



Nolympia / Ludwig Hartmann, Ismaninger Str. 9, D-81627 München

Munich, 01.03.2011

Dear Members of the Evaluation Committee,

We would like to take this opportunity to bring to your attention a few serious criticisms of the "Munich 2018" bid. We ask that you take these criticisms seriously and consider them when making your assessment for the awarding of the 2018 Olympic Winter games.

In the "Munich 2018" bid book a number of important facts are concealed or misrepresented, while half-truths are spread and the respective underlying planning is portrayed untruthfully.

The bid was and is characterized by a severe lack of transparency. If Munich is selected, actions will be carried out which will displease the populace, actions over which the people have not been informed and which will massively intensify the already existing resistance to the Olympic Games.

#### **Citizens' Petition / Referendum**

*Chapter 3.12* of the bid book states that no referendum is required. The text of the chapter does not touch on the possibility of a citizens' initiative/referendum.

**The citizens' petition in Garmisch-Partenkirchen began on February 22, 2011.** Thus an extremely important fact has been suppressed in this context. If the citizens' petition is declared "inadmissible" a lawsuit will be filed. Such legal proceedings would extend beyond July 6.

If the citizens' petition is declared "admissible" it too will stretch beyond July 6.

And the bid book fails to mention further legal possibilities which are already under consideration and which can still be employed.

#### **Land in Garmisch-Partenkirchen**

*Chapter 9.12* of the bid book gives the IOC the impression that all necessary land has already been secured or that the contracts required to secure the land are being drawn up.

This is incorrect: 63 property owners whose land lies within the area specified in the bid book or directly adjacent to it, have declared their refusal to lease or sell their land, and a further 100 property owners have expressed their solidarity.

**For this purpose an attorney has been retained who has, on several occasions, expressly pointed this out to the IOC, the bid organisation and to the media.**

The applicants' repeatedly presented alternate solutions ("Plan B") or workarounds that are not possible. If they were, these workarounds would have succeeded long ago if the bid book was interested in offering "definitive" solutions.

Since the required land will not be made available, the affected property owners are being threatened with expropriation. The Lord Mayor of candidate city Munich has already announced as much and called for action on the matter.

Expropriation (even just the threat of it) for the Olympic Winter games not only makes

a mockery of the idea of goodwill-building games, but also amplifies the populace's distaste of the IOC and the Olympic games. In addition, under German law expropriation for temporary sports events is almost impossible – legal proceedings for expropriation would drag on for years and it is very likely that the expropriations would be rejected.

### **Resistance**

The bid organisation fails to mention -- neither to the IOC nor publicly nor in the bid book -- the now widespread opposition to the bid for the 2018 Olympic Winter games. In *Chapter 6.4* of the bid book the German Nature Conservation (DNR) is still cited as a member of advisory bodies and above all as a party involved in the ongoing planning process. The DNR is an umbrella organisation of 98 environmental and conservation organisations in Germany. However, **on 09.13.2010 the DNR had already announced its exit** from the environmental commission and thus from the bid committees. Interestingly, the DNR is no longer listed as a supporter in *chapter 3.6* of the bid book. Naturally, one might assume that the DNR was deliberately not taken out in order to fool the IOC that broad support exists among environmental organisations.

Not a single mention is made of **the withdrawal from the environmental commission of most of the initially active large conservation and environmental organisations**: the Association for Nature Protection in Bavaria (Bund Naturschutz in Bayern e.V.) with 176,000 members, the Society for the Conservation of Mountain Areas (Verein zum Schutz der Bergwelt), CIPRA Germany and Mountain Wilderness. These associations have withdrawn from the environmental commission because the plans for the 2018 Olympic Winter games, in the proposed form, are not compatible with the statutes of these organisations, whose primary objective is the protection and preservation of nature and the environment. Furthermore, recommendations and objections made by these associations were ignored by the environmental commission.

The bid book likewise makes no mention of the bid's rejection by the non-partisan, inter-organisational "NOlympia" network, whose home page [www.nolympia.de](http://www.nolympia.de) registered over 150,000 visitors as of mid February 2011.

