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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background

The concept of the modern Olympic Games emerged from ancient Greece. The Greek Olympian Games were the most celebrated of four great national festivals. The Games occurred every four years at the sanctuary of Zeus at Olympia. While the Olympic Games were celebrated in much earlier times, the earliest written account of the games was dated 776 BC (Borja 1992).

The ideals of the first Mycenaean period Olympic Games revolved around the “pursuit of recognition and posthumous fame accompanied by precious material gifts” and were only for aristocrat Greek citizens (Yalouris 1996). These games ended but were later revived around 11th century BC in the valley of Elis, about sixty kilometers north of Olympia. The return of the Olympic Games was accompanied by significant changes in ideals. No longer were the Games limited to aristocrats, now participation was available to all Greek citizens.

The most important part of this revival was a theory of athletics that reflected “how the Greek mysticism was evolving parallel with rationalism” (Jellicoe and Jellicoe 1995). The feat of the hero or athlete should have a positive influence on the citizens and community as a whole. The story of Hercules illustrates this concept that the athlete’s achievements are measured both by physical strength as well as by their valuable effect on society. The Herculean myth impacted civilization by demonstrating a non-savage way of life. All his accomplishments were done for the perseverance of man and civilization.
The philosophy of this Olympic era was "the importance given to the citizens, who, all together as equals, felt responsible for the welfare of their city" (Yalouris 1996). This idea in conjunction with the Holy Truce, which observed a cessation of war during the Games, further affirmed the effect of the Games on the Greek national consciousness. This national consciousness gave the Hellenic world an awareness of community, not only in the terms of citizenship, but also in their ideals and outlook on life. "This ideal was proclaimed with fervor at the festivals celebrated every four years by the ancient Greeks at the games, in which they devoted themselves to the pursuit of harmonious development, not only of the body and the moral sense, but also of man’s cultural and artistic qualities" (The Olympic Movement n.d.).

In addition, (and most important to the profession of Landscape Architecture), the ancient Olympic Games further established the idea of *genius loci*, the sense of place. The site of the games, Olympia, was not a town but a sanctuary where man harmonized with nature. "An authentic and self-conscious sense of place is manifest in attempts to create places that reflect a clear and complete conception of man as well as sensitivity to the significance of place in everyday life" (Relph 1976, p. 71). The Hellenic period conceived the notion that city and citizens were one and that a place would develop organically as a result of function, activities, and physical appearance. Some would say that this idea was one of the most important contributions that the Greeks made to civilization.

The modern day Olympics are rooted in the ideals of Founder Baron Pierre de Coubertin. The "modern Olympia" was a territorial translation of Coubertin’s ideas, inspired by internationalism and aspirations of world peace, which were characteristics of European intellectual thought throughout the first half of the 20th century. Coubertin
believed sporting activity and sports education were the means of achieving those absolute objectives (Munoz 1996). Coubertin "wanted to give the modern world a lasting ancient institution whose principle was good for it again" (Coubertin 1919, p. 387). These principles were formed into an Olympic Charter which states three Fundamental Principles. The Fundamental Principles pertinent to this study are:

Fundamental Principle 2 – "Olympism is a philosophy of life, exalting and combining in a balanced whole the qualities of body, will and mind. Blending sport with culture and education, Olympism seeks to create a way of life based on the joy found in effort, the educational value of good example and respect for universal fundamental ethical principles" (The Olympic Movement n.d., p. 9).

Fundamental Principle 3 – “The goal of Olympism is to place everywhere sport at the service of the harmonious development of man, with a view to encouraging the establishment of a peaceful society concerned with the preservation of human dignity. To this effect, the Olympic Movement engages, alone or in cooperation with other organizations and within the limits of its means, in actions to promote peace” (The Olympic Movement n.d., p. 11).

The Olympics have been defined as a “mega-event” (Ritchie 1984). There are several characteristics which distinguish a happening as a “mega-event.” First, the event generates a large number of participants and observers resulting in international publicity. Second, the “mega-event” serves as a marketing strategy, especially in tourism, which gives the host community and region high visibility on the global stage. Finally, the “mega-event” has the ability to produce a long term legacy that reaches beyond the immediate period of the event (Ritchie 1984).
that a mega-event has significant potential to impact the host community, working as a tool for regional recreational development (Hall 1996).

By observing the ancient Greek games and the modern Olympics, it is evident that the design of Olympic events is determined by the values of the society in which it takes place. Social values characterize a place. The study of Olympic planning is also a study of cultural and social values through the ages.

Statement of Problem

Since the inception of the modern Olympic Games, cultural and social values have been reflected in the style in which they have been fashioned. The Olympics give host communities the opportunity to articulate their values and showcase them to the world. Arata Isozaki stated in “Designing an Olympic City” that “this kind of big event stimulates the existing city to develop its environment and image” (Isozaki 1996, p. 40). The Olympics are not only a sporting event but also a sociological event. “Everything surrounding the Games bears witness to the passing of time and the reality of an era; they are snap-shots of the reality of a particular moment of civilization” (Zweifel 1995, p. 12). During the last century, countries hosting the Olympics have been models for change in the historic, social, and environmental fabric of the world.

Initially, the motivations for the Winter Olympics were to display cultural values and pride. Today, the global battle to host the Olympics continues, but the incentives have changed. The opportunities for communities to control the pattern of urban development, economics and regional publicity have become primary incentives, although nationalist pride and emotion still play an important role.
Urban development in Olympic venues consists of infrastructure and environmental improvements. As a result of remaining infrastructure and environmental improvements, the Olympic budget is partially regained as “goods in kind.” “Goods in kind” can be defined as the generated commodities, such as athletic venues, and medal plazas and other infrastructure improvements, such as highways and public-transit. Olympic proponents use “goods in kind” to promote the Games to potential host communities during the pre-bid process.

Economic benefits are the most studied aspects of hosting the Olympics. Economics and publicity are interlinked since hosting the Games inspires communities to produce a world-class image, providing a major element for a global economic development strategy (Andranovich, Burbank, and Heying 2001).

Olympic television broadcasting historically has had the greatest impact on the Olympic movement. Television is the major factor in providing financial support for the Olympic movement, in promoting the Olympic Games experience to viewers across the globe. In the largest single broadcasting operation ever mounted, the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games were broadcasted in more than 220 countries and territories. Broadcasting records were broken as more than 3.7 billion viewers tuned into the Games, making Sydney 2000 the most watched event in history. (The Olympic Movement n.d., p. 35)

The commercialization of the Olympics has generated millions of dollars in television rights and more revenues are obtained through private multinational corporation sponsorship.

While there are many differences between the cities that have hosted the Olympics, there is a shared global aspiration: to raise the host’s international profile. The intense contest to host the Olympics shows that the international community regards this mega-event as a means to reap long-term benefits from short-term exposure. During the bid
process, cities battling for the prize of hosting the Winter Olympics organize elaborate pitches promoting their communities. Proposals catalog present facilities, and describe how the games will reward the community, both during and after the event. A considerable return is the gift of recreational open space and athletic facilities for the public.

During the pre-bid period, the open space benefit is promoted in order to sway public opinion. Many questions arise during this process. How much of what is proposed will actually be achieved? Do communities fully understand the potential advantages hosting the games can provide to their parks and recreation network? Will the open space infrastructure of host cities be enriched as a result of the games? Are these promotions purely hype, or have host cities truly seen a lasting benefit after the Olympic flame has been extinguished? The answer to these questions can be found by observing the historical, economical, and political aspects of holding the Olympics.

Purpose of the Study

When observing Olympic cities, different historical, social, and cultural variables emerge. Pierre de Coubertin said “Olympism is not a system; it is a state of mind. It can permeate a wide variety of modes of expression and no single race or era can claim to have the monopoly of it” (The Olympic Movement n.d., p. 9). Making a direct comparison of venues and infrastructure between various games would convey an incomplete and distorted image, due to discrepancies in circumstances. Therefore, it is necessary to understand the historical, social and cultural context of each site in order to fully evaluate the effect of the Olympics on their respective recreational open space legacy.
The purpose of this study is to examine the effects of hosting the Winter Olympics on the recreational open space infrastructure of the communities. It is hoped that, through the study and discussion of the mistakes and achievements of past hosts, future host cities might be better equipped to formulate an approach to design which will endow them with a true recreational open space legacy. Since Olympic communities are only on the global stage for about three weeks, it is crucial for planners to recognize and understand the importance of the post-Olympic use of facilities.

Methodology/Limitations

This study ventures to reveal the beneficial legacy of recreational open spaces and recreational facilities, created as a result of hosting the Winter Olympics, and to explore how those legacies came to be. The purpose of this investigation is to bring to light a more effective formula to ensure that the Olympics are not merely performance but a means to strengthen the recreational open space infrastructure leaving a winter sports heritage for future generations.

The three French Winter Olympic sites, Chamonix (1924), Grenoble (1968), and Albertville (1992), and one American site, Salt Lake City (2002), were chosen for this study. The French sites were selected for several different reasons. First, a monocultural comparative analysis limited cultural and social disparities, simplifying the examination. Second, France was the first country to host three Winter Olympics, which gave considerable contribution to the historical evolution of the Olympic program. The comparison of the first Winter Games, Chamonix 1924, to the most recent Games, Salt
Lake City 2002, was considered a constructive method of determining successful Olympic programming, by bringing the analysis full circle.

For consistency, the opening ceremonies, closing ceremonies, medal ceremonies, ice skating, speed skating, hockey, Nordic ski jump, bobsled and cross-country skiing were selected for more thorough investigation. These venues provide the focal point for the recreational open space inventory. This was decided due to the inconsistency and variety of the events that have taken place throughout the history of the Winter Olympics. The current breadth of events requires limiting the extent of the inventory in order to keep the research manageable. The first Games had only 13 events compared to 78 in the last Winter Olympics. The structure of the venue inventory was limited based on the venues that took place at Chamonix. However, where relevant to the topic of recreational open space legacy, a broader scope of venues will be integrated.

The methods engaged in this study were intended to be investigative in makeup due to the lack of post-Olympic research. Although the Olympics are appropriately viewed by many as a means for host communities to gain recreational open space, a current collection of knowledge on post-Olympic beneficial outcomes is lacking. This is primarily due to the concentration on the host city only before and during the events. Post-Olympic conditions are rarely researched and studied, compared to the massive attention given prior to the Games. This study is an attempt to research the long-term effect of Olympic infrastructure development on the recreational open space network of host cities.

A broad investigation into documentation, literature, and archival reviews was carried out in France and Switzerland. Information was obtained at the International Olympic Committee (IOC) Museum and Studies Centre in Lausanne, Switzerland,
Olympic host cities headquarters, libraries, museums and internet resources. At the IOC Studies Centre extensive Olympic documentation included candidature reports (bid reports), official reports, minutes of IOC sessions, press releases, and other primary sources. An archival search for maps, photos and other relevant material was conducted at the IOC Study Centre, town halls and museums of the three host cities selected as case studies.

To determine the long-term contribution of Olympic site development on the recreation and open space fabric of host communities, it was necessary to conduct before and after comparisons. Historical photographs obtained from the IOC museum and local sources were matched against current conditions. A considerable amount of time was spent in each of the three communities, conducting informal interviews, venue inventories and photographically documenting sites. This comparative analysis effectively illustrates the evolution of recreational open space in the case study cities. Recreation maps obtained in each town further illustrates how the Olympic recreational open space infrastructure has been incorporated into the present recreation network. Careful comparison of historic Olympic maps with the present day maps makes the open space contribution of the Games readily apparent.

Research for the Salt Lake City (SLC) Winter Games was performed roughly the same as for the French sites with some notable exceptions. Initially, including the SLC games as a fourth case study, effectively bringing the study home to the author’s "backyard" was the intention. However, several factors prevented an in-depth analysis of the most recent Winter Olympics. Most importantly, not enough time has passed to allow a fair assessment of a lasting legacy with respect to establishing recreational open space. A
more complete study should be done after at least ten years. Since there has not been
enough time since the games occurred, many assumptions have been made on the effects of
the Olympics. Access to documentation was limited based on a few factors. First, official
reports and other documentation are not completed nor put on record for up to a year after
the games (although candidature reports and other literature was accessible). The official
Salt Lake Organizing Committee (SLOC) documentation will not be cataloged and
available for at least three to five years due to financing and challenge of the procedure.
This documentation will be available at the Special Collections at the University of Utah
Marriot Library. Second, there is a strict policy on meeting minutes and other possible
pertinent information. This embargo is in place for thirty years and cannot be bypassed
without official authorization. This policy is especially true for SLC in the aftermath of the
SLC bid scandal.

The contrasting cultural context between the three French hosts and the American
host makes comparisons difficult. Nevertheless, informal observations have been made in
the concluding chapter.
CHAPTER 2

LEGACY OF RECREATIONAL OPEN SPACE IN THE WINTER OLYMPICS

"From its beginning, the Olympic Movement has left a most remarkable legacy for future generations." - 1988 Calgary Olympic Bid

"The Olympics is a temporary thing. It’s like a rocket that shoots up in the sky, a big expensive rocket, and then it’s gone" - Alvin Boskoff Emory University sociologist

The definition of legacy, “is nothing more or less than a vast picture of the future in which we sketch in the present” - Petros Synadinos, Post-Olympic Use: A picture of the future

Today, the general consensus is that hosting the Winter Olympics should enrich recreational open space infrastructure of the host community. Yet this has not always been an important component of hosting the Games. Motivation for hosting the Olympics clearly varies between cities. “The experience of previous Games host communities should be treated as broadly illustrative rather than predictive for the next host community. There are lessons to be learned from past experiences but there are also political, geographic and social factors unique to the host community or region that influence both the host’s approach to the games and the outcome of those Games” (Government of British Columbia 2002, p. 1). Rational has included: pure love of winter sports, showcasing existing sport facilities, introduction of winter sports to host cities,
political incentive, urban infrastructure improvements, and environmental enhancements. The contextual framework of the host city, its economic status and maturity, political system, plus national and city status can influence the objectives for hosting the Olympics (McKay and Plumb 2001). Each Olympic city is different and therefore each has different reasons for hosting the Games (Millet 1996). “Cities which are clearly experiencing a process of expansion find that the Games are an extraordinarily powerful instrument in directing, channeling and qualifying territories for new colonization” (Millet 1996). Other more established service-based cities use the Games to attract convention business and office-based activities of regional and global organizations (McKay and Plumb 2001). Therefore to completely understand how the Winter Olympics have enriched the recreational open space legacies of host cities, it is necessary to observe the historical evolution of the Winter Games. The main purpose of this chapter is to trace the history of the Winter Olympics as related to the evolving significance of planning for permanent recreational open space infrastructure in host cities.

The Olympic history of a host city can be separated into three periods: pre-Game, Game, and post-Game. The pre-Game phase is further divided into three parts. First, the city must contend to host the Games by organizing a bid proposal for its national Olympic organizing committee (for example, the United States Olympic Committee, USOC). Second, after winning the country’s bid vote, the host city must submit the bid report to the International Olympic Committee (IOC) illustrating the city’s Olympic strategy. Typically, the bid process takes one to two decades. The last part of the pre-Game phase is the actual organization of the Games, which takes up to ten years. The
second period of hosting the Games is the actual duration of the Games. The span of competitions and ceremonies is 17 days, or three weekends and two weeks. The last phase, or post-Olympic period, receives the least amount of attention, yet is undeniably the most important from a long-term perspective.

The Winter Olympics had an apprehensive start. Figure skating appeared in the schedule of the 1900 Summer Olympics, although it was ultimately cancelled (Wallechinsky 2001). At the 1908 London Summer Games, four figure skating events took place, rousing the idea of a Winter Olympics (Wallechinsky 2001). In 1911, an Italian IOC member, Count Brunetta d’Ussaux, suggested that the Swedish Organizing Committee include an independent winter event during the Stockholm Olympics (Wallechinsky 2001). This concept was unwelcome since it was perceived to jeopardize the Nordic Games, which had taken place every four years since 1901 (Wallechinsky 2001). The 1916 German game planners supported the idea and included Skiing Olympia in the planning which was heavily rejected by the Swedes (Wallechinsky 2001). The discussion was moot since World War I broke out, resulting in the cancellation of the Games. In 1920, the Olympics recommenced in Antwerp. These Games included figure skating and hockey in the program, but those events were held two months before the summer events (Wallechinsky 2001). The first official Winter Olympics took place in 1924 in Chamonix, France which was initially named “International Sports Week 1924”. The idea of creating a Winter Olympics was flatly objected by Olympic Founder Baron Pierre de Coubertin, since the ancient Olympiad was traditionally only summer sports. Yet, after successful completion, they were recognized and became part of the Olympic program.
The Winter Olympics can be categorized into three eras: inaugural, modern and post-modern. The inaugural period is pre-1960, the modern period is 1964-1984 and the post-modern is 1988 onward (Chappelet 1996).

The inaugural Games arose during the time when the Olympic Movement was idealistic and vague. This era was epitomized by metropolis development that influenced the ideology of the time resulting in the notion of an ideal city or “garden city.” The utopian concept that nature and buildings should co-exist in harmony influenced de Coubertin (Synadinos 2001). Inaugural Olympic villages experimented with this theory by taking advantage of the countryside and the city (Munoz 1996).

During the inaugural era of the Games, bid process was ambiguous. Generally, it was presumed that the country that hosted the Summer Games would also host the Winter Games. This trend was a result of Frenchman and IOC Member, the Marquis Melchior de Polignac, who made this proposition in 1923 while deciding where the first Winter Games would take place (United States Olympic Committee 1994). Therefore, it was not necessary for the winter host city to campaign on an international level, only for the support of fellow countrymen.

