

University of Utah
2002 OLYMPIC COORDINATION
FINAL REPORT
June 30, 2002

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY	1
I. History & Organization of University's Olympic Involvement	3
A. The Bid Process	3
1. <i>The 1990 Decision Process</i>	3
2. <i>The 1995 Bid and Letter of Understanding</i>	4
B. University Planning	5
1. <i>Initial Stages</i>	5
2. <i>Office of 2002 Olympic Coordination</i>	5
3. <i>Committee Structure</i>	6
4. <i>2002 Campus Master Plan</i>	6
5. <i>Final Report Process</i>	8
II. Campus-Wide Issues and Activities	9
A. Human Resources Policies	9
1. <i>Staff Leave Policy</i>	9
2. <i>Accreditation to Venues</i>	10
3. <i>Athletes' March Corridor</i>	11
4. <i>University ID Badging</i>	12
B. Academic Issues	12
1. <i>Academic Calendar 2001-2002</i>	12
2. <i>Curriculum Planning</i>	13
3. <i>Academic Service Contracts</i>	15
4. <i>Enrollment</i>	17
C. Individual Opportunities	17
1. <i>Internships</i>	18
2. <i>Volunteer Opportunities</i>	18
3. <i>Student Volunteer and Employment Opportunities</i>	19
4. <i>Alumni Involvement</i>	19
5. <i>Additional Opportunities</i>	19
D. Public Information and Communications	20
1. <i>Internal Communication</i>	20
2. <i>External Communication</i>	22
E. Contract Negotiation and Management	23
1. <i>The Process</i>	23
2. <i>Repair and Restoration of Facilities</i>	24
3. <i>Master Consulting Agreement</i>	25
4. <i>Marks Usage Agreements</i>	26
5. <i>Archives (Marriott Library)</i>	26
6. <i>Cultural Olympiad and other Games-Related Exhibits</i>	27
7. <i>Facility Rentals</i>	27
8. <i>Equipment Purchases</i>	28
F. Campus Atmosphere	29
1. <i>Arts & Culture Opportunities</i>	29
2. <i>Decorations and the 2002 Winter Festival</i>	31

III. The Venues	33
A. Rice-Eccles Olympic Stadium	33
B. Olympic and Paralympic Villages	34
C. Polyclinic and Medical Services	36
IV. Unit Impacts	38
A. Plant Operations	38
B. Public Safety	39
C. Transportation & Parking	41
D. University Student Apartments and Medical Towers	42
E. Bookstore, Copy Centers, and Printing Services	43
F. Huntsman Center and Athletics	44
G. University Hospital and Clinics	44
V. Financial	46
A. General and Auxiliary Funds	46
B. Development Funds	47
1. <i>Fort Douglas Heritage Commons</i>	47
2. <i>George S Eccles 2002 Legacy Bridge</i>	47
3. <i>Legacy Scholarship Fund</i>	47
VI. Conclusions and Recommendations	48
A. University of Utah Processes	48
1. <i>Emergency Operations Plan</i>	48
2. <i>Building Security Plan</i>	48
3. <i>Facility Rental Procedure</i>	48
4. <i>Internship Policies</i>	48
B. Recommendations for Future Large-Scale Events	48
1. <i>Coordination Structure</i>	48
2. <i>Contracting and Cooperation</i>	48
3. <i>Funding Operational Costs</i>	49
4. <i>Communication</i>	49
5. <i>Arts & Culture Expectations</i>	49
Appendices	50

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

The University of Utah hosted two venues of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games, the Olympic Stadium and the Olympic Village, as well as a number of cultural events. This report summarizes what we at the University did, the benefits and burdens of the Games, and what we might have done differently. For one audience, this report accounts to the University community and to the Utah taxpayers for what was done with their precious public resources during this time. For other institutions that are considering involvement with similar enterprises in the future, as well as for future planning at the University, this report may be a helpful guide.

The University of Utah's official mission statement includes not only teaching and scholarship but outreach to the larger community. It was the goal from the beginning of our involvement with the 2002 Games that this involvement serve the missions of the University. From creation of new facilities through finding parking solutions to offering of special courses, every phase of Olympic planning referred back to the missions of the University.

Academic progress of our students remained the first priority of the University, followed closely by the research and service missions. All buildings on campus, except those inside the two venues and other rare exceptions, were open and operating throughout the Games. Staff were expected to attend to their normal work schedules, except as modified to fit any particular unit's needs. Parking was available, although in some instances with less convenience than normal. All of these impacts, and the benefits flowing from the Olympic involvement, were summarized in the original motto for 2002: "Business *Somewhat* as Usual."

The University of Utah's involvement with the Olympics began in 1988 with the Bid Committee's request for commitments of facilities, became formal with the award of the Games in 1995, intensified with contract negotiations and planning through early 2001, and reached the implementation stage in the fall of 2001. During the seven years of planning and implementation, the Office of 2002 Olympic Coordination monitored and shepherded planning across all fronts, academic, cultural, facilities, legal, and security. This Office, however, took no decision responsibility away from any unit on campus. All units continued to perform their customary roles, although consultation across unit boundaries was somewhat enhanced for this special undertaking.

The principal theme of Olympic planning at the University of Utah, and perhaps our most important lesson for future planners, was to blend academic and administrative decision processes. As events drew closer, in an attempt to involve the campus community and take full advantage of opportunities, we adopted the theme of "Educate, Participate, Celebrate" as a slight shift from "Business *Somewhat* as Usual."

On the academic front, our first step was to adopt a calendar that started classes earlier than usual in January 2002, took a 3-week break for the Games, and finished one week later than normal. Despite a few difficulties, this calendar still appears to have been the best possible solution for all concerned. A few special courses were offered during 2001-02, although for the most part academic departments proceeded with their curricula as usual. The Arts and Cultural offerings on campus certainly provided a number of co-curricular options as well as academic outreach to the community.

The principal reason for University involvement in the Games was to take advantage of opportunities for international exposure and networking. In this regard, several hundred student

interns, several thousand volunteers, and a large but unknown number of temporary employment placements enhanced the experiences of individual students, staff, and faculty. At institutional levels, the University provided weather forecasting, doping control, medical services, language instruction, the Village newspaper, and cultural awareness training. All of these activities increased the knowledge base of the University departments, created links to professional colleagues, and enhanced delivery of services by the University.

Contract negotiation and administration between the University and SLOC was perhaps the most pronounced and visible arena in which the blend of academic and administrative coordination on campus was carried out. The Ceremonies Agreement and Village Agreement each consisted of about 75 pages of text, in many instances highly technical in nature. But each agreement was crafted with full consultation among those who would have to carry it out, and the agreements became less important than the shared objectives of those responsible for administering them.

A shared set of objectives among SLOC and University administrators resulted from each side's realizing that their success depended on the other. SLOC would not look good if University constituents were unhappy, and the University would not look good if the events themselves were not well carried out. This did not mean that the two entities were in "partnership" but instead that they were each carrying out their separate missions in a professional manner that depended on the other entity's being equally successful in their endeavors. Professional cooperation meant far more than any contract language in this regard.

Public safety both for the campus and the venues was an important consideration in Olympic planning from the beginning and took on even more impetus after the events of September 11, 2001. Public safety was addressed from the state level by creation of the Utah Olympic Public Safety Command (UOPSC) in 1998. This organization provided an umbrella for all public safety agencies in the state (including fire, EMS, and public works) as well as a liaison with the federal agencies. Under federal law, the Secret Service became responsible for security at the venues but carried out its mission in close cooperation with state and local agencies. Far from inducing conflicts, the working relationships among state, federal, and University public safety agencies was a model of cooperation.

The University took advantage of the Olympic presence to finish an Emergency Operations Plan that had been in the works for some time, and to implement it during the Games. The lessons learned from this experience need to be reinforced and practiced on a continuing basis. At the same time, we were able to implement a system of communication between building managers and the Security Division of our Public Safety Department that should likewise be maintained with current information and ongoing communication.

As a financial matter, the 2002 Games were very successful for the University. In addition to \$36 million of rent for the two venue sites, we have benefitted from Olympic impetus for private giving to the tune of over \$15 million for both facilities and student scholarship funds. The costs of providing the facilities and managing the impacts of the Games on campus are more difficult to calculate but consist mostly of displacement of residential students from their housing for one semester. Some units on campus experienced direct costs that are relatively minor and others experienced some loss of revenue during this year. On whole, the University should recognize a gain of over \$50 million in facility improvements.

I. History & Organization of University's Olympic Involvement

A. The Bid Process

In 1988, the University of Utah was asked by the then-named Salt Lake Olympic Bid Committee to commit to hosting the Olympic Village and the Olympic Stadium in the event of a successful bid. A Task Force Report to the Academic Senate and subsequent action by the Board of Trustees resulted in the position that we would provide facilities for those aspects of the Games subject to certain "Fundamental Principles" that were to be nonnegotiable. Prior to the 1995 vote by the International Olympic Committee (IOC), the University and Bid Committee entered into a Letter of Understanding that set out additional terms and conditions of the University's participation. Following the successful 1995 bid, the University began its planning process with the appointment of an Advisory Council and in 1997 an Olympic Coordinator, a full-time faculty member allocated 1/4 time to these administrative duties.

1. The 1990 Decision Process

The 1990 Task Force was appointed by the President to analyze the pros and cons of accommodating the Bid Committee's request for facilities. The Bid Committee was assembling its proposals for the IOC which was meeting in 1991 to award the 1998 Winter Games. The Task Force consisted of 31 members – faculty, staff, students, alumni, administration, and even one representative from the Salt Lake City Mayor's Office. The Task Force Report (Appendix IA1) recites its "working assumption that the University will want to participate in major projects that from time to time have gathered the support of the principal communities and institutions of the State." Thus the Task Force assumed the University's involvement and proceeded to list four "conditions" and 16 "recommendations" for University involvement. The four conditions eventually became the first four of the seven "Fundamental Principles" adopted by the Institutional Council and Board of Regents. The 16 recommendations dealt with more detailed matters such as academic calendar, location of Village facilities, financial matters, and the like. In retrospect, most of the recommendations were followed, although in some instances in modified form, as planning unfolded. At minimum, the recommendations were useful starting guidelines for the negotiators.

During the Task Force deliberations, the State Board of Regents was approached to endorse involvement by "several institutions of higher education" in the Games. On May 25, 1990, the Regents adopted a resolution authorizing its institutions to cooperate with Olympic bid processes to the extent of providing facilities, subject to conditions that ensured that any capital expenditures would be consistent with the priorities of the educational institutions.

The Task Force Report was considered by the University Senate in June 1990. The Senate debate is enlightening because it isolated reasons why the University should participate in the bid process. Those reasons, and the priority in which they were expressed, served as important guides for the planners throughout the years of planning. The Senate made it clear that money for new facilities was not a good enough reason for participating. The most important factor was to perform our role as a state institution in assisting with an enterprise that the State had made a priority of its own, in other words to provide a service to the state and its citizenry. Second in importance was the international networking and exposure that could come for Olympic involvement. This included prospects for faculty to connect with colleagues from around the world, for students and staff to be

involved as interns or volunteers, and for our cultural venues to attract new visitors to the campus. At a third level of priority, the Senate recognized the value of additional funds for new or renovated facilities.

The University Senate adopted a resolution favoring the offer of facilities to the Bid Committee, subject to four conditions that were stated as “Fundamental Principles” not subject to negotiation. The Senate also added as an internal condition that there be an Oversight Committee to monitor University involvement with the Games. That resolution was transmitted to the Board of Trustees (then known as the Institutional Council), which adopted a similar resolution but discussed additional points that ultimately were added to the Fundamental Principles. In general, the Fundamental Principles sought to ensure that University programs and services would be disrupted to the minimal extent possible (indeed, that some services were not to be disrupted at all), and that the financial aspects of the Games would not be detrimental to the interests of the University.

The Fundamental Principles

1. No student shall be delayed in the receipt of his or her degree as a result of the Games being held, or the Olympic Village [or the Paralympic Village] being located, on the University campus;
2. The academic research efforts, contracts, and grants of the members of the University community shall not be disrupted;
3. The University’s commitment to the Academic Outreach and Continuing Education, the provision of professional services, and the provision of medical services, including but not limited to, medical education and research shall not be disrupted;
4. No state educational funds, student fees, and/or tuition shall be used to support the Games;
5. To the extent possible, the University’s research facilities and libraries will remain open during the Games;
6. The Agreement will specifically identify any and all costs being incurred under the terms of the Agreement, and the party responsible to pay such obligations;
7. All costs incurred under the Agreement will be funded by the responsible party in accordance with a time schedule to be agreed upon in said Agreement.

The Bid Committee used this commitment in its unsuccessful bid for the 1998 Games, which were awarded in 1991 to Nagano amid widespread publicity of the gifts and largesse bestowed by the Japanese organizers on the IOC members.

2. The 1995 Bid and Letter of Understanding

As the Bid Committee prepared for a renewed effort looking to the 1995 IOC decision on the 2002 Games, some University constituents were increasingly concerned about the corruption and financial underpinnings of the Olympic movement. It was decided that there should be a more formal understanding between the UU and the Bid Committee before the IOC acted. The University retained outside counsel and a “Letter of Understanding” was entered into between the two parties in 1994. (Appendix IA2) The Letter of Understanding, which became the basis for negotiation of formal

contracts after the bid was awarded to Salt Lake City in 1995, contained these essential elements:

- ▶ Rent for the Olympic Village was set at \$28 million.
- ▶ Rent for the Stadium was set at \$8 million.
- ▶ The Fundamental Principles were incorporated.
- ▶ Committee promised “best efforts” for reimbursement of displaced students, staff, or faculty.
- ▶ Both committed “best efforts” to achieve full agreement on all terms by November 1, 1996.

As soon as the IOC announced the award of the 2002 Games to Salt Lake City, the University began its organizational efforts. The Vice-President for Administrative Services (whose duties include chief financial officer and contracting officer as well as management of facilities) was designated to be the University’s chief liaison to the new Salt Lake Organizing Committee.

B. University Planning

1. Initial Stages

The Oversight Committee required by the University Senate was appointed to include wide administration, faculty, and staff membership. As this committee began its deliberations, it seemed that the first order of business with SLOC would be negotiation of contracts for the Stadium and Village. But before the University could commit to specific time periods and methods of operation for those facilities, it would be necessary to know how to fit those activities into the academic year. So the first order of business for the committee became adoption of a modified academic calendar for the 2001-02 school year.

When SLOC hired a “Venue Development” manager in 1996, negotiations began for a contract regarding the Stadium. The first draft of a contract was modeled on one that was used in Atlanta. SLOC’s negotiating team consisted of the venue development manager, their Vice-President, and outside counsel. The University put together a team of one law faculty member, the Vice-President for Administrative Services, and one member of the University Counsel’s office. This team stayed in place throughout the negotiations of the Ceremonies Agreement and through most of the negotiation of the Village Agreement. By early 1997, it was apparent that the University needed one person to be designated to staff the coordination among academic and administrative functions.

2. Office of 2002 Olympic Coordination

A law faculty member with some background in the issues was appointed to a loosely-described and labeled position of Olympics Coordinator in March 1997. The initial appointment was on a 1/2 time basis reporting jointly to the President and VP(Admin). This was soon changed to a 1/4 time assignment with direct reporting through the VP(Acad). The reporting lines, however, were important only in providing a regular basis of communication; the key to success of the endeavor was the sense of cooperation and trust that existed among all the Vice-Presidents and the coordinator.

