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February 1, 2018

To whom it may concern:

Utahns are eager to host and support the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games and it is with enthusiastic pleasure that we stand in full support of Utah’s opportunity to welcome the world back.

Our state is proud of the outstanding legacy left by the Salt Lake 2002 Games. Stewardship is the Utah way, and as a result all of our 2002 venues are still in active use and maintained at world-class levels. Since 2002, we have hosted more than 150 international winter sports events and 500 additional elite-level events. Our venues are consistently used by local and international athletes as they compete and train. The 2002 Games opened doors to new economic opportunities and serve as a calling card for those looking for talented, prosperous communities. Reaching far beyond the 17 days of the 2002 Games, the positive economic, sport and social impacts have rippled throughout the State for years.

Since the 2002 Games, citizens of Salt Lake City and throughout Utah have embraced Olympian and Paralympic. Their enthusiasm for the Games is as strong as ever, so much so that we formed an Olympic and Paralympic Exploratory Committee comprised of our political, business, and civic leaders to explore the new hosting opportunity.

We recognize that hosting the Games once again in Salt Lake City will bring Utah and her citizens many rewards. Additionally, by staging first-rate, sustainable Games, we see the opportunity for our communities to give back to the Olympic and Paralympic Movement and the world.

Utah is “ready, willing, and able” to host the Games. We hope to welcome the world back to our beautiful capital city and our magnificent state for a future Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games.

Sincerely,

Gary R. Herbert
Governor
State of Utah

Jackie Biskupski
Mayor
Salt Lake City

Wayne Niederhauser
President
Utah State Senate

Greg Hughes
Speaker
Utah House of Representatives

UTAH: THE STATE OF SPORT
Introduction from the OEC Co-chairs

FEBRUARY 1, 2018

With tremendous community interest in the Olympic Games that has thrived since 2002, Utah’s leaders formed the Olympic and Paralympic Exploratory Committee (OEC) to determine if Utah should pursue a bid to host a future Games.

This report reflects the findings of the OEC over an intense five-month evaluation of the opportunity to host the Games in 2030. The findings in this report will be discussed with our community, political and business leaders, athletes, the USOC, IOC and IPC to determine if we will formally pursue a bid to host again.

We would like to thank so many individuals who have collaborated to produce this report. The OEC is comprised of volunteers who have donated hundreds of hours of effort, including Olympic and Paralympic athletes and members of: Utah State government, Salt Lake City and other host city governments, the Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation, the Utah Sports Commission, the business community, the venue owners, and Team 2002. The insights and expertise from this team of contributors provide a high level of confidence in the quality of the data and conclusions in the report.

The USOC—our partner should we be selected as the Candidate City from the US—has been a long-time friend and collaborator, with Utah home to key Olympic training facilities and host of world cups and numerous Olympic trials. We are grateful for their support in answering many questions and encouraging US cities to consider hosting.

We would also like to thank the IOC for establishing a clear two-stage process of informal dialogue, followed by a candidature process, to host the Games. The IOC’s support, transparency, and desire to help have motivated our effort. It is an exciting time in the history of the Olympic and Paralympic Movement. The new candidature process is partnership-oriented, and we are beneficiaries of this approach.

With the award of the 2028 Games to Los Angeles, we understand that hosting in 2026 or 2030 presents some unique challenges and opportunities. The focus of the OEC has been on 2030, recognizing that while the current process is to select a 2026 host city, there is a possibility of a dual award for 2026 and 2030 at the next host city election. The opportunity to support LA 2028 in its efforts and to collaborate in seeing that both Games are highly successful are key objectives in our seeking to host.

We look forward to continuing this very important dialogue with our community and the Olympic and Paralympic Family.

Sincerely,

FRASER BULLOCK
OEC Co-chair

WAYNE NIEDERHAUSER
OEC Co-chair

JEFF ROBBINS
OEC Co-chair
1. Introduction
1.1 Background

On October 13, 2017, the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) announced that it was interested in hosting the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games again.

Following a USOC Board meeting, Chairman Larry Probst said, “I put a stake in the ground and said we are interested in hosting the Winter Games. Ideally, that’s probably 2030 so there’s no confusion with the preparations for 2028. But if the IOC (International Olympic Committee) considers the possibility of dual awards of 2026 and 2030 as they did with ‘24 and ‘28, we certainly want to be in that conversation.”

An initial Dialogue Stage for potential 2026 candidate cities opened in October 2017 as part of a newly-designed, two-stage candidature process that brings greater flexibility for interested cities and enhanced bidding support from the IOC. This first stage invites cities that want to bid for 2026, but also potentially for 2030 in the event of a 2026/2030 dual award, to participate in a collaborative process prior to committing to a formal candidature in October 2018. The second stage, the Candidature Stage, runs from October 2018 to September 2019, when the host city is officially elected.

Three US cities have expressed interest in hosting a future Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games: Salt Lake City, Denver, and Reno/Tahoe.

The IOC has stated that the USOC should put forward one interested city by March 31, 2018.

If this timeline holds, the USOC will need to select an interested city imminently, which is challenging since the USOC’s focus is on preparing to compete this month in the PyeongChang 2018 Games. While the USOC has an ongoing dialogue with the three cities, it will soon need to define its process to select a candidate city.

1.2 Purpose of this report

On October 16, 2017, the Olympic and Paralympic Exploratory Committee (OEC) was formed and tasked to determine whether Utah should move forward with Salt Lake City as a potential candidate for the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games, focused on 2030, but recognizing the need to enter the 2026 process in the event of a dual award.

The primary audience of this report is Utah officials, Utah residents, the USOC, IOC and IPC.

This document comprises the OEC’s evaluation and was subject to robust underpinning studies based on available information.

1.3 OEC participants

The OEC sought participation from Olympic and Paralympic athletes, government and business leaders, staff members from Team 2002, the Utah Sports Commission, the Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation, and new volunteer contributors who bring us a fresh perspective.

The list of participants is in Appendix 8.2.
On October 16, 2017, the Olympic Exploratory Committee (OEC) was formed and tasked to determine whether Utah should move forward with Salt Lake City as a potential bidder for the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games, focused on 2030, but recognizing the need to enter the 2026 process in the event of a dual award.

There are several significant developments in the Olympic Movement that impact hosting Games. First, the IOC developed a roadmap for the future, called Olympic Agenda 2020, which covers a broad array of initiatives, including making Games hosting more economical and sustainable. In this case, Olympic Agenda 2020 highlights the importance of using existing venues and seeking other ways to reduce costs.

Second, the USOC and Los Angeles will be hosting the Olympic Games in 2028, impacting the hosting of Games in 2026 and 2030. Domestic sponsorships are the largest revenue source for hosting Games and this revenue would likely be negatively impacted with back-to-back US Games. A US candidate city would need to have a low-cost structure to be financially feasible. Fortunately, with its existing venues and experienced team, Utah could have a very attractive cost structure while still delivering great Games.

The Olympic Winter Games format has expanded significantly from 2002 with new sport disciplines and more athletes and officials. However, all Utah venues currently operate at world-class levels and can absorb these new Games requirements. Also, since 2002, transportation infrastructure has improved, significant new accommodations have been added, and a new world-class international airport is under construction. As a result, Utah is in a better position to host in 2030 than at any time in its history.

The economics for hosting an Olympic Winter Games is one of the most important considerations in deciding to move forward. A detailed expense budget was carefully developed totaling $1.353 billion (2018 values), including a $63 million endowment as a Games legacy. We believe that revenues can be raised that meet or exceed this expense budget. A budget this modest can only be achieved with existing Olympic venues and Games-ready infrastructure, a foundation that no other aspiring city has in place. Otherwise, the costs of hosting could be billions more, as evidenced by the actual costs of hosting recent Olympic Winter Games and the projected budgets of cities advancing through the 2026 Candidature Process.
2.1 Why should Utah host the Games in 2030?

We seek for all to experience fresh inspiration from the Games in 2030. New sport disciplines, new athletes, new and incredible sport legacies, a new generation of OCOG leadership guided by experienced hands from 2002, new technologies to share special moments with the world, new Games identity, new ceremonies, new infrastructure, and a new airport—it will be our focus to reinvent ourselves in a refreshing and exciting manner.

Utah has many extensive, compelling attributes to help achieve this fresh vision.

**UTAH EMBRACES, EXEMPLIFIES, AND STRENGTHENS THE OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC MOVEMENT**

The people of Utah rallied behind the Games in 2002 and continue to support the Olympic Movement. Once again, Utah aspires to host Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games that contribute to the IOC’s vision of a “peaceful and better world” united through sport.

**UTAH EXEMPLIFIES OLYMPIC AGENDA 2020**

Utah aligns with the Olympic Agenda 2020, which the IOC has adopted to safeguard the future of the Olympic Games and the role of sports in society. Olympic Agenda 2020 calls for evaluating bid cities with a strong focus on sustainability and legacy, directing special attention to:

- The athletes’ experience and fields of play being state-of-the-art
- The maximum use of existing facilities

By these measures, Salt Lake City would be an unparalleled host for the 2030 Games:

- Since 2002, Utah has hosted more than 150 international winter sports competitions ranging from junior world cup events to world championships
- All venues from 2002 are in place and highly utilized by recreational athletes and elite competitors

In addition, Olympic Agenda 2020 states, “The IOC [is] to establish a transparent management procedure for any change of requirements, regardless of its initiator, in order to reduce costs.” Due to its existing Olympic venues and experienced organizing team, Utah can put on spectacular Games more cost-efficiently than any other bidder, while still creating an exceptional experience for all stakeholders.

**UTAH CAN DELIVER AN OUTSTANDING LEGACY**

Finally, Olympic Agenda 2020 is greatly concerned with legacy: “The IOC [is] to ensure post-Games monitoring of the Games legacy.” Salt Lake City has demonstrated one of the most positive Olympic legacies anywhere in the world.

2.2 Utah has made significant ongoing contributions to the Olympic Movement

“SUPERB” GAMES IN 2002

IOC Honorary President Jacques Rogge used the term “superb” to refer to the Olympic Games hosted in 2002. By every measure, Utah delivered a great success and helped build momentum in the Olympic Movement.

**ACTIVE LEGACY VENUES**

Since 2002, Utah has shown the world a model for sustainability. Athletes of all ages and all ability levels, from youth participating in introductory programs to elite national team members, have fully utilized our Olympic venues.

**UTAH CONTINUES TO WELCOME THE WORLD**

Our facilities are open to athletes from all countries. On average, over 30 countries and more than 1,100 international athletes train or compete in Utah each year. More than 30% of US athletes competing in the PyeongChang 2018 Olympic Winter Games have close ties to Utah.

**TEAM 2002 LEADERS SERVE THE OLYMPIC MOVEMENT**

Members of Team 2002 have advised the IOC, IPC, USOC, and numerous OCOGs and bid committees...and continue to do so today.
2.3 Utah has widespread support for hosting again and the people of Utah embrace the Olympic Movement

**PUBLIC SUPPORT**

The Olympic and Paralympic Exploratory Committee (OEC) commissioned a public opinion poll from Dan Jones & Associates in November 2017 to gauge local interest. 89% of Utahns support bidding for another Olympic Games.

**POLITICAL SUPPORT**

In February 2018, the Utah State Legislature unanimously passed a resolution, with the endorsement of Governor Gary Herbert, supporting Salt Lake City’s hosting of the 2026 or 2030 Olympic and Paralympic Games should the opportunity present itself again (refer to Appendix 8.10).

**COMMUNITY SUPPORT**

There is also great support from our volunteer base, the business community, and the sport community. Utah’s generous volunteer base actively supports sports events and includes an unusually high concentration of citizens who have lived abroad and fluently speak the languages of participating countries. The sports movement widely recognizes our world-class venues, our excellent technical volunteers, and our strong track record of hosting events. Winter IFs and NGBs have strongly encouraged us to host again.

**UTAH SPORTS COMMISSION**

Utah has embraced sport in a significant way throughout the State. The Utah Sports Commission has an active board comprised of athletes and business, political and sport leaders who come together to promote sport and its economic impact on Utah. Since 2002, the Utah Sports Commission has partnered in hosting more than 700 sports events and has built a sport and economic legacy recognized worldwide.

2.4 Utah will realize positive economic benefits

The OEC conservatively estimates that hosting the Games in 2026 or 2030 will create at least as large an economic impact as the 2002 Games, which was over $6 billion. The economic impacts of the 2002 Games include: the regional economic impact (direct, indirect, and induced effects of new money spent in the state); new infrastructure that remains in place after the Games and serves residents and visitors; the surplus leftover from the Games that benefits the local economy; travel and tourism impacts; and intangible impacts, most noticeably, the positioning of Utah as a winter sports capital, business development opportunities, and increased visibility and awareness about Utah.

Hosting the Games in 2030 is likely to generate a surplus. Given all the existing venues, an experienced team, and emphasis on efficiency, the OEC is confident that a surplus could be generated from a future Games which would further strengthen the sport legacy in Utah and across the US.

2.5 Feasible, attractive opportunity for hosting Games in 2030

Utah has the foundation to meet Olympic Agenda 2020’s focus on sustainability and legacy, athlete experience, and building a new, more efficient hosting model. Veterans of Team 2002 are excited to reunite behind this new Olympic platform. This team is widely recognized in the Olympic Movement as highly capable, experienced, and trusted. It would be unprecedented to have such a seasoned team partner with the IOC, IPC and other stakeholders.

Salt Lake City is a shining example of Games legacy. Few host cities embrace and uphold Olympism to the extent that Salt Lake City has since 2002. Even fewer cities have a community and government so united behind an Olympic bid. And perhaps no city can elevate the athletes’ experience, utilize existing facilities, and provide state-of-the-art fields of play as cost-efficiently as Salt Lake City can.

Utahns remember 2002 with pride and are ready to host the Olympic Winter Games again. The OEC is confident that Utah can successfully host Games in 2030 that fulfill the Olympic Agenda 2020, set a sustainable model for future organizers, and advance Olympism. In every way, Utah embraces, exemplifies, and strengthens the Olympic and Paralympic Movement.
2.6 OEC recommendation

THE OEC HAS DETERMINED:

1. Utah should pursue hosting the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games in 2030 given the significant value and opportunity in hosting the Games.
   • Utah has a distinct advantage in hosting again due to its full set of existing venues operating at world-class levels, an experienced team, a unique, compact geography, and a history of hosting hundreds of sports events, including world cups and world championships.
   • Utah currently has in place key transportation and accommodation infrastructure that exceeds Games hosting requirements, assuring smooth Games operations and an extraordinary experience for all stakeholders.
   • Utahns enthusiastically support the prospect of hosting the Games again.
   • Utah meets, in every way, the ambitious objectives of the IOC in its recently implemented Olympic Agenda 2020.
   • The economic impact is likely to exceed $6 billion and produce other very significant intangible benefits.

2. A noteworthy challenge in hosting the 2030 Games is that it would be back-to-back with LA 2028, but this challenge, along with certain opportunities that back-to-back Games would bring, can be addressed as outlined in this report.

3. Should the USOC decide to engage in the 2026 Candidature Process and select Salt Lake as an Interested City prior to March 31, 2018, we encourage Utah’s leadership to consider next steps, including supporting the formation of a Candidature Committee to pursue this opportunity.

With the endorsement of the OEC Board to move forward with the recommendations above, a series of next steps developed as part of the exploratory process and summarized in this report will be initiated.

3. Bid process and environment
3.1 Current bid environment

General public attitudes toward bidding for and hosting the Games have become more negative over the past several years after sensational stories of cost overruns and wasteful spending that do not deliver a strong legacy to citizens of previous host cities. Several bids in recent candidature processes have failed due to poor public support or a lack of government backing.

The Olympic Agenda 2020, adopted by the IOC in December 2014, confronts this challenge with a series of initiatives that should help cities ensure that hosting the Games fits within their long-term development plans. It also seeks to reduce the cost and complexity of the Games while protecting the unique nature of this worldwide event.

The efforts triggered by Olympic Agenda 2020 are beginning to produce results, including a refined candidature process (see below) and a working group dedicated to enhancing the value proposition of the Olympic Winter Games and making them more sustainable operationally, financially and environmentally.

Significant emphasis is now placed on the use of existing or temporary venues and shaping the proposed Games concept for a city to align with its current situation and future development plans. These actions should begin to encourage potential candidates to step forward to pursue hosting the Games. However, it may take time to reverse negative perceptions regarding the benefits of bidding or hosting.

Salt Lake City could leverage the current bid environment by actively pursuing the Games in the era of Olympic Agenda 2020, given its strong alignment with Agenda 2020’s initiatives and the IOC’s simplified requirements.

Furthermore, with the benefits of hosting well understood by Utahns, the level of public and government support for the Games remains extraordinarily high...a critical advantage in any bid cycle, but even more so in the current period.
3.2 A new candidature process

The IOC has made significant changes to the 2026 Candidature Process that are intended to reduce cost, simplify procedures, and provide greater flexibility to potential host cities in developing their proposals for the Games.

Compared to previous candidature processes, the 2026 process reduces certain technical requirements, shortens the overall timeline, and provides a lengthy period of collaboration between the IOC and other stakeholders prior to committing to a full candidature.

The 2026 process is conducted over two stages:

- **Dialogue Stage** an opportunity for interested cities and the IOC to assess the benefits and requirements of hosting the 2026 Games and to ensure the Games align with long-term development plans of the Host City. This stage must be entered by the end of March 2018 and continues through October 2018.

- **Candidature Stage** the formal stage of the process, beginning in October 2018, that includes submission of a candidature file and further engagement with the Olympic Movement, culminating in the Host City Election in September 2019.

This new Dialogue Stage of the IOC’s Candidature Process becomes an attractive opportunity for Salt Lake City to benefit from interactions with the USOC, IOC, and other stakeholders. The IOC provides significant support during this phase, including technical experts, research and other interactions. The IOC has also removed the need for the submission of technical plans and guarantees during this phase.

With the two stages come designations that will be referred to elsewhere in this report. The first is “Interested City,” for cities that have entered the Dialogue Stage, and the second is “Candidate City,” for cities that have been invited by the IOC to present a candidature for the 2026 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games.

The 2026 Candidature Process is summarized in the diagram on following page.

Further detail on the process can be found in the Candidature Process Olympic Winter Games 2026 document available on the IOC’s website.

A discussion of potential next steps for Salt Lake City and Utah in the 2026 Candidature Process is found in Section 7.2 of this report.

---

Source: International Olympic Committee
3.3 Potential dual award for 2026 and 2030

Paris 2024 and LA 2028 were elected as host cities in an unprecedented dual award at the IOC Session in September 2017.

IOC President Thomas Bach stated, “This historic double allocation is a ‘win-win-win’ situation for the city of Paris, the city of Los Angeles and the IOC.” This outcome provided long-term stability for the Games after a difficult candidature process in which several cities dropped out of the race for 2024. The dual award may bring a number of benefits, including collaboration between Paris and LA on procurement and operations and enhanced marketing opportunities.

As of this report, the IOC has not confirmed that a 2026 / 2030 dual award will occur during 2026 Candidature Process. However, media reporting of IOC members indicate that it is a possibility. The USOC has stated that it wants to be part of any process that results in awarding the 2030 Games.

For Salt Lake City to host the 2030 Games, it may be critical to be part of the evolving discussions, particularly in the Dialogue Stage of the 2026 Candidature Process should there be a dual award.

