment, the Richmond Oval facility (which houses a temporary long track venue as well as two permanent international size ice surfaces [Sean Ireland interview]) is only dealt with in an abbreviated manner as making contact with the facilities there proved difficult. While the long-track surface in Richmond is will be removed after the completion of the Games, the city’s aim is for the $178 million dollar facility to become “BC’s premier multi-purpose sports, recreation and wellness facility” as well as incorporating the creation of a new international destination and meeting place. Richmond Mayor Malcom Brodie stated; “We are committed to creating a premier venue for the 2010 Games and to building a legacy that will be a point of pride for our community and an international centre in sports and wellness.” Tourism, sports and Arts Minister Olga Ilich echoes Brodie’s commitment to legacy, saying that “when the Olympics and Paralympic torches have been extinguished, this facility will be a place where young athletes can train and participate in sport year-round – a lasting legacy that will help us sustain international podium performance and achieve out goal of becoming the healthiest jurisdiction in North America” (CNNMathews).

Craig Lehto, the director of the Whistler Sliding Centre, and a veteran of the Calgary and Salt Lake City Games, pointed out that much has changed in the importance and structuring of legacies since the 1988 Games. He noted that the legacies of Calgary were the result of a surplus, and in part the result of a discussion over what to do with such leftover funds. Lehto commented that while the Los Angeles 1984 summer games had been a breakthrough in terms of hosting profitable games, the diffused nature of its organisation and funding meant that it left no legacies
in its wake. This was something Calgary organisers were eager to change when they decided to capitalize on their own surplus by creating the endowments that fund CODA.

Today, legacies have become a central aspect in the debate around the bidding and hosting of Winter Games, something that Vancouver has recognised by putting together one of the most concrete and earliest legacy plans to date. VANOC already has its two major endowments in place (the Speed Skating Oval Fund plus the Whistler Sliding Centre and Nordic Centre).

3.3.1 Whistler Legacies Society

The Whistler Legacies Society will receive forty percent of the revenue from the $110-million Games Operating Trust. The trust is funded by both the provincial and federal governments, and is the result of a multi-party agreement between the BC Government and David Emerson, Minister of International Trade and Minister for the Pacific Gateway and the Vancouver-Whistler Olympics (www.vancouver2010.com). The initial $110 million dollar investment has already accumulated significant income and as of March 31st, 2007 the Trust had reached $133.6 million (Office of the Premier Press Release). BC Premier Gordon Campbell commented that:

Through this fund, young British Columbians will be able to make their Olympic dreams come true. When we first started talking about the Games, we made it clear that these Games would leave lasting benefits to the province and this trust is just one of the ways we’re living up to that commitment.” (Office of the Premier Press Release)

VANOC states on their website that:

When it comes to the sustainable legacy of our Games, our focus to date has been on upgrading or building venues that will meet the competition needs of athletes in 2010 and have long-term community and sport uses after the Games. These facilities will allow continued development of high-performances athletes and
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12 The Whistler Legacies differ significantly in that the trust was established before the Games using government funds, rather than CODA which was established using Games surplus.
provide ongoing recreational sport for both able-bodies people and for people with disabilities. (www.vancouver2010.com)

The Games Operating Trust is subdivided into three components:

- 40% to the Speed Skating Oval Fund
- 40% to the Whistler Sliding Centre and Nordic Centre Fund (Whistler Legacy Society)
- 20% to a Contingency Fund

Jamie Bruce, the chair of the Games Operating Trust board of directors, commented on the collaborative effort needed to effectively set up the trust. “We greatly appreciate the collaborative approach by the City of Richmond and the Whistler Legacies Society concerning the division of the Games Operating Trust. The venues took the time to understand the expected needs of the legacy facilities and clearly communicated those to [sic] the trust. This cooperative approach was a huge help to trustees” (Office of the Premier Press Release).

The Whistler legacies are located near or on Blackcomb Mountain, with the new sliding track being integrated into the Whistler Resorts long term development plan. VANOC has proudly claimed that “the Whistler Sliding Centre will be an excellent site to showcase sliding sports to the public” (www.vancouver2010.com). The construction of the sliding tracks involved building the new 1,700m concrete sliding track, refrigeration facilities and an access road. The track is now operational. When interviewed about the role of the Whistler Legacies Society, CEO Bill France described its purpose as being to assume control and to operate the three sites in Whistler after the Games. The three sites are the Sliding Centre, the Nordic Centre and the Athletes Training Centre.

The main objective of the Whistler Legacies Society is to make sure that these venues remain sustainable after the Games. Because the planning for the legacy process was begun at a very early stage, France feels Whistler has a considerable advantage:
We’ve already started which is a very big plus, because no other games have done this. We’ve already started by putting the Legacy Society together and putting together a board of seven people and we presently are now working very closely with VANOC, and sitting in with them as they prepare for the games and prepare the facilities. We are making sure that what they do there will benefit the facilities afterwards. We’re working hand in hand with VANOC so we will have a sort of turn-key operation after the games are over. (Bill France)

John Aalberg is the director of all Nordic sports for VANOC as well as acting as the director of the Whistler Olympic Park, in addition to being the future event venue manager during the Games. Aalberg is in an ideal situation to comment on the different approach between Salt Lake and Vancouver since he has performed the same job as director for both Games. He spoke to the differences he has found between the two events:

It is just a different atmosphere here in Vancouver. We have provincial and national funding for the construction. There is a commitment to a trust fund for post-games. I have been able to do many things that we just had to trim out in Salt Lake. Obviously, you learn from, call it mistakes or what you wish, but we’ve been able to implement a few of those things here. (John Aalberg)

However, Aalberg was realistic that coordinating the objectives of the games committee with those of the legacy societies is not always easy:

It is important but it has not been an easy process. Actually putting on the games is quite easy compared to figuring out what the legacy is going to look like. I have been through this before, and putting on the games you’ve got a manual pretty much. It is down to formula and times and there are many requirements, so it is actually quite easy compared to guessing what the future would be like. The Legacy Society’s been living inside VANOC until now, and now it is just starting to move outside and operate on its own. It is part of our mission to provide for legacies, and they have a clear mandate but you do not want to create conflict. Sometimes you make a choice - where you have to do something one way for the games and want to do it another for legacy - but right now the games takes precedence. But there are best solutions to everything and we’re basically going hand in hand. Right now they are focused on how to market it, and how is it going to be ready in 2011 to continue on the high note of the games. (John Aalberg)
3.3.1.1 Involving the Community

Bill France spoke to some of VANOC and the Whistler Legacy Societies efforts to engage the communities in the areas that house the Whistler legacies:

*You have to involve the community, and we are doing that right now out in Whistler. For instance, the Canadian Luge Association is stationed at Canada Olympic Park know they are going to get a new track out in BC, so they’re not waiting till after the games to start setting up clubs. They have sent two staff people out there, that are living there now, and the purpose of those people is to generate interest. To get into the schools, to get into the community, and say, we are going to have some talent identification camps, some learn to luge camps, so we want you to come out. So they’ve started right now building clubs to try and create interest around the province. And that’s really important to start early rather than waiting till after the games and then trying to generate some interest. Involving the communities is really important.*  (Bill France interview)

The Nordic venues are in some ways the most accessible of the Whistler venues, in the traditional sense of involving children and the community with the sport. John Aalberg spoke of the efforts that the Nordic centre in Whistler is making to engage with a variety of levels of the community, from the national sports organisations (NSO), to the local community as well as attempts to involve the school system. It would seem that a large part of creating a successful legacy is the facility’s success in balancing the needs and desires of these different levels of community. For while the Whistler Nordic centre will be an important development and training centre for elite skiers, there is also the need to balance the requirements of internationally competitive athletes with the demands of the core of recreational skiers.

