

---

August 28, 2006

To: Economic Development and Parks Committee

From: Donald Eastwood, General Manager, Economic Development, Culture and Tourism

Subject: 2006 International Dragon Boat Federation (IDBF) Club Crew World Championships – Post Event Report

Purpose:

To provide a post event report, including a preliminary economic impact statement for the International Dragon Boat Federation (IDBF) Club Crew World Championships held at the Western Beaches Watercourse, Toronto from August 8-13, 2006.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

There are no financial implications resulting from the implementation of these recommendations.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that this report be received for information.

Background:

At its meeting held September 22, 23, 24 and 25, 2003 City Council adopted Clause 8 of Report No. 7 of the Economic Development and Parks Committee titled “International and National Event Attraction Strategy Supplemental Report” which endorsed the mandate of Toronto International. The mandate of the unit is: To identify opportunities and create alliances with bid proponents to host international and national sports, cultural, social and other events of significance to enhance Toronto’s profile, stimulate the tourism sector and generate legacies for the community.

Toronto International assisted a local bid team, comprised of members of the dragon boat community, local boat clubs, and tourism officials, in putting together the bid in 2004 for the 2006 International Dragon Boat Federation’s (IDBF) Club Crew World Championships (CCWC).

Previous Championships had been held in Vancouver, Canada; Auckland, New Zealand; Philadelphia, USA; and Cape Town, South Africa. On October 24, 2004 the International Dragon Boat Federation awarded the Championships to Toronto.

The awarding of the Championships became the catalyst for the construction of the new Western Beaches Watercourse, a \$23 million facility funded by the three orders of government through the Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation. This new facility is 600 m in length by 135 m wide.

#### Comments:

Toronto played host to the 2006 IDBF Club Crew World Championships (CCWC) from August 8 to 13, 2006, at the new Western Beaches Watercourse located at Marilyn Bell Park. This international sporting event brought together 130 crews and 3,530 competitors, coaches, and managers from 10 countries including teams from across Canada and the USA, and as far away as the Caribbean, Europe, Australia, and Asia.

The event involved four days of competition, cultural entertainment, activities for children, all with free admission to spectators and dragon boat enthusiasts. Media coverage was generated in every Toronto daily and national paper, television and radio. The media sponsors were CTV television and the Toronto Sun.

#### Western Beaches Watercourse

The event was the first to be hosted on new Western Beaches Watercourse at Marilyn Bell Park. This \$23 million facility was funded by all three orders of government with the City of Toronto and Province each contributing \$4 million, and \$15 million from the Federal Government.

The construction of this new facility was the first significant project completed by the Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation (TWRC) in keeping with City Council priority of making progress on the Waterfront. Managed by the Toronto and Regional Conservation Authority (TRCA), a working Committee comprised of the TWRC, TRCA, City, Provincial and Federal staff, and Consultants managed the project through the Feasibility, Environmental Assessment, Community Consultation, Design and Construction phases. The Watercourse will be owned and operated by the City of Toronto through Parks, Forestry and Recreation.

#### West End Beaches Stakeholders Association (WEBSA)

Another legacy of the Watercourse was the creation the West End Beaches Stakeholders Association (WEBSA). This Association is comprised of the key boat clubs in the western beaches (Argonaut Rowing Club, Boulevard Club, Toronto Dragon Boat Club and the Toronto Sailing and Canoe Club), and other key stakeholders. WEBSA will act as an advisory body to Parks, Forestry and Recreation in the permitting and planning activities for the Western Beaches Watercourse.

## Club Crew World Championship - City of Toronto's Role

Since the awarding of the Championships, the City of Toronto has worked with the Toronto Dragon Boats 2006, the local incorporated not-for-profit organizing committee (LOC), to organize and operate the Championships. The LOC was responsible for developing and maintaining a budget including all fund raising activities in addition to coordinating all the logistics of the event such as securing meeting venues and hotels, site and race scheduling and set up, local transportation, celebrations and events, and promotions and publicity.

Through the Event Support Team, a cross-departmental team of city and agency staff coordinated by Toronto Special Events, meetings were held every two weeks to coordinate City services.

The City of Toronto, through the Toronto International Unit of the Tourism Program, provided \$75,000 in direct assistance in marketing, promotion, city services and on site event set-up. Funding was primarily directed to street and hydro pole banners and site services at Marilyn Bell Park. Funding for these initiatives were included in the 2006 approved Operating Budget. Tourism Toronto also partnered with the City of Toronto and LOC to provide event assistance.

## Economic Impact Assessment – Methodology

Through the City of Toronto's membership in the Canadian Sport Tourism Alliance (CSTA) and a partnership with Tourism Toronto, the CSTA was engaged to help conduct an Economic Impact Survey and Study of the Event through the STEAM (Sport Tourism Economic Assessment Model). STEAM is a nationally recognized Economic Assessment model specifically calibrated to measure major sporting events. This model has been used in the past for the 2006 IIHF World Junior Hockey Championships in Vancouver, the Canada Games, the Canadian Curling Association Briar, and a host of others.