The Olympic Coordinator title eventually became Director of Olympic Coordination, and the

staff of the 2002 Olympic Coordination Office (2002 OC) grew to include an Associate Director, an Intern and Volunteer Director, a Program Coordinator, and two Secretaries. Together the staff was responsible for SLOC relationships, intern placement, volunteer recruitment, planning efforts, contract negotiation and monitoring, use of Olympic trademarks, campus tours, and other Olympic-related services. Olympic Coordination maintained its role as the active coordinating body for the University through March 2002 and slowly phased out of existence by June 2002.

3. Committee Structure

2002 Olympic Coordination worked with the 2002 Olympic Planning Committee and the 2002 Olympic Operations Committee. In addition, a Medical Services Committee addressed Games-related medical issues including the Olympic Village Polyclinic. (See Organization Chart – Appendix IB3a).

The 2002 Olympic Planning Committee consisted of the Vice-President or chief deputy from each area of the University along with the two venue managers, Plant Operations, Fine Arts, and Athletics. The Planning Committee monitored central administrative decision-making related to the Games, setting or recommending general policies and addressing key financial issues. The Committee also provided a medium for information distribution and promoted campus support for Games-related programs and activities. This Committee was chaired by the Director of 2002 Olympic Coordination, and meetings were generally held every 3 months. [Appendix IB3b – OPC Minutes]

The 2002 Olympic Operations Committee consisted of representation from Plant Operations, Public Safety, Fire Marshal, Environmental Health and Safety, SLOC venues, Auxiliary Services, Parking Services, Student Housing, Public Relations, and Olympic Coordination. This group was responsible for coordination among all operational units on campus and key external groups such as security agencies. The Operations Committee met monthly for about two years and moved to twice-monthly meetings starting about six months before the Games. The forum provided by this Committee resulted in operational conditions that were positive to both the Campus and the SLOC venues. The Committee was chaired by the Director of Plant Operations. [Appendix IB3c – OOC Minutes]

An informal team that sometimes referred to itself as the 2002 Olympic Operations Management Team (OOMT) handled day-to-day operations for the Games, although this group was never officially organized or named. It consisted of the Venue Representative for the Olympic Village, the Venue Representative for the Rice-Eccles Olympic Stadium, the Chair of the 2002 Olympic Operations Committee, and the Director of 2002 Olympic Coordination. This team began meeting regularly from 1999, often as an adjunct to meetings involving design of the new student housing. Throughout the months leading up to the Games, OOMT met weekly and expanded to include the University Director of Public Safety (Chief of Police). It is clear to the participants in this process that the informality of this team, as well as the meld of personalities involved, were critical to the smooth functioning of the University's involvement with the Games.

4. 2002 Campus Master Plan

The University of Utah 2002 Campus Olympic Master Plan was designed to address campus-related issues flowing from the University's involvement with the Salt Lake 2002 Olympic Winter

Games. The Master Plan was cast at a level of generality to provide a summary from which each unit could build specific plans for its operation in 2002.

The University modeled much of its unit-based planning process on a system utilized at the Georgia Institute of Technology, site of the Olympic Village for the Summer Olympics of 1996. Unit-based planning relies heavily on the involvement of the entire University community, allocating responsibility to each campus unit for developing its own plan for responding to a major event. Within the Georgia Tech planning manual for the 1996 Games, a unit plan is defined as, “a written document that depicts how a unit will operate in [the relevant academic year], developed to a level of detail necessary to ensure that the unit’s mission will be accomplished.”

In February 2000, the Olympic Planning Guidelines were issued campus-wide and each unit, as designated by the various vice-presidents, was asked to prepare its own draft Master Plan. The draft unit plans were collected by 2002 Olympic Coordination, and eventually orchestrated into a comprehensive Master Plan which summarized general concerns and issues found within the unit plans. Each unit on campus could then use the general information in the Master Plan to guide unit-specific detailed planning.

The purpose of the Planning Guidelines is to summarize those actions that we are obligated by law or contract to perform, to provide as much information as is available about the University’s remaining Games involvement, and to provide a framework within which each unit can prepare its own draft Master Plan. The individual unit plans varied greatly. Some were short with no enhancements, concerns, or modifications of service, while others were long and detailed with numerous proposals, concerns, and changes. Each plan was to address each of the following elements:

- potential opportunities to enhance educational mission or programs
- potential concerns that might threaten the educational mission of programs
- levels of service to be maintained, curtailed, or enhanced
- staffing needs
- equipment and funding needs

Although University planners consulted extensively with colleagues at Calgary and Georgia Tech, the experience at those sites was significantly different from that of Utah in 2002. Despite the differences in approach, the University planners are enormously grateful to our colleagues from Calgary and Georgia Tech for their assistance. A few examples of the structural differences may help guide future planners in similar situations.

The principal difference between us and the University of Calgary was their role as an integral member of the Olympic Winter Games Organizing Committee (OCO ‘88) and the Calgary Olympic Development Association (CODA), whose roles can be compared to the Salt Lake Organizing Committee’s responsibilities. By contrast, the University of Utah was a landlord to another entity and needed to deal at arm’s length with that entity.

Georgia Tech’s experiences hosting the 1996 Summer Olympic Games were different from the University of Utah generally for the following reasons: 1) summer enrollment varies from spring

enrollment, 2) almost the entire Georgia Tech campus was “inside the fence” of the Olympic Village or competition venues, and 3) Georgia Tech opted to establish several satellite campuses rather than attempt to maintain business-as-usual on main campus. By contrast, we were able to keep our campus open and operating primarily because the two venues could be relatively isolated from the rest of campus.

We also learned that an international event necessarily requires a high level of intuitive planning because of its evolutionary nature. Decentralization and flexibility were also key elements of a commitment to the maintenance of academic and research efforts throughout the 2002 events.

5. Final Report Process

The “unit-based planning” system used to produce the 2002 Campus Master Plan also formed the model for preparing the Final Report. Departments which responded at the planning stage were asked to complete a “2002 Unit Summary Report,” providing a brief description of their experiences. Participation at this stage was purely voluntary, but all were encouraged to respond. Most reports were received by the end of March 2002. Departments with high involvement submitted their reports at a later date, due to the volume and detail of their information. Detailed financial reporting was added at a later date, to give units time to assimilate detailed information that would not be available until restoration of venues was complete.

II. Campus-Wide Issues and Activities

The Planning Committee, University Senate, and Vice-Presidents constantly sought the proper balance of what policies and decisions needed to be made at the central level and which needed to be made within each administrative unit. Other than public works operations such as public safety and transportation, there were just a handful of issues that required central decisions. Those were primarily human resources issues, contracts with external organizations, logo usage, and the academic calendar. In each of those instances, policies were developed to afford as much flexibility as possible for each unit to implement the policies in light of its own programs and needs.

A. Human Resources Policies

1. Staff Leave Policy

Although classes were suspended during most of February for the Olympics, the campus was to be open and operating throughout. The President decided early on, at recommendations of the Planning Committee and Vice-President for Human Resources, that normal University leave policies and procedures for faculty and staff would remain in effect. Some staff and SLOC urged that the University grant paid leave for those who wanted to volunteer with the Games, and others even argued that staff should be allowed to have paid leaves. After thorough analysis both proposals were rejected.

There are several problems with granting paid leave for University convenience. First, it would have violated Regents' mandates for the University to use state funds to pay people to work for SLOC and could violate state and federal laws to grant extended paid leaves. Second, enormous morale problems are presented when most staff are given paid leaves while others are required to work, as happens occasionally for major winter storms. Some departments and units scheduled important tasks during this time and would have been very negatively impacted by centrally mandated staff leaves. Finally, extensive planning had been done to minimize inconvenience and disruption so that the arguments for not attending to work were in fact quite minimal.

The original Oversight Committee had recognized from the very beginning that there was a significant potential for negative impacts on staff morale if the faculty all went off to play in the Caribbean while the staff were required to be at their desks. This may be little different from any other period of class breaks when the faculty are free to pursue their own interests (and presumably put in long hours at other times), but the visibility of the Olympics and the negative feelings toward the Olympics on campus fueled the issue beyond normal bounds. In January 2002, one faculty member (who had announced his plans to spend February in Tahiti) approached the University Senate with a resolution to encourage departments to provide paid leave for staff during the Games. This resolution failed. The argument was floated that the Senate should adopt a resolution encouraging the faculty to stay and work during the Games but no motion was introduced.

Staff who wanted to volunteer for the Olympics and/or the Paralympics were able to use vacation leave or personal preference days, and in some departments compensatory time was available for this purpose. In all instances, the employee was to request approval in advance from the cognizant department head or supervisor to ensure that departmental operations were not disrupted. SLOC was extremely cooperative in attempting to assign University of Utah staff and faculty volunteers to University venues and activities occurring on campus, such as the Village or Opening and Closing Ceremonies.

The Vice-President for Human Resources issued a memorandum (Appendix IIA1) outlining a variety of options for staff who might find it difficult to commute to campus during the Games. These options included the obvious ones of using vacation or personal preference days. Human Resources, however, took several unusual steps to encourage experimentation during this period. The policy encouraged units to consider allowing comp time to be accumulated and used during the Games, allowing employees to reschedule in a “flex-time” format, or allowing tele-commuting. HR offered to assist with coordinating any of these options, including the tele-commute arrangements.

Several methods were used for communicating the flexibility of staff policies. They were distributed in written form to all staff. HR organized meetings with every unit to go through the policies and how they fit with Olympic timetables and plans. Administrators were encouraged to have departmental meetings to go through the details of operational planning at the unit level. The OOC website featured extensive information on all these matters.

Although anecdotal evidence is inherently unreliable, the general impression among all observers is that staff satisfaction with the Games turned out to be highly favorable. One relatively vociferous complainant, a secretary in one of the buildings most affected by the Stadium operations, approached her colleagues after the Games with her hand outstretched and made the following statement: “Please slap my hand. I complained about the Olympics and it turned out to be a lot of fun.” The most frequently recited comment in the immediate aftermath of the Games was “Gee, it sure went smoothly, didn’t it?”

2. Accreditation to Venues

Olympic venues are highly secure areas. Any staff person working within the venue was required to acquire a badge through a process known as “accreditation.” SLOC’s accreditation process included a review of information provided by the employee as well as a background check by law enforcement agencies. Because the University was responsible for some functions and services within the 2002 Olympic & Paralympic Villages and Rice-Eccles Olympic Stadium, it was necessary for some 300 University employees to gain accreditation. There were four types of accreditation: guest pass (accredited the night before entry), day pass (accredited but no badge issued), access pass (accredited with picture badge but no rights of access without a second badge), and full (accredited with picture badge and rights of access printed on the badge). In addition, for accredited individuals, there were many temporary passes consisting of separate badges, stickers, or wristbands as needed.

SLOC required that the University manage the bulk of its own accreditation process, up to the point of background checks and badge production. Responsibility for this program resided mostly with the Olympic Operations Project Coordinator in Plant Operations because a majority of accredited individuals came from that unit. The first step in the process was to identify each individual who might need access to a venue, the frequency of that access, and the type of work to be performed. From this information, SLOC venue managers could then decide which of the various types of credential each employee needed. This process went on at the same time that the information for background checks was being gathered, and the two tracks did not come together for final decisions until December 2001.

In August 2001 supervisors of units that would need accredited employees were issued a memo and appropriate forms to distribute to their employees. (Appendix IIA2) For several reasons,

employees were given a choice of whether they wanted to pursue accreditation. Any individual assigned to serve a venue would be unable to take significant vacation time during the period of January through March. Second, one's schedule would be subject to change to meet the needs of Olympic operations, and one would likely be asked to work overtime. Third, the individual might prefer not to undergo a background check by law enforcement agencies. Any employee who did not wish to be assigned to a venue was counseled to contact his or her supervisor to be considered for alternative job assignments during the Games period.

The University compiled all accreditation forms, digital photos from its identification card department and completed a spreadsheet format provided by SLOC. The majority of the list was submitted late Fall Semester 2001, and names continued to be submitted as necessary. Once the required information was accumulated, SLOC contacted the University. If accreditation was denied, details surrounding SLOC's decision was not disclosed to the employee's department or University Human Resources. Accreditation outcomes did not affect an employee's status with the University of Utah, although individuals denied accreditation could utilize an appeal process.

In January the University organized a shuttle bus to the downtown accreditation center so that most employees could receive their credentials without an enormous loss of university payroll time. Some individuals did not receive a printed pass, because their assignments were so minimal that access to the venues could be handled using what was called a "day pass." This was a system in which someone who had gone through the background check could receive a temporary pass for a certain purpose with a mere phone call to the venue office.

The process of accreditation was relatively cumbersome for several reasons. One is that it required rather detailed interaction between SLOC and University staff to know the nature of job assignments for many individual employees. The SLOC staff assigned to the system changed several times, and a new learning curve resulted each time. This was particularly significant because the system involved different levels of credentials without a sufficiently consistent jargon or terminology. Different staff members who had never seen the process in action could sometimes refer to "full," "2-part," or "day pass" credentials and have different concepts in mind. Eventually, however, with a great deal of good humor and cooperation, all pass needs were met.

In addition to accreditation status, SLOC provided a system of "Guest Passes" for the University at the Stadium and Village. To receive a guest pass, the individual had to register with 2002 OC at least one day before planning to visit, and the guest pass could then be picked up at the Village or Stadium entrance the following day.

3. Athletes' March Corridor

Apart from accreditation, it was realized early on that there would be a special situation for the Athletes' March Corridor. Athletes and officials parading in the Ceremonies (both Opening and Closing) proceeded from the Village through the center of campus to the Stadium. After September 11, the corridor for this march received even more attention and was very carefully laid out with the Secret Service. Those buildings that lay within the corridor were closed on event days to all but select identified University staff whose jobs absolutely required their presence on those days (approximately six in number). Those persons were required to report with their University ID to a designated corridor entrance and be escorted to and from their places of work. Those buildings

adjacent to the corridor were closed to the public but University staff who worked in those buildings were issued a placard and University lanyard to wear around their necks with University ID.

This system required a great deal of time for educating University building managers and staff to the mechanics. From the University side, everyone was very cooperative and events would have flowed smoothly except for one minor miscommunication. The National Guard troops who were assisting the Secret Service with building sweeps got the impression that these buildings were to be closed the day before the event. Arriving University employees that morning were met by uniformed troops wielding M-16's and ordering everyone away. This situation took somewhat less than an hour to resolve so that the buildings were open for business. Again, patience and good humor ultimately prevailed.

4. University ID Badging

In addition to required credentialing and badging, all buildings on campus were advised that the Olympic period would be a good time to experiment with requiring ID's to be worn at all times. The Hospital had been working toward this policy for some time, and a number of other departments took the opportunity to implement this policy. It coincided with plans for building security that in many instances left buildings closed to the public but available to employees with keys. (See the section on building security below.) As part of the Health Sciences Security Buffer, employees in most of the Health Sciences buildings were required to wear University ID during the Games, and several of those buildings have maintained the practice since then.

B. Academic Issues

The University was committed to maintaining close-to-normal conditions for students and academic programs to carry out the Fundamental Principle that no student should be delayed in receipt of his or her degree as a result of Games activity. This commitment was addressed through collaborative efforts aimed at minimizing disruption in the curriculum, stabilizing possible enrollment fluctuations, and modifying courses to accommodate students in the recovery stages following the unusually long break.

