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SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION

Harrison Price Company was retained by IBI Group on behalf of the Ministry of Land, Parks and Housing of the Province of British Columbia in January of 1986 to organize and carry out a charrette conference directed at determining the potentials for a major themed amusement attraction in the Vancouver area and the degree to which the availability of certain residual equipment, facilities and other values in Expo 86 can stimulate the creation of such a project.

Accordingly, HPC invited a group of experts in the attraction business to join with the client group assembled by IBI and the Ministry of Lands, Parks and Housing to treat this question in depth in a two-day conference held at the offices of BC Place in Vancouver on the 21st and 22nd of January, 1986.

Participation in the conference is identified in Table 1. Outside participants listed in this table were selected for the range and quality of their experience and background in the attractions business. James Wright, President of Space Needle Corporation, in addition to direct attractions experience at the Space Needle, has an extensive background in attraction management at Six Flags including parks in Orlando, St. Louis and Buena Park, California. Grady Larkins is a successful Florida-based independent attractions designer with substantial experience in the amusement park field—particularly at Busch Gardens. Alan Eskew was responsible for the excellent site development plan at New Orleans for Louisiana World Exposition and heads up an extensive architectural practice with heavy focus on recreation projects. Nick Winslow and Harrison Price have an extensive background in economic planning and feasibility analysis for several hundred attractions. As five year head of Paramount's Future General, Winslow has specific background in filmic and other high
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technology approaches to the attractions industry. The diversely
backgrounded client group also contained an attractions industry
professional in Frank Dillon--Vice President Operations at Expo
86 and many years an operating executive with Six Flags and Taft
parks.

In considering park re-use potentials, time is of the
essence. The national government has promised to clear and
restore the 1986 Exposition site within 60 days after the close
of the event. Further, Expo management intends to pre-sell all
disposable items prior to the Exposition's opening on May 2.

Provincial government has raised a question of potential for
a major themed amusement and recreation center in Vancouver which
could take advantage of Exposition residuals. Consequently, it
is contemplated that should an amusement facility be deemed
appropriate and economically viable, the amusement facility
would have first choice in the use of these assets.

The impetus for the idea of a theme park in Vancouver de-

1. The Northwest contains two of the largest resident markets
in North America not served by such an attraction (Seattle
and Vancouver). The nearest theme attractions are far
distant.

2. The Vancouver area benefits from a large scale tourism in
addition to its resident base--and that tourism will soon
receive a permanent upward thrust.

3. Attractions in Vancouver draw well--a sealife park in
Stanley Park draws close to a million attendance and a low
grade, marginal, portable, hard ride, carnival park on the
PNE grounds is well attended as the only available amusement
attraction in the area.
4. The massive installation at Expo 86 creates a one-time availability of certain structures, rides, attraction software and ancillary devices which could serve to lower the development cost and/or stimulate the development potentials of a Vancouver attraction.

Among the goals of the charrette are the following tentative and preliminary objectives:

- Quantify the potential visitor market for an amusement attraction.

- Estimate the likely market penetration relative to primary, excursion and tourist visitation.

- Identify amusement park content so as to establish an appropriate quality of experience together with a type of experience which would distinguish this facility as decidedly of the Pacific Northwest and more specifically of Vancouver and Canadian flavor.

- Assess the basic visual flavor and attraction of such an attraction.

- Review the current facilities under construction for the 1986 Exposition and identify which components of that event could be of value to a new amusement center.

- Review site locations relative to the general geography of Vancouver and access from the greater Seattle and Portland metropolitan areas to the south and other location factors.

- Determine if the project is economically viable based on preliminary determinations of its development costs, site acreage requirements, revenue and expense generation.
Operating in the original "storyboard" conference style developed by Walt Disney, an advance agenda was prepared as a rough guideline for the meeting. It is outlined as follows:

1. Introduction and orientation
   - Participants
   - Role of this charrette in the planning process (procedures and objectives)

2. Project background
   - Development objectives
   - Review of site options (size, location, accessibility, surrounding land uses) including the Expo site as an interim possibility
   - Possible constraints on operations (weather conditions/seasonality, site terrain, local availability of supporting infrastructure--hotels/motels, campgrounds, food service)

3. Preliminary indications of market support
   - Resident market size and characteristics
   - Tourist market
   - Competitive environment (other attractions in area and attendance experience)
   - Visitor accommodations in the area as a check on tourism counts

4. Experience of other attractions in the area
   - Market penetration and attendance
   - Operating season
   - Admission prices

5. Basic development parameters
   - General scope of project vis-a-vis indicated market support
   - Recommended operating season
   - Visitor length of stay objective

6. Expo residuals
   - Amusements
   - Pavilions/exhibits
   - Other structures and software

7. Specific content
   - Thematic orientation
   - Entertainment/recreation activities
   - Food/beverage service facilities
   - Merchandise sales facilities
   - Administrative and support facilities
   - Probable phasing of development
8. Preliminary estimates for proposed attraction
   • Market penetration and attendance
   • Design day attendance
   • Physical capacity requirements
   • Overall acreage requirements (first phase plus future expansion)

9. Summary and adjournment
   • Recap of charrette findings
   • Projected schedule of completion of summary paper
   • Assignment of individual responsibilities and follow up input from participants
   • Adjournment

The sections that follow attempt to highlight and summarize the consensus of the participants in the charrette. Although opinions were diverse, the group was essentially unanimous on most key elements—particularly in reference to the final concept, the nature and scope of the opportunity and the general outline of theme and content of the attraction.
SECTION 2

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The charrette opened with a discussion of several topics conditioning amusement/theme park opportunities in Vancouver. They were site requirements, site availabilities, seasonality and weather.

