

Taking Shape: The Molding of OCO' 88 Issues for Further Study in the Records of the XV Olympic Winter Games

Glenda Leslie

Archivist, Olympic Collection, The City of Calgary

In 1981 September 30, the Calgary Olympic Development Association (CODA) was awarded the XV Olympic Winter Games by the International Olympic Committee (IOC). Two of the bid committee's first tasks were to incorporate the organizing committee and to name its first President. Both of these tasks were completed, at least in part, by early 1982 when the Canadian Olympic Association (COA) authorized an application for incorporation in January (granted by Letters Patent 1982 April 16) and the organizing committee named David Leighton as its first President in March.¹

Leighton, as President of OCO'88 (as the Organizing Committee came to be called) faced the enormous job of directing the decision-making process and molding the organizing committee into a viable and functioning body which would accomplish its goal--to stage the XV Olympic Winter Games in 1988 February. He and the members of OCO'88 faced a wide range of issues in the early years of that organization's existence. Leighton often described his job in terms of "being on the fringe," and he regularly made reference to his heavy management responsibilities as he took on his full-time role as President of OCO'88. At the same time, he expressed enthusiasm for the task ahead of him.* An examination of some of the issues faced by Leighton and the rest of the Organizing Committee in the early years of OCO's existence demonstrates the enormous potential for further study and research within the records of the Organizing Committee for the XV Olympic Winter Games.³

Organizational Structure

OCO'88 was the name of the organizing committee for the XV Olympic Winter Games, even though it was

CODA which won the bid. OCO'88 was formed as a result of the clause in the Olympic Charter which required the organizing committee of an Olympic Games to disband six months after the completion of the Games. CODA was formed in 1957 and was the organization behind three previously unsuccessful Olympic bids--to hold the 1964, 1968 and 1972 Winter Olympics. Thus, many members of CODA had business, sports and bid experience on which to draw, so it is not surprising that many of the first Vice Presidents of the organizing committee came from OCO's parent organization. In March 1982, the same month Leighton was appointed President, four Vice Presidents were announced: Vice President of Games Operations; Vice President of Executive Operations (this portfolio was soon changed to that of Community Relations); Vice President, Finance and Administration; and Vice President, Communications. Initially, Leighton felt he should handle all revenue matters himself.⁴

However, at that time, the organizing committee was not yet officially incorporated, despite already facing pressure from the Province and the Calgary community to expand its Board of Directors, nor did its members have any office space.⁵ Thus, Leighton gave priority to these issues rather than to any further appointments to the organizing committee (with the exception of appointing the Vice President, Facilities and Technical Services, in April). "We need this time to get systems in place, budgets developed, boards organized and general plans made." Leighton also asked that speaking engagements and other publicity be kept to a minimum. He did not see these activities as priorities until after 1984.⁶

Although appointments to the organizing committee were not a priority, organizational structure was. The Committee received organizational information from former and upcoming Olympic cities such as Innsbruck, Montreal, Lake Placid, and especially Sarajevo and Los Angeles, yet the process of setting up OCO's structure was neither simplistic nor immediate.⁷

Besides consideration of the overall organizational structure of OCO, terms of reference of Executive members had to be finalized. Handwritten notes on some charts help to demonstrate the decision-making process involved as names and personalities were

matched with responsibilities.⁸ However, there was not always complete agreement on who should be a Vice President and who should not, or for what they should be responsible.⁹ Leighton was also concerned about the finer details of the organization and asked his Vice Presidents for a conceptual design for each of their major areas of responsibility, and a set of goals and objectives including budgets and personnel projections.¹⁰

Regarding staffing for the organizing committee, Leighton insisted that an “evolutionary” staffing plan was necessary and he suggested, at least initially, that the Committee should consider contracting out its overall planning work. Tied into this was the need for the development of a “personnel system”¹¹ plus consideration of employee salaries, benefits, travel policies and the like.¹² Two major reorganizations of OCO’88 occurred, the first in 1983 and the second in 1986-1987, but throughout its existence, OCO’s organizational structure remained quite fluid.¹³

What does the organizational structure chosen by the OCO’88 Executive tell us about the type of organization envisioned by these people, and how did changes in that organization reflect changes in that vision? Students of organizational structure need only to look at the records of OCO’88 to find a wealth of organizational change within a very limited time.

Site Selections

One of the major issues faced by Leighton even before he assumed the full-time role of President of OCO’88 was that of site selection.

The choice of Mount Allan as the site of alpine events is only the most well known controversy. CODA’s bid had proposed that alpine skiing events were to take place in the Spray Lakes area of Kananaskis Country. Mount Sparrow-hawk, a potential recreational skiing site, was to be the focus of the downhill events; Mount Shark was to be the site for slalom and giant slalom races. These sites met with the technical specification for ski race sites as outlined by the International Ski Federation (FIS), the world governing body for competitive skiing; and with CODA’s own criteria that the alpine events be held outside a National Park and that development of the alpine sites be the

responsibility of private firms with assistance from the Provincial Government.¹⁴