Building a core of recreations users is crucial, especially when confronted with communities in which no such tradition exists. Aalberg pointed to Squamish as being a community with little or no history in Nordic events, and so far, the Whistler venue has helped form separate Nordic, biathlon and jump clubs in the area. The result has been that the community in Squamish is already emerging as one of the primary users of the facilities. Aalberg noted efforts to attract those clubs, along with Whistler and North Vancouver clubs, to the Nordic
venue with attractive packages involving inexpensive rentals and access. Various school groups have been provided with opportunities of rentals and instruction for what Aalberg described as “almost free.” Aalberg believes that this approach, in which “we’ve got the schools involved, we’ve got the clubs involved, we’ve got the national sport organisations involved,” is key to successful legacy. The other critical factor is the ability of the Whistler Legacy Society to focus entirely on legacy while VANOC focuses on the games themselves.

It should be noted that despite the fact the facilities were built for the games, he believes that their success is not necessarily directly related to the reason for their inception.

*We’re really happy with how we’ve been able to involved the community so far. If you go there, like this Sunday we had a biathlon youth program, we had cross country youth programs. We had a club from Calgary out there jumping, both on the big hill and the little bunny hill. We had just over 500 recreational skiers paying day passes. There was just a fluster of activities everywhere, and this has nothing to do with the games. None of it.* (John Aalberg)

The conclusion then is that while the Olympics provide both the justification to construct such facilities, and the finances to back it, in the final analysis, such facilities need to stand on their own merit. If they cannot attract enough visitors without the grandeur of an Olympic games, then the games themselves will not be enough to sustain the facilities. This is similar to Ireland’s comments about which skating ovals have been successful, with Calgary’s main competition being in Erfurt, Germany at a non-Olympic venue. Aalberg did mention, however, that he felt the physical presence of the jump sites formed a sort of Olympic monument, as they are the among the first things that visitors see upon arriving at the new facilities. Memories of the Games provide an intangible psychological benefit for the facilities.

For Craig Lehto, however, the key is to find ways to bridge the gap between community involvement and the physically intimidating venue under his administration.

*Tracks are intimidating, for many reasons, there is a lot of steel and concrete and refrigeration. They look and they feel Olympic and very high performance - it is a difficult bridge but a key one. I guess it is just my philosophy, but the*
Community is phenomenally important. We cannot run races without the community. We do not have the workforce without volunteers – who are the community. (Craig Lehto interview)

Lehto commented that in the case of the sliding track, much of the budget is spend on the operations, meaning that volunteer support is even more important. The dominant theme brought up by all three men, Lehto, Aalberg and France, was that it is important to involve the community in a broad and versatile way so that the venues cater to more than just elite sport if they are to provide vibrant and dynamic legacies.

3.3.1.2 The Troubles with Timelines

One factor that all of the interviews discussing Vancouver talked about was the pressures that the timeline of hosting an Olympic Games presents. John Aalberg commented that is it always a challenge to try and balance the concern for legacy with the reality of hosting an Olympic Games:

We try not to build something that is just going to last for the games and then disappear - nobody wants to do that. You put so much time and effort into it, so you want it to continue in perpetuity or as long as possible. So while you always think about every decision you make in terms of what is needed for the games, you also try to think about what can be done to for, or can enhance the post games situation. Every step of the way you think about that, but obviously, we are here to put on the games. That is our number one priority. You cannot override that, and sometimes it’s either or. However, we try to do both as often as possible.

Take the ski trails. We need about fifteen kilometres to put on the games. They are building fifty, which is way above what you need for the games. You do that for legacy, and that was something that we had the budget to do, but it takes a lot of extra time to implement and plan and do. (John Aalberg)

Aalberg also commented on the manner in which the ability to allocate resources towards legacy planning diminished rapidly as the Games approach (a comment also made by Bill France and Craig Lehto). An Olympian in 1992 and 1994, Aalberg was in an ideal position to compare some
of the differing aspects of various legacies, and just what it is that makes some facilities successful. Based on his experiences, he predicted:

*I’ve raced all over the world and also at several Olympic sites. They have not all been successful and I think we will do better here. I already know, I already see that we’re doing better. Because many of those sites were just build for the games without thinking ahead, thinking further. Looking at Turin as an example, they did a good job with the ski jumps - they have lots of different hills - but there is not much legacy on their biathlon or cross country trails. Albertville was just shut down after the ’92 Olympics - it has never been used again. Nagano is lacking too. I think our building far beyond what is needed for the games is something that I don’t think has ever been done before. (John Aalberg)*

### 3.3.1.3 Volunteerism and Building Support

While both Salt Lake City and Calgary benefited from large community volunteerism rates, Vancouver’s is slightly lower (see Table 2). This does not seem to have been a huge barrier to date as by the 13th of February 2008, over 8,000 people had already applied to volunteer, though 40% of those were from outside BC *(The Province, Feb 13 2008).* In addition, the BC government has brought in a program to pay public servants who volunteer at the games *(The National Post, Feb 14 2008).* Attracting volunteers has been a critical factor in the success of North American Olympics. Brent Ritchie commented that one of the strengths of Calgary’s efforts was that they were able to capitalize on the pre-existing pool of volunteers; “the Stampede was the foundation for the Olympics; because of all the Volunteers for the Stampede, they just drew on that model” (Brent Ritchie interview).

