



**JOINT PARK CITY AND SUMMIT COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
1885 W. UTE BLVD.
PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH 84098**

January 24, 2023

The Park City and Summit County Councils of Summit County, Utah, met in open meeting on January 24, 2023, at 9:00 a.m. in the Council Chambers.

JOINT PARK CITY COUNCIL AND SUMMIT COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING

I. ROLL CALL

Park City Council Attendee Name	Status
Mayor Nann Worel Council Member Ryan Dickey Council Member Max Doilney Council Member Becca Gerber Council Member Jeremy Rubell Council Member Tana Toly Matt Dias, City Manager Margaret Plane, City Attorney	Present
None	Excused

Summit County Council Attendee Name	Status
Chair Roger Armstrong Vice Chair Malena Stevens Council Member Tonja Hanson Council Member Canice Harte Council Member Chris Robinson Janna Young, Interim County Manager Margaret Olson, County Attorney	Present
None	Excused

II) DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Summit County Discussion of Summit County's County Visioning Process and the Summit County Community Planning Lab: Derek Siddoway and Maddy McDonough:

Derek Siddoway, Summit County Communication Director, indicated that “Our Summit” was Summit County’s 2023 community envisioning project and it was a County-wide process that would look at land use, community planning, sustainability, housing, etc. to form a strategic plan to guide County decisions for the next 10-20 years and to inform the general plans. They were currently in Phase One, which was the initial outreach, and which consisted of information gathering and community conversations to find out what people loved about the County and areas for improvement.

Maddy McDonough, Summit County Community Development Department Planner, discussed the four phases that would become more specific as they go on with the goal to end this project around September 2023 and present the findings to the public before presenting to the County Council. Key takeaways included the need to spread the word about this initiative. They were working closely with the Park City Communications team to help engage the residents of Park City. She indicated www.oursummitcounty.com was the website that contained all the surveys and information. There would also be three kick-off events for this process:

The Community Planning Lab was an effort to empower community members to be more involved in the process and examine what planning was, planning concepts in general, and how they worked specifically in Summit County. It was a 10-week course and the first session was held last night. They had 35 applications and were able to accept 30 participants. All the sessions would be facilitated by the speaker along with a student from the University of Utah who was working on a professional project, along with guest speakers. They anticipated running this course at least once a year. A big part of the Community Planning Lab was that all participants would design a final planning-related project of their own choice which would be presented on April 3rd at the Summit County Library, Kimball Junction Branch. They would use a group of mentors to help in this process.

Council Member Dickey asked about the cost associated with it and the answer was that part of it was modeled off the Wasatch Transportation Academy which was started last year. There were academies across the country that they took ideas from and did interviews with, but they were creating most of it from scratch. The cost had been low so far but they were designing a guide during this process.

The demographics of the Community Planning Lab participants were fairly spread out in terms of age and geography, with more representation in Park City and Synderville Basin. There were people on the east side of the County participating, as well as some planners from Oakley and Kamas. They hoped to do another program in the fall.

2. Presentation and Discussion of Mountain Mediation Community Listening Session Data re: Olympic Bid Concerns and Opportunities; Kris Campbell and Nicole Wozniak, Mountain Mediation Center:

Mayor Worel stated the City partnered with Summit County to do a series of listening sessions along with Mountain Mediation. Kris Campbell, Mountain Mediation Board Chair, explained more about their organization. Nicole Wozniak, the Communications Coordinator, stated Mountain Mediation was contracted by the City and the County to host six to eight conversations in April, 2022, and she noted that all of the outreach was bilingual. They worked with Mayor Worel and Council Member Stevens, along with the Salt Lake Olympic Committee to create a three-minute informational video because the point of this was to gather information about the community's feelings about a potential 2030 or 2034 Olympics and to consider different perspectives from others. She shared details about how the team facilitated the conversations with a breakdown of the information in a final report. Discussion took place about engaging more community members and getting them involved, such as through an open house forum. They also wanted to involve more stakeholders such as business owners, parents, ski resorts, restaurants, small businesses, etc.

Vice Chair Stevens added that the concerns that she heard were similar to the general concerns about growth, development, and changes that made the community not as fun and active as it was now. She asked if there would be an opportunity to combine some of the visioning processes with some of these Olympic conversations.