Site Requirements

Area requirements for an amusement park with annual attendances in the range of 1.0 to 2.0 million are calculated in Table 2. The values shown reflect a short season park (120-140 days per year) with a 25 percent peak month attendance (as a percent of the annual volume). The range shown is 50.4 acres for one million attendance, 76.2 acres for 1.5 million attendance and 100.6 acres for a 2 million annual attendance.

A larger site than the values indicated would allow for periphery land development in related ventures (other attractions, related services, RV development and other accommodations, etc.). This can be a useful strategy depending on how much money can be tied up in banking land for peripheral development.

Site Availability

A theme park will not pencil out on high cost land. Therefore it was an agreed presumption that suburban land is essential. It was also agreed that the direction of movement for the center of gravity of the greater Vancouver market is southeast. Sites to the southeast intercept the main movement of tourism toward Vancouver from the east and the large market to the south in Seattle/Tacoma and Portland.
Table 2
SITE REQUIREMENTS FOR ANNUAL ATTENDANCES
IN THE RANGE OF 1.0 TO 2.0 MILLION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Attendance</th>
<th>1,000,000</th>
<th>1,500,000</th>
<th>2,000,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peak Month (24%)</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Week (÷ 4.43)</td>
<td>54,176</td>
<td>81,264</td>
<td>108,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Day (20%)</td>
<td>10,835</td>
<td>16,252</td>
<td>21,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak On-Site (70%)</td>
<td>7,585</td>
<td>11,377</td>
<td>15,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres of Required Area (400/acre)</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres of Park Expansion Area (20%)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Park (acres)</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking for Visitors (3.2 car, 120 cars/acre)</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking for Employees (2/car, 1 employee/10 visitors, 120/acre)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Expansion Allowance (20%)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Parking (acres)</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total Requirement (acres)</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>100.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Harrison Price Company.
A presentation by members of the Ministry of Lands, Parks and Housing identified two prime government-owned sites on or near Highway 99, among others that may be available in or near Surrey. The first and preferred site is the Sunshine Hills Golf Club in Delta. It contains about 150 acres, of which 30 is used as a par 3 golf course. It is presently listed by the government as excess land with a $700,000 asking price. The site is peat land in a river delta which would create extra costs of construction and drainage typical of low grade alluvial swampland. At 64th Avenue and 10th Street, it is well located adjacent to the new Annacis Island freeway into Vancouver now about to open.

The second site close to the U.S. border—also owned by the government—contains 300 acres and is accessed from the Campbell River Road ramp on 99 to the north and east some 4 miles distance in Surrey. It has a difficult two lane access road. Soil conditions are far superior to the golf course land. It is currently priced at $15,000 to $20,000 per acre. An additional 1,000 acres is available on adjacent land.

Surrey is the fastest growing city in Canada and both of these sites are centered in Vancouver's prime growth area with excellent general access to incoming tourist traffic.

It is apparent that government land, made available on appropriate terms by the Ministry of Land, Parks and Housing, can be a major assistance in implementing the proposed project.

The two sites discussed are shown in Figure 1.

Seasonality and Weather

It was agreed by the group that an amusement park operating in the Vancouver environment will likely be limited to a season of 120 to 140 days; full time June, July and August through early September or all of September, weekends only in April, May and perhaps the latter part of September and a weekend or two in October.
FIGURE 1
SITE MAP
Some extension of season may be gained by weatherizing and covering walkways and the use of warm air screens. Some elements of the project could be designed for all year operation but the majority of the attraction is essentially outdoor entertainment with a restricted season schedule related to intrinsic climate, touristic and school schedule constraints.

While Vancouver enjoys a moderately temperate climate, it has quite a bit of drizzling rain and/or fog which create discomfort for exterior amusement park guests. Wherever possible the design solutions should acknowledge the need for a rather significant amount of weather protection but at the same time recognize that a large part of the guest's expectation is for an outdoor park. Efforts to include giant gallerias, malls, megaenclosures, etc. may very well win the battle of climate control but lose the war of park-like experience. Caution should be taken in attempts to use the international building modules as a giant covered midway. On good days people in Vancouver want to be outside. If the amusement park is perceived as essentially an indoor event, a lot of the magic of the site and environment will be lost.
SECTION 3

THE MARKET

Park development is generally supported by three distinct markets with differing penetration experience—they are the primary local market generally considered to be within an hour's driving time (up to 50 miles); the excursion market—accessible in a round trip in a long day without staying overnight (more or less 100 miles driving distance) and the tourist market which is the number of visitors to an area from outside the primary and excursion markets.

The Resident Market

The primary market resident population in Vancouver, taken as a one hour driving time radius, is estimated at 1.5 million (compared to the SMSA at 1.2 million). The secondary resident population—a two hour driving time ring out to a 100 mile driving distance in some directions—including those additional residents who could attend the park in a one day trip without staying over night. This ring adds approximately 960,000, about half and half from Vancouver Island and the remainder from Whatcom, Snohomish and Skagit Counties in the state of Washington. The outer perimeter of these markets is approximated in Figure 2, 50 and 100 mile annular rings around Vancouver.