For venues such as those managed by the Whistler Legacy Society where there are not established sources of volunteer labour, one of the key elements is to both educate a pool of volunteers for their events, and retain those volunteers for future events in order to help sustain their future success. John Aalberg discussed the sorts of efforts that VANOC has undertaken to
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13 As Table 2 indicates, while Vancouver’s volunteer rate is marginally lower, the Greater Vancouver population is almost double that of the other two cities.
try and recruit volunteers for the Nordic facilities, in a region that does not have a rich tradition in Nordic sports:

There was a little bit of a small cross country community in terms of officials and event organizations. But they were all at the very basic level, low; what I would call recreational level, so we had to build that up for all the sports. We had a huge interaction. We had many hundreds of meetings with different organisations, going in and telling them what this is about. Then official seminars, different training seminars for the volunteers that we need to run these events. What we’ve done as a Nordic sport department is train 500 volunteers. They are on the venues this year, helping and doing the events with us. We are drawing from the whole Sea-to-Sky corridor almost down to the border. (John Aalberg interview)

3.3.1.4 What it means to elite and future athletes.

The director of the Whistler Sliding Centre, Craig Lehto, sees the sliding facilities as adding to the strong base in those sports that were fostered by the creation of the Calgary facilities twenty years ago (with which he was also involved). When asked what the new facilities would mean to future Canadian sliders and how the two centres would interact he had the following response:

If I took a philosophical look at it, I don’t see them being drastically different. The sports are so facility based, that doubling your ability to train athletes and compete within a country takes you a substantial leap up from where you’re at with one. Having one is the biggest step you can take, but a second one is another leap. Because competition is key, it is really good to have two tracks so you can develop clubs to have that competition with Calgary. The facilities don’t need to compete with each other over a national team athlete because that national team athlete when their sliding will just be better when their on both leaps and bounds better, since they are so starved for facilities. (Craig Lehto interview)

3.3.2 Housing Policy and Homelessness: Potential Legacy?

It would be difficult to write a paper dealing the upcoming Olympics that did not mention some of the debate around homelessness and the upcoming games that seized much of the media attention following Vancouver’s successful bid. Indeed, it provides a useful test to measure
whether Games planning can incorporate non-athletic social priorities. It is easy to conceptualize of a non-sporting legacy whose mandate would be to deal with some aspect of poverty or affordable housing. During the interview with Brent Ritchie, Ritchie commented that there is often not enough of this type of innovative work towards legacy. It seems entirely possible that future games will increasingly incorporate some of the basics of legacy planning (capitalising on an open policy window to create facilities or infrastructure and then funding them in perpetuity via a trust) to establish more diverse legacies. While Vancouver failed to capitalize on this as much as they could have, it certainly appears the window was there, especially given the media attention the topic has received since Vancouver was awarded the bid. It is a lesson to be learned for any future Hallmark event. The absolutely critical aspect, however, is that these decisions have to be made at the very start of the process.

In the referendum held in Vancouver on the 2010 Winter Olympic bid, local politicians were able to use the debate to bolster their plans for redeveloping the Downtown Eastside and to reduce homelessness. (Stewart and Smith, 2007) Vancouver Mayor Larry Campbell passed a motion for a non-binding plebiscite on the Olympic Games to be held on February 22, 2003. The plebiscite asked residents “Do you support or do you oppose the City of Vancouver’s participation in hosting the 2010 Olympic Winter Games and Paralympic Games?” (Stewart and Smith, 2007) Jim Green was able to use the provincial Liberal government’s desire to win the bid to leverage his own low income housing agenda. In return for Green publicly supporting the bid, the federal and provincial agreed to a $20 million “living legacy” fund for the Downtown Eastside. Additionally the province agreed to put aside some of the Olympic Village at False Creek for social housing after the games were over. (Stewart and Smith, 2007) This commitment towards inclusion of Vancouver’s inner-city neighbourhoods can be seen in VANOC’s “2010 Winter Games Inner-City Inclusive Commitment Statement,” which aspires to “create a strong foundation for sustainable socio-economic development in Vancouver’s inner-city
neighbourhoods, particularly in Downtown Eastside, Downtown South and Mount Pleasant,” and whose purpose is to “identify, develop and build positive legacies no for the inner-city neighbourhoods.” (www.vancouver2010.com) The statement goes on to outline that not only is VANOC committed to not exacerbating Vancouver’s homelessness problem but also to providing “and affordable housing legacy” which they planned to start immediately after winning the bid. (www.vancouver2010.com) While VANOC has made some moderate efforts towards establishing a social legacy, it is possible that much more could have been done given the situation presented.

If little comes of this “legacy” of low cost housing, it will not be surprising. It merely reflects trends already identified in the capstone. The chances of individuals or interest groups leveraging last minute concessions with the threat of opposition to the Games and then translating those gains into a lasting legacy are slim. The benefits of this form of legacy have to be identified, accepted, and endorsed by the wider community early enough to be part of the initial planning of the Hallmark event.

3.3.3 Vancouver Olympic Committee and their Stakeholder Engagements

Vancouver’s staging of the Winter Games reveals the ways in which the organizers of Hallmark events such as this have become more sensitive to the need to involve a wide spectrum of interest groups. VANOC acknowledges that the Olympic and Paralympics involve a broad cross-section of stakeholders (whom they define as “individuals of groups that are either involved directly in, or affected by, the Games”).

VANOC’s partners and stakeholders include:
• Athletes and officials
• Canadian public
• Community and non-government organizations
• Corporate sponsors, suppliers and licensees
• Educational institutions
• Four Host First Nations (FHFN) and Aboriginal people across Canada
• Municipalities and communities
• International and Canadian Olympic and Paralympics Committees
• Federal and provincial governments and host municipalities
• Spectators
• VANOC workforce (VANOC, 2007)

VANOC attempts to engage their stakeholders in ways that they feel are appropriate to each situation, based on what they feel are their responsibilities and the nature and effects of the issue. Relationships with partners are formalized via legal agreements outlining the associated benefits and obligations. The relationships with stakeholders are generally less formal and ranges from sharing of information to what VANOC describes as joint decision making. Furthermore, VANOC claims that they endeavour to learn from their partner and stakeholder engagements and apply them to their day-to-day decision-making, and provide feedback to their stakeholders on the degree to which their input has been taken into consideration.
4: Analysis and Policy Options

4.1 Five Key Factors for Successful Legacies

Based on the analysis of the case studies combined with information provided by the key stakeholder interviews, the following elements have been identified as being key factors towards the successful outcomes of Winter Olympic Legacies. These elements are equally important in planning any Hallmark event legacies. Each of the interview respondents touched upon all of these issues, though their weighting of them differed. The following are weighed in order of what the researcher felt was of most to least critical importance.

4.1.1 Community Engagement Matters

Many conceptualizations of the impacts and benefits of Olympic Games ignore the human element involved. (Haxton, 2005) The localized impacts and reactions of the residents of the communities involved is an absolutely critical factor that needs to be taken into consideration. Hiller (1990) notes that mega-events are more likely to be controversial when local citizens see them as elitist events to be enjoyed only by those that can either afford to participate or whom have an interest in the event. The traditional top-down approach of event planners has tended to foster “a top-down perspective that marks the majority of urban residents as passive recipients of the ideas of elite interests.” (Hiller 1990) The case studies show that community engagement is a necessity for successful legacy development.

It became apparent in Craig Lehto’s interview, that for him, community engagement was one of the dominant issues towards creating successful legacies.

That is a big base of it, because I think that is where legacy starts. Because you do not want to be putting all this effort into something and then have nothing to
show for it at the end of the day. It is not just a stage performance – it is something that should integrate into the community and be part of the community. So I think that programs around legacy happen on to “What is the intent?” and “Where are we at with the timing of it?” Because to implement programs, you can have a vision for the programs, which I think is important, but then they have to kick in once you have things available – pre-games, games, post-games. At each step the program needs to be absolutely defined. I think they will just keep getting better at what the program should be if they learn all the lessons learned from the legacies that have been established through the Olympic movement. (Craig Lehto Interview)

Lehto went on to comment about some of the innovative work being done with Chicago’s bid for the 2016 Games. Organizers there have adopted an approach that treats legacy as a complicated topic with many facets, and they have endeavoured to discover what sorts of legacy will work best for the communities and what legacy means for their city.