The organization of the venues was also exploratory during the inaugural era. The host’s means of providing the required facilities were diverse. During the first Winter Olympics in Chamonix, France, it was determined that the town should pair-up with the French Olympic Committee to construct the basic facilities (Comite Olympic Francais 1924). The necessary facilities were built - an ice rink, hockey rink, bobsled run and jumping hill – in trade for forty percent of the gross earnings, with at least half a million francs being guaranteed (U.S.O.C. 1994). The third Winter Olympics in 1932 at
Lake Placid, New York, were funded and organized by the town, despite the country being in a depression. Due to lack of funds, the president of the USOC, Dr. Godfrey Dewey, donated some family land to be used for the construction of the bobsled run (Wallechinsky 2001). These Games were broadcast live by NBC radio, bringing increased spectator participation and popularity to winter sports (U.S.O.C 1994). These Games resulted in an unprecedented growth in winter sports in America due to the coverage. The zeal for snow sports, spawned as a result of these Winter Games, prompted a new ski boom that seized the U.S. (Richardson 1984). The Lake Placid Olympics encouraged the first ski tow being installed at Woodstock, Vermont one year later (ibid). Yet, the potential of sports infrastructure was still not completely recognized.

On the flip-side, the 1936 Garmisch-Partenkirchen Games allotted millions of deutschmarks to the organization of the Games, with no operating costs being disregarded (U.S.O.C. 1994). These Games occurred during Adolf Hitler’s Nazi Party’s “narcissistic peak.” Therefore, great effort was made to guarantee the Games’ success (U.S.O.C. 1994). These Games marked a new epoch in the political puppetry of the Games, as they were used as a propaganda tool for the Nazi regime (Wallechinsky 2001). The prime motivation of these Games was not to create recreational facilities but to act as a conduit for Nazi propaganda.

Another development was the introduction of Alpine skiing into the program, regardless of the IOC criticism of skier professionalism. The battle surrounding professionalism would haunt the Olympics for another 40 years.

The Winter Games were cancelled for the next twelve years due to World War II. The countries that bid for the 1940 Games before the war were Germany, Japan, and
Switzerland with the bid going to Sapporo, Japan, on the island of Hokkaido (Wallechinsky 2001). Since Japan was in a war with China, the country had to withdraw in July, 1938, and St. Moritz was awarded the Games for a second time (Wallechinsky 2001). The Swiss pulled out due to the continued disagreement over professionalism of skiers (Wallechinsky 2001). In reaction, the Germans volunteered Garmisch-Partenkirchen in July, 1939, but the war started four months later (Wallechinsky 2001). Since Japan and Germany were barred from competing in 1948, the Games went to St. Moritz, Switzerland. The organization of these Games was not clearly focused on the development of recreational facilities, but was a result of convenience, since they were the first postwar Games and had also been held here in 1928. These Games established the popularity of the Winter Olympics and winter sports in general.

The period after WWII was not momentous in the development of recreational open space. Cities were more consumed by a delicate economic predicament and reconstruction. The next Winter Olympics hosted in 1952 took place at the birthplace of winter sports, Oslo, Norway. The 1956 Games were hosted by Cortina d'Ampezzo, Italy, and were the first Games to be televised (U.S.O.C 1994). This revolutionized the Winter Games by putting them on the world stage, making image imperative.

The modern era of the Winter Games started in 1960, with the acknowledgment of the importance of recreational open space. "The reconstruction of many European cities after the Second World War and the regional growth of many others from the 60s onwards were carried out based on the ideas of the modern movement divulged by Le Corbusier. "The separation of urban functions over the territory, the importance of commercial, health, educational and recreational sport facilities, open spaces next to the
residential areas and the notion of an urbanistic standard were some of the determiners of this urban model” (Munoz 1996, p. 44). However important, post-Olympic realizations of these concepts and ideals concerning recreational open space were not systematically evaluated.

During the 1960’s, hosting the Games became a huge financial risk. In order to provide first-class sports facilities and amenities for a growing number of participants and to portray an admirable appearance, the host city had to either erect new buildings or upgrade existing ones. Plus, to make it worth the country’s effort, post-Olympic use of facilities and infrastructure was addressed. “For the first time ever, there was a regional conception of the urban mass and behind the location of installation of Olympic facilities, there was a project for the territorial expansion of the city, of the colonization by the city” (Munoz 1996, p. 33). This was the beginning of Olympic urbanism becoming integrated into the host city development programs (Munoz 1996).

Squaw Valley, California, hosted the 1960 Winter Olympics. This was the first time that all of the facilities were built chiefly for the Games (Richardson 1984). Just 12 years prior to the Games, Squaw Valley did not even have a road. It had one chair lift, a restaurant, and several wooden cabins eight years before the Games (U.S.O.C. 1994). The Games were a major production, with sixteen million dollars allotted for the construction of the site (U.S.O.C. 1994) and Walt Disney directed the opening and closing ceremonies (Wallechinsky 2001). Squaw Valley’s existence is a direct consequence of hosting the Winter Games. Without the Games, the development of recreational open space would have been significantly postponed.
The 1968 Grenoble Games were on the cusp of expansive urbanism and land-use modification approaches in Olympic development. This began the promotion of metropolitan growth on a regional scale. The increasing popularity of the Winter Games required host cities to spend more on infrastructure. Therefore, it was identified as a reason to tackle urban development (Wallechinsky 2001).

The Grenoble Games are a good example of land-use modifications, which were already a major feature in European cities. Francesc Munoz describes this trend in recounting the Munich and Montreal Games:

The conversion of spaces, frequently subject to earlier planning initiatives, introducing a change in use or taking advantage of open spaces with potential as a focus was a constant in urbanism in these cities. Very often, it was a case of operations focused on achieving true recreational districts, providing sports facilities or leisure-culture facilities, or even both. Areas of the city characterized by their content, metropolitan leisure and the high, concentrated added value. (Munoz 1996, p. 44)

Observing Grenoble’s urban revitalization and expansion supports this notion. The city utilized the Games to enrich existing recreational open spaces. For example, the Paul Mistral Park was amended with the speed skating rink and ice skating stadium. Incorporating the Olympic venues within existing open space added value to the city. The Organizing Committee of the 1972 Munich Games put it best when they described their Olympic recreational open space legacy “...a marvelous large recreation park which has enriched the individuality of the city, has provided a new centre of varied community life, and has given new value to northern Munich” (cited by Munoz 1996, p. 44).

The Games of the 1960’s have been called the “urban” Games. These Games acquired this designation due to the utilization of the Olympics to expand communities’
residential fabric. The 1968 Games created their own version of Ebenezer Howard's garden-city, now called the satellite city (Munoz 1996). This “new revision of the housing and city efficiency conditions, setting the ‘efficient’ boundaries of habitable space and green space volumes per inhabitant” (Munoz 1996, p. 44). These concepts can still be observed today in the Malherbe and Echirolles neighborhood districts in Grenoble developed as a result of the 1968 Games (see chapter 4). This was the beginning of the belief that Olympic facilities should perform a dual role, functioning effectively during the Games and having a clear utility after the Games.

The Games of the 1970’s affirmed the urban land-use modification trend in the Olympic movement. Instead of escalating the development of an existing area of a city, a process of adapting an existing feature of a host city to serve the Olympic need was employed (Munoz 1996). Even though the Chamonix Games utilized this same formula in 1924, it did not become a recognized process until the 70’s.

The 1976 Games were the first time the environment and Olympic politics came into the spotlight. The 1976 winter Olympics were originally awarded to the city of Denver, but the Colorado citizens protested. “Seldom is the decision to host a landmark event a democratic decision; instead, it is an idea developed by the urban elite who then seek political support” (Hiller 1990). The taxpayers of Denver did not want to subsidize an event that was seen to benefit only elitist interests, while also harming the environment. “Ignoring appeals and threats from the government, business leaders and the media, the state’s citizens voted against public funds from being used” (Wallechinsky 2001, p. xv). This illustrated Denver’s snub to the elitism inherent in the Games. The 1976 Games were returned to the 1964 Olympic site, Innsbruck, Austria.
The next decade can be typified by the growth of leisure and consumption services (Munoz 1996). In 1979, United States economists determined that, by 1985, at least a full third of the gross national product would be related to the consumption of goods or services not necessary for a livelihood (Graham 1979). The fastest growing element of this phenomenon was active and passive recreation, with recreation being the fastest developing industry in the country. Support for recreational open space was encouraged by private and public sectors to promote participation in recreation activities (Graham 1979). Although it was perceived that the government had sufficed in providing recreation on a large scale (i.e., national and state parks) there was a shortage of local recreational open space amenities. “No matter how grand the Grand Canyon, it can’t mean much to the average suburbanite except once or twice in his life” (Little and Mitchell 1971, p. 8). Yet, it is unrealistic for recreational facilities to compete with commercial interests on a dollar-cost-per-square-foot basis due to the relatively large area needed for recreational activities (Graham 1979). As a result, in the 1980’s, bidding for the Olympics converted into a strategy to enrich local recreational open space. By utilizing the Olympics, host communities could tap into this economic resource and, at the same time limit the economic costs.

During the 1980’s the Olympics became increasingly multifaceted due to the rise of globalization and the decrease of government funds for cities. Globalization produced a new type of rivalry between cities, which were now vying for jobs and capital on an international scale. This rivalry forced cities to look for new strategies to promote economic growth. The Olympics became a new-fangled, high-risk approach, labeled a mega-event strategy. The Olympics were used by city leaders as a pretext to generate
jobs and improve their competitive position within the new global economy (Andranovich, Burbank, and Heying 2001).

Being a high-profile event, the Olympics provided the justification and motivation for local development. Since hosting the Olympics entailed creating a world-class image, it gave cities a unique chance to revamp their appearance, resulting in an exceptional opportunity for recreational open space improvements. The incentive to impress on a world stage gave the host city leverage to seek government funding for development opportunities (Andranovich, Burbank, and Heying 2001).

The 1984 Sarajevo Games were the first time that the Winter Olympics were hosted in a socialist country in Eastern Europe. “Just as first visits to America, Japan and Scandinavia had generated a kind of new wonder and enthusiasm, thus did the Games held in and around Sarajevo spark unprecedented interest in the sports of snow and ice” (U.S.O.C. 1994, p. 194). This was an important opportunity for the people of Sarajevo who agreed to pay additional taxes to finance the event preparation. “Sarajevo proved to be a friendly gathering place. Alas, within the space of less than two more Olympiads, the streets of Sarajevo would send a whole different set of pictures to the world” (U.S.O.C. 1994, p. 194). Sarajevo was distinguished as the most hospitable Games to date with no warning of the tragedy that would transpire. Even though the Games introduced winter recreational open space to the region, the legacy to the community was razed by war. “By 1992, the Olympic bobsled run had been transformed into an artillery position for Serbian guerrillas....The site of the slalom races was a Serb military installation and the Zetra Figure Skating Center has been reduced to rubble”
(Wallechinsky 2002, p. xvii). This heartbreaking legacy is not an indication of the spirit that was produced during the Games, a spirit that will always be remembered.

During this decade there was a dichotomy in the planning method. On one side there was permanence in development and renovation plans, on the other there was a strong ephemeral component. This ephemeral facet was a central part of the postmodern era, since design was now primarily meant to impress the television viewer, and not just the visitor (Munoz 1996). The commercialization of the Games was a major reason for temporary facilities. By this point in history the Olympics received a high level of corporate sponsorship and funding through television broadcasting rights. These forces steered development, with the local citizenry and host city no longer taking precedence. What was important was how the events looked on television, which required the construction of temporary structures and amenities. By the 1988 Games, it was obvious that the Olympics had become primarily a media event with more media personnel than athletes (Hiller 1990).

The way in which the Games were perceived on television gave rise to the importance of themes and graphics to portray an image. The Olympics were seen as an honored instant when a city and country flaunt themselves through the eyes of the television cameras to the entire world (Zweifel 1995). The escalating importance put on entertainment and consumerism has been viewed as “advancing hegemonic control of the masses” (Hiller 1990, p. 121) due to the mesmerizing Olympic splendor (Hiller 1990). Hiller suggests this is the means by which the “informal elite coalition” echoes their ideology.
"Olympic elitism," which mounted during the 1976 Denver Olympic bid, continued to plague the Games. "By definition, the Olympics is an elitist sporting event for which large public expenditures are made to support select athletes and to build facilities that are primarily for elitist sport training and competition" (Hiller 1990, p. 122). The 1980 Lake Placid Olympics focused on constructing facilities that would in turn be used as the United States Olympic training center. The recreational facilities developed would primarily benefit elite athletes with the general public not getting any tangible returns.

A movement to include the general public started during the 1988 Calgary Olympics, where planners created a medals plaza at the urban core. This marked the transition from primarily elitist to a more populist occasion (Hiller 1990). Close to two-thirds of Calgarians were able to go to at least one medal ceremony (Hiller 1990). The Olympic Plaza, which is next to the city hall on land that was going to be developed into a shopping mall, is considered one of the most significant legacies of the Calgary Olympics (Hiller 1990). "Since the Olympics, the plaza has served as the primary leisure-time attraction in the downtown core; its terraced surfaces facilitate the gathering of crowds for music festivals, holiday celebrations, noon-hour entertainment, ice skating, wading, and tennis matches" (Hiller 1990, p. 127).

The Calgary Games marked a very important restructuring of the U.S.O.C. bid process. After the 1988 Games, the U.S. returned with only six medals, prompting a congressional committee inquiry of the meager performance (Salt Lake 2002 Official Report 2002). The latest condition was that a bid city had to establish training facilities before winning the bid. The logic was that there needed to be more amenities to train
Olympic hopefuls, therefore generating more U.S. Olympic medals. The bid process was a means of producing these facilities through the new legacy venues. This was the first time that the U.S.O.C. concentrated on recreational infrastructure legacies. Due to this new tactic, the United States has been rewarded with excellent recreational facilities throughout the country, not only in Olympic host towns.

The 1990’s sustained communities’ aspirations to host the Olympics due to the new degree of popularity of tourism and leisure ventures.

Over the last few years, there has been growing interest in events of various kinds and their potential for stimulating local and regional economic development. One important reason for this seems to be the development of the tourism and leisure sector and the growing importance of events as a means of entertaining people. The mass media, in particular television, are important as catalysts for this development and for attributing economic value to these events. (Spilling 1994, p. 135)

The 1992 Albertville Games demonstrated advancement in the tourism and leisure sector. Two major reasons for hosting the Games were to acquire a winter sports status and to create a tourist industry after the Games (Sordet 1996). Albertville anticipated that the Games would stimulate tourist activity, therefore durable amenities were planned for the post-Game period (Sordet 1996). The real long term benefits of recreational open space were recognized in economic terms.

Another significant advance was the increased use of the Olympics in town planning. For the 1992 Games, Barcelona used a strategic town planning approach, presenting a new norm for Olympic organization. This new model stressed reconstruction over expansion, and redefining public territory in order to promote a healthy urban fabric (Abad 1996). Atlanta used this model to a certain extent during the 1998 Summer Games. The idea was to “make good of the functional imbalances
manifested by a city” (Synadinos 2001). This decade established the idea that hosting the Games gave the opportunity to restructure and improve its urban value (Abad 1996). The Games also worked to advance interests left pending indefinitely due to administrative disputes (Abad 1996). Urban improvements which would otherwise be left on the back burner gained momentum due to the Olympic process. Abad said that the Barcelona Games paid “homage to man’s ability to envisage town planning which blends in with and embraces its natural environment”.

The fundamental change which took place in the 1990’s was the prominence put on the environment. Emphasis on the environment intensified throughout the decade, reaching its zenith at the 2000 Sydney Games. One could say that the environmental movement within the Olympics originated during the 1976 Denver uproar. This initiated other bidding cities to insist on Environmental Impact Assessments like the case of the feasibility study conducted for Salt Lake City (see Chapter 6). Yet, the environment had not become a primary concern within the Olympics and was not worked into the official requirements. Albertville considered the environment to a certain extent when planning the Games, but it was not until the 1994 Lillehammer Games that the environment was used as a platform.

As the largest media event in the world and as a billion-dollar enterprise the Games can never really be environmentally friendly, regardless of any green actions. The Winter Olympics have long been considered a nemesis of the environment, much more so than the Summer Games (Trade and Environment Database [TED] 2002). The host cities have been chosen generally due to their “winter wonderland backdrops, not their existing sports facilities” (TED 2002, p. 6). This has led to the conclusion that the
only environmentally wise Olympics would be no Olympics at all (TED 2002). An alternative would be to recycle a location, creating a permanent site for the Games (Coote 1968; Hart 1981; TED 2002).

The suggestion that the Games should be hosted at a permanent site would obviously minimize the environmental impacts and provide optimal utilization from costly venues and stadiums. Yet, this is an improbable proposition, due to the exceedingly great amount of national pride and status associated with hosting the Olympic Games. Plus, the opportunity to develop host regions and economies are powerful incentives to sustain the Olympic spectacle. An additional incentive is the potential to attract foreign capital and tourism which is imperative in this global economy. TED suggests a compromise: to have a permanent Olympic site on every continent in order to disperse the “spoils” of hosting the Games.

“The very concept of the winter Games involves building huge winter sports arenas on once-pristine land and in doing so, they are often considered environmentally unfriendly” (TED 2002). This notion spurred environmentalists to be fervently against the Olympic Games in Lillehammer in “any shape or form” (TED 2002, p. 2). The battle between the environmentalists and planners over the speed skating hall placement within an internationally recognized bird sanctuary ultimately resulted in the forming of the “watchdog” group Project Environment-Friendly Olympics (TED 2002). The “greenness” of the 1994 Lillehammer Games is a direct consequence of the efforts of this group, which outlined a plan for the environment. The plan contained four points: 1) companies were directed to make use of natural materials wherever feasible; 2) importance was placed on energy conservation in heating and cooling systems; 3) a
A recycling program was developed for the entire winter games region; and 4) a provision was made that the arenas must harmonize with the surrounding landscape (TED 2002, p. 2). Although Lillehammer was charged with "eco-tokenism", Blair Palese of Greenpeace International stated "it's true they're really making an effort, and that's admirable" (TED 2002, p. 3). This movement by Lillehammer to make the environment a third pillar in their core values produced the first "green" Games in the history of the Winter Olympics. This venture had positive repercussions for environmental evolution within the Olympic movement particularly when IOC President Samaranch was quoted at the Lillehammer Games as saying "as we enter the Third Millennium, it is the IOC's chief duty to respect the environment" (TED 2002, p. 3).