The Tourist Visitor Market

Estimated available tourism within the primary and secondary markets is derived from an estimate HPC prepared for Expo 86 in December 1984, as shown in Table 3. It shows tourism in the area reaching 5.857 million in 1986—a level we would expect to be maintained thereafter as something of a permanent upward set in the trend of Vancouver tourism.
Figure 2

50 AND 100-MILE ANNULAR RINGS AROUND VANCOUVER
Table 3
ESTIMATE OF EXPO 86 AVAILABLE TOURISM AND NON-RESIDENT VISITATION RANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1977 Tourism in person overnight trips to BC (millions)</td>
<td>10.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ditto 1982</td>
<td>11.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Growth rate 1977-1982 is 1.3 percent per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>For 1982-1986 assume 1.3 percent growth per year or 1.053 or 1986 is</td>
<td>12.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SWBC gets 51 percent or</td>
<td>6.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Season adjustment is 75 percent</td>
<td>4.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fair kicker is 20 percent of 6.165 or</td>
<td>1.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Total available tourism is 1.233 + 4.624 or</td>
<td>5.857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Harrison Price Company, Forecasting Parameters for Expo 86 in Vancouver, B. C.
Attendance Potential

Table 4 shows potential attendance ranges for an attraction of the kind contemplated taking into account normal market penetration experience of like enterprises in other communities in Canada and the U.S. The attendance range shown is essentially 1.0 to 1.5 million.

Built into the equation of potential is the fact that neither the Vancouver or Seattle markets are served with a major park attraction and the first to enter this field should draw heavily from the other. The nearby Seattle/Tacoma regional market area contains 2.1 million and is a solid source for tourist derived attendance at a Vancouver park.

Several factors were discussed concerning the strength of Vancouver tourism and resident markets and the economic environment for the proposed project:

1. Expo 86 will create a new awareness of the quality and power of Vancouver as a tourist destination.
2. Exchange rates create an inducement for visitation and are likely to continue in the present balance.
3. The move of the Princess Line from the Mediterranean to Vancouver and the Inland Waterway next summer communicates the strength and stability of Vancouver as a tourist destination.
4. The role of Vancouver is expanding as a key economic unit within the Pacific Rim environment.
5. The underserved condition of the market.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Segment</th>
<th>Population (000)</th>
<th>Market Penetration Range</th>
<th>Attendance Range (000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Resident (1 hour)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>20% 30%</td>
<td>300 450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Resident (2 hour)</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>10% 15%</td>
<td>96 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Market</td>
<td>5,857</td>
<td>10% 15%</td>
<td>586 879</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Harrison Price Company.
6. The willingness of the government to enter into a joint private/public venture to stimulate the creation of a project of this nature.

7. The incentives implicit in a newly deregulated economy.

8. Emergence of a film and related entertainment industry as a stimulant to a venture of the type contemplated.

Hotel and motel availability in the area (14,000 plus rooms) is not a constraint on the tourist attendance potential indicated in Table 4. The distribution between residents and tourists shown is also consistent with theme park experience which for 42 major operations in the U. S. and Canada aggregates a reasonably similar result—about 55 percent tourist derived, 45 percent resident derived.

The charrette identified several profitable parks of a scope and dimension appropriate for a market of this size; for example, Worlds of Fun in Kansas City (1984 attendance 1.366 million) and Valley Fair in Minneapolis (1984 attendance 815,000). Taft's Carowinds in Charlotte, North Carolina (1984 attendance 1.135 million) is also in the range.

Another positive augury in the marketplace is the performance of the PNE ride park—1,500,000 attendance at the fair in its short run and some 600,000 attendance in the ride park in its non-fair season. The per cap is a relatively low $5.50. The quality of the attraction is low and its relatively high attendance reinforces the idea of an underserved market condition.

It was the conclusion of the charrette that what happens to the PNE carnival ride park does not impact this project heavily. The fair itself may depress attendance somewhat during its short run but the ride park during its non-fair season is not considered to be a competitive threat. Its site is an asphalt pad, its
attraction mix antiquated and it does not offer the amenities of a modern theme park attraction. Its use of high value in-city land will likely be ended in the long run. If in the future PNE were to move to a new site adjacent to the theme park it could create substantial logistic confusion (parking, crowd control, etc.) during the time of the fair.

The Vancouver Aquarium drew 756,000 in 1983 with 44 percent penetration of the resident market and 5 percent penetration of the tourist market. The per capita expenditure was a modest $3.30 U.S. We are told that in 1984 the attraction's attendance jumped to close to a million placing its draw equal to that of the Boston Aquarium in a much larger market and ahead of Marineworld in the larger San Francisco Bay Area market.

In assessing this project opportunity, Alan Eskew's comments on the nature of the market are pertinent:

"This design charrette in Vancouver represented my first visit. As an architect and urban designer, I had been introduced to Vancouver through professional journals and publications. My expectations for Vancouver were quite high as a result of the various publications and glowing reports which I had received from professional colleagues. However, my personal impressions of the city exceeded my most positive expectations. It is truly an extraordinary city that is blessed with breathtaking natural beauty complemented by a quality of urban fabric that is most impressive. It appears to be a city of great civic pride and sophistication. Cultural facilities appear to be of major importance to the community and a general attitude of design excellence and quality seems to prevail. Throughout the areas I visited, it seems that design quality of new construction is blended in a very thoughtful manner with historical structures strongly flavored by the British presence. In short, Vancouver possesses overwhelming attributes of a vibrant, contemporary city. It is a hidden treasure."
SECTION 4

