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ABSTRACT

In 2002, Salt Lake City joined an elite group of cities, in the world, when it hosted the 2002 Olympic Winter Games. This “once in a lifetime” chance gave the city, community, and state of Utah an opportunity to show the world a different side of the community than just the home to the peculiar people known as Mormons. The city took the chance and pulled it off beautifully. Salt Lake not only managed to stage one of the most impressive Olympic Winter Games ever but ended up with an unprecedented amount of profit. But what do you do after the party is over? In an effort to keep the spirit of the Olympics alive, the Salt Lake Organizing Committee (SLOC) wanted to build a legacy park where locals and tourists could visit and relive the thrill and excitement the Olympics. The announcement of the legacy park brought great support from the people, the city, and state government officials but unfortunately, it also brought along all of the politics and personal agendas involved when working with these entities. In the end, the legacy park was merged with a park which was originally planned to showcase just the Olympic cauldron at Rice-Eccles Stadium at the University of Utah.

The following thesis is the story of how the legacy park came to reside at the University of Utah, the planning and design of the park, the operations and maintenance, and the celebrations it hosted in the ten plus years since the
Olympic Winter Games. This thesis focuses on whether or not the Olympic Cauldron Park served as a legitimate and appropriate legacy for the 2002 Salt Lake Olympic Winter Games and if that legacy should continue now that original contracts are expiring. Primary research was gathered through local and national newspaper articles, oral interviews, personal experience, and official documents such as contracts between SLOC and the University of Utah. As time and the outdoor elements take their toll on the park, contracts are finished and expansion of the stadium for the Pac 12 Athletic Conference pending, the future of the Olympic Cauldron Park looks bleak. Although there are plans to have some items from the park live on at another Olympic legacy destination, the Olympic Cauldron Park story needed to be told before it ceases to exist.
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In the 1970s movie, *The Way We Were*, Barbra Streisand sings, "memories, like the corners of my mind, misty water colored memories of the way we were." Memories are something all human beings possess. Some are good, some are bad, and some we will carry with us through a lifetime, although it may have happened to us in our youth and some will fade from our recollection within a few short years. Most of our memories are personal, reminiscences of moments in our lives that were joyous, unique, or traumatic. Often we share memories with those close to us in our lives such as family and friends, parents, siblings, spouses, and children or even with people we spend a great deal of time with such as co-workers or neighbors. These shared memories are often referred to as collective memory. Collective memory extends far beyond those with whom we are acquainted. In fact, it can be shared with perfect strangers because it is shared by larger groups in our society such as communities, towns, states, nations, and even global communities.

Collective memories are formed from occurrences that have an impact on large groups of society such as wars, famine, political upheaval, inventions, and landmark celebrations such as bicentennials and anniversaries, as well as
sporting events like the World Series, the World Cup, and the Olympic Games. These collective memories are formed because they often evoke strong emotions in human beings. It is safe to say we would not usually form lasting memories from something to which we were indifferent. Collective memory does not have to be formed from something that was witnessed firsthand, but it can be nurtured through the celebrations of an event which occurred long before the current generations of society were born. A good example of this would be the Fourth of July celebration, which commemorates the signing of the Declaration of Independence in 1776 over 200 years ago, thus making it impossible for anyone living today to have experienced it firsthand. Yet, because of the traditions established through the celebration of this event and the stories and legends that are shared in conjunction with this holiday, every citizen of the United States has a collective memory of what took place when the Declaration of Independence was signed and why it is important to celebrate this event that took place so long ago.

There are those who are critical of the notion of collective memory. In his essay, *History, Memory and Monuments*, Kirk Savage suggests that “[t]he very idea of collective memory seems to assume a unity of purpose – as if many different people somehow share a common mind – that belies the reality of even the smallest family group, let alone a diverse nation like the U.S.” While some scholars may argue over the existence of collective memory, there is still something to be said for the desire of a community, a state, or even a nation to commemorate an event that seemed to be of great importance in the minds of
the majority of those citizens. In his book, *Remaking America; Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century*, John Bodnar explores the ways communities, cities, and states in the Midwest celebrated various events that were deemed worthy of commemoration in the collective memory of the citizens of the area and by the nation as a whole. Bodnar expresses several ideas which touch upon the reasons why we as Americans feel compelled to commemorate specific events in our nation’s history. These theories can apply to most situations involving the collective memory of human events.

One of the main themes to stand out in most of the writings on history and memory is we as a society want to pay tribute to the generations who came before us. The people whose perceived struggles and hard work contributed to what we have become today. Thus monuments are built and statues erected to those “pioneers” whose sacrifice, in fighting a war or conquering the “frontier,” whatever the frontier might have been at the time, made the world a better place. Good examples of this commemoration are the parades, wreath services, and celebrations which take place on the Fourth of July, Memorial Day, and Veteran’s Day. There are also state holidays such as Utah’s Pioneer Day and Massachusetts’ Patriot Day. Local communities often take this commemoration a step further and closer to home by staging Founder’s Day celebrations to honor a specific pioneer(s) who had the foresight and courage to establish a community in a new frontier. Bodnar mentions these local celebrations are often staged by specific ethnic groups who can trace their beginnings to immigrants who came to this country looking for a better life. He relates stories about specific groups in
the Midwest such as Swedes, Norwegians, Mennonites, and Irish who each celebrate their origins from immigrant ancestors whose hard work and sacrifice created the community which they hold so dear today. These commemorations have changed over time, evolving from celebrations of their homeland and the novelty of their new country to celebrations that became less and less about their country of origin the further away each generation grew from actual firsthand knowledge of that country or motherland and became more about their context in the wider history of the United States.\textsuperscript{4}

Another example of the commemoration of these pioneers occurs every two years, when the Olympic Games are staged. The host city of the Olympic Games feels a responsibility to show the world their heritage along with who founded the city and how it was built into the community it is today. This becomes evident during the opening ceremonies when the host city usually incorporates their history into the pageantry of the ceremony. During the opening ceremonies of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games, Salt Lake City chose to honor its Mormon pioneer roots by showing cast members dressed up as pioneers from the mid-Nineteenth century participating in song and dance. They also portrayed other pioneers such as the trappers and Native American tribes who both occupied the region long before the Mormons came and in the case of the Indians, still live in the state. Former Olympic athletes and medalists from the United States were also featured and were honored for the glory they brought to their country in past Olympics. In a particularly moving moment of the ceremony, a few of the athletes representing the United States carried out a tattered flag
which had been retrieved from rubble of the World Trade Center after the 9/11 terrorist attack. This flag was a symbol and a tribute to all of the men and women who died in this tragedy, thus sacrificing their lives for their country.

The flag and other 9/11 commemorations are excellent illustrations of why societies desire to hold these ceremonies and build monuments. Civilization seeks to commit to memory the heartbreak of a great catastrophe or the sense of joy at a notable accomplishment. Again the main elements that play into these commemorations are hard work or sacrifice or both. Citizens who participated in, or experienced, the event firsthand want to leave a legacy for several reasons. Some motives are extremely personal and others for the good of community. The first reason is so as citizens, they can have a place to go to pay homage to or make peace with a tragic event. The reading of the names of those who died at the World Trade Center on the anniversary of 9/11 not only honors their sacrifice but helps the loved ones of those persons gather and share memories and sorrow with others who experienced the same horrific situation. Bodnar begins his book with a discussion about the Vietnam War Memorial and how the simple granite wall with the names of those who died engraved on it has drawn millions of family members, former veterans, and U.S. citizens to contemplate the ramifications of this conflict and mourn the loss of those who died.\(^5\) This type of commemoration is not about crowds or flamboyant patriotic celebrations. It is about emotions and closure.

On a more jubilant subject, society also wants to commemorate great accomplishments to illustrate what groups of people can accomplish when united
in a common cause. Historical sites such as Independence Hall in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania remind Americans that a new country was formed because the colonists united together against a tyrannical king. The NASA museum in Houston and the Air and Space museum at the Smithsonian in Washington D.C. remind us that we have been to the moon and can go there and beyond with hard work and insight. The beautiful, newly constructed World Trade Tower is a reminder to Americans that we have fought back and rebuilt after a devastating loss. This brings out the second reason as to why as citizens of a community, state or nation wish to build monuments or other legacy items. It is so future generations will know this event occurred and perhaps learn from either the tragedy or joy of the circumstances. In this way, it becomes about establishing the legacy of a generation. We as a civilization want future societies to know we were here and what we accomplished. We simply want to validate our existence and be recognized.