Not long after the award of the bid, the situation changed drastically. “[W]e have been put in a very awkward position by our partners, most notably, the two senior levels of government,” Leighton wrote. “On the Alpine site situation, they have had a considerable change of heart from the bid stage.”¹⁵ OCO was contractually obligated to work in partnership with the Alberta Government, yet Mount Allan, the Province’s choice for the alpine events, had been rejected by CODA because its vertical drop was considered to be unsuitable, particularly for the men’s downhill event. Because its agreement with the International Olympic Committee also limited OCO’s flexibility with regard to site locations, Leighton and his OCO colleagues were forced to take a second look at Mount Allan, which they did with reluctance.¹⁶

A combined FIS/OCO inspection of Mount Allan on July 14, 1982, was followed by a meeting with Provincial representatives the next day. Leighton communicated the results of these events to the Board: “The upshot was that while Mt. Allan meets FIS standards for the various events, our inspection team was not very enthusiastic about the hill for downhill events, as the contour is too flat at the bottom. There is a possibility that the course could be improved . . .”¹⁷ With more specific reference to the men’s downhill event, Ron Collie, the Vice President of Facilities and Technical Services was less sure of FIS acceptance of Mount Allan:

Detailed reconnaissance on Mount Allan and in the Spray Lakes has been carried out by a technical team over the past month. The purpose was to identify the best possible courses for the various events. . . . The bottom line is that the best possible course for the men’s downhill event on Mount Allan is not satisfactory, although I believe we could persuade FIS to accept it.¹⁸

By choosing an alpine site outside a National Park, CODA had hoped to avoid running into the environmental concerns which had been such an important factor in Calgary’s unsuccessful bid for the

Olympic Perspectives

1972 Winter Olympics.¹⁹ However, this was not to be the case. Ross Goodwin, the Provincial Parks Representatives of the National and Provincial Parks Association of Canada (NPPAC) wrote to Leighton in support of Mount Allan as a more suitable site from an environmental point of view. "The Spray Valley, while having also suffered from some development since the advent of Kananaskis Country, still has significant wildland values which deserve to be preserved. . . ." The members of the NPPAC supported Mount Allan as the most practical choice for a ski area for the 1988 Games because, in their opinion, an alpine facility could be developed there with only minimum damage to the wildlands.²⁰ Members of OCO also arranged to meet with several environmental organizations in 1982 November. Among the groups invited to the meeting were the Bow Valley Naturalists, the National and Provincial Parks Association, the Federation of Alberta Naturalists, the Sierra Club, the Alberta Wilderness Association, the International Union of Conservation of Nature, the Upper Bow Valley Hunt and Fish Association, and two members of the University of Calgary's Faculty of Environmental Design.²¹

By November 1982, the OCO Board of Directors resolved to accept Mount Allan as the site of all alpine events of the 1988 Winter Games, but the Board also wanted it publicly known that they would "encourage simultaneous efforts to develop an Alpine training and competition centre at Mount Sparrowhawk, in conjunction with the Canadian Ski Association and the Province of Alberta."²²

At the same time as the site for alpine skiing events was in question, other venues also came under scrutiny. Nordic skiing events were to take place in the Bragg Creek area, while speedskating events had been planned for a proposed site on the University of Calgary campus. For the development of these sites, OCO was entirely dependent upon Provincial government financing.²³

The choice of Bragg Creek as the site for Nordic skiing events did not sit well with the Province because of a perceived lack of snow in the area. While members of the Provincial government began to investigate alternate sites for these events, OCO members began to look at sites in the Canmore region and in the Kananaskis area, and, in Leighton's opinion, "came up

Center for Olympic Studies

with something considerably better than the rather second-rate location that they [the provincial government] were examining."²⁴ Leighton explained to Canmore's Deputy Mayor the reasons for OCO's careful reevaluations of its proposed venues:

Our job in recent months has been to re-assess every single location to make sure that the best possible decision is being made. Inevitably someone gets hurt in this process. However, we have only one chance and our mistakes as well as our successes will be visible to the entire world, so we must be right.²⁵

The following "Table of Possible Sites" outlines the extent to which OCO went in their examination of alternate venues for many of the non-alpine events.²⁶

See Table One

Bragg Creek had also been the intended site for the bobsleigh and luge events in 1988. As that location came into question, OCO began negotiations for the development and use of facilities at Paskapoo (now Canada Olympic Park) on the outskirts of Calgary. Other possible sites in South Canmore were also investigated as an alternate to those at Paskapoo. For Leighton, the primary consideration in these negotiations was to make sure the province ended up owning the land and controlling public access to the area.²⁷

The first questions about the proposed speedskating venue came from outside of Canada. CODA's bid had stated that a covered speedskating oval would be considered for the 1988 Winter Olympics. Representatives from Norway, Sweden and the former Soviet Union voiced concerns to the International Skating Union (ISU) that a covered facility would give an advantage to Canadian athletes who would be able to train and compete in the facility beforehand. However, OCO members were relieved to discover that the USSR already had some covered speedskating tracks, and that the ISU rules permitted either open or closed 400 meter tracks.²⁸ However, OCO was still faced with negotiating the details of its proposal with members of the University. In October 1982, Leighton's correspondence with the President of the

University, Dr. Norman Wagner, indicated a mutually beneficial agreement was in the making. These negotiations must have soured soon after because, by November, Leighton requested Ron Collie to look into alternate sites for discussion at the upcoming meeting of the Board of Directors. "We should also get a reasonable handle on the likely cost of locating an open-air facility elsewhere--rough land costs (obviously site-dependent) and construction costs."²⁹

