

# **Special Event Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes**

Date: Wednesday, November 16, 2016

**Place:** Park City Library – Community Room, third floor

**Time:** 12:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m.

**In attendance:** Todd Hansen, Judy Cullen, Bob Kollar, Ginger Ries, Annette Sneed, Charlie Sturgis, Carrie Westberg, Cheryl Fox, Maria McNulty, Whitney Wall, Jon Weidenhamer, Jenny Diersen, Jason Glidden,

Tommy Youngblood **Absent:** Charlie Sturgis

Electronic Participation: Sarah Klingenstein, Mellie Owen

Meeting Facilitator: Jason Glidden Meeting Minutes: Tommy Youngblood

Next Meeting: Thursday, December 21, 2016 – confirm quorum

Meeting Called To Order (12:09 p.m.)

Approval of Minutes from October 11, 2016 Meeting

Ginger made motion to approve, Judy Seconded, all in favor Minutes approved from October 11, 2016 Meeting with no changes.

**Public Comment**: (Any items not included on agenda).

No Public comment at this time-

Persons commented on topic 1B & 2B – Angela Moschetta & Puggy Holmgren: read below

Topic #1: City Council Recap from 11/3 (12:10 p.m.)

**Purpose:** Review and discuss summary of City Council meeting from 11/3.

**Product:** Review outcomes from City Council meeting on Thursday, November 3.

Person: Jason Glidden & Jenny Diersen

**Notes:** 

Jenny stated that staff met with City Council on November 3 to discuss Structure of SEAC, Event Fatigue, Mitigation and Event analysis tools including Prioritization, Fee Reduction and Debrief. City Council had concerns regarding the balance of the committee. Staff will address that to SEAC later in the meeting. Council stated that they wanted to take the foot off the gas pedal for events and focus on impact mitigation, specifically with regards to residential impacts, transportation and environmental sustainability. Staff will return to City Council at a future meeting in November to affirm changes to the SEAC committee structure and will follow up with SEAC regarding Council direction.

Topic #1A: Prioritization & Threshold Next Steps (12:15 p.m.)
Purpose: Discuss changes and use for the Event Prioritization Sheet

**Product:** Better understanding of use of Event Prioritization Sheet.

**Allocated Time:** 15 minutes

Person: Jenny Diersen

Notes: The committee discussed changes to the prioritization sheet with a new DRAFT of the prioritization sheet which was included in the packet. Jenny also pulled up the old prioritization sheet. Questions were presented regarding ease of use and when the Prioritization Tool should be used. The committee made suggestions including that staff should complete the sheet since we have the information for mitigations and economic development. SEAC should be focused on the community perspective. Cindy Matsumoto clarified that City Council wants to hear SEAC's input from a community perspective. The committee also suggested changing the scale of the score to 1 to 5 instead of 1 to 10, and that Season of Occurance and Environmental should be a set score of either 1, 3 or 5. The committee also suggested that it may be necessary to clump some events together during periods of high threshold (for instance 4<sup>th</sup> of July) to look at a time period of high threshold.

The committee voiced concerns regarding being able to provide feedback regarding an event's economic impacts (positive or negative), as they do not have access to the information. The discussion continued that the resorts, restaurant and lodging associations have the information, and that this information may be intimidating when the community has concerns regarding event impacts to residents. It was clarified that Council wants a citizen committee and to understand the community feeling towards events.

Topic #1B: DRAFT SEAC Structure, Policies & Vacancies (12:30 p.m.)

Purpose: Review SEAC Policies and receive comments and edits from SEAC.

Product: SEAC Policies & Co-Chairs will be voted on at the December 21 meeting. New members will begin

at the December 21 meeting. **Allocated Time:** 15 minutes **Person:** Jenny Diersen

**Notes:** 

Jenny reviewed the options that will be presented to Council on the structure of SEAC. Staff Recommendation after input from the Nov 11<sup>th</sup> Council meeting will be to not have the School District or Summit County as voting members, consolidate the Restaurant and Lodging Association (would become non-voting members) with the Chamber representing those groups, adding 2 additional non-voting members. The second option is to keep the current board structure and add the School District and Summit County plus 4 additional members to form a 19-member board; the third option is that all business stakeholders would have non-voting seats and have advisory positions and the voting members would be a community board.