3.4 LA 2028

The USOC has a strong interest in hosting another Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games, with a stated preference for the 2030 edition, so as to simplify the conditions for LA 2028.

The back-to-back hosting of Games in the United States creates both challenges and opportunities which are detailed elsewhere in this report. The OEC believes, however, that the US already hosting the 2028 Games does not present a substantial barrier to securing the right to host a future Olympic Winter Games from the perspective of geographic rotation or negative perception from key stakeholders in the Olympic Movement.

3.5 Potential competitors

The current bid environment, outlined above, has limited the number of cities actively pursuing a bid for the 2026 Games. Many potential cities may have higher barriers to success than Salt Lake City, given that they would require significant capital investments or lack public support.

Within the USA, both Denver and Reno/Tahoe have expressed interest in pursuing a bid for the Olympic Winter Games. Denver established a committee in December 2017 to explore whether it should bid on a future Games. Reno/Tahoe has long had a local non-profit organization that seeks to promote the region’s Olympic aspirations.

As of this report, the USOC has not finalized any domestic selection process in which Salt Lake City must participate.

Internationally, several cities are currently at different stages of engagement in the 2026 process:

- Calgary, Canada: Calgary has completed a feasibility study and will decide in March 2018 whether to move forward into the Dialogue Stage
- Sion, Switzerland: Sion is an Interested City and is participating in the Dialogue Stage; the bid is subject to a referendum in 2018
- Sapporo, Japan: local officials and the Japanese Olympic Committee are in discussions with the IOC and are considering a candidacy
- Stockholm, Sweden: although lacking government support for a bid, the Swedish NOC and local officials are in discussions with the IOC

In future candidature processes other cities such as Almaty (Kazakhstan), Lillehammer (Norway), or Erzurum (Turkey) may step forward, but there has been little observable activity from these cities and their participation in the 2026 process appears unlikely.
4. Vision for Salt Lake 2030
4.1 Creating a vision for Salt Lake 2030: an amazing Winter Games experience

To host successful Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games, it is critical that a Games vision be developed during the candidature that will guide what Utahns want to achieve by hosting, how the Games will inspire and excite, and what the experience will be like during the Games. This vision will also need to ensure that the Games are aligned with Utah’s future.

As we begin to develop our vision for 2030, we are excited about exploring and incorporating the following concepts:

- **“One-Games Experience”**

  Our unique compact geography gives spectators, media, and the Olympic and Paralympic Family the opportunity to experience multiple heart-stopping competitions and memorable cultural festivities throughout the Olympic theater, all on the same day. The One-Games Experience also allows athletes and officials to compete, train or work in our world-class venues and move quickly back to the Village for recovery and relaxation.
5. Why Utah?

- **Re-imagined Games**
  We aspire to present the Games in a refreshing and compelling manner. We can deliver an exciting, new Winter Games experience that reflects Utah’s aspirations for the future and its passion for the Games.
  - Thrilling new sport disciplines such as Big Air, Slopestyle, Ski and Snowboard Cross, and Wheelchair Curling
  - High-quality services and hospitality throughout a sustainable Games journey
  - New sport legacies to be created
  - New inspirational Games identity and cultural celebrations
  - Reaching more than one million new residents in the Salt Lake region

- **New, modern infrastructure with:**
  - A stunning new international airport
  - New, extensive, zero-emissions transportation systems
  - A new and energetic downtown Salt Lake City that welcomes the world to gather, make new friends, trade pins, and share in celebration

- **New technologies to share the Games with the world**

- **Vital people-related legacies, including:**
  - A new generation of leaders guided by the experience of Team 2002 to bring fresh perspectives, original ideas and youthful inspiration
  - Promotion of health and physical activity, with collaboration among Utah’s schools, health agencies, sport and recreation stakeholders, and the business community

- **An effective and durable model for organizing Winter Games that can be shared with the Olympic and Paralympic Movement**

We see the opportunity to create a truly amazing Games experience for those attending in person and the billions of others engaging from all across the world.

These themes will be further developed into a Games vision in the candidature phase through collaboration with all key stakeholders.
In 2002, Salt Lake City hosted one of the most successful Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games in history. We are ready—and enthusiastic—to do so again. Our city is uniquely prepared to achieve the vision of sustainability and legacy set forth in the IOC’s Olympic Agenda 2020. With a united community, existing venues, and an experienced organizing team, Utah can put on spectacular Games in 2030.

Utah is in a unique economic position to host future Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games, which is one of the most important aspects of deciding to move forward with a bid. A carefully developed budget of $1.353 billion (2018 values), including $63 million for a legacy endowment, represents the lowest cost option for hosting Games compared to other aspiring cities. Prudent Games budgets such as this are only possible with existing venues, Games-ready infrastructure, and a long-term commitment to the Olympic Movement—a foundation for success that Utah uniquely enjoys. Other aspiring cities may require billions more in investments or operational expenditures, with significant burden placed on taxpayers to meet these requirements.

5.1 Utah embraces, exemplifies, and strengthens the Olympic and Paralympic Movement

The people of Utah rallied behind the Games in 2002 and have continued to avidly support the Olympic Movement. We aspire to once again host Games that will contribute to the IOC’s vision of a “peaceful and better world through sport.”
“Without the incredible venues created to host the 2002 Olympic Winter Games in Utah, I never would have realized my potential and achieved my Olympic Dream. I am a World Champion, World Cup Champion and Olympic medalist thanks to the venues of the 2002 Olympic Games, the organizations that maintain the facilities at a world-class level and the ease of accessibility to travel to these locations. I was raised to put my education before sports, and thanks to the location of the Olympic sliding track, I never had to choose between a college degree and an Olympic dream. I was able to graduate with a bachelor’s degree (with honors) in the recommended four years while training and competing on the world cup team for the US. It opened a vast window of opportunity for me and many others to have “home track advantage” as we could train so close to home and then compete against the best in the world on a track that we knew so well. Now, as my moments of training and competition are behind me, I look forward with great hope and anticipation to the next generation that will benefit from these venues and lead them to achieve their Olympic dreams.” — Noelle Pace

5.2 Utah exemplifies Olympic Agenda 2020

Utah is aligned with the Olympic Agenda 2020, which the IOC has adopted to safeguard the future of the Olympic Games and the role of sport in society. Agenda 2020 calls for evaluating bid cities with a strong focus on sustainability and legacy, directing special attention to:

- The Athletes’ Experience (Recommendation 2.1)
- The maximum use of existing facilities (Recommendation 2.2)
- The field of play for the athletes always being state-of-the-art (Recommendation 2.3)

By these measures, Salt Lake City would be an unparalleled host city for the 2030 Winter Games.

EXCEPTIONAL ATHLETE EXPERIENCE

Utah consistently provides outstanding experiences for elite competitors from around the world. World cups and world championships continue to succeed in Utah because they know we place athletes’ needs first: optimal conditions for competition coupled with our dedication to service with a smile. Athletes can travel to Salt Lake City and the fields of play with minimal stress, and spectators can fill the stands with ease because all Games venues are sited near interstate highways within 50 miles of downtown Salt Lake City and the international airport.

MAXIMUM USE OF EXISTING FACILITIES

Utah’s active role in winter sports means we can maximize use of existing facilities. All venues from 2002 remain in place and are highly utilized by recreational athletes and elite competitors. Current plans to maintain and improve existing facilities to meet current day standards are in process. No Games-dependent capital infrastructure investment would be required to host the Games in spite of the growth in the competition program. Our existing venues can accommodate the new disciplines and corresponding events.

STATE-OF-THE-ART FIELDS OF PLAY

Our potential Games venues have been maintained at world-class levels, with over $450 million spent on facility upgrades and improvements across the 10 competition venues in the years since the Games. Since 2002, Utah has hosted more than 150 international winter sports competitions ranging from junior world cup events to world championships. In February/March of 2019, Utah will host four world cup and world championship events, reflecting our ongoing commitment to international sport at the highest elite levels.
5.3 Utah has made significant ongoing contributions to the Olympic Movement

“SUPERB” GAMES IN 2002

The 2002 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games, regarded as “superb” by the IOC Honorary President, were by every measure a success and helped build momentum in the Olympic Movement. Athletes widely reported that they enjoyed the experience. Following the tragedy of 9/11, the 2002 Games unified the world through sport. New disciplines were enthusiastically embraced, and new, inspiring champions emerged, embodying our theme of “Light the Fire Within.” Well-operated and profitable, the 2002 Games were also a model of efficiency.

ACTIVE LEGACY VENUES

Since 2002, Utah has shown the world a model of sustainability. People of all ages and all ability levels, from youth participating in sport initiation programs to elite athletes, have fully utilized our Olympic venues. Additionally, the three Foundation-owned legacy facilities for speed skating, ski jumping and sliding, and cross country and biathlon serve as community recreation centers and tourism destinations. Indeed, Utah has pursued creative ways to dramatically increase public activity and revenues at legacy venues, reducing the traditionally high subsidies required to operate such facilities at world-class levels. Altogether, the three legacy venues see over 1.4 million users each year.

MORE EFFICIENT MODEL FOR HOSTING

Agenda 2020 states, “The IOC [is] to establish a transparent management procedure for any change of requirements, regardless of its initiator, in order to reduce costs.” Due to its existing Olympic venues and experienced organizing team, Utah can put on extraordinary Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games more cost-efficiently than any other bidder, while still creating tailor-made experiences for all stakeholders.

Hosting the 2030 Games in the US presents a unique economic challenge given that Los Angeles will host in 2028. Back-to-back Games could reduce the amount of domestic sponsorship dollars available for hosting in 2030. However, this challenge is surmountable because Utah embodies Olympic Agenda 2020 and embraces the Games Management 2020 initiatives to increase efficiency.

PASSION FOR SPORT, OUTDOOR RECREATION AND CULTURE

Our unique geography and active communities inspire both locals and visitors to be healthy and physically active. The legacy of 2002 includes a holistic approach to utilize our venues for all ages and all ability levels. We have embraced and help further shape “sport for all,” lending real-world examples of how Games hosts can inspire health and fitness for the long term.

ACTIVE CULTURAL LEGACY THAT REINFORCES OLYMPISM

The 2002 Cultural Olympiad ignited a passion to share Utah’s rich and diverse arts and culture scene with the world—one of the pillars of Olympism. Since then, artists and cultural programs have thrived, expanding into new, exemplary venues and promoting local talents.

PHENOMENAL LEGACY

Agenda 2020 is greatly concerned with legacy: “The IOC [is] to ensure post-Games monitoring of the Games legacy.” Salt Lake City has demonstrated one of the most positive Olympic legacies anywhere in the world.

FUTURE LEGACY

Utah is eager to work with the IOC to develop a key phase of Olympic Agenda 2020—a Games Management strategy that delivers high-quality Games, yet significantly reduces the costs of hosting. With its experienced team and existing venues, Utah would be an ideal partner for the IOC to optimize this new Games delivery model.
UTAH CONTINUES TO WELCOME THE WORLD

Leading up to and through the 2002 Games, Utah organizers were guided by an “athlete first” and a “fair play” mentality. We have never stopped embracing those priorities. Our facilities are open to the world’s athletes, especially those from developing countries, the USOC, winter sport NGBs, and our facility operators. On average, over 30 countries and more than 1,100 international athletes train or compete in Utah each year. More than 30% of US athletes competing in the PyeongChang 2018 Olympic Winter Games share ties to Utah (see Appendix 8.9 for the list of athletes that are native to or have trained in Utah). Many athletes also come to Utah to study in programs that support both their academic and athletic goals. For example, 10% of the US Olympic team competing at Sochi 2014 were attending Westminster College in Salt Lake City.

TEAM 2002 LEADERS SERVE THE OLYMPIC MOVEMENT

Members from Team 2002 have advised the IOC, the IPC, the USOC, and numerous OCOGs, bid committees and other sport organizations. Examples of their work include:

• Establishing a long-term revenue-sharing agreement between the IOC and USOC in 2012
• Providing a structure to the IOC for overseeing Games operations in 2002
• Restructuring the governance of the USOC in 2002
• Advising every OCOG since 2002 and numerous bid committees
• Serving on the IOC’s Evaluation Commission
• Serving the IOC on its Games Management 2020 working group

5.4 Utah has widespread support for hosting again

PUBLIC SUPPORT

89% of Utahns support bidding for another Olympics. This broad enthusiasm motivated us to proceed with the bidding process.

POLITICAL SUPPORT

In February 2018, the Utah State Legislature unanimously passed a resolution, with the endorsement of Governor Gary Herbert, supporting Salt Lake City’s hosting of the 2026 or 2030 Olympic and Paralympic Games should the opportunity present itself again (refer to Appendix 8.10).

VOLUNTEER SUPPORT

Utah’s deep volunteer base regularly supports sports events and features an unusually high concentration of citizens who have lived abroad and fluently speak the languages of each participating country.

BUSINESS COMMUNITY SUPPORT

The Utah business community, a large part of the OEC, is enthusiastic about hosting. This community of exceptional leaders and companies is significantly more robust than in 2002, providing an excellent base of support.

SPORT COMMUNITY SUPPORT

The sport community widely recognizes our world-class venues, our excellent volunteers and officials, and our strong track record of hosting events. Winter International Federations and NGBs have strongly encouraged us to pursue hosting the Games in Utah again.

UTAH SPORTS COMMISSION

Utah has embraced sport in a significant way throughout the State. The Utah Sports Commission has an excellent Board of athletes and business, political and sport leaders who collaborate to promote sport and its economic impact on Utah. Since 2002, the Utah Sports Commission has hosted over 700 events and has built a widely-recognized legacy in the world of sport.

UTAH OLYMPIC LEGACY FOUNDATION

The Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation manages three world-class facilities (Utah Olympic Oval, Utah Olympic Park, and Soldier Hollow Nordic Center) and provides opportunities for people of all ages and abilities to participate and excel in winter sports. Inspired by the success and momentum of the Salt Lake 2002 Olympic Winter Games, the Foundation has turned its focus toward embracing, engaging, and involving Utah’s youth in winter sport.
5.5 Utah will realize positive economic benefits

**ECONOMIC IMPACT**

The OEC conservatively estimates the 2030 Games will create at least as large an economic impact as the 2002 Olympic Winter Games, which was over $6 billion, as well as $3 billion in personal income, and 45,700 job years of employment. The economic impacts of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games include: the regional economic impact (direct, indirect, and induced effects of new money spent in the state); new infrastructure that remains in place after the Games and serves residents and visitors; the surplus from the Games that benefits the local economy; travel and tourism impacts; and intangible impacts, most notably highlighting Utah as a winter sports capital, expanding business development opportunities, and increasing visibility for and awareness about Utah.

**HOSTING THE GAMES IN 2030 IS LIKELY TO GENERATE A SURPLUS**

Most OCOGs lose a significant amount of money, but given our existing venues, experienced team, and great attention to efficiency, we believe we can generate a surplus to benefit sport in Utah and the US. Such a surplus would be another great long-term legacy.

---

5.6 Summary

Utah offers the ideal foundation and conditions to meet Olympic Agenda 2020’s focus on sustainability and legacy, athlete experience, and building a new, more efficient hosting model. Veterans of the 2002 organizing team are excited to reunite behind this new Olympic platform. This team is recognized in the Olympic world as highly capable, experienced, and trusted. It would be unprecedented to have such a seasoned team partner with the IOC.

Salt Lake City is a shining example of Olympic legacy. Few host cities embrace and uphold Olympism to the extent that Salt Lake City has since 2002. Even fewer cities have a community and government so united behind an Olympic bid. And perhaps no city can elevate the athletes’ experience, utilize existing facilities, and provide state-of-the-art fields of play as cost-efficiently as Salt Lake City can.

Utahns remember 2002 with pride and are ready to host the Olympic Winter Games again. The OEC is confident that Utah can fulfill the Olympic Agenda 2020, set a sustainable model for future organizers, and advance Olympism.

**In every way, Utah embraces, exemplifies, and strengthens the Olympic and Paralympic Movement.**
6. Feasible Games in Utah
6.1 Key feasibility considerations

This section of the OEC Report focuses on the feasibility of meeting the technical, financial and legal requirements of delivering a future Olympic and Paralympic Games in Utah, including the following elements:

- Overview of key sport requirements that drive the scale and scope of the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games, highlighting relevant changes from the 2002 program
- Assessment of potential competition venue sites, with an emphasis on technical readiness, future improvements and continuing commitment to host major winter sports events
- Evaluation of non-competition venue options, including the Olympic Village
- Assessment of regional transportation and accommodation infrastructure and key services that provide the foundation for an exceptional Games-wide experience
- Assessment of the timing for the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games
- Evaluation of opportunities around sustainability, particularly climate impacts
- Development of a preliminary OCOG budget projection and an overview of key legal considerations
AN INCREASE IN SPORT COMPETITION REQUIREMENTS

A comparison between the PyeongChang 2018 Games and 2002 indicates increases in sport and venue hosting requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
<th>SPORT / SESSION DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPORT DISCIPLINES</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>+ 24 %</td>
<td>WOMEN’S SKI JUMPING, HALFPIPE, SKIING SKI &amp; SNOWBOARD CROSS, SNOWBOARD BIG AIR, SKI AND SNOWBOARD SLOPESTYLE, SPEEDSKATING TEAM PURSUIT, SPEEDSKATING MASS START</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENT SESSIONS</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>+ 22 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increase in sport disciplines drives the increase in event sessions. However, the current sport program would not require additional venues in a future Games beyond the number utilized in 2002. Instead, certain venues would operate more frequently or via longer session durations in comparison with the 2002 Games.

6.2 Games-ready competition and event venues

The OEC evaluated the venue requirements for a future Games in Utah based on the Olympic and Paralympic sport program of PyeongChang 2018 and has concluded that:

- Utah currently has existing venues that meet the requirements to deliver an Olympic and Paralympic sport program
- A Baseline Competition Venue Plan based on utilizing legacy venues from the 2002 Games is highly feasible and ideally aligned to the Olympic Agenda 2020 framework
- Opportunities also exist to explore other venue sites (i.e., those not used in 2002) for a future Games, which provides flexibility to accommodate new winter sport disciplines and innovative ways to showcase Olympic sport at a future Games

The maps included in this section (pages 53-56) provide a preliminary assignment of Olympic and Paralympic sports against a Baseline Competition Venue Plan.