Alongside this theory comes an idea expressed at length by Bodnar. It is the idea that government officials, powerful executives, and wealthy businessmen often use commemorations to build public memory and reinforce the ideals of a community, state, or nation that have put them in their positions of power. In other words, they also want to be remembered for their accomplishments as well as keep society at the status quo in order to guarantee these same ideals will be preserved. This theory explains why there are numerous monuments and celebrations associated with powerful political men and innovators who grew rich from their accomplishments. It does not, however,
explain the fact that many celebrations especially in local communities are based on ordinary people who accomplished extraordinary things. Bodnar also mentions these commemorations go against the notion of rich men building monuments to themselves and instead rejoice in simple, common folk. One example of this are the annual celebrations that were held in communities throughout Kansas, prior to World War II, which paid tribute to the Mennonite farmers who arrived from Russia with two jars of Turkey Red Wheat in their possession. This particular strain of wheat was hardy and thrived in the harsh Kansas climate and from it thousands of farmers built their livelihoods. Bodnar points out that while government officials and powerful businessmen tried to organize formal and solemn ceremonies to pay tribute to their forefathers more often than not, these first immigrants were celebrated with leisure activities and informal gatherings. The ordinary people of this time were paying homage to the ordinary people of a past generation in their own unique way.  

Another theory on public memory comes from our sense of place discussed at length in David Glassberg's book, Sense of History. Glassberg argues that we as human beings often attach meaning to places because of the memories of what happened in that place. For example, what might appear as an ordinary house to one person becomes a type of shrine to a person who spent several years living in that particular house because of all the memories they associate with the house. Glassberg points out that this is extremely evident in adults who have spent much of their life living in one place. The attachment to place grows stronger the longer a person spends in one place. There is also a
grieving process that occurs when people are separated from a place against their will or by force. A good example of this is given in the essay written by Sean Field entitled, “Imagining Communities: Memory, Loss and Resilience in Post-Apartheid Cape Town.” The essay was published in a book edited by Paula Hamilton and Linda Shopes called *Oral History and Public Memories*. In his essay, Field shares the heartbreaking story of the citizens of a community called District Six in Cape Town, South Africa who were forced out of their homes by the Apartheid government and relocated to another township. Their homes were declared slums and were bulldozed to make way for a new, white, urban downtown district. This displacement proved to be devastating for many of the citizens of the community and resulted in depression and despair for countless people. Field points out, “[b]ut displacement was not solely about the removal of people from physical houses and spaces. It was also about the loss of emotionally and symbolically meaningful places, particularly ‘home’ and ‘community.’”

The sense of place is not experienced on just a personal level but can be witnessed on a community level as well. As members of a larger community, society feels a connection to places where life-changing events occurred. The battlefields at Gettysburg appear to be large, rolling fields where crops were once planted until one becomes acquainted with what took place on that field in central Pennsylvania. Ground Zero, as it became known after the attack on 911, became hallowed ground in the U.S. citizens’ collective memory and even as this author stood looking through a chain linked fence in a driving snowstorm in 2007,
there seemed to be a reverence about the place that can only be explained by the fact that as a citizen of this country, I experienced the disbelief, horror, and anger of the attack that took place there and mourned with the nation as we tried to make sense of a senseless act. Not only will the incident live on in the memory of those generations who experienced the life-altering act of violence but the place will also be etched in the collective memory of every person who witnessed the entire terrifying scene via live television. Glassman sums this up perfectly when he states; “[p]laces loom large not only in our personal recollections but also in the collective memory of our communities. Through conversations among family and friends about past local characters, about the weather, about work, we transform ordinary environments into ‘storied places.’” This demonstrates that these “storied places” do not have to be a location where something tragic occurred. It can be a place that is quite ordinary but day-to-day living over the passage of time has made it into a unique place for the people who live there. It can also be an ordinary place where something extraordinary took place such as the Olympic Games. For seventeen days in February, Salt Lake City became one of those somewhat ordinary places to which the world turned its attention to witness something extraordinary. The Olympic Games are so steeped in tradition that the stories have almost been preprogrammed into the psyche of those participating, in some type of fashion, in the Games. It would seem natural for the citizens of Salt Lake to want to remember the experience of the Olympics by finding a place to commemorate its collective memory. Famous writer Wallace
Stenger said, “No place is a place until the things that have happened in it are remembered in history, ballads, yarns, legends, or monuments.”

The final reason as to why society, especially American society, feels the need to stage commemorations and build museums and monuments is the almighty dollar. Annual commemorations or landmark anniversary celebrations such as ten years, fifty years, or even centennials of an event are an excellent way to draw crowds and pump money into a local, state, or even national economy. Bodnar gives several examples of celebrations that were staged for reasons other than to merely commemorate a historical event or observe public memory. One example was the yearly commemoration of the Swedish heritage of a town in Lindsborg, Kansas. The celebration turned into more of a profit making venture than a tribute to the community’s Swedish heritage during the 1940s. In their rush to attract tourists by the wearing of “authentic” costumes, most of their research was done by local people who relied on information found on postcards and pictures that appeared in National Geographic magazine. As a result, was they ended up with “costume designs and colors that emanated from a province that was not the home of most of the pioneers who had settled in the central Kansas region.”

Bodnar also uses the example of the celebrations of Civil War centennial in the South. Since most of the Civil War battlefields are found in the South, one of the most popular attractions were the reenactments of famous battles. Critics of these reenactments felt they were too “carnival-like” and did not honor the men who had fought and died in this tragic war appropriately. The South continued to stage these reenactments as well as
developing many other tourist attractions that promoted one governmental official
“to exclaim that the South may have lost the war but it was sure going to win the
centennial.”

Sporting events may not be as monumental as man’s first flight to the
moon or as devastating as a war where the participants are asked to make the
ultimate sacrifice of life itself, but just as in war, sports has wins and losses,
heroes and scapegoats, triumph and tragedy. At no time are these similarities
more evident than when the world comes together every four years to compete in
the Olympic Games. The vision of the founder of the modern Olympic Games,
Pierre de Coubertin, was that the Olympic Games would be like no other
sporting event in the world. It would be unique, full of pageantry, tradition, and
honor in simply competing. The Games have become everything de Coubertin
predicted and so much more. The rise of nationalism after World War I has taken
the Olympic Games to heights of commercialism and competition de Coubertin
could hardly have imagined. The honor an athlete brings to his country by
winning a gold medal in modern times parallels the honor a soldier brought to his
country by performing acts of valor on the ancient battlefields. It is this
nationalistic fervor along with the triumph of individual athletes pursuing their gold
medal dreams which sets the Olympic Games apart from all other sporting
events.

Because of its uniqueness, the cities that are chosen to host the Olympic
Games also feel they are distinctive and part of an elite group, just as the
athletes who compete in the Games are elite. Richard Cashman addressed this
concept in his article entitled *Olympic Legacy in an Olympic City: Monuments, Museums and Memory*. He mentions that at the time his article was written in October 1998, “only 21 cities on four continents …have earned the right to stage the Summer Games [and] 17 other cities that have staged the Winter Games.”

This places a city that has hosted the Olympic Games in a pretty limited group. This alone is a powerful motivator for an Olympic city to want to preserve the legacy of planning, developing and hosting the Olympic Games. The citizens of the city want to showcase the uniqueness of their city in being one of the few cities to belong to this exclusive club. Preserving the legacy of the Games is a way in which the city can remind the world and visitors to the metropolis that they hosted one of the biggest worldwide events ever to be held. In this way, the legacy also appeals to the tourism element that every city hopes will keep economic interests growing.

As Cashman points out in his article, the legacy an Olympic city leaves is widely varied and comes in several different forms from infrastructure, such as facilities and venues, roads, mass transit systems, and state-of-the art airports, to commemorative items such as statues and monuments, galleries, museums, and anniversary celebrations. Because of this diversity in legacy it seems ironic that although the Olympics is a monumental event for any city to undertake, the International Olympic Committee (IOC) does not require the city to leave behind any type of legacy whatsoever and what they do choose to leave is left strictly up to the Olympic committee. This is somewhat of a paradox given that every detail in the planning and staging of the Olympics is strictly monitored by the IOC and
the country’s Olympic Committee. In the case of Salt Lake, it was the United States Olympic Committee (USOC). This brings up the issue of how an Olympic city should be defined and if it should be required to have some sort of standardized form of commemoration of the Games. In this light, Cashman addresses the important reasons as to why the legacy of an Olympic city “should be approached in a more serious and systematic fashion.”

Some of these considerations include commemorating a peak experience, mourning the games, core legacy, guardians of the legacy, costs, and above all, the memory of the games. The building of legacy items such as museums or monuments “is one way in which the public can ‘touch’ the Games after the event and recapture some of the magic of the event and deal with sense of loss.”