Council Member Robinson asked what the bottom-line feeling was based on the input. Campbell indicated that as facilitators, they tried not to take a position, but some people related that along with the concerns, there were also opportunities. There was a wealth of knowledge in the community and a lot of valuable information. She noted that the community's concerns were around how to make things better if the Olympics came, and concern that things might get worse.

Stevens recognized that the Olympics were really a Utah State initiative and Summit County wouldn't be able to stop them. However, they could influence them and it would be to Summit County's advantage to mitigate the impacts/concerns while at the same time leverage those concerns to help solve some long-standing issues and turn them into opportunities. Council Member Hanson indicated there would be an opportunity to engage with the various organizations throughout Park City and Summit County.

Council Member Doilney stated there weren't many surprises in the report for him and the concerns were similar to concerns they have had. He wanted to highlight the desire to model a sustainable Olympics to the world. He asked if there were any surprise answers. It was indicated the state of snow and concern about enough water around the globe was a common concern, as was the sense of the east side of the County not really being a partner in this conversation, which was important to pay attention to.

Council Member Gerber asked for demographic information to know who still needed to be targeted. It was indicated the only information they gathered was the zip code at the

end of the survey. They spoke to the senior center and there could be a perception there that the seniors might not be around when the Olympics were held.

Council Member Rubell complimented the report and stated it showed a nice balance between the excitement and trepidation in the community about the Olympics. He suggested that one should assume the Olympics would be coming, be honest about the feedback, and transition it to a specific action plan. Also, be accountable and transparent to the public and don't just do what we wanted to behind the scenes.

Chair Armstrong enjoyed the format of the survey and recalled that during Myles Rademan's presentation in the past, the question to ask was, "What does Summit County/Park City want to get out of it and how do we communicate those principles?" He thought considering if the Olympics would be sustainable tourism would be a good focus and stated those things needed to be targeted now.

Mayor Worel concurred that the conversation needed to start now and she expressed thanks for the work which exceeded expectations. Council Member Robinson agreed that it was a quality report.

3. Olympic Bid Status Update; Colin Hilton and Tom Kelly:

Colin Hilton thanked Park City and Summit County in their quest for feedback, for engaging in the conversation, and for Mountain Mediation's professionalism. He asserted feedback was an important resource needed to understand how to plan towards a potential Olympic Games and to explain how concerns should be mitigated. The Games would provide a lens to the community and could be a catalyst for many visioning ideas. It would be beneficial to have a goals deadline, such as transportation or sustainability goals. Another important step would be having open houses and explaining the process to the public.

Tom Kelly stated the bid would be for 2030 and 2034, and they were interested in both. This past December, the International Olympic Committee (IOC) took a pause to look at some items, which was different from 2002. He indicated there was much more ongoing professional dialogue this time with the IOC. The IOC was looking at any interested cities, such as Sapporo, Vancouver, and Salt Lake City, but there could be other cities that might come into the mix. He also noted there was no specific timeline for awarding the Games.

Hilton explained that the IOC paused the process before the holidays due to climate concerns and the ability to stage an Olympic Winter Games in climate-reliable locations. This was an opportunity for Summit County because there were many good aspects about our location both geographically and regionally. He wanted to align those goals with the community and the IOC was really concerned about sustainability. Rotating the Games might be a possibility and he thought this was one of those good locations. He

hoped asking the community if they wanted to be part of an Olympics rotation could be part of the community discussion. Hilton stated they were working with the host venues on agreements now.

Mayor Worel asked about Vancouver's status and noted she was told that both Sapporo and Vancouver were continuing the dialogue for 2030. Council Member Toly asked whether conversations with places like Main Street had taken place yet and what would be the next step for areas that were not competition areas. Hilton answered that they hadn't gotten that far yet, and they wanted to get feedback from the Councils and community on what they would like. Council Member Toly suggested it should be more of a holistic regional Wasatch Back conversation since the Games would be more regional than anyone expected. Hilton welcomed the broader regional transportation and common goals discussion.

Chair Armstrong wondered how to engage and task the managers with setting up some of these cases. The way things worked today were very different from how they were in 2002 and how they would be in 2030 with the Mayflower, Canyons, and Park City Base area and the many other developments in the area, and he felt those discussions would be far different.