In *Chapter 3.4* one reads: *"While Munich's Green faction supports the bid, the Bavarian and German Green Party have expressed concerns regarding the bid."* This is incorrect. The Munich Municipal Council, the Bavarian State Association and the federal association of the "Alliance 90/The Greens" party (Bündnis 90/Die Grünen) have not "expressed concerns" but rather have **rejected the bid by majority vote**. Only the 11-member Green City Council Group (Grüne Stadtratsfraktion) failed to vote for the resolution. The "Alliance 90/The Greens" party is currently the third strongest political force in Germany.

### **Environmental destruction and false promises**

Protected landscapes are not mentioned in the bid book:

The Evaluation Committee must be aware that sports facilities, function areas and infrastructure will be built in part in high-value areas, including conservation areas (biotopes). This issue is not addressed in the bid book. Brief mention is made in *Chapter 6.1* that: *"Protected biotopes and protected landscapes exist in these areas, but are not indicated on the map."* If interested, we would be happy to point out these areas. Whether these areas will be shown in the environmental and sustainability strategy, as yet unsubmitted, remains to be seen.

Examples of destruction of natural habitat:

In Schwaiganger a majestic landscape in the Alpine foothills would see large areas permanently destroyed.

The "Snow-Cluster" plan calls for trees and forests to be cleared - the size of the areas is played down.

In Munich, at least 1,300 and more likely 2,000 trees will have to be cut down for the construction of the Olympic village.

This does not concur with environmental and sustainability concepts required by the IOC.

### **Transportation**

Infrastructure measures presented in *Chapter 15* of the bid book have still not been assured. Motorway connection to Garmisch-Partenkirchen will not happen.

According to the German Federal Transport Network Plan, plans for most of the projects presented can not begin before 2015 as they are only categorized as "secondary priority". These projects will only be authorized if financing is secured in 2015. As things currently stand the financing of the measures will also not be secured in 2015, the funds are not available.

Contrary to public statements, the promised expansion of the railway line from Munich to Garmisch-Partenkirchen (total length 100.4 km), one of the main arguments for the sustainability of the games, will only comprise some 6 kilometres. Here we have the populace being promised something which ultimately will not be honoured and which will lead to further rejection of the Olympic games.

### **Costs**

Requests to see the bid's budget have remain unanswered, the plans are completely opaque. According to a survey conducted by the Friedrich-Schiller University in Jena, 79% of Germans believe costs for the Olympic games will be completely inaccurate.

### **Credibility of the Bid organisation**

A number of other statements have also led to misunderstanding in the community:

- The false talk of the "2-Park Concept". In reality it is a 4-park concept (Munich, Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Schwaiganger, Schönau am Königssee) with the following distances (kilometres by road according to [www.viamichelin.de](http://www.viamichelin.de)):

Munich - Garmisch-Partenkirchen:	100 km
Munich - Schwaiganger:	70 km
Munich - Schönau am Königssee:	160 km
Garmisch-Partenkirchen - Schönau am Königssee:	190 km
Garmisch-Partenkirchen – Schwaiganger:	25 km
Schwaiganger – Schönau am Königssee:	170 km
- The actual land use is regularly specified as "less than 1 ha", "half a football pitch" or "one football pitch". But about 150ha will be required just for temporary structures in the way of sports facilities, in addition to 12,000 parking spaces plus infrastructure and Olympic villages etc. If the actual land use is eventually made known, the population will be up in arms. This falls back on the IOC and the Olympic Games.
- Opinion polls for approval/rejection of the bid:

The bid book only cites a "Spring 2010" poll. Not included was an October 2010 survey by Infratest dimap that revealed an approval rate of only 60% (a May 2010 poll by the same research institute showed an 80% favourable

rate).