The primary reason for an Olympic city to maintain a legacy of the Games is to recapture the memories, stories, and sense of pride that are treasured by individual citizens. These personal memories are the most vivid and driving forces behind commemoration. As Kirk Savage so eloquently stated, “‘[t]rue memory’ many Americans like… to claim, lay not in a pile of dead stones but in the living hearts of the people.”

Salt Lake City became one of the exclusive Olympic cities mentioned above on June 16, 1995. Like every other Olympic planning committee before them, the Salt Lake Organizing Committee (SLOC) went through the three phases of Olympic planning, including the pre-Games period which lasted for several decades for Salt Lake because of the many bids it submitted and did not win. The planning and preparation also takes place during the pre-Games time.
Next is the duration of the Games, which is the seventeen days in which the Games actually take place and ironically it is the shortest of the three time periods and lastly, the post-Games period which is the longest time frame and will last for many years and even decades. Again, it is ironic that although this is the longest time frame, it is the one with the least amount of planning. It is in the post-Games period where the story of the legacy of the Salt Lake 2002 Olympic Winter Games begins.
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“Once in every lifetime there’s a chance to stand apart. We can show the world our very best.” The children’s choir from the 2002 Olympic Winter Games sings this line from the theme song, Light the Fire Within, as images from the Opening Ceremonies flash across the three screens of the theater in the Olympic Visitor’s Center Gallery.¹ Any observer of this spectacle would be hard pressed not to react with the chills and goose bumps that often accompany such displays of pageantry, especially if one were personally involved with the Olympic Winter Games such as the citizens of Utah were and more specifically, the city of Salt Lake. The 2002 Olympic Winter Games were perhaps the single most important event Salt Lake City, and on a larger scale, the state of Utah will ever hold. It was a magical time when Salt Lake played host to the World’s best athletes in the field of winter sports and it seemed to transport the people, the city, and the state into another dimension. This dimension was full of hospitality, neutrality, mutual understanding and most of all, just plain fun. It brought the people of Salt Lake, where there are often large cultural divides, together and united them for seventeen days in a common cause.
After the Games were over and the last participant, journalist, and tourist departed the city, both the people who had taken part and those who were just observers longed for a way to preserve the euphoric atmosphere that existed during those days in February 2002, none more so than the Salt Lake Organizing Committee (SLOC), who had spent the previous seven years preparing for this monumental event, and of course the Salt Lake City politicians, who wanted to pay tribute to the amazing accomplishment that had taken place in their city as well as secure their legacy as part of this remarkable event. This “once in every lifetime” chance that Salt Lake had to stand apart as the song states, needed a legacy of what had happened during those seventeen days of the Games. The citizens of Utah wanted to keep the memory of this moment in time vibrant and alive. Almost immediately, questions began to be asked about how this historical memory was to be preserved.

Today, exactly ten years after the Salt Lake 2002 Winter Olympic Games took place, there is a small park located in the south plaza of Rice-Eccles Stadium at the University of Utah. This site is called the Olympic Cauldron Park and the space, along with the small visitors center adjacent to it, is the only legacy park constructed in Salt Lake City, as an attempt to capture the magic that held a city in its grasp. This cauldron park became the sole tangible historical memory of this monumental occasion, but so much more was originally planned. From the beginning, SLOC planned to leave the cauldron at Rice-Eccles Stadium as a legacy reminder that the Opening and Closing Ceremonies took place in the venue. The idea to preserve the cauldron at the University was hatched early on
in the planning process for the 2002 Olympic Winter Games. Although there is no indication of this plan or any other plan for a legacy park being discussed during the bid process, the idea does surface rather quickly after the bid for 2002 was won. The first mention of the plan for the cauldron to remain at the University is found in the *Ceremonies Agreement*, which lays out the terms and conditions for SLOC’s use of the University of Utah’s Rice-Eccles Stadium for the Opening and Closing Ceremonies for the 2002 Olympic Winter Games. In section six of the *Ceremonies Agreement*, it states that SLOC will install the cauldron at the stadium as a permanent structure once the Olympic and Paralympic Games were over in March 2002. The *Ceremonies Agreement* was signed on July 28, 1997.²

The idea called for a structure containing a fountain and a reflecting pool in which a scaled down cauldron would reside. Both SLOC and University officials believed this would be a tasteful reminder of the Games at the University but the fountain itself was originally a rather small footprint in the large plaza area that existed south of the oldest portion of the newly renovated stadium. Plans for the relocation of the cauldron began immediately after the Paralympics ended in March, 2002 as the stadium needed to return to its original configuration with a large video wall now standing in the place where the cauldron once burned. SLOC also wanted to have most of the construction done on the cauldron in time for the one-year anniversary celebration of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games. This was the extent of the plans at the time for a cauldron park at the University of Utah. A much larger and more grandiose legacy park was also envisioned,
but it was not at the University. Instead, it would be downtown in the heart of the city.

The creation of the Olympic Cauldron Park in its current state came from the actions and/or reactions of three major players: the Salt Lake Organizing Committee coordinating its last project before disbanding as an entity, the Salt Lake City Council along with the Redevelopment Agency of Salt Lake as well as Mayor Rocky Anderson and finally, University of Utah officials such as President Bernie Machen and high-powered donor Spence Eccles. Each of these organizations and individuals played a vital role in the development of a legacy park and each caught the vision of wanting to preserve the “once in a lifetime” feeling of the Olympics. Unfortunately, the age-old antics such as the dealing of political hands, jockeying for position, and never-ending bureaucracy played out in the media and front and center in the public eye as the decision as to where an Olympic Legacy Park would eventually end up seemed to change almost weekly. In the end, individual political agendas and time running out cut short the dream of a legacy park in downtown Salt Lake and served as the impetus for the cauldron park at Rice-Eccles Stadium to be expanded in its role to become the only legacy park from the 2002 Olympic Winter Games. The saga took place in a relatively short time as the journey from cauldron monument to legacy park took less than fifteen months to complete.

At the beginning of this journey, however, little transpired in the area of planning what would eventually happen to the cauldron after the Games. There was absolutely no conversation taking place about a legacy park being
constructed until the Games were actually over. It is not hard to assume why this was the case. As one can imagine, it takes a large amount of time, effort, and detailed planning to stage an international sports competition on the scale of the Olympic Winter Games. From the time the Ceremonies Agreement was signed until the day of the Closing Ceremonies on February 23, 2002, there appeared to be no development about what would take place with the legacy project. There was also the small matter of money. In the wake of the bid scandal which dampened organizers’ ability to attract sponsors and raise funds, no one was quite sure how much money, if any, would be left at the end of the Games. Clearly, plans for any type of permanent structure for the cauldron or any other legacy monument would depend on what type of financial situation SLOC found itself in at the end of it all. As it turned out, there was plenty of money.

Shortly after the Olympics were completed, it was determined that there would be a large surplus of money from the Games. SLOC announced that most of the $100 million in profits would go toward maintaining the Olympics competition venues to keep them operating in their current top notch state. SLOC also announced they intended to donate $6 million dollars to the City of Salt Lake for the creation of an Olympic Legacy Park. By April of 2002, President and CEO of SLOC, Mitt Romney, had turned the reins of what remained of the organization over to his good friend and SLOC CFO, Fraser Bullock, and headed to the east coast to begin his bid for the Presidency of the United States, by first running for governor of Massachusetts. He left the final legacy projects up to Bullock, Creative Director, Scott Givens and the remaining
SLOC boards to develop, organize, and complete. Bullock’s vision from the beginning was to have the legacy park located somewhere in Salt Lake’s downtown area, but he had no clear proposal on the exact locations. As the search began, several pieces of land were mentioned. A vacant lot, between Main Street, West Temple, and 400 and 500 South, owned by powerhouse businessman Earl Holding was considered but when the price of the parcel was rumored to be around $11 million, that suggestion soon went by the wayside.⁵ A couple of other places such as the Utah State Fairpark, property near the minor league baseball park, Franklin Covey Field, and the block by an abandoned mattress warehouse were also considered.⁶ Others hinted at the idea of building the park on the block where the medals plaza was staged during the Olympics. This land was owned by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (The LDS Church) and many believed the church would not be willing to donate a piece of land so pivotal to their operation. It appeared that this idea was dismissed before it was completely explored. Proof of this existed in an article, which appeared in The Salt Lake Tribune, a year after the debate began on where to house the park. The article indicates that Salt Lake City Mayor Rocky Anderson claimed the church was not interested, but City Councilman, Carlton Christensen, who was also a church employee, stated that “he spoke with church officials casually who indicated ‘it could have been a possibility.’”⁷

Since the legacy park was a gift from SLOC, building it on a piece of land the city already owned made the most sense. From the start, Mayor Anderson was fixated on one piece of land, a city park named Pioneer Park that was
initially put in place to honor Utah’s prominent pioneer heritage. Pioneer Park is located on the west side of downtown Salt Lake City and was originally the site of a fort built by the first Mormon emigrants to arrive in the Salt Lake Valley in 1847. Long known for the unsavory clientele who called the park home, Mayor Anderson believed that this was just the thing needed to clean up the park. Moreover, he believed it was the perfect location as it was fairly close to the where the medals plaza site was located and within walking distance of most downtown hotels and the newly developed Gateway shopping center. So with plans in hand, Mayor Anderson proposed the idea of Pioneer Park to SLOC’s newly appointed CEO, Fraser Bullock, and Artistic Director, Ray Grant, who, while still excited about the downtown location, were skeptical, given the nearly “sacrosanct status of the park.” Although SLOC claimed they could successfully mesh pioneer heritage and Olympic nostalgia, they wanted to make it clear the idea of the site was Anderson’s and not theirs. As Ray Grant stated, “SLOC does not covet Pioneer Park, SLOC is not coveting an individual site.”

