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**City Proposal**

**City pays (direct):**
- $130 million contribution (non-property tax)
- $30 million land
- $25 million Saddledome demolition
- $185 million (33.3%)

**City pays (indirect):**
- All infrastructure $150 million (eg. 17th Ave. extension)
- Green Line station TBD
- Utility upgrades TBD

**Event Centre/Arena**

**Flames’ Ownership pays:**
- $185 million (33.3%)

**Users pay:**
- (ticket surcharge) $185 million

**Calgarians get:**
- Property tax from Flames’ Ownership
- Flames hockey for at least 35 years
- Event Centre use during Stampede and for international events

---

**Flames’ Ownership Proposal**

**City pays (direct):**
- $225 million contribution
- $30 million land
- $25 million Saddledome demolition
- $280 million (50%)

**City pays (indirect):**
- All infrastructure $150 million (eg. 17th Ave. extension)
- Green Line station TBD
- Utility upgrades TBD

**Event Centre/Arena**

**Flames’ Ownership pays:**
- $100 million (18%)

**Flames’ Ownership gets:**
- 100% of all revenues

**Users pay:**
- (ticket surcharge) $185 million

**Calgarians get:**
- Zero rent
- Zero property tax from Flames’ Ownership
- Flames hockey for at least 35 years
- Event Centre use during Stampede and for international events

**CRL City Funding $225 M**

**Flames source not clarified $25 M**

**Users* Ticket surcharge financed by City**

**Users**

**City land and Saddledome**

Costs not included in Flames proposal $55 M
CalgaryNext to CalgaryNoMore?

Sean Kelso  
@kelsohockey

I can’t believe it YYC. Having @nenshi as mayor is worse than @realDonaldTrump being president. 
arrogant bracefordisaster outoftouch

11:20pm · 16 Oct 2017 · Twitter for iPhone
Today...

- Problem of public financing of stadiums
- Good governance principles applied to stadium financing
- Case studies
  - Atlanta
  - Edmonton
Public Financing of Stadiums

• Stadiums for professional teams are heavily subsidized by the public in North America

• Stadiums for professional teams do not provide the economic benefits promised

• Solutions on ending public financing of stadiums for professional teams have focused on legal solutions
Principles of Good Governance

- Transparency
- Public participation
- Solidarity
- Review
Case Study – Atlanta
Case Study – Atlanta
Case Study – Atlanta

• Transparency
  • Deal reached in secret

• Public participation
  • Only 12 speaking slots at the public vote by the County Commissioners

• Solidarity
  • Seemingly none

• Review
  • Judicial review upheld the bond issue
Case Study – Edmonton
Case Study – Edmonton
Case Study – Edmonton

- Transparency
  - Idea publicly mooted throughout

- Public participation
  - Public consultations in 2010, 2012
  - Leadership Committee comprised of elites

- Solidarity
  - Community Benefits Agreement, but no specifics

- Review
  - None so far
So What?

• Different stadiums can have different processes

• Why are the processes different?

• Does better process equal better substantive outcomes?
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