



The Florida Senate

Interim Project Summary 2001-009

November 2000

Committee on Commerce and Economic Opportunities

Senator George Kirkpatrick, Chairman

OLYMPICS 2012: POLICY OPTIONS FOR STATE SUPPORT OF A FLORIDA CITY'S BID

SUMMARY

Tampa is attempting to secure candidate city designation by the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) and, ultimately, host city designation by the International Olympic Committee (IOC) for the 2012 Olympics. Many of the details on the community's plans for the Olympics will not be available until after the local organizing committee submits its bid to the USOC in December 2000. Thus, the precise role that the state might play in supporting the bid or the hosting of the games is not defined. This project researches what public resources other states and countries have dedicated to the Olympic Games, in order to provide the Legislature with an array of policy issues to consider in defining the state's role in Tampa's bid and in evaluating requests for assistance that may arise as the bid process continues.

Because it is clear that an Olympic effort requires extensive intergovernmental and intragovernmental coordination, the state may wish to consider developing a mechanism through which the state government's participation can be coordinated, such as appointment of a special legislative committee, appointment of an Olympic officer, or both.

BACKGROUND

The Tampa Bay community has launched an effort to host the 2012 Olympics. A not-for-profit corporation, Florida 2012, has been established as an Olympic organizing committee to assist Tampa in its efforts to secure candidate city designation by the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) and, ultimately, host city designation by the International Olympic Committee (IOC) for the XXXth Olympic Games.

According to Florida 2012, hosting the Olympic Games in 2012 is expected to cost from \$2 billion to \$2.5 billion. Strategies for financing an event of this magnitude vary.

Some Olympic Games have been largely publicly financed, while others have been largely privately financed. In addition, financing is particularly significant to the organizing committee because financing is evaluated as part of the bid document. Profits, or revenue in excess of expenditures, can be relevant to the evaluation, as these monies are traditionally shared among the USOC, the IOC, and the communities represented by the organizing committees.

The complexity and magnitude of the event raises issues relating to what role the state should play in support of the Olympic bid and in the carrying out of the games. While the state has already taken a participatory role in preparing for the Olympics by passing legislation that addressed some initial public policy considerations,¹ the state's role remains undefined. To assist policy makers in defining this role, this interim project seeks to provide senators with general information pertaining to how the state could assist in effectuating a successful Olympic bid and in implementing a successful Olympic event if a Florida city were selected. This report researches what public resources other states and countries have dedicated to the Olympic Games, and explores other public resources that could be targeted to the bid.

Bid Procedures, Evaluation, & Timelines

The process of becoming an Olympic host city spans many years and begins with the submission of a bid document by an organizing committee to the USOC. The bid document consists of 19 different "themes," or issues to be addressed in the bid, including, but not limited to, medical, Olympic Village, venues, marketing, finance, environmental, media, and transportation. The bid is divided into three volumes, covers nearly 700 pages, and may not be circulated or made public to any other body until it has been accepted by the USOC.

¹ Chapter 2000-148, L.O.F., created the Olympic Games Guaranty Account to be used for the sole purpose of fulfilling the state's obligations under a games-support contract to indemnify and insure against any net financial deficit resulting from the conduct of the games up to \$175 million.

Florida 2012's bid document for the 2012 Olympic Summer Games is due to the USOC December 15, 2000.

The next phase after bid submission is a visit from the USOC Site Evaluation Task Force to assess what the bid proposes.

According to consultants to Florida 2012, in evaluating bids and cities the task force uses a model built on tiers.

Tier 1 includes the themes that are rated highest in importance when evaluating a city. These themes can most easily be described as the items that will directly and physically come into contact with the athletes. Legal Aspects and Finance are included in Tier 1 as well. Additionally, within Tier 1, special attention is given to the Sports Venues.

Tier 2 themes can best be described as support functions. These are also important to the event and the overall quality of the Olympics. Examples of Tier 2 themes include Security, Media, and Guarantees.