While the location for the park was not yet decided, the content was developing quickly. The park was to contain a gallery wall of hanging artwork that would wind through the city block along with the flags of each of the countries who had participated in the Games, a mini cauldron, which was a replica of the one at the stadium and was used for the medals ceremonies, and finally another potential fountain. The crown jewel of the park was to be a 7,500 seat amphitheater featuring the Hoberman Arch, which was also used at the medals plaza, serving as an impressive, artistic backdrop for the nightly medals
ceremonies. The amphitheater would host summer events such as plays, films and concerts. Mayor Anderson felt the amphitheater and the Olympic legacy park in general would be just what this depressed area of downtown needed to become popular with the public once again. The mayor and SLOC seemed sold on Pioneer Park as the place for the legacy gift but they first had to obtain permission from the Historic Landmark Commission and the final decision ultimately belonged to the Salt Lake City Council and the Redevelopment Agency.

It was the Hoberman Arch and the amphitheater that would prove to be the downfall of the Pioneer Park location. The Hoberman Arch is an enormous metal structure constructed of ninety-six linked panels that "open[ed] and close[d] like the iris of an eye or a camera lens." It is named after its inventor Chuck Hoberman who designed the arch to serve as an opening curtain for the Olympics Medal’s Plaza stage. Now SLOC was looking to preserve the piece by making it part of an amphitheater to be built in the projected legacy park. Designs for the amphitheater in which the Hoberman Arch would continue to function as a curtain required eight foot walls to be built on either side of the stage. Although the amphitheater would be open to the public when events were not taking place, City Council Chairman Dave Buhler pointed out that Pioneer Park was an open space zone and performing arts facilities, arenas and stadiums were specifically excluded from the zone. Fraser Bullock and Mayor Anderson were determined to make the park feasible but as time wore on SLOC grew impatient. It was now July and they wanted a decision about where the park would be located by
August, 2002. The mayor and some members of the city council appealed to SLOC to simply turn the donation of $6 million dollars for a legacy park over to the city and then the council members could take more time to decide the most practical location for the park. SLOC however, was adamant they would be the ones to see the project through. They feared the city would not share the same vision as they did on where the park should be and what it should contain or worse yet decide there was some other more pressing project in need of the money. As the clock tick tocked toward the deadline, there was speculation SLOC would simply scrap the downtown proposal and choose instead to expand the Olympic Cauldron Park at Rice-Eccles Stadium. It was about this time City Councilman Eric Jergensen stepped up to introduce another location for the park. He was concerned that due to the conflict surrounding the Pioneer Park location, SLOC may decide to rescind their donation altogether so he pitched the idea of another downtown location at the Gallivan Center as the new home for the legacy park to Fraser Bullock.

According to Jergensen, most of the city council members were not wild about the Pioneer Park scheme and felt that it had been a personal pet project of the mayor’s. To him, the Gallivan Center made much better sense. It was located in the heart of downtown on Main Street between 100 and 200 South and had been a hubbub of activity during the Olympics as it played host to the popular Bud World. The city block did not have the reputation as a public threat as Pioneer Park did, but it was certainly in need of something which would draw people to the area again, just as most of downtown Main Street needed, since
the departure of the ZCMI and Crossroads shopping malls. Other city council members such as Dave Buehler and Nancy Saxton were also against the use of Pioneer Park and seemed willing to look at other locations. Dave Buehler wondered why the mayor’s office did not consider the zoning restrictions which would hinder the site at Pioneer Park. Nancy Saxton also questioned why the mayor did not select another location stating, “I’m very disappointed that this park is going to be used and reused and overused and used again.” Councilman Carlton Christensen who was on board with Jergensen about the idea of Gallivan Plaza echoed the same sentiment when he said, “[n]obody else really wanted it to go to Pioneer Park and nobody wanted to tell [the mayor] that.” In addition to the concern over the Pioneer Park site, Jergensen had heard rumors that SLOC was thinking seriously about taking the entire legacy park to Park City, a small metropolis and ski resort located about forty-five minutes to the east of Salt Lake in Parley’s Canyon. He was told by officials close to SLOC that designs had even been drawn up to stage the park somewhere at the mountain resort where some of the Olympic competitions had taken place. The apprehension over the possibility that this proposal might become a reality prompted Jergensen to consider a new site downtown. Jergensen stated, “I knew one thing for sure, we couldn’t have this thing going as far away as Park City.”

Jergensen pitched the idea of the Gallivan Center to SLOC CEO Fraser Bullock on a Monday and by Friday of the same week Mayor Anderson and Bullock were holding a press conference to announce new plans to build the Olympic Legacy Project at the Gallivan Center. For obvious reasons, the
proposal succeeded and SLOC was off and running with the idea of moving the legacy park to Gallivan Plaza. Details of what would be contained in the park were sketchy when the new location was first announced, but the deadline of finding a suitable place by August 2002 had been met. By October, SLOC announced plans to put the Hoberman Arch near the entrance of Gallivan Plaza parallel to 200 South. The arch would be situated over a reflecting pool and would open and close on the hour, as recognizable, stirring Olympic music played. There was also an evening light show being considered. A new addition to the legacy park plans included seventeen historical panels which would be titled, the “Heroes Walk,” and would line a walkway throughout the park from the Main Street entrance to the front of the arch. SLOC suggested further improvements to the city block such as moving and expanding the ice rink, and adding new public seating areas and restrooms. In order to make room for changes, the city would remove the artwork of artist Kazuo Matsubayashi, who appealed to the city council “to keep the plaza as is.”

Similar to Mr. Matsubayashi, not everyone was enchanted with the idea of moving the park to the Gallivan Center. John Pace, designer of the original Gallivan Center, and Alice Steiner, who was the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) director when the plaza was being built, were some of the few who tried to convince the city council members this project would ruin the original intent of the plaza. Some of the dissent came from Jergensen’s fellow city council members. In their dual role as members RDA of Salt Lake, city council members such as Nancy Saxton felt the Gallivan Center was not the “right place” for the
park and went back to her original lament of hoping for new land to be donated where the park could reside instead of having to “reuse and redo” existing space.26 Others worried about the amount of money SLOC was asking the city to contribute. Once new plans for the park were solidified, SLOC wanted the city to “pony up” just over $3 million dollars for improvements to the infrastructure of the plaza.27 City Council Vice Chairman Carlton Christensen, now grew skeptical and told the Deseret News “I’m disappointed that our contribution is getting so high. We need some justification and some proof that this is a wise use of taxpayers’ money.”28 It was also no secret that Mayor Anderson was resistant to the idea at first, because of his fondness for the original location at Pioneer Park but he soon got on board with the proposal for the Gallivan Center when it became evident that SLOC was not interested in pursuing the Pioneer Park idea any further. With city council members at odds about the location of the park, a mayor who was hostile because his original plan had been complicated by the RDA, and an Olympic committee that was controlling the purse strings and was ever aware of the clock ticking, it became obvious that the situation was not going to be easily resolved. The personal agendas of key players were headed in different directions. It would be extremely difficult for a decision to be reached in the short time allotted by SLOC. According to the organization, groundbreaking needed to begin by October 2002 in order for this project to be realized. If not, it faced the real possibility of being abandoned altogether. Despite the infighting of city council members, on October 10, 2002 “[f]ive of the seven council members
decided they would rather risk changing the feel of Gallivan Center than lose the gift altogether.”