During the Championships, a team of 14 volunteers were trained to collect primary data from participants and spectators through surveys loaded on hand-held palm units. A total of 1,079 valid on-site surveys representing 2,302 people were completed over 3 days of the event. A sample of the survey is contained within Attachment No.1.

The data collected was used to run STEAM, along with additional statistical and organizational information from the Local Organizing Committee.

## Economic Impact Assessment – Preliminary Results

The combined expenditure of the organizing committee's operating budget, capital construction costs, and the estimated expenditure of visitors to the 2006 IDBF Club Crew World Championships in Toronto totalled over \$28.5 million, generating an estimated \$24.2 million in Gross Domestic Product (GDP) or new economic activity for the Province of Ontario, of which \$15.5 million occurred in Toronto.

These expenditures generated more than \$9.4 million in wages and salaries in Toronto, with an additional \$5.1 million paid throughout the Province. An estimated 255 person-years of employment, including 177 in Toronto were created.

Considerable tax revenues were also produced by the event, totalling over \$8.7 million. The event supported federal government tax revenues of just over \$4.2 million, with an additional \$2.3 million in taxes to the Province of Ontario and \$1.2 million by local governments (\$766,000 City of Toronto).

**Table 5.1 Provincial Economic Impact by Location (\$000s)**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Ontario</b>	<b>Toronto</b>
Initial Expenditure	\$28,564,823	\$28,564,823
GDP	\$24,205,734	\$15,468,466
Wages & Salaries	\$14,599,680	\$9,437,816
Taxes – Total	\$8,676,226	\$5,450,021
Federal	\$4,211,008	\$2,669,598
Provincial	\$3,281,982	\$2,013,953
Municipal	\$1,183,236	\$766,470
Jobs	255.2	177.1

Source: CSTA, preliminary Economic Impact Assessment-Attachment #1

It is important to note that the output is a preliminary assessment of the economic impacts. Once the Local Organizing Committee budget is finalized and audited, a final model can be run and the results be considered complete.

The complete preliminary study, including methodology and survey, can be found in Attachment #1 - 2006 IDBF Club Crew World Championships Draft Economic Impact Assessment, Canadian Sport Tourism Alliance, August 2006.

Conclusion:

With preliminary figures, the 2006 IDBF Club Crew World Championships provided a considerable economic benefit to all orders of government. The combined expenditures of visitors and event operations in Toronto were estimated to have exceeded \$28.5 million. This spending generated nearly \$24.2 million in new economic activity throughout the Province.

In addition, the IDBF Club Crew World Championship provided the City of Toronto with a unique hosting opportunity to organize a cultural and sporting event that positioned the City in a leadership role nationally and internationally. With over 20,000 active dragon boat participants in the Toronto Region, the largest concentration of dragon boat race activity in Canada, this event reconfirms Toronto as a leading dragon boat centre.

Finally, the Championships were the catalyst for the new Western Beaches Watercourse, a legacy facility. The Western Beaches Watercourse will be used for future events, community programs and sport training enhancing sport tourism, healthy lifestyles and bringing people to the waterfront.

Contacts:

John Tracogna, Director  
Toronto International Unit, Tourism Section  
Phone: (416) 397-5401  
Fax: (416) 392-5600  
E-mail: jtracogn@toronto.ca

Duncan Ross, Executive Director  
Tourism Section  
Tel: (416) 397-5395  
Fax: (416) 392-2271  
Email: dhross@toronto.ca

Donald G. Eastwood  
General Manager, Economic Development, Culture and Tourism

Attachments:

Attachment No. 1

2006 IDBF Club Crew World Championships Preliminary Economic Impact Assessment,  
Canadian Sport Tourism Alliance, August 2006

# **2006 IDBF Club Crew World Championships**

**August 2006**

*Canadian Sport Tourism Alliance*



*Alliance canadienne du tourisme sportif*

---

*The following analysis provides an assessment of the estimated economic impact of the 2006 Club Crew World Championships, held in Toronto Ontario from August 10-13, 2006, as generated by the Sport Tourism Economic Assessment Model – Professional version.*

# Table of Contents

**1.0 BACKGROUND.....3**  
**2.0 METHODOLOGY .....4**  
**3.0 VISITORS .....5**  
**4.0 CAPITAL & OPERATIONS .....8**  
**5.0 RESULTS .....9**  
**6.0 CONCLUSION..... 11**  
**APPENDIX 1: ECONOMIC IMPACT METHODOLOGY – STEAM-PRO ..... 12**  
**APPENDIX 2: GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED BY STEAM-PRO..... 14**  
**APPENDIX 3 CLUB CREW WORLD CHAMPIONSHIP SURVEY ..... 16**

The Canadian Sport Tourism Alliance gratefully acknowledges the support of the City of Toronto and Tourism Toronto.

**Disclaimer: The results contained within this report are preliminary and subject to change upon release of the final audited attendance and budget figures. For more information, please contact:  
Tony Fisher, Principal, Paradigm Consulting Group, (613) 266-6964, or  
John Tracogna, Director, Toronto International, (416) 397-5401**

## 1.0 Background

Dragon Boat racing is one of the most popular sporting traditions to emerge from China, and boasts participants worldwide, with an estimated 200,000 participants in Europe and 100,000 in North America, along with millions of others in Asia.