This movement acknowledged the impact of sport on the environment. Like any individual or corporation, the actions of a sportsman/woman, a sport association or a sport equipment manufacturer have an effect on their surrounding - the environment. As we build our stadia and sport centers, modify our water courses for training and competitions, modify shorelines of lakes, divert and or straighten rivers, and as we turn the planet into a veritable golf course, we are losing our wetlands, breeding grounds for our fish, birds and insects, polluting surface and ground water sources with pesticides, fungicides and chemical fertilizers and lowering our water tables and supplies. The ecological costs of these actions are indeed extraordinary. (www.unep.org/cpi/sport_env 2002/2/9/2002, p. 1)

Real progress occurred when the IOC signed a deal with the UN Environmental Program (UNEP) in June 1994. This agreement encompassed future Olympic Games and other international sporting events as a cooperative effort between the IOC and the UNEP in an attempt to make sports events environmentally friendly. "This agreement comes as a follow up to 'the momentum of the success of the Lillehammer Olympics', IOC President Samaranch said....Guidelines will be set up for sporting events organizers
covering the selection, construction, and holding of sports events, as well as green
criteria for Olympic host cities and environmental standards for sponsors”
(www.unep.org/cpi/sport_env 2002 2/9/2002). The IOC organized the “Sport and
Environment” Commission in 1995 which officially established the environment as being
the third dimension of the Olympic movement after sport and culture (The Olympic
Movement n.d.). “It sees to it that the Olympic Games are held in conditions which
demonstrate a responsible concern for environmental issues and works to promote a
policy of consciousness raising among the members of the Olympic movement in order
that all sports events may take environmental considerations into account in a responsible
way” (The Olympic Movement n.d.). This continued to evolve when the Sport and
Environment commission prepared the Olympic Movement’s Agenda 21, which was
included in 1999 (www.olympic.org/environment/index 2002). Agenda 21 was a result of
the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro “invitation to all members of society to adapt
this document to their particular circumstances and implement it”
to aggressively pursue sustainable development in their sports programs
(www.olympic.org/environment/index 2002).

The environmental movement’s influence on recreational open space is
momentous. As stated at the 1997 World Conference on Sport and the Environment,
Olympic Games clean-up campaigns and tree-plantings are more than just “lip service”
but leave a considerable “contribution to revitalization of sports grounds, rehabilitation of
former waste lands and bringing green space and life back into neglected areas” (World
However, one should refrain from painting a picture too rosy. The impact of any Olympic Game, 'green' or not, will by its hugeness necessarily leave its marks. Lillehammer is not the same after the Games, it has forever changed. However, it will be up to the locals and future generations to decide whether it has been a change for better or for worse. (TED 2002, p. 3)

The Winter Olympics have evolved, from a spotlight of national pride to a mega-event of global significance for host cities. As the ideals of modern society change, the planning for Olympic venues changes to incorporate them. With the birth of a world-wide, environmentally friendly recreational movement, the task of Olympic cities to build lasting legacies for recreational open space becomes increasingly important.
Background

Chamonix is a town in the province of the Haute Savoie in France. It is located in the French Alps at the base of Mt. Blanc, bordered by Italy and Switzerland.

Chamonix received its first tourist expedition in 1741, during the reign of Charles Emmanuel III. English soldiers, William Whindham and Richard Pococke, visited the valley and climbed the Mer de Glace “Ocean of Ice” Glacier. In 1786, Mt.Blanc was summited for the first time by Doctor Michel-Gabriel Paccard and Jacques Balmat. (Chamonix Office de Tourism 2002). This was the beginning of the fascination and attraction of tourists to the Chamonix Valley.

During this time, Chamonix established itself as a mecca for mountaineers and adventure seekers. The town was a breeding ground for experimentation in snow sports. Skiing made its debut in 1893, when the first ski arrived from Norway. In 1896, Alfred Couttet started the first ski school (101 Ans De Ski a Chamonix 1994). In 1907, the Glacier Tram, was built (Chamonix Office de Tourism 2002) and the tenth Concours International, an International competition, took place in Chamonix (101 Ans De Ski a Chamonix 1994). This amplified Chamonix reputation as the premiere snow sport destination in France.

With snow sports gaining popularity, the question of including them in the Olympic Games arose. Artistic ice skating was introduced at the 1908 London Games, with an event for the men, women, and couple skating (Un Siecle D’Olympisme En Hiver n.d.).
skating was a success, modern Olympic Founder Baron Pierre de Coubertin, did not think winter sports were as important as summer sports and continued to shun them from becoming an official part of the Olympics (Un Siecle D'Olympisme En Hiver n.d.). In opposition to this opinion, the Scandinavians (Norwegians, Finlanders, and the Swedes) inaugurated the Games of the North. The Games of the North were a huge success resulting in winter sports gaining esteem. As a result, at the IOC session on June 2, 1921, in Lausanne, Switzerland, the question surfaced: why there was not a winter sports program (101 Ans De Ski a Chamonix 1994)? On June 5, 1921, the IOC decided, despite Coubertin’s reproach, there would be a winter sports complement to the 1924 Paris summer Olympic Games. It was not one hundred percent supported since it was not officially called the Winter Olympics but “Semaine des Sports d’Hiver” or Winter Sports Week.

Because it was the first winter Olympics there was no bid process. It was assumed, since the summer Games were taking place in Paris, the Winter Olympics should also take place in France. This procedure of designations a Winter Olympic site based on where the Summer Olympics took place was essentially maintained until after WWII. Besides being in the same country, it was necessary that the Winter Olympics site be able to afford the process, accommodate the athletes and provide the facilities for the venues.

Chamonix’ winter sports reputation led to the decision by the IOC on January 24, 1923, that Chamonix would be the host for the inaugural Winter Sports Week (Comite Olympic Francais 1924). The First International Sports Week started on January 24, 1924, ran for eleven days (see Figure 3-2). This was thirty years after the first modern Olympics were held in 1896 in Athens. There were two hundred and ninety three athletes from sixteen countries. The events held at this first Winter Olympics included artistic ice-
skating, hockey, speed skating, curling, Nordic 60 meter ski jump, cross country skiing (18km, 50km, and military) the bobsled and skeleton (see Figure 3-1 for location of venues). During the closing ceremonies, Baron Pierre de Coubertin, IOC president, declared that “Winter sports are among the purest, and that is why I was so eager to see them take their place in a definitive way among the Olympic events,” which reflected his warming up to the games. At the 25th IOC session in Lisbon in May of 1926, the games were officially recognized as the first Winter Olympics on record (TSN Magazine 2002).
Figure 3-1. Location of Olympic venues as shown in the official report. A is the Olympic Stadium which included the opening, closing, and medal ceremonies, figure skating, hockey, speed skating, and curling. B is the bobsled course, and C is the Nordic ski jump. The cross country ski trails spanned the entire area (Comite Olympic Francais 1924).
The Games

*Opening and Closing Ceremonies.* The Opening Ceremony was organized as a procession of athletes and other representatives marching from the central town church through town to the stadium (see figures 3-3, 3-5, 3-7, 3-9, and 3-10). This processional route followed a historical pedestrian link from the church to the outlying areas, followed since early founding of the town.

This processional route is still in existence today (see figures 3-4, 3-6, and 3-8). The church remains a focal point of the town, surrounded by important town offices, and is utilized as a gathering spot for a variety of uses. The path of the parade was a result of the historical growth of the town and is still dominated by pedestrians coming and going from town with all the primary stores being located on this street.
Tradition provided the backbone of recreational open space legacy in the town of Chamonix. The historical importance of the Church, the way the community formed around it throughout history, made it an obvious choice for the opening ceremony. Likewise the historic use of the parade route gave the Olympic processional historical significance. This route did not emerge because of the Games, but the Games further strengthened the traditions and urban fabric of the town. It is important to understand that it was not just the Olympic event that created the sacredness of this procession but rather it is the continual use and adaptive reuse that give it importance. The community has developed an even more intricate and inviting passive recreational open space legacy, as a result of the Olympic use of the area.
Figure 3-3. Plan of the opening ceremony procession as illustrated in the official report. Note important locations: A is the starting point at church, G is the stands for the officials, and the patinoire is the Olympic stadium. The solid line indicates the route for the athletes and dashed line represents additional processions (Comite Olympic Francais 1924).

Figure 3-4. Chamonix 1924 opening ceremony procession map overlaid on 2002 town map.
Figure 3-5. Opening ceremony procession starting at the church, January 24, 1924 © IOC Museum.

Figure 3-6. Church where opening ceremony began, as seen in 2002.
Figure 3-7. Swiss delegation in front of the opening ceremony church, January 24, 1924 ©IOC Museum.

Figure 3-8. Approximate view shown in figure 3-7, as it appears today.
Figure 3-9. Opening ceremony procession reaching stadium © IOC Museum.

Figure 3-10. View of stadium during the Games © IOC Museum.
Medals Ceremony, Ice Skating, Hockey, and Speed Skating. It was necessary to build a stadium for the opening and closing ceremonies, the medals ceremonies, hockey, artistic ice-skating, and speed skating. The location chosen for the construction of the stadium was the site of an historic ice-skating rink, which was bordered by the Arve River (see figure 3-11, 3-12, and 3-13) (Comite Olympic Francais 1924). This was the best location, as the river provided necessary water for the rink in the winter as well as drainage outlet for the melting ice in the spring, and it was an advantageous central location for post-game use. The 36,000 m² stadium was opened in December 1923 by the International Olympic Committee (Gallay and Mollier 1998).

The original stadium and ice rink were later removed. In 1972, the Center for Sport and Culture was established which exemplified the spirit of the original stadium (see figure 3-14). This Center was erected on the same location as the Olympic Stadium, creating an extensive sports nucleus for the town. Located at the Center for Sport and Culture is the very large and important FISA ski school, the high school, the indoor ice skating rink, outdoor skating rink, the speed skating and running track, a skate park, an elaborate swimming facility, tennis courts, and a parapont landing area (see figures 3-15 through 3-22). It serves as the primary trailhead for extensive cross country ski, biking and walking trails.

The creation of a permanent recreational complex, rather than converting a prime development parcel to another land use, indicates the local value placed on tradition and recreational open space. During a speech on the 60th anniversary of the first Winter Olympics, the mayor of Chamonix said that "through the creation
Of the Olympic Park, Chamonix holds the stamp of the attachment and the integrity of the ideas which were the driving force of the 1924 Olympic pioneers’ (Discours du President a Chamonix 60e Anniversaire des Premiers Jeux d’Hiver Chamonix 1984). The value of integrating this historic Olympic site into the modern recreational open space fabric indicates the importance of the Olympics to Chamonix. This is just another example of how Chamonix’ adaptive reuse of an Olympic site has strengthened the recreational open space legacy. This enduring footprint of the happenings of the fleeting fortnight has established a lasting legacy for residents of Chamonix.
Figure 3-11. Chamonix 1924 stadium plan (Comite Olympic Francais 1924).
Figure 3-12. Olympic stadium as it appeared during the Games © IOC Museum.

Figure 3-13. Hockey match at Olympic stadium © IOC Museum.
Figure 3-14. Chamonix 2002 Center for Sport and Culture approximate location of original stadium.

Figure 3-15. Center for Sport and Culture tennis courts with Mt. Blanc in background, in 2002.
Figure 3-16. Center for Sport and Culture pool, spring 2002.

Figure 3-17. Trails next to the Arve River.
Figure 3-18. Trail system radiating from Center for Sport and Culture with Arve River to the left; approximate location of original Olympic stadium.

Figure 3-19. Center for Sport and Culture speed skating rink and track.
Figure 3-20. Center for Sport and Culture skate park with speed skating rink, indoor ice rink and high school in the background.

Figure 3-21. Center for Sport and Culture indoor ice rink.
Figure 3-22. Center for Sport and Culture outdoor ice rink.
Nordic Jump. Nordic jumping was very popular in the Chamonix valley with several ski jumps already existing prior to the 1924 Games (Gallay and Mollier 1998). The Tremplin du Grépon, erected at the base of the Galcier des Bossons in 1908, was selected as the Olympic venue (see figures 3-1 C, figure 3-23, and 3-25) (Gallay and Mollier 1998). To suit the needs of the competition, the jump was extended to 60 meters with a maximum slope of 35°, and an area was provided for spectators (Comite Olympic Francais 1924).

Today, there is still a Nordic ski jump at Les Bossons (see figures 3-24, and 3-26). It has been reconstructed but is located on the same site. The jump is currently used for local contests and as a training area for local Olympic hopefuls. The area is characterized by the Nordic jump with its associated lifts and structures, and a restaurant at the base called Le Tremplin Café (the Nordic ski jump café). There is no doubt that the ski jump has had a formative impact on Les Bossons of Chamonix. Other ski jumps established at the time of the Olympics are no longer in use and have deteriorated. This leads to the assumption that Les Bossons has derived lasting value for the community as a recreational facility due to its place in the Olympics. The reuse of the Nordic jump is another instance of the importance put on traditions that transcend time creating a recreational open space legacy.
Figure 3-23. Les Bossons Nordic ski jump during the Olympic competition, 1924 © IOC Museum.

Figure 3-24. Les Bossons Nordic ski jump, dominated by Mt. Blanc on the right, as viewed in spring 2002.
Figure 3-25. Olympic ski jump competitor in 1924 © IOC Museum.

Figure 3-26. Nordic ski jump in spring 2002 similar view as shown in figure 3-25.
Bobsled. It was decided by Olympic organizers that the rapidly growing popularity of the bobsled demanded a competition course. The bobsled course needed to be constructed and it was determined to locate it at Pélérins de Chamonix (see B on figure 3-1, 3-27, and 3-28). This was a good location since the start of the course could be reached by the Glacier Tram. The bobsled course was designed by Edouard Dorges, utilizing the Bernouilli theory to determine trajectories based on centrifugal forces (101 Ans De Ski a Chamonix 1994). The run had 19 turns with the famous “S” turn called the Ecureuils (Gallay and Mollier 1998). There had never been a bobsled course built with this amount of consideration before. The event was extremely popular due to the danger and speed that the track created.

Today, the bobsled track has deteriorated and is concealed by trees and brush. The Glacier Tram that carried people to the top of the track is antiquated and no longer used. The road that leads to the Mt. Blanc tunnel (a tunnel going through Mt. Blanc from France to Italy) is located near this site, and construction of the road destroyed parts of the bobsled run. The remnants of the bobsled course can be found while hiking up a series of trails leading to the Bossons Glacier (see figure 3-29).

It is peculiar that the bobsled has been overlooked as part of the town’s recreational open space, given the role of other venues from 1924. Some assumptions can be made regarding its neglected condition. First, the cost of maintaining a bobsled track is very high. It is traditionally the white elephant of Olympic venues. Second, the sport has a limited amount of competitors due to the cost of acquiring equipment and lack of training facilities. Finally, access to the track was made difficult with closing of the Glacier Tram. The bobsled ruins have become part of Chamonix recreational open
space network indirectly by defining trails and creating charming play areas for local children.
Figure 3-27. Construction of bobsled course, 1923 (Rapport Officiel 1924).

Figure 3-28. The bobsled track during Olympic competition in 1924 © IOC Museum.
Figure 3-29. Ruins of bobsled track as viewed in spring 2002.
Cross-country Skiing. There is no mention of the construction of the cross-country courses in Olympic documentation. It is possible that the course followed existing footpaths through the valley, since cross-country skiing was already well established in the Chamonix valley and was recognized as the optimal means of snow travel at the time. During the Olympic Games in 1924, there were three cross-country skiing courses; the 18-km course, the 50-km course, and the military course (see figures 3-30 through 3-34).

Cross-country skiing is still very popular in the Chamonix valley. It is undeniably a huge part of the culture, with trails running through neighborhoods and towns, crossing public and private land (see figure 3-35 through 3-38). The trail system is extensive spanning throughout the entire valley. The trails, which are used for biking, running, hiking and picnicking in the summer, are groomed for cross-country skiing and walking in the winter. Some of the trails run through agricultural land that is used for grazing during the off season. The trails are a wonderful way to travel through the valley and are used by everyone (see figures 3-36 & 3-38). The network is a result of cooperation between ski resorts, town officials, and local residents. A seasons pass is good for trails throughout the region (including the 1992 Olympic trails at Les Saisies).

This trail network is not a direct result of hosting the Olympics, but is another example of how the Olympics are an integral part of the community’s legacy by enriching an already existing recreational open space feature. It is difficult to determine whether the current trails are in the exact locations of the Olympic trails, although current trail maps do suggest that the same general routes were used (see figure 3-37). The role these trails play in the community cannot be over emphasized. They are a means of
connecting the communities, they represent the strong values put on sport, and illustrate how the landscape can be modified for multiple uses (see figure 3-36). The cross-country trails are the symbol of the recreational open space legacy in Chamonix, which was enhanced by hosting the Winter Olympics.

Plan du parcours des 18 kms.

Figure 3-30. Cross-country skiing 18 km course map (Rapport Officiel 1924).
Figure 3-31. Cross-country skiing 50 km course map (Rapport Officiel 1924).

Plan du parcours de l'épreuve de ski militaire.

Figure 3-32. Cross-country skiing military course map (Rapport Officiel 1924).
Figure 3-33. Cross-country skiing military © IOC Museum.

Figure 3-34. Cross-country skiing military © IOC Museum.
Figure 3-36. Cross-country and walking trails, 2002.
Figure 3-37. Chamonix Valley/Argentiere 2002 cross-country skiing and walking trails map © Foyer Ski du Fond Chamonix 2002.