Ironically, October 2, 2002, is exactly when the groundbreaking ceremony took place at Rice-Eccles Stadium for the Cauldron Park. The cauldron had long since been removed and was being stored in a Questar gas company parking lot in Murray, as it awaited the completion of its permanent home in the south plaza at the stadium. Spence Eccles, a prominent Utah businessman, philanthropist and avid University of Utah and Olympic fan, was in attendance along with gold and silver medalists from the Games and SLOC officials at the groundbreaking ceremony at University of Utah that day. Mr. Eccles had been adamant the cauldron remain at the stadium which bore his name after the Olympics were over. Eccles was invested, literally from the start, in the life of the 2002 Olympic Cauldron as the then SLOC CEO, Mitt Romney, approached him regarding the creation of the cauldron. Romney, who was appointed CEO in the wake of the bid scandal, was forced to make drastic cuts in order to bring the organizing committee back in budget. As a result, Romney had cut the expenditure for the cauldron to a mere $600,000 dollars. Knowing this was not going to begin to cover the cost of the cauldron in its current design, Romney went to Spence Eccles and told him he could stay with the current budget and have a small, rather embarrassing cauldron by Olympic standards or, with Mr. Eccles’ help, Salt Lake could have a cauldron which was unprecedented and truly spectacular. Mr. Eccles obliged with a gift of $8 million dollars to assist with the purchase of the Olympic Cauldron, help with the ceremonies in general and to purchase
tickets for disadvantaged children to attend the ceremonies. Knowing SLOC had promised the cauldron would remain at the stadium as part of their ceremonies contract with the University, Eccles wanted to ensure the cauldron had an impressive permanent home and again donated $2.1 million for the construction of the historical structure. As recognition for his tremendous contribution, a plaque was erected as part of the Olympic Cauldron Park that pays tribute to George Mariner Eccles, Spence’s father, who was an avid Utah sportsman and skier.

There were no specifics mentioned as to what the cauldron park would contain in the original Ceremonies Agreement. There are merely three short paragraphs stating only that the cauldron would remain at the University and that SLOC would be solely responsible for the installation and maintenance of the permanent structure as well as the design and placement. It also states SLOC “will use best efforts to obtain the necessary consents and approvals from the USOC and/or the IOC to permit the University to license or use any protected marks, logos, symbols or terminology affixed to the Cauldron.” On April 24, 2002, Olympic and University of Utah officials made the first announcement regarding the content of the cauldron park. It would “showcase the 72-foot tall cauldron, [a] reflection pool, fountain and a list of medal-winning athletes”. Mark Burk, director of the stadium and Norm Chambers, former Associate Vice President of Auxiliaries remember the discussions did not begin on what the cauldron park would look like or how construction would go forward until the summer following the Olympics and then the talk focused on a small footprint in
the south plaza. They recalled the plan would include the cauldron rising out of a reflecting pool but did not remember the original plans including a fountain wall cascading water behind it and the names of the medal winning athletes etched in granite somewhere by the reflecting pool. They believed these elements came in later modifications to the design. There was no conversation, at first, of anything beyond this small scale. This fountain and pool became known as “Phase 1” in the Cauldron Plaza Agreement, which was entered into by the University and SLOC in October, 2002.

As construction went forward and the coordination for the one-year anniversary at the Olympic Cauldron Park got under way, the project of placing the legacy park at Gallivan Center began to unravel. Once again, the Hoberman Arch proved to be the major stumbling block in the plan, but this time its sheer size became its undoing. Because of its location near the current amphitheater at Gallivan, no sponsorships other than approved United States Olympic Committee (USOC) and International Olympic Committee (IOC) sponsorships could be displayed by or near the amphitheater. As mentioned previously, in the agreement entered into by the University with SLOC, it stated that SLOC would make its best effort to obtain use of Olympic licensing and marks to be used in the Olympic Cauldron Park. Apparently, this proved more difficult for the Gallivan Center to obtain this permission, as was revealed in an article which appeared in the Deseret News on August 26, 2002. In the article, Fraser Bullock stated, “[t]o avoid sponsorship conflicts, the word ‘Olympic’ won’t be part of the center’s expanded name. It will be something associated with our Games, ‘at the Gallivan
Center." The Deseret News also reported that "the U.S. Olympic Committee raised concerns about non-Olympic sponsors selling products or displaying advertising around the arch or other Games-related displays planned at Gallivan." This caveat also proved difficult for the seventeen story panels designed to lead the visitor through a tour of the city block on a day to day account of the Games. The Salt Lake Tribune reported "Olympic rules about sponsorships could have ended the center’s popular free concert series.”

Former City Councilman Jergensen acknowledges it was the sponsorship element that finally forced the city to back off on the building of the legacy park at the Gallivan Center. According to Jergensen, the city explored an idea where the Olympic elements in the park would actually be covered up during events in which sponsorships other than USOC or IOC approved sponsors were being displayed or products sold and it was determined the Olympic displays in the park would be covered up about half of the time which "completely defeated the purpose of the park in the first place.” Jergensen represents the city was totally unaware of the possible conflict of sponsorships in the park until Fraser Bullock sprang it on them right before construction was to begin and by then it was too late. Perhaps it was never officially explained to the city council members by SLOC, but as far back as April 2002, The Salt Lake Tribune reported that the USOC would not allow any commercial agreements at the planned Olympic Legacy Park in Salt Lake City and quoted USOC President Sandy Baldwin who said, "[w]e love the idea…but you don’t start selling Pepsi there.” Later, an embittered Mayor Anderson called the city council “reckless” for not doing their
homework in this area.\textsuperscript{44} It is easy to see, however, how the city council might have been led astray, when Fraser Bullock is quoted in a \textit{Salt Lake Tribune Article} from November 2002 in which he states “we don’t think there will be any restrictions. If there’s an event with a non-Olympic sponsor, we’re just fine.”\textsuperscript{45} It was not just fine. Eventually, the sponsorship restrictions enforced by the USOC became too much for the city and they wanted more time to think about where to put the park, but for SLOC time had run out. They were on a deadline and the only deadline being met thus far was at the Olympic Cauldron Park. In the end, it was the University of Utah that came to the rescue of the Hoberman Arch and the Olympic Legacy Park.

Enter Jim Lohse, an architect with FFKR who had worked on the designs for the expansion of Rice-Eccles Stadium as well as the Olympic Cauldron Park. Jim was asked to “find a place” for the Hoberman Arch in the plans he had drawn of the original cauldron park. Once he did, the President of the University of Utah, Bernie Machen was invited by SLOC to a presentation at the FFKR offices to show him the new add-ons to the park, which included not only the addition of Hoberman Arch but the seventeen story panels of the “Heroes Walk.”\textsuperscript{46} By this time the \textit{Cauldron Plaza Agreement} had expanded into what was called “Phase 2,” which included a “building to serve as a visitors center and expanded plaza and additional enhancements.”\textsuperscript{47} President Machen liked what he saw and contract amendments were put in place to bring the Hoberman Arch up to the Olympic Cauldron Park as one of the “additional enhancements” as well as other elements originally planned for the downtown legacy park, including the
seventeen story panels. It was announced in December, 2002, the Hoberman Arch was officially going to Rice-Eccles Stadium. Some felt bringing the Hoberman to the University was an odd fit since it was never actually used at the stadium and now it was to be located a considerable distance away from the place where it had resided in its medals ceremony capacity, but SLOC officials were pleased because they finally found a home for the large legacy piece. Fraser Bullock commented on not being able to find a place for the arch downtown, stating “[w]e’re probably a little disappointed.” At the same time he indicated that he was happy about the University saying, “[w]hat we have created here, is a wonderful destination that will tell the story of the Games.”