Chair Armstrong introduced Shane Scott, the new Summit County Manager, who was participating via Zoom, and noted he would start in two weeks.

4. Affordable and Workforce Housing Updates - New Approvals, New Openings, Current Park City and Summit County Affordable Housing Counts; Jason Glidden, Park City Affordable Housing Manager and Jeff Jones, Summit County Economic Development and Housing Director:

Chair Armstrong stated it was critical that Park City and Summit County made sure the public and legislators understood the scope of what affordable housing had been built and what was in the pipeline, and know that our governments were not afraid of it, but were actively pursuing it. The purpose of asking for this update was to provide our local and State press with accurate information as to what we were doing for affordable housing.

Jeff Jones indicated there were 1,095 affordable or deed-restricted units in Summit County and 638 affordable or deed-restricted units in Park City through public-private partnerships and development agreements.

Browne Sebright, Park City Housing Program Manager, explained the Homestake Housing project had 99 affordable units out of 120 total, ranging between 40-80% Area Median Income (AMI), which was a true public-private partnership. He noted the recent approval of Studio Crossing Development, which was a private development with 185 affordable units ranging between 60-80% AMI. The City had also been working on two

new affordable housing programs: a lite-deed program which was a neighborhood vibrancy pilot program to encourage year-round occupancy in primary residential neighborhoods, and Workforce Employer Rental Incentive Program (WERIP), with Mountainlands Community Housing Research Center, which offered incentives to homeowners who signed a lease with employees who worked for participating companies. This was the first winter of the program, and Deer Valley was the first partner on board. He hoped the program would expand to other employers in the future.

Sebright reviewed other upcoming projects, and stated the City currently had an RFP open on the Mine Bench property in the Upper Deer Valley section of Park City for a workforce employee housing opportunity. Staff was looking for a creative solution for a public-private partnership there. The City was working on feasibility studies for Clark Ranch and Woodside Park Phase Two, where the senior center was located. The Planning Department was also looking at Land Management Code amendments dealing with the Affordable Master Plan Development section of the code.

Jones indicated the 1,790 combined total units in Summit County was 11.15% of the total estimated number of occupied housing units, which was a lot for a small area. To put that in perspective, Salt Lake County would need 46,861 income-price-restricted units to match Summit County's 11.15%. On that basis across the state, Summit County was holding their own. Affordable housing was something Park City and Summit County had concentrated on for several years.

Jones continued that Summit County had 330 workforce units in Silver Creek Village, 169 units in Slopeside Village Apartments at the Canyons, 37 units in the development stage at Promontory, and 45 units under construction at Discovery Ridge. Future projects included adding Fox Point to the County buyback program which the County currently had for Bear Hollow units and those would be specifically targeted for County staff. They were creating an RFP for developing the five-year affordable housing needs assessment and were looking at proposals for affordable housing development where County-owned land could be leveraged. The County would continue the moderate-income housing plan implementation. Lastly, the County was looking at a combined survey tool with Mountainlands Community Housing to see how the community felt about workforce housing and to engage the business community with participation.

Council Member Robinson asked how the Homestake partnership operated and if it was clarified that the City would retain land ownership and the developer would operate and manage the units. Sebright explained the City would have the ground lease and deed restrictions on all the rental units.

Council Member Hanson asked for details about the lite-deed restrictions. Sebright stated it was based on programs in Colorado. Park City purchased lite-deed restrictions from private homeowners to restrict their units to full-time occupancy. The WERIP

program, based on an Aspen, Colorado, program, would give an incentives package for the season to homeowners who provided housing to employees, with the Housing Resource Center facilitating this. It was further clarified that these programs were aimed at seasonal workers.

Council Member Rubell noted two aspects were important. The City had been working to protect the residential neighborhoods which feed into the affordable housing conversation. Second, the City was looking for better leverage as they proceed, and they wanted to do it right. There were lots of signs that they were moving in the right direction.

Chair Armstrong requested that Summit County staff engage with Park City staff on more of these details and start to figure out how to work together. He wanted staff to address the questions of needed development code changes and changing densities.