Tier 3 themes are factors that can draw the line between a very good bid and a great bid. The theme that receives the most emphasis in this tier is Theme 11, Olympism, Culture, and Legacy. Primary areas of interest included in this theme are strong youth programs and an outstanding venue for the Opening and Closing Ceremonies. Other examples of Tier 3 themes include Meteorology, Environmental Protection, and Customs and Immigration.

The USOC Site Evaluation Task Force evaluation model and guidelines are modeled directly after the IOC Task Force model. The five main areas that the evaluators place emphasis on when visiting a city and evaluating a bid include: content, including bid clarity and quality; partnership, including city and state government relationships and public and government support; international appeal; extras, including bid uniqueness; and "bid killers," including lack of well established partnerships and failure to obtain requested guarantees. The final evaluation is based on the actual site visit and the bid information, as well as the established guarantees.

After visiting all cities, the USOC announces the finalist cities, and then the U.S. Candidate City. The U.S. Candidate City will then compete with international cities to host the Olympics, and finally the IOC will select the Host City. For the 2012 Olympic Summer Games, the U.S. Candidate City will be selected in fall 2002 by the USOC, and the Host City will be selected by the IOC in the fall 2005.

METHODOLOGY

Florida 2012's Olympic bid is due to the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) by December 15, 2000. Because of the competitive aspect of the bid process, many bid specifics are of a confidential nature and, as such, will not be available for consideration in this report. Therefore, this report will take a broader approach to the exploration of the issue of state support of the Olympics. This approach includes the use of examples of states and countries that have hosted, or are in the process of preparing to host, the Olympic Games. For comparative purposes, these examples place particular emphasis on cities and states located in the United States. Research techniques included interviews, Internet research, library research, including text, periodical, and journal research, and direct mailings requesting information from Florida 2012, Department of State, Enterprise Florida, Inc., Visit Florida, and selected states that have previously hosted the Olympics.

FINDINGS

Florida 2012 has created regional partnerships to effectuate the Olympic bid. Although other Florida cities ultimately may play a role in staging the Olympic Games, at this writing Tampa, St. Petersburg, and Orlando will participate in the activities related to the bid and could benefit from the games coming to Florida.

Because of the competitive nature of the bid process, many bid specifics are confidential. This is especially true for venue financing, which Florida 2012 anticipates being able to release to the public shortly after submitting the bid in December. Other venue details continue to be released by Florida 2012, including locations. At this writing, the following venues have been proposed by Florida 2012:

- Tampa: Baseball - Legends Field; Soccer - Raymond James Stadium; Indoor Volleyball - Ice Palace and University of South Florida SunDome; Rhythmic Gymnastics - USF SunDome; Archery and Shooting - MacDill Air Force Base; Team Handball - Florida State Fairgrounds Exposition Hall; Rowing and Canoe/Kayak-Sprint - Tampa Bay Water Reservoir; Synchronized Swimming and Water Polo - Aquatics Center in downtown Tampa; Field Hockey - the Florida State Fairgrounds.
- St. Petersburg: Gymnastics and Basketball - Tropicana Field; Wrestling - Bayfront Center; Triathlon - Straub Park and the downtown St.

Petersburg area; Diving - Temporary structure ideally on or near the waterfront.

- Orlando: Baseball - Disney's Wide World of Sports complex; Soccer - the Citrus Bowl; Basketball - T.D. Waterhouse Arena Disney's Wide World of Sports Fieldhouse; Table Tennis, Badminton, Judo, TaeKwonDo, Fencing, and Weightlifting - Orange County Convention Center.

An International Broadcast Center, the nerve center for all Olympic radio and television communications, must be provided for as part of the bid document.

Florida 2012 has proposed the location of the center in St. Petersburg, and after the Olympics the center will serve as a high tech business incubator. It is hoped that the incubator will serve as an impetus for revitalization in the surrounding area.