1. Academic Calendar 2001-2002

The Olympic Oversight Committee (which was later replaced by the Planning Committee) analyzed the details of the 2002 Academic Calendar in early 1997. These decisions needed to be made before the contract for Opening and Closing Ceremonies could be negotiated to conclusion, because the Ceremonies Agreement would include dates for SLOC use of parking lots and some buildings and would in turn affect transportation and parking for the rest of campus.

The 1990 Task Force and Senate discussions had produced a commitment to keep the campus open and operating to the extent possible but to modify the calendar to the extent necessary. The 1997 Oversight Committee discussion (Appendix IIB1a) included options for holding no classes in Spring 2002 until after the Games by using such mechanisms as Saturday classes, longer and fewer class periods, and running later than usual. The recommendation adopted by the Senate and Trustees was to start classes early (January 3), take an extended spring break (February 2 - 26), and take only one Monday holiday (January 21). With this schedule, commencement was held during the second

week of May, one week later than the traditional first week of May. (Appendix IIB1b – Academic Calendar)

The 1997 report noted that the “principal reason for not attempting to run a standard semester in Spring 2002 is simply our belief that it will be virtually impossible to expect either students or faculty to concentrate seriously on academics during the hustle and bustle of Olympic activity both on and off campus.” Experience showed this statement probably to be reasonably accurate.

The week before the Opening Ceremony came to be known as Opening Week and was by far the most disruptive period on campus. It included two dress rehearsals, multiple receptions, the Opening Ceremony, loss of most parking in the Stadium quadrant of campus, and numerous road closures. It probably would have been close to impossible to hold any classes during this week; in fact, the President ultimately decided to close the campus on two days of that week, meaning that all but “essential” employees were excused from work with pay.

Although the logistics of parking, building usage, and security would have been greatly complicated by holding classes during the Games themselves, probably it would have been possible from an operational standpoint to hold classes after Opening Week. Several thousand students and staff, however, were either volunteers or paid workers during the Games. Many more attended some events. On the plus side, it would have been possible to hold a more normal class schedule by taking a break of only one week, and there would have been many more people on campus to visit some of the arts and cultural offerings. On balance, however, things flowed so smoothly using the 3-week break schedule that it would be difficult to recommend any modification.

It is very difficult to determine whether the extended break had a significant effect on student learning. Faculty comments after the fact reflected an interesting distinction between graduate-level and undergraduate courses. Those teaching graduate and professional students generally thought it was little problem. Comments for some faculty teaching undergraduate students thought it was a serious problem for some students: “difficult to come back,” “lost stride,” “very long time without another break,” and “even good students felt their grades would be lower.” It is possible that learning to interrupt and resume work is a skill that graduate students have learned better than undergraduates.

A related point on the calendar was that some activities were compressed into the post-Games period when they might otherwise have been spread over the whole semester. This affected some long-term class assignments but was more directed to applications and reviews of scholarships, annual events such as lectures, and special events of co-curricular nature.

2. Curriculum Planning

Curricular issues were approached with the same goal used in all our planning: minimizing disruption while maximizing benefits. Some early initiatives were taken by urging faculty to consider new courses that would take advantage of the Olympic presence. The issue was discussed on a few occasions with the Undergraduate Council and in the University Senate. In October 1997, the Council of Academic Deans discussed the importance of having faculty members communicate both teaching and research interests to a central point so that opportunities would not be missed, although everyone recognized that academic initiative would remain a highly decentralized matter.

The Office of Olympic Coordination assembled an Academic Programs Committee designed to

report to the Olympic Planning Committee. At its one and only meeting, the group expressed sympathy with the objectives but a sense of futility in trying to orchestrate academic programming from a central vantage point. The strong feeling of the group was that academic innovations necessarily flow from individual creativity and not from a central planning entity.

Finally, an ad hoc group was assembled in August 2000 to brainstorm on the subject of "Academic Enhancement." This group consisted of the 10 people on campus most likely to have some existing knowledge or connections to the Olympics. After reviewing what the individual units were hoping to do, the focus of the discussion was on what more, if anything, could be done from a central point. The consensus of the group was that the only thing worth pursuing centrally would be creation of a Center, such as already existed in Sydney. Even this would be worth doing only if it would bring together a number of researchers on campus and could be funded with a minimal effort on the part of faculty (who are notoriously bad at fund-raising). The proposed entity should have a name and focus something like "Center for the Study of International Sports," broadening out from Olympic studies to deal with the socio-political aspects of sports, the mechanics and health implications of sports, and possibly event management. The group recognized that this activity would occur only if some faculty member took the initiative to make it happen. Although the idea remains feasible if a source of funding could be identified, no action has occurred on this as yet.

Meanwhile, a surprising fact of academic life surfaced. There was no existing policy mandating when faculty could schedule classes. The Registrar's Office pointed out that there were literally hundreds of different blocks of time used for classes throughout the week, and faculty began to question whether they could schedule classes during the Olympic Break period. At the behest of the Olympic Planning Committee, it was decided that specific policy guidance for classwork during the Break was required.

On October 3, 2000 a memo addressing 2002 Curriculum Planning was issued to all campus units from the Sr. Vice President of Academic Affairs and Director of Olympic Coordination (Appendix IIB2b). The memo encouraged units to factor the Games into academic planning for the 2001-2002 year. Specifically, the message set forth two guidelines and several possibilities for academic enhancement. The guidelines with respect to scheduling classes specified that no regular classes should be conducted on campus or at off-campus sites during the break but that off-campus components such as field work could continue even if they involved meetings between faculty and students. The suggestions for enhancement of academic offerings included increasing summer offerings, mini-courses in January, self-study projects over the Break, service-learning and other special courses designed to take advantage of the Olympic presence, and online course offerings.

Faculty and departments were also advised to modify courses and class syllabi to adapt to the 3-week break in February 2002. Individual course structures were always left to the departmental and instructor levels, but in this instance some centralized guidance may have been helpful. Everyone recognized that the best method of handling a 3-week break in rhythm would vary with the nature of the course (math or engineering could be very different from history or languages) as well as the personal predilections of the instructor.

The Council of Undergraduate Studies took responsibility for this topic with the objectives of first formulating advice to the academic units and then monitoring developments to provide feedback to the campus. Nothing much ever came of this initiative because faculty did not consult with the

Council. Two sources of feedback occurred during and after the Games. Several students complained that their instructors assigned “homework” during the Break; these students were told that assignments were the prerogative of the instructor.

The second feedback came in the form of a senior academic administrator’s reporting that she had “more than one end-of-semester conversations with faculty members that have stressed how disruptive to the educational process the Olympic break was, how much classes had to repeat, how hard it was to get students re-engaged with the course, etc.” On further inquiry to teaching faculty, the following pattern was observed. Those teaching graduate students said it was little problem. Those teaching undergraduates thought it was a serious problem for the students: “difficult to come back,” “lost stride,” “very long time without another break,” “even good students felt their grades would be lower.” Someone pointed out that learning to interrupt and resume work is a skill that graduate students have probably just learned better than undergraduates have. Another issue was the difficulty of having some activities compressed into the post-Games period that might normally be spread more over the whole semester. This affected assignments within classes, processes such as applications for and reviews of scholarships, and annual events such as lectures and special weeks or days.

Games-related courses either focused on the Games as subject material or involved direct interaction with the Olympic Winter Games activity in 2002. Pursuing Games-related courses potentially enhanced the academic program through Games connections, while possibly attracting students to the University. A handful of Games-related courses were offered in Spring 2002 and are described in Appendix IIB2b.

3. Academic Service Contracts

Some academic departments enhanced their programs through service arrangements with SLOC. Some of these will pay off in instructional impacts just as would any research or service project. All of these were arranged under the “Master Consulting Agreement.” (See p. 25 below.)

•Weather Prediction, Department of Meteorology

The Cooperative Institute for Regional Prediction (CIRP) coordinated the weather support activities provided by SLOC, the National Weather Service, and the KSL/NBC forecast team. In addition to weather support for the staging of the events, weather support was also required for public safety and health, transportation, emergency response, and security. Faculty in the Department of Meteorology began to help plan weather support requirements for the 2002 Games during 1996. CIRP received a total of \$1.3 million from the U.S. Congress during FY 1998-2001 to help prepare and support the operational forecast responsibilities of the Olympic Weather Support Team. To offer forecasts to competitors and the public, the Department of Meteorology installed 27 automated weather stations, designed by Campbell Scientific of Logan, Utah, at the five outdoor venues to monitor temperature, wind, humidity and precipitation. The weather support infrastructure developed for the Winter Olympics will have long-term benefits to the public. Improved access to weather information throughout the West and improved understanding of winter weather in complex terrain are examples of the Olympic weather support legacy.

The Olympic weather support project at the University of Utah contributes to the educational, research, and public service missions of the University. Some students were aides collecting weather

information at outdoor venues. Others contributed to research that expands our knowledge of winter weather.

- Drug Testing, College of Pharmacy

During non-Games times, the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) and the U.S. Anti-Doping Agency (USADA) oversee drug testing. During the competition period of the 2002 Games, a professor in the College of Pharmacy, also director of the Center for Human Toxicology, orchestrated the final test. After the medals were awarded, the gold, silver, and bronze medalists and two randomly selected participants from every competition were given drug tests. The University professor and his team organized the collection of the specimens, sent them to the International Olympic Committee (IOC) lab to be analyzed, and made sure that all results were reported to the IOC. The Professor of Pharmacy's involvement ran across a 3-year period, under a contract by which his salary was paid by SLOC. in proportion to the time commitment.

- Language Training: Department of Languages & Literature

Department of Language students and faculty helped resolve communication barriers by volunteering to interact with foreign guests.

- Volunteer Training, International Center

In the Fall of 2000, SLOC approached the International Center to design and implement a Cultural Awareness Training Module for volunteers for both the Olympic and Paralympic Games. The training was conducted in three 2.5-hour sessions; two sessions were attended by 400 volunteers for the Games and one by 200 volunteers for the Paralympics.

The experience at all three sessions was extremely positive for both presenters and volunteers. Comments after each session generally fell in the area of "this was the best training session we have had so far." Based on this successful experience, the Director of the International Olympic Committee will feature this project in their training portfolio.

An additional project with the Salt Lake Tribune was not as productive as had been hoped, although conceptually all involved were satisfied. The International Center identified and recruited about 30 students who followed Olympic news reports in their home country papers and then reported what was printed to a contact reporter at the Tribune. Reports were generally good and interesting but not as profuse as was anticipated. So instead of the anticipated daily or bi-weekly reports, eventually one final report for each country was provided to the Tribune.

- Geographic Information Science (GIS) or Digit Lab, Department of Geography

To supplement the transportation system of the Salt Lake Organizing Committee Accommodations function, the University Digit Lab utilized GIS technology in determining the time and distance from key hotels to Olympic venues. The Digit Lab also updated existing campus maps with new infrastructure associated with the Village and Stadium venues, as well as prepared an interactive map, featuring Games-related parking lot allocation on campus.

- International Sports Broadcasting, Department of Communication

The Department of Communication participated in the Broadcast Training Program (BTP) in

cooperation with International Sports Broadcasting (ISB), the host broadcaster for the 2002 Olympic Winter Games. Two of the three major training workshops were held at the University. About 248 students from six colleges and universities participated in these workshops. The over \$11,000 in fees paid by these participants to the Department were used to cover costs associated with workshops, purchase decorative pins for participants, purchase new equipment for the Telecommunication Laboratory and for other departmental needs. More students from the University's Department of Communication participated than from any other college or university. Students who successfully completed the program earned \$150-\$170 a day from ISB during the Games and gained real-life exposure to live event telecasting.

- Daily Utah Chronicle, Olympic Record

The Daily Utah Chronicle produced 29 editions of the Olympic Record for the Salt Lake Organizing Committee. The issues, which were 8 pages long and included color photos, mirrored the life in the village and spotlighted the athletes who lived there. The writers and photographers were students of the University of Utah. SLOC provided a designer and multiple editors. The 29 editions were produced consecutively starting the day the Olympic Village opened and concluded the day it closed. The stories were produced in both English and French to serve a wider audience. The Daily Utah Chronicle's 10 staffers also produced the Paralympic Record, which was 4 pages long, for 19 consecutive days. The staff had access to both the international and residential zones, moving freely except into eating areas and athletes' rooms. The student editor had control over story assignments and layout, while the SLOC editor had control over specific content to ensure that all Olympic contracts were upheld.

- Music Department, Olympic Spirit Band

Members of the University's Music Department were approached by SLOC to organize, train, and conduct a band that could appear at events and venues, either *en masse* or in smaller combinations. As discussions focused on the legal issues and responsibilities, it was decided that it would be better for this activity not to be an official University function but merely a professional activity of one Associate Professor in the Music Department. As it finally unfolded, the Olympic Spirit Band included 132 students from the state of Utah, including 72 University students.

4. Enrollment

It was difficult to speculate in advance with regard to the impact of the Games on enrollment. The closest corollary was Calgary in 1988, which experienced an increase during the Games. Georgia Tech experienced a downturn, but their entire campus was occupied by the Olympic Village.

The University of Utah experienced an increase for Fall Semester 2001 of 5.7% FTE compared to Fall 2000. Spring 2002 enrollment was 2.9% higher than Spring 2001. Factors in these increases probably include the appeal of Olympic activity on campus, normal growth patterns, and a downturn in the national and state economies affecting the job market.

C. Individual Opportunities

The 1990 Task Force Report "recommend[ed] that students be given as much information as

possible on jobs both paid and unpaid that may arise in conjunction with the Olympics.” The Senate debate showed that one of the two principal reasons for Olympic involvement would be the “international networking” opportunities for the University community. One early step in the process was the recruitment of a volunteer alumna who began in 1996 to make contacts and think of ways to involve students in SLOC programs. By 1998, this person became the Associate Director of 2002 Coordination and in 1999 was designated by SLOC to coordinate all internship offerings in its organization, regardless of the home base of the student, in return for which SLOC paid a portion of the support needed for that office. Another 3/4 time professional was added in 2000 to take on the specific task of Intern and Volunteer services. The final outcome of this activity was the placement of over 400 interns, 3000 volunteers, and an unknown number of students in paid positions with Games-related employers.

1. Internships

Internships can enrich a student’s life, provide valuable experience, and enhance career options after graduation. These objectives warranted special effort in promoting internships with SLOC and related organizations, but there were some initial questions regarding what constituted an internship and some legal issues. These ultimately were resolved as reflected in Appendix IIC1a.

We felt justified in providing a referral service to students outside the University, at least so long as the majority of students placed were from our campus. This approach cemented our relationship with SLOC and also provided one more mechanism by which our student interns had connections with students from other states and even other countries.

The majority of internships were unpaid rather than paid positions. Although no “internship” listing was accepted that was not deemed worthy of academic credit, it turned out that most students preferred not to pay the tuition to receive the credit – they just wanted the experience. Strong efforts were made to match the major of the student to the internship so that the experience was both integrated with the student’s academic program and productive to a career path. Many of the interns were hired for paid employment after the completion of the internship.

In the final analysis, it turned out that the major difference between an intern and volunteer was the level of commitment to the position. Interns usually worked 20 hours per week for three to six months, while “volunteers” worked far shorter periods of time in less intense settings. Most interns agree the time spent was valuable to them in terms of experience, networking, and resume value. The atmosphere of the Olympic aura and a vibrant international event should not be underestimated.