5. Status Update on Park City/Summit County Housing Workgroup Process; Jason Glidden and Jeff Jones:

Jones reviewed the Housing workgroup met periodically between Park City and Mountainlands Community Housing Trust and the next project was to put together a County-wide survey tool about affordable housing.

A suggestion was made that Mayor Worel, Chair Armstrong, Council Members Gerber and Stevens, and Jeff Jones, Matt Dias, and Shane Scott reconvene and start scheduling regular Housing workgroup meetings.

6. Park City Discussion re Launch of Bonanza Park Neighborhood Area Plan and the Community Engagement Process Concerning Arts and Culture; Deputy City Manager Jen McGrath:

Jen McGrath stated in late 2022, Park City issued two concurrent Requests for Proposals (RFP) for Bonanza Park and the Arts and Culture District to support significant community and land use planning exercises. Park City received several qualified proposals. In December, a selection committee was formed including the City, County, community stakeholders, and local non-profit leaders, and the group was actively working toward a final selection. A contract would come to Council for consideration in February. In the meantime, Mayor Worel had asked for volunteers for an advisory committee for each of those projects which would be comprised of Park City staff, residents, property and business owners, non-profits, partner agencies, etc. They also hoped for volunteers with specific expertise in areas such as programming, finance, the arts, development, etc., and they would be pushing this out in the next few weeks.

The boundary of the Bonanza Park area was outlined in the Park City General Plan and the Arts and Culture district was within that area. Staff was careful to separate those

efforts yet coordinate them because staff wanted to consider the neighborhood's needs as a whole and also look at the feasibility of an arts and culture district on a piece of City property.

7. Wrap Up Comments And Schedule The Next Meeting:

Chair Armstrong stated the City and County used to engage with the Park City School District periodically in the past, and he wondered if they should to do that again. Mayor Worel noted the Park City Council had two liaisons with the Park City School District and they had been meeting regularly. They had appointed two new liaisons and Mayor Worel thought it would be important for the County to assign a liaison or two from to join them. Council Member Stevens supported that idea. Council Member Gerber indicated the School District could collaborate with the City on similar issues such as housing, transportation, growth, etc., and she supported it.

Council Member Robinson confirmed that an Intercept Parking group had been meeting to affect transportation and he was advocating for a similar affordable housing group and/or a County housing authority. He expressed thanks to Park City for their collaboration and the ideas they were bringing to the table, and he looked forward to more of the same. Chair Armstrong concurred that the collaboration between Luke Cartin and Emily Quinton was a shining example of that and it was helpful to have that level of expertise available.

Council Member Gerber requested a group conversation about the expiration of the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) stabilization grants this year towards childcare. A suggestion was made to have the Early Childhood Alliance present to both Councils to determine next steps.

Council Member Doilney requested updates from UDOT regarding the two entrances to Park City and the failing intersections that exist. Chair Armstrong proposed the next meeting for Tuesday, April 25, 2023, at 9:00 a.m., and indicated Park City would host it.

III) ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:56 a.m. by Chair Armstrong.

Paige Galvin, Deputy City Recorder



Olympic Conversation Final Report

November 2022

Table of Contents

Contract Agreement	2
Locations	3
Promotion, Planning, & Execution	3
Attendance	5
Group Feedback	6
Concerns	6
Hopes	10
Voices	13
Survey Feedback	14
Conclusion & Future Suggestions	15

Contract Agreement

In April 2022, Mountain Mediation Center (MMC) was contracted by Park City (the City) and Summit County (the County) municipal governments to host 6-8 Community Conversations (Conversations) about Utah’s Olympic bid. The Conversations, entitled *The Utah Olympic Bid: A Summit County Listening Project*, were executed from mid-September through the beginning of November, with both in-person and virtual Conversation offerings.

The five main goals of this project as stated in Mountain Mediation Center’s contract with the City and County were:

1. to provide Summit County residents a safe space to constructively voice their hopes and concerns regarding potential community benefits and impacts that could derive from a successful Olympic Bid and to share community input with the PCMC and Summit County Councils to inform their planning;
2. to allow people often left out of important community discussions to make their voices heard;
3. to build relationships/understanding among community members who may have different opinions on the Olympic bid;
4. to dispel misinformation about the planning process and the role of our community in the decision-making process; and
5. to provide synthesized information collected to Summit County and PCMC so they can use the information to determine how to move forward with subsequent Olympic Bid community conversations, mitigation strategy, planning, and/or other community participation in a potential Utah Olympics. Such synthesized information will be distributed to Summit County and PCMC in a final report (“Final Report”).