Figure 3-38. Chamonix Valley/Argentiere 2002 cross-country and walking trails.
Conclusions

Chamonix has a strong cultural identity that has been defined by the mountains. Therefore, when Chamonix hosted the Winter Olympics, it was indisputably the most authentic place to host the event. Like the sanctuary of Olympia, Chamonix grew naturally as a consequence of its physical appearance, functions and activities. The physical nature is dominated by the Alps and glaciers, most notably Mt.Blanc. This landscape directly influenced the evolution of the town’s form and function. Everything from agriculture and building materials to building locations, and transportation (trams and cross country skiing) have roots in the town’s natural setting. The town’s tourism based economy is a result of its physical appearance. The traditions and local attitude are centered around the mountains and winter sports. By looking at the historic Olympic venues, one can see that the locations were chosen based on the community’s connectedness to the landscape and tradition. Chamonix’ Olympic program was an expression of the integral sense of place in the community. Olympic development that respected natural physical form and local traditions ensured that the venues would prevail after the Olympic fortnight was over.

An important aspect of the Chamonix Olympic program was the reuse of existing facilities, eliminating guess work and guaranteeing that the area would be a successful choice. Since the sport traditions were already in place, it assured that the area would be used after the Games. Today, all areas (with the exception of the bobsled track) have been restored and integrated with additional recreational and social facilities. The uses of these areas have transcended time which is the heart of a legacy.
The Olympics cannot be given primary credit for the recreational open space legacy of Chamonix. Yet the renovation of the Olympic sites strengthened and created a finer texture within the recreational open space system. The reuse and reconstruction of the Olympic sites endowed the town with a more deeply grained culture, landscape, community and history. By taking the sense of place and local traditions into account during the 1924 Winter Olympics, Chamonix was gifted with an enriching recreational open space legacy.

Chamonix is unique among the case studies due to its historical context, but it is comparable due to its motivation to host the Olympics. Chamonix was a pioneer in using a showcase event to attract international attention. Being the first Winter Olympics, it continues to garner worldwide recognition during every Winter Olympics. This illustrates the importance the Olympics play in a town’s global exposure and image. It is this aspect of the Chamonix games that the next Winter Olympics hosted by France at Grenoble in 1968 embraced and acknowledged as being the key to creating a community legacy as an outcome of hosting the games.
CHAPTER 4

GRENOBLE

Background

For the majority of Grenoble’s history it was characterized as a small and not exceptionally thriving town, developed behind 3rd century Roman walls (see figure 4-1). Grenoble maintained these qualities until the 19th century, even though it was the capital of Dauphiné province (Frappat 1991). With the development of hydroelectric power at the end of the 19th century, the town began to expand. The population surged following WWII, growing from 80,000 before the war to 300,000 in the early sixties (www.ville-grenoble.fr). The city became a hub of scientific research in the 1950’s, largely as a result of the research work of physicist Louis Néel (Frappat 1991). All of these advancements transformed Grenoble into a bustling urban center. However, the town did not have the infrastructure to handle this new growth.

The bid to host the games began on December 18, 1961, when a group formed the pre-Olympic committee (www.ville-grenoble.fr). Hosting the 1968 Winter Olympics was seen as an opportunity to seal Grenoble’s transformation to major city status by enhancing its international reputation. The Olympics were perceived as a vehicle for urban improvements (see figure 4-2, and 4-3).

In the Candidature report submitted to the IOC, Grenoble was marketed as a mountaineering center in the magnificent location nestled among the Belledonne, Chartreuse and Vercors mountains (see figure 4-4 and 4-5). The history of skiing in the area dated back to 1878, when Henry Duhamel skied the vast snow fields for the first
time. The Candidature report pointed out that the citizens of Grenoble were driving the immense development of this “winter playground”, demonstrating public support for winter sports, which would make Grenoble an ideal center for Winter Olympics (Comité de Candidature Grenoble, 1968. 1962).

Although the town was publicized as being the capital of the Alps, it was still mainly an industrial city, not a winter resort town with an image appropriate for hosting the Winter Olympics (TSN magazine 2002). In addition, public facility expansion had not kept pace with the extraordinary population growth that Grenoble experienced after WWII. In 1964 the Ministère de la Construction chose Henry Bernard, a Parisian architect, to create an urban development master plan for Grenoble (www.ville-grenoble.fr 2002). This was in an effort to further support the bid to host the 1968 Games.

At the 1964 IOC session in Innsbruck, Grenoble was granted the 1968 Winter Olympics by a narrow 27-24 vote over Calgary (Wallechinsky 2001). This was most likely a result of Lyon, France being denied the Summer Olympics, which leaned the vote towards France. The honor of hosting the Winter Olympics truly acted as a catalyst for Grenoble’s urban renovation and improvements.

The privilege to host the Olympics, in conjunction with the previously initiated effort to upgrade the city’s urban infrastructure, provided a unique alliance between the two jobs. The improvements required to host the Olympics necessitated the preparation of Grenoble’s first comprehensive master plan for urban development and the construction of housing, schools, sports and leisure facilities (www.ville-grenoble.fr 2002). The list of urban renewal projects was extensive, ranging from new motorways to
a new town hall. The Olympics generated an exceptional amount of energy for the
development of new facilities. The benefits of this novel relationship between the host
city and the Olympics can still be seen today in Grenoble.

It is important to understand the historical context surrounding the 1968 Grenoble
Winter Olympics. The context differs significantly from the first Winter Olympics in
Chamonix. First, there was an intense competition for the Games, since they were now
recognized as a means of obtaining international recognition, as well as a means of
enhancing the host city. Due to advancements in technology, notably television,
Grenoble was expecting an unprecedented amount of international attention from the
Games. The result of this was pressure to develop a marketable image that would be
highly regarded.

By the time Grenoble was awarded the Games, the Olympics were recognized as
such a costly undertaking that one country could not host both the summer and winter
events. This was the beginning of the growth of the elaborate spectacle associated with
the Games. The Olympics had evolved from a simple undertaking to a huge international
event that demanded a complex organizational process (Borja 1992). Hosting the
Olympics was seen as a national affair. During the IOC’s 63rd session in Madrid in
1965, the Winter Olympics were recognized as a “new kind of enterprise, engaging
numerous collective organizations and institutions.” The magnitude of the job of hosting
the Olympics confirmed that Grenoble, and French citizens, had an optimistic view of the
enterprise. In the 63rd IOC session’s ending remarks it was stated:

It goes without saying that these projects to be carried out in preparation for the
Olympic Games have a permanent value for the city and the region. The sports
improvements will enhance the quality and capacity of the skiing resorts, the
public substructures being in accordance with operations previously planned within the region, the Olympics will but serve to speed their completion....This endeavor will long continue to bear fruit for the prosperity of Grenoble and the region. (Comite d'Organization des Xes Jeux Olympiques d' Hiver 1965, p. 10)
Figure 4-1. 1867 Map of Grenoble. Note Roman walls and approximate location of parc Paul Mistral (courtesy of Grenoble’s archive office).

Figure 4-2. Bird’s eye view of Grenoble in 1965 (Comite de Candidature Grenoble, 1968).
The Games

*Opening Ceremony.* The Opening Ceremony location was not determined as of the 63rd Session of the International Olympic Committee in Madrid 1965. The Saint Nizier 90-meter Nordic Jump site was given consideration due to the natural amphitheatre and its proximity to Grenoble (Comité d'Organization des Xes Jeux Olympiques d’Hiver 1965). A back-up plan was formulated using a “tubular framework” that could be set up in a relatively short time (Comité d'Organization des Xes Jeux Olympiques d’Hiver 1965). During the 64th Session of the IOC in Rome “after considerable hesitation, the decision was finally made to hold the opening ceremony in the existing municipal stadium in the Paul Mistral Park. This solution, which may not please everybody, presents a certain number of advantages the first of which is, in my opinion, to closely associate the Grenoble population with this ceremony” (Comité d'Organization des Xes Jeux Olympiques d’Hiver 1966). It must have been a big enough
controversy because the location was moved later to the Malherbe neighborhood located by the Olympic Village (see figure 4-3).

The opening ceremonies were by far the most elaborate ceremonies that the Winter Olympics had ever experienced, involving 18,000 participants (see figures 4-8 through 4-10). The Olympic flame was flown by air from Athens to France. Thousands of paper roses were released on the stadium by several helicopters. Five parachutists drew the Olympic rings in the sky with smoke. Cannons fired the Olympic flags into the sky and General Charles de Gaulle read the Olympic Oath (TSN Magazine 2002). This initial ceremony set the tone for the rest of the Games and tagged the Grenoble Games as the “Grandiose” Olympics (TSN Magazine 2002).

During his opening ceremony speech, IOC President Avery Brundage said, “The Olympic flame has arrived in France, may its light cut through the clouds of discord, and the misunderstanding of the true Olympic philosophy of that distinguished and universally respected Frenchman, Baron de Courbertin, and light the way to a less materialistic but a happier and more peaceful world” (TSN Magazine 2002).

Original plans called for the Olympic flame to be extinguished and relocated to the other sites (see figure 4-46). But because of the symbolic representation of the flames as an ancient symbol of honor and courage and the pledge of peace and friendship, it was decided to keep the flame lit (Comité d'Organization des Xes Jeux Olympiques d’ Hiver 1968). Being visible from surrounding areas, the Olympic flame made the opening stadium an attraction throughout the Games (Comité d'Organization des Xes Jeux Olympiques d’ Hiver 1968). Since the Grenoble Games, the Olympic flame has been a
uniting factor for communities during the Games and a symbol of the events even after the Games have left town.

Today the location for the opening ceremony of 1968 is part of the Malherbe neighborhood (see figures 4-11 through 4-15). As a result of the urban master plan, it has become a nicely integrated part of the Olympic Village that was designed close by. This study has not addressed the Olympic Village but it is important to note that this neighborhood was designed in conjunction with the Olympic facilities as a result of demographic pressures. The housing is high density, interlinked by paths and open space. The neighborhood represents well thought out urban planning, but in my opinion, it is not a result of the opening stadium having been located there. Nevertheless, this area could be used as a model for future cities trying to utilize the Olympics to revitalize and shape their urban fabric. The area of the opening ceremony is a wonderful passive and active recreational open space. The community’s recreational open space legacy has been enriched indirectly as a result of the Winter Olympics.
Figure 4-7. Plan of opening ceremony stadium and venues (compare to figures 4-2 and 4-5) (courtesy of Grenoble archive office).
Figure 4-8. The opening ceremony. The parade of the delegation: a flag bearer. © IOC Museum.

Figure 4-9. Bird’s eye view of the Olympic stadium during opening ceremony © IOC Museum.
Figure 4-10. General View of the Olympic stadium during the opening ceremony © IOC Museum.

Figure 4-11. Approximate location of opening ceremony as seen spring 2002.
Figure 4-12. Open space surrounding trails at opening ceremony location.

Figure 4-13. Passive recreational open space surrounding opening ceremony location.
Figure 4-14. High density housing of the Malherbe neighborhood.

Figure 4-15. Trail and recreational open space system extends into parc Jean Verlbac (see figure 4-5 for location).
Medal Ceremonies, Ice Skating, Hockey and Closing Ceremony. Because of Grenoble’s low elevation (215 meters), snow-related events were held outside the city. Within the city were ice events, staged indoor events on a well refrigerated site (Comité d’Organization des Xes Jeux Olympiques d’ Hiver 1965). The medal ceremonies, ice skating, hockey, and closing ceremony took place in the ice rink that was constructed for the Olympics. The stadium was built on the perimeter Paul Mistral Park (see figure 4-1 and 4-2), located just outside the old Roman walls. In 1963, the park had already become the site for the local ice skating rink (Comité d'Organization des Xes Jeux Olympiques d’ Hiver 1965).

The decision to hold the medals ceremonies in the ice stadium which allowed the press photographers to work in the “best possible conditions” (see figures 4-16 through 4-20). The hockey and ice skating events took place in the ice stadium with training also taking place in the historic ice rink (Comité d'Organization des Xes Jeux Olympiques d’ Hiver 1968). The closing ceremony was also in the rink and was modest in comparison with the opening ceremony. It took place on February 18th. In his speech delivered during the closing ceremony, Avery Brundage, urged that “the Olympic flame be handed down in this way through the ages with still more enthusiasm, sincerity and fervor for the good of humanity” (Comité d'Organization des Xes Jeux Olympiques d’ Hiver 1968).

The area surrounding the stadium is obviously a node for passive and active recreation today (see figures 4-21 through 4-24). The Olympics enabled the city to expand the established facilities increasing the attraction to the site. The Olympic Hall is used for ice skating exhibitions, concerts, and other social functions. The readaptation of this site following the Olympics has proven to be successful, assisting in the area’s
prosperity. The use of the Paul Mistral Park for active and passive recreation strengthened the existing urban fabric, enriching Grenoble’s recreational open space legacy.

Figure 4-16. The closing ceremony at the ice stadium © IOC Museum.
Figure 4-17. View of the ice stadium during a medal ceremony © IOC Museum.

Figure 4-18. The medal ceremonies at the ice stadium, Jean-Claude Killy (FRA) © IOC Museum.
Figure 4-19. Spectators in front of the ice stadium during the Olympics © IOC Museum.

Figure 4-20. The surroundings of the ice stadium during the Olympics © IOC Museum.
Figure 4-21. View of ice rink, spring 2002.

Figure 4-22. Original ice rink established in 1963, spring 2002.
Figure 4-23. Olympic caldron at the entrance of Paul Mistral Park, spring 2002.

Figure 4-24. Paul Mistral Park with Ice Stadium in background, spring 2002.
Speed Skating. The speed skating rink was located adjacent to the 1963 ice rink and in the vicinity of the new ice stadium in the Paul Mistral Park (see figure 4-2, 4-25, and 4-27). Because of Grenoble’s altitude, it was necessary to artificially freeze the rink. There were no noted problems with the rink during the 1968 Olympics.

Presently, the rink has been maintained and is heavily used by locals as an ice skating and rollerblading rink (see figures 4-26 and 4-28). The foresight to incorporate the speed skating venue into the existing urban fabric was a successful choice. Grenoble’s recreational open space legacy was enriched as a result of the placement of the speed skating rink. This site is an example of a host city incorporating the Olympic facilities into a well conceived urban master plan creating a “true recreational district.” The adaptive use of the Olympic facilities continues to provide the community with passive and active recreational use (see figure 4-26 and 4-29). The speed skating rink is part of an intricate recreation network, which owes its existence to the Olympics. The placement of the oval in an established Paul Mistral Park, together with the adjacent ice stadium (see figure 4-28) has produced a strong recreational open space system for the city of Grenoble.

The Grenoble Games became a model for future Olympic hosts in terms of using venues to reinforce and expand their recreational open space networks. This was a defining moment for the Olympics, coupling new development strategies with the Games.
Figure 4-25. Preparation of the track for Olympic competition © IOC Museum.

Figure 4-26. Adaptive reuse of speed skating oval with Olympic Ice Hall in the background, spring 2002.
Figure 4-27. Speed skating training at the oval during the Games © IOC Museum.

Figure 4-28. Speed skating rink, spring 2002.
Figure 4-29. View of speed skating oval with Paul Mistral Park on the edge.
**Nordic Jump.** The 70-meter Nordic ski jump was located in the town of Autrans near the cross-country ski courses. It was positioned on the historic ski-jump site on the north-slope of the colline du Claret (Comité d'Organisation des Xes Jeux Olympiques d’Hiver 1965). The 90-meter Nordic ski jump was located at Saint Nizier, 17 km from Grenoble, and was visible from the city (see figure 4-30). It was chosen because of the natural amphitheater formed by the landscape, at the foot of the Trois Pucelles rocks, and because it was thought that the northern exposure protected it from the wind (Comité d'Organisation des Xes Jeux Olympiques d'Hiver 1965).

The 70-meter jump in Autrans exists today and is still used for Nordic jumping and training (see figure 4-31). The area surrounding the site has maintained its charm and is distinguished by a rural landscape setting (see figure 4-45).

Autrans’ Nordic ski jump is in good condition in contrast to the 90-meter jump at Saint Nizier, which has been abandoned (see figures 4-33 and 4-35). Despite good intentions on the part of planners, the site turned out to be too windy (Coote 1968). It is now a monument to the 1968 Games, illustrating how poor site selection for an event can result in a white elephant. The area is used for recreation and competition but not for Nordic ski jumping. The area surrounding the jump has been modified for World Cup mountain bike competitions and training (see figures 4-35 and 4-36).

These two Nordic jump sites represent how the program for site selection is critical for post-Olympic use. Autrans’ 70-meter jump is an example of successful site selection because it exists for the same purpose it was built (see figure 4-32). A tradition for the sport was already established, and the facility location has proven to be successful for the sport.
On the flip side, the 90-meter jump selection was an example of the grandiose spectacles typical of the 1968 games. The primary logic reported in the initial stages of site selection was based on the idea that the site was protected from the wind. It was quickly verified that the site was too windy during competitions, which caused its failure. Since no competitors or clubs would use the site, it did not receive the financial support it needed to be sustained. In addition, there were no local traditions that could lend support to the maintenance of the structure (see figure 4-34 and 4-36). The 90-meter jump, while not an example of successful site location, still enriches the legacy of recreational open space (World Cup mountain biking figure 4-37). Maybe not the kind of legacy intended, but certainly not a total loss.

Figure 4-30. View of the 90-meter Nordic jump (right) and the Trois Pucelles rocks (left) at Saint-Nizier.
Figure 4-31. The 70-meter Nordic jump in Autrans during Olympic competition © IOC Museum.

Figure 4-32. The contemporary Nordic jumps at Autrans, spring 2002.
Figure 4-33. View of the 90-meter Nordic jump in Saint-Nizier during the Olympics © IOC Museum.