With the construction of the Western Beach Watercourse at Marilyn Bell Park, the City of Toronto has developed a new \$23 million facility, with the inaugural event being the 2006 International Dragon Boat Federation (IDBF) Club Crew World Championship (CCWC). The event was a spectacular success, attracting more than 3,500 participants and large crowds of spectators. Furthermore, the event provided a considerable boost in economic activity for the City, through the construction of the course, the spending of the organizers in hosting the event, and the spending of out of town participants and spectators while at the event. It is these economic impacts that are the focus of this study.

The next two sections of this paper cover the spending of travelers, with Section 2 detailing the intercept survey methodology, with the findings of the survey contained within Section 3. Section 4 provides the details regarding other expenditures that contributed to the economic impact of the event; while Section 5 presents the results from the Sport Tourism Economic Assessment Model – Professional version (STEAM-Pro) arising from the combined expenditures of the visitors, participants, and the organizing committee's operational expenditures. Section 6 concludes the document; while detailed information regarding the economic impact model is contained within the Appendix, as is a copy of the survey.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The economic impact projections detailed in this report were generated by the Canadian Sport Tourism Alliance's (CSTA's) Sport Tourism Economic Assessment Model – Professional version (STEAM-Pro). STEAM-Pro was developed in 2006 as an economic impact assessment tool that is consistent with the projections of the CSTA's STEAM which was designed to make use of information available to event organizers to prepare consistent and credible economic impact projections. Partners in developing the model have included the Canadian Tourism Commission, the Canadian Association of Convention and Visitor Bureaus, the Canadian Tourism Research Institute (CTRI - a branch of the Conference Board of Canada) and Sport Canada. The model is based on CTRI's TEAM model, which is the most widely used tourism economic impact model in Canada, and STEAM has been calibrated with on-site expenditure surveys from more than twelve different events throughout the country. A more detailed description of STEAM and STEAM-Pro is contained within Appendix 1.

## 2.0 Methodology

Intercept surveys were conducted on site at Marilyn Bell Park over the four day duration of the CCWC, both in the spectator area and the restricted access athletes only area. Surveying was done using a total of 10 volunteer surveyors equipped with Palm PDAs running Techneos Entryware Pro survey software, provided by Techneos Systems of Vancouver, BC. A copy of the survey instrument is contained in Appendix 3.

A total of 1,421 intercepts were made over the 4 day period; 40 records were incomplete and not used, 221 respondents refused to participate, and 79 had been previously surveyed, yielding a total of 1,079 valid surveys, representing 2,302 people. The complete breakdown of traveler origin and role is contained within Table 2.1.

**Table 2.1 Survey & Population Estimates**

Origin	Participant				Spectator			
	Surveys	Party Members	Population*	Confidence Interval	Surveys	Party Members	Population	Confidence Interval
Local	128	281	964	4.9	375	847	8,876	3.2
Regional (up to 320km)	67	146	504	6.8	103	275	1,611	5.4
Ontario Long Haul	22	46	166	12.3	13	24	192	18.8
Inter-provincial	50	86	376	9.3	30	87	458	9.5
U.S.	104	169	744	6.6	34	82	547	10
Overseas	96	153	776	7.1	21	42	355	14.2
<b>Out of Town Total</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>2,566</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>510</b>	<b>3,162</b>	<b>4.0</b>

The figures in the second column represent the number of people for which expenditure data was reported for, while the number in brackets refers to the number of responses.

\*Participant population is based on registration records

The estimated spectator attendance figures contained within Table 2.1 were derived by combining information contained in the survey in combination with on-site estimates of the crowd size over the course of the event; see Section 3, below, for more details.

### 3.0 Visitors

#### Participants

A total of 3,530 athletes, coaches and managers attended the event over the four day weekend, coming from all across Canada, the U.S., Europe, Asia, and Australia, as detailed in Table 3.1

**Table 3.1 Participant Origin**

Origin	Number
Canada	2,010
of which local	965
U.S.	744
Australia	250
China	120
Germany	170
Great Britain	65
Jamaica	35
Netherlands	56
Philippines	48
Ukraine	32

Travel patterns of participants were consistent with normal patterns, generally the further a participant travelled, the more likely they were to be travelling with a small party size, and the more likely they were to stay in Toronto for a longer period of time. Not surprisingly, participants, when asked to rank the importance of their event in their decision to travel to Toronto on a scale of 1 to 10, nearly all reported that the event was the only reason they came to Toronto.

**Table 3.2 Participant Characteristics**

	Regional	Ontario Long-Haul	Inter- provincial	U.S.	Inter- national
% Day trips	32%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Avg. # of Nights	3.5	4.7	5.5	4.9	8.8
Average Party Size	2.1	2.1	1.7	1.6	1.6
Importance of event	9.5	9.8	9.5	9.6	9.7

Expenditures made by participants and other members of their visitor party were also consistent with previous survey results, namely that spending per party is the highest for overseas travellers, however this is usually a function of a longer length of stay. Consequently, average spending per person per day is highest for inter-provincial and U.S. travellers.