One might speculate that attempts to tie low income housing to the Games may prove to be ineffectual both because it did not appear to reflect a consensus of all stakeholders and because they were not integrated into the early planning.

4.1.2 Plan as far in Advance as Possible

One of the themes touched upon by almost every interview was the need to start the legacy process as early as possible. For Bill France and Brent Ritchie, this was important so that legacy organizers could capitalize on the momentum of the games themselves, rather than waiting until after the event to try and generate public interest to support their projects. France repeatedly pointed out the advantages of planning legacies so that they can function as “turn-key” events with the legacy organisation simply taking over from the Games organising committee.

Craig Lehto also emphasised the importance of early planning, but for him the dynamic revolved more around the increasing difficulties of incorporating anything into Olympic planning other than running the games themselves as the deadlines for the games approach. He contended
that it is possible to put a diverse plan for legacies into action early on in the planning, but as the
games approached, more and more of manpower and resources are required to make sure that the
games go off smoothly. This takes the emphasis and priority away from legacy planning. Lehto
went so far as to argue that it should start as early as the bid process itself, saying that “I think
defining what legacy means during your bid process is really important, and really key to what
will be afterwards.” (Craig Lehto interview) Both Lehto and France commented that by planning
early, you allow Legacy organisers to work and co-operate with the event organisers so that each
have a clear understanding of that the other is trying to accomplish. John Aalberg had a unique
look on the advantages of a long-run time line. For Aalberg, advanced preparation allows for a
period of flexibility in which the legacies operators can discover what the best fit is for their
facilities in terms of their future operations.

This venue has three or four different sports, and they all have their opinions on
what is best. You just have to listen to everybody and be very flexible at this
point- through the games, to be open to many directions. We don’t need to make
a decision yet, what the legacy is going to be. It needs to be flexible for a while,
because you need to search your way for what is right or wrong. It is going to
take a couple of years, and that is I think the importance of being ther early. It
gives us that opportunity, to find out way, define our budgets. Everybody asks
about our business plan for legacy. Just wait- they’ll know more in a couple of
years. I think that is the key thing: we built this early, so now we can use it to try
to learn. We have time now to learn how to do what makes sense post games.
(John Aalberg)

It may well be the case that initial failure in the bidding process may benefit a city
hosting a Hallmark event. Cities with multiple failed bids, that continue to apply, frequently have
held extensive stakeholder discussions that identify and develop issues and questions surrounding
the hosting the games before they are awarded an event. This was the case in Toronto, which
dealt with issues pertaining to homelessness in their 1996 bid that subsequently strengthened their
4.1.3 Money Matters

It is imperative to set aside funding that is sufficient to cover the cost of operating the desired legacies in perpetuity. How that money will be obtained clearly will vary from the particular political environment. Hallmark events held in Canada will benefit from a tradition of government support at both the federal and provincial levels. Events held in the U.S. will continue to be expected to find private and commercial funds to run their programs. In other words, legacy planning and revenue predictions are tied to the immediate political ethos.

Canadian planners may benefit. When expected revenues depend on private funding and when the financial assets after the games are lower than anticipated, then the scope of the legacy will be reduced. As a 2001 presentation to the Annual Conference of the Travel and Tourism Research Association noted in regards to the upcoming Salt Lake Games; “policy makers at every level of government will be concerned about any remaining tax liability the Games may require, including liabilities for operation and maintenance of facilities once the Games conclude.” (2002 Winter Olympic Games- Impacts, Images and Legacies, 2001) The report notes that in the case of Salt Lake City, the Organizing Committee has obtained 96% of its $1.3 billion budget with several months remaining, meaning that the SLOC would be able to fulfil its $200 million in Olympic legacy contributions, which included sales tax repayments, endowments and facilities construction debts. The report also noted that it was critically important to continue cost benefit analysis work after the games to “determine the true costs and benefits associated with this event.” (2002 Winter Olympic Games- Impacts, Images and Legacies, 2001) By contrast, legacy planners working with VANOC are working within a model of greater financial predictability.

4.1.4 Location Matters

Considering location is a critically important element of legacy planning. In the case of Calgary, not only did an indoor speed-skate oval help remedy the city’s unpredictable weather
patterns, but once the troublesome Chinooks were dealt with, other climactic elements, Calgary's relatively high altitude and very dry climate, were ideal for a world class facility. Salt Lake has similar attributes with the addition of even higher altitude.

By contrast, an international calibre speed skate oval in Vancouver presented organizers with a range of technical difficulties that would make creating an ice surface as fast as either Salt Lake or Calgary nearly impossible. It was clearly impossible, given Vancouver's low altitude and damp maritime weather, to create an ice surface on par with the facilities at Calgary and Salt Lake City. These factors likely contributed to the lack of commitment by VANOC to maintaining the long track facility.

The location of the Whistler Olympic Park also presented other challenges, as it is outside of the immediacy of the Vancouver metropolitan region. According to John Aalberg, who has now designed two Olympic Nordic venues, there are two sides to the dilemmas that location can provide:

*It depends on how you look at it. Obviously, the best would be if you could build somewhere close to where people live, as you automatically get more out of it. If you compare Cypress as a cross-country area, it's one of the biggest in the country. It's a lousy trail system, it's horrible, but it gets one of the highest uses in Canada because it's so close to the big city. This Nordic venue (Whistler Olympic Park) is in the wilderness and your just don't get the daily support or visitors as you would if it was close to Vancouver, but you also have to deal with the reality of where you could build something like this.* (John Aalberg)

One of the alternatives that Aalberg had to debate was building a trail system at the Lost Lake Trail System at Whistler (essentially on a golf course). However, Aalberg instead took the opportunity to build what he feels has the potential to be one of the best venues in the world.

*If you think twenty, thirty years ahead, in the long term it's better. So right now a lot of Europeans say 'This isn't going to work, it's too far away.' But if you think down twenty years maybe it will have been the right thing to do. You've got to look at the future a bit. The nice thing here is that you've got this legacy trust that would secure operations.* (John Aalberg)
Location was something the Craig Lehto had to consider very carefully in terms of the Whistler sliding facilities – and a decision in which he had played no part. However, he was able to debate some of the advantages and disadvantages of being close to an urban centre by comparing the new facility with his experiences in Calgary, as well as at other tracks around the world. His assessment was balanced:

What you have in Calgary is a wonderful support system of a city with a million people right there, so the attributes of that means you never have a problem with rooms or accommodating people. You have a great base of athletes to draw on, and they are living at home, so there are great advantages to that piece of it. Though, when you look at a lot of the successful tracks in the world, they are not in major centres, they are in little mountain villages, because of this funnel effect that I talked about in sport development. A track is a funnel, so if you have a more intimate community around, sometimes the community can get a lot more intimate with it, as opposed to a large city. You would really rather 15 kids on the top of the hill in order to give them a better experience, and better coaching. Those are some of the things that are advantages to Whistler. Its nice to have big city with a lot of resources to make it work, but its also nice to have an intimate community where the sport development and pure models area little bit easier to obtain when you are not competing against a whole bunch of other programs in a big city. (Craig Lehto)

4.1.5 Capitalize on an Open Policy Window

There are several examples of this being an important factor in previous Games. In the case of the Calgary Games, organizers used the existence of potentially inclement weather to build a premier indoor facility in the Olympic Oval, and in doing so established a new international norm. Since 1988, only the Winter Games in Albertville have held their long track competition outdoors.