Because of the magnitude of planning for the Olympics, the bid document submitted to the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) in December may not necessarily reflect final Olympic elements. In fact, according to the *USOC Bid Procedures Manual* (p. 80), the "actual costs of the Olympic Games have historically demonstrated significant variances from the original budgets submitted by bid committees in the competitive bidding process." Therefore, the bid document should be viewed as a dynamic document.

State Roles and Issues

The state government can potentially play many roles in the planning and staging of the Olympics. Past Olympic experiences are indicative of these varied state roles. For example, the 1996 Summer Olympics in Atlanta is viewed as being largely self-funding, and privately organized, while the 2000 Summer Olympics in Sydney is viewed as being largely publicly funded and supported.

The New South Wales government is responsible for providing venues and facilities through an Olympic Coordination Authority.

Specific state roles can be as minimal as providing certain guarantees, including letters of support, or more engaged, including involvement in transportation, medical, security, and legislative issues and the building of venues. Other roles state government plays are less obvious, including responding to increases in demand for regulatory services such as consumer protection (temporary business customer complaints, potential ticket fraud); professional licensing; consumer complaints (workplace safety, anti-discrimination, fair housing, insurance); tax services; historical society (categorizing and displaying three-dimensional memorabilia); and archives. Because of these potentially varied roles, the state may wish to address the issue of

self organization, specifically, evaluating how the state can organize itself to provide a coordinated and efficient front for interaction with other Olympic partners. Through research, including analyzing bid requirements, and looking to the Olympic experiences of former Host Cities, potential state roles and issues can be grouped into categories.

Guarantees

Guarantees are required as part of the bid document and are specifically requested in various themes. These guarantees represent letters of support, financial commitments, and the ability of the bid city to construct venues, provide transportation, medical, health and security personnel, and facilities, including accommodations.

Letters of support are required from local and state governments that demonstrate support for hosting the games. These letters are illustrative of statewide support for the games, and are viewed by Olympic organizers as a critical component of the Olympic bid. According to Olympic consultants, letters of support should be received from the: Governor, Cabinet, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, House and Senate Minority Leaders, and other appropriate governmental agencies.

Transportation

According to Florida 2012, the greatest challenge of hosting any Olympics is providing efficient and effective transportation within the Olympic corridor, including transportation between the Olympic Village, Media Village, hotels/motels, and Olympic events. These efforts require the greatest assistance, support, cooperation, and commitment by local, state, and federal governments. The bid must effectively provide four separate transportation systems: one for the athletes; a second for members of the Olympic family; a third for the press; and the largest one for spectators.

According to Olympic organizers, the current transportation infrastructure in Florida will require upgrading in order to host the Olympics. This upgrading is required, in part, by heavy congestion on the Interstate 4 corridor – the highway envisioned to connect Tampa venues to Orlando accommodations during the Olympics. This situation will provide unique challenges to Florida 2012 in preparing the bid, and if Tampa were to win the bid as the host city, may pose challenges to the state in upgrading transportation infrastructure to support the Olympics in a timely manner.

Studies are already under way to address Olympic transportation issues. First, the Olympics Transportation Study will determine the impacts that the Olympic Games would have on the Central Florida transportation system if Tampa is selected as the site for the 2012 Olympics, including identification of transportation systems and infrastructure needed to accommodate the games, identification of required resources beyond those included in the long range transportation plans for the area, and present feasible alternatives for implementation of needed transportation improvements and systems. The study, being conducted by the Department of Transportation's (department) District 7 Public Transportation Office in Tampa under contract with a consulting team, is being very closely coordinated with Florida 2012. The total cost of the study is \$800,000, and the final report for this study will be published in late December 2000.

The second study examining Olympic transportation issues is the Coast to Coast Rail Feasibility Study, initially proposed by the Central Florida Transit Technology Corridor Consortium (CFTTCC) under the department's Fast Track program. The Legislature authorized \$900,000 to undertake this project but required that the department conduct the study instead of CFTTCC.