**Table 3.3 Participant Expenditures (per party per trip)**

Distance Category	Regional	Long Ontario	Inter-Provincial	U.S.	Overseas
Accommodation	\$181.42	\$227.27	\$434.82	\$460.88	\$487.24
Restaurant	\$138.84	\$258.41	\$310.70	\$229.47	\$271.61
Grocery Stores	\$27.70	\$70.68	\$74.48	\$36.30	\$164.42
Recreation & Entertainment	\$25.22	\$40.00	\$56.22	\$63.13	\$90.26
Event Merchandise	\$52.55	\$88.64	\$94.14	\$101.38	\$87.58
Retail - Clothing	\$8.58	\$46.36	\$104.50	\$18.60	\$105.05
Retail - Other	\$0.00	\$5.91	\$11.40	\$16.63	\$50.57
Vehicle Rental	\$3.13	\$9.09	\$73.12	\$41.06	\$103.84
Own Vehicle	\$38.19	\$72.00	\$35.82	\$30.43	\$22.08
Local Transport	\$5.07	\$9.73	\$39.10	\$13.79	\$35.68
Public Transport	\$4.45	\$4.09	\$9.90	\$14.96	\$18.22
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$485.16</b>	<b>\$832.18</b>	<b>\$1,244.20</b>	<b>\$1,026.63</b>	<b>\$1,436.56</b>
<i>Per person, per day</i>	<i>\$65.68</i>	<i>\$85.59</i>	<i>\$134.47</i>	<i>\$135.52</i>	<i>\$101.18</i>

## Spectators

Counts of the crowds at Marilyn Bell Park over the four days of the event show that an estimated total of 30,000 people, however surveyors noted that 29% of those interviewed in the spectator areas were participants, thereby yielding a net spectator count of nearly 22,000. One-third of spectators interviewed were from out of town, and this number was then divided by average number of days survey respondents reported attending the CCWC, yielding the number of unique out of town individuals attending the event. Finally, this number was distributed across the relative spectator origins yielding the population figures reported in the right hand panel of Table 2.1.

As with participants, basic information from spectators is reported in Table 3.4, below. A much higher proportion of spectators reported attending the event as a day trip than participants, with the average day trip spectator making 1.6 trips to Toronto to watch the event. Participants from Canada tended to stay longer in Toronto than spectators; however international spectators reported having longer stays in the city as compared to participants. Finally, spectator parties tended to

be slightly larger than those reported by participants, and the reported importance of the event in spectators travel decision to Toronto was somewhat lower, particularly for international visitors, however this is reasonable given the average two week length of stay despite the event's length of four days.

**Table 3.4 Spectator Trip Characteristics**

	Regional	Ontario Long-Haul	Inter- provincial	U.S.	Inter- national
% Day trips	80%	23%	20%	3%	0%
Avg. # of Nights	2.7	5.0	5.3	7.1	14.0
Average Party Size	2.6	1.8	3.0	2.3	2.1
Importance of event	8.8	7.8	8.4	7.1	5.2

Detailed spending information of out-of-town spectators was captured as a part of the intercept survey, with the results summarized in Table 3.5. Note that the average spending per person per day was lower for regional spectators as a result of the higher incidence of same-day travellers.

**Table 3.5 Spectator Expenditures (per party per trip)**

Distance Category	Regional	Long Ontario	Inter- Provincial	U.S.	Overseas
Accommodation	\$32.52	\$204.15	\$168.67	\$336.29	\$350.48
Restaurant	\$63.99	\$130.38	\$300.03	\$366.18	\$354.52
Grocery Stores	\$14.13	\$39.62	\$106.97	\$138.53	\$78.33
Recreation & Entertainment	\$31.21	\$48.54	\$119.87	\$144.85	\$82.38
Event Merchandise	\$32.17	\$21.15	\$86.53	\$41.18	\$65.00
Retail - Clothing	\$17.77	\$38.46	\$107.83	\$36.74	\$126.19
Retail - Other	\$7.38	\$9.92	\$20.50	\$33.53	\$41.90
Vehicle Rental	\$4.85	\$0.00	\$85.00	\$75.00	\$57.14
Own Vehicle	\$31.17	\$37.46	\$33.83	\$59.41	\$17.00
Local Transport	\$3.26	\$6.85	\$40.00	\$15.29	\$41.43
Public Transport	\$3.01	\$10.92	\$17.20	\$0.74	\$17.67
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$241.47</b>	<b>\$547.46</b>	<b>\$1,086.43</b>	<b>\$1,247.74</b>	<b>\$1,232.05</b>
<i>Per person, per day</i>	<i>\$45.07</i>	<i>\$107.08</i>	<i>\$123.37</i>	<i>\$213.79</i>	<i>\$198.28</i>

## **4.0 Capital & Operations**

Winning the rights to hold the CCWC was the catalyst in the construction of the course which totalled \$23 million, when including the feasibility and environmental impact assessments associated with its construction, and city officials confirm that if the event did not occur, the facility would not have been constructed.