It is important to note that the OEC evaluation focused on analyzing feasible and viable options for Games venues, not on producing a definitive recommendation of venue sites to be included in a bid. Decisions on proposed venues included in a future bid would be determined during the candidature process under the direction of the Candidature Committee.
Olympic Winter Games Venues Concept

1. **SNOWBASIN RESORT**
   - Alpine Skiing

2. **THE ICE SHEET**
   - Curling

3. **RICE-ECCLES STADIUM**
   - Opening and Closing Ceremonies

4. **OLYMPIC VILLAGE**

5. **VIVINT SMART HOME ARENA**
   - Figure Skating, Short Track

6. **UTAH OLYMPIC PARK**
   - Bobsleigh, Skeleton, Luge, Ski Jumping, Nordic Combined

7. **MAVERIK CENTER**
   - Ice Hockey

8. **UTAH OLYMPICoval**
   - Speed Skating

9. **PARK CITY MOUNTAIN**
   - Snowboard, Freestyle Skiing

10. **DEER VALLEY**
    - Freestyle Skiing, Alpine Skiing

11. **SOLDIER HOLLOW NORDIC CENTER**
    - Biathlon, Cross-country Skiing, Nordic Combined

12. **PEAKS ICE ARENA**
    - Ice Hockey

IBC - **INTERNATIONAL BROADCAST CENTER**

Note: Final venue selection will be determined during candidature process.
PyeongChang 2018 pictograms are respectfully used to showcase events by venue.
Paralympic Winter Games Venues Concept

1. **SNOWBASIN RESORT**
   Para Alpine Skiing, Para Snowboard
   ![Paralympic pictogram](snowbasion.png)

2. **THE ICE SHEET**
   Wheelchair Curling
   ![Wheelchair Curling pictogram](wheelchair_curling.png)

3. **RICE-ECCLES STADIUM**
   Opening and Closing Ceremonies
   ![Opening and Closing pictogram](opening_closing.png)

4. **PARALYMPIC VILLAGE**
   ![Paralympic Village pictogram](paralympic_village.png)

5. **VIVINT SMART HOME ARENA**

6. **UTAH OLYMPIC PARK**

7. **MAVERIK CENTER**
   Para Ice Hockey
   ![Para Ice Hockey pictogram](para_ice_hockey.png)

8. **UTAH OLYMPIC OVAL**

9. **PARK CITY MOUNTAIN**

10. **DEER VALLEY**
    Para Alpine Skiing
    ![Para Alpine Skiing pictogram](para_alpine_skiing.png)

11. **SOLDIER HOLLOW NORDIC CENTER**
    Para Biathlon, Para Cross-country
    ![Para Biathlon pictogram](para_biathlon.png), ![Para Cross-country pictogram](para_cross_country.png)

12. **PEAKS ICE ARENA**

Note: Final venue selection will be determined during candidature process.

PyeongChang 2018 pictograms are respectfully used to showcase events by venue.
SUPPORT FROM VENUE OWNERS / OPERATORS

Over a three-month period ending in January 2018, the Venue Outreach Working Group of the OEC met with each of the 2002 Olympic & Paralympic Winter Games competition venue owners/operators and several owners/operators of the large non-competition venues. Additionally, the group received interest from other ski resort and facility operators in the Salt Lake region that were not a part of the 2002 Games.

The Working Group’s purpose was to:
• Update venue operators and community leaders on the OEC purpose, process, and offer answers to any questions
• Determine the level of interest of venue operators in participating in a future Games
• Understand venue operators’ primary concerns and explore possible alignment of future interests
• Review and discuss the timing, operating intent and financial considerations of possible future venue use agreements
• Commit to maintain contact to ensure informed involvement through all phases of an exploratory process and candidature

In a unanimous expression of support, all owners/operators of the baseline venue sites (i.e., 2002 venues) reinforced their strong desire to be a future Olympic and/or Paralympic host. From these meetings emerged commitments and genuine interest to:
• continue each venue’s individualized approach to furthering legacy efforts
• maintain and enhance their facility’s existing infrastructure leading up to a future Games
• collaborate on and implement initiatives inspired by Olympic Agenda 2020 principles

Letters of support from venue owners/operators are included as Appendix 8.5 to this report.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND EVENT HOSTING ENHANCE READINESS FOR A FUTURE GAMES

All of the interested venues have already made capital investments or have investment plans in place for improvements and expansions that would enhance feasibility and readiness for a future Games.

As an example, since joining the PAC-12 conference, Rice-Eccles Stadium is planning to expand its seating capacity prior to 2026. This expansion would increase seating from 45,000 to approximately 55,000, which exceeds the 52,400 total seats (46,000 permanent plus 6,400 temporary) in place for the 2002 Opening and Closing Ceremonies. The expansion will also include modern hospitality features and amenities.

Venues managed by the Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation (Utah Olympic Park, Utah Olympic Oval, and Soldier Hollow Nordic Center) have completed more than $29 million in capital projects since 2002 and are planning approximately $55 million more in future improvements over the next 10 years. Additional athlete housing facilities and sports medicine services will begin to more fully service athlete training and competition needs under these current plans.

Ensuring facility readiness for a future Games is further reinforced by ongoing efforts to host major winter sports events across venues in Utah. This is important because the IOC assesses a candidate city’s ability to provide the appropriate level of experienced competition venue management personnel required to deliver the Games.

The 2018-2019 calendar of world cup and world championship events (see table below) not only demonstrates Utah’s commitment to sport and the Olympic Movement, but also enhances readiness for professionals and volunteers who will be critical to the operations of a future Games.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>VENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCT. 29–NOV. 4, 2018 or NOV. 5-11, 2018</td>
<td>ISU WORLD CUP SHORT TRACK</td>
<td>UTAH OLYMPIC OVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY 1-10, 2019</td>
<td>FIS FREESTYLE, SNOWBOARD, FREESKI WORLD CHAMPIONSHIPS</td>
<td>PARK CITY MOUNTAIN DEER VALLEY SOLITUDE MOUNTAIN RESORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY 11-17, 2019</td>
<td>IBSF BOBSLED &amp; SKELETON WORLD CUP</td>
<td>SOLDIER HOLLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY 18-24, 2019</td>
<td>ISU WORLD CUP SPEED SKATING (LONG TRACK)</td>
<td>UTAH OLYMPIC PARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH 4-10, 2019</td>
<td>ISU WORLD CUP SPEED SKATING (LONG TRACK)</td>
<td>UTAH OLYMPIC OVAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The OEC concludes that Utah possesses a strong and deep pool of experienced competition and operational personnel across all sports and disciplines of the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games sport programs.
6.3 Non-competition venues

OLYMPIC VILLAGE AND ATHLETE / OFFICIAL HOUSING

The Olympic Village for 2002 was hosted at the University of Utah. New student housing was built with room sizes and bath facilities specifically designed to meet the 2002 Games requirements. The Village housing was located near the Fort Douglas area of the campus and consisted of the Chapel Glen, Gateway Heights, Benchmark Plaza and Sage Point housing complexes.

As indicated in the table below, since 2002 the number of participating athletes and officials has increased, with a total bed requirement for the Olympic Games estimated at 4,900 for the 2018 Games.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2018*</th>
<th>INCREASE</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATHLETES</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>+21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICIALS</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>+82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARALYMPIC WINTER GAMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHLETES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2018 forecast

The University of Utah has expanded their on-campus housing to now over 3,100 beds with an additional 1,000 projected to be undertaken within the next three years. Conservative estimates place the total housing capacity at 4,100 total beds, with more anticipated after 2020 to meet rising student enrollment. This will allow for flexibility on handling the future requests to temporarily relocate students for the Games period.

While the bed quantity meets the estimated 4,900 required, some of the new rooms may not be fully compliant with current Olympic standards for size and configuration. However, the Olympic Agenda 2020 initiatives may allow flexibility on these standards; this is an example of an item to be explored with the IOC during the Dialogue Stage.

The University of Utah provides an ideal setting and an abundance of athlete-friendly features to once again serve as the Olympic and Paralympic Village. The availability of numerous alternative housing locations in Park City and Heber City nearby snow venues further strengthens the overall accommodation offering for Games athletes and officials.

BROADCAST AND MEDIA FACILITIES

The size of the IBC and MPC for PyeongChang 2018 are approximately 34,000 and 20,000 square meters respectively, totaling 54,000 square meters. Prior Games of Sochi 2014 and Vancouver 2010 were similarly sized.

At nearly 100,000 square meters, the Salt Palace Convention Center far exceeds Games requirements and would be an ideal venue for the IBC and any necessary media spaces. Adequate exterior space is available for broadcast compound and temporary power staging, and the parking capacity of 1,000 stalls also exceeds Games requirements.

In addition to the exceeding the technical specifications, the Salt Palace offers benefits that will enhance the Games experience for broadcasters and members of the media, particularly its proximity to numerous hotels, shopping centers and vibrant downtown restaurant and nightlife scene.
6.4 Regional infrastructure and key services

IDEAL GEOGRAPHY FOR THE WINTER GAMES

Few regions in the world offer the unique combination of a robust metropolitan area located so closely to the natural splendor of a dramatic mountain range. The ability to design a Winter Games masterplan that blends together as one the mountain culture of snow sports and the vibrancy of a metropolitan center hosting ice sports and entertainment venues is not only unique, but the foundation upon which an amazing ‘One-Games’ experience can be built.

The OEC acknowledges the practical benefits of our geography, primary among them being the overall accessibility that affords a level of convenience and ease that is uncommon for an Olympic Winter Games. The benefits of proximity extend beyond the practical and reflect the greater purpose and intent of the Games: which is to bring the world together in time and place in peaceful celebration.

It is in this respect that our natural geography creates the foundation for a Games concept...a concept that not only delivers practical benefits, but injects meaning and purpose into the overall effort.

ABUNDANT ACCOMMODATION

An OCOG needs to secure approximately 24,000 rooms for the Olympic Winter Games, enough to accommodate the diverse needs of various stakeholders such as media, NOCs, IFs, sponsors and the Olympic Family. This requirement does not include the supply of accommodation options for spectators, non-local workforce members and other non-accredited visitors.

Fortunately, Salt Lake City and the surrounding region have sufficient accommodation inventory in various star ratings to more than satisfy this requirement, and Utah’s ability to meet the intensity of demand for the Games was successfully demonstrated in 2002.

In 2002, the Salt Lake Organizing Committee contracted approximately 19,100 rooms, which at the time represented 55% of the available market of 35,000 rooms. Since 2002, the accommodation inventory in the Salt Lake region has increased more than 15%, and new properties are expected to come online over the next several years that will further expand the available inventory.

There are more than 24,000 hotel rooms just within a 50 km (31 mile) radius of downtown Salt Lake City, and thousands more within the Games region.

Importantly, the compact geography of the Games concept and the close proximity of many hotels to mountain venues will ensure convenience for all stakeholders.

The density of accommodation options in the metropolitan area should be able to satisfy stakeholders with specific needs, such as the media, who need quick access to transportation, the IBC, and nearby services. A media village is not needed to meet Games requirements.

New developments in the accommodation sector, such as home-sharing and other alternative options, will augment the hotel rooms available to spectators and other visitors to Utah during the Games.

The candidature process requires that the 24,000 required rooms are secured via guarantees with property owners, covering matters such as room availability, rates, minimum stays, financing of any planned hotel investments, and price controls for services. Interactions with property owners would need to begin shortly after Salt Lake City enters the Dialogue Stage.

EFFICIENT TRANSPORTATION AND MOBILITY

The transportation requirements of the Olympic Winter Games are significant, with the need to move a projected 1.7 million spectators in and out of venues while mitigating the impact of the Games on the baseline traffic demands of our fast-growing region. Additionally, the OCOG must provide dedicated transport systems to the athletes, media and other members of the Olympic and Paralympic Family, which add to the complexity of delivering smooth Games-time transportation services.

The 2002 Games demonstrated the capability of Utah’s transportation sector to meet Olympic-level requirements. In the years since 2002, there have been substantial investments in transportation infrastructure that further bolster this capability. The compact geography of the venues in a potential Games concept ensures that journey times are favorable compared to many previous Winter Games. Clear transportation governance in Utah also assists in the coordinated delivery of services.

A future Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games can be feasibly delivered with the current transportation network and no major transport-related capital investments would be required. All proposed Games venues are in operation today and the existing transportation network serves these venues well for hosting events. Services can be augmented as required to ensure convenient transportation services for all stakeholder groups. Further, a range of exciting initiatives are being explored by Utah’s transportation leadership that could provide innovative transportation, increase the efficiency of the transportation network, improve safety, and reduce emissions and costs.
Billions in infrastructure upgrades since 2002

Since 2002, the Salt Lake region has continued to invest wisely in its transportation infrastructure and systems. The maps provided in this section (pages 65 and 66) indicate the significant expansion of public transit in the years since 2002, including new mass transit connections to the Salt Lake International Airport via light rail and a commuter rail service between Ogden and Provo. This provides many new opportunities for sustainable transportation of spectators to Games events, as well as extra capacity to serve the ongoing transit requirements of the region’s residents during the Games.

An entirely new Salt Lake City International Airport is currently being developed on the site of the existing airport. Delivered in two phases, the first in 2020 and the second in 2024, the airport will serve an impressive 23 million passengers each year. The redevelopment project is sustainable and financially prudent, with funding coming from airport revenues, federal grants, passenger charges, user fees, and revenue bonds. Local tax dollars are not being used. The Games arrivals and departures experience is anticipated to be convenient and pleasant, with spacious airport interiors, updated security designs, and easy links to ground transport.

Other transportation projects have helped improve transit since the 2002 Games, and these enhancements can also be leveraged for the Games.

Further investments, both public and private, are keeping pace with Utah’s population growth. Transportation agencies are cooperatively planning ahead and regularly update a Unified Transportation Plan for Utah, which can be found at: www.utahunifiedplan.org.

Clear transportation governance

Transportation governance in Utah is fairly simple compared to other major cities, with responsibilities summarized in the following diagram:

Officials from these entities support the hosting of a future Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games and they collaborate regularly on this and many other initiatives. This same group of partners, supported by the 2002 OCOG, delivered a seamless transportation experience for Games participants and Utah residents, including in areas such as:

- Surge capacity for the public transportation network
- Background traffic management (20-40% reduction in 2002)
- Games route network design
- Traffic operations and intelligent transportation systems
- Incident response
- Parking management
- Signage
- Snow removal
- Venue loading/unloading

Many of the transportation leaders from 2002 are still in place and are ready to guide the next generation of officials and operators.

“The teamwork from the transportation community in 2002 was exceptional; we all pitched in to make a seamless Games experience and we are excited to explore the opportunity to do so again.”

—Carlos Braceras, Executive Director, Utah Department of Transportation
In 2002, Utah Transit Authority’s rail network was less than 20 miles.

In 2018, Utah Transit Authority’s rail network has expanded to cover 135 miles.
Spectator transportation funding

While detailed planning on a Games transportation strategy has not yet commenced, one notable challenge to be resolved during a candidature is the approach to funding the spectator transportation system. Federal funding supported the spectator system in 2002, but federal resources to support a future Games is not secured.

In the event of a shortfall in funding, costs for the spectator system could be recovered through a surcharge on tickets or through other methods. The costs of spectator transportation could also be minimized by reducing venue spectator capacities (particularly at the mountain venues), reducing the size of temporary park and ride lots, and leveraging private, on-demand ride-sharing services. A resourcing strategy and exploration of these opportunities would be defined during the candidature process.

It is noted that with a very compact plan, robust existing transportation infrastructure, and the lack of additional infrastructure improvements required for the Games, federal funding related to a future Salt Lake Games (i.e., non-OCOG budget) would not only be significantly lower than 2002 levels, but also lower than what other US cities would require to deliver a Games.

Tremendous benefits to Utah and the Olympic Movement

Utah is looking for a transportation ecosystem that leverages public-private partnerships and innovative technology to improve mobility and accessibility, decrease congestion, and result in clean air. We are in a unique position to partner with the IOC, the IPC, and other stakeholders to deliver a Games transportation model that does these things for the public benefit and contributes to the IOC’s sustainability objectives.

Leverage innovations in transportation

Disruptive transportation technologies are changing the way we move in Utah, the US, and globally. On-demand ride-sharing services available on mobile devices (e.g., the Uber/Lyft model) are rapidly growing in popularity. Automakers are focused on all-electric, autonomous, connected vehicles. Smart infrastructure and vehicles will be interconnected in the future—for example, your car will know there is a pedestrian or stop sign ahead.

Specific opportunities to be explored during the candidature process include:

- Encourage, permit, or contract with on-demand ride-sharing systems that:
  - Introduce resiliency into the Games transport network, allowing the private sector to respond to market demand
  - Decrease the need for parking
  - Are integrated with the high-capacity public transit system

Simplify Olympic transport

A future Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games would be an excellent platform in which to partner with the IOC, the IPC, and other stakeholders to explore ways to simplify and reduce the cost of dedicated transportation systems while maintaining a convenient, safe experience for athletes, media, and other users.

Combining dedicated systems (for example, workforce and media), replacing dedicated vehicles with on-demand services, providing shared-ride services, and implementing convenient drop-off zones outside the security perimeter would introduce efficiencies and:

- Reduce the number of buses, fleet vehicles, depots, drivers, etc., and their associated costs for the OCOG
- Reduce parking and overlay requirements at the venues
- Reduce the number of vehicle screening areas

Accelerate clean transportation to clear the air

New transportation innovations will allow for cost and user benefits, but perhaps the biggest opportunity is to accelerate electric vehicle deployment in Utah to help clean the air. Approximately 50% of inversion-causing emissions along the Wasatch Front are from mobile sources. Using the Games as a catalyst to increase the adoption of electric transit and fleet vehicles will make a noticeable impact on clean air in Salt Lake City.

Park City already operates a fully electric express bus route, and has committed to only purchase electric buses in the future. These buses are more cost-effective to run per mile compared to traditional diesel buses, cost significantly less to maintain, and produce zero tailpipe emissions.

SAFETY AND SECURITY

The IOC requires Candidate Cities to demonstrate that they have the expertise and resources to assure a safe and secure environment to manage safety and security risks related to the Games.

The scope of risks and mitigation capabilities spans a wide range of areas including fire, physical security and anti-intrusion of Olympic venues, crime
and civil disobedience, technology and cybercrime, terrorism, traffic, crowd management and catastrophes, both natural and manmade.

During the candidature, the IOC assesses numerous security concerns, including:

• Organizational model and structure – responsibilities and relationships between entities involved in Games security, including the underpinning legal framework and who has ultimate responsibility for security during the Games
• Resources – ability to provide the personnel and security assets required to deliver a large-scale security operation, including details related to roles, sourcing and logistical support
• Other considerations such as the capabilities of intelligence services (for threat assessment), the role of the armed forces, the role of the OCOG in security matters and the security approach for the Paralympic Winter Games

Safe and secure Games are feasible

The OEC assesses that the 2030 Games can be celebrated in a safe and peaceful environment, just as the Salt Lake 2002 Games were safely delivered in the months following the terrorist attacks of 9/11. Utah and the United States can meet the critical requirements of the security program, including having an effective command structure, sufficient resources, and all necessary support from security agencies.

NSSE designation and federal support

In the United States, a National Special Security Event (NSSE) is an event of national or international significance deemed by the United States Department of Homeland Security to be a potential target for terrorism or other criminal activity.

NSSE designation requires federal agencies to provide full cooperation and support to ensure the safety and security of those attending the event and the community within which the event takes place.

Roles of the federal agencies would include:

• United States Secret Service in charge of physical security and air interdiction
• Federal Bureau of Investigation in charge of intelligence, counter terrorism, hostage rescue and investigation of incidents of terrorism or other major criminal activities
• Federal Emergency Management Agency in charge of recovery management in the aftermath of terrorist or other major criminal incidents, natural disasters or other catastrophic events

The Salt Lake 2002 Games were the first Olympic Games to receive the NSSE designation, and since then more than 30 NSSE events have been effectively secured through this framework.

Based on experience from the 2002 Games and plans for the LA 2028 Games, the OEC concludes that a future Olympic Winter Games would meet the NSSE criteria and would therefore receive the full support of the federal government.

A single, unified command with Games experience

US law in place since before the 2002 Games not only allows, but requires, a a single chain of command for integrated security operations for any NSSE designated event. Similar to 2002, the OEC anticipates a unified command structure for a future Games would be achieved by a Utah Olympic Public Safety Command (UOPSC)-type model, which is a tested, proven structure for ensuring Games safety and security.