In order to fulfill these goals, Mountain Mediation Center was tasked with tracking event attendance and providing participants with a written evaluation form to assess their satisfaction with the process and anonymously share their insights. Our facilitators and leadership met regularly after each Conversation to discuss our process and implement any necessary changes. This Final Report (Report) is intended to summarize the planning and execution of the Conversations as well as sentiments raised by participants therein.

Locations

The City & County indicated their preference for MMC to hold 6-8 Conversations on weekday evenings with the requirement to host a minimum of one Conversation in each of the following locations/formats: Coalville, Kamas, Park City, Snyderville, and virtually.

The locations, dates, and times of the eight Conversations were as follows:

Kamas Library	September 13, 2022	6-8pm
Zoom Conversation	September 20, 2022	6:30-8pm
Kimball Junction Library	September 22, 2022	6-8pm
Christian Center of Park City	September 28, 2022	6-8pm
Coalville's Ledges Event Center	September 29, 2022	6-8pm
Park City Library	October 6, 2022	6-8pm
Zoom Conversation	October 27, 2022	12-1pm
Zoom Conversation	November 1, 2022	12-1pm

The two final Zoom Conversations were added to the schedule after the City and County received feedback to include daytime Conversation options.

Promotion, Planning, & Execution

Mountain Mediation Center was initially brought into this process in late-April to begin work on this series of Conversations. Early efforts included: sourcing available locations, generating an introductory video, crafting the Conversation framework and questions, scheduling facilitators, and preparing marketing materials.

As dates and locations were finalized, MMC marketed the Conversations with flyers throughout Summit County - with campaigns focused in Coalville, Kamas, Park City, Snyderville, and virtually. The Conversations were promoted on local radio & news outlets, community calendars, social media, and through direct outreach (e.g. speaking at the Park City Senior Center). MMC shared weekly reminders regarding upcoming Conversations with our mailing list. Those who RSVP'd for a Conversation received a reminder email the day before their chosen session.

As all of Mountain Mediation Center's Conversations are bilingual, our marketing materials were provided in both English and Spanish, and we attempted to post flyers in locations where Spanish speakers frequent (physically and virtually).

MMC, the City, the County, and the Salt Lake City-Utah Committee for the Games collaborated on a 3-minute video to introduce the series and be played at the onset of each Conversation. To ensure consistency for the overall project, each Conversation was conducted using the same format. Following a short introduction and the video, an MMC facilitator explained the Conversation process and expressed the Conversation Agreements that participants must adhere to.

Mountain Mediation Center places a precedence on creating a safe, confidential Conversation environment where participants feel confident that they will be respected and can speak freely. As this series sought feedback for the City and County, our facilitators received consent from participants at the beginning of each Conversation to take notes on overarching topics discussed within the groups to be anonymously recorded in this Report. At the end of each Conversation, participants were also given the opportunity to fill out a physical or digital version of a survey to, in their own words, anonymously share their thoughts with the City and County.

With the public interest surrounding this topic, many members of the press attended Conversations in this series. During the general introduction, MMC requested that any members of the press identify themselves as such in their small groups, actively participate in the Conversation as individuals, refrain from notetaking, and interview willing participants at the Conversation's terminus. When necessary, MMC facilitators reminded the press of these requests during small group Conversations.

After addressing the press, participants were broken out into small groups. If there was more than one group, participants were numbered off in an attempt to separate them from any acquaintances they may have arrived with. A facilitator opened the circle by sharing a quote, noted their role as a time-/peace-keeper who would participate in the Conversation as an individual, and then asked the first question. The questions asked were as follows:

1. Please tell us your name and share your experience with the Olympics.
2. What challenges do you think our community might face if the Olympics return?
3. What benefits could the Olympics bring that would potentially enhance our community?
4. Thinking about who could be most impacted by an Olympics, as the City and County engage in planning, whose voices do you think need to be heard and how?