Operational expenditures of the CCWC organizing committee were just over \$1 million, being spent to cover costs such as site supplies, communications costs, advertising, salaries, etc.

In addition, the event was supported by considerable value in kind donations, to volunteers, totalling more than 15,000 hours, whose involvement was critical to the success of the event.

## 5.0 Results

Total expenditures as a result of the combined capital, visitor and operations expenditure were substantial, totalling nearly \$28.6 million in Toronto (Table 5.1). These expenditures supported nearly \$14.6 million in wages and salaries for the province as a whole, with a total of 255 jobs being supported by hosting CCWC. The majority of jobs were based in Toronto (177) and a further 78 in the rest of the province. The net economic activity (GDP) generated by the event was just over \$24.2 million, of which nearly \$15.5 million took place in the City of Toronto.

Considerable tax revenues were also supported by the event, totalling nearly \$8.7 million. The federal government saw \$4.2 million of its tax base supported, with an almost \$3.3 million for the Province of Ontario and nearly \$1.2 million for municipalities throughout Ontario, of which more than \$766,000 was in the City of Toronto.

The largest contributor to the economic impact of the event was the construction expenditures; however visitor and operational expenditures totalled more than \$5.5 million. Thus, if the event was held without the construction expenditures, the industry output would have totalled more than \$13.8 million, with new economic activity of \$6.6 million, wages and salaries of nearly \$4.4 million and 100 jobs, and the tax revenues supported would have been nearly \$3.0 million. (Table 5.2)

**Table 5.1 Provincial Economic Impact by Location (\$000s)**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Ontario</b>	<b>Toronto</b>
Initial Expenditure	\$28,564,823	\$28,564,823
GDP	\$24,205,734	\$15,468,466
Wages & Salaries	\$14,559,680	\$9,437,816
Taxes - Total	\$8,676,226	\$5,450,021
Federal	\$4,211,008	\$2,669,598
Provincial	\$3,281,982	\$2,013,953
Municipal	\$1,183,236	\$766,470
Jobs	255.2	177.1

**Table 5.2 Provincial Economic Impact by Type of Expenditure**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Visitor</b>	<b>Capital</b>	<b>Operations</b>
Initial Expenditure	\$4,527,823	\$23,000,000	\$1,037,000
GDP	\$5,437,470	\$17,557,464	\$1,210,800
Wages & Salaries	\$3,551,596	\$10,161,599	\$846,484
Taxes - Total	\$2,513,066	\$5,687,766	\$475,394
Federal	\$1,157,181	\$2,822,475	\$231,353
Provincial	\$952,794	\$2,150,419	\$178,769
Municipal	\$403,091	\$714,872	\$65,273
Jobs	82.3	155.3	17.6

## 6.0 Conclusion

The 2006 Club Crew World Championship provided considerable economic benefits to the Province of Ontario and the City of Toronto. The combined expenditures of visitors, along with event operations and capital investment exceeded \$28.5 million in the Province of Ontario. A total of \$9.4 million in wages and salaries were paid in the Toronto, with an additional \$5.1 million paid throughout the rest of the province. The event supported an estimated 255 jobs, including 177 in Toronto. In sum, the event is estimated to have generated more than \$24.2 million in GDP (new economic activity), of which nearly \$15.5 million occurred in Toronto. Hosting the event is estimated to have supported nearly \$8.7 million in taxes; of which \$4.2 million accrued to the federal government. Nearly \$3.3 million was collected by the province and nearly \$1.2 million by local governments, including more than \$766,000 by the City of Toronto.

## **Appendix 1: Economic Impact Methodology – STEAM-Pro**

### **Background**

Briefly, the purpose of STEAM is to calculate both the provincial and regional economic impacts of sport tourism. The economic impacts are calculated on the basis of capital and operating expenditures on goods, services and employee salaries, and on the basis of tourist spending within a designated tourism sector. The elements used to measure the economic impacts are Gross Domestic Product (GDP), Employment, Taxes, Industry Output and Imports. STEAM measures the direct, indirect & induced effects for each of these elements.

### **Technical Description of the Impact Methodology used by STEAM-Pro**

STEAM and many other impact studies are based on input-output techniques. Input-Output models involve the use of coefficients that are based on economic or business linkages. These linkages trace how tourist expenditures or business operations filter through the economy. In turn, the coefficients applied are then used to quantify how tourism related activity in a particular region generates employment, taxes, income, etc. The input-output approach indicates not only the direct and indirect impact of tourism but can also indicate the induced effect resulting from the re-spending of wages and salaries generated.

All impacts generated by the model are given at the direct impact stage (i.e. the "front line" businesses impacted by tourism expenditures), indirect impact stage (i.e. those industries which supply commodities and/or services to the "front line" businesses) and the induced impact stage (induced consumption attributable to the wages and salaries generated from both the direct and indirect impact). In this sense, the model is closed with respect to wages. Imports are also determined within the model, so the model is closed with respect to imports. Exports are not endogenized (i.e. additional exports are not assumed with the induced impact) which consequently generates more conservative impacts. Another assumption of the model, which leads to more conservative impacts, is that not all commodities and/or services purchased are assumed to have at least one stage of production within the province. This assumption is crucial for souvenirs, gasoline and other commodities.