For the 2002 Games, Utah legislation (SB159 passed in 1998) combined state and local public safety entities with federal law enforcement agencies, the military and the Salt Lake Organizing Committee to coordinate all efforts under one security plan.

For a future Games in Utah, a similar UOPSC-type legal and operational framework would create a unified command structure with the Secret Service as the lead federal agency in charge of event security in accordance with NSSE framework, the FBI as lead on intelligence and counter terrorism, and FEMA as lead on incident response management. Other national, state and local security services would be fully integrated as they were for the 2002 Games, utilizing the depth of experience they gained through the 2002 Games.

As outlined in the budget projection in this report, the OEC anticipates a similar finance and resourcing structure to that of the 2002 Games, with the strong financial support of the federal government and clear roles and responsibilities through the UOPSC-type model.
6.5 Proposed timing for the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games

The IOC and IPC require candidate cities to propose dates for each Games, with the primary consideration being that weather conditions are optimal for athlete performance and align with the international sports calendar.

The OEC has identified the following as optimal time periods for each event:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Olympic Winter Games</th>
<th>Early-Mid February, with the Games opening on a Friday and running for 17 days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paralympic Winter Games</td>
<td>10-14 days following the Olympic Winter Games and running for 10 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The OEC has reviewed the potential impacts of climate change at the mountain venues for 2026 and 2030 based on long range studies that have been carried out in efforts to assess climate change at intervals of the years 2030, 2050, and 2075. Excerpts from this study are included as Appendix 8.4. Based on long-range trends, mountain venues could anticipate later snow pack formation at the beginning of winter, earlier snowmelt at the end of the ski season and less precipitation (snow coverage) at all elevations, with the most significant impacts at the base areas of the ski resorts.

These challenges are not unique to Utah. A recent study of the effects of climate change on 21 previous Olympic Winter Games hosts found that by 2050, many prior hosts may be too warm to ever host the Games again. Fortunately, Salt Lake City fares better than nearly all of the host cities reviewed.

Given the timing of the Olympic Winter Games (early to mid-February), reliable snow and climate conditions for a 2030 Games will remain. Course conditions will also meet requirements for the Paralympic Winter Games (early to mid-March), but the opportunity to condense the transition period between the two Games with an earlier start to the Paralympics could be explored during the candidature process to provide further surety. It is noted that potential Games venues have superior snow making systems and operations that can help provide optimal competition and training conditions for participating athletes.

6.6 Delivering a sustainable Games

The Olympic Agenda 2020 has sustainability as one of its three pillars, with the stated objectives of including sustainability in all aspects of the Olympic Games. To deliver a lasting legacy, the Games shouldn’t just focus on doing less harm—they should also be able to create significant long-term benefits. With the 2026 Candidature Process, the recommendations of Olympic Agenda 2020 are now integrated, and the IOC has set a Sustainability Strategy to ensure that the Olympic Games can be a catalyst for sustainable development.

The IOC Sustainability Strategy includes five focus areas, as follows:

- **Infrastructure and natural sites**: use of existing or temporary infrastructure and minimizing the environmental footprint of Games-related facilities
- **Sourcing and resource management**: sourcing that considers environmental and social impacts; product and material lifecycles are optimized
- **Mobility**: sustainable mobility solutions
- **Workforce**: safe, healthy, positive work environments; encourage active lifestyles, diversity and inclusion, education and training opportunities
- **Climate**: effective carbon reduction strategies and adaptation of Games plans to the consequences of climate change

A Salt Lake 2030 Games would provide many compelling opportunities to make significant progress in Games sustainability and to showcase Utah's ingenuity and commitment to the focus areas of the IOC strategy. Through the candidature process, existing conditions can be evaluated and benchmarked, followed by the development of proposed Games-specific sustainability initiatives.

The OEC has identified some initial ideas described below that could demonstrate our ambitions in the area of sustainability, particularly as relates to infrastructure, sourcing and mobility focus areas.

**EXISTING GAMES INFRASTRUCTURE**

Utilizing all existing venues in the Games concept, a future Games would already have reduced environmental impacts compared with many previous host cities (10% to 26% less than if newly built venues were needed).

**100% RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY**

The conversion to renewable electricity in Utah is already underway, with Park City, Salt Lake City, Moab, and Summit County setting 100% renewable energy...
goals by 2032. The Olympic Games electricity needs could be integrated into this overall goal. These communities have a need for any excess renewable electricity that would be produced after the Games.

**ELECTRIFICATION OF VEHICLES**

Electrified transit programs are already underway. Park City currently operates a fully electric express bus route, and has committed to only purchase electric buses in the future. The buses are more cost-effective to run per mile compared to traditional diesel buses, cost significantly less to maintain, and produce zero tailpipe emissions. Using the Games as a catalyst to accelerate the adoption of fully electric transit will reduce operating costs of transit systems.

Utahns are embracing electric vehicles at a record pace. Approximately 50% of inversion-causing emissions in Utah are from mobile sources. Using the Games to accelerate the adoption of electric vehicles will make a noticeable impact on air quality in Salt Lake City. Electrification in combination with renewable electricity will generate jobs and tax revenue for the state and communities where these renewables are sited.

**CIRCULAR ECONOMY**

A circular economy is a strategy that incorporates resources, waste, and energy systems to reduce loss and increase value. This concept would have sustainable and economic benefits. A future OCOG could ensure that all procurement was planned with a post-Games purpose in mind. For example, if this strategy is employed by both Los Angeles and Salt Lake City in back-to-back Games, both organizing teams could benefit. From trash cans to temporary seating, there are many opportunities to create a circular economy and improve sustainability.

**ZERO WASTE**

For food waste, a zero-waste program could be implemented. Currently there are organizations in Utah that can handle commercial scale operations, such as Wasatch Resource Recovery. This waste can be turned into a renewable natural gas or fertilizer for beneficial re-use while decreasing the volume and cost of waste reduction.

**CLIMATE-POSITIVE GAMES**

A future Salt Lake Games could adopt an international reporting scheme to monitor its carbon footprint. With the use of existing facilities in Games operations, shifting transportation fuels to electricity, committing to 100% renewable electricity, considering offsets if needed, and implementing principles of a circular economy, a Games in Utah could help establish a path to systematic sustainability.

---

**6.7 Strengthening the legacy**

As has been reinforced throughout this report, the legacy of hosting the 2002 Olympic Winter Games continues to this day to benefit communities across Utah. Our world-class venues are highly utilized by both elite athletes and our local citizens, often side-by-side on the ice and on the snow. Expertise gained from hosting in 2002 continues to drive our commitment to host other large-scale sporting events and encourages sport tourism across all of Utah.

Should we proceed with a candidature in this upcoming cycle, we will explore ways to build on this foundation of a strong legacy, with an emphasis on inspiring the next generation of young people around the positive values of sport.

Delivering on legacy requires organizational commitment, and fortunately Utah possess two organizations dedicated to collaborating on this mission: the Utah Sports Commission and the Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation.

**UTAH SPORTS COMMISSION**

The Utah Sports Commission enhances Utah’s economy, image, and quality of life through the attraction, promotion, and development of national and international sports, acting as a catalyst for Utah’s Olympic Legacy efforts. The Utah Sports Commission plays a leadership role in attracting key sporting events to the state and leverages the sports market to generate economic impact and media exposure for Utah. The commission continues to act as a facilitator, catalyst or coordinator, to enhance the State of Utah through sport.

Leading the state’s efforts to enhance its standing as a top-notch sports location, the Utah Sports Commission facilitated the creation of TEAM UTAH, which consists of numerous state and private organizations within Utah working with the Utah Sports Commission to improve the state through sports. The organization also created “Utah: The State of Sport,” the tag line created along with their iconic “arches runner man” logo to build brand equity and brand association worldwide for the Utah Sports Commission and state of Utah by leveraging the media and promotional value sports drives globally.

The Utah Sports Commission has played a critical role developing and executing on Utah’s Olympic Legacy strategy since 2002. Working closely with TEAM UTAH, they have hosted approximately 700 events in 38 Utah cities, generating well over a billion dollars of economic impact across the state. These events have also showcased Utah to a national and global television audience providing the state with hundreds of millions of dollars in media value. The Utah Sports Commission was also chartered to manage the 2002 Salt Lake City Olympic Winter Games Volunteer Database as a Legacy from the Games, and it continues to do so today.
Strong support from elected officials has boosted the work of the Utah Sports Commission. The Governor and Utah State Legislature have charged the Utah Sports Commission with keeping Utah “ready, willing, and able” to bid on a future Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games. In 2015 and again in 2018, the Utah Legislature passed resolutions supporting pursuit of the Games (refer to Appendix 8.8 for 2015 and 8.10 for 2018).

The Utah Sports Commission’s broader charter includes making life better for all citizens of Utah, and helping the sports industry and our communities grow economically through sport. The Utah Sports Commission works with its partners on bid development, volunteer coordination, sponsorship, event logistics planning, event promotion and other related services. This valuable resource provides well-trained volunteers for sporting events.

**UTOH OLYMPIC LEGACY FOUNDATION**

The Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation (UOLF) is a Utah nonprofit 501(c)(3) organization responsible for managing and maintaining world-class facilities and providing opportunities for people of all ages and abilities to participate and excel in winter sport. Inspired by the success and momentum of the Salt Lake 2002 Olympic Winter Games, the UOLF has placed a focus on embracing, engaging and involving Utah’s youth in winter sport. The UOLF supports national sports organizations and community recreational winter sport programs, as well as subsidizes the operation of three Olympic venues: the Utah Olympic Oval, Utah Olympic Park, and Soldier Hollow.

The UOLF, with its $60 million Legacy Fund and investment earnings, has been instrumental in minimizing the use of taxpayer resources for its operations and maintenance. Since 2002, the UOLF has:

a. Spent $147.6 million on venue operations, maintenance, and program delivery costs. Today, our annual operating & maintenance budget balances at approximately $17 million.

b. Expended $25.8 million on venue capital improvements

c. Earned over $64.5 million in net investment earnings, averaging $4.3 million per year

d. Raised public program revenues from $2.4 million in 2004 to over $8 million in 2017

e. Steadily increased staffing numbers to handle the increased volume of activities. Current employment numbers include 111 full-time year-round staff, 467 part-time and seasonal staff, totaling 578 staff across three Utah communities.

f. Staged over 200 national and international sporting events.

g. Forecasted to spend an additional $210 million over the next 10 years to further maintain venues and operate programs in efforts to fulfill our mission and long-term Olympic and Paralympic sport goals.

**6.8 Games finances**

**BUDGET OVERVIEW**

For any potential candidate city, the budget is one of the most important factors in determining whether or not to pursue hosting.

Historically, hosting the Games has required a major commitment of financial resources far beyond the revenues realized, requiring government entities to infuse significant capital in the billions of dollars.

Cities considering candidature become enamored with the opportunity to host, but when the economic reality sets in, many such cities withdraw, as happened in the 2022 and 2024 candidature processes.

However, the IOC recognized this challenge and has adopted the Olympic Agenda 2020 with the goal of reshaping the economic model through utilizing existing venues and changing the operational model to increase efficiency.

The OEC recognizes the importance of having an accurate understanding of the financial requirements of the 2030 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games, and has developed budget projections based on current Games requirements, the experiences of the 2002 Games and hundreds of events hosted in Utah since, and anticipated cost efficiencies brought about through Olympic Agenda 2020. Additionally, for key budget drivers such as venues and labor costs, the OEC created a detailed, bottom-up build of expected costs.

**A UNIQUELY PRUDENT, FEASIBLE GAMES BUDGET**

The economics for hosting an Olympic Games is one of the most important considerations in deciding whether or not to move forward. Without existing, well-maintained Olympic venues and Games-ready infrastructure, between $2.5 and $4 billion may be needed to properly host the Games, requiring extensive government assistance to offset expenses. However, given Utah’s state of readiness for Games and its long-term commitment to sport, we estimate an expense budget of $1.353 billion (2018 values), including a $63 million legacy endowment. We believe that revenues can be raised that meet or exceed this expense budget. Our exceptional infrastructure, compact geography, and experienced team ensures Utah is in a unique positive economic position to host future Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games.

**REVENUES**

OCOG revenues include worldwide Olympic Partners (TOP), domestic (US) sponsorships, broadcast contributions, ticketing, merchandising, donations, asset liquidation, rate card sales (rental of assets to Olympic Family members), and other minor revenue opportunities.
Estimates can be reasonably made for revenues from TOP Partners, broadcast, ticketing, merchandising, donations, asset liquidation, and rate card sales based upon actual results from Salt Lake 2002 or projections from the IOC. The 2030 Games would be back-to-back with LA 2028, creating a unique situation with domestic sponsorship revenue.

The Olympic Movement relies upon marketing partner support in many ways, including for financial contributions to sport development, promotion and hosting of the Olympic Games. Marketing partners are categorized as follows:

- **TOP (The Olympic Partners) Program:** A limited number of worldwide partners who have rights to all territories and support the hosting of Olympic Winter Games with financial contributions and value-in-kind (VIK) support. The TOP Program also supports the entire Olympic Movement and a percentage of contributions are shared with 206 NOCs and the international sports federations.

- **Domestic marketing partners:** Includes national sponsors, local sponsors, and suppliers who provide cash and VIK and in return receive marketing recognition and rights commensurate with their sponsorship levels. These partners are secured for a specific edition of the Games within the host territory.

The IOC has projected significant TOP Partner contributions to future Olympic Games, with a number of partners already committed beyond Tokyo 2020, including four partners through 2024, one partner through 2028 and another partner through 2032.

Our assumption is that the TOP Program will continue to secure healthy sponsorship contributions. TOP contributions for the 2030 Games should be incrementally higher than the projected 2026 contribution of $200 million, and we have accounted for this growth in our model.

An OCOG’s largest revenue source is typically from domestic sponsorships, which are essential to being able to meet the economic requirements of hosting the Games. For example, total budget-relieving SLOC sponsorship revenues were $564 million in 2002. This is equivalent to $756 million in 2018 dollars.

The rights to the domestic sponsorship market are owned by the USOC, which derives a significant amount of its revenues through these important sponsors to support the US Olympic team. To host the Games, we would need to form a marketing partnership with the USOC to ensure it maintains continuity in its revenues in this important area. With LA 2028 and the USOC already sharing revenue through a joint marketing program that ends in 2028, the available marketing rights duration for the 2030 Games OCOG could either be for just 2029 and 2030, or from 2029 all the way through 2032, depending on a future agreed-upon arrangement with the USOC. We look forward to developing a productive and collaborative relationship with the USOC with around the domestic sponsorship program.

Los Angeles will host the Games in 2028 and is appropriately the top priority for the USOC and the Olympic Movement in the US. Nothing should interfere with LA 2028’s success. LA 2028’s exclusive marketing rights through the end of 2028 present unique challenges and opportunities to achieving a balanced budget or a surplus for hosting in 2030. If Salt Lake City seeks sponsorships separately from LA 2028, then it may not be able to officially market until January 2027 and these sponsorships may not be activated until 2029. However, it would be worth exploring marketing partner opportunities, at least to some degree, jointly with LA 2028 with the understanding that any such collaboration must include a net benefit to them. In this case, marketing for 2030 could begin earlier than 2027. It is also possible that a back-to-back Games in the United States could be an attractive sponsorship opportunity for some marketing partners.

Domestic sponsorship revenues will therefore be affected by the revenue split with the USOC, the timing as to when sponsorships are sold, the available time for marketing partners to activate, the duration of sponsorships (through 2030 or later), and the potential challenges and opportunities of back-to-back Games with LA 2028. These factors potentially create domestic sponsorship revenue uncertainty until the late stages of Olympic Games preparations.

However, these sponsorship revenue risks can be mitigated by:

- Seeking a collaborative approach with the USOC and LA 2028
- Seeking permission to market before 2027 to Utah companies that would not otherwise sponsor the LA 2028 Games. Utah companies provided approximately $200 million (in 2018 values) in sponsorship value for the 2002 Games. Since 2002, Utah’s highly robust economy has doubled the state’s GDP, providing expanded sponsorship opportunities.
- Reducing the expense budget by leveraging Utah’s existing venues and a Games-experienced management team

Given the uncertainty in the domestic sponsorship category, the OEC focused on reducing projected expenditures as much as is reasonable to reduce the amount needed in domestic sponsorship revenues to at least break even.

Finally, the IOC has projected broadcast revenues for the 2026 Games at $452 million in 2026 dollars. We used this as a basis to estimate the IOC’s contributions to the organization of the 2030 Games, including a conservative projection for revenue growth between 2026 and 2030.

**EXPENSES**

**Expenses overview**

An OCOG budget represents the direct costs of hosting the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games, including categories such as venue rent, overlay, venue operations, labor, technology, food and beverage, Olympic Family transportation, etc. (there are over major 40 expense categories in total).
Beyond the OCOG budget, a host city/nation may incur infrastructure or services costs in support of the Games, such as venue construction, public transportation, and security. A Salt Lake 2030 Games would essentially eliminate the single largest cost drivers that are Games-related, as Utah already has in place existing venues, significant transportation upgrades, a new airport, sufficient accommodations, advanced telecommunications infrastructure, stable energy supplies, etc. Within the area of services, we have assumed the following:

- **Security** – security costs are provided for by the federal government, which is responsible for the security of large special events per Presidential Decision Directive (PDD) 62
- **Transportation** – spectator transportation costs, which were covered by the federal government for the 2002 Games, which may or may not be the case in 2030

Other minor public services costs, such as supporting a Games sustainability management system or educational and culture programs, are unlikely to be substantial and will fit within existing funding structures.

Transportation systems in Utah have greatly expanded since 2002 and the spectator system would benefit from these improvements, requiring less funding to host a future Games. Our relationships with UDOT and UTA were exceptional in 2002 and based on our conversations with them through the OEC, they look forward to partnering with us again. For funding needed beyond the resources of UDOT and UTA to implement the spectator transportation system, we could add a transportation fee to any tickets sold which transfers the expense to the user of the service.

**EVOLUTION OF THE GAMES IMPACTS OCOG BUDGETS**

The IOC, as a key initiative of Olympic Agenda 2020, is seeking to make hosting the Games more efficient and has identified over 100 opportunities to do so. With Utah’s existing venues and an experienced team, Salt Lake City is extremely well-positioned to work with the IOC to implement these efficiencies and create a sustainable model for the Winter Games. Such a partnership with the IOC can assist in significantly advancing the IOC’s objectives, the Olympic Movement, and future Olympic hosts.

Increasing efficiencies in accordance with Olympic Agenda 2020 fits well with Salt Lake City’s objective of reducing costs to fit the revenue challenge of back-to-back Games with LA 2028. We are in a unique position to realize significant cost efficiencies compared to many cities worldwide.

A Salt Lake 2030 Games would benefit from:

**Existing venues and infrastructure.** Every venue needed is in place. The specialized venues (speed skating oval, ski jumps, sliding track, cross country) alone would cost over $450 million to build new. If we had to build these venues, the economic risks would make a bid unfeasible. Each of these Salt Lake 2002 legacy venues is top condition, hosting national and international events and operating at world-class levels. In addition to these specialized venues, the costs associated with building an Olympic Village, ice sheets, transportation infrastructure, telecommunications infrastructure, etc., could exceed an additional billion dollars.

**An already-proven, efficient hosting experience in 2002.** We were a model of efficiency in 2002, spending far less than others on our Games, yet producing a spectacular result of which we were all incredibly proud.