Craig Lehto’s emphasis on community involvement incorporated the concern of an open policy window as he stressed that successful legacies will increasingly need to be designed around the local community’s norms and values. For example, most of the infrastructure created for the Salt Lake Games fit into a larger venue planning strategy on the part of the USOC. In
addition, one could envision the homeless situation in Vancouver having the potential to provide a similar open window for a non-sporting legacy.

4.2 Legacy Models

In past Olympic Games, these key factors have varied considerably depending on the time and location of the Games. Analysis of the research conducted for this study and of the case studies examined, indicates three general streams by which legacies can be structured.

4.2.1 The European/Los Angeles Model:

Named after the tendency for European Games to be legacy free, this option does not attempt to incorporate legacy planning into the design or bid of hosting an Olympic Games. In this model, the Games are organised with limited or no efforts to establish legacies after the events, allowing planners to focus exclusively on the games and to keep the tightest financial bottom line possible. While this might make sense if the Games are organised using entirely private funding, as was the case in Los Angeles, it does raise ethical and distributional questions about how surpluses should be divided – especially if the event was funded using public funds. Conversely, if an Olympic Games should encounter serious financial difficulties and run a deficit, cancelling any legacy program might be the only option available. This model is unlikely in any Canadian context because of the involvement of public funding.

4.2.2 The CODA Model:

Named after the successful Calgary Olympic Development Association, this option pertains to legacies oriented around elite (or potentially grass roots) sport development funded from the interests of endowments generated by the Games. These endowments tend to rely heavily on volunteer support within the community and need to constantly engage and attract the
broader community, be it as volunteers, spectators, grassroots athletes, or as recreational users of the facility. CODA has always followed a clear mandate to develop Olympic calibre athletes and to generate improved Canadian Olympic performances. Within these parameters, CODA has been phenomenally successful. The Olympic Oval was home to seventeen of the nineteen speed skaters that attended the 2006 Turino Games. By 2006, fourteen members of the Canadian National Cross Country Ski Team had been born and raised in Canmore. At the 2006 Winter Games, more than 25% of the 196 member Canadian team was from the Calgary area, and three-quarters of the medal winners were either Alberta raised, or trained out of the 1988 legacy facilities (Zimmerman, 2007). CODA clearly has met its 1988 mandate.

4.2.3 The Outside-the-Box Model:

This model is relatively under-explored but would include efforts made to create sustainable legacies for such non-traditional endeavours as long-term low-income housing or, as Brent Ritchie recommended, business research facilities to examine the long term tourism impacts of such events. (Brent Ritchie interview) While this area remains under examined, it is felt that long term financing “in perpetuity” from a surplus legacy would be a good fit with antipoverty programs. The predictable long-term income stream would give policy makers greater flexibility and certainty in managing such programs. This direction seems to be where legacy planning is heading. London has made efforts to incorporate this style of legacy programming into their bid, and there has already been a good deal of innovative community outreach in Chicago’s current Summer Olympic bid for 2016 (Craig Lehto interview). Legacies established within this model will inherently require closer collaboration and consultation with a wide variety of stakeholders in the community than the other two models. While the CODA Model can be established using the Games venues and relying heavily on experts within the relevant sporting fields and by experts with hands on experience, the Outside-the-Box Model
requires a considerable coordination across a variety of sectors to move legacies beyond sporting endeavours in a significant manner.

One potential area that could be incorporated into this umbrella would be transportation infrastructure operated via a similar trust. All three case studies looked at in this paper were accompanied by rail projects whose completion or expansion were sped up in order to be operational by the host city’s Games. This includes Calgary’s successful C-train, which has the highest rider-ship of any light-rail system in North America (www.calgerytransit.com) as well as the light rail system operated by the Utah transit authority. While the Utah project was given priority over other transit projects competing for federal funding, it would have been constructed regardless, it was simply expedited to be done in time for the Olympics (www.rideutah.com). The Canada Line being added to Vancouver’s Skytrain system is a similar case in that its construction was timed to be coordinated with the Olympics; however, it is an independent project. These three projects are not considered to be classified as legacies, however, since they do not make use of Olympic funds, and they would likely have been constructed regardless of the Games.

4.2.4 Weighing the Models

History has demonstrated that there is not one single formula for successful legacies. Leaving positive and lasting benefits after a Hallmark event depends on being sensitive to the particular social environments in which the event occurred. Past Olympics, however, illustrate how certain models have emerged reflecting a regional, national, or temporal approach to the issue of legacies. The five identified elements for legacy planning apply to both the pro-legacy options put forward by this capstone. Given those elements as constants of effective planning, a matrix was created looking at the three options and using four criteria — political acceptability, ease of implementation, financing and the degree of community engagement — to assess the benefits and liabilities afforded by each of the options. The elements within the matrix are
weighed on a five point scale. Since the matrix is dealing with hypothetical legacies, there is a degree of overlap between the various options that reflects the potential spectrum in how the options might be structured. In addition, the criteria have been weighted in a manner to reflect their relative importance based on the results of the interview process.

- **Political Acceptability** is the likelihood of a legacy project being accepted and championed by key staff within the three levels of government involved with hosting Olympic Games (municipal, provincial, and federal). A zero on this scale would be a legacy that was politically unviable, while a five is something that would be universally supported by all three tiers of government.

- **Degree of Community Engagement** is a measure of the potential for the Legacy project to involve a wide cross section of the community and stakeholders in a meaningful way that will reflect the values and ambitions of that community. A zero score would reflect a decision making process that was entirely unilateral on the part of the organizing committee without stakeholder input. A score of five would indicate a process that generated a legacy that was reflective of a wide cross section of stakeholders, had universal support, and was of great value to the host community.

- **Ability and Ease of Financing** is a measure of the ability and likelihood that the Legacy project will be financed in perpetuity. This measure is unique in that it varies greatly on the scope of the Legacy project. A score of 0 would mean a Legacy that was unable to sustain itself, while a 5 would be one that operated entirely self-sufficiently in perpetuity.