AVAILABLE ASSETS AT EXPO 86

The afternoon and evening of the first day, the charrette group visited the fair site to gain some first hand familiarity with the kinds of structures, rides, equipment and supporting gear that might be made available for a park development. On the morning of the second day, the group met with Frank Dillon, Vice President Operations, Expo 86, to review the subject in broad terms. Among the items thought to be of possible interest were the following:

I. Rides and Attractions

1. Vekoma Steel Coaster
   (Arrow design, 3 trains) 1,800-2,000
2. Challenger Swinging Space Shuttle 1,200
3. Classic 1907 vintage antique carousel (leased) 600
4. Two 540-meter aerial skyways (leased)
   Von Roll 900
   Garaventi 900
5. Intamin steel flume, 2 lifts, 2 chutes
   46 passenger boats, rotary turntable 1,600-1,800
6. Totally automated deluxe streamlined monorail with 5.4 kilometer of rail, 10 trains for 99 passengers each, by
   Hybagger/Von Roll 4,000
7. Gyro-tower (parachute drop) by
   Intamin
   Parachute 1,200
   Tower 700-800
8. McMillan activity park for children
   containing some 24 separate playground items with closed circuit TV monitors for supervision all in a 30,000 square foot area 800
II. Performance Facilities

1. T-11 Theater building with a high-styled demountable moveable roof containing seating for 4,000 and substantial equipment (leased)

2. Pacific Bowl, and covered, demountable, steel stadium, available in Sections up to 3,500 seats

3. German Beer Hall (20,000 square feet)

4. Miscellaneous bandstands

III. Food and Drink

1. Fast food carts
2. Various restaurant equipment packages
3. Reusable 2,500 square foot modular structures, some in glass and steel

IV. Merchandise Facilities

1. Reusable 2,500 square foot modular structures, some in glass and steel

V. Site Service and Other Structures

1. Reusable 2,500 square foot modular structures applicable to a variety of maintenance, administration and service functions
2. Security house
3. First Aid station
4. Miscellaneous glass and steel modular buildings
5. Guest relations office

VI. Site Beautification and Service Equipment

1. Restroom fixtures
2. Benches and fountains
3. UFO water spurt sculpture (from EPCOT)
4. Ship of Dreams exhibit
5. Sign frames, holders and selected graphics
6. Air Plaza/Aviation Country exhibit
7. Trash cans
8. Street lamps
9. Lockers and strollers
10. Fire truck
11. Three fully actuated gates
12. Ticket machine and turnstiles
13. TV monitors
14. Flag poles
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Most all of the above exemplify the kind of facilities and equipment found in contemporary theme parks and are of interest to any entity attempting to develop such a project in Vancouver. However, moving some of these items may be impractical for a variety of reasons, for example: (1) some equipment is leased and will probably be returned, (2) items may not fit the chosen park design or required size, or (3) moving cost may be prohibitive or a wash with the cost of building new.

In addition to the foregoing list, several corporate exhibits within the Exposition may contain equipment items of interest. Worthy of examination are the pavilions installed by Air Canada, CP, General Motors, CN and Telecomp which is presenting its story in Circlevision and others.

Several items which might or might not be of interest will likely continue in use on the site and are apparently not available such as:

1. The rustic structures and activities of the Polk Life Center, an ethnic happening with a theater in the round.
2. IMAX 3D in Canadian Place.
3. Omnimax with the largest screen in the world at Expo Center.
4. ShowScan in the B. C. Pavilion (leased).

The world of high impact film with its special effects and excellent capacity generation sometimes used in theme parks, is more or less preempted except possibly for Circlevision.

There is an urgent need to make a detailed on-site appraisal of precise and well defined interest in these residuals considering the disposition schedule of Expo 86.
The consensus estimate of potential savings in development cost to be effected by making use of available and applicable Expo assets in the implementation of the proposed theme park project was in the range of $7 million to $10 million U.S.

Park designer Grady Larkins had these comments to make in assessing overall reuse potentials:

"Components from Expo can form a valuable contribution to the core requirements of a theme park although not in altogether obvious ways.

There is first the question of not what will leave the Expo but what will stay. A theme park, which is simply an entertainment center with a theme, has only a finite number of ingredients to form its vital core--the program mix--and additional components serve only to reinforce and expand the core. Expo obviously will have all of the basic ingredients--rides, shows and attractions. If a significant number of any of these components remain at Expo they detract from the core--the basic attraction power--of the park. In a park of the discussed investment size, it would be very difficult to match and compete with any key component left at Expo. It would be difficult to provide a better component. A park will survive in the Vancouver area only if sufficient mass is deflected from the Expo site and inserted into the park site.

Further attention must be given to the impact of any component considering that it is "the second time around" for the attractions that might be moved to the park. Financially, there is the consideration of relocation. Rides are especially vulnerable to a misconception of reuse value for two major reasons--a) the bulk of the cost of major rides (water flumes, coasters, etc.) is not in the equipment itself but rather in the infrastructure and foundations needed to site the ride. This is a cost that will be completely repeated; and b) the question of public impact as a major factor for appeal--the ride is simply not as attractive when it is well known. There is also a potential psychological problem of the perception of the park as a poor step-child, or worse, Expo II, instead of the park having its own identity."