**Existing operating plans in place from 2002, shortcutting Games planning processes.** Putting the planning team in place is one of the largest expenses of hosting. Hundreds of staff are hired years in advance to develop venue designs and overlay plans, event operational plans, stakeholder and services plans, etc. Because planning will be focused on adaptations and refinements to existing Games-ready features—rather than completely new projects—we can be much more efficient and streamlined in our staffing.

**An experienced team that has already identified significant additional efficiencies.** At a high level, we have identified many opportunities for cost reductions from the already-efficient 2002 Games. These opportunities are tightly tied to the efficiency opportunities identified by the IOC through their Games Management 2020 initiatives. These include reductions almost everywhere in the projected 2030 budget, but the larger savings are realized in the following areas compared with 2002:

- Labor
- Venue overlay
- Broadcast production (now paid for by the IOC)
- Telecommunications (infrastructure is in place)
- Sport (fewer test events are needed)
- Olympic Village (already built)
- Shared new venue construction (Peaks Ice Arena, Steiner Ice Sheet, Maverik Center, Ogden Ice Sheet, Rice-Eccles Stadium expansion)
- Transportation (new systems and infrastructure built for 2002 and expanded since then)
- Smaller capacities planned in a few venues (Utah Olympic Park, Snowbasin, Park City). We delivered very large seating capacities for these venues in 2002 and the expenses to deliver the infrastructure and services to support such large capacities (e.g., transportation, security, venue overlay, food and beverage, etc.) often exceeds the marginal ticketing revenue.

**A philosophy of “must-have” versus “nice-to-have.”** We had a significant projected budget deficit in the years leading up to 2002. We adopted a
philosophy of focusing on the “must-haves” and postponed the “nice-to-haves” in the event we raised sufficient revenues to spend on these “nice-to-have” areas. One example is the building wraps placed around downtown Salt Lake City for the 2002 Games. We added these when we knew we had the funds to do so. We would adopt a similar philosophy for 2030 Games, wherein we would implement a base budget of essentials and if we are successful in raising additional sponsorship revenues, we could add enhancements to the Games experience later in the planning process.

Some expense areas can be accurately forecasted, while others are more challenging (e.g., technology costs), since they evolve rapidly and the corresponding sponsorship dynamics are changing. Therefore, even though there is a high level of confidence in the accuracy of 2030 budget projections due to previously hosting, there are still notable uncertainties. As a result, the budget projection includes a $60 million contingency (in 2018 values).

Tremendous assistance from the IOC and IFs. Different to 2002, the IOC now assists the OCOG throughout its entire lifecycle and provides guidance, training and knowledge transfer support valued at $83 million (in 2026 values). Further, the IOC and the IFs have developed Sport Delivery Plans, which help clarify roles and responsibilities in staging Games competitions and enable much stronger support of the IFs to the OCOG. These developments will reinforce savings in labor and other cost areas.

Opportunities for cost efficiencies with LA 2028 through back-to-back Games. Back-to-back Games within the same host country offers many interesting concepts for cost efficiencies that can be explored with the support of LA 2028, the IOC and the USOC. While these ideas haven’t been included in the OEC’s budget projection for 2030, there may be substantial savings available to both Games by pursuing:

- Reuse of overlay, equipment and other products, which would have the added benefit of increasing sustainability and supporting a circular economy
- Multiple Games contracts for key service providers
- Economies of scale for other procurement
- Sharing of Games talent to further reduce labor budgets
- Simplification of planning and stakeholder engagement, particularly at the national level

Beyond the OCOG, there may be potential synergies between the host cities of Los Angeles and Salt Lake City in areas such as sustainability, inclusion, innovation and technology. This cooperation could be built on the model being implemented by Los Angeles and Paris through their Olympic Cooperation Agreement signed last year.

A projected $293 million (2018 values) is needed from domestic sponsors ($260 million) and an enhanced donor program ($33 million) to break even, which includes a $63 million base endowment. The $260 million compares to $564 million (2002 values) in domestic sponsorship SLOC achieved. Given the domestic sponsorship dynamics and the potential in Utah of an enhanced donor program, $293 million is achievable and perhaps even a conservative assumption.
MORE THAN $460 MILLION IN SAVINGS

This budget projection reflects significant savings from hosting in 2002. If the actual costs of hosting in 2002 ($1.389 billion in 2002 values) are adjusted to meet the current Olympic Winter Games requirements, such as new sports, ($26 million in 2002 values) and offset with savings achieved from existing infrastructure, Olympic Agenda 2020 initiatives, and an experienced team, then the net savings totals $436 million (2002 values). The key sources of this reduction are (2002 values):

Estimated potential savings via Olympic Agenda 2020 initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COST REDUCTION</th>
<th>2002 VALUES (IN MILLIONS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BROADCAST PRODUCTION</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VENUE CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABOR</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VENUE OVERLAY (NET OF INCREASED REQUIREMENTS)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMES OPERATIONS</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>436</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS

The base expense budget projection of $1.353 billion (2018 values) inflates the actual expenditures from 2002, incorporates all of the savings listed above, includes a $60 million contingency, and assumes a $63 million base endowment for the Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation (UOLF) and the Utah Sports Commission for the realization of Games Legacy and the promotion of sport within Utah. The 2002 Games endowment to the UOLF has gradually been reduced from $76 million to $60 million (2018 values) and needs to be refreshed. If we are going to go to the effort of hosting the Games again, the OEC believes we should have the opportunity of once again leaving long-term sport legacies for our state and extending these legacies as a model for the Olympic Movement.

If the 2030 Games OCOG is in the fortunate position of having revenues exceed projected expenses (including the endowment outlined above), then we would seek to do the following:

- Enhance the Games experience (e.g., Look of the Games, Ceremonies, more contingency assets, etc.)
- Enhance permanent venues. For example, instead of renting temporary broadcast lighting, permanent lighting could be purchased to enhance future use
- Generate a surplus. We accomplished this in 2002, leaving behind a $76 million endowment for the legacy venues, a transformative legacy that has allowed the continued operation of these world-class venues. Per existing agreements, the surplus was also shared with the USOC.

If the 2030 Games generate a surplus, we would have the following objectives:

- Add to the endowment of the Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation and Utah Sports Commission to ensure their operation for generations to come
- Fund an endowment for US Olympians and Paralympians. The federal government does not provide athlete funding—unlike in most countries where governments readily provide such funding—and many athletes struggle. The Games have done so much for Utah, and a surplus would provide a unique chance to give back to the Olympic Movement by providing ongoing funding for athletes, many of whom live and train in Utah.

A BUDGET THAT MAKES A FUTURE GAMES FEASIBLE

We are in the fortunate position of building on the 2002 hosting experience to develop a detailed, sensible budget. We also have the advantage of existing venues, plans, and an experienced team. Each of these factors gives confidence to budget assumptions and revenue and cost projections.

Hosting back-to-back Games in the US presents some unique challenges in domestic sponsorship revenues, but also offers intriguing opportunities for cost efficiencies to both OCOGs. However, initially we must be highly conservative in our domestic sponsorship revenue assumptions, in parallel with the drive to reduce the costs of hosting.

The need to reduce baseline hosting costs aligns perfectly with the IOC’s Olympic Agenda 2020 and there are many efficiencies that can be realized through this work, which have been built into 2030 budget estimates.

The resulting budget is a highly efficient “must-have” plan. If revenues exceed forecasts, the budget can flex up to include “nice-to-have” elements. We may generate a surplus, in which case we could enhance the Games experience and provide Olympic and sport-related legacies that could be transformative.

Financial plans will continue to be refined as we learn more going forward in the Dialogue Stage, with greater certainty gained through collaboration with the IOC, IPC, USOC and other stakeholders.
The key message regarding budget is that by utilizing our tremendous existing infrastructure, the expertise of an experienced team, and significantly reducing costs consistent with the IOC’s Olympic Agenda 2020, the baseline 2030 Games budget projects the need for $293 million (2018 values) in domestic sponsorships and an enhanced donor program to generate a $63 million endowment, which is included in the base budget. Utah sponsors of the 2002 Games alone provided approximately $200 million (2018 values), thereby giving us confidence we can meet or exceed necessary revenue targets.

### 6.9 Legal matters

A complex legal framework exists around the staging of the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games. At the highest level of this framework, the IOC has developed an Olympic Charter, which regulates the Olympic Movement and outlines the conditions for hosting the Games.

Additionally, each Olympic and Paralympic Games host is required to enter into an agreement known as the Host City Contract (HCC) with the IOC upon being awarded the right to host.

The HCC contains a number of provisions (outlined below) which impose specific legal obligations upon the parties involved.

Nearly all previous host regions/nations have implemented further legal measures to ease the organization of the Games, often through legislation or administrative rules. Event hosting in Utah and the United States is already in sync with the legal framework of the Olympic Games and successful Games hosting in 2030 does not face significant legal barriers. Any efforts undertaken by LA 2028 with the federal government could likely be extended to a 2030 Games.

During the candidature, a number of guarantees regarding Olympic Charter, Host City Contract, and other legal and ethical matters are required from appropriate authorities. The OEC does not anticipate any challenges in ensuring a future Salt Lake candidature’s compliance with these guarantee requirements or in future Games hosting from a legal perspective.

### 2026 HOST CITY CONTRACT ANALYSIS

For the purposes of the OEC report, the LA 2028 Host City Contract, the elements of which were made public by the IOC, was evaluated. The IOC will release the draft HCC for the 2026 Games in July 2018. The requirements for the 2026 host are expected to be very similar to those required of LA 2028.

The primary obligation in the HCC is the requirement that the Host City and the Organizing Committee be responsible for all financial obligations arising from planning, organizing and staging of the Games. This responsibility is “joint and several,” which means that each of these entities is equally responsible for all financial obligations related to the Games. The HCC also provides the “split” of any surplus revenue from the Games between the Host City, OCOG and the USOC.

In addition, the 2028 HCC imposes other key obligations on the Host City and the Organizing Committee related to the Games. These include the following obligations:

- Television Broadcast. OCOG required to provide all services and facilities to OBS (as agreed in Broadcasting Cooperation Agreement and HCC)
- Security. OCOG and Host Country Authorities are responsible for security and safety of all participants
- Intellectual Property. OCOG must protect intellectual property rights belonging to the IOC
- Accreditation, Visa and Work Permits. OCOG, USOC and Host City are responsible for ensuring accreditation, visas and work permits
- Indemnification. OCOG, USOC and Host City are required to indemnify the IOC from all third-party claims, liabilities and expenses
- Marketing Agreement with IOC and USOC. OCOG will be required to create a joint marketing agreement with USOC and IOC
- Taxes. OCOG and USOC to work with federal and state government to ensure that tax legislation is implemented in a manner that prevents double-taxation, indirect taxes, or taxes on the payments made by OCOG to IOC
- Key Operational Deliverables. OCOG, USOC and Host City must provide:
  - Olympic-caliber venues
  - Test events
  - Olympic Village/accommodations for athletes and team officials
  - Transportation systems
  - Ticketing programs
  - Games technology platforms
  - Energy supply for Games activities
  - Insurance coverage
  - Anti-doping controls and testing
  - Torch relay
  - Cultural events related to Games
  - Look of the Games and branding
- Organization and Staging of Paralympic Games
7. Recommendation & next steps
The two key recommendations found below reflect the opinions of the diverse constituent groups represented within the OEC, including: Olympians and Paralympians; political leaders from host cities and the State of Utah; business and community leaders; leadership of the Utah Sports Commission and the Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation; and leaders from the Salt Lake 2002 Games.

The collective contributions of these individuals to the OEC’s evaluation process have yielded broad consensus on the following:

1. Salt Lake City should pursue hosting the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games in 2030 given the significant value and opportunity in hosting Games.
   - Salt Lake City has a distinct advantage in hosting due to having a full set of existing venues operating at world-class levels, excellent infrastructure that is Games-ready, an experienced team, a unique, compact geography, and a track record of successfully hosting hundreds of sporting events, including world cups and world championships
   - Salt Lake City already meets all other key Games hosting requirements, such as in transportation and accommodation, which would provide ready-made solutions for smooth Games operations
   - Salt Lake City and Utah have an active cultural scene and deep talent in the arts, a valuable legacy from the 2002 Games which can contribute to the richness of future Games and reinforce one of the three pillars of Olympism
   - Citizens of Utah enthusiastically support the prospect of hosting Games again
   - Salt Lake City meets, in every way, the ambitious objectives of the IOC in its recently implemented Olympic Agenda 2020
   - Addressing back-to-back Games in the United States:
     - Salt Lake City is seeking the opportunity to host in 2030. However, the current candidature process is for 2026. Given the dual award of Games to Paris for 2024 and Los Angeles for 2028 during the most recent candidature process, there is a possibility that there may again be a dual award for 2026 and 2030. Salt Lake City should participate in the current 2026 process given this potential.
- While the focus is on hosting in 2030, if there is a lack of viable bids for 2026, the OEC believes that it is feasible for Salt Lake City to partner with Olympic and Paralympic stakeholders and host the 2026 Games. This is a complex scenario given LA is hosting in 2028 and would be more challenging from a financial perspective, despite Salt Lake City’s readiness to host in 2026 from a venue and operational perspective.

- Olympic Movement stakeholders would need to see clear advantages of back-to-back Games hosted in the United States. This is possible, given:
  - The embodiment of Olympic Agenda 2020’s focus on existing and temporary infrastructure, athlete experience and sustainability; these were highly praised in Los Angeles 2028’s Games concept and can be further extended in Salt Lake City’s Games concept
  - The opportunities for collaboration and shared knowledge between two back-to-back Games that could dramatically reduce cost and complexity of hosting
  - The tremendous public support for the Olympic Games found in US host cities, with Los Angeles residents at 83% support for 2028 and Utah residents at 89% for 2030
  - The USOC’s recognition of the value of hosting the 2030 Games, and their depth of experience and capability in the Olympic movement
  - The global challenge of finding cities equipped to meet the unique requirements of the Olympic Winter Games and being willing to host

- Sponsorships from US companies (domestic sponsors) are essential to meet the economic requirements of hosting the Games. Given that LA has exclusive US marketing rights through 2028, this presents unique challenges and risks to achieving a balanced budget or surplus for hosting in 2030. However, the OEC has determined that, given Utah’s existing venues, experienced team, and local sponsorship base, it is possible to significantly reduce expenses and overcome this economic challenge. It is also possible that a back-to-back Games with LA could be an attractive opportunity for some national marketing partners, and this possibility could be explored after entering the Dialogue Stage.

2. Should the USOC decide to engage in the 2026 Candidature Process and select Salt Lake as an Interested City prior to March 31, 2018, we encourage Utah’s leadership to consider next steps, including supporting the formation of a Candidature Committee to pursue this opportunity.

- With the high levels of preparation and experience already in place, along with the flexibility offered by the IOC’s new candidature process, the financial investments required to enter the Dialogue Stage as an Interested City are expected to be approximately $600,000, and the Candidature Committee would pursue private funding. The cost of participating in the Dialogue Stage is relatively modest in view of the tremendous opportunity to host again.

- The Dialogue Stage would keep Salt Lake City involved in the 2026 (and potentially 2030) process through September 2018, a key period where a great deal can be accomplished, including:
  - The USOC’s selection of its candidate city
  - Monitoring other cities worldwide that are ready to commit to the Candidature Stage of the 2026 process
  - Further refinement of the Salt Lake 2030 Games concept and budget with the IOC through their collaborative approach
  - Developing a strategy for back-to-back US Games with the USOC and LA 2028, covering elements such as domestic sponsorship, cost and planning efficiencies, sustainability, sport development, stakeholder coordination, etc.

- If, by October 2018, Salt Lake City decides to continue into the Candidature Stage with the support of the USOC, and the IOC accepts its candidature, then this more intense phase would require:
  - A budget of approximately $9.4 million, resulting in a total candidature budget of $10.0 million (refer to page 82 for budget details)
  - This compares favorably to stated candidature budgets for other cities pursuing the 2026 Games of $25+ million
  - 12 months of significant effort in fulfilling the requirements of the candidature process
  - Participating in the Host City Election process in September 2019

### 7.2 Next steps

With the endorsement of the OEC Board to move forward with the recommendations above, the next steps include:

- Present the OEC report to the Utah Legislature and the Salt Lake City Council for their input
- Once the USOC has defined a process for selecting a US Interested City, Utah’s leadership should consider activating a Candidature Committee
- Work through the USOC’s process, endeavoring to be selected as its candidate for entry into the Dialogue Stage
- Once Utah’s leadership decides to form a Candidature Committee, begin to raise $600,000 to fund the Dialogue Stage effort
8. Appendices
## 8.1 Terminology

Throughout this report, the following terms and acronyms are used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate City</td>
<td>The official designation given to cities that have been invited by the IOC to present a candidature for the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidature Stage</td>
<td>The second stage of the 2026 Candidature Process, which runs from October 2018 through September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue Stage</td>
<td>The first stage of the 2026 Candidature Process, which must be entered by March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td>An informal reference to the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBC</td>
<td>International Broadcast Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>International Sport Federation, the world governing body of each sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested City</td>
<td>The official designation given to cities that have entered the Dialogue Stage of the 2026 Candidature Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOC</td>
<td>International Olympic Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPC</td>
<td>International Paralympic Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPC</td>
<td>Main Press Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>National Governing Body, the highest level of administration for each sport in the United States; known as a National Federation (NF) internationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOC</td>
<td>National Olympic Committee, the administrative body for the Olympic Movement in each country. The NOC for the United States is the USOC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 8.2 About the OEC leadership team and committee

### OEC OVERVIEW

The OEC was formed in October of 2017 with the following framework and goals.

**Purpose:** Determine if Utah should pursue a bid for the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games in either 2026 or 2030, with Salt Lake City as the host city.

**Background:** The IOC has initiated the official Discussion Period for hosting in 2026. A city must declare its intent to host by March 31, 2018. It is possible that both 2026 and 2030 could be awarded in this bid cycle.

**Objective:** Determine by February 1, 2018 if Salt Lake City should pursue a bid. A key determinant of this decision will be economic feasibility given that hosting either 2026 or 2030 would mean hosting back-to-back Olympic Games in the US, which has an impact on the amount of potential domestic sponsorship revenue.

### OEC LEADERSHIP

#### Fraser Bullock | Co-Founder | Sorenson Capital

Fraser Bullock is a Co-Founder and Senior Advisor of Sorenson Capital, a private equity firm, which has approximately $1 billion in assets under management.

Mr. Bullock began his career at Bain & Company as Consultant and Manager. He then became a founding partner of Bain Capital, a highly successful investment firm based in Boston.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBS</td>
<td>Olympic Broadcasting Services, the official broadcaster of Olympic Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCOG</td>
<td>Organizing Committee for the Olympic Games (the entity that operates the Games)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEC</td>
<td>Olympic and Paralympic Exploratory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Movement</td>
<td>A term that encompasses the organizations, athletes and other persons who operate under the Olympic Charter. It primarily refers to the IOC, the NOCs and the IFs, along with national sports organizations and their athletes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic and Paralympic Family</td>
<td>A general term that refers to leadership of the Olympic and Paralympic Movement specifically or key stakeholders (athletes, officials, etc.) more broadly depending on context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlay</td>
<td>Temporary infrastructure, installations and equipment added to an existing, new or temporary venue to make the venue “Games-ready”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City and Utah</td>
<td>Even though the official Host City would be Salt Lake City, the Games would take place throughout the Wasatch Front; except where a formal reference to Salt Lake City is needed, most of the time we refer to Utah as the Games host.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOC</td>
<td>Salt Lake Organizing Committee, the operator of the 2002 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>In reference to the Games, a stakeholder refers to athletes, officials, members of the media, the Olympic and Paralympic Family, the Games workforce, and the spectators and general public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team 2002</td>
<td>The management team of the Salt Lake 2002 Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USOC</td>
<td>United States Olympic Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 1999, Mr. Bullock became Chief Operating Officer and Chief Financial Officer of the Salt Lake Organizing Committee for the 2002 Olympic Winter Games in Salt Lake City. He played a key role in delivering one of the most successful Olympic Winter Games in history, recognized for a great athlete experience, near-flawless operations, and generating a $100 million profit. For his Olympic service, Mr. Bullock received the Olympic Order in Gold from the International Olympic Committee.