Besides the speedskating oval, Leighton was also negotiating the building of the Athletes' Village on the University campus.³⁰

Across the street at McMahon Stadium, another set of negotiations was taking place with the members of the McMahon Stadium Society (MSS) with regard to financial arrangement for a proposed stadium expansion, the use of the facility for the Opening Ceremonies, and the use of office space by OCO both in the stadium and in the Red and White Club. Leighton wanted to make sure that OCO would have a voice in the design and construction of the new facilities, and that any surplus money be donated to amateur sport. As with many of the other venues, OCO was dependent upon financial cooperation from the Provincial Government. In the end, a three-way agreement would be required before any work could begin on McMahon Stadium.³¹

Members of the Organizing Committee were also negotiating the details of an agreement with the Olympic Saddledome Management Foundation for use of that facility during the 1988 Winter Olympics and for certain other pre-Games and post-Games periods. In this case, OCO'88 was more directly involved in the financing of this facility and Organizing Committee members wanted this to be reflected in the agreement. Another concern was more specifically related to the rules and regulations of the Olympics, especially those regarding advertising and box level seating.³²

Leighton's report on "Venues Time Lines" from 1 October 1982 outlines the general issues which he felt had to be resolved during deliberations on the selection of sites, and it proposes deadlines for the conclusion of the selection processes. He felt that the University issues could be settled by November of that year, while announcements of venues for the Nordic events could take place in December. He anticipated that the

resolution of the alpine venues would not take place until March or April of 1983.³³ In fact, agreements for the development and use of many of the facilities for the XV Olympic Winter Games were not signed until well after Leighton predicted.

Relationships with Governments and Other Organizations

The negotiations over site selections alone brings into focus the fact that OCO'88 did not act alone while planning for the 1988 Winter Olympics, and in most cases, it was not even the primary organization responsible for the development of a facility or venue. It might be better to describe OCO'88 as the agency into which all other organizations concerned with the Olympics fed their raw materials--their rules, regulations, concerns, funding--and it was the job of the Organizing Committee to combine all these materials and produce the final product, an Olympic Winter Games.

The major raw material provided by the Province of Alberta and the Government of Canada was funding. We have already seen how much the provincial government was involved in the choices of sites for the development of many of the Olympic facilities as the major financial backer. The province's huge financial investment in the Games, meant that, right from the start, that it was keenly interested in all financial aspects of the Games. As early as October 1982, the Government of Alberta had completed a preliminary confidential study on the impact that the Games would have on Calgary and the province. A summary of their findings was released to the Organizing Committee. This outlined the creation of a projected 2400 to 2900 "man years"³⁴ of direct employment, particularly as a result of the increased construction to take place in the Calgary area. The planning and operation of the Games was expected to generate \$223 million,³⁵ again mostly in the Calgary area. Tourism revenue during the Games was expected to reach an estimated \$40.3 million, but the potential growth in tourism was projected to be long term and province-wide. In particular, the report indicated that, with the increased promotion of winter sports which would come with the Games, Alberta's tourism industry would not be as subject to the seasonal fluctuations which had often occurred up to that time. The report also recommended

Olympic Perspectives

that OCO'88 and the tourist industry develop a close working relationship with regard to marketing strategies for pre-Games and post-Games times as well as the two weeks of the Olympics. Promotional activities for utilization of the facilities once the Games were over was of particular importance, as well as consideration of the ongoing operation and maintenance of these facilities. The report also made note of the many other business opportunities in the service and marketing industries which would result from pre-Games and Games-time activities.³⁶

The Government of Canada was also concerned with expenditures and revenues right from the beginning. One of the major sources of revenue for the Organizing Committee was expected to come from the Sports Betting Pool which was to be created by the Federal Government. In August 1982, along with its plans for revenue-generating coin and stamp programs, the Secretary of State announced the Canadian Government's plan for this lottery. With the potential revenue from these schemes expected to be about \$200 million, this announcement was welcomed by members of OCO'88, and they very carefully entered into negotiations for a formal agreement with the Federal Government.³⁷

While no problems were expected in the development and passage of the required legislation for the coin and stamp programs, there was a major snag in the proposal for the Sports Betting Pool and that was the fact that control of lotteries was in the hands of the Provincial Governments. Members of OCO'88 were concerned about rumours of bitter provincial opposition to the betting pool proposal.³⁸ Leighton held discussions with the Hon. Ray Perrault, the Minister for Fitness and Amateur Sport, about the delicate timing required to guide the legislation through the House of Commons so as to avoid any potential problems.³⁹

As the Federal Government was announcing plans for programs to generate revenue for OCO'88, Leighton was also facing announcements from the City government that potential budget cutbacks in the City would affect Olympic funding. This was an important consideration for Leighton and his team, because the IOC awards an Olympic Games to a city, not to a country. Leighton resolved to develop a closer and more direct working relationship with the Mayor of

Center for Olympic Studies

Calgary, Ralph Klein.⁴⁰ OCO's ongoing relationship with The City of Calgary has potential to be a fascinating area of study.

Leighton and his colleagues were also dealing with numerous other national and international associations during the course of OCO's existence. OCO's associations with these groups is a study in acronyms. The records of the Organizing Committee are filled with references to NOCs, IFs, ISUs, IOCs, FISs, COAs, CCAs, CSAs as well as to CODAS, CABLAs, CASSAs, ANOCs and such. In some cases, OCO's involvement with these organizations was not fully developed until the Games drew closer. In other cases, dealings between OCO'88 and these groups was effective and successful from the start.