Architect Alan Eskew offered these comments in assessing reuse potentials:
"Expo 86 certainly occupies one of the great development sites in recent world's fairs. The governmental requirement to clear the site except for three or four major structures will result in the elimination in the perception of an ex-fair site. This decision to clear the site is a very good technique for insuring that the positive memory of the fair remains. Because of the need to clear the site immediately, the new amusement park has the opportunity to capitalize on the residual buildings and equipment. The architectural character of the fair site is quite impressive. The modular structures housing the international pavilions are quite memorable in shape and materials. However, it must be cautioned that the appropriateness of their strong visual character for the Exposition may in fact be too overpowering in the context of a much finer grained amusement park. Without doubt the modular buildings would be a great resource and would provide flexible design options. Their external appearances will probably always be closely identified with Expo 86 and to that end, the design team will be required to deal with a collection of buildings that may generate overwhelming and indelible memory of the '86 fair site. As pointed out during the charrette, the buildings are of such a large scale and such a strong skeletal geometry that attempts to disguise their visual characteristics will be difficult, even impossible. Therefore, use of these modules in a residual mode must be done carefully so as to walk a fine line between continuing the memories of the Expo 86 and developing a new design look and personality for the new amusement park.

While the modular international buildings are clearly the most obvious residual facilities, there are a number of other items that can be effectively used; the entrance gates, amphitheaters, hospital and first aid facilities, food and beverage kiosks and merchandising structures.

The Exposition design and construction is of excellent quality. Given the high quality standards of the site development, selecting appropriate pieces for re-use in the new amusement park should be an easy exercise. Selected elements can be effectively modified and/or renovated into facilities that are appropriate to the scale and texture of a new amusement park."
SECTION 5

THE TIVOLI APPROACH TO ATTRACTION DESIGN

Since such development might impact a theme park, a considerable amount of time was spent discussing the existing Expo site and its feasibility as a future UrbanPark entertainment zone. In particular, the concept of a Tivoli-style park was discussed in detail. It was the consensus of the charrette that the Tivoli concept cannot be replicated on the Expo site because of existing constraints and that it is also an intown, center city creation which is not applicable to a suburban themed attraction.

Tivoli Park is, in fact, a highly unique phenomenon in recreational park design. While not technically a "theme park"—that is, a park of segmented zones each of which is usually keynoted by an architectural or other visually related motif—the mere perception of the park in its native environment of urban Copenhagen is one of "theme." Also, while widely perceived by the North American as a ride park, Tivoli is actually a complete recreational complex of dining, daytime and nighttime entertainment, a pleasant gathering place for a wide variety of social interaction for all ages and, incidentally, a complement of mechanical rides.

Tivoli is attended by over five million in about 110 days in an intensely used 21 acres. The total market size in Copenhagen is comparable to that of Vancouver so that the secret of the high attendance is repeat trade in the center of the city with average stay a relatively short 3 to 4 hours.

The real key to Tivoli's profound reputation is its urban location and accessability in the very center of Copenhagen, its varied entertainment base, its controlled environment and again, incidentally, its rides. The "language" of the environment is
expressed in lighting, banners, water views, pageantry, intense landscaping and color. Tivoli offers a full complement of feeding and merchandise options and a constant day and night array of free entertainment--concerts, plays, puppet theater, parades, fireworks, dancing and so forth.

Because of certain social and planular constraints on the Expo site the urban program of Tivoli cannot be met. A park cannot be gated on the Expo site and the gate pays for the diversity of free entertainment offered day and night. And, like any well planned successful program, if any one of the critical ingredients are deleted from the formula then the entire balance is upset. For instance, if the rides are not allowed as a part of the program--and they are said to be impossible on the after Expo site--then the entertainment base is weakened and/or if the admission gate is deleted then the integrity of the park's environment is threatened as the guest flow to the facility cannot be monitored or controlled and entertainment funded. The inclusion of these ingredients is critical to the success of the urban park; the deletion insure a product that is totally different from Tivoli. The limitations on the Expo site do not allow a proper program structure for a Tivoli replication and the facility cannot be a complete integral entertainment package.

This is not to say that effective entertainment, feeding and merchandising options will not be developed in the Expo site.

A related question considered by the group was the potential for festival shopping as an entertainment function in Vancouver and its impact on the proposed theme park. In that context, Granville Island is off and running in a most effective format with sales generation reportedly in excess of $300 per square foot in an attractive setting. The B.C. Pavilion is seen as an Ontario Place format--an intown assemblage of festival center and entertainment elements in a large space. The Market is reported to contain 95,000 square feet of mixed specialty retail and food
and generating volume in excess of $300 per square foot. None of these options influence the direction taken by the proposed theme park except to underline that any consideration of a festival center operation in its suburban format is eliminated by definition.
SECTION 6

EVOLUTION OF A THEME AND CONCEPT

A key consideration of the group was the kind of thematic presentation appropriate in the Vancouver market and how this format would be expressed in a conceptual plan.

The group considered historical presentations of Canada and the Northwest, internationalism of the Pacific Rim, the impact of Expo residuals on theme development, high tech as an important factor in the economy of the Northwest and a variety of formats evolved in the park business in the three decades since Walt Disney shook up and dressed up the amusement park with the creation of a thematic design approach.

It was a consensus that a Vancouver park should have a new look, that it should not be a gussied up story park in the genre of Six Flags subject to high obsolescence of its format. In its use of Expo residuals it should find a treatment avoiding the feeling of an Expo burial ground. It would draw on the internationalism and modernity of Vancouver. It would take a cue from Rouse--avoid traditional theming and create zones of personality with a dramatic color emphasis. Themed areas wear out rapidly--personality areas can be added to and developed and provide a platform for a heavy use of live entertainment, a wide array of popular and folk life performances. The idea was expressed as a need to celebrate the legacy of Expo rather than cover it up with a facade of ersatz decor, a goal of developing a new kind of park for Vancouver.