The study will evaluate the feasibility of a rail transportation system connecting St. Petersburg to Port Canaveral. The department selected STV, Inc., to undertake this study, and the contract with STV was negotiated at \$701,000. The study's project schedule required the consultants to develop preliminary information by September 10 for input into Florida's Olympic bid. In this preliminary information, the consultants found that it is entirely possible to design, build, and operate a contemporary, relatively high-speed passenger rail system in the Orlando-Tampa/St. Petersburg corridor in time for the Olympics, but it will be an expensive undertaking. The consultants are currently looking at a number of strategies that could satisfy this objective.

The department has ensured that this study and the Olympics Transportation Study are well coordinated and that there is no duplication of work efforts. A preliminary report on strategies and implementation feasibility will be prepared for submission to the Legislature and the Governor by January 1, 2001. The final report on this study will be completed by June 30, 2001. The study will have an extensive public involvement program, including the study review meetings and public workshops.

Once finalized, these studies, along with the bid, should further crystallize the role the state may choose to play in resolving Olympic transportation issues. These roles may require legislative action, particularly if the state chooses to authorize certain state property for Olympic uses. For example, one U.S. city vying for the 2012 Olympics has proposed the use of school buses for Olympic transportation. The use of Florida school buses for Olympic transportation would require authorization by the Legislature.

Salt Lake City

In preparing for Salt Lake City's hosting of the 2002 Winter Olympics, the State of Utah has played a role in the provision of Olympic-related transportation services and in the effectuation of Olympic-related transportation infrastructure projects. Both roles have required the dedication of state resources.

In Utah's role of providing for Olympic-related transportation services, expenses were incurred as a result of providing increased services, and predominately are comprised of overtime associated with the operation of a new Traffic Control Center 24 hours per day during the games.

Expenses were also incurred by the state as a result of Olympic-related transportation infrastructure projects. Although federal funds were acquired for these infrastructure projects, these funds require state matching funds, which at this time are estimated to be \$750,000. In addition, the state's role in transportation projects extends well beyond that of financial contributor. To provide adequate transportation infrastructure for the games, the state's goal is to accelerate projects from the long-range transportation plan in order to provide critical transportation systems in time for use by visitors during the games. Every effort is being made to accelerate the federal funds for the planned projects to coincide with the accelerated construction schedules. In fact, because the federal government now allows design-build projects,² Utah has used this method for major highway expansion projects. According to the Utah Department of Transportation, design-build projects saved time because when the design portion of the project was completed, the construction was halfway completed.

Security

The USOC requires bid cities to possess the necessary infrastructure to guarantee total security. Accordingly,

² Design-build projects generally refer to projects for which the design and building are conducted by the same organization.

the *USOC Bid Procedures Manual* requires a detailed security plan, which indicates both the type of security proposed and the roles of public and private security organizations.

Given the state security resources, the state's role in providing security for the Olympics could be extensive. In fact, this role is seen by some as critical to the Olympic bid and successful staging of the games. State resources that could be dedicated to the games include the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, which could assist with security planning, management, and administration; the Florida Highway Patrol, to assist in protecting and policing highways in the Olympic corridor; and the Marine Patrol and Florida National Guard to assist in the development of the security plan. The state role may also encompass the issuing of guarantees, required from relevant national, state, and local authorities, indicating that all proposed arrangements will be made by those authorities to ensure peaceful and orderly running of the games.

In support of Florida 2012's bid for the Olympics, the Florida Department of Law Enforcement is currently involved with a number of other law enforcement agencies in the security planning required as part of the bid document.

Atlanta

To coordinate local, federal, state, and volunteer security resources for the 1996 Summer Olympic Games, former Georgia Governor Zell Miller established the State Olympic Law Enforcement Command (SOLEC), centrally commanding 29 state agencies, 23 sheriffs' offices and police departments, 15 state colleges and universities, and 11 federal agencies. To fund this effort, the Georgia General Assembly appropriated \$26 million for public safety during the Olympics. SOLEC coordinated efforts with private security provided by the Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games (ACOG), which private security enforced rules within the venues. When law enforcement situations arose within state-owned venues, SOLEC would respond, while also assisting local authority outside venues.