Such was the case, as we have seen, in the choice of an alpine skiing venue. OCO had to satisfy both its major financial backer, the Provincial Government, and the International Ski Federation. The FIS was one of the many international sports federations (IFs). These groups (others being the International Skating Union (ISU), the International Ice Hockey Federations (IIHF), the International Bobsleigh and Tobogganing Federation (FIBT) and the like) controlled the technical specifications for all Olympic venues. For example, the approval of the FIS was essential before Mount Allan could be named as the site of the men's downhill event for the 1988 Games; and ISU regulations allowed for the construction of a covered speedskating oval despite concerns from some European countries.⁴¹

The National Olympic Committees (NOCs) were, like Canada's Canadian Olympic Association (COA), the organizations within each nation which enforced IOC rules and bylaws and selected their countries' participating athletes and officials.⁴² And it was through the COA that Olympic funding was transferred from the IOC to OCO'88. Thus, OCO was accountable to the COA for some of its financial decisions, such as OCO's proposed salary structure, which OCO had to be revised with the implementation of the Federal Government's "6 and 5" initiative, and the expenditure of \$28,000.00 for OCO's Graphics Manual.⁴³ The manual, Leighton insisted, was "absolutely essential for us in dealing with potential printing suppliers and other users." He assured the secretary of the COA that some of the costs would be phased in while others would be

Olympic Perspectives

delayed.⁴⁴

OCO also had to deal with Canada's own sports federations, such as the Canadian Ski Association (CSA), the Canadian Figure Skating Association (CFSA), the Canadian Amateur Speed Skating Association (CASSA), the Canadian Curling Association (CCA) and the Canadian Amateur Bobsleigh and Luge Association (CABLA), because it was expected that these organizations would be very involved with the running of particular sporting events during the Games and would be the beneficiaries of the legacy of facilities which would result from the Calgary Olympics. OCO's relations with these organizations developed to a greater extent as Games drew closer.⁴⁵

The most important of all international associations with which OCO had to deal with was the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and its set rules and regulations known as the *Olympic Charter*.⁴⁶ The IOC awarded the XV Olympic Winter Games to The City of Calgary and monitored the progress of OCO's organization from start to finish. The IOC was a major source of funding for OCO as the Committee began its work. Leighton and his colleagues kept IOC officials informed of OCO's organizational progress and with decisions about site selections as they changed from those proposed during the bid stage.⁴⁷ By the early 1980s, however, the IOC also wished to have a hand in OCO's corporate sponsorship program and in the negotiations for an eventual share of the profits from television rights.⁴⁸ These interests developed especially as a result of the huge financial success of the Los Angeles Olympics in 1984.

Marketing: Television Rights

The revenue potential from the sale of television rights and the marketing potential of the Olympics Games became significant factors in Games organizations especially after 1984. Still, as early as 1982, the potential was recognized by both Leighton and by the IOC which had already updated Rule 51 of the *Olympic Charter* to ensure that it was directly involved in the negotiations for television rights.⁴⁹ Leighton saw the creation of a "TV Committee" as one of the Organizing Committee's immediate priorities. He requested copies of the television contracts negotiated for the Los Angeles Olympics and he asked for information on the

Center for Olympic Studies

sale of television rights from earlier games.⁵⁰ By the late summer, Leighton and his colleagues were well aware of the financial impact which a well prepared broadcasting plan could have on the success of an Olympic Games.

[T]he necessity of planning and preparation in this area [broadcast rights] cannot be understated. The extent to which we are able to attract major dollars from television broadcasting will depend on our ability to (a) provide first class host broadcasting services, and (b) to properly schedule the actual events of the Games into prime U.S. television markets (obviously we will have to work closely with the IF's to finalize scheduling).⁵¹

In an early marketing plan of OCO'88, the choice of a host broadcaster was to take precedence over the sale of television rights;⁵² nevertheless, negotiations with the American networks began as early as August 1982. Suzanne Curtis of Marketing and Don Siler, VP of Executive Operations held several meetings in New York with the various networks, where they were set onto a rapid learning curve relating to the various aspects of sports broadcasting and selling the Olympics on television.⁵³ Even at this early date, significant financial rewards were anticipated and nothing was taken for granted.⁵⁴

Leighton's first discussions on the appointment of host broadcaster came in the fall of 1982 when he met in Ottawa with Pierre Juneau and Marcel Deschamps of the CBC.⁵⁵ Included in these discussions was the issue of broadcasting the cultural events staged as part of the Olympic Games. "Mr. Juneau recognized clearly the tremendous potential advantage to Canadian cultural quarters if the Canadian cultural rights could be handled and sold in a very similar manner to the athletic events. The CBC is very interested in broadcasting the cultural events, and in being consulted at an early stage in the planning of these events."⁵⁶ The Canadian Television Network (CTV) was appointed host broadcaster and Canadian television rights holder in December 1983, and ABC was awarded American rights in January 1984.⁵⁷

Besides the sale of television rights, other marketing strategies were also of major concern to OCO'88.