Once it was announced the Hoberman would come to the University, plans for a legacy park downtown seemed to dissolve into thin air, although “Bullock said organizers are still committed to leaving behind some sort of Olympic legacy in downtown Salt Lake City.” The focus of an Olympic Legacy Park seemed to shift solely to the University as construction for the Olympic Cauldron Park was well underway. Deseret News reporters Brady Snyder and Lisa Riley Roche reflected “while the city’s elected officials botched an opportunity to revitalize the city’s economically challenged central business district, the U. is a benefactor.” As is often the case, however, not everyone was thrilled with the idea of having an expanded legacy park at the University. A student editorial printed in the Daily Utah Chronicle expressed the opinion that the SLOC legacy could be put to better use by funding education rather than spending money on “cheesy, oversized memorials to better times.” Some
University officials also questioned President Machen’s decision to bring the Hoberman to the University when it had nothing to do with the role the stadium played during the Games. The choice to make the monument a static display rather than the moving, retractable opening curtain it had been for the medals presentation also baffled not only the facilities managers at the University but the FFKR architect as well.\textsuperscript{53}

Some dissenters even went so far as to say that they felt the University had “sold out” to SLOC, as there were no identifying University markers contained on the south end of the stadium. One of the great regrets expressed by former Associate V.P. Chambers is that during the designing process, the University did not demand more identity signage be placed on the south side of the stadium and in the plaza where the Olympic Cauldron Park is located. He also recalled the University of Utah’s Athletics Department was not happy that they were asked to give up the backside of the large south scoreboard as an advertising space for upcoming Athletics events in order to make room for the large replica of the Salt Lake 2002 snowflake logo.\textsuperscript{54} Many were also upset that the color of the signage was blue, as this was color not normally found on the U. campus since it is the color of the University’s primary rival. The University eventually petitioned the USOC to add a sign to the bottom of the 2002 snowflake logo which identified Rice-Eccles Stadium and the University of Utah as the location of the park. A letter was sent to Mr. Jim Scherr, President of the USOC, in November of 2003 by President Machen requesting the sign be added.\textsuperscript{55} Although there is no official document, the petition must have been
granted as the identifying sign is now in place below the Salt Lake 2002 logo. Overall, the sentiment toward the cauldron park was positive as the excitement began to grow over the cauldron being put back into place at the stadium and lighting it to commemorate the one-year anniversary of the Games on February 8, 2003. Prior to the addition of the Hoberman, plans had been expanded to include a state-of-the-art theater within the 6,000-plus square-foot visitors center that was also moving forward.56

As for an Olympic legacy downtown, it was revealed a few days prior to the one-year anniversary of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games that five Olympic look towers similar to the ones used at the Olympic venues would serve as markers in various locations downtown. These markers as well as some story panels would be placed at the Gallivan Center, the Delta Center (now known as Energy Solutions Center), and Abravanel Hall, home to the Utah Symphony. These locations were the first to be announced. There would eventually be five large “look of the Games” markers.57 A marker also stands at the entrance of the visitors center at Rice-Eccles Stadium. After all of the excitement of the possibility of a downtown legacy park that might be able to revitalize one of the dormant sections of Salt Lake City, what the metropolis was actually left with seemed rather paltry. While it is true the University of Utah is technically located within the city limits of Salt Lake, the decision to move the park to the University was still viewed by many as an opportunity squandered by politicians following personal agendas instead of doing what was best for the city. The mayor and city council members also engaged in finger pointing and blaming one another for the
botched chance at the legacy park. In an article, that appeared in the *Deseret News* on December 6, 2002, City Council Chairman Dave Buhler blamed the mayor by stating, “[i]t’s another opportunity lost really by the mayor.” Buhler believed the mayor tried to push his idea of Pioneer Park for so long it made the RDA waffle on the decision to put the park at Gallivan. Mayor Anderson retorted, “[i]f the council would have backed off, we could have done it at Pioneer Park.”

An article appeared in *The Salt Lake Tribune* some four months later, in April, 2003, where the blame game theme was the same but the players were a bit different. This time Mayor Anderson blamed City Councilman Jergensen for the dismissal of his idea to use Pioneer Park. *Salt Lake Tribune* reporter Heather May hints at an underhanded scheme by Jergensen and fellow city council member Carlton Christensen when they stepped in and proposed SLOC think about the Gallivan Center instead. This move took place after Mayor Anderson had left on an extended vacation.

While some city council members felt the mayor wasted an important opportunity, others expressed frustration in working with SLOC. Jergensen would be one of those council members. He felt the thing that ultimately doomed the downtown project at Gallivan was SLOC’s neglect in not telling the full story of how much the requirements placed on sponsorships by the USOC would stifle the already existing cultural events at Gallivan. He was disappointed in how the mayor handled the situation as well. A *Deseret News* editorial written on April 18, 2003 expressed that although the Hoberman Arch was certainly no Seattle Space Needle, if it had remained downtown along with other Olympic
memorabilia in an Olympic Legacy Park it “could have been a lasting and impressive reminder of the largest, most public and positive event ever staged in the area.” The editorial pointed out concern that the displays at the University of Utah were too far away from the crowds of visitors who often frequent downtown Salt Lake City. Former City Councilman Eric Jergensen voiced this same opinion. While he was happy that at least the park was kept within the city limits, it would have better served its purpose of reaching tourists in a downtown location. The ongoing saga over where the Olympic Legacy Park should go eventually prompted Tribune writer, Dan Nailen, to write a tongue-in-cheek article where he suggests the city should buy back the portion of Main Street it had sold to the LDS Church prior to the Olympics and make it into the Olympic Legacy Park. The article poked fun at the city’s politicians as the argument over the city’s selling of this small but valuable parcel of land to the LDS Church was attuned to the same level of squabbling now taking place over the current Olympic Legacy Park location. As mentioned previously, the loss caused by the infighting among Salt Lake City politicians was the University of Utah’s gain. It is safe to say if the legacy park proposals would have been approved at either Pioneer Park or Gallivan Center, or if the city would have had more time, the Olympic Cauldron Park would not have turned into the sole historical museum of the Games.
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CHAPTER 3

A LEGACY BEGINS

As the clock begins to strike midnight, Cinderella runs out of the ball hoping to get away before the last chime of the clock fades away. Similar to this fairytale story, everyone in Salt Lake had such a good time at the Olympic ball they did not want to leave but just like Cinderella rushed to escape before the spell was broken, SLOC rushed to get all of the loose ends tied up on their last project before the final midnight chime and all the magic disappeared. Eventually time did run out, however, and in October with construction underway on the cauldron park, SLOC, staying true to their word, dismantled as an organization. On Halloween 2002, SLOC officially closed shop. There would be a few senior staff people who would remain on as independent contractors with the organization, which was now known as Ceremonies Legacy LLC (Limited Liability Corporation). It was thought at the time that these contractors would oversee the “development of the Olympic memorial parks at the University of Utah and in downtown at the Gallivan Center.”¹ It was also expected that current President Fraser Bullock and Game-time President Mitt Romney would return to preside over the festivities that were being planned for the one-year anniversary of the Opening Ceremonies.² Moreover, in October, with the groundbreaking over and
done, University officials turned their attention to assisting the Ceremonies LLC in creating a beautiful, yet functional historical park. As the Cauldron Plaza Agreement between the University and SLOC continued to be modified and amended, a committee made up of University of Utah representatives, SLOC contractors, FFKR architects, and Jacobsen Construction managers began to meet on a weekly basis to decide what elements were actually going to make up the park and visitors center. While the basic concept of the park had been established the project was still mostly a work in progress with some aspects being worked out on an as-built basis. The University of Utah representatives came from the following departments; Plant Operations, Campus Planning and Design, Grounds, and Athletics in addition to the Director of Rice-Eccles Stadium as well as the Associate Vice President of Auxiliary Services, the department under which the stadium operates as a venue.

Some of the agenda items up for discussion by this committee included who would be responsible for the furniture, fixture, and equipment (FF&E) for the visitors center gallery and theater, whether or not there would be a gift shop and/or a merchandising area in the gallery for the University Bookstore, would a restaurant or a café be included, should additional storage space be added, whether the orientation of the restrooms should be changed so people in the gallery could not look directly into them, where would the parking for the visitors be located and would it be free. The list of questions went on and on. One of the most time-consuming discussions was where the perimeter fencing of the park would go. There was a great deal of concern over what parts of the park should
be inside the stadium perimeter and what area would be outside. The question continually arose of how exactly would a public park function at a stadium? The committee had to figure out how to keep the feel of a public park while protecting the integrity of the stadium, which is usually closed to the public except on game and event days. The area that perhaps underwent the most dramatic changes in the planning process was the “Phase 2,” or Salt Lake 2002 Visitors Center Gallery, portion of the park. After it was decided in August the park would include the “Phase 2” option as lined out in the Cauldron Plaza Agreement, the gallery and its contents continued to evolve on a weekly basis. It started out as an art gallery, café, and small gift shop where Olympic memorabilia would be sold and ended up as a completely different concept. The only thing to survive from the original plan was the art gallery and that ended up being quite small with limited pictures.