Salt Lake City

To coordinate public safety efforts across government agencies, the 1998 Utah State Legislature passed SB 159 (Utah Code Annotated 53-12), which established the Olympic Public Safety Command (command). This new statute gives the command responsibility for coordinating Olympic public safety efforts across all government agencies. Essential public safety services for which the command is responsible include: police services; fire

protection; emergency medical services; public works; emergency management; aviation support; explosive ordinance disposal; traffic control; in-transit security; intelligence; tactical response; dignitary protection; infrastructure protection; communications; and crime and fire protection.

During the 2002 Winter Olympics in Salt Lake City, it is anticipated that generally the Salt Lake City Organizing Committee (SLOC) will provide perimeter access control, security, and crowd management "within the fence" at all Olympic venues. Federal, state, and local governments represented in the command will provide the remaining security and public safety surrounding visitors and activities.³

Salt Lake City had estimated its public safety expenses at \$18 million; however, if the federal government fails to provide the same services it has provided for previous Olympic Games held in the United States, the costs to the state could be much higher. For comparison purposes, Olympic security expenses for the 1996 Summer Olympic Games in Atlanta totaled \$26 million.

Venues

Hosting the Olympics requires facilities, or venues, in which athletes can compete. Approaches to developing venues vary from renovation of existing venues to the building of new venues. Both approaches to the development of venues can be costly, and many states have made financial contributions to such. Olympic organizers view state contributions as a bid-enhancing measure not only by guaranteeing certain financing of projects, but also by promoting partnerships.

The *United States Olympic Committee (USOC) Bid Procedures Manual* requires a detailed listing of the total number of proposed competition venues, including indication for each venue if minor or substantial alterations are required, or if the venues need to be built, and related construction costs.

It would not be uncommon for states to be asked to participate in the resolution of other issues surrounding venue development that expand beyond that of project financing. These issues include eminent domain, property condemnation, and maintenance of legacy facilities.

Atlanta

³ *State of Utah Annual Report of the State Olympic Officer Relating to the 2002 Olympic Winter Games* (June 14, 1999), p. 11.

In hosting the 1996 Olympic Summer Games, the Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games (ACOG) spent more than \$500 million to cover construction costs for sporting venues. Other public and private sources contributed more than \$230 million as enhancements to ACOG's construction of new venues.

Funds spent by ACOG for venue construction were generated from sponsor and television rights. Construction projects included building an Olympic Stadium for the Opening and Closing Ceremonies and track and field competitions, a velodrome for cycling, a natatorium for swimming and diving events, a tennis complex, athlete dormitories, warm-up facilities, and upgrades to existing facilities for other venues. Many of these projects stand as permanent legacy facilities maintained and owned by both public and private entities.

Salt Lake City

According to information obtained from the Utah Legislature, the State of Utah began planning for the Olympics in the 1980s, when the state proposed, and the public passed, a statewide referendum that authorized a diversion of state sales tax of 1/64th of 1 percent to raise \$59 million to help build Olympic quality winter sports facilities. Since this time, the Salt Lake City Organizing Committee (SLOC) has agreed to purchase these state-built winter sports facilities from the state for \$99 million. Of that amount, \$59 million is dedicated to repay the state and local governments for the sales tax diverted to the Utah Sports Authority to construct those facilities. The remaining \$40 million is dedicated to establish a legacy fund to operate the state-built facilities for 20 years following the games. Under the terms of this agreement, the ownership and operation of the facilities, and management of the legacy fund, will be turned over to the non-profit Utah Athletic Foundation no later than May 1, 2002.