Figure 4-34. The abandoned Nordic jump at Saint-Nizier, spring 2002.
Figure 4-35. View of Olympic spectators and Grenoble from the 90m Nordic jump during competition at Saint-Nizier © IOC Museum.

Figure 4-36. View of Grenoble from the abandoned 90m Nordic jump, mountain bike track on left.
Figure 4-37. World Cup mountain bike course at Saint Nizier jump site.
Bobsled. The bobsled race was the furthest event from Grenoble, held in the town of Alpe d’Huez (see figure 4-38). During the IOC 63rd session, the decision to hold the bobsled event at the Alpe d’Huez was defended because of its high altitude and the notion that the sport was already a tradition there. As had been the case with the 90m ski jump, problems emerged as a result of poor site selection. Alpe d’Huez was acknowledged as a sunny area which was not fully accepted until the first test of the track in 1967 (Coote 1968). As a result, two corners had to be rebuilt and three corners were artificially frozen (Coote 1968). Plans to hold the event during the evening (see figure 4-39 through 4-41) which did not solve the problem, since the course was unable to completely refreeze after a day of sun. The events were moved to the early morning (Coote 1968).

James Coote wrote in his account of the bobsled event:

Without doubt the most popular man in the sport had won his well deserved gold medals (Swiss Jean Wicki), but that was about the only satisfactory feature in a session of bobbing that most of those who took part, not to mention those who stood and watched, will quite happily forget. Whether the Alpe d’Huez bob track is ever used again must be questionable, but if it is I hope not to be there to see it. (Coote 1968, p. 132)

Coote does not have to worry, as the bobsled track has long since been removed.
Figure 4-38. Map of the bobsled track at Alpe d'Huez, Olympic venue © IOC Museum.

Figure 4-39. View of the track at night during competition © IOC Museum.
Figure 4-40. Two-man bob during competition at Alpe d’Huez © IOC Museum.

Figure 4-41. A bend in the bobsled track ©IOC Museum.
Cross-country Skiing. The town of Autrans was also chosen for the site of the cross-country skiing events based on the “gentle relief and moderate altitude resembling the Scandinavian countries” (Comité d’Organization des Xes Jeux Olympiques d’ Hiver 1965). The stadium was at the north end of Autrans with the trails laid out in the snow-covered forests with varied topography (see figures 4-42 through 4-45) (Comité d’Organization des Xes Jeux Olympiques d’ Hiver 1968). It was believed to be one of the only events and locations to truly represent the Olympic spirit of community and unity. The compact town encouraged interaction between competitors and spectators which the other events seemed to lack (Coote 1968).

Autrans still retains the qualities one would imagine were present in 1968. It remains a small charming village with the Olympic flame featured in the town center (see figure 4-46). The trails are used for both cross-country skiing and mountain biking, (see figure 4-47 and 4-48) attracting tourists from the surrounding areas.

The events at Autrans are another example of how adaptive use and reuse of existing sport facilities results in an enriched community recreational open space legacy. Cross-country skiing was an integral part of the community’s heritage, like Chamonix, reinforcing the town’s traditions and strengthening previous trails systems. Plus, the Olympic facilities were built on a human scale, allowing for a natural transition into the local recreational open space fabric. The town has been graced with a recreational open space legacy as a result of hosting the Winter Olympics Nordic ski jumping and cross-country ski events.
Figure 4-42. Aerial view of the Olympic event facilities in Autrans © IOC Museum.

Figure 4-43. View of the village of Autrans and the Olympic installations during the Games © IOC Museum.
Figure 4-44. The audience in the stands and along the cross-country tracks during competition © IOC Museum.

Figure 4-45. View of the cross-country track during event © IOC Museum.
Figure 4-46. View of the town from the Nordic jump site, spring 2002.

Figure 4-47. The Olympic flame in the town center at Autrans, spring 2002.
Figure 4-48. Map of the cross-country ski trails at Autrans © Office du Tourism Autrans 2002.
Conclusions

The Winter Olympics served the city of Grenoble well, providing the means to obtain public facilities it desperately needed. The list of urban improvements and new amenities is extensive. The 1968 Games demonstrates a step in the progression of the Winter Olympics becoming a major force in urban and recreation space development. Grenoble marked a turning point for the image of the Olympics: initiating gigantism in the Olympic makeup, it was the pinnacle of sport spectacles for the era, it was the beginning of commercialization of the Games, and it was the dawn of professional athletes (Naville 2001).

Although the 1968 Games were a success in terms of urban development, there were still concerns surrounding them. One concern was that the magnitude of the Games influenced too many aspects of the events. While successful in terms of overall impression, the traditional unifying spirit of the Games suffered (Is Bigness Bad 1968). The IOC’s move to hold the Winter Olympics in larger cities, that are not essentially winter sports centers, resulted in the venues being more dispersed, creating the lack of cohesiveness, except in the town of Autrans, where athletes from different countries were seen mingling and living as a true international community, exemplifying an initial goal of the Olympics. The lack of a unified Olympic spirit left spectators wondering what the Olympics were all about (Is Bigness Bad 1968). The spring 1968 issue of Ski Magazine, in the article “Is Bigness Bad?” stated that “at Grenoble, magnificence reigned without spirit.” The article said:

Things which are destined always to grow bigger must suffer the eventual fate of becoming too big. That is the current state of the Winter Olympics. In order to conduct the various ski, ice and sled events which comprise the Games, it has
become necessary to overhaul entire cities and to involve a bureaucracy buried in paper as deep as the snow of the surrounding mountains. 
(Is Bigness Bad 1968, p. 12)

Some would argue this was a change for the better, others would beg to differ.

The selection of Grenoble as the site for the 1968 Winter Games has been highly criticized. Marc Hodler, IOC treasurer and president of the International Federation of Skiing (FIS), used Grenoble as an example of how the IOC made decisions based on self-interest not from common sense (Coote 1968). Grenoble was not a winter sport center. The necessary dispersal of events undermined the goal of the Olympics to bring people together. The location of Grenoble simply did not lend itself to winter sports. It is too far south, and the influence of Atlantic weather and southern winds from the Mediterranean result in the area being misty and not conducive to winter sports (Coote 1968). It could also be argued that common sense did not play a role in selecting the venues; the choice to hold the bobsled event at the Alpe d'Huez (the sunniest place), the Alpine events at Chamrousse (the foggiest), the luge at Villard-de-Lans (the lowest in elevation) and the 90-meter Nordic ski jump at Saint-Nizier (the windiest) all speak to poor site selection.

The issue of commercialism was a prevailing concern throughout the Grenoble Games. Ironically, this quote was cited at the end of the foreword of the Canaditure Report:

As the people of ancient Greece used to forget their differences and meet to admire their athletes from all over the land, so may it be in 1968. May the Olympic flame bring men and women of all nations to Grenoble to compete for the symbolic olive crown in a spirit of true friendship and mutual understanding.
It was the notion of the symbolic olive crown, the idea that the Olympics were not to be a materialistic endeavor but rather an effort for the betterment of humanity that plagued the 1968 Games before, during, and after the events.

Since 1968, commercialism has become a most powerful influence on the Games. Commercialism directs the design of venues as a result of the desire to market the city, the Olympics, the athletes, and the sponsors. Today, the Olympics are the number-one televised event in the World, radiating its influence even farther. This has resulted in sites being developed primarily for television audiences. This pressure can lead to a lack of consideration for local landscape and the legacy of the Games, as long as the host is portrayed well on television.

The impact of the Games on the open space infrastructure of Grenoble had varying results. There are certain instances where the community’s recreational open space legacies were enriched. The venues bordering the Paul Mistral Park have become an integral piece of Grenoble’s passive and active recreational open space fabric. This is most likely the result of a couple of factors. First, the facilities were adapted to enhance an already existing recreational open space. The site is heavily used today. The events at Autrans were successful for similar reasons. The Nordic ski jump was built on an already existing sports facility. The town had a pre-existing cross country ski network. These sport amenities were not solely built for the Games but as an enhancement of the existing sport network.

The Grenoble Olympic sport facilities still in use are the ones that were modified from sites traditionally used for those sports. Like Chamonix, this program of developing
Olympic recreational open space proved to be a means of endowing the community with an enriched recreational open space legacy.

Conversely, the Olympics made absolutely no contribution to the lasting recreational open space legacy of other host communities. The 90-meter Nordic ski jump at St. Nizier is in complete disrepair, and the bobsled is non-existent. Environmentally, the sites were not suitable for the sports. Therefore the sites were not seen as optimal future sites for competition and training. Nordic ski jumping and bobsledding lack financial support groups, which ultimately resulted in the deterioration of these structures. Traditionally, these sports were not an integral part of the community. This lack of support further undermined any recreational open space legacy that could have been possible as a consequence of hosting the Winter Olympics.

Grenoble acted as a precursor for the direction of the Olympics and set the tone for future hosts. First, it demonstrated how commercialism was to become a major factor. Second, it became a model for future host communities on using the Olympics to stimulate and justify local development, referred to as the mega-event strategy (Andranovich, Burbank, and Heying 2001).

After the 1968 Winter Olympics, the Games were regarded as both a development strategy for national and local governments, and an opportunity for private companies to get global publicity. Financing was now supported by private sponsorship and revenues obtained from the selling of television rights (Borja 1992). This additional economic support invigorated development of venue facilities, creating state of the art amenities.

Grenoble’s Olympic preparation set a precedent for successive Winter Olympic Games. The idea of using the Olympics as a vehicle for infrastructure development
evolved with each subsequent Olympic host. The 1972 Sapporo Winter Olympics perceived the Games as an opportunity to economically stimulate the island of Hokkaido (Borja 1992).

In the 1980’s, the potential for winter sports related tourism was completely recognized. The 1984 Sarajevo Games saw the possibilities of the impressive Olympic sport facilities as a tourist attraction. Using this strategy Sarajevo attracted thousands of European skiers, until civil war broke out in the late 1980’s (Borja 1992). The development strategy for tourist attraction was a major factor in the bid for the Albertville Games in 1992.
“Here culture and nature have their land of preference. A country, where faith, humanities and art have left the testimony of man’s wonder in the face of the mountain, all through the centuries.” (Comité de Candidature Albertville, 1992, 1986 p. 4)

Background

Albertville is situated in the French Savoie province between the Arly, Tarentaise, and Maurienne valleys in the Rhone-Alps. The region has a unique history that has formed the distinctive identity. Due to its special location in the Alps, Savoie was at crossroads between the Germanic and the Latin worlds in ancient times (Savoie Press Briefing 1991). The pilgrim roads represented the beginning of the Savoyards ability to create a human dimension within the mountains. The Savoyards and their traditions have been molded by the mountains, which inspire faith, literature, art and work. Under the power of the House of Savoie, Europe’s most ancient ruling family, from 1034 to 1860, this independent state was the last province to unify with the French State (Savoie Press Briefing 1991).

Albertville and the region appealed to founders of monasteries. Among the Savoyard valleys, monasteries and abbeys were built, strengthening the connections between the mountain passes. The benedictine monks of Solesmes, famous for their Gregorian chants, still live in the royal abbey of Hautecombe on Lake Bourget (Comité de Candidature Albertville, 1992 1986).
Agriculture is a very significant part of the Savoyards heritage and has been a primary part of the region's economy through history. Beaufort cheese comes from prized cows, who feed on the grasses of the Beaufortain Valley. Regional identity is defined by agricultural products and remains a significant part of French culture.

Beginning in the sixteenth century, the region stirred the imagination and emotions of notable authors, poets and artists. Rousseau left Geneva for the area and was the earliest romantic to glorify the mountains in his writings (Comité de Candidature Albertville, 1992 1986). The English poet Percy Bysshe Shelley wrote a poem called "Mont-Blanc." The mountains and glaciers have been immortalized in Mary Shelley's book *Frankenstein*. The painter William Turner traveled through Savoie. The works created during this visit, inspired by the Tarentaise valley innovated landscape painting (Comité de Candidature Albertville, 1992 1986). Captivated by the mountains promised by these romantics, millions of tourists flock to Savoie (Comité de Candidature Albertville, 1992 1986). This area became a center for alpine expeditions starting in the seventeenth century.

As a result of the influx of diverse inhabitants, the culture has been influenced by people from all over Europe. The folklore, art and traditions are a product of Savoie's history.

Today, the region continues to be characterized by the mountains. Since joining the French state, the economy of Savoie has gone through two economic transformations. At the end of the nineteenth century, the region took advantage of the magnetism of people to "white coal" (snow) which evolved into winter sports tourism (Savoie Press Briefing 1991). Currently, the area boasts one of the largest networks of ski terrain in the
world. Economically, Savoie is dominated by tourism, but retains its industry and agriculture (Savoie Press Briefing 1991).

The Winter Olympics was no stranger to the region, since it is situated halfway between Chamonix and Grenoble. It seemed only natural that Albertville should host the Winter Olympics too. On December 5, 1981, Jean-Claude Killy and Michel Barnier put this idea into motion by starting a candidacy campaign for Albertville’s bid for the 1992 Olympic Winter Games. During the 90th IOC session in East Berlin on June 3-6, 1985, the Albertville Candidacy was officially presented (Savoie Press Briefing 1992). The candidacy campaign focused on the region’s history and mountain heritage. It touted what Savoie could do for the Olympics and what the Olympics could do for Savoie. It bragged of cultivating the most Olympic champions of any region, stating “these people know what they can offer others in their field, i.e. alpine skiing” (Comité de Candidature Albertville, 1992 1986). The candidacy report recognized the Olympics’ ability to fill gaps in Savoie’s snow sports infrastructure, especially skating and ice hockey, in addition to what it could do for its image. There was also a global emphasis in the Candidacy report which was a result of the IOC president Juan Antonio Samaranch’s request to give the programs a “world dimension” (Comité de Candidature Albertville, 1992 1986).

The Albertville Olympics happened during a time of intense globalization. This globalization created international competition between cities for jobs and capital. The global economic competition set the stage for the Olympics to act as a potentially high risk strategy for stimulating local economic growth referred to as the mega-event strategy. City leaders pursued the mega-event strategy to create jobs and increase their competitive advantage (Andronovich, Burbank, and Haying 2001). One competitive
advantage is the stimulation of winter sport tourism through creation of recreational open space. Since World War II the Savoyard government has acknowledged the influence of winter sports on the local economy and has sponsored resort development (Borja 1992). The opportunity to host the Games was seen as a means to modernize, renovate and transform the region. Events of this magnitude present cities with an unprecedented opportunity to showcase themselves to a huge global audience. Given the present day rivalry to host the Olympics, this global competition is revealed dramatically in the selection contest for the Olympic Games (McKay and Plumb 2001).

On October 17, 1986, during the IOC session in Lausanne, Switzerland, the 1992 Winter Olympics were awarded to Albertville and Savoie (see figure 5-1 and 5-2) (Savoie Press Briefing 1992). The responsibility to host the games was seen as a regional task with 13 different Savoyard sites hosting events. These games marked two significant historical points: due to the scale of the Olympics, this would be the last time the summer and winter Games would be held in the same year. It was the first time that one region had hosted three Olympics.

The dominance of television in modern society had a major impact on the development of the games. On May 24, 1988, USA broadcasting rights were sold to CBS for $243 million. The selling of broadcasting rights comprised 31.32% of the revenue generated by the Games (Savoie Press Briefing 1992). It was estimated that two billion people world wide watched the games (Borja 1992). As a consequence of television, commercialization increased. The Olympics utilized corporate sponsorship from companies like Coca-Cola, and Kodak, to fund the games, making up another 29.01% of the total revenues (Savoie Press Briefing 1992). This represented a drastic shift since the
Grenoble Olympics, when the majority of funding came from the public. Only 20.86% of the Albertville funding came from public contribution (Savoie Press Briefing 1992). These changes put an increased emphasis on image not only for the region but also for sponsors. In a progress report issued in 1987, the essential principles defining the Olympics were outlined. One principle, the “Olympic Savoie,” was based on the “development of a common visual identity for all elements that make up the Winter Olympics ‘product’” (Savoie Press Briefing 1992). Another principle was to uphold a national and international element.

The attention put on image affected recreational open space infrastructure in many ways. First, the finest recreational facilities were necessary to portray a first-class image for the host and sponsors. These recreational facilities provide the backbone of Albertville’s and Savoie’s recreational infrastructure, fortifying its recreational open space legacy. Second, ecological concerns had moved increasingly to the forefront of global attention, therefore it was necessary to present an environmental image. In 1987, the Department of Savoie and the national government signed an accord addressing a five-year program to enhance the landscape and protect the environment. The added incentive to portray an environmental image resulted in as strengthened local open space infrastructure.

Post-Olympic use of the recreational space became more important after the Grenoble Olympics. Learning from Grenoble, the “Olympic infrastructures were designed in continuity with the specific features of Savoie’s ski resorts and within a regional planning and development concept” (Savoie Press Briefing 1998). The post-Olympic use of the event facilities was determined as much as possible (Savoie, Comite
In addition, all of the sport facilities were designed based on analysis of prior Olympics or international competitions (Savoie, Comité d’Organisation des XVies Jeux Olympiques d’Hiver d’Albertville et de la 1992). Planning and design for the Olympics was also approached with a long range perspective of how infrastructure development could assist the revitalization of host towns and resorts (Savoie, Comité d’Organisation des XVies Jeux Olympiques d’Hiver d’Albertville et de la 1992).

The importance of the post-Olympic impacts on Savoie was recognized in a study released in 1998, which examined infrastructure, image, tourists, culture, recreational facilities and economic figures. In the press brief it was stated that “the programmes undertaken during the Games are bearing their fruit today, most notably through their highly beneficial effects on the structures and organization in Savoie” (Savoie Press Briefing 1998). This study confirmed Albertville’s and Savoie’s recreational open space legacy.

Preparation for the Games included a regional development strategy based on the long-term outlook and the environment. Most impressive was a conscious decision to organize the athletic events in a manner consistent with the natural landscape and existing use of the site (Savoie Press Briefing 1998). The local sports traditions were observed in order to attain the best possible “match” with the Olympic events they would host. This concept was used in Chamonix. However, in Albertville this idea became a concrete, planned strategy.