2. Volunteer Opportunities

The Salt Lake Organizing Committee planned to use approximately 20,000 volunteers during the 2002 Games and 6,000 during the Paralympics. The University set a goal of having at least 5000 of those volunteers be University faculty, staff or students. Recruitment for volunteers began in March of 2000 and continued until the fall of 2001. Training took place during most of 2001. Official Games volunteers were asked to make a commitment of 8 to 10 hour shifts for 17 days for the Olympics and 10 days for the Paralympics. Most actual days worked were less than that, but schedules will not be set until just before Games-time. Each volunteer was provided with a full uniform and numerous other benefits.

Because classes were not in session, some faculty members were able to volunteer during the Games. SLOC recruiters targeted University of Utah faculty as preferred volunteers, particularly to work in positions on the campus. Because the campus was open and operating throughout, nonexempt staff members who wanted to volunteer would need to use vacation leave or personal preference days. Although SLOC recruiters also targeted University of Utah staff as preferred volunteers, they were not selected to be official Olympic volunteers if they were not available for the stated time commitment.

With these issues in mind, 2002 Olympic Coordination at the University of Utah worked as a liaison with SLOC and the Salt Lake Convention and Visitor Bureau to create volunteer opportunities that allowed more flexible time commitments. One of these opportunities was the “Visitor Information Service” which provided information and assistance to spectators and other visitors. Requiring 10 four-hour shifts during the weeks the Olympic Village was open or over the period of the Cultural Olympiad, shifts were very flexible. Assignment varied more than at the competition venues because the Olympic Village was open 24 hours per day and the Cultural Olympiad extended before and after the Games with many events in the evening.

3. Student Volunteer and Employment Opportunities

Just as with internships, the University Administration believed participating as volunteers for the Games enhanced students’ experiences. Because classes were not in session, students who were not working full time were free to volunteer. SLOC recruiters viewed University of Utah students as preferred volunteers in many categories. In addition to the regular volunteer recruitment, a last-minute recruitment, aimed at students, took place in fall of 2001.

In addition, SLOC targeted University of Utah students as potential temporary paid labor during the Games. Some of the students were free to take paid jobs during the Games but not necessarily during the Paralympics.

4. Alumni Involvement

University of Utah College of Fine Arts alumni was represented at: 1) the Olympic Medals Plaza each night with performance by “Antigravity”, founded by University alumnus and 2) the Opening and Closing Ceremonies where performance and organization of some of the ice dancing elements were provided by alumnus of Modern Dance. The College of Engineering received national recognition for 2002 Games participation by engineering alumnus, M. Fuller, design of the cauldron and H. Van Boerum, luge. In addition, dozens of University alumni participated in the Torch Relay.

5. Additional Opportunities

Since 1987, the Lowell Bennion Community Service Center has been providing service opportunities to the students, faculty, staff, and alumni of the University of Utah. The staff and students of the Bennion Center had the opportunity to participate in two Olympic-related service projects. One was to assist SLOC in creating education awareness presentations to schools and various organizations on campus, as well as recruit individuals to be a costumed “mascots” for the Games. The second opportunity was involvement with the center for homeless individuals. A drop in volunteers for other projects was experienced by the Bennion Center and other volunteer organizations in the community as a result of volunteer interests in Olympic-related projects.

D. Public Information and Communications

2002 Olympic Coordination (2002 OC) and University Relations partnered to launch a major educational campaign to inform all our constituencies of the impacts of 2002. In general, University Relations was responsible for overseeing all media and external efforts regarding Games-related University plans and activities. This included press releases, media kits, neighborhood meetings (Community Forum), news/magazines feature stories, and other external promotional and informational efforts as needed. 2002 OC managed and coordinated internal communication regarding the 2002 Olympic Winter Games, which included brochures, website, department/college notices and update meetings.

The line between internal and external communications obviously could not be drawn in a hard and fast fashion because many efforts targeted multiple audiences. It was important for 2002 OC and University Relations to work in a cooperative venture. Two representatives of University Relations shared attendance at 2002 OC weekly staff meetings and the Olympic Operations Committee meetings. The Vice-President for University Relations was a member of the Olympic Planning Committee. In general, the two offices maintained constant communication to the maximum extent possible.

1. Internal Communication

Our information efforts started with the theme of “Business *Somewhat* as Usual” and shifted to “Educate. Participate. Celebrate.” The principal mechanisms for internal communications at the University were websites, brochures, meetings, and newsletter.

a. Websites

The Olympic Coordination website (www.utah.edu/2002) became available in late 1998. The University’s home page as well as a variety of other sites also carried information relevant to specific services and constituencies such as parking, student services and curricular information. OC began by attempting to develop and manage the website ourselves with assistance from Marriott Library staff. As we realized that the website would be a critical forum because of the complexity and rapid evolution of information, we invested in hiring web design skills from University Media Relations. Under their guidance, the website obtained a look and feel that we could then use in other publications to sustain identification with our audiences.

The University’s home page linked to an “intermediate page” which then linked to the OC website as well as to parking and transportation information. The OC website itself was organized both by topic and by audience (student, faculty or staff). The principal pages in each category are in Appendix IID1a. Topic categories included:

Overview (summary of key topics, 2002 Olympic Coordination staff contact information, committee rosters, history, parking overview map, pdf. version of brochures)

Parking (maps including road closures, a parking overview map, links to detailed parking availability by day, links to the Utah Transit Authority’s University-specific pages)

Opportunities (internship job descriptions database, volunteer applications, Games-Time Employment applications)

Calendar (2001-2002 academic year calendar, month-by-month campus events, and a “Weekly Highlights” page)

Campus Events (arts & cultural events and exhibits with links to their venues, information on the University’s Winterfest)

Academic Issues (Games-related courses, special involvement of academic departments in the Games, and guidelines for adapting to the unique 2002 Spring Semester conditions)

News & Publications (pdf versions of all printed brochures, articles, newsletters and other publications produced by the University, plus links to the two Salt Lake City newspapers’ Olympic coverage)

Venues (information on the Olympic & Paralympic Villages and Rice-Eccles Olympic Stadium)

Policies (Games-related policies such as staff-leave policy, rental policy, logo/marks usage, fundamental principles and 2002 Campus Master Plan)

b. Brochures

We produced two general brochures, one at the beginning of Spring Semester 2001 that summarized the content of the 2002 Campus Olympic Master Plan and one at the beginning of Fall Semester 2001 that served as a comprehensive (but brief) guide to campus for the Games period. An Arts & Culture brochure highlighted the University’s special Games-related exhibits and performances. Transportation and Parking Services also produced two brochures, the 2002 Commuter’s Survival Guide and the 2002 Health Sciences Survival Guide, which addressed all parking and transportation issues. The University enhanced the information in their brochures with SLOC publications as well as Salt Lake City’s Peak Experience Magazine. A collection of the University’s Olympic-related brochures are at Appendix IID1b.

c. Newsletters

Existing newsletters on campus were instrumental in disseminating information (FYI, UUSAC, Pulse, Community Forum). FYI was particularly helpful with a weekly feature box “Educate, Participate, Celebrate” that highlighted Games-related current events and important information for University employees.

d. Meetings

One truth of the modern world that we discovered is that electronic and printed information are worthless to people who do not read it. Nothing captures a person’s attention like face-to-face contact. Therefore, we held meetings with all constituencies to offer at least the chance of being face-to-face at least once with every one of our 40,000. constituents. This activity began in late 1999, intensified in Spring 2001 and peaked during Fall 2001. Initially, 2002 Olympic Coordination led presentation efforts with meetings at the departmental level (Spring 2001). In Fall 2001 leading up to the Games, 2002 OC was joined by Parking Services, Human Resources, Campus Safety & Security, the Associated Students of the University of Utah (ASUU) and Public Relations in presentation efforts. In addition to those meetings that we initiated, we received requests from a variety of quarters and chose a presented to match the requesting group and topic of interest. For example, ASUU provided presentations to student groups while Human Resources managers

attended to their assigned departments.

2. External Communication

University Relations both participated in the internal communication flow and orchestrated efforts to showcase the University and its experts, research and programs prior to and during the Olympics. Long-term benefits are difficult to assess at this point, but the short-term benefits are apparent. Interaction with media from around the world may result in long-term associations. The departmental staff gained invaluable experience increasing appreciation for this institution, improving communication methods with the media, and learning how to leverage major campus events to maximize media coverage and worldwide visibility.

Outreach meetings were also important in Fall 2001, focusing on religious groups, neighborhood coalitions and community councils. Along with Salt Lake City Corporation and SLOC, we hosted a Community Open House on October 2, 2001 featuring information booths of 50 Olympic-related entities, live entertainment, concessions, and a summary presentation. The event drew an audience of about 2,000 from the surrounding community.

In addition to the brochures, websites, and meetings mentioned earlier, the principal media initiatives leading up to 2002 were:

- involvement in the Utah Media Center (staffing a booth and participating in media conferences);
- producing and distributing media kits, experts lists, B-roll tapes, feature videos relating to University research activities;
- mailing 2500 postcards to reporters with contact information and reminders;
- placing monthly newspaper ads for campus events;
- extensive personal contacts with media including one trip to New York City to deliver media kits/tapes to key TV and print media covering the Olympics;
- partnerships with the Utah Travel Council, Salt Lake Convention & Visitors Bureau, Joint Information Center, Visitor Information Center, and National Weather Service.

The immediate results of this activity can be summarized with this data. During the two months leading up to and during the Games, an estimated 500 national and international reporters requested information from the PR Office. During February, the University was mentioned in 168 news stories at stations in the top 50 TV markets in the country, not counting local stations. By the second week of the Games, the university was mentioned on nearly 1,000 pages of the Lexis/Nexis periodical database research service. Reporters accessed our online “experts list” and contacted faculty on a myriad of topics. The University’s chief economist, for example, fielded 35 calls from national media dealing with the economic impacts of the Games. McNeil/Lehrer NewsHour produced a story about the impressive safety measures being implemented at the University. The largest TV networks from both Japan and Australia broadcast live from the University’s Marriott Library the days of the Opening and Closing Ceremonies. Various ABC and CBS affiliate stations did stories about University students and their involvement during the Games. A *New York Times* editor toured the campus and wrote a story on the numerous museum and cultural offerings available on campus to the public during the Games. Beta “B” roll video footage of the University’s scenic campus, Olympic

Village and Rice-Eccles Olympic Stadium were hand delivered to and used by reporters from CNN, ABC, CBS, NBC, PBS, Fox News and ESPN. National media used the University's videos that highlighted cutting-edge research and science projects. Five press conferences were scheduled to highlight University students who were Olympic athletes, the University's Meteorology Department, the David Eccles School of Business, the University's involvement with the Olympic Polyclinic, and the Marriott Library's ski archives. All received significant local and national media coverage, and some international attention from the foreign press.

E. Contract Negotiation and Management

1. The Process

Two management goals of the University created a healthy tension throughout the entire six-year period. First, it was important that normal decision processes not be disturbed by the unusual nature of the Olympic involvement. It was also clear, however, that an unusual level of attention should be brought to coordinating all decisions so that academic and administrative concerns were melded. The tension of these two goals benefitted the University by providing constant reminders of the interests that needed to be consulted in coming to agreement with SLOC and related organizations while making it clear that those persons who had jobs to do under those contracts were free to get the job done without micro-management from elsewhere.

In practical terms, as contract negotiations began, this meant that the coordinator was the lead negotiator along with a lawyer from the University's Office of Legal Counsel, with two very different groups behind them. One group consisted of those persons with expertise and the responsibility of carrying out the terms of agreements, including the managers of various facilities or programs that would be impacted. Every detail in the negotiation process needed to be informed by the needs of these managers, and it was important for the negotiator to understand the programs and facilities to the point of being able to carry out their interests.

The other group was the decision makers – University Trustees, President, Vice-President for Academic Affairs [VP(Acad)], and Vice-President for Administrative Services [VP(Admin)]. The VP(Admin) was the “chief contracting officer” for the University and set negotiating positions on all but the most significant matters, which would be forwarded to the President. The Trustees had already set the basic policy parameters when authorizing negotiations and were consulted on key issues prior to approving the major contracts. By the nature of universities, academic policy is more diffused. The VP(Acad) was consulted regularly along with the various bodies that make up the academic policy structure.

As the University dealt with SLOC, various state and local government agencies, and other organizations, it became helpful to explain our structure in the following terms. The University is a full-service municipality with 40,000 part-time inhabitants and highly decentralized decisional processes. That makes us a difficult entity with which to do business. The job of the Olympic coordinator was to provide a single point of entry for outsiders to this complex structure, and to obtain decisions from those who needed to make them.

This structure also worked to our advantage in the negotiation process for the same reason that

the negotiator in any system should not have final authority on important decisions. It is always helpful to be able to say that an important issue must be taken back to someone else, so that there is a buffer and an opportunity to strategize outside the presence of the other parties.

Note also needs to be taken of the role of the State Olympic Officer in contract negotiations. By statute, all Olympic-related contracts by state agencies were to be approved by the State Olympic Officer. In practice, this official entered into negotiations only when there were particularly delicate issues to be resolved. This role was very helpful in resolving some of the most difficult issues, such as the financing for new construction and building restoration. The State Olympic Officer was also instrumental as part of the overall team approach to implementing the operations of the Village and Stadium and served as an important liaison among state agencies and SLOC.

Negotiations for the Stadium contract formally began in November 1996 and were concluded with signing of the Agreement on July 28, 1997. Negotiations for the Village Agreement began in Fall 1997 and were concluded with a signed agreement on June 12, 1998.

Other contracts with SLOC included intellectual property arrangements, a master agreement for additional services, and facility rentals (all discussed below). We also entered into contracts with other entities regarding cultural exhibits and performances, as well as facility rentals with National Olympic Committees and private organizations hosting receptions. In all, there were a total of 38 separate contracts signed relating to the Olympic presence on campus, most of which were completed within the nine months preceding the Games. To manage this activity, we developed a distribution sheet to ensure that all relevant campus units were consulted before a contract was signed, and we also developed a database to track the status, parties, and subjects of contracts at all stages of their development. A truncated printout from the database is at Appendix IIE1 – Contract List.

2. Repair and Restoration of Facilities

An overarching issue with rental of facilities for a major event is the obligation of the user to return them in acceptable condition. Both the Village Agreement and Ceremonies Agreement stated that SLOC would return the premises “in clean, orderly condition and in good repair and working order, taking into consideration reasonable wear and tear.” Before discussing the contract issues, it is worth observing that the University is quite satisfied with the repair and restoration work that SLOC has accomplished. In a few instances, the University has chosen to complete the work itself on a deferred schedule to accommodate other projects in the same vicinity, and SLOC has made cash settlements to cover its portion of those projects.

Two issues deserve to be highlighted with regard to the contracts. First is the need for careful documentation of the existing conditions at the time that possession is transferred to the tenant. We did this very carefully with respect to the interiors of buildings and their contents. Every piece of furniture and equipment was inspected and labeled, most interiors were videotaped, and specific descriptions of identified damage or defects were written down.

In a few instances, however, the exteriors (both hardscape and softscape) were neither videotaped nor described in detail. Thus, when defects in sod or cracks in concrete appeared in Spring 2002, we had some differences of opinion over the degree of SLOC’s responsibility. Again, to the credit of the SLOC managers, they did not deny responsibility and questioned only the extent of their

responsibility. For one example, the largest parking lot (West Stadium lot) was severely impacted by SLOC temporary structures and construction work, but it had already been damaged to some extent by regular University use and further by TRAX construction. We ended up making a rough guess that the three sources of problems had been equally responsible, and SLOC made a cash payment of 1/3 the cost of resurfacing the lot. Our only recommendation in this regard is to carefully document exterior conditions as well as the interior conditions when entering into a major event of this nature.