- **Ease of Implementation** is a reflection of the logistical complication of implementing the Legacy. A score of zero would be a legacy that was logistically unworkable, while 5 would be an entirely turn-key operation, in
which the legacy seamlessly began operations after the Games with a bare minimum of adaptation of the facilities.
Table 3.1: Legacy Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>European/Los Angeles Model (No Legacies)</th>
<th>CODA Model (Sporting Legacies)</th>
<th>Outside-the-Box-Model (Social Legacies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Acceptability</td>
<td>0-2: -what to do with surplus + no need to justify spending +allows organizing committee to follow tightest budget possible -huge capital expenses for no long term gain (how does community benefit?) -most likely hurts bid application</td>
<td>2-4: -&gt; Poses a question of values, pro-Olympic supporters and advocates of sport/active life will endorse legacy creation, but will likely meet resistance from other groups, especially if those groups perceive a trade off between sport driven legacy and other options (i.e., poverty)</td>
<td>3-5: This is arguably the way of the future and the direction towards which legacies are evolving towards. -&gt; the political acceptability of such legacies depends heavily on how well they fit with a policy window, and need to be congruent with the needs/desires of the community -&gt; the unlimited scope of the option is potentially problematic to acceptability as avenue chosen needs to be defended, and is potentially controversial (ie. issues with NIMBY-ism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Community Engagement</td>
<td>0-1: The chief benefit of this option to communities is that it limits risk of debt. However, research has suggested communities that host hallmark events value perceived benefits over perceived risks in their decisions whether or not to support events (Gursoy and Kendall, 2006)</td>
<td>2-3: While there are obvious limitations to the degree in which a community will be able to integrate with sports oriented facilities, there is also a wide range of demographics that might be affected by sport oriented legacies (youth, outreach, lifestyle fitness, grassroots and elite sport for example).</td>
<td>POTENTIALLY VERY HIGH (2-5): Depending on the avenue selected, there is the opportunity to both impact and engage with a wide cross section of the community. However, some legacies that might fit real community needs might also be very specifically focused, creating a narrower scope of community engagement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the final analysis, it is felt that the legacies of future Winter Olympics and Hallmark Events in general, will increasingly evolve into the Out-Side-the-Box social legacies. This option has the greatest opportunity to meet some of the real needs of the communities that will host future Olympic Games and to serve as catalysts towards real change. However, social legacies are also the riskiest of the three options, as there are no large scale existing social legacies to model future projects on, and it does not fit as easily into the existing framework of an Olympic Games as a sport oriented legacy does.
The more traditional sport oriented legacies remain viable options for future Olympic planners. Though narrower in scope than social legacies, there is still a wide range of possibility for these legacies depending upon their scope and mandate. Any sporting style legacy needs to remain accessible to the community, however, no matter how elite in focus its mandate may be. As has been noted throughout this capstone, elite amateur sport is not finance generating and therefore broader programming is required to make sporting legacies sustainable. It is also likely that there is a critical mass for truly elite focused legacies in one country (Canada in this case), and, as in the case of Richmond’s oval, some subsequent legacies are better off being grass roots focused.

Regardless of what is attempted with either sporting or social legacies, they need to have tightly defined mandates in order to be successful (and for their success or failure to be adequately gauged). Even more importantly, these legacies need to have financing and revenue streams that match the scope of their mandates, so that the more ambitious the mandate, the greater the revenue stream. It is highly recommended that if a legacy has an inadequate stream of finances, that its mandate be trimmed to an appropriate extent.

It is imperative to engage the community in the legacy process, and as Olympic venues and bids continue to involve, this will increasingly become the norm. Along with adequate financing, early planning will likely be the single greatest determinant in legacy success or failure. Proper community engagement and efforts to meet the needs of the community is a lengthy process that needs to be started as early as possible. As mentioned throughout this capstone, the closer the date comes to the actual games, the more likely such engagements are to be brushed aside or merely treated as token gestures. Communities are cognizant as to whether their input has been duly considered, and the more involved they perceive themselves to be with the process, the more likely they are to believe that they are achieving positive benefits from hosting the Winter Olympics and from the resulting legacies.
Lastly, it remains an unfortunate reality that for some future Olympic Winter Games, the only option available for them will be the first default option; to have no lasting legacies. As Brent Ritchie noted in his 1999 report to Salt Lake City, for legacies to be possible, the Games themselves need to be a success. If the event associated with a legacy is perceived as a failure, it is unlikely to generate the financing needed for legacy planning, and the legacy process itself is likely to be politically untenable. In these cases, it is fruitless to continue with legacy planning, no matter how great the opportunities are to integrate them meaningfully into the community.
5: Recommendations and Conclusion

Legacies are becoming an ever increasingly important component of Winter Olympic planning. Yet there remains a need to take the concept of legacy away from the abstract and put it into concrete demonstrable forms. This capstone has looked at three examples of legacy planning from three different North American Olympic Winter Games, and outlined factors that are important criteria in creating lasting legacies.

It is strongly believed that as legacies continue to evolve, they will increasingly become oriented not just as tools of sport development, but also as catalysts of social change that can create lasting benefits to the non-sporting public. More research remains to be done on both the best ways to finance such legacies and on how best to conduct the stakeholder engagements with the communities. Future Olympic organising and bidding committees are already moving in this direction, as can be seen in the work being done by both the London 2012 Organising Committee and the Chicago 2016 Bid Committee to incorporate the citizenship in a more meaningful way. Hopefully, these processes will be better documented than the efforts of past Games and can add to the slim literature around legacy planning.

This capstone has argued the need for such formal literature and has both identified the aforementioned key factors as well as made recommendations about the nature of legacy option future planners might wish to pursue.

5.1 Contributions, Limitations and Further Research

While these recommendations have been general in nature, this is primarily because it is believed that any such option should be tailored to the needs of the unique community that hosts future Games. To be effective, legacy planning must fit the needs identified by their key
stakeholders. This study represents an attempt to create a formalized discourse around legacy creation and to open the concept up to innovative proposals aside from those linked directly to the sporting infrastructure build for a 16-Day sporting event. As communities continue to question the merits of hosting Hallmark events, it is felt that well structured legacies can serve as both tools to legitimize the hosting of Hallmark events and as real opportunities to contribute to the host community in a meaningful way. This structuring, however, will require a far more formalized engagement with the community that has been the case in the past, as the organizing body needs to better identify and address the needs of the community.

While it is too late for Vancouver to attempt this sort of engagement in a comprehensive way, there may be the possibility to establish some smaller legacies after the fact, especially if the 2010 Games should generate a surplus. The CODA legacies greatly benefited from the unexpectedly large surplus’s of the Calgary Games and it is possible that this might be the case in 2010.

One of the limitations identified in this study is the lack of in-depth research into the manner in which the recommended stakeholder engagements should be conducted. Given the lack of formal work in this area in traditional North American legacies, this would have required a considerable expansion of the interviewees to include specialists in this sort of community focused stakeholder engagement from fields outside of the sporting bodies that tend to be involved with Winter Games organizing committees.