The recreational facilities were also approached from the perspective of long term sustainability. This led to the notion that some Olympic amenities should actually be
planned from the outset as temporary in nature, rather than investing unnecessary resources on elements which would not be useful in the long term. The modification of existing facilities as Olympic venues ensured their continued future viability. This methodology has rewarded Albertville and Savoie with a strong recreational open space network. It is fair to say that Albertville improved their future by looking to the past, therefore creating a lasting recreational open space legacy.

Figure 5-1. Albertville 1992 poster of event locations © IOC Museum.
The Games

Olympic Park: Opening and Closing Ceremonies, Speed Skating, and Ice Skating.

The Olympic Park was situated on the old municipal sport center in the town of Albertville (see figures 5-3 and 5-4). The theater for opening and closing ceremonies, speed skating and ice skating events were located in the Olympic Park (see figure 5-5 and 5-6). As a result of deep discussion and thoughtful planning, the original municipal sport center was restored with improvements (see figures 5-7 and 5-8).

Opening and Closing Ceremonies. The opening and closing ceremonies took place in a temporary structure, seating 35,000 (Savoie Press Briefing 1998). The opening ceremony were said to be the most memorable part of the Games, according to a public opinion survey taken two years after the Games. 61 percent of the people surveyed said that the opening ceremony was the most noteworthy part of the games. (Savoie Press
The facility was dismantled after the Games, with the central mast left as a reminder of the wonderful production that took place.

The site has since been altered into a sports and leisure park, hosting a broad range of activities (Savoie Press Briefing 1998). The eventual transformation of the site was foreseen in the initial planning for the 1992 Games. An assortment of sports venues are now located at the site including, rugby, soccer fields, skate boarding facilities, a fitness trail, and an archery range (see figures 5-9through 5-13). These facilities are used by the general public as well as sport groups.

**Speed Skating.** The speed skating oval was built exclusively for speed skating events. After the Olympics it was re-inaugurated as the “Olympic Stadium,” with the track modified to meet international standards, and addition of a sports field and boxing hall. Of the 10,000 seats in place during the Olympics, 8,208 were temporary, with the remaining seats retained for subsequent spectator use (Savoie Press Briefing 1998).

Today, the Olympic Stadium is used a great deal. Visiting the site, it is not unusual to find the entire area being employed by school children (see figure 5-14 and 5-17).

Undeniably, the Olympic speed skating facility has contributed to the long range recreational infrastructure of Albertville. The consideration of post-Olympic use during the planning and design process ensured the continuing success of the site. The use of temporary stands permitted the site to be transformed into a more practically usable place. In addition, making the site available to school children and sport groups ensured that the site would be taken advantage of long after the Games. Ten years after the Olympics, the plan appears to be working.
Ice Skating. The ice hall was used for the figure skating during the Games. It held 9,000 spectators, 7,800 accommodated by temporary seating. The ice skating rink was renamed the “Olympic Hall,” and is used today for a variety of events by groups ranging from schools and clubs to the French ice sports federation (see figure 5-15). In addition, it is used for training by the French ice hockey, short track, and figure skating teams. The Olympic Hall houses two removable tennis courts, the largest man-made climbing structure in Europe (see figure 5-15), and is utilized for concerts, festivals, trade fairs, exhibits, and conventions (Press Briefing 1998).

Clearly, the Olympic Hall has contributed enormously to the recreational infrastructure of the community. The assortment of activities taking place there guarantees the continued success of the Hall and the revenue generated by this use contributes significantly toward maintenance of the facility.

Post-Olympic use was a primary factor in the planning and design process, which has compensated Albertville with a true recreational open space legacy. The use of temporary seating and structures enabled the area to transform back to a human scale supporting post-Olympic use. By taking into account the previous recreational use of the area, Olympic functions were programmed in the most compatible manner, ensuring continued post Olympic viability.
Figure 5-3. Albertville 1985 map of town before Olympics. Note the Municipal park on grid B5 © Albertville Office du Tourism.
Figure 5-4. Albertville 2002 map of town after Olympics. Notice Olympic park on grid C5 © Albertville Office du Tourism.
Circuit de visite touristique du Site Olympique des XVIèmes Jeux olympiques d’hiver

Le siège du COJO
Le Comité d’Organisation des Jeux Olympiques et aujourd’hui un lieu professionnel pour plus de 500 élèves
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La flamme olympique
Allumée au Stade de France pour les XVème JO de 1990, elle est depuis 1996 en constante évolution.
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Office du Tourisme

Le théâtre des cérémonies
Lieu de cérémonies officielles et de clôture pour les JO de 2000, lieu de tournage de nombreuses productions cinématographiques, lieu de tournage de la série télévisée "Le Tour du Monde".

Le mat olympique
Salle de match, l’endroit de la rencontre des deux premiers JO de l’histoire des JO.

Le siège du COJO
Le Comité d’Organisation des Jeux Olympiques et aujourd’hui un lieu professionnel pour plus de 500 élèves.

Figure 5-5. Albertville 2002 map of the Olympic park facilities © Albertville Office du Tourism.
Figure 5-6. View of the opening ceremony © IOC Museum.

Figure 5-7. View of opening ceremony location, spring 2002.
Figure 5-8. General view of the Olympic park with speed skating on left, stadium in distance on opening ceremony rehabilitation site.

Figure 5-9. View of soccer field at the opening ceremony location.
Figure 5-10. Skate park located at opening ceremony site.

Figure 5-11. Rugby game in front of ice stadium at the Olympic park.
Figure 5-12. Olympic ice hall at the Olympic park at Albertville during the Olympics © IOC Museum.

Figure 5-13. Commuters in front of ice stadium with Olympic flame, spring 2002.
Figure 5-14. High school kids practicing the javelin.

Figure 5-15. Inside the ice stadium, school children ice skating and the indoor climbing wall.
Figure 5-16. Olympic speed skating site during the Olympics © IOC Museum.

Figure 5-17. School children running around speed skating track with playing field.
Medals Ceremonies. Because the events took place throughout the region, it was logical to have the medal ceremonies at the event venues (see figure 5-18). As no permanent medal ceremony plaza was built, this activity did not contribute to the overall recreational open space infrastructure.

Figure 5-18. Medals ceremony at the ice rink © IOC Museum.
Nordic Jump. The Nordic ski jump events were held in the resort town of Courchevel at the Praz de Saint Bon (Savoie, Comité d’Organisation des Xvies Jeux Olympiques d’Hiver d’Albertville et de la 1992). This was the exact location of wooden ski-jumps built in the 1940’s and 1950’s (Savoie Press Briefing 1998). Due to the historic tradition of Nordic ski jumping it was logical that Praz de Saint Bon would host these Olympic events.

Both 90-meter and 120-meter ski jumps were constructed (see figure 5-19). Notably, this is the only 120-meter ski jump in France to be protected from the wind (Savoie Press Briefing 1998). The was designed with ceramic and plastic brush linings, so it could be used year round for training and competition, with or without snow (see figure 5-20). Presently, the ski jump is used for the Nordic Combination World Cup and the summer ski-jumping Grand Prix, which attract approximately 10,000 spectators (Savoie Press Briefing 1998).

The Nordic ski jump is another success story, as a result of planning and design conducted in consideration of the past and the future. Albertville’s venue selection process was based on design in “continuity with the specific features of Savoie’s ski resorts and within a regional planning and development strategy.” Consideration of post-Olympic use enriched the community’s recreational open space legacy. The use of facilities by national groups for training and competition supports on-going use in addition to generating the revenue necessary to maintain it.
Figure 5-19. Nordic ski jump site at Courchevel during the Olympics © IOC Museum.

Figure 5-20. Nordic ski jump with Olympic flame in foreground as seen spring 2002.
Bobsled. The bobsled course was located in the town of La Plagne (see figure 5-21). The track was used for both the bobsled and luge races and was maintained by forced cooling (Savoie, Comité d’Organisation des Xvies Jeux Olympiques d’Hiver d’Albertville et de la. 1992). The site was chosen based on the theory that the Olympic facilities should be consistent with the existing nature and activities of the site. From the 1940’s to the 1960’s, bobsled fans used a logging road on a location the locals call La Roche as a makeshift track (Savoie Press Briefing 1998). This local tradition influenced planners to locate the Olympic bobsled structure in the same area.

Today, the bobsled run is used by public and private groups (see figure 5-22. The track is host to World Cup, European Cup and French Cup competitions (Savoie Press Briefing 1998). The bobsled is another example of how good planning and site consideration endowed the area with a recreation legacy.
Figure 5-21. Bobsled Olympic site La Plagne during competition © IOC Museum.

Figure 5-22. View of bobsled with town nestled between turns, spring 2002.
Figure 5-23. Start of bobsled track, spring 2002.

Figure 5-24. View of the bobsled course.
Cross Country Skiing. The cross country skiing events were held in the town of Les Saisies. Les Saisies was chosen based on its high elevation, reliable snowfall and beautiful landscape. Home of the famous Beaufortain Valley, this area is characterized by its open spaces and grassy hillsides at the base of Mont-Blanc (see figure 5-25 and 5-26).

Site planning and design considered the sensitive alpine ecology. The 100km network of trails exists today (see figure 5-27). The trails welcome both the general public and serious athletes. They are used for French Cup cross country skiing, French Cup biathlon, and the Etoile des Saisies, a well known cross country ski marathon (see figure 5-28 and 5-29).

The recreational open space infrastructure that was protected and generated by the Olympic planners is considerable. Today this historically significant landscape is enriched with a valuable trail network, while maintaining the area’s character, heritage and environment.
Figure 5-25. View of the Beaufortain Valley.

Figure 5-26. View of the landscape where the cross country trails are in the town of Les Saisies.
Figure 5-27. Map of the cross country trails at Les Saisies, 2002 © Regie des Saisies Chalet Espace Cristal.
Figure 5-28. The Etoile des Saisies cross country ski race through town with Olympic flame, winter 2002.

Figure 5-29. Office du Tourisme with Olympic flame, spring 2002.
Conclusions

Olympic planning and design in Albertville and Savoie has proven to be successful in providing the region with a sound recreational open space legacy. By examining past international and Olympic sporting events, the region was able to learn from mistakes and benefit from accomplishments of others. The 1992 Games had two good models, Chamonix and Grenoble, from which to learn. By looking at Chamonix, Albertville could see that sport traditions were integral to providing a successful recreational open space legacy. By learning from the mistakes of Grenoble, Savoie realized that careful site scale and location could result in continued post-Olympic use.

The conscious effort to integrate local sport traditions into the Olympic design benefited the recreational open space legacy during and after the Olympics. By choosing venues based on past use, the success of the site could be assessed, compatibility errors could be limited (i.e. wind at the ski jump site, sun on the bobsled course), and post-Olympic use could be guaranteed.

Albertville 1992 attests to the importance of integrating post-Olympic use into the planning and design. The Olympic Park’s design incorporated temporary amenities and modifications as a result of the post-Olympic use objectives. The venues were not completely removed but rather adapted for viable post-Olympic use. The opening and closing ceremony location, which was restructured to maintain the central mass, symbolizing the event, enhanced its legacy as a municipal park. It is evident that this planning and design approach was successful in its goal.

Albertville has been awarded a considerable recreational open space legacy as a result of hosting the Olympics. Observation of the Olympic sites ten years after the
Games shows that the recreation infrastructure has been strengthened and will continue to be used for years to come. The 1992 Winter Olympics of Albertville and Savoie is a good model for future Olympic cities looking to use the Olympics as a vehicle for producing a recreational open space legacy.
Background

Salt Lake City is located in a distinctive region known as the Intermountain West in the American state of Utah. Salt Lake City is the capital of Utah, situated in the Salt Lake Valley, which is located between the Wasatch Mountains to the east, the Oquirrh Mountains to the west, and the Great Salt Lake to the north. The area has a unique geological history from oceans, inland seas, and deserts. These distinct geological formations, the Rocky Mountains, the Great Salt Lake and the Great Basin Desert characterize the region.

Centuries before European settlement, Utah was utilized by prehistoric Indians and most recently the Ute, Shoshone and Piute Indians for hunting, fishing and gathering seasonal foods. The state of Utah gets its name from the nomadic Ute tribe who lived in the Great Basin Desert. In approximately 1825, the first white trapper was reportedly seen in the area. Yet, it was not until 1847 that the area was permanently settled by the first Mormon wagon train. The history of Mormon settlement is a significant one. One of the religious founders, Brigham Young, was inspired so much by the area that he declared it to be Zion. The Mormon settlement transformed a harsh landscape into a more hospitable place to live. The society was based on self-sufficiency, religion, irrigation, agriculture and village industry. For about a generation that Salt Lake City was able to maintain the ideals which the area was founded. The original vision faded when the region distinguished itself as a transportation axis. Salt Lake City became the last major supply point for the California exodus. In addition, in 1869 the
transcontinental railway was established, running through the region. Initially, the main economic source was agriculture but quickly transformed into regional mining and industry. The Depression hit the area hard, but the economy was again boosted World War II. This led to the establishment of the most defense-oriented economy in the nation during the 1960’s. Recently, the region has developed a tourism industry economy. The discovery of white gold,( the state claims to have the “greatest snow on earth”), revitalized surrounding communities. In 2002, the region increased its international stature by hosting 2002 Winter Olympics.

The history of Utah’s bid to host the Winter Olympics is almost as old as the Winter Games, with the first attempt being in 1929 (www.wintersports2002.com/oly/view/). The Norwegian Athletic Club of Salt Lake put in a symbolic bid to host the 1932 Winter Games (www.wintersports2002.com/oly/view.html). During this time, the norm was for summer and winter Games to be hosted in the same country. Because the 1932 Olympic Summer Games were to be held in Los Angeles, an American city was needed to host the Winter Games. Lake Placid and Salt Lake City were the two contestants. Lake Placid won the vote (www.wintersports2002.com/oly/view.html).

Although Salt Lake did not host the Games, the bid established Salt Lake City’s interest in snow sports and snow sport competition. The 1935 U.S. Olympic ski jump trials took place on Ecker Hill in Parley’s Canyon, an existing jump built in 1929 (www.wintersports2002.com/oly/view.html). Alta had one of the first lifts, Collins lift, in 1938.

It was not until the early 1960’s that the topic of hosting the winter Games was approached again. It all began during a business lunch where four successful business
men, Gene Donovan, Jack Gallivan, Max Rich and Walker Wallace discussed the potential of Utah hosting the Winter Games (www.wintersports2002.com/oly/view.html). This was the start of a “grass-roots campaign” supporting the bid for the 1968 or 1972 Winter Games (www.wintersports2002.com/oly/view.html). For the second time, Utah lost the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) vote to Lake Placid, in the fall of 1962 (www.wintersports2002.com/oly/view.html). Utah was successful in getting the USOC vote for the 1972 Games, but was defeated in the IOC vote by Sapporo, Japan in 1966 (www.wintersports2002.com/oly/view.html). In 1967 Utah tried again, but the USOC nominated Denver as the bid city. Denver dropped its bid and the USOC unanimously voted for Salt Lake City (Salt Lake 2002 Official Report 2002). Salt Lake City mayor Jake Garn had some conditions, most notably that the federal government fund the Games (www.wintersports2002.com/oly/view.html). When it was obvious that Utah would not get any federal support, Garn withdrew the bid to the IOC (www.wintersports2002.com/oly/view.html). This was a major setback in Utah’s drive to host the Winter Games. Due to the forced referendum by Denver citizens to reject the Games, concerns surrounding the Olympic surfaced. The Games were seen as being pushed on cities by local “bigwigs” who ignored the environment and local economy (www.wintersports2002.com/oly/view.html). These issues diminished support for the Winter Olympics by Utah citizens. From 1973 to 1983, a plan to host the Games became a distant memory. In 1983, the idea surfaced again, when John Nicholson, Utah State University professor, addressed Brad Barber, a state planner, with the notion that Utah was a “natural site for the Winter Games” (www.wintersports2002.com/oly/view.html). Barber and Nicholson researched an approach to bidding for the Games by talking to the
Olympic cities' officials. They proceeded to Governor Scott M. Matheson and Salt Lake City mayor Ted Wilson with their conclusions, which led to the formation of a committee to examine the probability of bidding and hosting the Winter Games (www.wintersports2002.com/oly/view.html). A key consequence of this feasibility study was the Environmental Quality Impact Analysis, an environmental impact study conducted in cooperation with "the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service, a committee of experts specializing in ecology, land management and engineering conducted detailed analysis on wilderness areas, wildlife and fish, threatened and endangered species, range management, timber, water and soil, air quality, fire protection and vegetation" (Salt Lake City Candidate to Host the XIX Olympic Winter Games, 2002 1994). The public interest, expressed at workshops and hearings, was incorporated into the planning process (Salt Lake City Candidate to Host the XIX Olympic Winter Games, 2002 1994). The feasibility analysis "concluded that the Olympic Winter Games could be held without impacting the environment or negatively harming the quality-of-life." The feasibility committee voted in June 1985 to support a bid for the 1992 Winter Games (www.wintersports2002.com/oly/view.html). Once again Salt Lake City was defeated. Anchorage, Alaska was voted by the USOC as the nominee for the 1992 and 1994 Games (Salt Lake 2002 Official Report 2002). However Anchorage lost the IOC vote to Albertville and Lillehammer, making Utah the U.S. front-runner to host the 2002 Games.