SLOC will also pay for the use of a university stadium for opening and closing ceremonies. The University of Utah will receive \$8 million in cash (in 2002 dollars) from SLOC plus \$250,000 in heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment for exclusive rights to use the expanded stadium. This payment will be used by the university to help offset a portion of the cost to expand and renovate the stadium to 46,500 permanent and 3,500 temporary seats. The total cost to expand the stadium was more than \$50 million. Under the terms of the rental payment, the university will cover the cost of all utility usage during the use period, as well as all normal maintenance, scheduled custodial service, some snow removal, and normal security. SLOC will cover the costs for all temporary facilities, additional utility

hookups, additional security, and operating the ceremony events. Because the university is required to provide above normal support services and staffing during the SLOC use periods, the university could experience some one-time additional costs related to the ceremonies. In contract negotiations, the university estimated that its direct costs for these services would be less than the value of the HVAC equipment received under the contract.⁴

Although housing is not considered a venue, it is noteworthy because an Olympic bid must address the need for athlete housing. States have partnered with Olympic organizers to meet this need, including the State of Utah, which has given the SLOC exclusive rights to use newly constructed student housing and the existing historic buildings at Fort Douglas. SLOC has agreed to pay the University of Utah the equivalent of \$28 million (in 2002 dollars) for this right. The university is using these funds to help offset the total construction costs of \$120 million for the new student housing. The State Building Ownership Authority issued revenue bonds to provide funds to help pay for the construction of the student housing, and the bonds will be repaid by SLOC in a lump sum amount of approximately \$31.6 million on May 15, 2005. The value of this bond in April 2002 is approximately \$28 million.⁵

Legislative Issues

As Florida's bid for the Olympics evolves, issues may arise which lend themselves to legislative resolution other than state appropriations. As such, the state may be asked to pass legislation to meet bid requirements or to simply support staging of the games.

Fund Raising – Six years prior to the 2002 Olympic Winter Games in Salt Lake City, the Utah Legislature authorized a special Olympic license plate, the proceeds of which, after administrative costs, will be used by the Salt Lake Organizing Committee (SLOC) for programs designed to provide tickets and other Olympic experiences for disadvantaged Utah youth.⁶

⁴ *State of Utah Annual Report of the State Olympic Officer Relating to the 2002 Olympic Winter Games* (June 14, 1999), p. 23.

⁵ *Id.*, p. 22.

⁶ Section 320.08058, F.S., authorizes a Florida United States Olympic Committee specialty license plate and a Florida Special Olympics specialty license plate. The Florida United States Olympic Committee license plate provides financial support to the Florida Sunshine State Games and the United States Olympic Committee; the Florida Special Olympics license plate is used for Special Olympics purposes.

One year prior to the 1996 Olympic Summer Games held in Atlanta, the Georgia Legislature authorized a special Paralympic license plate to support the 1996 Paralympic Games. Ten dollars of every \$15 license plate sold was dedicated for use by the Atlanta Paralympic Organizing Committee.

Price Gouging – In lieu of legislation that prohibits price gouging, SLOC asked all major hotels in the Olympic corridor to sign an agreement that they will charge no more than 10 percent above then-current room prices during the Olympics.

The Georgia Legislature passed a law to regulate hotel room rates during the Olympics. It prohibited hotels, motels, motor lodges, and bed-and-breakfast establishments from charging rates in excess of the published room rates, and also prohibited them from requiring guests staying during the Olympics to reserve rooms before and after the Olympics.

Professional Licensure – In 1999, the Utah Legislature passed a law providing an exemption from state licensure requirements for individuals licensed in another state while engaged in Olympic-related work under specified circumstances. This is particularly important for providing medical care to athletes, as countries bring their own medical staffs.

The Georgia Legislature in 1994 passed a law relating to professional licensure, which exempted certain non-residents from licensure, registration, or certification, when practice in the state was time-limited services to athletes and other members of the Olympic family or Paralympic family in connection with the 1996 Olympics. The law further provided that health care services could only be performed at certain designated sites, and services were limited to being provided to members of the Olympic family or Paralympic family who are citizens or members of the delegation of that provider's sponsoring country.