Olympic Perspectives

Almost immediately, different marketing agencies were in contact with OCO with enquiries about the Organizing Committee's marketing strategies and offering themselves as consultants to OCO in these matters. Representatives of CBS, the broadcaster of the Lake Placid Games in 1980, offered their assistance to OCO so that some of the mistakes which had hampered those Games would not be repeated in Calgary. Leighton responded to this offer with interest: "As you mentioned, there are aspects of the 1980 experience that you would recommend we try to duplicate and many we should not repeat; it is insights like those which have the most value to us."⁵⁸

Among the agencies with whom Leighton or his colleagues corresponded were International Creative Management of New York, International Management Group in New York and Toronto, and Western Management Consultants in Vancouver. In August 1983, Trans World International Inc., a subsidiary of International Management Group, was appointed marketing consultant for OCO'88.⁵⁹

Marketing: Corporate Relationships

With the financial disaster of the Montreal Olympics in 1976 and the political, if not economic, failure of the Moscow Games in 1980, the financial benefits of a corporate relationship with the Olympics was not a certainty in the early 1980s. The financial success of the Los Angeles Games had not yet become evident, and care and caution may be the best way to describe OCO's initial approach to this area of its organization. In early 1982, short-term financing was Leighton's main priority, along with the development of a detailed budget.⁶⁰

In order to cover OCO's operating costs, Leighton wished to focus on the development of the sponsorship program.⁶¹ He recognized this to be the best source of "up-front financing" for OCO's operations. In the past, merchandising and licensing had "created the greatest problems for Organizing Committees," so Leighton wanted a clear-headed approach to the development of these programs. He did not want to "fall into the trap of downplaying [their] importance."⁶²

Equally important was the supplier program which was closely tied to the sponsor program.⁶³ As with the

Center for Olympic Studies

marketing of television rights, numerous business and marketing companies were quick to contact the Organizing Committee so as to be in a good position to benefit from the potential business opportunities. Some of the more questionable business proposals included a scheme to develop a monorail system to the newly developed ski areas and the suggestion that fund raising could be accomplished, at least in part, by the sale of Calgary Olympic Bonds.⁶⁴

Other suggestions were taken more seriously, including the modest proposal from a Canmore business for the production of Olympic logo coffee mugs which could be used as gifts for board members and visitors.⁶⁵ Most of the business proposals were on a larger scale, however, such as the one from General Motors of Canada. GM's Merchandising Manager wrote to express interest in maintaining his company's involvement in Olympic activities and to indicate their plans to put together a proposal outlining the potential extent of their involvement.⁶⁶ Canadian Pacific Limited had discussions with OCO officials about the possibility of that company becoming a major supporter of the 1988 Winter Olympics, rather than having separate divisions of the company negotiating with OCO.⁶⁷

Other companies recognized that even a volunteer association with the XV Olympic Winter Games could provide business opportunities of a more indirect nature. For example, Noreen's Manager of Community Relations met with Leighton to discuss areas where members of that company could act as volunteers in assisting the Organizing Committee, most particularly in the area of hosting visiting dignitaries.⁶⁸

As OCO officials began to investigate the possibilities of the marketing and licensing program as a whole, they began to realize the magnitude of the job ahead. "It appears . . . as though we may have been somewhat conservative in our estimate of the time required to properly look into the area of licensing and marketing."⁶⁹

Conclusion

Leighton sought assistance from a wide range of business and sports organizations as he tried to set OCO'88 on a course to fulfill its mandate. By October

1982, he had travelled to New York, Toronto, Berne, Zurich and Lausanne to hold discussions with a number of individuals and organizations on various issues, including Swiss Timing, IOC funding, demonstration sports and potential problems surrounding the use of COA pictograms.⁷⁰ Other members of the Organizing Committee travelled to the 1982 Commonwealth Games held in Brisbane, Australia to learn from their Games organization,” while a former member of the Lake Placid Olympic Organizing Committee, William Kissell, offered to meet with members of OCO’88 to provide any assistance he could, particularly in the areas of legal services, corporate marketing and government agreements. He concluded his offer with the following warning: “The learning curve is tremendously sharp and although these events never come off perfectly, there certainly is a fair amount of experience that is transferable and there is no reason why you folks shouldn’t have the benefit of all of our success as well as our mistakes. . . .”⁷² Information on methods of operation also came from the former Olympic cities of Innsbruck, Sarajevo, Montreal and Los Angeles.⁷³

David Leighton resigned as the President of OCO’88 in January 1983, citing a difference in management philosophy as the reason for his decision.⁷⁴ While OCO’88 hired a new President and faced one of many reorganizations, many of the issues which confronted Leighton continued to be negotiated by his colleagues. The records of OCO’88, preserved in The City of Calgary Archives, hold many of the details which tell the story of how the Calgary Games of 1988 came to be referred to as “the best Games ever.”⁷⁵

Endnotes

1. See XV Olympic Winter Games: Official Report, 1988. P. 53. Leighton was a Harvard Business Administration graduate and had been active in the business and arts fields for many years. At the time of his appointment as President of the Organizing Committee for the XV Olympic Winter Games, he was President of the Banff Centre. All references in this paper are to materials found in the City of Calgary Archives, Olympic Collection.
2. See DSRL to Terry McTaggart, President, Niagara Institute, Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ont., 8 October 1982; DSRL to Philip G. Wolff, Chief of Staff, Lake Placid

Olympic Organizing Committee, Lake Placid, NY, 8 October 1982; DSRL to Emery N. Castle, President, Resources for the Future, Washington, D.C., 14 October 1982, and DSRL to Pat J. Mitchell, Major-General, Chief Land Doctrine and Operations, National Defence Headquarters, Ottawa, 18 October 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, October-December, 1982; DSRL to D.J. McDougall, Chairman of the Board, Cockfield Brown Inc., Toronto, 30 September 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, August-September, 1982.