This time around, there were some significant changes in the bid process. After the U.S. Olympic team won only six medals at the 1988 Calgary Games, a congressional committee started an investigation into the country’s poor performance (Salt Lake 2002
Official Report 2002). The committee’s findings spurred the USOC to change its criteria for selecting candidate cities. This new criteria required bid cities to build sports training facilities. The USOC believed that winter sport training facilities would enable future generations to develop their skills (Salt Lake 2002 Official Report 2002), therefore increasing the U.S. hopes for winning medals. Utah demonstrated its dedication to the Olympic pursuit by establishing a committee to obtain amateur sporting events and winter sports competition (www.wintersports2002.com/oly/view.html). The public voted to spend 56 million dollars in state funds to construct a bobsled/luge run, ski jump, and speed-skating oval (www.wintersports2002.com/oly/view.html). Due to its commitment to building new sports facilities, Utah won the USOC’s endorsement for the 1998 U.S. bid in June 1989 (Salt Lake 2002 Official Report 2002). In January 1990, the Utah legislature created the Utah Sports Authority and the sales-tax diversion, which directed one-sixteenth of one percent of tax revenues toward developing Utah’s winter sport facilities (Salt Lake 2002 Official Report). Despite all of Salt Lake City’s efforts, in June 1991, the IOC awarded Nagano the 1998 Games. Once again public support began to wane, with some citizens expressing disgruntlement with the politics surrounding the Olympic bidding process. Public opinion polls revealed that many citizens thought Utah should stop playing the “bidding game” (Salt Lake 2002 Official Report 2002). Regardless of the polls, government officials decided to attempt it one more time.

By this time, Salt Lake City had probably put more effort into hosting the Games than any other city, gaining much experience with the bid process. The Salt Lake City bid committee for the Olympic Winter Games for 2002 formed a seamless and well organized bid report. The Salt Lake bid committee was privately funded by local
businesses and individuals (Salt Lake City Candidate to Host the XIX Olympic Winter Game, 2002 1994). It marketed the people of Salt Lake City as “hard working, caring for the environment and good sportsmanship” (Salt Lake City Candidate to Host the XIX Olympic Winter Games, 2002 1994). In addition, the bid report addressed many local concerns and regional issues.

Regionally, within the State of Utah, current topics of concern include quality of life issues such as economic and population growth, as well as environmental considerations. The State of Utah has long been a leader in balancing environmental concerns and economic growth. Much of the current debate centers on long-range planning, and balancing growth with the traditional value of a quality environment.

One of the bid committee’s major platforms was environmental protection. “Mr. Thomas K. Welch, President of the Salt Lake City bid Committee for the Olympic Winter Games, confirmed that all work for the organization of the Olympic Winter Games, 2002 will comply with city, state and national laws and regulations regarding the protection of the environment and the planning and zoning of the area” (Salt Lake City Candidate to
Host the XIX Olympic Winter Games, 2002 1994). The bid used results from a 1984 feasibility study to support the ecological soundness of hosting the Winter Games in conjunction with “continued review and approval by the ecological agencies” (Salt Lake City Candidate to Host the XIX Olympic Winter Games, 2002, 1994 p. 28).

Another bid tactic was the promotion of sport facilities. Utah already had winter sport infrastructure in place, due to past bid efforts, and the local government was committed to backing future sport infrastructure. Salt Lake City Mayor Deedee Corradini was a leading enthusiast (Salt Lake City Candidate to Host the XIX Olympic Winter Games, 2002 1994). The bid report confirmed that “the city supports the development of the sports facilities, regardless of the outcome of the awarding of the Olympic Winter Games, 2002. It is dedicated in accomplishing this goal for the benefit of the city and the advancement of amateur winter sports” (Salt Lake City Candidate to Host the XIX Olympic Winter Games, 2002 1994 p. 23). USOC’s requirement that Olympic host cities already have sport facilities in place was a key component in the enrichment of recreational open space. This led to the recognition of recreational legacy potential and its importance to the host communities.

At the 104th IOC Session in Budapest, Hungary, on June 16 1995, Salt Lake City prevailed and was awarded the 2002 Olympic Winter Games (see figure 6-1) (Salt Lake 2002 Official Report 2002). After the city was awarded the Games, significant advancements took place with regard to post-Olympic use of facilities. There was a strong commitment to support the post-Olympic use of publicly funded facilities (the Olympic Oval and Olympic Park), secured when the 1998 official operating budget set aside 40 million dollars for the legacy foundation (Salt Lake 2002 Official Report 2002).
The purpose of the legacy foundation was to ensure that these facilities be maintained after the Olympic fortnight was over. This was a conscious effort to create recreational legacy. In an informal interview, Utah Athletic Foundation Director of Communications Frank Zang said that SLOC recognized the necessity of creating an endowment to secure the future use of Olympic venues by observing other host cities. Without money for maintenance and development (general activities, competition, camps, and tourist marketing) these venues were susceptible to becoming “white elephants.” SLOC planned to hand over the responsibility of these venues to the Utah Athletic Foundation for management after the Games. In October 2002, Soldier Hollow was added to the legacy venues although it was not initially funded by the public (www.olymparks.com/aboutus/soldierhollow.html). In addition to the 40 million dollar legacy fund, surplus from the Games enabled the IOC to set up a 70 million dollar endowment (Salt Lake 2002 Official Report 2002). “The fund will maintain facilities in perpetuity, including all replacement cost, without any taxpayer burden” (Salt Lake 2002 Official Report 2002, p. 26). This new awareness, to set up a fund for long-term maintenance of Olympic facilities for post-Olympic expectations, has created a new standard for future Olympic host cities.
The opening and closing ceremonies were held in Rice-Eccles Olympic Stadium at the University of Utah. Construction of the stadium was started as a result of winning the Olympic bid and finished November 19, 2002 (Salt Lake 2002 Official Report 2002). It was estimated that 3.5 billion people watched both the opening and closing ceremonies on television, in addition to the 50,000 spectators in attendance (see figures 6-2 and 6-3) (Salt Lake 2002 Official Report 2002).

The stadium is managed and utilized by the University of Utah (see figures 6-4 and 6-5). It has enhanced the University campus, functioning as a multi-sport facility and competition arena. Current, construction of a plaza at the stadium will provide a suitable site for the Olympic caldron (see figure 6-4). Because of the location of the stadium on campus and the general demand for transportation, the University light rail was extended...
to the stadium and is presently being lengthened even further. One year after the Games, it is evident that the stadium has improved the recreational infrastructure of the area and has been a catalyst for other important improvements.
Figure 6-2. Opening ceremonies © Dan Campbell.

Figure 6-3. Closing ceremony © Dan Campbell.
Figure 6-4. Olympic caldron at Rice-Eccles Stadium spring 2003.

Figure 6-5. Construction of plaza around Olympic caldron at Rice-Eccles Stadium.
Medals Plaza. The medals plaza was located in the heart of Salt Lake City (see figure 6-6 and 6-7). The concept of the medals plaza was a new phenomenon. The original purpose of the medals plaza at Calgary was to include the general population in the Olympic festivities while adding a public Olympic facility in the form of a park after the Games were finished (Hiller 1990). The medals plaza at Calgary was very successful and considered the major legacy created as a result of the Games (see Chapter 2). The medals plaza concept was also adopted by the 1998 host city of Nagano. The Nagano medals plaza was not as successful, due to its small size of the site, and the difficulty of accessing the site (Barrett 2003).

In 1998, site options were investigated at University of Utah, Salt Lake City Hall, downtown Salt Lake, and Park City (Barrett 2003). It was decided to use a ten-acre parking lot owned by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS) with one condition: admission to the plaza had to be free to the general public and would be returned to its previous use (Salt Lake 2002 Official Report 2002). The medals plaza was a huge success. It attracted thousands of people to the downtown area and provided additional Olympic entertainment for local citizens and television viewers.

As Rick Barrett, SLOC landscape architect, declared, “All good things must end....” Unfortunately, the plaza leaves no legacy to the city since it was restored to a parking lot one month after the Games (see figures 6-8 and 6-9). As a result of public outcry, efforts are being made to place an Olympic element in the Gallivan Plaza near the original medals plaza site (see figures 6-10 and 6-11).
Figure 6-6. Olympic Medals Plaza © Dan Campbell.

Figure 6-7. Medals ceremony at Olympic Medals Plaza © Dan Campbell.
Figure 6-8. Olympic Medals Plaza restored, fall 2002.

Figure 6-9. Poster from downtown Salt Lake, fall 2002.
Figure 6-10. Proposed Olympic Plaza, Gallivan Plaza, spring 2003.

Figure 6-11. Gallivan Center downtown Salt Lake.
Ice Skating. Ice skating events were held at the Salt Lake Ice Center, otherwise known as the Delta Center. This venue was considered to be an already existing venue and required few alterations (Salt Lake City Bid Committee for the Olympic Winter Games, 2002 1994). The Center is a multi-purpose facility, used for conferences, exhibitions, sport (home of the Utah Jazz, professional basketball team) and entertainment events (Salt Lake City Bid Committee for the Olympic Winter Games, 2002 1994). The Center resumed its previous functions after the Games and is still managed by the Larry H. Miller Group (Salt Lake 2002 Official Report 2002).

Figure 6-12. Ice skating at the Salt Lake Ice Center/Delta Center © Dan Campbell.
Speed Skating. The long track speed skating events (short track events were held at the Salt Lake Ice Center) took place at the Olympic Oval (see figure 6-13 and 6-14). The Olympic Oval was built near the Kearns Fitness Center and Oquirrh Park (see figures 6-15) and is regarded as the premier speed skating facility in the world, the “fastest ice on earth” (www.olymparks.com/aboutus/uoo.html).

Today, the Oval is used for a multitude of functions, including conferences, figure skating, hockey, speed skating, curling, running, and bungee jumping (www.olymparks.com/aboutus/uoo.html). There are “Learn To” programs available for all ability levels. The Oval was not only built near an already existing recreational facility but near two schools, which provides a steady stream of users to the facility.

This venue has enriched the recreational open space for the surrounding area as well. Adjacent to the Oval is a park with a playground, and playing fields (see figure 6-16) which provides recreational open space that otherwise might have been a housing development.
Figure 6-13. Olympic Oval during Games © Dan Campbell.

Figure 6-14. Olympic Oval 2003.
Figure 6-15. Kearns athletic center.

Figure 6-16. Recreational open space surrounding Olympic Oval, spring 2003.
Olympic Park: Nordic Ski Jump and Bobsled. The Olympic Park is a 389-acre site abutting the Wasatch Mountains in Park City (www.olymparks.com/aboutus/uop.html). The Olympic Park held the bobsled, luge, skeleton, and ski jumping events during the Games and includes six Nordic ski jumps, freestyle aerials, and a bobsled track. These facilities are used for year-round training. The public can go on tours, watch freestyle aerial training and jumping shows (see figure 6-17), and take 70 mile-per-hour bobsled rides (www.olymparks.com/aboutus/uop.html). The Park has camps for developing athletes throughout the year.

This site is part of Utah Athletic Foundation’s (UAF) legacy venues, receiving facility support from the endowment fund. Legacy venues are inherently expensive to operate as Mark Lewis, UAF president, said, “It’s an expensive business but that’s the purpose to ensure that these facilities serve athletes, spectators and tourists....providing tremendous opportunities for the community” (www.olymparks.com/cgi-bin/news.cgi). A recreational legacy for the Salt Lake region is arising as a result of Olympic organizers recognizing the need to fund future training, competition, and community participation at these venues.

Figure 6-17. Aerial training facility at Olympic Park, fall 2002.
Nordic Ski Jump. As part of Salt Lake’s Olympic bid campaign, a 90-meter jump was built in 1992. This jump was the beginning of today’s Olympic Park. Once Salt Lake was awarded the 2002 Winter Games, organizers began to develop an extensive training facility and competition center at this site. The first 90-meter jump was replaced by the current Nordic jump makeup of 10-, 20-, 40-, 65-, 90-, and 120-meter jumps (see figure 6-18). While construction of the jumps took into account existing natural topography, considerable restoration of the site was required (Salt Lake 2002 Official Report 2002). This was a result of growing environmental awareness taking place within the Olympic movement.

During the 2002 Games, temporary spectator stands accommodated large crowds attending the Nordic ski jump events. The seating area was returned to a reasonable scale for post-Olympic use.

Today the jumps are used for training in the winter and the summer and are used for international and national competition. The area surrounding Olympic Park is experiencing a considerable amount of land development. The site should serve as a valuable amenity for the growing community.
Figure 6-18. Nordic ski jump at Olympic Park during the Games © Dan Campbell.
Figure 6-19. Nordic ski jumps winter 2002-2003.
Bobsled. The bobsled track is also part of the UAF endowment fund. Today, it is used by competitive athletes for year-round training. The track is open to the general public for 70mph rides and track hosts regional, national and international events (Salt Lake 2002 Official Report 2002).

Figure 6-20. Bobsled track during Olympic competition © Dan Campbell.
Cross-Country Skiing. The cross-country skiing events took place at Soldier Hollow in Midvale. The site is 600 acres in Wasatch Mountain State Park with spectacular Mt. Timpanogos in the background (www.olymparks.com/aboutus/soldierhollow.html). Originally the events were scheduled for Mountain Dell Park in Parley’s Canyon (Salt Lake City 2002 Candidature Report 1994), but as a result of environmental pressures on the sensitive watershed, it was moved to Soldier Hollow (Salt Lake 2002 Official Report 2002).

During the Games, the site was recognized for its challenging trails (www.olymparks.com/aboutus/soldierhollow.html). It was praised for the spectator site lines, since almost the entire course was visible (see figure 6-21).

Initially, Soldier Hollow was not part of the legacy venues. However, October 2002, it was decided that the UAF would lease the site for a 21 month period (www.olymparks.com/aboutus/soldierhollow.html). This was an effort to maintain viability after the Games and provide opportunities for aspiring athletes (www.olymparks.com/fundraising/index.html). Today, the area provides year-round recreation with tubing, mountain biking, hiking, camping, snowshoeing, biathlon and cross-country skiing (www.olymparks.com/aboutus/soldierhollow.html). With the continued financial support and community interest, Soldier Hollow has a lot of potential to become a lasting recreational open space legacy for the community.
Figure 6-21. Cross country trails at Soldier Hollow during the Games © Dan Campbell.
“To enhance and share the opportunities that emerge from involvement in the Olympic Movement with the people of the community, the country and the world.”


Conclusions

During the 2002 Salt Lake Olympics, significant contribution to recreational open space legacies was made by a conscious effort to establish a post-Olympic endowment for the legacy venues. In observing other host cities, SLOC realized that Olympic venues require a significant amount of financial support to sustain viability. SLOC also learned that community involvement and athlete support contributed to the long-term survival of the venues. By establishing the non-profit organization, Utah Athletic Foundation, to manage and operate the legacy venues (venues that did not have private support), Salt Lake has guaranteed post-Olympic use of these facilities while protecting the Utah citizens investment in recreation infrastructure. This foresight has been accepted as a new norm for Olympic planning. Incorporating post-Olympic use into the bid process has become crucial for bid cities, giving them a competitive advantage. Vancouver has already established a legacy program for their bid for the 2010 Games.

When Salt Lake received the bid to host the Games, environmental protection was a growing movement. During venue development, environmental consideration was not a required component for planning. Nevertheless, Salt Lake rose to international environmental standards. In the wake of the Lillehammer and Sydney Games, which both were marketed as the “green games,” Salt Lake had tremendous pressure to portray an environmental image. This environmental tokenism most likely enriched recreational
open space, through urban forest movements and restoration projects. However, the Olympic environmental movement has more potential to enhance recreational open space than was demonstrated at Salt Lake.

The Salt Lake Games had great promise to enrich the passive recreational open space in the downtown area. The disappointment surrounding the medals plaza removal should serve as a lesson for future cities. The creation of the medals plaza should have resulted in some kind of lasting legacy to the community, to illustrate the spirit that engulfed the city during the Games. Yet, this site was restored to its original use: a parking lot. The amount of money invested in a venue like the medals plaza should create some kind of return for the community. The Salt Lake medals plaza signified the importance put on commercialization, sponsorship, and television. It is ironic that the medals plaza, which brought people together from all around the world, most likely staging the most memorable events of the Games and today it is now a parking lot. However Salt Lake decides to memorialize the Olympics, it will never hold the significance that the medals plaza could have held.

As time passes, the recreational open space legacies resulting from the 2002 Salt Lake Winter Games will be realized more comprehensively. It is not realistic to make assessments of the Games’ effect on community legacies when barely a year has passed. New observations and conclusions will develop, shedding more light on the topic and giving more insight into how the Olympics enriched recreational open space.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSIONS

"The Olympic Games must harmonize nature with the city, in other words, man with the environment and society." (Petros Synadinos 2001 p. 33).

The Olympics have been a symbol of harmonious cooperation since the inception of the ancient Greek games. Additionally, the Olympic movement has attempted to push the world towards a more enriched civilization through cultural development. Hosting the Olympics can be seen as a crucial part of host communities' cultural development by providing a more rich and diverse recreational open space; therefore giving citizens the opportunity to enhance their lives through sports and leisure.

The unparalleled nature of Olympic-related recreational open space does not come from design alone, but from the ultimate use of the space during and after the Games. Impacts from the Olympics extend in many directions with economics taking precedence. The most profound outcome of the Olympics is not on a host's economy, but on the urban shape and governance of the host city (McKay and Plumb 2001). Although there are significant short-term benefits to local economies and social atmosphere, the real gain comes from long-term legacies (McKay and Plumb 2001).

There are huge expectations put on the Olympic host communities. A host community's development opportunities lie in the aspiration to create a world-class appearance. Since the Olympics are considered to be the premier sporting event in the world, it generates a lot of recognition. This projected image provides the reasoning to pour large amounts of government funding into these communities. Cities can generally
manage event preparations so they also promote a range of development opportunities (Andranovich, Burbank, and Heying 2001). Fortunately, it has been realized over the years that in the process of creating a desirable international image, communities can also produce a lasting local legacy of urban form. What the Olympics leave to host communities, not just momentary athletic feats, manifest the popularity and prestige surrounding the Games.