Second, our contracts with SLOC included some interesting possibilities with respect to insurable events. Both contracts required SLOC to maintain \$100 million general commercial liability insurance and to make the University a named insured. The indemnity language included a statement that SLOC would indemnify the University against “claims by third parties arising from or in connection with the Organizing Committee’s activities under this Agreement.” This language should have provided coverage for injuries to third persons from a terrorist attack on the facility itself but would have left some argument with regard to whether an attack on another building on campus was “arising out of or in connection with” SLOC activities.

The more difficult insurance issue had to do with property insurance. Both parties carried property insurance for their own property. In the University’s view, the facilities became SLOC property during its period of exclusive use. But the Village Agreement contained language, inserted at the last minute as part of the Restoration requirements, stating that the University’s property insurance “shall be the intended recourse of the University for any damage or loss of any University Property,” except that “to the extent that the University’s per-occurrence deductibles . . . would [cause the University to] incur out-of-pocket costs, . . . then SLOC shall have Restoration obligations to restore all such damaged or lost University Property.”

Several meetings and exchanges of correspondence attempted to clarify these provisions. In the University’s view, they meant only that SLOC restoration obligation extended to all damage to the premises if the source of the damage was either a planned activity or a known source, but that the University’s insurance would cover insurable damage from unknown sources so long as SLOC paid the deductibles. In SLOC’s view, the language meant that any instance of damage could be referred to the University’s insurance and SLOC would have the choice of either paying the deductible or doing the repairs themselves. As events unfolded, we never had to resolve the difference because all damage was repaired by SLOC or its contractors and the premises were returned to the University in satisfactory condition. We only mention this issue to highlight the need for extreme care in drafting contracts of this magnitude and to reinforce the point that the informal methods of venue management were more important than the formal contract language in this situation.

3. Master Consulting Agreement

To avoid having to negotiate many similar contracts for services and take them through all the formal steps of contract approval, the University and SLOC entered into a “Master Consulting Agreement” to be the umbrella for services provided by University personnel. This agreement called for individual “Work Orders” to identify the specifics of work to be performed, the person(s) performing it, and payment terms.

Under this arrangement, the University provided services from these departments: Meteorology (Weather Forecasting), Pharmacy (Drug Testing), Olympic Coordination (Internship Services),

Modern Languages (some Language Training), and the Daily Utah Chronicle provided the Village newspaper.

4. Marks Usage Agreements

In two separate agreements, the University obtained rights to use protected marks belonging to SLOC, one providing for noncommercial use and the other for branded items for resale. Both agreements provided only the framework under which each specific proposed use would be approved.

Departments which created Games-related printed materials – such as newsletters, fliers, and invitations – including the 2002 Olympic Winter Games and 2002 Paralympic Winter Games logos and the official site designation language, were required to obtain SLOC approval. No use of a protected mark was to be initiated without prior approval for that particular use. Failure by any unit to follow this process may have cost the entire University the right to use SLOC marks. To facilitate approval, the Associate Director of 2002 Olympic Coordination worked with campus units as the single point of contact with SLOC.

“Co-branded” items, displaying both University and SLOC logos, fell into the following categories: 15 pins, 25 other three-dimensional items (clothing, banners, and even a bridge), 45 printed publications, 2 mastheads of continuing publications, 2 computer presentations, and 15 site designations with name and logo. There were many other uses of the word “Olympic” or “SLOC” within other publications, and each of those had to be reviewed carefully to avoid intellectual property violations (and in some instances to obtain approvals). There were 16 requests that were denied, although some of those were replaced with approved alternative uses of protected marks.

Although some units on campus resented the centralized processing of marks approvals, most understood the need for the process. Only one unit failed to cooperate and received a “cease and desist” notice from SLOC for using protected marks without authorization; this situation was resolved without significant loss of goodwill between the SLOC and the University. Most units on campus understood that the University was receiving permission to do things for which commercial entities were paying \$30 - 60 million dollars each (and we were being paid \$36 million by SLOC for use of the two venues). Under these circumstances, it was in our interests to monitor and police use of protected marks so that the permissions were not abused. As SLOC came to realize that the University could perform this function internally much more effectively than SLOC could from the outside, the SLOC staff came to trust our staff and to approve requests very promptly and efficiently. This was one of the most telling illustrations of the principle that the University benefitted from a cooperative professional attitude much more than could have occurred with an adversarial attitude.

5. Archives (Marriott Library)

The longest negotiation period occurred over the archiving of SLOC records and materials. Discussions began in early 1999 (coincidentally, just after the bid scandal broke in November 1998, increasing exponentially sensitivity regarding SLOC records) among a collection of entities interested in the historical record of the Games. The University’s Marriott Library had a pre-existing Ski Archives collection and a close connection with the Alf Engen Ski Museum. The initial discussions included the Utah Sports Authority and the Engen Museum, but it quickly became clear that the principal entities interested in long-term preservation of the record and having potential resources to manage the record were the University, Utah State Historical Society and State Archives.

One early thought was to divide materials so that “documents” would go to Marriott Library, photographs to State Historical Society, and artifacts to the Engen Museum. As it became apparent that there would be no new money available to support these collections, Marriott Library was the only entity capable of receiving all the materials, and an informal understanding arose that Marriott would receive all the materials and enter into cooperative arrangements whereby the Historical Society and Museum would use materials from the collection to mount exhibits when appropriate.

The contract between SLOC and the University was deferred over an extended period of time while discussions took place in other settings to attempt finding some funds to manage the archives. Marriott Library estimated that it would take 10 years to index all the materials in the ordinary course of business but that the job could be done in less than 5 years if \$500,000 could be found to pay additional staff. The contract was finally signed in October 2001, long after Marriott had already begun receiving materials from SLOC and placing them in storage facilities.

6. Cultural Olympiad and other Games-Related Exhibits

The Cultural Olympiad presented significant challenges for the University. There are several possible explanations. Even before there was a program or staff in place at SLOC, the University consulted with veterans of the Atlanta Games, who advised us to expect very little from this program because their experience was that only downtown locations in the heart of tourist paths would get any significant visitorship during the Games. Another factor was that the SLOC program was obligated to spread its largesse across a variety of Utah communities. And, finally, there is the sheer difficulty of planning and promoting an artistic event, particularly in the context of attention-grabbing sports events.

The most significant disappointment for the University was the collapse of a planned consortium exhibit from the seven leading museums of Western American art, which was close to fruition before the designated curator of the exhibit left his position to take a new job. And there were two exhibits at the University that could not be part of the official program because they had non-Olympic sponsors affiliated with them.

Despite these difficulties, our museum and theater directors felt the necessity to pursue cultural opportunities related to the Games. The University successfully completed six separate contractual arrangements for Cultural Olympiad listings, including substantial financial support in a couple of instances, and hosted several other cultural offerings that were not affiliated with SLOC. The entire cultural program of the University is described below at p. 29.

7. Facility Rentals

All units on the University of Utah campus were informed not to pursue rental agreements related to the Games without working through 2002 Olympic Coordination. Tradition on this campus was for each building manager to act autonomously with regard to renting space to outside organizations. In this instance, however, the University was committed to an array of Games-related obligations which would stretch the capacity of various infrastructure and support systems on campus. Potential financial gains as well as programmatic opportunities anticipated from rental agreements were weighed against these concerns. Under these circumstances, it was necessary that issues be addressed on a campus-wide scale.

When a unit was approached by an outside entity interested in renting a space, the renting unit contacted either Administrative Services or 2002 Olympic Coordination. Some units preferred to do their own negotiations, while others enlisted the assistance of 2002 OC at this stage. A form Facilities Use Agreement was available and served as the model for all Games-related rentals. If negotiations were successful, the Facilities Use Agreement was circulated through an internal approval process, which called for approvals from the following: Plant Operations, Public Safety, Parking and Transportation, Environmental Health and Safety, Fire Management and 2002 Olympic Coordination. The VP for Administrative Services signed all leases after receiving assurance from Olympic Coordination that all issues had been approved by the responsible persons. This process assured that all operational concerns were addressed on a campus-wide scale.

All entities doing business with the University at Games-time were alerted to advertising and signage restrictions imposed as a result of University contracts with SLOC.

Predictably, a few campus entities were mildly resistant to this process, viewing it as an intrusion into their autonomy. As matters unfolded, however, most campus entities came to realize the need for coordination with public safety and plant operations. Only one entity actively resisted and failed to cooperate. This entity is one that has a facility adjacent to, but slightly separated from, the campus and also has a corporate existence within state government. Even that entity, however, eventually complied with the requirements because of the necessity to have approvals from the State Olympic Officer and SLOC.

One of the more entertaining issues of the Olympic experience related to alcohol, or what came to be known as the “A word.” Many of the building managers on campus had been interested for years in being allowed to permit outside organizations to serve alcohol at receptions or events in rented space. Although state law generally prohibited serving or consuming alcohol in a “public building,” the statutes specifically provided that when a building was rented to a third party for a “proprietary event” (meaning one with no admission fee), then that portion of the building would not be considered a “public building” for purposes of the alcohol rules. The issue of alcohol on campus thus was more a policy choice than a legal matter.

As pressure mounted for alcohol to be served at Olympic-related receptions and events on campus, it was decided to allow this under the conditions that the event be related to the Games, and at a time and place when no students were likely to be in the area. Entities receiving this permission were required by contract to comply with all applicable state laws (meaning essentially that their caterer obtained a temporary service permit) and to provide assurances of adequate liability insurance coverage with the University as a named insured. Under these conditions, some half-dozen events with alcohol occurred on campus during the Games and all went smoothly with no public political fallout. The question for the University administration now is whether to formalize this policy or leave it to informal processes as other requests emerge.

8. Equipment Purchases

Part of the Olympic legacy for a host city may include high-tech or large equipment that is purchased or received as VIK from suppliers of the organizing committee, and which can be left with the venues for a fraction of its retail cost. There are many small items that have been purchased

directly from SLOC at the Stadium and Village, major equipment purchases would require three-party agreements among the organizing committee, the venue, and the supplier. The reason for this is that a major piece of equipment would have to fit specifications of the venue for long-term use and would probably include negotiated warranties and service provisions.

As part of the Ceremonies Agreement, York supplied HVAC equipment for the Stadium pursuant to its VIK arrangements with SLOC. The only other major purchase in which the University participated was telecommunications cabling and hardware that were installed in the new student housing. A third contract was negotiated among the University, SLOC, and Panasonic for a new video board for the Stadium, but this never materialized for a variety of cost and technology reasons.

F. Campus Atmosphere

The campus prior to the Games was bustling, and parking was at a premium. During the Games, it was a relaxed environment but the presence of the Games was visible.

1. Arts & Culture Opportunities

The University promoted a series of special cultural events and activities on campus, many of which were listed with the Cultural Olympiad. Although planners from prior Olympics, notably Atlanta, warned us not to expect many visitors to the cultural events, University planners believed that it was important to “put on a good show” even if the only audience were ourselves. To some extent, we were successful in reaching out at least to the local community, but the principal beneficiaries of these efforts probably were our own students, staff, and faculty.

At least one of our museums has observed that its visitorship was down significantly during February 2002 from its normal February levels, both because of perceptions that the campus would be difficult to access and because the local public schools held no field trips during the Games. Their visitorship for the spring period following the Games has risen as schools try to squeeze in their field trips, thus placing heavy demands on staffing and scheduling.

- Nine special Games-related art & cultural exhibits and performances, centered around Presidents Circle and the corridor from Olpin Union to the Utah Museum of Fine Arts: (Seven of the nine special Games-related art & cultural events at the University were official components of the Salt Lake Organizing Committee’s Cultural Olympiad.)
 1. *Athletes in Antiquity Works from the Collection of the J. Paul Getty Museum* at the Utah Museum of Fine Arts, February 1 through April 15, 2002. The art and artifacts illustrating the ancient Greeks’ cultural legacy and its effect on the Western world were discovered in this fascinating exhibit, from the J. Paul Getty Villa in Malibu, California. This exhibit was steeped in the rich history of the Olympic Games and was supported by the S.J. and Jessie E. Quinney Foundation. Admission was free.
 2. *Utah’s First Nations: Peoples of the Great Basin and Colorado Plateau* at the Utah Museum of Natural History, January 18 through July 29, 2002. Goshute, Navajo, Northwestern Shoshoni, Paiute, San Juan Southern Paiute, Skull Valley Goshute, Ute, White Mesa Ute. Eight distinctive Native nations have lived for centuries on the land that

- rests within the present-day borders of Utah. It is a richly varied landscape of sagebrush, red rock and mountain forests that continues to challenge and sustain its Native inhabitants. Within these ancestral homelands, traditions persist and culture endures. Utah's First Nations took visitors on a journey that celebrated the unique and individual cultures of Utah's diverse tribes. The beauty and utility of traditional arts, the power of the spoken word and evocative images of the past and present will tell stories of historical events, contemporary concerns and future goals of each tribe.
3. *THE NAZI OLYMPICS Berlin 1936* at the Marriott Library September 12, 2001 through March 22, 2002. The National Holocaust Museum presented its traveling exhibit on the 1936 Olympic Games at the University's Marriott Library. In January 2002, the Exhibit embraced a local exhibit, "A Homeland in the West: Utah Jews Remember", honoring Utah's enduring Jewish heritage. This element of the exhibit was presented by the University's Marriott Library, Common Ground Productions, United Jewish Federation of Utah and the 2002 Cultural Olympiad. Admission was free.
 4. *Keepers of the Flame* at Kingsbury Hall, February 4 & 12-14, 2002. For four nights at Kingsbury Hall, Utah contemporary musicians, Sam Cardon and Kurt Bestor, paid a musical tribute to the Olympic Movement with *Keepers of the Flame*. Cardon and Bestor created musical sound tracks illuminating Olympic athletes' stories. Guest Olympians narrated the concert while filmmaker Bud Greenspan provided a backdrop of Olympic film footage. This event celebrated the men and women who have made the Games the world's greatest gathering. Emmy Award-winners Cardon and Bestor have composed music for the 1988 Olympic Winter Games, National Geographic and the IMAX films *Mysteries of Egypt* and *Treasure of the Gods*. Tickets ranged from \$25.00 to \$65.00.
 5. *Yesterday's Tomorrows: Past Visions of the American Future* at the Bailey Exhibition Hall at the Graduate School of Architecture, Nov. 12, 2002-Feb. 2002. The University of Utah's Graduate School of Architecture and the Utah Humanities Council were proud to host this exhibit prepared by the Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition Service. From ray guns to robots, nuclear powered cars to Atom-Bomb house, the exhibit displayed predictions and inventions that went awry and helps us understand the values and hopes Americans hold and have held about the years to come. Admission was free.
 6. *The Cowboy Way: Architecture, Life & Myth on the San Jacinto Ranch, Elko County, Nevada*, at the Bailey Exhibition Hall at the Grad. School of Arch., Jan. 7-Mar. 1, 2002. In conjunction with the traveling Smithsonian exhibition, the Graduate School of Architecture together with the Utah Humanities Council also presented *The Cowboy Way*, a Western Regional Architecture Program exhibition. Viewers experienced western vernacular architectural endeavors of the past as well as explored the connection the Nevada landscape has to the myth of the cowboy. Admission was free.
 7. *Children's Dance Theatre: In concert with Pete Seeger*, at the Capitol Theatre, February 11 & 22-23, 2002. The Pete Seeger and University of Utah's Children's Dance Theatre performances were representative of quintessential American art/folk music; designed to appeal to a broad audience, easily understood by all ages and with music that celebrates Americana. The performance included folk music, some "sing-along"

opportunities for the audience, newly choreographed works by the faculty and dancers of CDT, and the music and voices of Pete Seeger, Tao Rodriguez & The Mammals, and local musicians Julie Mark, Maggie Beers and James Morris. Tickets for performances did not exceed \$25.00 per ticket.