Our facilitators monitored the time within their groups and coordinated to regroup as a whole to review the overarching themes and distribute the survey. For in-person Conversations, MMC provided physical surveys, as well as slips with the survey’s QR code and printed web address. For virtual meetings, the survey link was sent in the Zoom chat. Participants who shared their email address at check-in were sent an email that thanked them for their participation and included the survey link in case they did not have an opportunity to fill it out following their Conversation. Participants who RSVP’d and did not attend were sent a follow up email that re-included the sign-up link, as well as dates of future Olympic Conversations.

Attendance

Location	Number of RSVPs	Number of Attendees*
Kamas Library	8	9
Zoom Conversation	25	11
Kimball Junction Library	18	21
Christian Center of Park City	19	30
Coalville’s Ledges Event Center	5	12
Park City Library	38	21
Zoom Conversation	36	20
Zoom Conversation	24	14
Total	173	138

*This number includes representatives and facilitators from MMC who participated in each Conversation as public individuals.

Actual turnout tended not to reflect the number of RSVPs, and we calculated a ~61% no-show rate (in relation to those who RSVP’d and failed to attend) over the course of the entire series. This no-show rate was tempered by walk-ins.

An important element of MMC’s Community Conversations is that they are bilingual (English/Spanish). We marketed with both English and Spanish versions of our materials, and had translators available at each Conversation. Our RSVP form was available in both languages.

Though we had a few participants sign-up using the Spanish form, none indicated that they needed an interpreter when prompted. Overall, our bilingual services were not utilized in the actual Conversation setting.

Group Feedback

This segment will focus on the cumulative feedback that our facilitators recorded in their small groups. Members of the public were able to attend any meeting fitting their schedule and location, so though there will be some location specific feedback, most feedback will remain generalized. The feedback will be organized in the same order as the questions were asked, beginning with participants' concerns, then hopes, and finally the additional voices participants suggested the City and County need to hear from. The topics discussed are presented in alphabetical order and not listed by priority. Though we developed categories to relay this feedback, we recognize that there is overlap between many of these insights.

Concerns

Community & Growth

- Losing the character of our community/communities
 - Focus on making money, development, and growth hurts the community
 - No longer a small town
 - No longer a ski town
 - No longer a historic town
 - Government will overlook the needs of the community in favor of growth/economics
- Increasing socioeconomic disparity
- Impact on the daily lives of residents
 - Shopping for groceries
 - Accessibility of services for those with disabilities/ailments and their caregivers
- Impact on minorities
- Impact on seniors
- Will the Games reach Kamas and Coalville?
 - Facilities, transportation, etc.

- In 2002, one might not have known an Olympics was happening so nearby in Park City
- Growth
 - Will be accelerated by the Olympics
 - Those who come will only be focused on business/money and not on community values
 - Short- and long-term impacts of event-centric growth
- Can we host well twice and what are the implications to Summit County if it's not as good?
- Is hosting an Olympics as inevitable as it is being presented?
 - How much say does this community have in the Olympic process?

Development, Money, & Politics

- Developers, resorts, & realtors are the only ones who will receive benefits
- Potential for bribery and taxpayer money waste
 - Wasteful purchases in 2002 will be repeated
- Effect on local governmental budgets and funding
- Exclusivity of the event
 - Cost of tickets
 - How do we show equity and inclusion as we plan for the Games?
- Commercialism and a sole focus on merchandising
 - Are the Games transactional or inspirational?
- Low political transparency

Environment & Resources

- Water
 - Wasteful water usage during the Games
 - Will there be enough water?
- Climate change & snow
 - Will there be adequate (natural) snow?
 - Snowmaking's impact on water usage

- Can an Olympics be “green”?
- What can be done now to ensure we will still have a winter for the Olympics?
- Protection of open space
 - Encroachment due to the development of facilities, housing, roads, etc.
- Inversion
- How do we leave an environmentally sustainable legacy?