Mr. Bullock continues to be active in the Olympic Movement and has provided advisory services to: the International Olympic Committee, currently on an important IOC working group; the US Olympic Committee, serving on a governance restructuring committee and helping renegotiate the IOC/USOC revenue sharing agreement; and several cities hosting the Olympic Games, including Torino, Vancouver, Sochi, and Rio. He also served as the Chairman of the Utah Athletic Foundation, which operates the Olympic legacy venues in Utah.

Mr. Bullock has been active in his community, as Chairman of the Governor’s Education Coalition and as Vice Chair of the Governor’s Optimization Commission. He has received numerous awards— in 2016 alone he was inducted into the Utah Technology Hall of Fame, received the Lifetime Achievement Award from BusinessQ, and was named Director of the Year by Utah Business.

Mr. Bullock received a bachelor’s degree in economics and a master’s degree in Business Administration, both from BYU. He lives with his wife, Jennifer, in Alpine and they are the parents of five children and eight grandchildren.

Melissa. They have been married for thirty-five years and have five children and two grandchildren. Melissa graduated with a Bachelor’s degree in Clothing and Textiles with an emphasis in Fashion Merchandising. The Niederhauser family have made Sandy their residence for twenty-three years. They have enjoyed their involvement in the community and are committed to serving where they can to see that the quality of life they have enjoyed is preserved for future generations.

The President is a Certified Public Accountant. He is an owner and the Broker of CW Real Estate Services, a real estate development and sales company. CW focuses on residential and commercial projects that enhance a quality lifestyle and the surrounding community. They are a leader in designing open space, parks and trails as an integral part of development. Their Spring View Farms project located along the Jordan River in Bluffdale, Utah was awarded the 2004 Merit of Planning Design by Envision Utah.

President Niederhauser serves on many boards including his service as Co-Chair of the Utah Sports Commission, Chair of Senate President’s Forum (the national senate president’s association), National Vice Chair of the American Legislative Exchange Council, and member of the Executive Committee of Envision Utah.

The President has many outdoor hobbies, most of which he enjoys with his family. He has a particular passion for backcountry skiing and mountain biking. His favorite sporting event is the Tour de France and his favorite outdoor place is Moab.

Wayne Niederhauser  |  Utah Senate President

Utah Senate President Wayne Niederhauser was first elected in 2006. He is in his third term representing Senate District 9, which covers most of Sandy, Little Cottonwood Canyon and parts of Cottonwood Heights. He has served as Senate President since January 1, 2013.

President Niederhauser graduated with a Master of Accountancy degree from Utah State University in 1985. While attending the University, he met his wife, Melissa. They have been married for thirty-five years and have five children and two grandchildren. Melissa graduated with a Bachelor’s degree in Clothing and Textiles with an emphasis in Fashion Merchandising. The Niederhauser family have made Sandy their residence for twenty-three years. They have enjoyed their involvement in the community and are committed to serving where they can to see that the quality of life they have enjoyed is preserved for future generations.

The President is a Certified Public Accountant. He is an owner and the Broker of CW Real Estate Services, a real estate development and sales company. CW focuses on residential and commercial projects that enhance a quality lifestyle and the surrounding community. They are a leader in designing open space, parks and trails as an integral part of development. Their Spring View Farms project located along the Jordan River in Bluffdale, Utah was awarded the 2004 Merit of Planning Design by Envision Utah.

President Niederhauser serves on many boards including his service as Co-Chair of the Utah Sports Commission, Chair of Senate President’s Forum (the national senate president’s association), National Vice Chair of the American Legislative Exchange Council, and member of the Executive Committee of Envision Utah.

The President has many outdoor hobbies, most of which he enjoys with his family. He has a particular passion for backcountry skiing and mountain biking. His favorite sporting event is the Tour de France and his favorite outdoor place is Moab.

Jeff Robbins  |  President and CEO  |  Utah Sports Commission

Jeff Robbins is President and Chief Executive Officer of the Utah Sports Commission, the statewide public/private partnership created prior to the 2002 Olympic Winter Games to facilitate sports development, attract major sporting events and competitions to Utah and continue Utah’s Olympic legacy efforts. This organization also promotes Utah’s sports brand, Utah: The State of Sport, using national print and broadcast mediums to target sports-related recreational and tourism markets.
Mr. Robbins and the Utah Sports Commission have worked on approximately 700 events generating almost $2 billion for Utah’s economy, all while driving hundreds of millions of dollars in media value to Utah. This organization has received national awards for its marketing and advertising efforts. In this position, Mr. Robbins works with a wide range of local, national and international sports organizations to help grow Utah’s sports industry and ensure that the state’s world-class sports venues are fully utilized. He works closely with an executive committee comprised of key private, public and sports organizations and other constituents throughout Utah’s sports community. This includes working closely with the Governor, Legislature, and other key public officials.

Mr. Robbins currently is Co-Chair of Utah’s Olympic Exploratory Committee (OEC) and served on the 2012 Olympic Exploratory Committee as well. Both OEC’s worked on behalf of Utah’s Governor, Legislature and sports and business leaders to examine and prepare Utah for a future Olympic Games.

Mr. Robbins has served as Chairman of Kirilenko’s Kids Foundation, a charitable organization created by NBA All-Star Andrei Kirilenko. He also served on the boards of the Utah Tourism Office, Olympic Parks of Utah, the Economic Development Corporation of Utah, Intermountain Health Care’s The Orthopedic Specialty Hospital and the Jimmy Shea Foundation. In addition, Mr. Robbins was co-chair of the Moscow-Utah Youth Games, the summer and winter multi-sport competition held between Moscow, Russia, and the State of Utah, where he acted on behalf of the Governor of the State of Utah. Mr. Robbins also served on the Board of the Governor’s 2002 Olympic Hosting Organization, which coordinated the Governor Mike O. Leavitt’s key hosting initiatives during the 2002 Olympic Winter Games. Mr. Robbins also served on Governor Jon M. Huntsman Jr.’s transition team in 2004 focusing his efforts on tourism.

Prior to joining the Utah Sports Commission in 2000, Mr. Robbins was Director of Olympic Relations and Sports Development for the State of Utah. He also worked in the executive office of Novell, Inc. and held marketing and strategic relations positions with WordPerfect Corporation and Utah Power.

Mr. Robbins holds a bachelor’s degree from the University of Utah and an MBA from the University of Phoenix. While at the University of Utah, he competed nationally and internationally in tennis. He was an All-American at the University, ranked in the top 200 in the world in singles and 76 in the world in doubles on the ATP Tour. He was selected three times to the Parade Magazine High School All-American Tennis Team, was a member of the US Junior Davis Cup Tennis Team, and is the youngest member to be inducted in the State of Utah Tennis Hall of Fame.

**OEC BOARD MEMBERS**

- Gary Herbert | Utah Governor
- Jackie Biskupski | Salt Lake City Mayor
- Greg Hughes | Utah Speaker of the House
- Spencer F. Eccles | Chairman Emeritus / Wells Fargo Intermountain Banking Region | Recipient / Pierre de Coubertin Medal | 2002 Olympic Committee
- Jeremy Andrus | CEO / Traeger Grills
- Lane Beattie | President and CEO / Salt Lake Chamber
- Cindy Crane | President and CEO / Rocky Mountain Power
- Spencer P. Eccles | Managing Director and Co-Founder / The Cynosure Group
- Eric Heiden | MD / Heiden Orthopedic Group | Olympian
- Becky Kearns | Former Vice President Resort Banking / Zions Bank
- David Layton | President and CEO / Layton Companies
- Al Mansell | Former President / Utah State Senate
- Steve Miller | President / Miller Sports Properties
- Peter Mouskondis | President and CEO / Nicholas & Company
- Catherine Raney Norman | Olympian | Development Director / US Ski & Snowboard Foundation
- Derek Parra | Olympian | Sport Director / Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation
- Noelle Pikus Pace | Olympian | Get My Goal Consulting
- Steve Price | President and CEO / Price Real Estate
- Jim Sorenson, Jr. | Vice Chairman / Sorenson Development
- Chris Waddell | Paralympian | One Revolution Foundation
8.3 Economic impact study details

INTRODUCTION

The 2002 Olympic Winter Games enlarged Utah’s economy and left a lasting legacy. This legacy continues to grow and change as the Utah economy matures in each subsequent year since the games.

The initial impact includes the injection of outside funds that paid for the operation of the Games, new infrastructure, visitor spending, and other benefits. In the years following the Games, other economic benefits take hold as the infrastructure from the Games remains in service to residents and visitors alike, the surplus/endowment from the Games is spent, the travel and tourism industry expands, and Utah’s sports industry grows. In a like manner, many intangible benefits foster additional economic growth as Utah develops as a winter sports capital, attracts businesses related to the Olympics, and other intangibles such as increased visibility and awareness.

This report provides Utah decision-makers with a high-level summary of Utah’s living economic Olympic legacy and considers the economic prospects of a potential 2026/2030 Olympic Games. Should Utah decide to pursue another bid, we recommend an in-depth economic study that builds upon this research and provides comprehensive and detailed modeling of the economic impacts, including costs and benefits.

Economic impact of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games

The economic impacts of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games include the regional economic impact (direct, indirect, and induced effects of new money spent in the state), new infrastructure that remains in place after the Games and serves residents and visitors, the surplus leftover from the Games that benefits the local economy, travel and tourism impacts, and intangible impacts, most noticeably, highlighting Utah as a winter sports capital, expanding business development opportunities, and increasing visibility.

Regional economic impact (output, income, and jobs)

Regional economic impacts are changes in the size and structure of a region’s economy when goods and services are purchased from businesses within the region using money generated from outside of the region. The Salt Lake Organizing Committee (SLOC) spent an estimated $1.9 billion. 2018 constant dollars between 1996 and 2003 on the 2002 Games, including wages, venue
construction and enhancements, broadcasting expenses and general operational purchases. Adding additional infrastructure investments financed outside of the SLOC budget, visitor spending during the games, and federally-funded security expenses to SLOC expenditures, direct expenditures totaled an estimated $3.5 billion. After adjusting for purchases from out-of-state companies, in-state revenue sources, and the displacement of regular skier visitation, net-new direct expenditures total an estimated $2.5 billion.

Net-new direct expenditures spur additional economic activity in the region as they stimulate purchases from local suppliers, who in turn hire employees and make purchases from other local businesses. These rounds of activity produce indirect economic effects and then direct and indirect employees spend a portion of their wages in the local economy, further generating “induced” effects. The total economic impact of an event is the sum of these net-new direct, indirect, and induced effects.

All told, between 1996 and 2003, the 2002 Olympic Winter Games created total economic impacts in Utah equivalent to approximately $6.1 billion in economic output, the value of every transaction in the economy supported by the Games, 45,700 job-years of employment, and $3.0 billion in personal income.1

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Impacts of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games in Utah (1996 - 2003; CONSTANT 2018 DOLLARS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLOC Expenditures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Infrastructure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visitor Expenditures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Funds for Security</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Spending &amp; Displacement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Direct Spend</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out-of-State Spending &amp; Displacement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net New Utah Direct Spend</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Multiplier Effects</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Output</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job-years Employment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Income</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation of 2002 Olympic Winter Games Surplus (2002 DOLLARS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxpayer Repayment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endowment to Maintain Facilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charitable Contributions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>US Olympic Legacy Plazas</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>US Olympic Committee Credits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation

Olympic infrastructure

2002 Olympic Winter Games’ infrastructure includes the Utah Olympic Park (freestyle, freeride and Nordic jumps, along with sliding sports track), Olympic Oval (speed skating oval and two multi-sport ice rinks), Soldier Hollow (a new access road, ski lodge, trail system, and snowmaking/water systems), four new or improved ice rinks (located in Murray, Ogden, Provo, and West Jordan), and University of Utah facilities (Olympic Village’s 3,500 student housing capacity and Rice-Eccles Stadium expansion).

In addition, many infrastructure investments were accelerated to accommodate the Olympic Winter Games, including transportation investment (I-15 enhancements, I-80 Silver Creek and Kimball Junctions, Trappers Loop Road, and light rail transit), lodging expansion, and ski resort expansion.2

These infrastructure enhancements not only helped service the 2002 Olympic Winter Games, but have provided expanded opportunities for residents and visitors in each year since the Games. No venues have been removed since the Games, but rather remain in place and part of a vision for sport, community, and physical activity.

Games endowment and surplus

The 2002 Olympic Winter Games produced a surplus of $163.4 million, $59.0 million of which was paid back to the state of Utah per agreements made in the 1990s.2 The largest portion of the surplus ($76.0 million) was placed in an endowment for the Utah Athletic Foundation to maintain and operate Olympic facilities. The remaining funds were used for charity ($11.2 million), Olympic legacy plazas ($10.2 million), and United States Organizing Committee business credits ($7.0 million).4 The surplus continues to pay dividends to the Utah’s economy as the state has maintained its Olympic facilities and hosts world class competitions that further contribute to the Utah economy.

1 Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute January 2018 updated analysis of Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget (GOPB) estimates of the economic impacts of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games. The original GOPB study was completed in November 2000. This new analysis incorporates final budget, visitation, and other economic indicator estimates from the 2002 Games and updated economic impact modeling methodologies. See Appendix A for a description of methods and limitations. All financial figures are presented in constant 2018 dollars.
2 Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation.
3 Dollar amounts in this paragraph are 2002 dollars.
4 Based on consultation with the Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation.
Travel and tourism: before, during and after

The Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute evaluated visitation data before, during and after the Games. The analysis confirms the positive post Olympics trajectory of the Utah travel and tourism industry. Possible explanations for these increases include the increased exposure from the Olympics, global and national economic conditions, non-Olympic marketing efforts, tourism infrastructure investment, and other factors.

Table 3 provides a summary of travel and tourism performance indicators before and after the 2002 Olympic Winter Games.

Table 3
Travel and Tourism Performance Before and After the 2002 Olympic Winter Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent change in average visitation/passengers/employment 14 years prior and after</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE NUMBER OF SKIER DAYS</td>
<td>+ 43 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL PARK RECREATION VISITS</td>
<td>+ 25 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOMMODATION TAXABLE SALES</td>
<td>+ 60 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLC INT’L AIRPORT PASSENGERS</td>
<td>+ 25 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEISURE AND HOSPITALITY EMPLOYMENT</td>
<td>+ 47 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISITOR SPENDING</td>
<td>+ 99 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Analysis prepared by the Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute based on published sources

Highlights of the visitation analysis include the following:

Skier days - Utah experienced a 43% increase in the average number of annual skier days in the 14 years after the 2002 Olympic Winter Games compared to the 14 years before the games.

We also observe a clear displacement effect as the nearly three-week Olympic events (including Olympic and Paralympic Games) “crowds out” visitors who would otherwise visit the state. Original estimates by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget predicted 3.8 million skier visits during the 2001/2002 ski season, with a 20% displacement of ski visitors, for an estimate of 3.1 million visits.5

We estimate skier visit displacement effects in 2002 at Utah ski resorts of 5%-9% fewer visits. Alternatively, national park visits, accommodation taxable sales, airport passengers, and private leisure and hospitality employment were higher in 2002 than 2001.

National park visits - Utah’s national parks experienced a 25% increase in the average number of annual recreation visits in the 14 years after the 2002 Olympic Winter Games compared to the 14 years before the games. Visititation to Utah’s national parks during the first quarter of 2002 was 30% higher than during the first quarter of 2001. In fact, visitation at Utah’s five national parks remained, on average, higher than the year prior and the year after the Games through the spring of 2002. Likewise, all Utah visitor centers reported increased visitation in February 2002 compared to February 2001.

National park recreation visits accelerated from 2014 through 2016. Many attribute this to the success of the Utah Office of Tourism’s Mighty Five© ad campaign, providing one more indication of the impact of visibility and marketing on Utah’s travel and tourism industry.

Accommodation sales – Utah experienced a 60% increase in the average annual taxable accommodation sales in the 14 years after the 2002 Olympic Winter Games compared to the 14 years before the games. Taxable accommodation sales during the first quarter of 2002 were 21% higher than the same time period during the prior year, and 30% higher than the first quarter of the following year. In February 2002, lodging room rates across northern Utah were up over 50% compared to February 2001 and lodging occupancies were up anywhere from 10% to 30% as well.6

Airport passengers – The Salt Lake City International Airport experienced a 25% increase in its average annual (enplaned and deplaned) passengers in the 14 years after the 2002 Olympic Winter Games compared to the 14 years before the Games. However, in the first quarter of 2002, total passenger numbers were down 6% compared to the first quarter of 2001.7

Table 4
Estimated Skier Visit Displacement in 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SKIER VISITS</th>
<th>% DIFF FROM 2001</th>
<th>% DIFF FROM 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>3,278,291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>2,984,574</td>
<td>- 8.96 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>3,141,212</td>
<td>- 4.99 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute

5 2002 Olympic Winter Games Economic, Demographics, and Fiscal Impacts report by the Utah Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget: https://governor.utah.gov/DEA/Publications/Backup/Old/oly/lob.htm.

6 Research Evaluation of the Salt Lake City 2002 Winter Olympics presentation by Jon Kemp of the Utah Division of Travel Development.

7 Ibid.
Leisure and hospitality employment – Utah’s average annual private leisure and hospitality employment base was 47 percent higher in the 14 years after the 2002 Olympic Winter Games compared to the 14 years before the Games; the average annual base for all other private-sector jobs was 42 percent higher in 14 years after the Games compared to the 14 years prior. In the first quarter of 2002, Utah Department of Workforce Services reported an average of 6,926 more direct private leisure and hospitality jobs, a 7 percent increase over the first quarter of 2001 5 percent higher than the first quarter of 2003. Specifically, private arts, entertainment, and recreation jobs were up nearly 25 percent during the first quarter of 2002 compared to the previous year, while accommodation and restaurant jobs were up 4 percent.

Visitor spending – Consumer Visa card spending between February 1st and 24th of 2002 was up 31% from the same time frame during the previous year.6 Average annual taxable leisure and hospitality sales were up 59% in the 14 years after the 2002 Olympic Winter Games compared to the 14 years before the Games. All other average annual taxable sales were up 38% in comparison. Total taxable leisure and hospitality sales in 2002 were 4% higher than both 2001 and 2003; all other taxable sales (non-leisure and hospitality) in 2002 were 3% lower than 2001 and 2% higher than 2003.