The look of the place will be driven by the modular buildings--a new look with a high-tech direction. Theme does not have to mean roccoco or quixotic facade. It can be international-multipolar. It can contain high-tech gardens. It does not need to depend on zones of thematic character.
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Grady Larkins expressed the quest for theme as follows:

"The overwhelming success of Expo will cut like a sword through all future concepts for a new park. The group discussed the "legacy" of this success at length.

Expo is composed of elements of unmistakable visual identity as well a singular emotional impact. Together these are seen, and not questioned, as a complete once-in-a-lifetime experience. But how the physical elements are removed and are viewed singly becomes a question of profound importance. Seen as single units (mainly the architectural structures), or in some diminished form and left unaltered or isolated the components run the risk of being perceived as pale ghosts of a glorious event or embalmed artifacts of questionable value--out of place, context and time.

It is an important goal of the conceptors of the park, both visual and managerial, to mold and blend Expo components into a new identity, life and vitality.

As to visual considerations, the use of Expo components, especially its architecture, will fix and drive the concept of the park. These highly dynamic structures exclude and eliminate a park of the traditional "theme" or ersatz adventure and architecture set apart in tidy "theme zones." The visual energy of the usable components are far too strong for simple disguise or cladding. However, when properly used in a new context the elements will lose the identity of Expo and direct their visual energy to the new identity of the new park.

The energy that must be directed, however, must now be allowed to be compromised through clumsy attempts at concealing the original identity of the component. There will be no need to attempt this once the traditional idea of theme is abandoned. This, then, allows the components to drive and determine that the park is a place of personality, an envelope for events, not a backdrop for make-believe. While this doesn't preclude traditional theme in particular "mood-zones" or interiors, the overall program will be one of diverse energies seen as the personalities of the park--something far less definable, elusive and therefore more exciting than areas defined by architectural theme content.

It is this energy, this individual personality, that will preserve the legacy of Expo--a place of profound experience, a memorable visit, a rewarding activity--a very special place."
From Alan Eskew's notes:

"I would caution against a carnival-like approach to the park. Vancouver seems to be a rather sophisticated market that may have expectations a bit higher than a typical American market. Certainly, quality of food and beverage and cleanliness of physical facilities must be higher than most American standards. Another caution is the overt theming of the "Paul Bunyan/Rambo lumberjack/Indian Totem Pole" genre which is all too obvious. Rather than building on a caricature of the Pacific Northwest, shape the thematic content around views of the future and the emerging kinship of the Pacific Northwest to the Pacific Rim and Asian cultures.

Vancouver projects a sense of excellence. The new park should continue that spirit. Authenticity of the environment of the Pacific Northwest should be encouraged. Genuineness of place should be pursued wherever possible. The park should be decidedly Canadian. It should be seen as a distinct visit to an international destination for those guests coming from the Seattle and Portland market. The park should have a forward looking personality and not revert to syrupy theming.

Effort should be made to capture the essence of Vancouver in both food, merchandise and quality of site development. Perhaps an organizing theme might be "A Taste of Vancouver" which would build on the positive Exposition experience. A visit to this new amusement and recreation facility should give the guest a true sample of the Vancouver environment."
SECTION 7

PRELIMINARY ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS

The final deliberation of the charrette group was concerned with refinement of a preliminary development cost model, projection of revenue generation from visitor expenditures, expenses of operation and indicated operating surplus generation.

Development Cost

The beginning point of the park development model is its required ride and entertainment capacity which is expressed in units per hour. A park designed for an annual crowd of 1,500,000 will have an on-site design day attendance of 11,400 (from Table 2). This in turn requires a capacity of rides and entertainment of 20,000 to 25,000 units per hour.

As shown in Table 5, a capacity of 15,700 is contemplated as the Phase I complement of rides, about half from Expo inventory and half in new rides. It is recommended that a classic wood roller coaster be installed in Phase II. A fine wood roller coaster is perceived as the Rolls Royce of park ride devices but its cost is high and it should come later. Phase I ride cost totals $13.0 million U.S. Entertainment capacity is 5,650 units per hour bringing total capacity to 21,350 units per hour.

Entertainment is a priority item in evolving the Vancouver park. Three small theaters and the moved and reconstructed T-11 and Pacific Bowl theaters make up a 5 facility complex costing $4.0 million U.S. A children's area containing Expo's McMillan park and a collection of children's rides is costed at $1.0 million U.S.

As shown in Table 6, required space for food and drink at $3.00 U.S. per capita, 1.5 million attendance and $200 per square foot revenue generation is 22,500 square feet. Similarly, re-
Table 5

RIDES AND ENTERTAINMENT CAPACITY AND COST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Rides</th>
<th>Capacity Per Hour</th>
<th>Estimated Reuse or Installed Cost New ($ millions U.S.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaster</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinging Space Shuttle</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carousel</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Skyway</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyro Tower</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flume</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Selected New Rides @ 700 per hour</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,700</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Entertainment

| T-11 Theater                      | 1,000             | $2.50                                                  |
| McMillan Activity Park            | 800               | 0.50                                                   |
| Kiddie Rides (5)                  | 1,500             | 0.50                                                   |
| Pacific Bowl Theater Segment      | 600               | 0.30                                                   |
| 3 Small Theaters                  | 750               | 1.20                                                   |
| (bird show, stunt show,           |                   |                                                        |
| high diving, saloon show)         |                   |                                                        |
|                                   | 4,650             | 5.00                                                   |