Clearly there were many decisions that had to be made in the building of the Olympic Cauldron Park, and while the University did have a voice in what would be included in the park, SLOC was responsible for all of the expenses that would be incurred in the construction of the project. They decided on the design and overall look of the park and hired the contractors to implement the ideas. The University was not involved directly with those contractors nor did they decide what type of materials would be selected or what construction methods would be used in the building process. The park was definitely the brainchild of SLOC official Scott Givens, former Director of Creative Services, and CEO Fraser Bullock. They were given full creative license by the University, which is exactly
what they wanted from the beginning and why they balked at the idea of simply giving money to the city to build a legacy park at a later date at a downtown site yet to be determined. Time was always of the essence in this process. In April of 2002, Fraser Bullock was quoted in the Deseret News saying, “[w]e don’t want a long gap between the Olympic fervor and building the park.”\textsuperscript{6} Almost as important as the deadlines was the need for creative control. When asked why SLOC refused to give the city money to develop a legacy park at a later date, Caroline Shaw, SLOC spokeswomen responded by saying, “[t]he board of directors determined we would not give a grant in dollars but a gift of a center. They wanted to make sure the Olympic movement and the organizing committee were well represented.”\textsuperscript{7}

Grant Thomas was a key administrator in the SLOC organization. Although SLOC ceased to exist Fraser Bullock asked Thomas to stay on as President of the Ceremonies Legacy, LLC. It is Grant Thomas’ name on the bottom line of the contract between SLOC and the University of Utah for the Olympic Cauldron Park.\textsuperscript{8} When asked who decided on all of the elements that would be contained in the park, Thomas stated, “Fraser Bullock collaborating with U of U representatives.” Bullock was the person who decided the Hoberman Arch and the seventeen story panels would be included along with the cauldron in the park itself.\textsuperscript{9} As far as look and overall branding of the park, Scott Givens and some lingering members of his staff from the Creative Services department of SLOC were the primary players in deciding exactly how these elements would appear to the public. Some of the decisions were small details such as the color
and size of the font on the story panels and some were enormous such as the placement and angle of the Hoberman Arch on the northeast corner of the stadium and 500 South. Thomas also indicates that most of the choices made on what would be contained in the Salt Lake 2002 Visitors Center Gallery were mainly dictated by Scott Givens and his creative team.\(^{10}\) This statement was confirmed by Maggie Probst who served in a dual role as a producer for Video West, an affiliate of KSL TV, the local NBC station and as an employee of the Creative Services Department at SLOC. She remained as one of the key members who worked closely with Scott Givens to determine the content of the video aspects of the 2002 Visitors Center Gallery. Probst’s main focus was to create the eight-minute highlight film to be shown in the theater. She worked closely with the official SLOC videographers, NBC and KSL broadcast companies to create the stirring piece. Everything they did in the park was to mirror the light the fire within theme and this was reflected in the film as well. They also sought to incorporate the park visitors and movie viewers into the ceremonies experience and wanted them to feel like they were actually standing on the ice rink on the floor of Rice-Eccles Stadium during the Opening Ceremonies.\(^{11}\)

The theater was designed in a round space so people would get the sense of an ice rink and feel like they were a part of Games. In addition to her duties as the producer of the film, she worked with architect Jim Lohse at FFKR to design the theater so it would convey the concept the Creative Services team had developed. In order for the film to produce the full effects of the three screens to
be installed in the theater, Probst and her team actually recreated some of the scenes for the film so it would translate more dramatically onto the screens. She also indicated the quotations heard and displayed as visitors walked into the darkened theater and waited for the movie to begin were tied into the overall look and concept of the Games and she and her colleagues had to follow a specific format given to them by the Creative Services team to produce this look. They were informed from the beginning of the project that the entire theme of the Visitors Center and OCP was the same as it was for the 2002 Olympics, which was "Light the Fire Within." This theme is evident in the film as it starts out a bit dark and cloudy and then gets lighter and lighter until in the end, all three screens burst into flashes of light with fireworks that can be seen from space as the camera pans out from Salt Lake to the United States to the earth and up into the vast atmosphere where everyone on earth seems to be equal. In addition to the film, Probst produced the film shorts which were placed in the kiosk where visitors could press different buttons and watch a brief highlight video on various aspects of the Games. There was also the video of the Olympic torch running from Greece to the Salt Lake cauldron that played on two flat screen televisions on the outside of the theater so visitors could watch while waiting for the next viewing of the film. When asked if there were any budget restrictions for the film and video projects she states; “we tried to keep the costs at a reasonable level and we were able to accomplish everything they wanted to within the amount allotted.” She continues on to say that she did not feel anything was missing from either the theater or the park and that “it was beautifully put together.”
The key player in putting together this beautiful park was Scott Givens. Fraser Bullock might have decided the main elements placed into the OCP and Visitors Center Gallery, but it was Scott Givens who made them come alive. When asked who decided how the pictures, film, story panels, kiosk and fountain would look, Grant Thomas has only one answer, Scott Givens, the Director of Creative Services. Although Givens was the main decision maker, he consulted with many people to ensure that all parties involved would be pleased with the outcome. For example, he worked with the University’s Athletics Department and more specifically the booster organization known as the Crimson Club on what would be placed in the center of the gallery. The Crimson Club desired to hold VIP receptions prior to University of Utah football games so the pictures that were to be displayed in the Visitors Center Gallery needed to be removable so the space could be used for something other than just a museum on game days or for other events in general. Not only did Givens oversee all the minute details of the park, from the rolling wooden panels for the pictures to the names of all of the medal winners being engraved on the granite stones that surrounded the cauldron, he was the overall driving force behind the interpretation of the Olympic Cauldron Park and ensured the goals of SLOC in building this legacy park would be met. Those goals according to Grant Thomas were to “commemorate the games, the success, the excitement, the magic and the legacy.”

On February 8, 2003, some of the magic of the Opening Ceremonies was recaptured as the cauldron now residing in its new location in the south plaza of
Rice-Eccles Stadium was relit in spectacular fashion and then burned for the next seventeen days in celebration of the one-year anniversary of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games. A few weeks prior to the celebration, the cauldron was hoisted into its new home by two large cranes. SLOC officials as well as dignitaries such as Spence Eccles were on hand to witness the cauldron’s return to Rice-Eccles Stadium.18 2002 Olympic athlete, Derrek Parra, was also present for the placement and described the cauldron’s return in this way, “[i]t shines as a light for our dreams. I had a dream come true here.”19 Hosting the Olympics seemed like a dream to Utahns and one year later the public still seemed to be as enthusiastic about hosting the Olympics as they were a year before it happened. Just as Fraser Bullock had hoped, the Olympic fervor had not died. The following statement taken from an editorial written in the Deseret News captures the sentiment generated by the cauldron perfectly, “[h]istorians some day will come to terms with the meaning of the Salt Lake Games of 2002. When it comes to their meaning for Utahns, we hope they will find that the Games showed people they have nothing to fear from the world and that the state has much for which to be genuinely proud. And the cauldron will stand proudly in place as a symbol of that forever.”20 Knowing the emotion the cauldron could generate with the public, it was important it was in place for the one-year anniversary. The cauldron was a key player in the culmination of the show for the evening. Since the cauldron was used for an Olympic Games, SLOC had to get permission from the USOC and the IOC in order to light the cauldron at the one-year mark of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games.
There was a great deal of coordination that went into the anniversary celebration. It seemed almost as soon as the flame on the cauldron flickered out at the Closing Ceremonies, SLOC began preparations to light it again. Planning was in full swing by October 2002 when construction began on the Olympic Cauldron Park, yet another reason why the deadline for groundbreaking had to be met. As far as SLOC was concerned there was no other place to hold the anniversary celebration than at Rice-Eccles Stadium where the cauldron resided and they had set aside a large chunk of money from the surplus to ensure it was a grand party. The event was so big it even had its own letterhead. A letter addressed to the Vice President of Administrative Services of the University of Utah, Arnie Combe from Brett Sterrett of the Utah Sport Commission regarding the serving of alcohol at the anniversary celebration was written on stationary entitled “Utah’s Olympic Anniversary Celebration & Fundraiser.”\textsuperscript{21} For the second time in a year, the street known as 500 South, located on the south side of the cauldron plaza, was shut down to traffic and a stage as well as bleachers were brought into the plaza for the show. One of the main differences in the planning of the anniversary celebration, however, was instead of taking the stadium over as they had during the Olympics, and completely running the show with their own committee members and staff, this time SLOC worked with the University and the stadium director and event coordinator to stage the logistics of the celebration. A budget was decided upon and SLOC paid for the University staff that was involved in the planning and implementing of the celebration and for the event
expenses as well as the cleaning and mechanical preparation to relight the cauldron.\textsuperscript{22}