Taxes and employment are key economic impacts and as such must involve the use of both input-output and econometric techniques. As the data embodied in the provincial input-output tables are from 1996 (which is the latest currently available), taxes and employment must incorporate current coefficients and/or rates. These coefficients and/or rates are then applied to measures determined within the input-output framework of the model. Determining the level of taxes and employment outside the input-output framework of the model allows rates

and/or coefficients to be selectively changed for updating or in order to conduct a scenario analysis.

### **Regional (Sub-Provincial) Impact Methodology**

The method used to simulate intraprovincial commodity flows and ultimately regional impacts follows directly from regional economics principles. The principle is referred to as the "gravity model". Basically the "gravity model" states that the required commodity (& service) inputs will be "recruited" in a manner that takes into consideration economies of scale (i.e. production costs), transportation costs and the availability of specific industries. Economies of scale (i.e. lower production costs) are positively correlated with input demand while greater transportation costs are negatively correlated with input demand. Fulfilling that demand from other provincial regions is contingent on the fact that the specific industry does actually exist. An advantage of using the "gravity model" to simulate intraprovincial commodity flows is that as the industrial composition of the labour force changes, or as new industries appear for the first time in specific regions, the share of production between the various sub-provincial regions also changes.

By following this principle of the gravity model, all sub-provincial regions of a province are assigned a coefficient for their relative economies of scale in each industry (using the latest industry labour force measures) as well as a coefficient to represent the transportation cost involved to get each industry's output to the designated market. One variation on the "gravity model" principle involves the estimation of "relative trade distances" by incorporating different "weights" for different modes of transport. Once these coefficients are generated for all regions and over all industries, a measure of sensitivity (mostly relative to price, but in the case of service industries also to a "local preference criteria") is then applied to all commodities. Another variation on the strict "gravity model" approach is that the measure of sensitivity is adjusted by varying the distance exponent (which in the basic "gravity model" is 2) based on the commodity or service required. The variation in distance exponents revolve, principally, around two research hypotheses: (1) the greater the proportion of total shipments from the largest producer (or shipper), the lower the exponent, and (2) the greater the proportion of total flow which is local (intra-regional), the higher the exponent.

## Appendix 2: Glossary of Terms used by STEAM-Pro

**Initial Expenditure** - This figure indicates the amount of initial expenditures or revenue used in the analysis. This heading indicates not only the total magnitude of the spending but also the region in which it was spent (thus establishing the "impact" region).

**Direct Impact** - Relates ONLY to the impact on "front-line" businesses. These are businesses that initially receive the operating revenue or tourist expenditures for the project under analysis. From a business perspective, this impact is limited only to that particular business or group of businesses involved. From a tourist spending perspective, this can include all businesses such as hotels, restaurants, retail stores, transportation carriers, attraction facilities and so forth.

**Indirect Impact** - Refers to the impacts resulting from all intermediate rounds of production in the supply of goods and services to industry sectors identified in the direct impact phase. An example of this would be the supply and production of bed sheets to a hotel.

**Induced Impact** - These impacts are generated as a result of spending by employees (in the form of consumer spending) and businesses (in the form of investment) who benefited either directly or indirectly from the initial expenditures under analysis. An example of induced consumer spending would be the impacts generated by hotel employees on typical consumer items such as groceries, shoes, cameras, etc. An example of induced business investment would be the impacts generated by the spending of retained earnings, attributable to the expenditures under analysis, on machinery and equipment.

**Gross Domestic Product (GDP)**- This figure represents the total value of production of goods and services in the economy resulting from the initial expenditure under analysis (valued at market prices).

**NOTE:** *The multiplier (A), Total/Initial, represents the total (direct, indirect and induced) impact on GDP for every dollar of direct GDP. This is a measure of the level of spin-off activity generated as a result of a particular project. For instance if this multiplier is 1.5 then this implies that for every dollar of GDP directly generated by "front-line" tourism businesses an additional \$0.50 of GDP is generated in spin-off activity (e.g. suppliers).*

*The multiplier (B), Total/\$ Expenditure, represent the total (direct, indirect and induced) impact on GDP for every dollar of expenditure (or revenue from a business perspective). This is a measure of how effective project related expenditures translate into GDP for the province (or region). Depending upon the level of expenditures, this multiplier ultimately determines the overall level of net economic activity associated with the*

*project. To take an example, if this multiplier is 1.0, this means that for every dollar of expenditure, one dollar of total GDP is generated. The magnitude of this multiplier is influenced by the level of withdrawals, or imports, necessary to sustain both production and final demand requirements. The less capable a region or province is at fulfilling all necessary production and final demand requirements, all things being equal, the lower the eventual economic impact will be.*

**GDP (at factor cost)** - This figure represents the total value of production of goods and services produced by industries resulting from the factors of production. The distinction to GDP (at market prices) is that GDP (at factor cost) removes indirect taxes and adds subsidies.