A January 2011 Infratest dimap poll in Bavaria also resulted in an approval rate of only 60%. No mention was made of a variety of online surveys which unanimously rejected the bid (of course, if the surveys had turned out positive for the applicants they would have been presented):

BR-online, 14/02/2010:	56.4% against
Merkur online, 14/02/2010:	78% against
tz online, 14/02/2010:	88% against
Augsburger Allgemeine, 23/07/2010:	65% against
Frankfurter Rundschau, December 2010:	61% against
AZ online, 15/12/2010:	76.6% against
BR2 online, 18/01/2011:	57.8% against
Garmisch-Partenkirchner Tagblatt, 21/01/2011:	50.4% would support a citizens' petition against Olympia

- The rationale of the 18 "Leading Environmental Projects" has repeatedly been refuted. For example, the Olympic Village in the "Ice Park" would not be built to the plus-energy standard. Other environmental concepts mentioned already exist or implement existing legislation. "NOlympia" is compiling a separate opinion on this.
- A forthcoming opinion contradicts the bid book in significant areas and lays out the actual facts. These include, for example, projects that have nothing to do with the context of the bid: e.g. the "UNESCO Project" listed in chapter 1.3 and falsely categorized as part of the bid, or the repeated reference to "existing, legally binding development plans" which in reality have nothing to do with the developments planned for the 2018 Olympic Winter games.
- Publicly presented information by the applicants conflict with the bid documentation. See the following few examples.
  - Press release of 22/11/2010 by Winfried Herrmann, Green MP, member of the sports committee and transport policy spokesman for the Greens: *"Existing trails, snow guns, ski jumps and halls will be utilized, no new or additional construction. Only the facilities for cross-country and biathlon will be temporarily constructed and subsequently removed."*
  - Dr. Thomas Bach in "Tagesspiegel" on 23/11/2010: *"But we do not need new rail lines, no new roads."*
  - Bernhard Schwank, CEO of the bid organisation, in "yahoo.sport" on 03/01/2011: *"We have a complete infrastructure. We do not need to lay any rails or build roadways."*
  - Boris Schwartz, head of the "Environmental Commission", on 17/02/2011 in "münchen.tv": *"For the most part the sports facilities that we need for all the ski races, for the cross country races, for the biathlon races, are already there, they're in place. These are the same courses that are currently being used for the world skiing championships."*

All these statements blatantly contradict statements in the bid book, and even testify to ignorance of the bid application and are simply false. These statements have been

repeatedly and credibly contradicted by NOlympia and others in the public venue – and we have based our analysis on the published bid application documents. Yet there is still no response from the authors of these statements. All of this speaks against the credibility of the bid committee and thus indirectly against the credibility of the IOC.

### **Summary**

The citizenry will hold responsible not only the bid organisation or individual representatives of the applicants for this, but first and foremost the IOC and the Olympic games themselves. Consequently, the Olympic spirit would suffer permanent damage. With respect to environmental protection and conservation, the German people are very open-minded, concerned and sensitive. In this regard, environmental destruction and broken promises in the wake of the 2018 Olympic Winter games will certainly generate further resistance and protests among the population. The same will hold true for the costs, which till now have been kept completely opaque.

The "Olympic legacy" will express itself in the German population in the rejection of the IOC, the Olympic games and the bid committee.

### **Therefore we urge you not to promise your support for the “Munich 2018“ bid.**

We can assure you that going forward we will continue to make public the issues mentioned above, in addition to many other aspects, and will continue to inform the populace of the damage which the 2018 Olympic Winter games will inflict on Bavaria. An opinion on the bid book is currently being prepared, as well as one on the environmental and sustainability strategy. We will also continue to ensure transparency, which the bid organisation prides itself on, yet fails to put into practice. We will continue to make public all documents, from the host city contract to the ancillary agreements, as well as the true costs, and review contracts for possible violations of German law.

Yours sincerely,

#### **Ludwig Hartmann**

BÜNDNIS 90 / DIE GRÜNEN, Mitglied des Bayerischen Landtags  
(BÜNDNIS 90 / DIE GRÜNEN, Member of the Bavarian Parliament)  
Munich

#### **Axel Doering**

Bund Naturschutz in Bayern, Kreisgruppe Garmisch-Partenkirchen  
(Garmisch-Partenkirchen Section of the Association for Nature Protection in Bavaria)

#### **Christian Hierneis**

Bund Naturschutz in Bayern, Kreisgruppe München  
(Munich Section of the Association for Nature Protection in Bavaria)

#### **Dr. Wolfgang Zängl**

Gesellschaft für ökologische Forschung  
(Society for Ecological Research)  
Munich