The amount of effort it takes to build Olympic facilities has raised the question of holding future Games at previous host cities, where infrastructure exists. James Coote wrote in 1968 (p. 152) that “perhaps the ideal solution for the future of the Olympics is that the winter Games return to the sites which have proven to be the most successful in the past. This would be a better guarantee for good weather, good competition, good communication, and save much of the wrangling that surrounds the choice of sites.” To a certain extent he is right. But, there is too much to gain by hosting the Olympics. International competition to host the Olympics is driven by the promise of commercial opportunity. Most likely, the Winter Olympics will not be held at the same location no matter how logical it is. A proposition for future hosts would be to inventory their sport amenities and make serious efforts to reuse and readapt sites to accommodate the Games. This will not only ensure that the areas are appropriate for the events, but will strengthen the existing recreational open space infrastructure.

In theory, the Olympics "exemplify the developments in urban planning and the utopias of the twentieth century (from the garden city of the twenties and thirties, to the "living machines" of the sixties and the "urban renovation' projects of the nineties and the new millennium) and they illustrate the extent to which the utopian ideals of the planners
have actually been realized after the Olympics” (Synadinos 2001). By investigating case studies in a historical context and post-Olympic perspective, effective planning tactics for future Olympic cities have been illuminated in order to enrich recreational open space legacies.

The Olympics have been described as an “intermezzo” (a short movement connecting the main parts of a composition) (Spilling 1996). I would agree that the actual events are an intermezzo. Looking at the Olympics in this light, it becomes apparent that the competition production is simply a small part of the main picture, and this is the important point. Because, what happens before and after the Olympics is the main production and the true benefit to a host community. Yet, if host communities do not recognize that the Olympics last longer than just the actual competition duration, their full potential cannot be realized. The question of this study is what are the lasting benefits on the recreational open space? Are the images merely being projected and not truly realized? What are the historical, social, cultural contexts that support this lasting image? All these are questions a host city must answer in a strategic approach to enrich communities recreational open space legacies.

Winter sports have a direct bond with the environment. Sports like skiing, ice skating, ski jumping and bobsledding create a synergy between man and nature, resulting in marvelous feats of physical and artistic expression. A ski jumper flying through the air is breathtaking, an ice skater gliding on the ice is inspiring, and the speed of a bobsled is mind-boggling. Winter sports are the very essence of harmony between man and the environment. I agree with Petros Synadinos when he suggested that the Olympics should make “good of ecological imbalances through the creation of green belts and recreation
areas" and consider all the buildings to be constructed for the Olympic Games in a post-Olympic light. New advancements within the Olympic Movement, particularly the initiation of Agenda 21 and the Legacy program, create the potential for enriching communities' recreational open space. If the Olympics remain focused on ancient insight, that the Games should benefit society rather than just providing a means of obtaining monetary success, the full potential of the Games can be genuinely realized.

Given the breadth and complexity of Olympic recreational open space legacies, further studies are required to gain a better understanding of the topic and its application in the planning process. This study presented some interesting questions and subjects for further research. For example, the relationship between recreational open space and the commercialization of the Games; a comprehensive analysis of cultural differences in the planning process; and real estate development as the result of the Games and the effects on recreational open space, just to mention a few. Ultimately, Olympic planners should recognize the effects of the Winter Olympics on recreational open space and plan accordingly in order to effectively achieve the Olympic goal of community enrichment.
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I am requesting your permission to include the attached material as shown. I will include acknowledgments and or appropriate citations to your work as indicated as well as copyright and reprint rights information in a special appendix. The bibliographical citation will appear at the end of the manuscript as shown. Please advise me of any changes you require.

Please indicate your approval of this request by signing in the space provided, attaching any other form or instruction necessary to confirm permission. If you charge a reprint fee for use of your material, please indicate that as well. If you have any questions, please call me at the number above.

I hope you will be able to reply immediately. If you are not the copyright holder, please forward my request to the appropriate person or institution.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Jennifer A. Brown
I hereby give permission to Jennifer Anne Brown to reprint the following material in her thesis.

(Bibliographical information on attached page)

Reproduction cost ________ 50.00 CHF.

(Signature) [Signature]

Date: 24th April 2002

Je demande votre permission d'inclure les matériaux ci-joints. Les sources de toutes citations, ainsi que toute information sur les droits de reproduction et droits d'auteur seront mentionnées en annexe supplémentaire, tels que démontrés. La citation bibliographique paraîtra en fin du manuscrit, telle que démontrée. Faites-moi, s'il vous plaît, parvenir tout changement nécessaire.

Veuillez donner votre approbation à cette demande par votre signature en bas de cette lettre, en joignant si nécessaire toute consigne ou formulaire me confirmant votre permission. S'il y a des frais de reproduction, veuillez me les indiquer dans votre réponse. Si vous avez besoin de plus amples renseignements, n'hésitez pas à me contacter au numéro ci-dessus.

Je vous prie de faire suivre cette demande auprès des personnes ou institutions concernées si vous n'êtes pas le propriétaire des droits d'auteur.

Dans l'attente de vous lire dans l'immédiat, je vous remercie pour toute l'attention et la coopération que vous portez à ce courrier.

Jennifer A. Brown
Je donne par cette lettre permission à Jennifer Anne Brown de reproduire les textes et matériaux suivants.

(Données de bibliographie sur page ci-jointe)

(Frais)

(Signature)

OFFICE DE TOURISME
85, place du Triomphe de l'Amitié
74400 CHÂTEAU-MONT-BLANC
Tél. 04 50 33 00 24 - Fax 04 50 33 56 90
Map of Chamonix, France 2002
Map of Chamonix, France 2002
Map of Chamonix, France 2002
VALLÉE DE CHAMONIX

ITINÉRAIRES AUTorisés AUX VÉLOS TOUT TERRAIN

du 1er juillet au 31 août

VALLÉE DE CHAMONIX

RESPECTEZ LE STAN CHEF PARC HACIA!

0 10 km - Foyer de ski de fond -> Bos du Bosquet -> Citrail
> Bétonneur -> Les Bos et Pont de la Cuvette -> Le Vieux (> Golf) -> Parc Feuillère -> Pont des Portes -> Route nationale
> Avenue de Pâquier -> Foyer de ski de fond

0 5 km - Foyer de ski de fond -> Trajet vers le site direction les Gaillands -> Les Bossettes - Les Houches - Boveire - Gare SNCF - Retour idem ou route nationale et chemin Napoliens

0 4 km - Foyer de ski de fond -> Les Moulins - Piste des Planets -> Les Moulins - Retour idem.

0 4 km - Bâti de l'Orthez -> EdF -> Béthencourt - La Norvège -> Les Sources

Suggestions de parcours

1 5 km - Sommet des Sources - Le Lavancher

2 3 km - Sommet des Sources - Les Tresses par le réservoir

3 5 km - Le Lavancher - Les Cînargis - La Bourg - Forum
> Route de fond -> Roche - Charronne - Téléphérique - Tour du Lavancher
> La Joux - Le Mas - Les Tresses - Pont de la Cuvette

4 5,5 km - Le Bourget de Cermis -> Le Pinard - Le Tour - Montbran -> Téléchamp -> Argentine (route de Chamonix)

5 Le Tour - Cînargis - Les Bossettes - Valleronne

6 Argentine - Téléphérique de Lognan - Lognan - Plan Joran

7 Les Praz - Gare du Téléphérique - La Flégère

8 Chamonix - Gare du Blériot - Planpraz - Prévent

Les parcours sont entrelacés du 4 mai au 31 octobre.

Prudence et Courtoisie ! Les sentiers sont très fréquentés par les piétons et randonneurs...
Copyright request form Chamonix office of cross country skiing.

Jennifer A. Brown
92 Les Cimes de Lognan
Les Grassonnetts
74-700 Chamonix
France
tel 06-73-63-93-78
jennybjen@netscape.net

April 27,2002

Foyer de ski de fond Chamonix,
Avenue du Bouchet
74-401 Chamonix Mont-Blanc France

Cher Foyer de ski de fond Chamonix,


Je demande votre permission d’inclure les matériaux ci-joints. Les sources de toutes citations, ainsi que toute information sur les droits de reproduction et droits d’auteur seront mentionnées en annexe supplémentaire, tels que démontrés. La citation bibliographique paraîtra en fin du manuscrit, telle que démontrée. Puis-je donc, s’il vous plaît, parvenir tout changement nécessaire.

Veuillez donner votre approbation à cette demande par votre signature en bas de cette lettre, en joignant si nécessaire toute consigne ou formulaire me confirmant votre permission. S’il y a des frais de reproduction, veuillez me les indiquer dans votre réponse. Si vous avez besoin de plus amples renseignements, n’hésitez pas à me contacter au numéro ci-dessus.

Je vous prie de faire suivre cette demande auprès des personnes ou institutions concernées si vous n’êtes pas le propriétaire des droits d’auteur.

Dans l’attente de vous lire dans l’immédiat, je vous remercie pour toute l’attention et la coopération que vous portez à ce courrier.

Jennifer A. Brown
Monsieur,

Suite à votre courrier du 27/04/82, je vous confirme que vous pouvez utiliser le plan des pistes de ski de fond édité par la ville de Chamonix.

Je vous adresse, mademoiselle, l'expression de mes salutations les plus cordiales.

Jean-Jacques LAGOT
Map of cross country ski trails Chamonix, France.
Cher Office de Tourisme de Grenoble,


Je demande votre permission d’inclure les matériaux ci-joints. Les sources de toutes citations, ainsi que toute information sur les droits de reproduction et droits d’auteur seront mentionnées en annexe supplémentaire, tels que démontrés. La citation bibliographique paraîtra en fin du manuscrit, telle que démontrée. Faites-moi, s’il vous plaît, parvenir tout changement nécessaire.

Veuillez donner votre approbation à cette demande par votre signature en bas de cette lettre, en joignant si nécessaire toute consigne ou formulaire me confirmant votre permission. S’il y a des frais de reproduction, veuillez me les indiquer dans votre réponse. Si vous avez besoin de plus amples renseignements, n’hésitez pas à me contacter au numéro ci-dessus.

Je vous prie de faire suivre cette demande auprès des personnes ou institutions concernées si vous n’êtes pas le propriétaire des droits d’auteur.

Dans l’attente de vous lire dans l’immédiat, je vous remercie pour toute l’attention et la coopération que vous portez à ce courrier.

Jennifer A. Brown
Je donne par cette lettre permission à Jennifer Anne Brown de reproduire les textes et matériaux suivants.

(Données de bibliographie sur page ci-jointe)

Office de Tourisme de Grenoble
14, rue de la République
BP 227
Tél. 04 76 42 41 41 - Fax 04 76 51 28 69
38016 GRENOBLE CEDEX

Je fais figurer la mention suivante :

© Copyright Office de Tourisme de Grenoble

Aucune partie de ce plan ne peut être reproduite sans l'autorisation de l'Office de Tourisme.
Jennifer A. Brown
92 Les Cimes de Lognan
Les Grassonnetts
74-700 Chamonix
France
tel 06-73-63-93-78
jennychjenjem@netscape.net

April 27, 2002
Office du Tourisme Autrans
38880 Autrans France

Cher Office du Tourisme Autrans,


Je demande votre permission d’inclure les matériaux ci-joints. Les sources de toutes citations, ainsi que toute information sur les droits de reproduction et droits d’auteur seront mentionnées en annexe supplémentaire, tels que démontrés. La citation bibliographique paraîtra en fin du manuscrit, telle que démontrée. Faites-moi, s’il vous plaît, parvenir tout changement nécessaire.

Veuillez donner votre approbation à cette demande par votre signature en bas de cette lettre, en joignant si nécessaire toute consigne ou formulaire me confirmant votre permission. S’il y a des frais de reproduction, veuillez me les indiquer dans votre réponse. Si vous avez besoin de plus amples renseignements, n’hésitez pas à me contacter au numéro ci-dessus.

Je vous prie de faire suivre cette demande auprès des personnes ou institutions concernées si vous n’êtes pas le propriétaire des droits d’auteur.

Dans l’attente de vous lire dans l’immédiat, je vous remercie pour toute l’attention et la coopération que vous portez à ce courrier.

Jennifer A. Brown

OFFICE du TOURISME
38880 AUTRANS
Tél. 04.76.95.30.70
Fax 04.76.95.38.63
Je donne par cette lettre permission à Jennifer Anne Brown de reproduire les textes et matériaux suivants.

(Données de bibliographie sur page ci-jointe)

OFFICE du TOURISME
38880 AUTRANS
Tel. 04 76 95 30 70
Fax: 04 76 95 38 63

(Frais) 0 €

(Signature)

le 07/05/02
Map of Autran’s cross country ski trails.
Jennifer A. Brown  
92 Les Cimes de Lognan  
Les Grassonnets  
74-700 Chamonix  
France  
tel 06-73-63-93-78  
jenjenjen@netscape.net  

April 27, 2002  
Office du Tourisme d’Albertville  
BP 174  
73204 Albertville Cedex  

Cher Office du Tourisme d’Albertville,  


Je demande votre permission d’inclure les matériaux ci-joints. Les sources de toutes citations, ainsi que toute information sur les droits de reproduction et droits d’auteur seront mentionnées en annexe supplémentaire, tels que démontrés. La citation bibliographique paraîtra en fin du manuscrit, telle que démontrée. Faites-moi, s’il vous plaît, parvenir tout changement nécessaire.  

Veuillez donner votre approbation à cette demande par votre signature en bas de cette lettre, en joignant si nécessaire toute consigne ou formulaire me confirmant votre permission. S’il y a des frais de reproduction, veuillez me les indiquer dans votre réponse. Si vous avez besoin de plus amples renseignements, n’hésitez pas à me contacter au numéro ci-dessus.  

Je vous prie de faire suivre cette demande auprès des personnes ou institutions concernées si vous n’êtes pas le propriétaire des droits d’auteur.  

Dans l’attente de vous lire dans l’immédiat, je vous remercie pour toute l’attention et la coopération que vous portez à ce courrier.  

Jennifer A. Brown
Je donne par cette lettre permission à Jennifer Anne Brown de reproduire les textes et matériaux suivants.

(Données de bibliographie sur page ci-jointe)

(Frais) 

(Signature)
Map of Albertville 2002.
Map of Albertville pre-Olympic construction.
Circuit de visite touristique du Site Olympique des XVIèmes Jeux olympiques d'hiver

Le siège du COJO
Le Comité d'Organisation des Jeux Olympiques est aujourd'hui un lycée professionnel pour plus de 500 élèves.

Le théâtre des cérémonies
Le théâtre des cérémonies d'ouverture et de clôture avec 35 000 places.

La plus grande structure permanente du site, avec des aires de spectacles spécifiques pour les épreuves de patinage sur glace.

Le maître olympique
Nommé par la Fédération française de sport en janvier 2011.

Les 1000 places supplémentaires
Une trentaine de places supplémentaires dans le gymnase.

Les prolongements
Deux prolongements de la structure de la cérémonie d'ouverture.

Le Môle olympique
1000 places supplémentaires dans une salle modulable.

Le stade olympique
En phase de construction, le projet est en phase de construction.

Le point Accueil (446)
Office du Tourisme.
Jennifer A. Brown
92 Les Cimes de Lognan
Les Grassonetts
74-700 Chamonix
France
tel 06-73-63-93-78
Jenniferjenny@netscape.net

PO Box 920034
Snowbird, Utah 84092
USA

April 27, 2002

Office du Tourisme Les Saisies
Avenue des Jeux Olympiques
73620 Les Saisies France

Cher Office du Tourisme Les Saisies,


Je demande votre permission d’inclure les matériaux ci-joints. Les sources de toutes citations, ainsi que toute information sur les droits de reproduction et droits d’auteur seront mentionnées en annexe supplémentaire, tels que démontrés. La citation bibliographique paraîtra en fin du manuscrit, telle que démontrée. Faites-moi, s’il vous plaît, parvenir tout changement nécessaire.

Veuillez donner votre approbation à cette demande par votre signature en bas de cette lettre, en joignant si nécessaire toute consigne ou formulaire me confirmant votre permission. S’il y a des frais de reproduction, veuillez me les indiquer dans votre réponse. Si vous avez besoin de plus amples renseignements, n’hésitez pas à me contacter au numéro ci-dessus.

Je vous prie de faire suivre cette demande auprès des personnes ou institutions concernées si vous n’êtes pas le propriétaire des droits d’auteur.

Dans l’attente de vous lire dans l’immédiat, je vous remercie pour toute l’attention et la coopération que vous portez à ce courrier.

Jennifer A. Brown
Je donne par cette lettre permission à Jennifer Anne Brown de reproduire les textes et matériaux suivants.

(Données de bibliographie sur page ci-jointe)

(Frais)

(Signature) REGIE DES SAISIES

Château Espagne Cristal

73620 LES SAISIES

Tél. 04 75 58 86 89 - Fax 04 75 39 02 24
Map of cross country trails Les Saisies.
March 11, 2003

Dan Campbell
Dan Campbell Photography
5 St. Andrews Court
Park City, Utah 84060
1-(435)-655-7700

Dear Dan,

I am in the process of preparing my thesis in the Landscape Architecture Department at Utah State University in Logan, Utah U.S.A. My thesis topic is "How The Winter Olympic Games Enrich Community Legacies For Recreational Open Space -- A case study of selected European and American Olympic sites." I hope to complete in the spring of 2003.

I am requesting your permission to include your pictures from the Salt Lake City 2002 Winter Olympics: opening & closing ceremonies, medals plaza, nordic jump, bobsleigh, cross-country, ice-skating and speed skating events. I will include acknowledgments and/or appropriate citations to your work as indicated. Please advise me of any changes you require.

Please indicate your approval of this request by signing in the space provided, attaching any other form or instruction necessary to confirm permission. If you charge a reprint fee for use of your material, please indicate that as well. If you have any questions, please call me at the number above.

I hope you will be able to reply immediately.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Jennifer A. Brown

I hereby give permission to Jennifer Anne Brown to reprint the following material in her thesis.

(Fea) [Signature]