**Wages & Salaries** - This figure represents the amount of wages and salaries generated by the initial expenditure. This information is broken down by the direct, indirect and induced impacts.

**Employment** - Depending upon the selection of employment units (person-years or equivalent full-year jobs) these figures represent the employment generated by the initial expenditure. These figures distinguish between the direct, indirect and induced impact. "Equivalent Full-Year Jobs", if selected, include both part-time and full-time work in ratios consistent with the specific industries.

**NOTE:** *The multiplier (B) is analogous to Multiplier (B) described earlier with the exception being that employment values are represented per \$1,000,000 of spending rather than per dollar of spending. This is done to alleviate the problem of comparing very small numbers that would be generated using the traditional notion of a multiplier (i.e. employment per dollar of initial expenditure).*

**Taxes** - These figures represent the amount of taxes contributed to municipal, provincial and federal levels of government relating to the project under analysis. This information is broken down by the direct, indirect and induced impacts.

**Imports** - These figures indicate the direct, indirect and induced final demand and intermediate production requirements for imports both outside the province and internationally.

## **Appendix 3 Club Crew World Championship Survey**

# CCWC v1

---

## Location

### 1 Location of Survey

[Location]

- <sub>1</sub> Practice
- <sub>2</sub> Athletes Village
- <sub>3</sub> Spectator Main Site
- <sub>4</sub> Spectator Startline
- <sub>6</sub> VIP Tent
- <sub>5</sub> Other \_\_\_\_\_

## Day

### 2 Day of Survey

[Day]

- <sub>1</sub> Pre Race Training
- <sub>2</sub> Thursday
- <sub>3</sub> Friday
- <sub>4</sub> Saturday
- <sub>5</sub> Sunday

## Introduction

### 3 Hello, My name is \_\_\_\_\_, and I am conducting a short survey on behalf of the event organizers and Tourism Toronto in order to measure the economic impact of the CCWC for the city of Toronto. Would I be able to ask you a few questions about your visit?

[Introduction]

- <sub>1</sub> Yes
- <sub>2</sub> No

## Previous

### 4 Have you previously been questioned regarding your spending patterns at the CCWC?

[Previous]

- <sub>1</sub> Yes
- <sub>2</sub> No

## Role

### 5 What is your role at the CCWC? [only ask if unsure]

[Role]

- <sub>1</sub> Spectator
- <sub>5</sub> Participant
- <sub>3</sub> Coach
- <sub>4</sub> Volunteer
- <sub>6</sub> Technical Official
- <sub>7</sub> Other \_\_\_\_\_

**NumSpect**

6 Did any spectators come to watch you race today?

[NumSpect]

<sub>1</sub> Yes

<sub>2</sub> No

**NumSpect2**

7 How many specators came to watch you race today?

[NumSpect2]

<sub>1</sub> Yes

<sub>2</sub> No

**Visitor**

8 Do you live in Toronto or did you travel here from out of town?

[Visitor]

<sub>1</sub> Out of town

<sub>2</sub> Live in town

<sub>3</sub> Define out or town

**VP Size**

9 How many people are in your Family Visitor Party (members of the same family who reside at the same address), including yourself?

[VP\_Size]

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_

**VP dist**

10 In your Family Visitor Party, how many members are aged:

**18 and Under**

[VP\_dist.r18\_and\_Under]

\_\_\_\_\_

**19-29**

[VP\_dist.r19\_29]

\_\_\_\_\_

**30-39**

[VP\_dist.r30\_39]

\_\_\_\_\_

**40-49**

[VP\_dist.r40\_49]

\_\_\_\_\_

**50-59**

[VP\_dist.r50\_59]

\_\_\_\_\_

**60-69**

[VP\_dist.r60\_69]

\_\_\_\_\_

**70 and over**

[VP\_dist.r70\_and\_over]

\_\_\_\_\_

# CCWC v1

---

## Days Attend

11 How many days has / will your party attended the CCWC:

[Days\_Attend]

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_

## AvPty

12 Will all [#VP\_Size] members of your family visitor party attend the CCWC for the [#Days\_Attend] days you plan to attend the event?

[AvPty]

<sub>1</sub> Yes

<sub>2</sub> No

## AvgVPSize

13 On average, how many people in your family visitor party will be attending the CCWC over the course of the event?

[AvgVPSize]

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_

## Residence

14 Where is your normal place of residence?

[Residence]

<sub>1</sub> Canada

<sub>2</sub> U.S.

<sub>3</sub> Overseas

## Canadian Province

15 Province

[Canadian\_Province]

<sub>1</sub> Ontario

<sub>2</sub> Quebec

<sub>3</sub> B.C.

<sub>4</sub> Alberta

<sub>5</sub> Sask.

<sub>6</sub> Manitoba

<sub>7</sub> N.B.

<sub>8</sub> N.S.

<sub>9</sub> P.E.I.

<sub>10</sub> NI/Lab

<sub>11</sub> Yukon

<sub>12</sub> NWT/Nun.