Cindy, asked what would the committee vote on?

Jenny answered although it is still being finalized but they would vote on fee reductions and a debriefs of events individual events

Jason stated we are here to discuss all three options to see want the current SEAC board recommendation to council.

Whitney stated she thinks a 19 committee would be too big; and supports option 1, Staff recommendation Annette stated that the community member should be from different areas of town.

Mellie said she felt intimidated having Vail and DV on the committee and discussing the economic aspects of their events and questioned the need to have them at the table since in the past there has been little contention over their events.

Jason stated that the resorts are part of the community which is why they are on the committee originally.

Bob commented that Mellie thoughts were similar to Option 3, with removal of the non-voting members from the meeting. This would be a community board only that would take the temperature of the town when it came to individual events, to be taken to Council. This would get the opinion of the residents to Council.

Cindy thought that a community board would turn into a complaint driven group which could discourage people to apply for the board. However the majority of council felt that a community group would be preferable.

Sarah liked idea of resident group and felt Council agreed, she likes Option 1 but questions have many things come down to a vote. In the past year the committee had more consensus than votes.

Jenny wants to open for public comment (12:55pm)

Cheryl likes Option A if we are to be a postmortem group having stakeholders in the room would be helpful.

Annette commented that the five stakeholders, staff recommendation, is a great base for the business. Currently the citizens at large are overwhelm by business and other stakeholders and needs balance.

### **Public Comment opened (1:06pm)**

### **Angela Moschetta**

Encouraged about conversation but concerned about lack of data from the anti-event side which is anecdotal information. She advocates for balance on the committee. There are people in the community with an event background that can evaluate events and their qualifications should be considered. This committee should analyze data and Council should listen to public opinions. Park City's economic and quality of life viability is too dependent on events to make recommendation on opinion.

#### **Public Comment closed**

Ginger asks for clarification on why SEAC was formed originally. What is the goal?

Jason Council wanted a committee to make recommendations on events based on threshold, provide more information on event debriefs.

Jenny the committee does not have the authority to approve or deny events but makes recommendations for Staff to return those to Council

Ginger stated that SEAC was not clear on what council wants and should go back to Council and ask.

Bob stated that Council specifically denied SEAC applicants for the at-large seats that had event experience; they want to hear from residents not event organizers.

Tommy asked if it was time for a community vision session on events?

Ginger stated that data from the entire community would be helpful which should include outside of the city limits because our events had a broader impact.

Annette stated that a general survey will help, possibly in the water bills including representation outside the city.

Sarah (on phone) has not been able to hear last 15mins of discussion and is concerned that a vote on the future structure would not be helpful because the community members, herself and Mellie have not been able to be full participants in meeting and only one community member is present in person.

Sarah signed off on call

Jason finalized that staff will ask Council what are the goals of the committee to get clarity and is this proper tool or is a survey of the community more appropriate.

Topic #2: Event Debrief (12:45 p.m.)

**Purpose:** Discuss event debrief for events with regards to challenges and successes for the 2016 year.

**Product:** Committee discussion and feedback

**Allocated Time:** 80 minutes

**Notes:** Major events to be discussed are listed below. Please refer to calendar attachment and advise if you have comments about other events or activities.

#### 2A: PSSM End of Season Review (12:45 p.m.)

**Purpose:** Discuss event debrief for event with regards to challenges and successes of the event.

Person: Jenny Diersen & Jason Glidden

**Allocated Time:** 15 minutes **Questions for Committee:** 

What do you think is working /What do you like and why?

What isn't working, where and how can the event improve, What don't you like and why?

What feedback have you heard either from community members or from organizations? How many people are giving you this feedback and how are the comments coming to you or being solicited?

Notes: Minutes from 4/12 and 7/12. End of Season Debrief with City Council.

Item will be opened for public comment.

This item was postponed until a future meeting.

#### 2B: Triple Crown (1:00 p.m.)

Purpose: Discuss event debrief for event with regards to challenges and successes of the event.