Housing

- Affordable housing
 - Not enough affordable housing in our community currently
 - Housing prices will increase
 - Development will be focused on high-income wants
- Impact on renters and those who are housing insecure
 - Nightly rentals will affect overall rentability
 - Locals with long-term housing needs will be kicked out in favor of short-term rental profits
- Post-event housing boom
- Inability for certain populations to rent out their home and leave town during the Olympics as a suggested solution for residents who would prefer not to be around during the event

Infrastructure

- Facilities
 - Need improvement
 - Will be rebuilt, not reused
 - Inadequate amount of training facilities/housing for athletes
 - University of Utah students displaced for athlete housing purposes
 - Inadequate lodging
 - Amount of venue seating
- Over-development
 - Building athletic infrastructure to meet Olympic needs, but not community needs

- Long-term land use regulation implications
- Skepticism surrounding “if you build it they will come”
- The effect of construction on winter sports conditions pre-Olympics
- Is our community large enough to handle the volume of vehicles/crowds?
- Emergency services & healthcare
 - Wasatch Back has limited police/fire services etc.
 - Strain on our healthcare system
 - Proper allocation of resources/equipment for first responders
- Accessibility
- Parking
- Internet access
- Security/safety
 - Terrorism
 - A pandemic/other crisis could affect attendance/revenue and there aren't adequate provisions in place to handle that potential outcome

Traffic & Transportation

- Traffic and congestion
 - Traffic flow/ability to move freely
- Accessibility of town [Park City/Kimball Junction]
- Buses
 - Will people utilize buses?
 - “Everyone should take the bus except me” attitude regarding ridership
 - Will residents be able to use buses as normal?
 - Traffic will cause buses to get stuck/delayed
- Transportation infrastructure
 - Will be temporary
 - Will not be green
 - Is the transportation infrastructure necessary for the Games the same infrastructure the community needs post-event?
- Coalville: noted the lack of transportation between Park City and Coalville

Workers & Business

- Workers
 - Will there be enough?
 - Lodging/housing for workers
 - Childcare for workers
 - School closures
 - Transportation/commuting issues
 - Decrease of business in advance of the Olympics
 - Effect on small businesses
 - Effect on other major events
 - Event fatigue before/after the Olympics
 - Sponsorships
 - Corporate commitment fatigue
 - Olympic sponsor fatigue
-

Hopes

Community

- Provide an increased sense of community
 - Build community pride & bring the community together
 - Model a strong sense of community to the world
 - A chance to come together despite political divisions
- Unique experience for Summit County residents
- Opportunity to engage with different cultures and learn from them
- 2002 Olympics had a positive impact on our community spirit
 - Potential to repeat that with a future Utah Olympics
- Many residents volunteered for/worked for/participated in the 2002 Olympics and have remained in Summit County
 - Utilize their knowledge/insights

Corporate/Federal Funding & Economics

- Funding can be put to the best use
 - Used to build structures for the Olympics that can later become affordable housing
 - Go towards underserved members of our community
 - Address issues born from growth in N. Utah
 - Reapportion budget to get public transit
- Short term economic boost
- Financial benefit for local businesses
- Bring in money and attention

Diversity & Showcasing Utah

- Increase/attract diversity
 - Athletes, attendees, community
- Inclusivity and equity
- Utahn/LDS language ability well prepares us to host international groups
- Chance to model for the world and take pride in our state/community
 - Put our best foot forward
- Set/retain our legacy
- Event aligns with Utah well
 - Being able to ski into events makes it very intimate

Environment

- Planning for an Olympics will be a catalyst for a greener Utah
 - Motivated green decision making
 - Protecting open space
- Adopt alternative energy and green solutions to address existing environmental issues
- Increase conservation and sustainability
- Model a sustainable Olympics to the world
 - Show other nations that a greener Olympics is possible/how to do it

Housing

- Build/convert Olympics housing into affordable housing
- Increase motivation to create affordable housing options
- Address homelessness

Infrastructure & Technology

- Improve/repair facilities
 - Facilities already exist
 - Lower environmental impact than cities who would need to build new facilities
 - Updated/more facilities will attract athletes to train in Summit County
- Increase the amount of parking
- Improve technology
 - Benefit to our community
- Improve style guides, building code, and preserve historic buildings

Olympic Spirit & Youth

- Inspirational/motivational
- Promote physically/mentally healthy lifestyle
 - Get people outdoors
- Youth
 - Inspire the next generation of athletes
 - More facilities for the youth to utilize
 - Opportunity to train with Olympic athletes