3. Ibid., pp. 53-55. Aside from the Olympic Chapter, this study does not include an examination of other sources on the 1988 Calgary Olympic Winter Games, such as media reports on the various issues discussed below, but concentrates solely on information found in the records of OCO’88.

4. “Calgary Committee Takes Shape.” ca. 1982; and DSRL [David Leighton] to Frank King/Bob Niven, 25 March 1982, from OCO’88, Communications Group, I, Box 10, Internal Memoranda (Don Siler, etc.), 1982. Henceforth, all correspondence to and from David Leighton will be referenced as DSRL.

5. See Frank W. King, Chairman to DSRL, Banff Centre, 1 March 1982, in Communications, I, Box 9, Canadian Olympic Association (COA), 1981-1982. The interim Board of Directors consisted of Richard Pound, James Worrall, Maurice Allan, Roger Jackson, Ralph Klein, Robert Niven, Frank King, William J. Warren, John Lecky, and David Leighton. In March 1983, the Board was expanded to 25 members, and further amendments in 1984 allowed up to 35 members on the Board; see “City of Calgary Archives, XV Olympic Winter Games Organizing Committee: Inventory to the Records of the Governing Bodies and Executive Group,” 1992 September, Administrative History, pp. 4-6. Also see John Pickett to DSRL, 14 September 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, August-September 1982; Frank King, Chairman, OCO’88 to Miss. Lucille C. Dougherty, Chairman, Calgary Regional Planning Commission, 15 December 1982, and “President’s Report,” 22 October 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, October-December 1982.

6. DSRL to King/Niven, 25 March 1982; and “Vice-President Technical Services, 1982,” from Communications, I, Box 10, Internal Memoranda (Don Siler, etc.), 1982.

7. DSRL to King/Niven, 25 March, 1982; “XV

Olympic Perspectives

Olympic Winter Games Organizing Committee, Term of Reference: Board of Directors, Executive Committee and Presidents,” 20 August 1982; and “XV Olympic Winter Games Organizing Committee, Terms of Reference: Olympic Councils, 14 September 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, August-September 1982.

8. See “The XV Olympic Winter Games Organizing Committee,” 16 January 1982, in Communications, I, Box 9, Charter, 1982; and “The XV Olympic Winter Games Organizing Committee,” 8 February 1982, in Communications, I, Box, 8, Abbreviated Plans, ca. 1982-1983. “The XV Olympic Winter Games Organizing Committee: Plan of Organization, May 1982,” in Communications, I, Box 9, Organization Charts, 1982, includes a “Proposed Organization Structure” in two versions. Also see DSRL to King/Niven, 25 March 1982; DSRL to Frank [King], 30 September 1982; “Terms of Reference” for Olympic Councils, Compensation Committee, Management Review Committee, n.d.; “The XV Olympic Winter Games Organizing Committee,” Terms of Reference, Board of Directors, 20 August 1982, in Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, August-September 1982; and President’s Report, 22 October 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, October-December 1982, 1982.

9. See John Pickett to DSRL, 14 September 1982; and DSRL to R.J. Holmes, The City of Calgary, 30 September 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, August-September 1982. Also see Don Siler to “David,” November 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 2, Revenues, 1982; and notations on memo from DSRL to King/Niven, 25 March 1982, from Communications Group, I, Box 10, Internal Memoranda (Don Siler), etc.), 1982.

10. DSRL to All Vice-Presidents, 16 September 1982; and DSRL to Management Committee, 15 November 1982, from Executive, XII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, October-December 1982. John Pickett to DSRL, 14 September 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, August-September, 1982, and DSRL to John Pickett, 15 November 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 2, Operations, 1982.

11. DSRL to King/Niven, 25 March 1982.

12. Don Siler to DSRL, 14 September and 16 September 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, August-September, 1982;

Center for Olympic Studies

Communications Group, IV, Box 1, Memos from Administration, 1982-1984; and Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, October-December, 1982, 13. XV Olympic Winter Games: Official Report, pp. 53-55, 63-69.

14. Untitled “Draft” report, 14 May 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 2, Technical Services, 1982. With regard to Parks Canada’s policy on competitive skiing in national parks, see Rodney Touche, President and General Manager, Skiing Louise Limited, Calgary, to DSRL, President, The Banff Centre, 15 April 1982 in Executive, XIII, Box 2, Sports, 1982.

15. DSRL to Victor Emery, London, England, 30 September 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, August-September 1982.

16. Nevertheless, Leighton did not rule out entirely the possibility of looking at an alternate alpine site in the Panorama area. See DSRL to W.E. Lloyd, Resort Manager, Panorama Resort, Invermere, B.C., 13 August 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, August-September, 1982.

17. “XV Olympic Winter Games Organizing Committee, President’s Report,” 20 August 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, August-September, 1982.