## U.S. States

### 16 Select State

[U.S.\_States]

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> _1 Alabama         | <input type="checkbox"/> _41 South Dakota  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _2 Alaska          | <input type="checkbox"/> _42 Tennessee     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _3 Arizona         | <input type="checkbox"/> _43 Texas         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _4 Arkansas        | <input type="checkbox"/> _44 Utah          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _5 California      | <input type="checkbox"/> _45 Vermont       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _6 Colorado        | <input type="checkbox"/> _46 Virginia      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _7 Connecticut     | <input type="checkbox"/> _47 Washington    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _8 Delaware        | <input type="checkbox"/> _48 Washington DC |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _9 Florida         | <input type="checkbox"/> _49 West Virginia |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _10 Georgia        | <input type="checkbox"/> _50 Wisconsin     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _11 Hawaii         | <input type="checkbox"/> _51 Wyoming       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _12 Idaho          |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _13 Illinois       |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _14 Indiana        |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _15 Iowa           |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _16 Kansas         |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _17 Kentucky       |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _18 Louisiana      |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _19 Maine          |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _20 Maryland       |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _21 Massachusetts  |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _22 Michigan       |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _23 Minnesota      |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _24 Mississippi    |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _25 Missouri       |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _26 Montana        |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _27 Nebraska       |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _28 Nevada         |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _29 New Hampshire  |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _30 New Jersey     |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _31 New Mexico     |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _32 New York       |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _33 North Carolina |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _34 North Dakota   |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _35 Ohio           |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _36 Oklahoma       |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _37 Oregon         |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _38 Pennsylvania   |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _39 Rhode Island   |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _40 South Carolina |  |

## International

17

[International]

- <sub>1</sub> Australia
- <sub>2</sub> France
- <sub>3</sub> Germany
- <sub>4</sub> Italy
- <sub>5</sub> Japan
- <sub>6</sub> U.K.
- <sub>7</sub> Mexico
- <sub>8</sub> New Zealand
- <sub>9</sub> China
- <sub>10</sub> India
- <sub>11</sub> Other \_\_\_\_\_

## FSA

18 Can I have the FIRST THREE digits of you postal code

[FSA]

---

---

## Sameday

19 Are you returning home each night of the event, or are you staying overnight in Toronto?

[Sameday]

- <sub>1</sub> Sameday
- <sub>2</sub> Overnight

## NightTotal

20 In total, how many nights will you be away from home?

[NightTotal]

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_

## AllinTO

21 Will all of these nights be spent in Toronto?

[AllinTO]

- <sub>1</sub> Yes
- <sub>2</sub> No

**NightON**

22 In TOTAL, how many nights will you be in Ontario?

[NightON]

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_

**NightTO**

23 In TOTAL, how many nights will you spend in Toronto?

[NightTO]

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_

**NightComm**

24 How many of your nights in Toronto will be spent in commercial accommodation?

[NightComm]

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_

**day trips**

25 How many day trips did you make to [@this] to attend the event?

[day\_trips]

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_

**SpendIntro**

26 I am now going to ask you some questions regarding the spending of your family travel party. Please report the spending for all members of your party, and provide an estimate as to the total spending in the Greater Toronto for each category for the entire duration of your stay.

## Spending

27 How much was spent in Toronto on:

Accommodation

[Spending.Accommodation]

\_\_\_\_\_

Restaurants/ Bars/ Concession

[Spending.Restaurants]

\_\_\_\_\_

Grocery/Other F&B

[Spending.Grocery\_Other\_F\_B]

\_\_\_\_\_

Rec & Ent (movie/casino/attraction)

[Spending.Other\_Rec\_\_\_Ent\_mov]

\_\_\_\_\_

Event Merchandise

[Spending.Event\_Merchandise]

\_\_\_\_\_

Retail Clothing

[Spending.Other\_Merchandise\_Sh]

\_\_\_\_\_

Retail Other

[Spending.Concession]

\_\_\_\_\_

Car Rental

[Spending.Car\_Rental]

\_\_\_\_\_

Own Vehicle Expenses (Gas,Parking)

[Spending.Vehicle\_Expenses\_\_Ga]

\_\_\_\_\_

Local Transport-Taxi or Intercity bus \$ spent  
in TO

[Spending.Local\_Transport\_\_Bus]

\_\_\_\_\_

Public Transportation

[Spending.Public\_Transportatio]

\_\_\_\_\_

## Importance

28 On a scale of 1 to 10, how important was the CCWC in your decision to come to Toronto area, (with 10 being the CCWC was the only reason you came)?

[Importance]

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_

**Switch**

29 Did you change the timing of a trip that you would normally take to Toronto in order to attend the CCWC

[Switch]

- <sub>1</sub> Yes
- <sub>2</sub> No

**Xtend**

30 Did you lengthen your trip to Toronto in order to attend the event?

[Xtend]

- <sub>1</sub> Yes
- <sub>2</sub> No

**xtend length**

31 By how many days?

[xtend\_length]

Answer: \_\_\_\_\_

**Endofsurvey**

32 Thanks for your time, this completes the survey

**Comments**

33 Surveyor Comments?

[Comments]

---

---