Workers' Compensation – The Utah Legislature passed a law providing workers' compensation coverage for Olympic volunteers. The Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games (ACOG) felt the thousands of Olympic volunteers during the 1996 Olympics presented significant exposure to injury, medical treatment, and medical expenses. In response to this concern, the Georgia Legislature passed changes to law that allowed for workers' compensation coverage for Olympic volunteers.

Sales Tax Exemption – The Utah Legislature in 2000 created an exemption for sales of admissions or user fees associated with the 2002 Winter Olympic Games.

Intergovernmental Coordination

Staging the Olympics is frequently a cooperative effort between national, regional, and local governments and other entities. State support of the Olympics often involves many different agencies and entities within the state government, making coordination of state resources particularly important.

Salt Lake City

The Utah Legislature created the position of Olympic Officer to coordinate the legal, financial, and inter-government arrangements for Salt Lake City's hosting of the 2002 Winter Olympics. Together with the governor's representative on the Salt Lake City Organizing Committee (SLOC), the State Olympic Officer will represent the state's major interests in Olympic planning. The Utah Legislature also has established an Olympic Coordinating Committee comprised of members from both chambers. This committee oversees the SLOC commitments to the State of Utah, identifies issues relating to the use of state property during the Olympics, and provides oversight to SLOC budgets and state contracts.

Atlanta

The Georgia Legislature passed an act creating the Metropolitan Atlanta Olympic Games Authority (MAOGA). Aimed at satisfying the International Olympic Committee's (IOC) desire to have a government on paper in Atlanta's Olympic bid, MAOGA had broad legislative authority, including buying or condemning land, raising money, awarding construction contracts, and creating a police force. To simplify and expedite the contracting process for state-owned venues, as many primary facilities used to stage the Olympics were state owned and operated, the Atlanta Commission for the Olympic Games (ACOG) entered into a risk management agreement with the State of Georgia. This agreement allowed for the use of state-owned facilities by the ACOG.

Sydney

The Olympic Coordination Authority (OCA) is a statutory authority of the New South Wales government, and was responsible for coordinating the state's responsibility for the Sydney 2000 Olympic and Paralympic Games. OCA's primary task was to deliver new facilities and venues for use during the Olympic and Paralympic Games that also meet the long-term social, cultural, and sporting requirements of the citizens of the

state. The director general of OCA reported to the New South Wales Minister for the Olympics, who also served as the President of the Sydney Organizing Committee for the Olympics.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The planning for and hosting of the Olympic Games is a monumental effort, the scope of which will continue to evolve over time. It is apparent that this effort cannot be accomplished alone, as it will require extraordinary coordination and collaboration by public and private entities alike.

The precise role the State of Florida will play in Tampa's bid to host the Olympic Games has not yet been clearly defined. As such, this report was designed to provide the Legislature with an array of broad policy issues to consider in defining the state's role in Tampa's bid, and

in evaluating requests for assistance that may arise as the bid process continues.

Because the state's role has not been defined, and because it is clear that an Olympic effort requires extensive intergovernmental and intragovernmental coordination, the state may wish to consider developing some mechanism through which the state government's Olympic participation can be coordinated, providing maximum efficiency and effectiveness. Possible mechanisms include the appointment of a special legislative committee, appointment of an Olympic officer, or both. These mechanisms not only could focus on coordinating Olympic efforts, but also could be used as an information exchange, assisting the state in defining its role in Tampa's bid to host the 2012 Olympics.

COMMITTEE(S) INVOLVED IN REPORT *(Contact first committee for more information.)*

Committee on Commerce and Economic Opportunities, 404 South Monroe Street, Tallahassee, FL 32399-1100, (850) 487-5815

SunCom 277-5815

Committee on Budget

Committee on Comprehensive Planning, Local and Military Affairs

Committee on Fiscal Resource

Committee on Transportation

MEMBER OVERSIGHT

Senator Jim Sebesta