**Person:** Jason Glidden **Allocated Time:** 15 minutes **Questions for Committee:** 

What do you think is working /What do you like and why?

What isn't working, where and how can the event improve, What don't you like and why?

What feedback have you heard either from community members or from organizations? How many people are giving you this feedback and how are the comments coming to you or being solicited?

**Notes:** Item will be opened for public comment.

Bob – Triple Crown is a youth softball /baseball destination tournament, was not designed to appeal to locals, they rent fields from PCMR, Snyderville Basin, Summit County over 2 weeks it used to be 3 weeks. Local teams do participate.

Bob sighting heard comments stating it feels we are 'renting' our town out.

It drives 3000-4000 room night over 2 weeks a few million in larger

Travis – Oakley and Coalville rely heavily on the economic benefit in the summer.

Families come with the players and they make a vacation out of it. The Triple Crown organizers plan the games so that the participants can enjoy the community.

There is a opening parade on lower Main that closes lower Main for 3 hours.

Triple Crown has been in town since before 2003, originally 3 weeks of girls' softball with almost 400 teams. After the recession in 2009 the size reduced because the teams are price sensitive.

The team numbers are starting to increase.

Attendees tend to revisit Park City outside of the tournament timeframe.

They are a visible presence when they come to town.

Judy - Triple Crown is s huge positive economic impact for their business.

Triple Crown would like another 5-year deal. The current contact ends at after the 2017 year.

Does this still work in our community?

## **Open for Public Comment**

#### **Puggy Holmgren**

Triple Crown has been really good. They are bringing in families and spend a money on Main Street, and in the grocery store. I have not had any bad experiences. They use the buses a lot.

They have money and are able to travel. "I am very pro on this one."

#### **Closed for Public Comment**

Jason the most negative comments come from residents adjacent to the fields that Triple Crown uses. Annette feels it is still a worthwhile event; the city can be more proactive to mitigate negative impacts.

## No vote taken there is no quorum

**2C:** Autumn Aloft (1:15 p.m.)

Purpose: Discuss event debrief for event with regards to challenges and successes of the event.

Person: Jenny Diersen **Allocated Time:** 15 minutes **Ouestions for Committee:** 

What do you think is working /What do you like and why?

What isn't working, where and how can the event improve, What don't you like and why?

What feedback have you heard either from community members or from organizations? How many people are

giving you this feedback and how are the comments coming to you or being solicited?

**Notes:** Item will be opened for public comment.

**NO DISSUSSION** 

2D: Shot Ski (1:30 p.m.)

**Purpose:** Discuss event debrief for event with regards to challenges and successes of the event.

**Person:** Tommy Youngblood **Allocated Time:** 10 minutes **Ouestions for Committee:** 

What do you think is working /What do you like and why?

What isn't working, where and how can the event improve, What don't you like and why?

What feedback have you heard either from community members or from organizations? How many people are

giving you this feedback and how are the comments coming to you or being solicited?

**Notes:** Item will be opened for public comment.

NO DISSUSSION

2E: Halloween on Main (1:40 p.m.)

**Purpose:** Discuss event debrief for event with regards to challenges and successes of the event.

Person: Jenny Diersen **Allocated Time:** 10 minutes **Questions for Committee:** 

What do you think is working /What do you like and why?

What isn't working, where and how can the event improve, What don't you like and why?

What feedback have you heard either from community members or from organizations? How many people are

giving you this feedback and how are the comments coming to you or being solicited?

**Notes:** Item will be opened for public comment.

**NO DISSUSSION** 

**Topic #3: Recap Recommendations** 

**Purpose:** Summarize recommendations made during the meeting.

Person: Jenny Diersen **Allocated Time:** 5 minutes

**Notes:** 

NO DISSUSSION

# Meeting Adjourned (estimated time 1:55 p.m.)- 1:52 pm - Meeting adjourned due to loss of quorum

# **Upcoming Meetings / Reminders**

- Next meeting is scheduled on Wednesday, December 21 at noon.
  - \*January meeting may be cancelled/changed due to proximity of meeting to the start of Sundance Film Festival.
  - \*Please view attached SEAC meeting schedule.
- Upcoming Projects: Fee Reduction Changes & Calendar Coordination