18. “Facilities and Technical Services Progress Report No. 1,” 9 September 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 2, Technical Services, 1982.

19. XV Olympic Winter Games: Official Report, p. 51.

20. Ross Goodwin, Provincial Parks Representative, National and Provincial Parks Association of Canada, University of Calgary, to DSRL, 1 November 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 2, President, General Correspondence, 1982.

21. R.A. Collie to DSRL and Francis Jackson, 25 October 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, October-December, 1982.

22. DSRL to The Hon. Peter Trynchy, Minister, Recreation and Parks, Edmonton, 5 November 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, October-December, 1982.

23. DSRL to Victor Emery, 30 September 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, August-September, 1982.

24. Ibid.

25. DSRL to Deputy Mayor Paula Andrews, Town of Canmore, 15 December 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, October-December, 1982. Also see DSRL to Ron Collie, 13 October 1982,

Olympic Perspectives

- from Executive, XIII, Box 2, Technical Services, 1982.
26. "Table of Possible Sites," 29 October 1982, From Communications, I, Box 10, Schedules, Charts, Lists, Agreements, 1982. The events referred to in this chart are as follows: "SJ" - ski jumping; "B/L" - bobsleigh/luge; "XC" - cross country skiing; "B" - biathlon; "SS" - speedskating. A note added to this Table noted several other possible sites for the speedskating events: Mount Royal College, Glenmore Park, or adjacent to other City of Calgary recreational facilities.
27. DSRL to Ron Collie, 13 October 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 2, Technical Services, 1982. See also DSRL to Ron Collie, Brian Murphy, Bill Warren, 15 October 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, October-December, 1982.
28. Jean Grenier to Frank King, 7 May 1982, from Executive, XII, Box 2, Sports, 1982.
29. DSRL to Ron Collie, 10 November 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 2, Technical Services, 1982.
30. DSRL to A.G. Anselmo, President, The McMahon Stadium Society, 17 December 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, October-December, 1982.
31. See DSRL to A.G. Anselmo, President, The McMahon Stadium Society, 16 November 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, October-December, 1982. This letter is the same as the one dated 17 December 1982 but includes more detailed information on the expansion proposals, including financial requirements and a time schedule.
32. Robert Niven, Vice-Chairman, XV Olympic Winter Games Organizing Committee to W.C. Hay, Chairman, Olympic Saddledome Foundation, 9 July 1982, and William J. Warren, Counsel for XV Olympic Winter Games Organizing Committee to Bob Niven, 7 July 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 2, Technical Services, 1982; Frances Jackson to Don Siler, 18 June 1982, and John Pickett, Vice President Games Operations to R.D. Niven, 23 June 1982, in Executive, XIII, Box 2, Operations, 1982.
33. "Venues: Time Lines," by DSRL, 1 October 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, October-December, 1982.
34. Term used in the report.
35. These figures were in 1981 dollars.
36. Suzanne Curtis to All Management, 6 October 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 2, Revenues, 1982.
37. The aim of Oco'88 in its negotiations with all levels

Center for Olympic Studies

- of government was a "four-party agreement." See "President's Report," 22 October 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, October-December, 1982.
38. See "Draft" report on "Revenues," 12 August 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 2, Revenues, 1982; and DSRL to Hon. Mary J. LeMessurier, Minister, Culture, Edmonton, 8 October 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, October-December, 1982. For more on the Olympic Coin program, see Suzanne Curtis to Bill Warren and DSRL, 3 June 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 2, Revenues, 1982; "Address to the Board of Directors of the Canadian Numismatic Association Meeting," 14 July 1982; and Suzanne Curtis, Marketing to J. Donald Gartland III, Executive Vice President, Numinvest Corporation, New York, NY, 30 August 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, October-December, 1982.
39. "President's Report," 22 October 1982; and DSRL to All Vice-Presidents, Frank King, Bob Niven, Bill Warren, 13 October 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, October-December, 1982.
40. See Wendy Orr to Don Siler, 11 August 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, August-September, 1982; and DSRL to His Worship Ralph Klein, City of Calgary, 18 October 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, October-December, 1982.
41. Suzanne Curtis to Don Siler, 17 August 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 2, Revenues, 1982; also see Comité International Olympique, Olympic Charter 1982, Rules 42 and 43, pp. 22-23.
42. Curtis to Siler, 17 August 1982. Also see Olympic Charter 1982, Rules 24-31, pp. 15-19. One of the IOC's conditions for Olympic candidate cities was that the Organizing Committee be appointed by the NOC; in OCO's case, the COA had to make this appointment.
43. This program to fight inflationary trends included a wage restraint clause.
44. DSRL to Maurice Allan, Secretary, COA, 30 September 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, August-September, 1982.
45. Curtis to Siler, 17 August 1982; DSRL to John Harvie, President, Alberta Division, Canadian Ski Association, Calgary, 5 May 1982; and William E. Dyer, President, Canadian Amateur Speed Skating Association, Fort St. John, B.C. to Frank King, Chairman, CODA, Calgary, 9 April 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 2, Sports, 1982.