8. *Game Face: What does a female athlete look like?* at Ray Olpin Student Union Building, January 28 through March 29, 2002. A 100-plus photo collection featuring women in all sports, a celebration of everyday triumphs of the female athlete. Curators Jane Gottesman and Geoffrey Biddle created this wonderful exhibit, which opened in July 2001 at the Smithsonian in Washington D.C. The University of Utah's Women's Resource Center welcomed the exhibit as part of its 30th Anniversary and in honor of Women's History Month. Admission was free.
9. *Flor y Canto (Flower and Song)* at the Museum of Fine Arts, February 9-21, 2002. The (old) Museum of Fine Arts housed a traveling exhibit from the Mexican Cultural Institute featuring 35 pieces by 16 contemporary Mexican artists. The pieces displayed the artists' sensitivity, impressions and sentiment toward femininity. Each piece reflects one of four subthemes – passion, pain, joy or life & death. The exhibit will first be shown in the United States and will then travel to other countries. It is significant, not only because it is a sample of contemporary art that showcases new trends in art in Mexico, but also because it is an effort to present a new and different image of Mexico to the world. Admission was free.

Some of the museums and other exhibit venues would advise those considering similar pursuits to consider costs and benefits very carefully before pursuing involvement in the Cultural Olympiad. Although the academic value of the exhibits is unquestionable, some interruption in usual operations can be expected due to the intense nature of hosting such events. Time lines are condensed, organizing committee officials' and sponsoring entities can be demanding and departmental staff may be pushed beyond their usual capacities. Despite these difficulties, most of those who hosted arts & cultural events agree that the experience, was worth the opportunity to be involved with a unique element of an international arts festival.

2. Decorations and the 2002 Winter Festival

The University, led by Student Affairs, Human Resources, and University Relations attempted to promote a "festival grounds" or "gathering place" for our staff and students prior to and during the Games. It was appropriate to expend some resources for this effort for at least two reasons: to reward our staff who were required to perform their normal work under what were occasionally difficult circumstances, and to assist our staff in being knowledgeable and cheerful hosts to international visitors.

The core of the Festival Plaza was the corridor from the Museum of Fine Arts to Olpin Union, festooned with "Educate, Participate, Celebrate" banners. The Union provided large screen television coverage through the cable networks, but we rejected the idea of attempting live feed from the venues because the difficulty was not matched by likely benefits (in fact, some supervisors worried that live coverage of events would draw staff away from work assignments to an undue extent). Winterfest 2002 succeeded in the following events:

- Snow Daze: Held on January 23, this outdoor event featured an ice sculpture competition and timed relays in the snow. Participants organized themselves into teams of five and the best combined score from all events earned a MPS or DVD player. The team's sponsoring University department also won a free party in the Union Recreation Center. Drawing for the University Medals Night at SLOC's Olympic Medals Plaza.
- Village Tours: To help facilitate positive feelings about the upcoming Games, 2002 OC negotiated with SLOC Village officials in organizing tours of the exclusive Village site before opening to athletes, on the condition that ONLY University-affiliated individuals would attend. To ensure this requirement was met, a University identification card was required to obtain a ticket. The tickets were free and only one was given out per ID. The hour-long tours were held every half-hour on January 17 from 2:00 until 5:30 p.m.
- Essay Contest: In March 2002, all students, staff, and faculty were invited to compete in an essay contest describing or memorializing the Games experience. Some 37 entrants submitted essays, and a highly distinguished panel of faculty judges chose the three winners. A full volunteer uniform and other prizes were awarded at a luncheon to which all entrants were invited.

SLOC decorated the two venues with theme materials and provided street banners for the approaches to the venues. In addition, SLOC allowed the University to purchase official "Look" banners to install on light poles belonging to us. The University produced its own "Educate, Participate, Celebrate" banners, although ultimately the State reimbursed most of the expense of decorating the campus.

In retrospect, it is likely that the tone we struck was just about right. Perhaps the campus could have been more festive with more visitors, but it is clear that the bulk of "gathering" took place in the heart of downtown Salt Lake City. Even the official City square suffered from lack of visitors, and it was only a couple of blocks from the center of activity. The almost universal sense of those who were on campus during this time is that it was relaxed yet reflective of the presence of a major international event in our community.

The University did experience a great deal of indirect visitorship to one particular Olympic icon, the 2002 Olympic Cauldron. This structure, placed at the South end of Rice-Eccles Olympic Stadium, drew thousands of visitors daily, particularly in late afternoons and early evenings during the Games. Individuals arrived at the University TRAX station, in cars, and on foot, eventually requiring a portion of 500 South to be closed. The University will retain the Cauldron and currently has plans, awaiting funding and construction of an appropriate commemorative setting, to place it on the Stadium grounds near its original site.

III. The Venues

A. Rice-Eccles Olympic Stadium

Under an agreement dated July 28, 1997, the University provided Rice-Eccles Stadium and several associated parking lots for use as the Olympic Stadium for Opening and Closing Ceremonies of the Olympics and Opening Ceremony of the Paralympics. Under the original agreement, the University would receive \$8 million in April 2002 for use of these facilities. (See Appendix IIIA – Ceremonies Executive Summary)

Two formal Amendments to the Ceremonies Agreement proved to be necessary. The first was done in conjunction with the Village Agreement as part of the financing through a public bond offering for the construction of new student housing. The First Ceremonies Amendment deferred the \$8 million payment to January 2, 2003, with interest making the total payment \$8,345,000. At the same time, other documents gave the University a security interest in future revenues of SLOC.

The Second Amendment to the Ceremonies Agreement completely reworked the use of parking lots and adjacent buildings. It was completed on December 12, 2001, and included a very detailed matrix outlining 26 different use periods for various parking lots. In net effect, the University ended up with more parking spaces than under the original agreement, but SLOC obtained more usable spaces for the periods of time that the Ceremonies production staff needed them.

In addition to the two formal amendments, a system was worked out for processing minor changes. A form for “Request for Additional Services” allowed SLOC to identify services that they needed from the University and for the University to indicate the amount to be paid for those services. When these forms were signed by responsible parties, they acted as invoices and records of the goods and services provided. This system worked well and contributed to the strong working relationships between the SLOC venue team and the University management.

Major impacts of the Olympic Stadium flowed from use of University parking lots and closure of South Campus Drive. Areas between the Einer Neilson Field House and Rice-Eccles Stadium were used for temporary seating from October/November 2001 to March 2002. Most of the West Stadium lot was taken up with temporary structures in January and much of March 2002. The five additional parking lots closest to the Olympic Stadium were partially occupied by SLOC during the Games (2/8/02 - 2/24/02), although University employees were able to use most of those lots on days without official events. Most other parking lots on campus were available for shared SLOC and University use, which easily accommodated all faculty and staff during the Games. The Ceremonies Agreement sets out the basic terms and conditions under which the University of Utah leased Rice-Eccles, along with associated parking lots and related facilities, to SLOC for use as the Olympic Stadium in 2002. The period of SLOC’s occupancy began on 11/25/01 extending until 4/15/02 for the Stadium with a variety of shorter periods for various parking lots.

The University provided electrical power and other utilities to the full capacity of our systems in the Stadium. Snow removal consisted of completely clearing facilities and parking lots at the time they were turned over, and then ordinary and customary practices were observed (except that on event days, SLOC designated priorities for assuring access to the Stadium area). Maintenance of the Stadium “in good repair and working order” was provided by the University with some dedicated staff, but SLOC was responsible for unusual needs occasioned by its uses.

The University agreed to provide a “clean venue,” which means no visible advertising or trade marks, either on the Stadium or the rest of campus. Trade names throughout the rest of the campus were permitted to the extent that they represented our normal and customary identification of goods and services, such as in the Bookstore or food service facilities.

In the six months leading up to and during the Games, operations of the Stadium & Tower were gradually transferred to SLOC, and SLOC took formal possession immediately after the last football game on November 24, 2001. Due to the massive load-in and setup required for the Ceremonies, stadium and tower events could not be scheduled during the Holiday Season, which had some negative impacts from the loss of regular reception and meeting business in the Tower. These losses were more than offset by the gain to the facility. Again, success of the Ceremonies was attributable in large part to the excellent cooperation that existed among University staff, SLOC, and UPOSC.

B. Olympic and Paralympic Villages

The 1990 Task Force Report had been based on use of existing residence halls on campus along with the Student Union and portions of the College of Health’s classroom and recreational buildings (the HPER Complex). This would have severely impacted the main part of the campus. During the intervening years, two events coalesced. Student Affairs commissioned studies that indicated increasing need for student on-campus housing, and the United States Army experienced decreasing use for facilities in adjacent Fort Douglas. In 1991, the University acquired 51 acres of the Fort Douglas facility, which was listed as a National Historic Landmark and included 40 historic buildings. The University decided by 1996 that it would like to build new student housing on this site and to incorporate the historic buildings into a “living-learning complex.”

To provide an Olympic Village completely within the Fort Douglas area, however, required more housing than could be constructed on the 51 acres. Negotiation of the Village Agreement therefore was accompanied by negotiations with the Army to acquire an additional 12 acres. This acquisition was concluded in December 1997.

Under an agreement dated June 12, 1998, the University provided housing and service buildings to the Salt Lake Organizing Committee (SLOC) for the Olympic Village. The Olympic Village accommodated roughly 3,500 athletes and officials, and a section of the site housed 1,100 athletes and officials for the Paralympic Winter Games. All of the 70-acre Olympic Village was within the historic area of Fort Douglas and its adjacent student housing. (See Appendix IIIB – Village Executive Summary)

For the most part, the Olympic Village was isolated from, and had little impact on, the rest of the campus. Other than the Annex-HPER parking lot, most of which was in SLOC’s possession from January through March, very few University functions or facilities were located in the Olympic Village area. Vehicular access to most of the campus was not impeded by Olympic Village operations. Access to the Medical Center was open to the public on North Campus Drive and Wasatch Drive including South Medical Drive. Students who needed on-campus housing during Spring Semester were accommodated in the original residence halls; student meal plans were effective during this time in the Union dining.

The Olympic Village consisted of newly-constructed facilities as well as existing historic structures. The new housing development had a total project cost of \$120 million, financed through a combination of a revenue bond and a \$28 million user fee from SLOC.

Design work for the new student housing occupied a great deal of time for about six University employees during 1997 & 1998. SLOC Village staff were closely involved in all phases of the project, attempting to strike a balance between the requirements of IOC specifications and the needs of the University. The University consistently stated that we would incur no expense for Olympic needs that did not also serve the needs of our students or conference users of the facilities. The only areas that presented any difficulties were the number and precise design of bathrooms, but the final configuration provides the University with one of the most efficiently equipped facilities for student and conference space in the country.

The basic philosophies of student housing design flowed from trying to take advantage of the historic setting of Fort Douglas. Two themes emerged. One was having the new structures complement the existing structures, blending elements of the original rather than attempting to match them. The other theme drew on the existing structures to create “neighborhoods” of student housing so that students could be grouped for living arrangements with others of similar age and interests.

Portions of the housing were occupied in Fall 1999 and the remainder by Fall 2000. The University also invested \$8 million in refurbishment of the houses on historic Fort Douglas Officers Circle, the Officers’ Club, Post Theater, Post Chapel, and the Commanders’ House along with a reproduction of the original Bandstand. Officers Circle was the International Zone of the Olympic Village, providing services for athletes and officials such as a bank, post office, convenience store, hair salon, television room, coffee shop, international calling center and World Wide Web access center.

The University provided the Olympic Village with its standard level of services, resources and staffing as normally provided during campus operation. SLOC augmented these activities to meet the enhanced needs of the Olympic Village. SLOC was also responsible for temporary facilities added to the complex such as office space for the National Olympic Committees and a main dining hall with seating for 600.

SLOC took possession of the site on January 9, 2002. Portions were returned by March 2 and the remainder of the site was used until March 27, 2002 for the Paralympic Village. The Village Agreement provided for a series of “Supplemental Plans,” in which the parties would agree to details regarding such matters as staffing, construction of temporary improvements, and restoration of the premises. As events unfolded, a cooperative informal approach to these issues proved to be more productive than formal written plans.

The security fence was placed according to a Security Plan developed by UOPSC and the Secret Service, but the U’s approval was essential prior to placement of the fence. As discussed below, the fence construction proved to be a minor stumbling block because of a lack of direct linkage between the fence contractor and either SLOC or the University. (See p. 40)

One more agreement was negotiated with SLOC Village for use of three of the Officers’ Circle buildings as office space beginning in the summer of 2001. This arrangement proved extremely beneficial for both parties, placing the two staffs within yards of each other, giving SLOC Village

staff full familiarity with the site before taking exclusive possession, and allowing them to have daily access for advance preparation work without unduly interfering with University functions.

All other requests for goods and services were tracked by SLOC and University staff members with the explicit understanding that only designated persons could agree to provide or to pay for additional goods and services. Only one item was transacted with the formality of the “Request for Additional Services” form, and that was the provision of shuttle bus service in the Village by the University. It was critically important that some system be in place, either by forms or detailed tracking, to ensure that no dispute arises later over whether particular goods or services were authorized and agreed for payment.

C. Polyclinic and Medical Services

As part of the Olympic Village Agreement, the University agreed to provide a facility within the Village suitable for use as the “Polyclinic,” a multi-purpose acute and emergent care facility available to residents and staff of the Olympic Village. Under an agreement dated October 21, 1998, the University of Utah Medical Center staffed and equipped the Polyclinic as well as first aid stations for other Olympic events held on campus. (See Appendix IIC – Medical Services Executive Summary) Although Intermountain Health Care was the medical services provider for the 2002 Games, the University remained responsible for medical services on its campus while building stronger links throughout the world-wide network of sports medicine. In addition, one member of the Pharmacy faculty served as the Director of Doping Control for SLOC, a role which should contribute to even further international networking and exposure.

The Olympic Polyclinic began operations at noon on January 29, 2002 and ceased operations at noon on February 26, 2002. It operated 24 hours per day for 29 days. The Paralympic Polyclinic began operations at noon on March 1, 2002 and ceased operations at noon on March 19, 2002. It operated 24 hours per day for 19 days.

The Polyclinic occupied 840 square meters (9,000 square feet). According to IOC guidelines, the minimum requirement for a Winter Olympic Polyclinic is 500 square meters (5,300 square feet). The additional space was necessary to accommodate digital radiography equipment, onsite laboratory services, adequate staff work space, and sufficient space for patient care services. It is difficult to imagine using a smaller space for this operation.

The Polyclinic space included a waiting room, 2 reception/check-in desks (1 for the main clinic and a separate one for physical therapy), a data entry room, a preliminary consulting room, a conference room, a medical records storage room, an administrative office, a large triage/treatment room (with 3 exam tables), laboratory, pharmacy, 2 eye exam rooms, nurses station, 5 multi-function exam rooms (including 1 with a radiology PACS viewing station), digital radiography room, 2 radiology consultation and dictation rooms, 2 dental chairs, dental panorex x-ray, dental work room, office for the IOC Medical Commission, physical therapy treatment room, physical therapy fitness room, 3 unisex lavatories, 1 men’s lavatory, 1 women’s lavatory, staff break room, and extensive storage space. In addition, there was a mobile MRI trailer, a large storage trailer and a medical waste disposal container just outside the Polyclinic.