Focusing on community engagement is the primary area in which further research should be conducted; more specifically how existing literature on community engagement can be adapted to legacy planning. However, there are numerous additional topics that are of interest to study. An expansion of the data set to include the 1980 Lake Placid Winter Games would be interesting to see how those facilities have been maintained nearly 30 years after their creation. Another valuable area of research is an examination of the impact that the financing shifts that
followed the 1984 Los Angeles Games have had on Olympic venues. For example, the Whiteface ski resort that hosted the 1980 Games continues to be operated by the New York State Government, a marked difference from the private funding of the Park City, Deer Valley and Snowbasin resorts that hosted the Salt Lake City ski events. Additional research into the legacies of Summer Olympics also merits research. Craig Lehto commented in his interview that there are perhaps more innovative options open to cities that host Summer Games as they often have most of the large infrastructure in place to host the summer games (such as stadiums, sports fields or velodromes) prior to bidding on the event. By contrast, host cities of Winter Games will often need to justify the considerable expense of constructing such capital intensive projects as bobsleigh tracks and ski jumps.

5.2 Lessons Learned for Vancouver

The organizers of the Vancouver Olympics have done well to learn from past Games in the planning for their major legacy projects – the Whistler Olympic Park and the Richmond Oval. In this regard they are ahead of the Calgary planners who were not able to commence their work until after the 1988 Games were over. Bill France commented that he believed that Vancouver 2010 is the first time that legacies have been planned so early on by an organizing committee.

Nonetheless there was a great deal of controversy about the process by which the Richmond Oval came to be in Richmond rather than SFU, and perhaps VANOC could have been more transparent in their decision making process. This transparency is necessary to achieve the sort of meaningful engagements that are recommended to achieve lasting legacies. VANOC did little to structure legacies that were outside of the scope of existing legacies, as the Whistler Legacy Society is heavily modelled on the CODA. In moving away from simply maintaining the facility as an elite speed skating centre and creating a more multi-purpose facility, the Richmond Oval can perhaps be construed as a tentative step towards the Outside-the-Box Model.
The most significant policy recommendation this paper can make is that future bids conduct a formal legacy stakeholder meeting at the beginning of the initial procurement process. Interest groups could then make legacy proposals, both athletic and non-athletic. A committee chosen from various members of the community would then select a few that they felt were the most viable. Those selected should be able to demonstrate wide public support in both the long and short term. While there are some logistical problems that come with coordinating such commitments in the turnover from the bid committee to the organizing committee, it is felt that commitments made to legacy in a public and transparent process will both strengthen the public appeal of the bid and increase the chances of the bid’s success. To be implemented effectively, such an endeavor would require coordinated efforts to engage interest groups as widely as possible and to craft legacies that are genuinely unique and meaningful to the host community.

5.3 Recommendations

Successful legacy planning for future Hallmark events, whether they are Olympic Games or other major events, will depend on a number of factors:

- A need for greater theoretical literature on planning and policy options for enduring legacies.

- The need for the organizers and host community explicitly to give equal priority to the creation of lasting legacies that they do to a successful hosting of the event. Attempts to give lip service to the issue of legacies or to fit legacies into the more important planning of the event itself will ensure unsuccessful or underutilized legacy creations.
• **There must be a full and real commitment to involving communities and social stakeholders in the planning process right from the start.** Lasting legacies are only possible if large parts of the host communities agree with the social importance and benefits of this planning.

• **Legacy planning must be a part of the very early bid planning and an integral part of all subsequent planning.**

• **There is no simple blueprint for a successful legacy plan.** Any successful legacy plan will work only if it is sensitive to the values, priorities, and need of the particular social environment.

While this researcher believes in the value of establishing both grassroots and elite sport legacies, it is recognised that this is far from a universal value. Bidding for Olympic Games shows no signs of diminishing in the near future and that even the interests of non-Olympic advocates can be served from engaging with these admittedly expensive ventures. It is believed that communities can benefit from hosting such events if both they and the organising committees are willing to engage in a meaningful discourse to establish lasting legacies. The Olympic Games provides a great opportunity to serve as a catalyst for the establishment of a wide range of possible legacies if both parties are willing to work to establish them, and the legacies of Olympic Games need not be confined to sporting venues.

It is also in the IOC’s interest to look at the legacies planned by those cities that compete to host Olympic Games, so that these Games can best endow cities with lasting benefits. The Olympic charter already entrusts the individual Olympic Committees of nations to encourage the ethics in the development of sport, perhaps it is time to extend this towards social responsibility as well (Olympic Charter, 2007). The creating of legacies is an area in which the IOC should
consider examining more closely if it wants to ensure that future host cities foster the ideals with the IOC endorses.

Increasingly, Hallmark events, at least those held in democratic and open societies, will be increasingly perceived as successful only if they also involve the creation of significant, publicly valuable and long-lasting legacies. Future events in North America will face only greater demands for transparency, accountability, and community input from the tax-paying public.
### 6: Appendices

**Appendix A: Classification of Hallmark Events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Examples and Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Fairs/Expositions</td>
<td>Expo ’67/ Montreal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knoxville ‘82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Orleans ‘84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver ‘86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique carnivals and festivals</td>
<td>Mardi Gras/ New Orleans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quebec Winter Carnival/ Quebec City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oktoberfest/ Munich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stampede/ Calgary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major sporting events</td>
<td>Sumer Olympics/ Los Angeles ‘84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winter Olympics/ Calgary ‘88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Cup Soccer/ Spain ‘82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marathons/Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Prix Racing/ Monza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant cultural and religious events</td>
<td>Oberammergau/ Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Papal Coronation/ Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Wedding/ London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical milestones</td>
<td>Lost Angeles Bicentennial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500th Anniversary of the Discovery of America (1942-1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical commercial and agricultural</td>
<td>Wine Purchasing/ France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Winter Fair/ Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floriade ‘82/ Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major political personage events</td>
<td>Presidential inaugurations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funerals of heads of state/Tito (Yugoslavia), Brezhev (Russia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Papal Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major political leadership conventions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Appendix B: Turning 16 Days into 16 Years: Summary Report

The following is a summary of Brent Ritchie’s report on the possible applications of Calgary’s 1988 Olympic experience to Salt Lake City’s 2002 Olympic preparations. Ritchie was commissioned in 1999 by the Utah Division of Travel Development, and the following is directly quoted from their summery report.

- A successful event and successful marketing of the host city are distinctly different concepts

- There seems to be no such thing as a “typical Games.” There is no “fixed formula.” Each host city/region has its own unique physical, social and political characteristics that combine to create unique advantages and challenges.

- Ensure the Games themselves are a major success. In the end, the major image of the host city related to the message of the competence and perceived desirability of the destination.

- Ensure there is no “financial hangover.” Nothing will turn host city residents against tourism development faster than the prospect of a long-term taxpayer liability.

- Extensive and detailed planning is essential. But flexibility and adaptability must be an integral part of the organisation. In 1988, the Chinook Winds that blew for much of the 16 days of the Games almost turned the “Winter Games” into the “Summer Games.” A high degree of adaptability proved essential to success.

- Getting there is definitely not half the fun. Ease of access and an efficient transportation system are critical. In Calgary, the use of very large, easily
accessible parking lots reduced severe congestion and avoided a common criticism

- Visible local support sends an important message to the media – and the world.