Games

| 10 Pitch @ $75K/each              | 900               | $0.75                                                  |
| Video                             | 100               | 0.25                                                   |
|                                   | 1,000             | 1.00                                                   |
| Total                             | 21,350            | 19.00                                                  |

Source: Harrison Price Company.
Table 6
MERCHANDISE AND FOOD THEME STRUCTURE, VIDEOPOLIS AND OTHER SITE STRUCTURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost Unit</th>
<th>Cost ($ million US)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Service, 22,500 sq. ft.</td>
<td>$60/sq. ft.</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandise Service, 25,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>60/sq. ft.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme Structure</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videopolis</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Structures:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front of House--10,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>40/sq. ft.</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(guest services, first aid, gates, ticketing, security, rentals, kennels)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back of House--50,000 sq.ft.</td>
<td>25/sq. ft.</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(administration, employee wardrobe, warehousing, storage, shops, garage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Costs $6.00
Cumulative Costs $25.00

Source: Harrison Price Company.
quired space for retail sale of merchandise at $3.00 U.S. per capita, 1.5 million attendance and $180 per square foot revenue generation per year is 25,000 square feet. Average cost of the food complement is estimated at $60 U.S. per square foot based on using Expo module shells, carts and some equipment. Similarly, average cost of the retail installation is estimated at $60 U.S. per square foot based on using Expo modules and some fixtures. Food service is visualized as a combination of a beer hall with entertainment and dancing, fast food, snacks, carts, stands and sit down restaurant capacity of 400 seats. A module and area for major group picnics is contemplated for special gatherings of all sizes. Total cost of merchandise and food facilities is estimated at $4.35 million U.S.

A theme structure is required probably at the entrance which could take the form of Expo's giant hockey stick, the gyro tower, or an elegant gate in all likelihood drawn from residual inventory. It would probably be desirable to achieve a new identity in this treatment.

Videopolis is a dance and recreation center for young adults modeled in part after a similar highly successful installation recently placed in Disneyland. It is a contemporary, wholesome hangout place for teenagers. Its key features include a stage with exotic lights for live and video taped performances (MTV), stacks of video monitors showing pre-recorded tapes, live dancing, seating areas (including some raised areas for "scoping") and limited food service. Its cost allocation is $1.5 million U.S.

The remaining hard construction costs are made up of front of the house and back of the house site structures ($1.65 million U.S.) and site development costs shown in Table 7 totalling $16.29 million U.S. Thus, the total hard cost construction estimate is $41.29 million U.S.
### Table 7

**SITE DEVELOPMENT COSTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost Unit</th>
<th>Cost ($ million US)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grading, berm, on-site utilities and sewer package on 40 acres</td>
<td>$60K/acre</td>
<td>$2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping, signage, graphics, paving, hardscape, restrooms</td>
<td>$85K/acre</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-site utilities, access roads to gate</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms-100 fixtures</td>
<td>$750/fixture</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking lot for 3,555 visitor cars, 569 employee cars, 4,124 total, 110/acre = 38 acres</td>
<td>$1,100/car</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peat Premium on Site Number 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% of building cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Harrison Price Company.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final step in the computation of development cost is the aggregation of soft costs shown in Table 8. The largest is design and architectural fees at $4.95 million U.S. (12 percent of hard costs), followed by preopening costs of $2.70 million U.S., duties and taxes of $1.45 million U.S. and contingency of 5 percent ($2.52 million U.S.). The grand total of development cost is $52.39 million U.S. or $74.07 million Canadian. That cost would approach $85 to $90 million U.S. or more without the contemplated infusion of Expo residuals.

Indications of Economic Feasibility

A park of the type discussed should generate per capita revenues of $18 Canadian or a total revenue stream of $27 million Canadian. Operating profit before any land rent, fixed charges and depreciation are estimated at 37.5 percent of the revenue stream (62.5 percent operating costs is a relatively high percentage compared to American parks), an annual amount of $10.13 million Canadian. Depreciation charges amount to $4.94 million Canadian (based on typical 15 year straight line composites on the total $74.04 million Canadian cost) leaving a balance before taxes of $5.19 million Canadian. At a capitalization rate of 10 percent this balance justifies a development expenditure of approximately $52 million Canadian leaving an unjustified balance or gap of $22 million Canadian.

The conclusion follows that a joint private/public approach is required to implement the project. Corporate sponsorship may cover a portion of this gap but substantial assistance is nonetheless required. Prospects for corporate sponsorship in the park should be enhanced by expected response at Expo 86.

A project of the type under discussion has a very strong economic impact reflected in park visitor expenditures, extra
Table 8
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost Unit</th>
<th>Cost ($ million US)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Hard Construction Cost, Tables 5, 6, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>$41.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design A &amp; E, 12 percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-opening Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandise</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duties and Taxes</td>
<td>3.5% of hard cost</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency 5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Development Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>$52.91 US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
<td>$74.07 Canadian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Harrison Price Company.
stay time end expenditures by tourists, expenditures of employees, payments for materials and taxes. It is a volatile cash business with a high economic impact multiplier. It would be easy to demonstrate a rapid amortization of any public investment in the project.
SECTION 8

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The charrette conference was unanimous in its opinion that all indications point to a blockbuster performance by Expo 86. Vancouver will be discovered by a lot of the world as a result of this effort in the same way that Seattle was discovered as a result of its fair. A quality amusement park could certainly take advantage of this momentum of discovery and in so doing continue the showcasing of Vancouver to international visitors.