Intangibles

In addition to the quantifiable benefits, the hosting of an Olympic Games brings with it many difficult to quantify, but important economic impacts. These include, but are not limited to, the following6:

• Intercultural experiences
• Popular memory
• Production of ideas
• Collective effort and volunteerism
• New sport practitioners
• Notoriety on a global scale
• Experience and know-how
• Reputation

These, and many other, difficult to pin down and less recognized benefits still have economic value. Some intangible benefits lead to increased income and employment in the region; others contribute to life quality, which further improves economic outcomes. Some intangibles may even detract from the economy, as is the case of increased congestion or impacts on cost of living and housing.

Three prominent intangible benefits from the 2002 Olympic Winter Games include the following:

1) Visibility and awareness, 2) Winter sports capital, and 3) Business development. We provide examples and lists of these benefits as an expression of their importance and contribution.

Visibility and awareness

The 2002 Olympic Winter Games created an unprecedented opportunity to share Utah with the world. The Utah Division of Travel Development (now the Utah Office of Tourism) estimated the following visibility and awareness benefits:

• TV viewership – 2.1 billion viewers in 160 countries and territories amassed 13.1 billion viewer hours. The US audience included 187 million viewers who watched 27 hours of Olympic coverage.
• Visitors – 220,000 total visitors (90,000 domestic, 15,000 international, 64,000 sponsors and guests, 15,000 Olympic organizations, 15,000 media representatives, 15,000 security personnel, and 6,000 VIPs.) 1.5 million tickets were sold to Olympic events.
• Print media exposure – The estimated value of tourism print media exposure from the Games is $22.9 million.
• Ad campaign – Television ads promoting Utah tourism aired in select markets reaching an estimated 6.1 million people the week of the Games. Follow-up ads reached another estimated 7.6 million.
• Delta Air Lines promotion – An estimated 2.2 million Delta Air Lines passengers viewed the 27-minute Bud Greenspan film Discover Utah!
• VIP visitors – Leaders from 77 countries and eight Presidential Cabinet Members visited Utah.
• State hosting – State hosting efforts included 96 receptions involving trade delegations from 21 countries and 18,400 participants. Ten receptions were hosted by the state in large cities along the torch relay route.
• Corporate guests – Business leaders welcomed 350 venture capitalists and 600 corporate guests to Utah during the Games.10

Taken together, these exposure, marketing, hosting, and visitation opportunities created visibility for Utah that is without precedent.

Winter sports capital – marquee events

Since the 2002 Games, the Olympic facilities and slopes remain world-class. They have been used to host over 165 national and international competitions including more than 60 World Cup events, seven world championships and

---

6 Source: Salt Lake Chamber.

---

6 Research Evaluation of the Salt Lake City 2002 Winter Olympics presentation by Jon Kemp of the Utah Division of Travel Development.
many high-attendance sporting events. Table 5 provides a sampling of major Olympic-related World Cups and Championships hosted in Utah since 2002.

Winter sports capital – athlete involvement

Additionally, Utah has become a training center for many world-class athletes and Olympians, as well as two USOC National Governing Bodies and several national sport organizations. They include the following:

- US Ski and Snowboard Association (USSA)
- US Speedskating
- Women’s Ski Jumping USA
- USA Nordic (USANS)

Utah possesses ideal conditions for Olympic athletes to train for upcoming competitions. Utah is also home to many Olympians. Examples of the extent of athlete engagement include, but are not limited to, the following:

- 40% of the Olympians who participated in the 2010 Vancouver Olympic Games live in Utah
- Since 2005, 130 USSA athletes have taken classes at Westminster College in Salt Lake City, Utah with 14 qualifying for the 2010 Olympics
- 10% of all US Olympic team members competing in the 2014 Sochi Olympic Games were attending Westminster College
- If Utah were competing as its own country at the Sochi Olympic Games, it would have finished 10th in overall medal count (5 Gold, 4 Silver, 2 Bronze)
- The historic, first Women’s Ski Jumping team to compete in the Sochi Olympic Games were all Park City, Utah natives
- USSA constructed a $22 million Center of Excellence national training and education center, providing world-class training facilities and educational resource for athletes, coaches and officials in Park City, Utah
- Between 2014 and 2017, the Utah Office of Tourism’s winter ad campaigns have featured local Utah Olympians and Paralympians (Sage Kotsenburg, Karl Malone, Chris Waddeli), as well as a local Olympic hopeful (Brolin Mawejje)

Business development

Utah has become a more appealing place for businesses because of the success of the 2002 Winter Olympic Games and the increased awareness of Utah’s “State of Sport” brand image. The Utah Sports Commission is tasked with building “Utah: the State of Sport.” As part of its sports and legacy efforts, the Utah Sports Commission reports it has partnered on approximately 700 sporting events, driving an estimated $1.5 billion to Utah’s economy and several hundred

---

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>FIS Alpine World Cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>FIS Freestyle World Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Luge World Cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Luge Junior World Cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Essent ISU World Cup Speed Skating, Spring Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>World Cup Short Track Speed Skating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Visa Jumping World Cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2017</td>
<td>Freestyle World Cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>FIS Ski Jumping World Cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>ISU World Sprint Speed Skating Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>FIL World Luge Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>FIS Freestyle World Cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>US Cross Country Skiing Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Essent ISU World All Distance World Cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Speed Skating Olympic Trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>US Cross Country Skiing Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>FIS Freestyle World Cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Luge Junior Nationals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>US Cross Country Junior Olympic Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>International Skating Union Single Distances Speed Skating World Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2012</td>
<td>NBC Sports Dew Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>FIS Freestyle Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Samsung ISU World Cup Speedskating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Ski Halfpipe World Cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>USA Hockey High School Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>USA Volleyball US Open Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2019</td>
<td>US International Figure Skating Classic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>US Cross Country Nationals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014, 2017</td>
<td>US Speedskating Olympic Trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>Luge World Cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>US Speedskating National Championships Short Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>US Figure Skating Nationals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>IBSF Para Bobsled &amp; Skeleton World Cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>US Speed Skating Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Lieissman Luge World Cup &amp; BMW Sprint World Cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Grand Prix Luge &amp; Snowboardcross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>IBSF Bobsled &amp; Skeleton World Cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>FIS Nordic Junior and U23 World Cup Ski Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>US Olympic Team Trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Curling Arena Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Freestyle and Snowboard FIS World Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>US Speed Skating World Single Distance Championships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled and estimated by the Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute based on conversations with the Utah Olympic Exploratory Committee.
million in media value to the state. In 2016, direct travel and tourism spending in Utah was $8.40 billion, which supported approximately 144,200 total jobs and $5.6 billion in total wages.\textsuperscript{12} The Outdoor Industry Association estimates Utah’s outdoor sports and recreation industry annually generates $12.3 billion in spending, 110,000 direct jobs and $3.9 billion in direct wages.\textsuperscript{13}

After the 2002 Games, prominent polling firm Wirthlin Worldwide surveyed Fortune 1000 executives who watched the 2002 Olympic Winter Games and asked if they were more or less likely to move to Utah for a job or business opportunity. The data showed a 6% increase in those who were “total likely” to move to Utah for an opportunity after viewing the 2002 Games.

A variety of Utah companies have their roots in the 2002 Olympic Winter Games. Some examples include the following:

- **Fusion Imaging** - awarded the largest graphics contract for the 2002 Games, it was “THE job that put Fusion Imaging on the map.” Fusion Imaging now has multiple high-profile clients such as The New York Marathon, Bill Clinton’s Global Initiative, and is a preferred vendor for Nike. (fusionimaging.com, 2017)

- **Skullcandy** - the idea for the brand was born on a chairlift, and took off at the conclusion of the Olympics. Skullcandy made the slopes of the mountains in Utah their headquarters, honing in on the fusion of winter sport and music. Skullcandy frequently supports athletes and three-time Olympian Emily Cook is the manager of the company’s Sport and Human Potential. (TSE Consulting, 2016)

- **LDD Partners** - Ron Heffernan left Utah after college for New York City where he founded consulting firm LDD Partners. It was not until the 2002 Olympic Winter Games pushed Salt Lake City to improve their infrastructure that LDD Partners opened an office in Utah. “Salt lake City is a soft landing city for international companies that are looking to launch their businesses because we have the infrastructure, resources and... this is directly attributable to the Olympics.” (US Chamber of Commerce, Aug 5, 2016)

- **Cuisine Unlimited** - Maxine Turner, founder, describes the impact of the Olympics in this way: “The impact on our local company is one that we have felt for more than a decade since the Salt Lake games. It has taken us to Beijing, Vancouver, London, Sochi, and Rio now having been involved with seven Olympic Games. It has given our company unparalleled experiences and a legacy rich in cultures, international cuisines and certainly catering opportunities. Without a doubt, it has changed the face of our company and resulted in national recognition. Best of all, we keep in touch with people from across the globe.” (Maxine Turner, 2017)

- **Infinite Scale** – The Company was founded following the 2002 Olympic Winter Games in Salt Lake City. The company’s three partners all relocated to Salt Lake to work on the Games and following the completion of the Games, chose to stay in Salt Lake and start Infinite Scale. Recent projects include the World Cup of Hockey game, NHL All-Star game, and the Little Caesars Arena in Detroit. (Matt Caldwell, 2017)

- **Vista Outdoor** - Vista Outdoor spun off from Alliant Techsystems Inc. and established its headquarters in Clearfield, Utah, creating 90 high-paying, high-skilled jobs for the community. “The state takes advantage of its four season environment,” said Chairman and CEO, Mark DeYoung. “It has great infrastructure, including facilities built for the 2002 Winter Olympics... Utah focuses on outdoor recreation as a market segment, so it has welcomed us as a producer of equipment for hunting, skiing, golf and other outdoor activities.” (Forbes, 2015)

- **Winter sport companies** – A variety of winter sport companies have established a presence in Utah since 2002. These include Amer Sports, Descente North America, Kahuna Creations, Goode Ski Technologies, Scott USA, SnowSports Interactive, and Rossignol. (Salt Lake Chamber, 2017)

### ECONOMIC PROSPECTS FOR A POTENTIAL 2030 OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES BID

From an economic perspective, there are two major differences between the 2002 Games and the 2026/2030 Games.

1. **More winter sports** - Since 2002, the Olympic Winter Games have added sports, which means more athletes and viewers. We estimate the 2030 Olympic Winter Games will be approximately 8% larger than 2002 in terms of tickets sold and, with more attendees and increases in spending pattern,
visitor spending will be over 40% higher (inflation-adjusted dollars). We also expect the number of event days and television viewership to be 19%-35% larger. Other things being equal, this growth in sports, events, and viewers will create a larger economic footprint in Utah than the 2002 Games.

2. More efficient games - A Salt Lake City bid in 2030 will have a smaller budget, other things being equal, than 2002 because most of the facilities are already in place. This means Salt Lake City can host extremely efficient games from a budgeting perspective. We estimate the organizing committee budget to be 9.8% less in 2030 than in 2002 because of less infrastructure spending (inflation-adjusted dollars). While investment in the Olympic speed skating oval, bobsleigh tracks, ski jumping facilities, cross-country track, athlete housing, and other facilities will still be needed, the investment will be much less than in 2002 and much less than in other potential host cities. Other things being equal, this efficiency will create a smaller economic footprint in Utah than the 2002 Games.

Table 6 provides a side-by-side comparison of the estimated economic reach of 2002 and 2030.

Table 6
Estimated Economic Reach Comparisons 2002 and 2026/2030 Olympic Winter Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>% DIFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZING COMMITTEE BUDGET</td>
<td>$1.53 B</td>
<td>$1.29 B</td>
<td>-15.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TICKETS</td>
<td>1.525 M</td>
<td>1.641 M</td>
<td>7.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENT DAYS</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>34.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISITOR SPENDING</td>
<td>$178 M</td>
<td>$255 M</td>
<td>43.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEVISION VIEWERS</td>
<td>2.1 B</td>
<td>2.5 B</td>
<td>19.1 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All dollar figures reflect direct, in-state expenditures.

Source: Compiled and estimated by the Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute based on conversations with the Utah Olympic Exploratory Committee.

Additionally, based on our analysis of Utah’s travel and tourism industry before and after the 2002 Olympic Winter Games, we expect skier visits, national park recreation visits, accommodation taxable sales, airport passengers, and private leisure and hospitality employment to continue a positive growth trajectory after another Olympic Winter Games. A growth trend of 25%-60% over 14 years, depending on the indicator, would be consistent with past experience.

Given these comparisons, we conservatively estimate the 2030 Olympic Winter Games will create at least as large an economic impact as the 2002 Games. This impact will occur as new money is brought into the state (host broadcaster, visitor spending, sponsors, federal funds and other sources) and then circulates throughout the economy creating indirect and induced economic effects.

Further, Utah’s travel and tourism industry will benefit from infrastructure investment and the increased visibility from hosting the Olympic Games. The 5%-9% skier visit displacement observed in 2002 can be mitigated with advanced marketing and planning.

Finally, the intangible benefits of Utah’s continuing ascension as a winter sports capital (home to world class events and elite athletes), business development opportunities, increased visibility and awareness, and other intangibles further strengthens the economic impact of hosting another Olympic Winter Games.

If Utah pursues another Olympic Games, decision-makers would be wise to commission a detailed economic study that builds upon this research and comprehensively models the economic impact of another games, including benefits and costs.

APPENDIX A

Regional economic Impact analysis methods and limitations

The Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute used the REMI PI+ model to update the economic impact analysis of the 2002 Games originally completed by the Utah Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget (GOPB) in 2002. REMI is a dynamic model that incorporates input-output, economic geography, econometric, and general equilibrium components.

We derived direct effect model inputs using final expenditure information provided by the Utah Exploratory Committee, original GOPB data input tables, and a November 2001 Government Accountability Office report on federal expenditures for Olympics Games. Our limited scope review did not allow for a precise accounting of the allocation of the portion of SLOC purchases that did not cover compensation, broadcasting, and construction, actual non-SLOC infrastructure investments, or the timing of expenditures; we used the original GOPB work to develop assumptions where actual data was unavailable. Further, since no visitor survey research was done during the games, we used the visitor spending inputs developed by GOPB. This analysis does not contemplate the additional economic impacts associated with allocation of surplus funds, including the Olympic Legacy Foundation endowment. Because of these limitations, the results of this analysis should be viewed as signaling an economic impact of a significant magnitude and not necessarily an exact enumeration of impacts.

8.4 Climate analysis

POTENTIAL CLIMATE IMPACTS

Utah’s Wasatch Mountains and legendary snow create a unique setting for the Games. Due to the impacts of human-caused climate change, there are three major climate risks.

Stronger high-pressure ridges

The likelihood of strong, high-pressure ridges could create challenges with air quality, temperatures, and natural snowfall. These high-pressure ridges, referred to as quasi-stationary high amplitude atmospheric wave patterns, affect the western United States with dry and warm conditions. The ridge does not allow smaller storms to pass through, resulting in drought-like conditions and impaired air quality. These events have become stronger and more frequent. This will result in a significantly higher probability of inversions in the Salt Lake region, and diminished natural snowfall in the mountains.

Fewer sub-freezing days

Utah has shown a steady decline of days below freezing since 1970. This trend is projected to continue through 2030 and result in an estimated loss of 10 to 15 days of days below freezing. The Soldier Hollow venue is at most risk of loss of cold temperatures.

Significant warm events

In early spring, there has been a higher occurrence of prolonged unseasonable temperatures. This causes quick melting, flooding, and loss of snowpack. An example of this event was during February 2017. The winter had produced record snowfall in many areas, and below 7,000 feet held a robust snowpack. February saw record temperatures throughout the west, resulting in expedited melting. Heber Airport reported 19 consecutive days with temperatures (33-60°F) significantly above freezing (Image 5). The resulting melt created flooding. Snowpack below 7,000 feet completely melted out in less than two weeks. This would create a challenge in maintaining world-class venues. Soldier Hollow could be the most affected. Due to its current elevation (5,645 feet), and International Ski Federation (FIS) specifications, the Nordic venue cannot be moved to a higher elevation. Significant infrastructure improvements at Soldier Hollow may be needed to host events in light of these climatic challenges.

8.5 Letters of support from venue owners / operators

DEER VALLEY

January 10, 2018

Colin Hilton
Utah Olympic Exploratory Committee
Venue Outreach Workgroup
CIO Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation
P.O. Box 982337
Park City, UT 84098

Dear Colin,

As per our discussion, Deer Valley has strong interest in becoming a venue for either the 2026 or 2030 Olympic Winter Games. Our experience as a venue for Salt Lake City’s 2002 Games was such that we would be pleased and proud to again participate in whatever fashion, and for whatever disciplines, the Committee deems best suited to our resort and the overall effort.

In addition, we are supportive of the IOC’s agenda item for their upcoming 2020 meeting regarding discussion of effective coordination of venue-operating plans and are happy to provide any information that might be helpful for the conversation.

Thank you for the efforts of the Utah Olympic Exploratory Committee. We are excited about the possibility of once again becoming a venue, and hopefully look forward to working with you to host the 2026 or 2030 Olympic Winter Games.

Sincerely,

[Beth Winedo]
President/COO
Deer Valley Resort
January 15, 2018

Mr. Colin Hilton
Olympic Exploratory Committee
Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation
3419 Olympic Parkway
Park City, UT 84098

Dear Colin and Members of the Olympic Exploratory Committee,

Thank you for including Park City Mountain in discussions around hosting certain Olympic events in the 2026 or 2030 Olympic Games to potentially be held in Utah. While there are obviously still many details that will need to be worked out and economic and other impacts that will require full review and consideration, Park City Mountain is interested in furthering confidential and non-binding discussions around hosting certain Olympic events at Park City Mountain.

Sincerely,

Bill Rock
Senior Vice President and Chief Operating Officer
Park City Mountain Resort

January 5, 2018

Venue Outreach Work Group of the Utah Olympic Exploratory Committee
Attention: Colin Hilton, Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation
P.O. Box 560337
3419 Olympic Parkway
Park City, UT 84098

Dear Venue Outreach Work Group—

With wholehearted enthusiasm on behalf of Larry H. Miller Sports & Entertainment, we formally express our interest and willingness to use our downstat Salt Lake City arena as a competition venue in Utah’s bid for the 2026 or 2030 Olympic Winter Games.

This venue has an honorable legacy as an Olympic host. In our building known as the “Salt Lake Ice Center,” we were proud to host the figure skating and short track speed skating events as part of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games. Our future participation would support the Olympic Agenda 2020 platform of sustainability for its host venues.

Owned and operated by the Larry H. Miller Group of Companies, the currently named Vivint Smart Home Arena completed an extensive $125 million renovation in 2017 on all six levels of the building to enhance the guest and athlete experience.

New features include a 12,000-square-foot atrium as the main entrance, redesigned lower and upper bowl concourses with new fully cushioned seats in the bowls, rebooted technology with high-speed public WiFi and destination dining restaurants. Seating capacity for basketball games is 18,306 spectators.

Vivint Smart Home Arena opened in 1991 as the homecourt of the NBA Utah Jazz. It is a premier facility for sports and entertainment events, and our organization would be thrilled to once again be part of the Olympic legacy for this next generation.

Sincerely,

Steve Starks
President, Utah Jazz
President, Larry H. Miller Sports & Entertainment
Dear Colin,

First and foremost, I would like to thank you for your efforts and outreach in acquiring information and most importantly our interest in being a host venue for either the 2026 or 2030 Olympic Games.

I have met with all parties involved in our ability to be a host venue and received unanimous support. The three main entities involved in an undertaking of this size are Weber County, Weber State University and Ogden City. We have the benefit of personal at all three entities that participated during the 2002 Games and will gladly lend experience and understand the scope.