Planning

- Planning today will solve tomorrow's problems
 - Effective management/healthy decision making is important
 - Have trust in our leadership
- Learn from and improve upon past Olympics
 - 2002 Utah Olympics and other recent Winter/Summer Games

- Opportunity to improve coordination between private resorts and Park City

Traffic & Transportation

- Solutions to existing transportation issues
 - Address issues such as traffic, parking, bus, gondola, etc.
 - Excelerate and expand response to said issues
- Opportunity to increase sustainable transportation
 - Incentivizing alternative transportation
- Improve transportation between Salt Lake City and Park City
 - Include Cottonwood Canyons in transportation plans
- Create transportation between Coalville and Park City
- 2002 transportation worked well

Volunteering & Attending

- Opportunity to volunteer
 - Showcase hospitality & hosting expertise
 - Make Olympic memories
- Fun/Exciting
 - Olympic Games are entertaining/enjoyable to attend
 - Pin trading
- Free tickets for students to attend events

Voices

Listed below are the voices that participants think the City & County should engage with throughout the Olympic bid process.

Business Owners Elected Officials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● State and National leaders 	Families <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● (Single) Parents ● Caregivers
---	---

<p>Landlords & Tenants</p> <p>Low Income</p> <p>Minorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Latino/Latinx <p>Previous Olympic Volunteers/Employees</p> <p>Residents Outside of Park City</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Kamas, Coalville, etc. <p>Senior Citizens</p> <p>Specialists</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Transportation ● Environmental ● Developers/planning commission ● Security professionals 	<p>Workers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Commuters ● Essential workers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Medical personnel/healthcare workers ○ Law enforcement <p>Youth & Athletes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In primary and secondary education ● Young athletes ● Olympic athletes (past and present)
--	--

Survey Feedback

This survey provided the public with the opportunity to anonymously relay their feelings to the City & County in their own words. Respondents were asked to respond to the following questions and statement:

1. The format of the Conversation worked well (ranked on a scale of 1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree)
2. What one thing would you most like to communicate to City and County representatives regarding a future Olympics in our community?
3. What is your zip code?

In the collected survey responses (51), 76.5% of participants reported that they agreed and strongly agreed that the format of the Conversations worked well. 19.6% were neutral, and 3.9% disagreed with that statement. No one strongly disagreed.

The responses to this survey are linked [here](#).

(https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1XQWQnXUKeD-o-J89FveD_2MD0XLLb7qoS8SZyiULhPs/edit?usp=sharing)

Conclusion & Future Suggestions

MMC successfully facilitated eight Conversations in this series and delivered on the agreements set forth by the City & County with the completion of this Report. Community members were provided with a safe space to share their input in a setting where multiple opinions had a chance to be heard. Additionally, Mountain Mediation Center marketed diversely across the County to encourage the widest group of participation in these Conversations.

For future community engagement and conversations, MMC recommends that efforts are made to hear from the groups outlined in the “Voices” section (pgs. 13-14). Such outreach might include meeting those communities where they gather regularly (e.g. hosting a conversation after a Spanish mass to reach the Spanish-speaking community, coordinating with business owners to find a time to engage with area employees, etc.). Additionally, offering a variety of dates - potentially weekends - and times would be beneficial to those who may be unable to attend a weeknight event.

As a neutral facilitator, MMC balanced the need to provide factual information about the Olympic bid process without presenting an opinion about the Olympics. While the video and informational sheet at each Conversation were intended to serve as neutral and unbiased background, the inclusion of materials in collaboration with the Salt Lake City-Utah Committee for the Games, resulted in limited feedback that suggested potential perceived bias of MMC.

This process was a productive manner to initiate discussions between community members and local governments surrounding Olympic sentiments, and has laid appropriate groundwork for future conversations to occur on this topic. This statement is backed by a 76.5% ranking of 4 and 5 on the survey. The MMC Conversation process creates an environment where participants have an opportunity to consider and address opinions that may contradict with their predisposed positions, and express their insights in a nuanced and informed manner.

Mountain Mediation Center would like to thank the City & County for their support through this process, our facilitators for their diligent work to engage our community in conversation, and all the members of the public who took the time to share their voices on this project.