## Comparative Value Proposition Framework (For Illustrative Purposes Only)

| Options for City of                       | OPTION 1            | OPTION 2                  | OPTION 3                                |
|---|---------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Calgary spending relative to Calgary-     | Host Olympics &     | Do Not Host No Olympics & | Maintain Sports                         |
| based value:                              | Paralympics         | Paralympics, but same     | Maintain Sports Facilities Only         |
| based value.                              | i araiyiiipics      | investment in sports      | racincles Only                          |
|   |                     | facilities                |   |
|   |                     |                           |   |
| CITY INVESTMENT:                          | Total City Share of | Amount required to        | Significantly less                      |
|   | OPWG                | invest in equivalent      | investment than                         |
|   | (A.1)               | sports infrastructure     | Options 1 or 2                          |
| LECACY MALLIE                             |                     | (A.2)                     | (A.3)                                   |
| LEGACY VALUE: (Examples)                  |                     |                           |   |
| Value of sports                           |                     |                           | Significantly < than                    |
| infrastructure                            | В                   | В                         | Options 1 or 2.                         |
| Long-term                                 |                     |                           |   |
| sports-related economic                   | Same as Option 2.   | Same as Option 1.         | Significantly < than                    |
| & social benefits derived from the assets | TBD under 'cost-    | TBD under 'cost-benefit'  | Options 1 or 2                          |
| Hom the assets                            | benefit' study      | study                     |   |
| Affordable Housing                        | С                   | < C                       | N/A                                     |
|   | -                   |                           | Significantly < than                    |
| Economic activity & Jobs                  | D                   | < D                       | Options 1 or 2.                         |
| ,   |                     |                           | •                                       |
| Tourism                                   | E                   | < E                       | Significantly < than<br>Options 1 or 2. |
|   | <u> </u>            | \L                        | •                                       |
| Community involvement & participation     | High                | Less < than Option 1      | Significantly < than Options 1 or 2     |
| & participation                           | iligii              | Less \ than Option 1      | •                                       |
| Branding / Reputation                     | High                | Less < than Option 1.     | Significantly < than Options 1 or 2.    |
| RISKS:                                    | Risks & mitigation  | Risks & mitigation        | Risks & mitigation                      |
| (Examples as noted in                     | strategies TBD      | strategies TBD            | strategies TBD                          |
| Report)                                   | D. 2006             |                           | 11.1                                    |
| TIMELINE:                                 | By 2026             | Likely later than 2026    | Unknown                                 |
|   |                     |                           |   |