It was the group opinion that the British Columbia/United States Northwest area is an untapped market for such an attraction. The vitality of the region, the paucity of such entertainment and the flush of excitement of Expo 86 all point favorably to the establishment of a theme park. While initial population parameters will not indicate the support of a "megapark" (an investment in excess of $150 million Canadian) it would appear that there is sufficient base for a modest initial investment of $70 to $80 million Canadian. This investment would give the project sufficient core, mass and content to qualify as a full-entertainment vehicle and enable it to demand a substantial per capita expenditure from the guest. This investment level expanded by attraction and service items available from Expo, could incorporate sufficient entertainment units to insure a solid place in the regional recreational market.

Given preliminary discussions regarding implementation, it seems possible that a new park facility could be opened with the second anniversary of Expo 86, May 2, 1988. The two year gap would be enough time to design and construct the new park and the possibility of celebrating the "Second Anniversary of the Second Life" could be a good marketing approach.
Good public sites are available southeast of the city on Highway 99 in the optimum direction of growth to tap the resident market and for intercepting tourism to Vancouver coming in from the east and south.

The probable economic parameters for a project of the type contemplated are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Annual Attendance Goal</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Month Attendance</td>
<td>360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Day Attendance</td>
<td>16,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site Design Day Attendance</td>
<td>11,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage Requirements with a 20 percent</td>
<td>76.2 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable Primary Season</td>
<td>120-140 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Market size in Vancouver is adequate to support an important regional park:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary market (one hour driving time)</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Excursion Market (two hours driving time)</td>
<td>960,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>5,857,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,317,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At 1.5 million attendance, a market penetration of 18 percent is indicated which is well within standards of this industry. Market outlook is enhanced by lack of competition in the Northwest, the momentum of Expo, the economic vitality of Vancouver and its track record for execution of projects with a high content of quality architecture and design.

A tremendous inventory of park elements is available at Expo; a variety of rides, a children's activity park, performance theaters, modular structures suitable for food and drink, retail merchandising, administration and services, and all kinds of equipment for handling the operational and maintenance activities.
of a park. A major reduction in development cost can be effected by making use of these assets. Time is of the essence in conforming to the disposition schedule of Expo 86. We have identified some desirable components; undoubtedly many more will be determined to be usable on detailed examination.

The charrette examined the Tivoli park concept to see if it might be an alternative choice to a suburban theme park. Such a project requires an intown location. It is not applicable to the Expo site because of constraints against gating and rides. Therefore, no competition of this kind is foreseen. The PNE ride park is not viewed as a limitation of the opportunity for the proposed theme park.

In its deliberation on theme and concept, the group recommended the following approach:

**Do's**

- Stress high tech treatment
- Present multinational, multicultural character
- Redress Expo assets to a new identity—celebrate the legacy of Expo
- Focus on entertainment and personality
- Emphasize folk arts in merchandise presentations
- Stress quality in rides, food and entertainment, cleanliness of the grounds and operations
- Obtain strong children's and teen elements
- Stress color, pageantry, lighting, music, landscaping and other ingredients of ambience
- Evolve a new kind of park

**Don'ts**

- Replicate Six Flags or like storied dressings
- Create a burial ground for Expo artifacts
- Repeat traditional theming approaches
Care must be taken not to have the new development seem as a carcass of the successful Expo 86. While a number of the parts of Expo 86 will be re-used, they should be re-used in a dignified manner. They should create a new image and memory. Given the success that Expo 86 will certainly enjoy, the residual use of its buildings must be done with skill and care. The Exposition residuals should have a noble afterlife in the new park. They should not be allowed to suffer the kinds of indignities and loss of respect that some previous fair sites created.

The park evolved on the blackboard by the charrette group has a capacity of 15,700 units per hour in 16 major rides and a game and video arcade. It has a major children's area containing a McMillan Activity park and 5 kiddie rides. In keeping with its mission to stress entertainment, the park contains the T-11 and Pacific Bowl theaters from Expo and 3 smaller theaters for diverse entertainment. Its feeding operations contain a beer hall with entertainment, and Videopolis, a Disney-inspired teen hangout of high contemporary quality. Total capacity--rides and entertainment--is 21,350 units per hour. Major elements of cost are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hard Costs</th>
<th>Cost in Millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rides and Entertainment</td>
<td>$19.00 US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Merchandise</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Structures</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Development</td>
<td>16.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41.29 US</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soft Costs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; E</td>
<td>$4.95 US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-opening</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duties and Taxes</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11.62 US</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Development Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$52.91 US</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Development Costs: $74.07 CN
On the basis of an $18 Canadian per capita expenditure, revenue generation is $27 million Canadian, operating profit before depreciation $10.13 million Canadian, net after depreciation $5.19 million Canadian. On a 10 percent capitalization rate, the park justifies about 70 percent of its development costs indicating that certain joint public/private approaches will be necessary for its implementation. The project has a high economic impact which may justify that approach.

Given the quality of discussions during the two day charrette and the options which were identified, a post-fair amusement and recreation facility seems to be an important opportunity for continuing to showcase the personality of Vancouver. The advantage of residuals from the fair site should give this facility the kind of economic headstart that is not available to most private sector developers. With such a positive economic push, the park should be able to make the kind of regional statement necessary to establish it as a major tourist destination and an important component of the Vancouver tourist draw.