Olympic Perspectives

46. *Ibid.*, Condition 1, p. 80.
47. DSRL to King/Niven, 25 March 1982; DSRL to Mme. Monique Berlioux, Director, Comité International Olympique, Lausanne, Suisse, 30 August 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, August-September, 1982.
48. See "Draft" report on "Revenues," 12 August, 1982; and Curtis to Siler, 17 August 1982. Also see Olympic Charter 1982, Rules 51 and 53, and By-Laws to Rules 6 and 53, pp. 27-30, 36-37.
49. DSRL to King/Niven, 25 March 1982, XV Olympic Winter Games: Official Report, p. 341; and Olympic Charter 1982, Rule 51, pp. 27-28. On 30 September 1982, Leighton wrote to Ron Yatter of the William Morris Agency in New York; "We certainly can't move on an issue as important as television rights negotiations without [Madame Berlioux's] concurrence," from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, August-September, 1982.
50. DSRL to King/Niven, 25 March 1982.
51. "Draft" report on "Revenues," 12 August 1982. This report also expresses interest in investigating radio broadcasting for "additional coverage and dollars."
52. "Marketing Plans," n.d., from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, August-September, 1982.
53. Suzanne Curtis, Marketing to J. Larre Barrett, Director, Sports Sales, ABC Television, New York, NY, 30 August 1982; Don Siler, Vice President, Executive Operations to J. Larre Barrett, Director, Sports Sales, ABC Television, New York, NY, 25 August 1982; Don Siler, Vice President, Executive Operations to John T. Lazarus, Vice President, Sports Marketing & Sales, ABC Television, New York, NY, 25 August 1982; Suzanne Curtis, Marketing to Kathryn C. Pelgrift, Vice President, Corporate Planning, National Broadcasting Company Inc., New York, 30 August 1982; Suzanne Curtis to Peter Tortorici, Director Program Planning and Acquisitions, CBS Sports, New York, 30 August 1982; and DSRL to Neal H. Pilson, President, CBS Sports, New York, 15 October 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, October -December, 1982.
54. A summary of this agreement and worldwide broadcasting rights can be found in XV Olympic Winter Games: Official Report, pp. 341-347.
55. DSRL to All Vice-Presidents, Frank King, Bob Niven, Bill Warren, 13 October 1982.
57. A summary of the CTV/OCO broadcast agreement can be found in XV Olympic Winter Games: Official

Center for Olympic Studies

- Report, pp. 341-345.
58. Suzanne Curtis, Marketing to Thomas O'Mahaffey, CBS Broadcast International, New York, 30 August 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, August-September, 1982
59. See DSRL to Richard E. Moore, International Management Group, New York, 5 November 1982; DSRL to Peter H. Smith, International Management Group, Canada, Toronto, 8 October 1982; and DSRL to James E. Armitage, Western Management Consultants, Vancouver, B.C., 18 October 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, October-December, 1982. Also see XV Olympic Winter Games: Official Report, p. 341.
60. DSRL to King/Niven, 25 March 1982.
61. *Ibid.*, Leighton suggested that contact with Peter Ueberroth of the Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee was necessary here.
62. "Draft" report on "Revenues," 12 August 1982.
63. *Ibid.*
64. See D.J. Siler to DSRL, W.J. Nield and R.A. Collie, 2 June 1982; F. Warren Hurst to DSRL, Banff Centre, 7 May 1982; and R.A. Collie, Vice President, Facilities & Technical Services to G.J. Maier, President & Chief Executive Officer, Bow Valley Industries Ltd., Calgary, 26 July 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 2, Technical Services, 1982.
65. DSRL to Frances [Jackson], 18 October 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, October-December, 1982.
66. R.G. Simpson, Merchandising Manager, Pontiac, Buick, GMC, General Motors of Canada Limited, Oshawa, Ont., to John Pickett, Vice President, Games Operations, 23 June 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 2, Operations, 1982.
67. R.A. Collie to W.H. Wardle, 12 November 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 2, Technical Services, 1982.
68. Cecelia Davies, Manager, Community Relations, Noreen Energy Resources Limited, Toronto, to DSRL, President and Chief Executive Officer, XV Olympic Winter Games, 11 November 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 2, President, General Correspondence, 1982.
69. Don Siler, Vice President, Executive Operations to Charles W. Gibbes, Chairman of the Board, Spencer Marketing Services, New York, 1 September 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 3, Leighton Correspondence, August-September, 1982.
70. See "President's Report," 22 October 1982.
71. See R.A. Collie, Vice President, Facilities and

Olympic Perspectives

Center for Olympic Studies

Technical Services to Frank King, 21 September 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 2, Technical Services, 1982; and John Pickett to DSRL, 23 July 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 2, Operations, 1982.

72. William H. Kissel, Attorney At Law, Lake Placid, NY to John Pickett, Vice President, Games Operations, XV Olympic Winter Games Organizing Committee, 22 December 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 2, Operations, 1982.

73. See "Progress Report, Games Operations Division," John Pickett to DSRL, 14 September 1982, from Executive, XIII, Box 2, Operations, 1982.

74. See XV Olympic Winter Games: Official Report, pp. 53-55.

75. *Ibid.*, pp. 9-13.

Table One
TABLE OF POSSIBLE SITES

Events	SITES UNDER STUDY									
	Bragg Creek	Paskapoo	South Canmore	Georgetown	Kananaskis Valley	Ole Black Mountain	Hawkridge	Lyon Mountain	Univ. of Calgary	Other
SJ	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
B/L	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
XC	X		X	X	X	X				
B	X		X	X	X	X				
SS		X							X	X