The space was temporarily converted from meeting and conference rooms in the lower level of the University of Utah Guest House, a hotel and conference facility. Following the Paralympics, the space was restored to its original configuration. The University of Utah Hospitals and Clinics assumed responsibility for the cost of construction and restoration of the Polyclinic space.

The Polyclinic was staffed with a mix of salaried personnel and volunteers. The salaried personnel were temporarily reassigned from the University of Utah Hospitals and Clinics to work in the Polyclinic instead of their regularly assigned shifts. This arrangement resulted in a very stable workforce. There were a few individuals who called in sick or missed a shift due to scheduling changes that were not sufficiently communicated, but overall the clinic experienced no attrition or significant “no shows.”

The salaried personnel, who received their usual wages through the University of Utah Hospitals and Clinics, included medical program assistants, nurses, pharmacists, physical therapists, laboratory technicians and radiology technologists. Physicians were in large part volunteers recruited from the University of Utah and the Salt Lake VA Medical Center. Other physicians were recruited from the community and other parts of the country as needed.

The primary administrative responsibilities were covered by the Administrative Director, Venue Medical Officer (Medical Director), Deputy Venue Medical Officer (Deputy Medical Director), Venue Medical Supervisor, and Assistant Venue Medical Supervisor. This leadership team provided 24-hour support for the Polyclinic, as well as an on-site presence from 0700-2400.

The majority of supplies and equipment at the Polyclinic were loaned or donated. Official SLOC sponsors and suppliers provided most items, but a substantial amount of equipment was borrowed from the University of Utah Hospitals and Clinics and its affiliates. General medical supplies (consumables and some durable goods) were provided by Allegiance (a subsidiary of Cardinal Health, Inc.), pharmaceuticals came from Cardinal Health, Inc., the digital radiography equipment was donated and installed by Eastman Kodak, the MRI trailer was provided by GE Mobile Medical Systems in conjunction with Eastman Kodak, the dental Panorex was provided by Instrumentarium in conjunction with Eastman Kodak, and the exam tables and exercise equipment were provided by Dynatronics (in conjunction with Allegiance). Patterson Dental worked with several suppliers to obtain dental equipment and provided the technical expertise to install and maintain the dental equipment.

The Moran Eye Center at the University of Utah Hospitals and Clinics provided the eye examination equipment. Associated, Regional and University Pathologists (ARUP) provided the laboratory equipment, staff, and reagents. The University of Utah Hospitals and Clinics provided a courier system between the Olympic Village and the University Hospital, as well as all other supplies and equipment that were unavailable through the sources above.

There were a total number of 2,098 visits to the Olympic Polyclinic, although this does not include all laboratory and pharmacy visits. Medical encounter forms were filled out on 1,884 patients. During the Games, typically 70-120 patients were seen per day. Athletes represented the most frequently seen group of patients, at 39% of total visits. Although the morning hours were busiest, there was a fairly constant flow of patients throughout the day. Alpine skiing generated the most athlete visits. Primary care saw the greatest number of patients, followed closely by Musculoskeletal

Services and Physical Therapy. Sixty-nine percent of patients were male.

Paralympics: 537 patients were treated in the Paralympic Polyclinic. During Games time, typically 30-50 patients were seen per day. Athletes represented the most frequently seen group of patients, at 33% of total visits. Although the morning hours were busiest, there was a fairly constant flow of patients throughout the day. Primary care saw the greatest number of patients, followed closely by Musculoskeletal Services.

Johann Koss, M.D. (former Olympian and delegate on the IOC Athletes Commission) reported to the IOC Medical Commission in February 2002 the following: “There’s never been, in my experience, a better appearing or functioning Polyclinic in any Games. Their leadership, the quality of the medicine being practiced and the warmth and generosity of their staff have been absolutely outstanding.”

IV. Unit Impacts

A. Plant Operations

Plant Operations generally is responsible for servicing and maintaining facilities on campus. In addition to maintaining normal levels of service across campus, this department provided essential support in the preparation and maintenance of venues and corresponding infrastructure. The assignment of personnel within Plant Operations was heavily impacted by the Games, a reality that was justified by the necessity of making the Olympic operations flow smoothly while keeping the rest of the campus up and operating, in other words the necessity of absorbing a major international event within our normal operation. The following chart breaks down the percentage of time, number of employees and description of Games-related assignments found in Plant Operations:

Percentage of time	No. of Staff	Description of Games-related Assignments
less than 25 %	500	Occasional cleanup responsibility
25 % to 50 %	20-50	Setup for the Olympics, utilities work, maintenance support on University assets inside venues, preparing campus generally.
50 % to 75 %	10-20	Same as preceding, except more intensively. Also, more in-depth planning activities for events and restoration
75 % to 100 %	10	Planning, financial coordination, design issues, restoration, and other coordination

Normal University service levels were either not impacted (except on closure days, of course), or positively impacted. For instance, custodial groups were able to perform certain services during

the extended spring break. In some cases, response time was delayed because of the rerouted traffic flows and security measures that were implemented for extended periods of time. Although more employees took leave time than normal for the period, this did not seem to have a significant impact on our ability to do our work.

For other units, most specifically the Electric Shop, Plumbing, and snow removal crews, alternative scheduling and overtime compensation had to be initiated to accommodate Olympic activities. A number of improvements in preparation for the Games inherited a more accelerated schedule than originally planned. This, in turn, compromised both operating budgets as well as work priorities. In some cases, burdens resulted from oversights in the development of the formal agreements between SLOC and the University. The budget, employee morale problems, and Olympic-related costs were also significant issues experienced in this department.

A significant burden arose on some occasions from a lack of coordination between key functions within SLOC, resulting in certain tasks' being completed on an inappropriate schedule, or to the wrong design, or not identified/completed at all until the eleventh hour. This caused avoidable waste on both sides. Furthermore, there were some problems with SLOC staff and contractors working directly with individual staff members or shops, when originally, specific channels had been designated. This often compromised relationships and agreements set forth in planning phases, and also convoluted the accounting and billing for these jobs.

Although their involvement at times was consuming and challenging, many individuals within the department welcomed a variance in traditional "maintenance" responsibilities and the benefits resulting from their involvement. One of the major benefits was the examination and implementation of drastic improvements in the University emergency operations planning, and all the facets thereof. In addition, paths of communication, cooperation, and comradery all improved as a result of involvement. Furthermore, as some members of staff were called upon to lend substantial portions of their time to Olympic planning, other individuals were given the opportunity to practice extra responsibility and leadership. Physical benefits resulted from the improvements that were implemented in preparation for the events, a number of which were left behind, either at reduced cost or no cost.

B. Public Safety

The responsibility for law enforcement on the University of Utah campus rests with the University Police Department (Department of Public Safety). All property owned, operated, or controlled by the University is under the primary jurisdiction of the University Police Department and all crimes in campus facilities must be reported to the University Police Department.

Public safety efforts related to the 2002 Olympic Winter Games were coordinated by the Utah Olympic Public Safety Command (UOPSC), which was created by statute in 1998 to include representatives of local, state and federal agencies To coordinate the state's response, and to utilize the state's resources in the most efficient and practical manner possible, the governor directed departments and agencies of the state coordinate their efforts. The University's Director of Public Safety was a member of the Utah Olympic Public Safety Command since its inception.

Following the Atlanta Games, federal law was amended to provide that the Secret Service could be authorized by Executive Order to provide security services for a “Special Event of National Significance.” The 2002 Games were the second event so designated, and the Secret Service played a key role with regard to activities “inside the fence.” During the Games Period, many people found it useful to think in terms of two distinct areas:

Inside the Fence – For those portions of the campus that were designated for the exclusive use of the Salt Lake Olympic Committee (SLOC), security was provided by UOPSC and the Secret Service while law enforcement responsibility remained with the University Police Department.

Outside the Fence – For the remainder of campus, the University Department of Public Safety performed their normal law enforcement and security duties at an enhanced level for the anticipated presence of a large number of people on campus during the Games.

Although this distinction made sense for law enforcement purposes, the concept of “inside the fence” for security purposes expanded out to include all areas that could be impacted by a threat of unlawful activity related to the Games. Thus, the Secret Service took an interest in the Health Sciences Complex adjacent to the Village and areas of campus near the Stadium on “event days.”

Early fears of “federal intrusion” into the lives of the University community proved unfounded as UOPSC and the Secret Service responded with professionalism and flexibility to the needs of the campus. Particularly following the events of “9/11,” University constituents demanded increased assurances of their safety while still longing for total convenience of access to their facilities. The federal officers assisted greatly in demonstrating to our citizenry that some loss of convenience was necessary to provide for their safety. At the same time, those officers were extremely responsive to the legitimate concerns and needs of the University community.

The only “glitch” in this system was that the Secret Service allowed the Department of Defense, through the Army Corps of Engineers, to manage construction of the security perimeter around the Village. COE carried this out through a private contractor. As a result of this arrangement, neither SLOC nor the University, and apparently not even the Secret Service, had a direct chain of contractual arrangements with the fence contractor. Although ultimately most matters were satisfactorily resolved, a great deal of time and energy were wasted on scheduling of fence installation and monitoring of the contractor’s performance, time and energy that could have been saved if there had been a more direct contractual link. We recommend that any future arrangement of this type include a contractual link with either the event organizer (SLOC) or the landlord (University) or both.

In addition to the resources afforded by direct links with the Utah Department of Public Safety, UOPSC actively recruited additional officers from throughout the state and out-of-state, to supplement the police resources of all law enforcement agencies in the 2002 Games arena. In this regard, University of Utah Police actively recruited officers from other colleges and university campuses in the state and nationally.

Issues surrounding building security were addressed in cooperation with UOPSC. The first step was to identify which buildings were most vulnerable to unlawful activity and disruption during the 2002 Games, particularly buildings that possess hazardous materials or sensitive systems and buildings that have high staff, residential, or public populations during the Games. The University

engaged outside consultants to make a risk assessment and present their findings to UOPSC in hope that this would justify additional funds for building security. Although no additional funds were found, the report served as a useful device in identifying internal steps that could be taken to increase security.

Once the initial step of assessment was complete, building managers were identified for each building on campus. This was a task that Public Safety had been trying to accomplish for some years, and the impetus of the Olympic presence finally made it happen. The main role of the building manager for the Games-period was to work with the Security Division of Public Safety in creating a security plan for each specific building. This included coordinating with multiple departments in their building (where applicable), determining when the building would be open and closed, deciding if employees would be required to wear University ID, and implementing additional security measures if desirable. Units were encouraged to make safety and security decisions based upon their individual needs and the information and recommendations provided by University Public Safety and 2002 Olympic Coordination.

Mail Delivery was an area of safety that became cumbersome for some departments. The policies and procedures for deliveries to buildings were set forth in a memo at Appendix IVB.

The Emergency Operations Plan of the University had been in a draft form for several years. The pendency of the Olympics gave the impetus to finish the plan as well as an opportunity to test it in action. The Olympic presence actually fit the definition of a “Level 2 Emergency,” an event that seriously impacts the campus without closing it down. In fact, Ceremony event days rose to “Level 3,” an event that closes the campus. On event days, the Emergency Operations Center was put into operation, requiring that a dozen key individuals be closeted in a room with complete communications equipment for about a 12-hour period each day.

C. Transportation & Parking

Parking and Transportation Services faced its most serious disruptions ever in its efforts to provide commuter services to the campus population as a result of the 2002 Games. With the expected loss of over 3,000 parking spaces to lower campus and severe travel restrictions in the HSC, several thousands of faculty, staff and students were encouraged to alter drastically their commuting habits. Fortunately, due to a cooperative campaign with several campus groups, UTA, University administration, and Salt Lake City Transportation, surprising positive results were realized.

In the months leading up to the Games, the University went through a metamorphosis of changing perceptions on what was actually going to happen on campus. Leading the forefront was the perception by many of the university’s 40,000 plus students, faculty and staff that the only way to get to campus during the games would be by parachute. The reality turned out to be quite contrary. As an indicator of changed perceptions, “Parking and Transportation Services” changed its name to “Transportation and Parking Services” in 2001.

A comprehensive marketing campaign was implemented in the summer and early fall of 2001. The goal was to saturate the campus with pertinent information and alternative commuting options.

This was made possible through the cooperative efforts of Transportation and Parking Services, Auxiliary Services, Marketing and Communications, the Office of Olympic Coordination, Publications and Printing Services, Utah Transit Authority (UTA) and ASUU. The efforts of ASUU leadership was invaluable in gaining the cooperation of students.

The campaign included informational brochures; advertising, including joint ads with UTA in local newspapers; signs on campus shuttles, lawns, entrances to parking lots and roadways; information booths in strategic places around campus; and hundreds of briefings to a wide variety of student, faculty and staff groups within the University community and neighborhood groups. As a result the community was aware of the Olympic challenge the campus was facing, enabling people to make informed decisions.

UTA opened the TRAX light rail line to campus on December 16, 2001, two weeks after SLOC took possession of the large parking lot at the Stadium and two days after the end of the Fall Semester. By January, when classes resumed, everyone on campus was aware of the reduced parking and the presence of the light rail system. The timing could not have been better if we had planned it.

With the combination of light rail, the campus shuttle system, and the willingness of University students faculty and staff to use mass transit, the overall impact of the Olympics was much less intrusive than originally anticipated. In January and March 2002, while classes were in session, SLOC controlled almost one-third of the University's parking spaces on main campus (roughly 3,000 out of a total of 10,000 spaces). Through cooperative efforts of University Police, Plant Operations, Salt Lake City Corporation, Utah Department of Transportation, and Transportation and Parking Services, we were able to provide temporary overflow parking for approximately 1,200 cars on several roadways on and near campus. This fact, along with the increased utilization of mass transit, resulted in approximately 1,000 empty parking spaces available on campus each day, with significantly increased numbers during the Olympic break.

Now that the 2002 Games are history, the impact of light rail service to campus continues to be significant. Public transportation remains the commuter choice for a large population of students, faculty and staff. Since April 1, 2002, the campus has averaged almost 3,000 vacant parking spaces everyday – before the Olympics, the number was closer to 300 to 400. This is remarkable considering the record enrollment that the university experienced during Spring Semester 2002.

Transportation and Parking Services is working to continue this trend with a new marketing campaign highlighting the benefits of public transportation. The light rail extension to the University would not have happened with the speed it did were it not for the Olympic presence. Although losses of revenue and additional costs were experienced, it may be that the long term benefits to the campus (from fewer vehicles and higher utilization of mass transit) will outweigh the expenses we suffered.

D. University Student Apartments and Medical Towers

University Student Apartments created good will by providing temporary housing for more than 70 students displaced from Fort Douglas Heritage Commons. Unfortunately, some students who had been on the waiting list for 12 months had to wait an additional 3-4 months, and the timing of these

moves produced some increased cost of cleaning these units and loss of rental revenue until a new tenant could move into the unit. Numerous activities were held by different housing courts to celebrate the Olympics. These events generated positive community development for those who attended.