- The focus of the Olympic attention can create new resort communities in very short time frames. The small town of Canmore, the site for cross-country skiing, has grown from a few thousand to nearly ten thousand since 1988. It is now larger than Banff (Canada’s mountain icon), and is rapidly starting to rival Banff in terms of facilities and visitation.

- Be a true international host- be prepared for disappointments and controversies regarding the performance of a national [sic]. Resist the temptation overlook the successes of visiting athletes.

- Be prepared for the post-Games letdown. Although Calgary residents were close to exhaustion when the Olympic flame was doused, there was an almost universal feeling of sadness that, after so much planning and effort, the once-in-a-lifetime experience was over.

- Start getting ready immediately to fill the void that is created in the post-Olympic environment. Since it is unlikely the Games will ever return; it is advisable to start right away to identify other “visions” for community and destination development.

- In the short run tourism may suffer more than it benefits from hosting the Games. However, in the long run, tourism is usually greatly enhanced by the hosting of the event. Many tourism operators were caught unawares from a fall off in business during the 1988 Games. Now, more than 10 years later, both leisure and business visitation have grown at rates above the national average.
• The leverage that can be gained by building “alliances” can greatly enhance the total success of the Games. The many smaller village, town and even cities that are in reasonably close proximity to the event want to both contribute to — and benefit from — a mega-event experience. Sharing, without diluting the essence of destination identity, can create a stronger product.

• The cultural component of the Olympic program turned out to be highly supportive and an important contributor to the overall success of the Games and tourism destination development. The diversity of cultural events enables the organisers to spread the “Olympic experience” into many geographic areas.

• The difficulty in marketing a province/state. It is clear that the hosting of an Olympic Games puts the primary focus on the city. However, in the case of the Calgary Games, the Alberta Government saw the event as an opportunity to market the province as a tourist destination — and accordingly, it invested substantially in the support of the Games. However, attempts to launch a new “Alberta image” gave rather poor results.

• The primary marketing theme should be consistent with a politically supported “vision” for the future of the city/region/state. As powerful as they are, Olympic campaigns to promote the host destination should be built on and enhance existing appeals.

• North American and international awareness of Calgary was dramatically increased as a result of the Olympic Games coverage. In the case of Calgary, unaided to-of-mind awareness increased from about 19% to 43% in the U.S. In Europe, it rose from 10% to 40%. In both cases, this represents a four-fold increase in destination awareness.
• In addition, TV coverage resulted in a substantial change in Calgary’s international image. Calgary’s image shifted from that of primarily being the “stampede city” to that of being the “Olympic City.”

• Make sure your marketing image for the Games is consistent with residents’ view of themselves and the region. Attempts to use a short-term image for the Games risks alienating those on whom long-term success in tourism depends – residents.

• Getting the Games “at any cost” is no longer an option. The repercussions of past practice in obtaining the Games have made the task of hosting the event much more difficult.

• The entire Olympic movement, under the IOC, is in serious danger of losing its credibility. The disillusionment of world citizens as a result of questionable bidding practices and on-going drug problems, and the growing power of professional sport could be a deadly potion.
Appendix C: VANOC Stakeholder and Partner Engagements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Sharing</th>
<th>Consultation</th>
<th>Seeking Advice</th>
<th>Shared Decision Making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasing partner or stakeholder participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping people informed</td>
<td>Responding to input and incorporating it into decision making</td>
<td>Actively seeking advice to resolve issues or plan strategically</td>
<td>Collaborating and sharing decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver2010.com website</td>
<td>Open Houses</td>
<td>Inner-City initiative Advisory Groups</td>
<td>Shared initiatives with Four Host First Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing and meetings</td>
<td>Environmental assessment sessions regarding venue construction</td>
<td>Meetings with interest groups</td>
<td>Joint initiatives with government partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits by VANOC's Chief Executive Officer to Canadian communities</td>
<td>Venue tours for environmental assessment approvals, the media partners and the IOC</td>
<td>Sustainability practitioner dialogues</td>
<td>Collaboration with disability community on barrier-free venues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver 2010 Information Centre in Whistler</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogues with sponsors to explore mutual interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News releases and conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D: CODA Operations

- is working to create the nation's first Canadian Centre of Sport Excellence where athletes can access world-leading advanced human and technical resources and training facilities. A national call to action has been launched;
- provides financial support to national sport organizations, including nearly $2 million in direct sport grant funding, educational opportunities and subsidizes the operation of unique training and recreational facilities and subsidized training opportunities;
- operates the Haig Glacier Complex in Peter Lougheed Provincial Park; a summer high-altitude training area for Canada's Nordic athletes;
- owns and operates Canada Olympic Park, Calgary's premiere sport and recreation facility, and captures the history of Canada's participation at Olympic Winter Games in the Olympic Hall of Fame and Museum
- established the National Sport School, in partnership with the Calgary Board of Education to provide Canada's high-performance athletes an opportunity to pursue excellence both academically and athletically;
- established the National Sport School, in partnership with the Calgary Board of Education to provide Canada's high-performance athletes an opportunity to pursue excellence both academically and athletically;
- provides a subsidy of more than $2 million annually towards operating and programming at the Olympic Oval at the University of Calgary;
- operates the $4.2 million "Ice House" – CODA's National Sliding Centre, the world's only year-round, indoor start training facility for Canada's bobsleigh, skeleton and luge athletes.
- operates the Bill Warren Training Centre at the Canmore Nordic Centre and the Bob Niven Training Centre at Canada Olympic Park;
- provides necessary support to hosting major national and international winter sporting events at various facilities, making the Calgary/Bow Valley Corridor home to high-performance winter sport in Canada;
- is a founding and sustaining partner with the Canadian Olympic Committee, Sport Canada, Coaching Association of Canada, the University of Calgary, the Province of Alberta, and the Canadian Sport Centre – Calgary which provides services and support to Canada's athletes.¹⁶

¹⁶ http://www.canadaolympicpark.ca/media/kits.asp?kit=1
Appendix E: General Interview Questions

1. Can you tell me a little bit about your experiences with legacy planning at previous Games?

2. What is your current role with the Vancouver Olympic Committee?

3. In your experience what do you think are the most important factors in establishing positive lasting legacies, and what in your experience has fostered successes or failures?

4. Do you think there exists a series of prerequisites that need to be met in order to ensure a successful legacy?

5. What lessons do you think were learned from past Olympics that were applied in your current work?

6. What elements do you think are most important to focus on when planning for Olympic legacies?

7. How important is it to involve the community in the process of legacy planning?

8. Do you feel the ability for legacies to be financed in perpetuity the most significant factor in establishing successful legacies?

9. How and in what ways volunteer support at the initial set up and time of the event significant in the outcome of legacies?

10. How and in what ways is community support of the event important in the outcomes of Olympic Legacies?

11. How important is it to tie Olympic legacies into both the spectacle of the Games as well as the existing community and culture?

12. How important is physical geography in the success of Olympic legacies?

13. What can be done to try and ensure community involvement?

14. How important is having an integrated vision between the legacy foundations and the main organizing committee?

15. Do you have any other comments about legacy planning?
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