We also are on board with "IOC Agenda 2020", that strives for a more effective coordination between organizers and venue operations staff. Utah has an amazing palate of venues, that have been maintained to a high standard throughout the years, and therefore give us a chance to start years ahead of the curve for hosting the games. As an example, our facility has added 57,000 square feet of space that will allow the Weber County Ice Sheet to create a world class experience for both athletes and spectators.

Thank you,

Todd Ferrario
Division Director, Weber County Parks and Recreation
Office 801-778-6354  Cell 661-319-6080
tferrario@co.weber.ut.us
January 15, 2018

Members of the Venue Outreach Workgroup

c/o Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation

PO Box 980337

3419 Olympic Parkway

Park City, UT 84098

RE: Venue Use for Future Olympic and Paralympic Games

Members of the Venue Outreach Workgroup:

On behalf of the Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation (UOLF), I am confirming 100% support of our Foundation toward utilization of our three legacy venues – Utah Olympic Park, Utah Olympic Oval, and Soldier Hollow Nordic Center – for a future Olympic and Paralympic Games in Utah. Our board and staff are excited at the prospect of using our well-maintained and highly-utilized facilities to host the world again.

Our Foundation and collective communities within the state have spent significant time and resources to effectively operate and maintain these venues for a host of athlete training, competitions and community uses. We feel we are showcasing a powerful and purposeful path toward promoting the values of Olympism and Olympic Agenda 2020 at a grassroots level.

We look forward to the next steps in the process!

Sincerely,

Colin Hilton
President & CEO, Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation
Poll shows strong statewide support for hosting future Olympic Winter Games

Olympic/Paralympic Exploratory Committee (OEC) discusses state’s readiness to host games during initial meeting

SALT LAKE CITY (November 21, 2017) – A new statewide poll shows 89 percent of Utahns are in favor of hosting a future Olympic Winter Games.

“Historically the citizens of Utah have been extremely supportive of Utah hosting the Olympic Winter Games,” said Jeff Robbins, president and CEO of the Utah Sports Commission and co-chair of the OEC. “The results of the poll are clear: Utah and its citizens are ready, willing and able to host the games again.”

Conducted by Dan Jones & Associates, the poll surveyed 600 people across the state from November 14-21 and has a margin of error of four points.

“In many ways, we are even better prepared to host the games today than we were 15 years ago,” said Senate Pres. Wayne Niederhauser, who also co-chairs the OEC. “With such strong support from people across the state we can continue our work as a committee to verify that we are as able as we are willing and ready to host again.”

The OEC held its first official meeting yesterday at the Salt Lake City Mayor’s Office. Meeting agenda items included budget, transportation, venues, environment and climate, legal, Utah economic impact, promotional value, and public opinion. The United States Olympic Committee (USOC) previously announced its desire to put forth a bid for an upcoming Winter Olympics, but still has yet to determine a specific year. For now, the Utah-based OEC is preparing for future games, without knowing when the next bid window will be.

“Our ongoing commitment to building an Olympic legacy has allowed us to utilize our facilities to host additional events and play an important role in training American athletes,” said Fraser Bullock, who served as COO of SLOC for the 2002 games and is co-chair of the OEC. “Clearly that has helped keep the Olympic spirit burning in the hearts of the people of our state.”

The OEC will provide recommendation to its board by February 1, 2018. Future OEC meeting dates are available here: https://www.utah.gov/pms/index.html

8.6 Public poll press release
8.7 Candidature Committee budget

The following table reflects projected costs for a Candidature Committee to pursue the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games in 2018 dollars. Projections are based on available information regarding the 2026 Candidature Process and are subject to change based on the needs of a campaign. Potential savings to this projection may be identified in collaboration with public stakeholders and the USOC, IOC, and IPC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PROJECTED COSTS (2018 VALUES IN MILLIONS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BID OPERATIONS</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE AND OFFICE EXPENSES, TRAVEL, ETC.</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFFING &amp; TECHNICAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>STAFF AND ADVISOR FEES, TECHNICAL STUDIES</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCTION</td>
<td>MAJOR MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS, CANDIDATURE FILE PRODUCTION, TRANSLATION, WEBSITE AND SOCIAL MEDIA, GRAPHIC DESIGN, FILMS, ETC.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATIONS &amp; PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS, PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PROGRAMS, COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINGENCY &amp; BID-TO-HOST TRANSITION</td>
<td>CONTINGENCY COSTS AND COSTS TO ENSURE CONTINUITY UNTIL OCOG INCEPTION</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SIGNED RESOLUTION, MARCH 2015

Enrolled Copy

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF UTAH’S SPORT AND OLYMPIC LEGACY EFFORTS

2015 GENERAL SESSION
STATE OF UTAH
Chief Sponsor: J. Stuart Adams
House Sponsor: Steve Eliason

LONG TITLE

General Description:

This concurrent resolution of the Legislature and the Governor acknowledges the important role that Utah’s sport and Olympic legacy activities play in our economy and branding.

Highlighted Provisions:

This resolution:

• expresses support for Utah's ongoing sport and Olympic legacy activities;
• expresses appreciation for and support of Utah's efforts to continue to strengthen and expand its position as "The State of Sport" in the national and international sport and Olympic spaces; and
• encourages Utah to remain "ready, willing, and able" as the opportunity arises to continue to host major sporting events of all kinds and be prepared should an opportunity arise to host a future Olympic Games.

Special Clauses:

None

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the state of Utah, the Governor concurring therein:

WHEREAS, the 2002 Olympic and Paralympic Games was an unforgettable and truly remarkable event in the history of Salt Lake City and the state of Utah;

WHEREAS, the 2002 Olympic and Paralympic Games left a powerful and lasting
impressive impact that has facilitated Utah's ability to build a robust sports brand and create a significant
Olympic legacy;
WHEREAS, Utah's sports brand has been an ongoing benefit to Utah's citizens, the
state's image, and the state's economy;
WHEREAS, Utah continues to invest in sport and Olympic legacy activities that are
being conducted at an extraordinarily high level;
WHEREAS, Utah has hosted hundreds of major Olympic and non-Olympic sporting
events since the 2002 Games that have enhanced Utah's economy, image, and global position
in sport;
WHEREAS, Utah's world-class Olympic and non-Olympic venues continue to host
events and train athletes and also allow Utah's citizens to use and enjoy these world-class
facilities;
WHEREAS, Utah's sports community continues to be unified in its effort to strengthen
Utah's sport and Olympic legacy initiatives and amplify Utah's global sport brand as "The State
of Sport";
WHEREAS, Utah continues to actively partner with and support the mission and
charter of the United States Olympic Committee, the International Olympic Committee, and
many other partners who are helping Utah enhance its sport and Olympic legacy;
WHEREAS, Utah's sport and Olympic legacy efforts continue to leverage and use
significant 2002 Games infrastructure and assets, including athletic and related venues,
transportation improvements, "green" initiatives, and many other elements from the 2002
Olympic Winter Games that continue to provide significant benefit to Utah's citizens and
economy;
WHEREAS, because of Utah's excellence in hosting the 2002 Winter Olympic and
Paralympic Games, extraordinary sport and institutional knowledge continue to be used in the
hosting of many major sporting events of all types; and
WHEREAS, Utah is "The State of Sport," and sport and Olympic legacy activities
continue to generate and drive significant economic benefit and return on investment to Utah's

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislature of the state of Utah, the
Governor concurs therein, expresses support and encouragement to the Utah Sports
Commission and its many partners, including the Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation, venues,
sports partners, the national governing bodies of sport and international sports federations,
community partners, volunteers, and others in their efforts to keep Utah well positioned
globally in sports and the Olympic movement so that when the opportunity arises, Utah will
stand "ready, willing, and able" to welcome the world back.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be sent to the International
Olympic Committee, the United States Olympic Committee, the Utah Sports Commission, the
Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation, the Governor's Office of Economic Development, the Utah
State Chamber of Commerce, and the members of Utah's congressional delegation.
USOC announces 242-member 2018 U.S. Olympic Team, 77 athletes share ties to the state of Utah

PARK CITY, UT (January 26, 2018) – Since the 2002 Salt Lake Olympic Winter Games, the Olympic spirit has continued to thrive in the state of Utah. The 2017/18 winter competition season has been full of events with fierce competition among top international athletes on World Cup circuits – as well as American athletes vying for spots on Team USA.

The event season between November and January at Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation venues included the 2018 U.S. Olympic Trials Short Track, 2018 U.S. Olympic Trials Nordic Combined & Ski Jumping, BMW IBSF World Cup Bobsled & Skeleton, and ISU World Cup Speed Skating.

With the announcement of the 242-member 2018 U.S. Olympic Team by the United States Olympic Committee, Utah’s Olympic legacy continues to shine with 77 athletes sharing ties to the state heading to PyeongChang, South Korea. Utah is also proud to have ties to Paralympic athletes. Official team announcements are scheduled for the middle of February.

The number of athletes with Utah ties has increased notably since the 2014 Olympic Winter Games with a 50% increase in native Utahns.

“The Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation venues are busier than ever with competitions and training—a testament to Utah’s continued commitment to the Winter Olympic movement,” said Colin Hilton, CEO and President of the Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation.

Highlights of athletes with Utah ties:

- 77 athletes of the 242-member team have a connection to Utah
- 16 Olympic athletes are native Utahns
- 49 Olympic athletes are native Utahns or train primarily in Utah
- 16 sport disciplines represented including: aerials, alpine skiing, bobsled, cross-country skiing, figure skating, halfpipe skiing, halfpipe snowboarding, long track speed skating, luge, moguls, Nordic combined, short track speed skating, skeleton, ski jumping, slopestyle skiing and snowboardcross.

2018 U.S. Olympic Team

NATIVE TO UTAH

Jerica Tandiman, Long Track Speedskating
Sarah Hendrickson, Ski Jumping
Will Tweedie, Ski Jumping
Abby Ringquist, Ski Jumping
Nathan Chen, Figure Skating
Chris Fogt, Bobsled
Rosie Brennan, Cross-Country Skiing
Nolan Kasper, Alpine Skiing
Ted Ligety, Alpine Skiing
Steven Nyman, Alpine Skiing
Jared Goldberg, Alpine Skiing

8.9 Team USA at PyeongChang 2018 with ties to Utah

UTAH OLYMPIC LEGACY FOUNDATION PRESS RELEASE, JANUARY 26, 2018

USOC announces 242-member 2018 U.S. Olympic Team, 77 athletes share ties to the state of Utah

PARK CITY, UT (January 26, 2018) – Since the 2002 Salt Lake Olympic Winter Games, the Olympic spirit has continued to thrive in the state of Utah. The 2017/18 winter competition season has been full of events with fierce competition among top international athletes on World Cup circuits – as well as American athletes vying for spots on Team USA.

The event season between November and January at Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation venues included the 2018 U.S. Olympic Trials Short Track, 2018 U.S. Olympic Trials Nordic Combined & Ski Jumping, BMW IBSF World Cup Bobsled & Skeleton, and ISU World Cup Speed Skating.

With the announcement of the 242-member 2018 U.S. Olympic Team by the United States Olympic Committee, Utah’s Olympic legacy continues to shine with 77 athletes sharing ties to the state heading to PyeongChang, South Korea. Utah is also proud to have ties to Paralympic athletes. Official team announcements are scheduled for the middle of February.

The number of athletes with Utah ties has increased notably since the 2014 Olympic Winter Games with a 50% increase in native Utahns.

“The Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation venues are busier than ever with competitions and training—a testament to Utah’s continued commitment to the Winter Olympic movement,” said Colin Hilton, CEO and President of the Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation.

Highlights of athletes with Utah ties:

- 77 athletes of the 242-member team have a connection to Utah
- 16 Olympic athletes are native Utahns
- 49 Olympic athletes are native Utahns or train primarily in Utah
- 16 sport disciplines represented including: aerials, alpine skiing, bobsled, cross-country skiing, figure skating, halfpipe skiing, halfpipe snowboarding, long track speed skating, luge, moguls, Nordic combined, short track speed skating, skeleton, ski jumping, slopestyle skiing and snowboardcross.

2018 U.S. Olympic Team

NATIVE TO UTAH

Jerica Tandiman, Long Track Speedskating
Sarah Hendrickson, Ski Jumping
Will Tweedie, Ski Jumping
Abby Ringquist, Ski Jumping
Nathan Chen, Figure Skating
Chris Fogt, Bobsled
Rosie Brennan, Cross-Country Skiing
Nolan Kasper, Alpine Skiing
Ted Ligety, Alpine Skiing
Steven Nyman, Alpine Skiing
Jared Goldberg, Alpine Skiing
Megan McJames, Alpine Skiing
McRae Williams, Slopestyle Skiing
Alex Hall, Slopestyle Skiing
Madison Olsen, Aerials
Taylor Morris, Luge

TRAIN PRIMARILY IN UTAH

Maame Biney, Short Track Speedskating
J.R. Celski, Short Track Speedskating
Lana Gehring, Short Track Speedskating
Thomas Hong, Short Track Speedskating
Aaron Tran, Short Track Speedskating
Brittany Bowe, Long Track Speedskating
Jonathan Garcia, Long Track Speedskating
Erik Jackson, Long Track Speedskating
Mia Manganello, Long Track Speedskating
Joey Mantia, Long Track Speedskating
Carlijn Schoutens, Long Track Speedskating
Mitch Whitmore, Long Track Speedskating
Kimani Griffith, Long Track Speedskating
Elisabeth Stephen, Cross-Country Skiing
Faye Gulini, Snowboardcross
Bradley Wilson, Moguls
Emerson Smith, Moguls
Morgan Schöld, Moguls
Jaelin Kauf, Moguls
Troy Murphy, Moguls
Kaelon McCarry, Moguls
Jonathan Libal, Aerials
Mac Bohonnon, Aerials
Ashley Caldwell, Aerials
Kiley McKinnon, Aerials
Ben Berend, Nordic Combined
Bryan Fletcher, Nordic Combined
Taylor Fletcher, Nordic Combined
Jasper Good, Nordic Combined
Ben Lawson, Nordic Combined
Kevin Bickner, Ski Jumping
Casey Larson, Ski Jumping
Maddie Bowman, Halfpipe Skiing

SPENDS TIME TRAINING IN UTAH, HAVE PREVIOUSLY TRAINED IN UTAH OR WERE EDUCATED IN UTAH

Tommy Biesemeyer, Alpine Skiing
Jared Goldberg, Alpine Skiing
Megan McJames, Alpine Skiing
Resi Stiegler, Alpine Skiing
Andrew Weibrecht, Alpine Skiing
Jacqueline Wiles, Alpine Skiing
Tim Jitloff, Alpine Skiing
Mark Engel, Alpine Skiing
Alice McKennis, Alpine Skiing

Wiley Maple, Alpine Skiing
Breezy Johnson, Alpine Skiing
Bryce Bennett, Alpine Skiing
Ryan Cochran-Siegle, Alpine Skiing
Jessie Diggins, Cross-Country Skiing
Kikkan Randall, Cross-Country Skiing
Mike Goorjian, Slopestyle Skiing
Dorian Stevens, Slopestyle Skiing
Alex Ferreira, Halfpipe Skiing
Brita Sigourney, Halfpipe Skiing
Kendall Wesenberg, Skeleton
Sam Michener, Bobbed
Sam McGuffie, Bobbed
Carlo Valdes, Bobbed
Cevin Logan, Halfpipe and Slopestyle Skiing
Maggie Voisin, Slopestyle Skiing
Jesuita Jenson, Slopestyle Snowboarding
Mitch Dierdorf, Snowboardcross
Kelly Clark, Halfpipe Snowboarding

For more information about Utah’s Olympic legacy, please visit www.UtahOlympicLegacy.org.

About Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation
Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation is a Utah non-profit 501(c)(3) organization responsible for managing and maintaining world-class facilities and providing opportunities for people of all ages and abilities to participate and excel in winter sports. Inspired by the success and momentum of the Salt Lake 2002 Olympic Winter Games, the Foundation has turned its focus toward embracing, engaging and involving Utah’s youth in winter sport. The Foundation supports national sport organizations and community recreational winter sport programs, as well as subsidizes the operation of three Olympic legacy venues – Utah Olympic Oval, Utah Olympic Park, and Soldier Hollow Nordic Center. For more information, please visit UtahOlympicLegacy.org or call 435-658-4200.
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RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY PASSED THE LEGISLATURE AND WAS SIGNED BY THE GOVERNOR ON FEBRUARY 6, 2018

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON UTAH'S OLYMPIC EXPLORATORY COMMITTEE AND ITS EFFORTS TO EXPLORE HOSTING OF A FUTURE OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC WINTER GAMES

2018 GENERAL SESSION
STATE OF UTAH
Chief Sponsor: Wayne L. Niederhauser
House Sponsor: Gregory H. Hughes

LONG TITLE

General Description:
This concurrent resolution of the Legislature and the Governor encourages the exploring of Utah and Salt Lake City hosting a future Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games.

Highlighted Provisions:
This resolution:
- supports and encourages Utah's Olympic Exploratory Committee in its efforts to ascertain if Utah and Salt Lake City are "ready, willing, and able" to host a future Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games and supports hosting a future Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games.

Special Clauses:
None

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the state of Utah, the Governor concurring therein:
WHEREAS, as highlighted in S.C.R. 9, Concurrent Resolution Recognizing the Importance of Utah's Sport and Olympic Legacy Efforts (2015 General Session), the state of Utah values the experience of Salt Lake City hosting the 2002 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games and the long-term importance of sports and the Olympic legacy to Utah;
WHEREAS, Utah is recognized as "The State of Sport" and continues to make major investments in sports with the Utah Sports Commission, the Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation, and many other key partners who are helping drive Utah's Olympic legacy and sports activities by hosting hundreds of major Olympic and non-Olympic sporting events, training, and other activities at world-class venues since the 2002 Games;
WHEREAS, Utah continues to actively partner with and support the mission and charter of the United States Olympic Committee, the International Olympic Committee, and many other partners who are helping Utah enhance its sport and Olympic legacy;
WHEREAS, because of Utah's and Salt Lake City's excellence in hosting the 2002 Games and the hosting of many major national and international sporting events since 2002, extraordinary sport and institutional knowledge exist in Utah;
WHEREAS, Utah continues to use and leverage significant 2002 Games infrastructure and other infrastructure and assets, including sports, athletic, training, venues, transportation improvements, sustainability and green initiatives, and other key related strategic activities;
WHEREAS, due to the high level of Utah's Olympic legacy and ongoing sports efforts, venues, and institutional knowledge, Utah and Salt Lake City are favorably positioned to host another Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games and can say with confidence that they are "ready, willing, and able" to host the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games again and to warmly welcome back the world; and
WHEREAS, an exploratory committee was formed October 17, 2017, by Utah's public leaders, to begin the process of carefully examining hosting the 2026 or 2030 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games:
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislature of the state of Utah, the Governor concurring therein, supports and encourages the Olympic Exploratory Committee in the committee's hard work to determine whether Salt Lake City and Utah can host a future Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games on budget and can conduct excellent Games.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Legislature and Governor strongly support Utah's and Salt Lake City's hosting of a 2026 or 2030 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games should the opportunity present itself to bid again.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be sent to the International
The Olympic Committee, the United States Olympic Committee, the Utah Sports Commission, the Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation, the Governor's Office of Economic Development, the Utah State Chamber of Commerce, and the members of Utah's congressional delegation.