Residents of Medical Plaza were required to pass through security gates and car searches each time they came and went from their apartments. Residents were also required to have personal access passes. No major problems were reported but it was a great inconvenience to these residents. Due to security measures we did not allow people to move in or out of Medical Plaza during the Games. This resulted in a couple of empty apartments that we could not rent. It also resulted in some residents' having to change moving plans until after the Games.

Maintenance crews were kept very busy preparing apartments both prior to the move over of students and after they returned to Residential Living. We were not able to get 30 days' notice of student vacating which would allow us to clean and re-rent all apartments. USA also experienced some incremental personnel costs such as staffing gates on event days, office staff time for event related activities and staff hours for Parking Services needed on checkpoint duty. Increased costs also occurred in such areas as telephone charges, printing and copying notices sent to all Student Apartments residents concerning parking, security, maps, event notices and road closures.

E. Bookstore, Copy Centers, and Printing Services

The University Bookstore operates from two locations. The main campus store serves the educational needs of University of Utah students, faculty, staff and guests on lower campus. The Health Sciences store located in Heritage Commons serves the medical, educational and reference needs of University of Utah students, faculty, staff and health professionals. During the 2002 Games, there were substantial financial and operational impacts on the two facilities.

The Health Sciences store was temporarily relocated out of the Olympic Village to a small conference room in the hospital cafeteria from January 9 - March 4, and five employees were accredited to the Village to retrieve inventory from the original location as needed. Throughout the fall semester communications were made to the Health Science community regarding the temporary relocation of the Health Sciences Store. The cost of the Health Sciences store relocation is estimated at \$2,000 (fixtures, phone moves, and personnel). The subsequent return of the Health Sciences Store to its primary location has actually resulted in a decline in sales; the convenience of the temporary hospital location during the Olympics dramatically helped the Health Sciences Store's sales.

Several initial expectations never materialized: 1) extension of store hours, 2) a need to deal with limited foreign currency or other forms of foreign monetary payment and 3) an inordinate amount of out-of-area checks. With the drastically reduced customer traffic flow in the store, special employee training and many special projects (administrative and facilities-related) were planned and completed during the month of February.

The Bookstore is the designated manager of licensing of University marks and produces branded merchandise for retail sale. We were able to produce unique co-branded merchandise as a result of a Commercial Licensing Agreement with SLOC. An Olympic Shop, featuring University of Utah

merchandise with both University and Olympic logos, along with Olympic merchandise and collector pins, was located in the Bookstore. Expected sales were realized, with very little merchandise remaining at the end of March, producing a total revenue of almost \$400,000 on Olympic-related merchandise over a 3-year period.

In addition to the Olympic-related merchandise, information tables were located in the Bookstore, staffed by campus staff and students with mass transit schedules, maps and visitor guides for Salt Lake City, the surrounding area and the State of Utah. The General Books Department also carried Olympic-related books depicting the culture and environment of the Sale Lake area, the state of Utah and the Western United States. Books by local authors were readily available, as were maps and visitor guides for Salt Lake City, the surrounding area and the State of Utah.

University Copy Centers offered full services through the duration of the Olympics. Thus full overhead was incurred, while revenues were reduced. Because of the academic break and client participation in the events, business dropped off dramatically. Our workflow and revenues were cut in less than half.

Our main production facility, the Heritage Commons Copy Center, was located within the Olympic Village and thus isolated from direct client contact. Security inspections at access points prompted us to curtail deliveries to twice daily, but employees hand-carried many smaller jobs through the checkpoints. Many of our clients also sent us files to be printed or copied over the campus network, dropping jobs off in our electronic in-box, obviating the need for pick-up or delivery of hard copy originals.

F. Huntsman Center and Athletics

The Jon M. Huntsman Center (JMHC) is the University's indoor sports arena and is the primary venue for Intercollegiate Athletics men's and women's basketball teams and women's gymnastics team. Its location placed it directly between the Olympic Village and the Stadium, which produced two main impacts from the Games. The JMHC was used as the staging area for Olympic athletes prior to the Opening and Closing Ceremonies, which resulted in additional hours for the JMHC Director but did not affect other JMHC staff. The second impact was that a significant amount of parking adjacent to the facility was used by the Village, thus making it more difficult to provide parking for intercollegiate events before and during the Games period. With creative use of offsite parking, public transportation, and shuttle bus services, spectators were minimally affected.

Although school was closed during the Olympics, winter and spring sports were in season. Athletic staff needed full access to their offices and facilities during the Olympics. The JMHC was available to Athletics staff on all days during the Olympics, although only minimal staff was allowed access to the JMHC on the day of the Opening and Closing Ceremonies.

Athletics requested that Mountain West Conference schedule our home games the week prior to and between the Opening and Closing Ceremonies of the 2002 Olympics, and the Conference cooperated fully with our scheduling needs. This avoided the most difficult access issues for home although it turned out that a men's basketball game and a dress rehearsal for the Opening Ceremonies both occurred on February 4th. Women's Gymnastics does its own scheduling and similarly avoided the Olympic period.

G. University Hospital and Clinics

The University Hospital was able to showcase the quality of our medical services and the warmth of our staff on an international stage. The University took care of many athletes and other members of the Olympic Family. The University of Utah Health Sciences Center through subcontract with IHC was responsible for all Medical Services in the Village (Polyclinic) and at the Olympic Stadium for Opening and Closing ceremonies. Over 75% of the patients seen at the Polyclinic were athletes or Olympic Family, whereas at other venues less than 15% of the patients were athletes or Olympic Family. The University benefitted from a number of research and data collection activities that took place in the Polyclinic and at other venues under the direction of Polyclinic medical leadership. There are at least four papers that will be published as a result of these activities with the ultimate goal of improving the care provided to athletes in future Games.

The activity of organizing medical services on the University Campus was in itself a challenge to those involved, especially in the early days of planning. As the Games drew closer, however, administrative support increased and served to lessen the burden. We increased medical coverage at the Stadium due to the tight rehearsal activities at that venue. This increased coverage created a challenge for the EMTs and other medical staff involved at the stadium because we had not anticipated the broad coverage that was required. In addition, the reassignment of clinical and support staff from Health Sciences departments and clinics to the Polyclinic created a challenge for those areas as they tried to maintain ongoing operations. The non-reimbursed care provided at the Hospital and the loss of patient volume at the clinics and Hospitals created some additional financial burdens beyond the costs associated with the Polyclinic and Stadium.

The Olympic presence on campus resulted in a dramatic decrease in outpatient clinic visits and elective procedures at the Hospital. Although traffic and parking were not actually a problem during the Games, the general perception of our patient population was that the University Hospital was not easily accessible. Patients scheduled their appointments around the Olympics, so January and February resulted in greater than anticipated revenue loss. Also, a number of physicians scheduled time out around this time, which added to the financial loss in January and February.

There were numerous Health Sciences employees who volunteered outside of the Polyclinic and Stadium, utilizing vacation or personal time to assist with the Olympic events.

While there was anticipation of considerable traffic, parking and access issues for all of the Health Sciences campus, the coordinated campus approach and cooperative work with Health Sciences Center administration resulted in a successful operation. Research activities were able to continue uninterrupted. The inconvenience of parking, security and traffic operations were handled in a safe and functional mode that made us all proud of the performance of the campus during the Olympics 2002.

V. Financial

A. General and Auxiliary Funds

In general, the University has been well-treated financially by the Olympic presence. Although detailed accounting is beyond the scope of this report, preliminary data show that we will net somewhere over \$50 million from the experience. The bulk of the revenue comes from the Village rent (\$28 million), Stadium rent (\$8 million), and Olympic-related fund-raising (\$16 million). Other smaller amounts were realized for specific services and facility rentals.

The estimated net revenue, however, must be read with at least two serious caveats in mind. First, it must be understood that, while we lived up to our commitment not to expend any general educational funds “in support of the Games,” an event of this magnitude cannot be managed without financial impact. We have tracked all general fund expenditures that were “caused by” the Olympic presence, what may be thought of as the “incremental cost” of hosting the Games. In no instance, however, do the general fund expenditures reflect support of the Games – to the contrary, they are expenditures in support of the University’s missions in light of a major international event’s occurring on campus. We have been extremely diligent in ensuring that no general funds were used for direct support of SLOC or other third-party activities. When general fund expenditures might have been involved for direct support, for example in the payment of incremental utility costs, there have been fund transfers from auxiliary services accounts to cover those costs.

Second, the net figures could be misleading if it appeared that the University had a windfall of many millions of dollars. Two significant factors need to be considered in this regard. One issue has to do with lost revenue, which is extremely difficult to track. In some instances, the impact of the Olympics is difficult to separate from other factors such as market conditions and consumer preferences. The downturn in revenue for in student housing was already taken into account in the financial projections of the bonds that were issued for construction, so in a sense this was not “lost” revenue because it was already budgeted. The second significant factor to realize is that the rental payments were all spent in construction of the housing and stadium facilities. There is no cash surplus to the University, and these facilities could not have been built in suitable fashion for University needs in advance of the Olympics without those payments. Therefore, it would be a mistake to think that SLOC overpaid or that the University received a windfall from these payments. The payments were necessary to obtain the facilities that resulted.

The net figures could also hide some significant impacts on individual units within the University. Transportation and Parking Services had significant out-of-pocket costs that are not likely to be reimbursed in any fashion, although those costs eventually will be absorbed into the overall Auxiliary Services funds. Athletics and Campus Recreation probably experienced some significant lost revenue, but it is not possible to be completely confident about the numbers in these areas. It may be possible to get a better picture of these impacts after the next fiscal year when a comparison can be made on either side of the 2002 fiscal year, and even then it will not be possible to know how much of these losses were timing of the Olympics without regard to whatever impacts occurred on campus. Despite these caveats, it is clear that some units on campus experienced negative financial impacts from the Olympic presence.

B. Development Funds

One of the more satisfying aspects of Olympic involvement has been the impetus that it has provided for private giving to the University.

1. Fort Douglas Heritage Commons

As soon as the University began receiving buildings from the US Army, we commissioned architectural studies that estimated it would take about \$45 million to renovate the 44 historic buildings in Fort Douglas. Raising this money centered around the concept of the Fort Douglas Heritage Commons as the target for a major capital campaign. An aggressive start for the campaign targeted the historic buildings that were most critical for success of the Games as well as for the living-learning complex. This initial thrust generated \$16 million in time for renovation work on 14 buildings and construction of a new bandstand to be completed before the Games. The remaining 30 buildings will take time, but this is a very satisfying beginning to the capital campaign for Heritage Commons.

2. George S Eccles 2002 Legacy Bridge

A major safety element for the new student housing was the crossing of Wasatch Drive from Fort Douglas to the campus. A mere “pedestrian bridge” would not have sufficed for several reasons. The initial conceptual study indicated the need for a bridge costing several million dollars, but further work on the design and a gift of \$2 million from the George S. and Dolores Doré Eccles Foundation toward the total cost allowed the bridge to be constructed and to become a landmark legacy of the Games for the campus.

3. Legacy Scholarship Fund

As part of the Ceremonies Agreement for use of the Stadium, the University obtained the right to purchase 100 tickets each for the Opening and Closing Ceremonies. Rather than use these tickets for officials or existing benefactors, it was decided that they should be used as inducements for new student scholarship funding. The Legacy Scholarship Fund was created by obtaining contributions of \$12,000 or more from each donor who in turn received 2 tickets to either Opening or Closing Ceremonies. Donors also received a commemorative gift and reserved parking for the ceremonies within walking distance of Rice-Eccles Olympic Stadium. The \$12,000 contribution provided for a \$10,000 tax-deductible gift with \$2,000 used to cover the cost of ceremony tickets and the commemorative gift. The generous contributions of donors to the Legacy Scholarship fund totaled over \$700,000, providing funding for more than 50 new scholarships. The unique scholarships created from these donations will be perpetual reminders of the spirit of the Games and the people of Utah.

VI. Conclusions and Recommendations

We learned some lessons, we experienced some benefits and burdens, and we have thoughts for any university campus, including potentially our own, which might be considering involvement with a future major international event of this magnitude. This section represents our attempt to capture some of those thoughts.

A. University of Utah Processes

The long-term legacy of the 2002 Games should include preservation of some of the processes that were put in place for this event. Specifically, the following were important improvements to campus procedures:

1. Emergency Operations Plan

The lessons learned, and experience gained, from the Emergency Operations Plan should be maintained. It is critical that opportunities to practice the operation be found. Otherwise, the experience dissipates and people are not prepared to act when an unexpected emergency occurs.

2. Building Security Plan

Related to Emergency Operations was the effort to obtain a cohesive plan for building security on campus. It would be a significant loss if the list of building manager contacts were not maintained and utilized periodically so that the Public Safety Department had the latest information on building usage and procedures. It is also important that building managers be reminded of the significance of their roles in the public safety environment of the campus.

3. Facility Rental Procedure

The Facilities Rental form and its accompanying approval process should be made universally available to building managers, and the Vice-President for Administrative Services should continue to be the signatory for all rental contracts. Categories excepted from this requirement might be defined according to dollar amount, period of time for the event, or experience base of the renting unit.

4. Internship Policies

There are now a half-dozen people on the University of Utah campus who understand what the various departments and colleges expect from internships and how they are structured. This expertise will dissipate if it is not recorded and used in some fashion.

B. Recommendations for Future Large-Scale Events

1. Coordination Structure

It is critical with an event of this magnitude to maintain both academic and administrative decision processes. This could be accomplished by a blended “team” approach or by formal mechanisms to ensure that both are consulted throughout the process. Our experience with the blended “team” approach was quite positive.

2. Contracting and Cooperation

The University of Utah obtained strong cooperation from SLOC and security agencies while

offering cooperation ourselves. Some observers and participants have wondered if the level of cooperation would have been as high had SLOC been more strapped for money, so the importance of carefully negotiated contracts cannot be ignored. It is also possible that the lengthy and detailed contract negotiations themselves set the stage for cooperation among the managers who had to carry out the agreements.

3. Funding Operational Costs

The University made an early decision to invest all rent revenue for the Stadium and Village into construction of the facilities themselves, which left no specific fund for expenses attributable to the Games. We recommend for future events that 5% - 10% of rent revenue be designated for operational costs.

4. Communication

One fact of life that was reinforced by this experience is that not everyone will heed all efforts at communication but that it is nevertheless important for administrators to devote substantial effort to this activity. The communication effort itself is one of the expectations of a large institution regardless of whether the messages are received by all who should hear them.

5. Arts & Culture Expectations

In a similar vein, it is wise for the arts and cultural managers to realize that the level of visitorship to their venues is not likely to be very high during an event of this magnitude but that they may want to make the effort for special exhibits and events anyway. The mounting of the effort is itself an element of university outreach to the community.

Appendices

- I.A.1 1990 Task Force Report
- I.A.2 1994 Letter of Understanding
- I.B.1 Responsibilities Chart
- I.B.3a Organization Chart
- I.B.3b Planning Committee Minutes
- I.B.3c Operations Committee Minutes
- II.A.1 Human Resources Memo to Staff
- II.A.2 Accreditation Notice
- II.B.1a Calendar Recommendation
- II.B.1b 2002 Academic Calendar
- II.B.2a Unit Academic Planning
- II.B.2b Deans' Memo re Curriculum Planning
- II.B.2c Games-Related Courses
- II.C.1 Internship Definition & Policies
- II.D.1 Olympic-Related Brochures
- II.E.1 Contract List
- III. Ceremonies Executive Summary
- IV Village Executive Summary
- V Medical Services Executive Summary
- VI.B Mail and Delivery Memo