The celebration was a grand affair attended by thousands of volunteers and Salt Lake City residents. Although it was not on the scale of the Opening and Closing Ceremonies, it was “a modest production every bit as classy as what Utahns have come to expect from the Salt Lake Organizing Committee.”\textsuperscript{23} The program, entitled “The Fire Still Burns” consisted of short speeches from IOC President, Jacques Rogge via a taped message from IOC headquarters in Lausanne, Switzerland, Governor of Utah, Mike Leavitt, Salt Lake City Mayor, Rocky Anderson, and a taped message in place of an anticipated live appearance from former SLOC President and Governor of Massachusetts, Mitt Romney. Romney had been in town but had to depart early due to a heightened terror alert issued by the Bush Administration.\textsuperscript{24} Romney’s wife Ann addressed the crowd and told them how disappointed her husband was he could not be there with the people because they “were the heart of the Games.”\textsuperscript{25} These same people turned out by the thousands in deep-freeze temperatures to witness the celebration and participate in the spirit of the Olympic Games once again and they were not disappointed as the program unfolded. The Mormon Tabernacle Choir performed and short video clips of the Games were shown in between the speeches. Finally, the cauldron was lit and the show culminated in a twenty-two-minute fireworks display, which was longer than the fireworks show at the Opening Ceremonies. “‘We wanted to go out with one big bang,’ Salt Lake Organizing Committee President Fraser Bullock said of the event.”\textsuperscript{26}
Most of the people who braved the cold and stood in the road along 500 South were volunteers who were there to reunite with other volunteers with whom they had worked alongside during the Games and to rekindle memories of their Olympic experience. Much of the program was devoted to thanking the volunteers who made the Games special for not only the visitors but the athletes as well. In a short speech during the program, U.S. bobsled medalist Brian Shimer commented that “[t]he community, welcomed us with open arms.”

Men’s Skeleton U.S. gold medalist, Jimmy Shea echoed Shimer’s sentiments when he said, “[t]he world came here and saw so many great things, was greeted with so much kindness.” Paralympics athletes were also represented by veteran Chris Waddell who commented that the Games will pay future dividends. He said, “[i]t gave disabled kids heroes, [and] made a difference in their lives.”

The parking lot at Rice-Eccles filled hours before the celebration started at 6:30 p.m. with a gathering of these same volunteers. Each venue or specific function of the Games had its own tent in the expansive lot where the volunteers could meet and share memories. Perhaps the most popular spot in the sea of tents was the one that contained two oversized flags provided by SLOC, who appealed to all of the volunteers, performers, and staff members to sign the flags as a memory of their participation in the Games. One of the more light-hearted moments of the evening was when the volunteers were given bags of chips called “Wahoos.” The little known snack food had been a staple on the menu for volunteer meals during the Games after an apparent mix up with the order that left SLOC with “enough chips to feed volunteers from four Olympics.”
The celebration at the Olympic Cauldron Park did more than serve as a remembrance for those who participated in the Games, it sparked the imagination of those who are hoping to host the Games in their city one day in the future. Members from the Chicago Olympic Bid Committee were among the guests in the crowd that night, drinking in the Olympic spirit as Utah relived their moment in the spotlight. *The Chicago Tribune* sports columnist, Bill Plaschke who was with the contingency, had this to say about the celebration, “In Chicago, and everywhere else, the U.S. Olympic Committee has been embarrassing itself in recent months, the people have no clue. Here, they understand perfectly. The Olympics are not about a blazer, or a budget, or USOC blowhards who routinely abuse both. The Olympics are about what a woman described over the weekend as she stood on a sidewalk after a parade commemorating an event that ended nearly a year ago. [P]atting her parka covered chest…[she said] ‘[i]t’s about what’s in here. It’s about remembering the feeling.’”

People came to the celebration at the cauldron park to remember that feeling. In this way, it served as a historical legacy because it helped the people of the community to recall the memories of a monumental time. The Olympic Games had forever changed Salt Lake and the State of Utah in general. Reporter Linda Fantin of *The Salt Lake Tribune* wrote “[t]he Olympics brought a high-octane harmony to the region that didn’t exist before, an atmosphere of congeniality that spread from the athletes to the volunteers to the security guards to the spectators. The streets in downtown Salt Lake City were plugged with people, music and yes, liquor, and the
reporters, usually critical of every little host-city misstep were drugged with some sort of post-Sept.11 sedative.”

The celebration was far from over when the program at Rice-Eccles ended. For the next seventeen days, the cauldron burned in honor of each day of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games. Just as they did during the Olympics, hundreds of individuals again stopped their cars along 500 South, to photograph the burning cauldron. This show of support demonstrated that the Salt Lake 2002 Winter Games was a thrilling time for most of the citizens of Utah. They felt a pride in the city, the state and the athletes of the United States that had not been felt on this large of a scale previously. There are only a handful of cities in the world that can lay claim to the fact they hosted the Olympic Winter Games and that alone was a basis for burgeoning civic pride. During the Olympics, the city and the state seemed to step out of the shadow of being regarded as a strange and peculiar place where only Mormons or polygamists live, and as the theme song states, Salt Lake was given a chance to “show the world our very best.” An editorial in The Salt Lake Tribune echoes this sentiment and challenges Utahns who were basking in the nostalgia prompted by the relighting of the cauldron with this statement, “[the] willingness to embrace new ideas should be a legacy of the Olympics as Utah builds its future. Utahns were pleased to show the world during the Games that they aren’t some weird breed of religious cultists. At the same time, they learned that their visitors weren’t weird or dangerous either, even if they did take a drink while celebrating.” The pride Utahns felt for their state and the City of Salt Lake, as well as acknowledging SLOC for staging probably the
most successful Winter Olympic Games in history, all needed to be demonstrated, but the question must be asked, did the Olympic Cauldron Park fulfill that desire for a legacy or did the expectation fall short because the legacy park which was planned for downtown Salt Lake never came to fruition?

The cauldron was extinguished after the one-year anniversary in much less spectacular fashion than it was lit. The flame was snuffed out after a twenty-minute ceremony in which representatives of Utah’s five American Indian nations came together and Clifford Duncan of the Ute Nation gave a blessing in his tribe’s language. The debut of the Olympic Cauldron Park had been a success. The euphoria from the event even prompted University of Utah President Machen to declare “[i]t’s our expectation we’ll fire up the caldron at least every year. Even though “[i]t costs about $3,000 a day to keep the steel-and-glass structure lit.” This certainly was not the time, however, for the University or SLOC to sit back and rest on its laurels. Work was far from over in the building of the remaining parts of the park. There was much to do before the dedication of the park that was slated to take place just a week prior to the start of the 2003 football season. By May, the visitors center and theater were nearly completed and the small ticket office on the east side of the stadium had been torn down to make room for the installation of the Hoberman Arch. The cauldron fountain wall was nearly finished as well and it had turned out to resemble a “wide-mouthe V, that flank[ed] the caldron.” Still left to be done at that time was the installation of the granite stones around the foot of the reflecting pool, engraved with the names of the 2002 medalists, along with the seventeen “Heroes Walk” panels, depicting
each day of the Games along the perimeter fence on the South side of the plaza. The interior of the panels told the story of what happened on each particular day during the seventeen days of competition and ceremonies and the exterior side facing 500 South contained the same images that appeared on the building “wraps” featured on the downtown high rise buildings during the Games.\(^{37}\)

Obviously, the scope of the park had changed dramatically in the year’s time since the idea was first fleshed out, but perhaps the area where this metamorphosis was most evident was in the theater and visitors center. Known as “Phase 2” of the project, it was not part of the original plans for the cauldron park. “Phase 1” of the project was the structure, fountain, and reflecting pool surrounding the cauldron itself and although it was not referred to as “Phase 1” in section six of the *Ceremonies Agreement*, this was the portion of the park that was a known entity from the start.\(^{38}\) “Phase 2” first appears in section D in the *Cauldron Plaza Agreement* that was drawn up in the months immediately following the Games. It is unclear when the idea for the theater and visitors center was hatched, but the language of the contract suggests it had been developed some time ago, perhaps as far back as the *Ceremonies Agreement*, but it was going to be contingent on factors that are not mentioned. More than likely it was based on how much money would be available post Games. Evidently, even as the contract was being written on the cauldron park, it was still tentative whether or not this phase would come to fruition, but the parties involved in the contract wanted to make sure provisions were made for it just in case the money was available for expansion.\(^{39}\) Approval for the visitors center
was obtained sometime after the announcement by SLOC of surplus money in April and before the groundbreaking in October. An article appearing in the *Deseret News* on April 25, 2002 discusses the development of the cauldron park but makes no mention of a visitors center. In a subsequent *Deseret News* article published on September 18, 2002, the visitors center now appears to be part of the plan. Reporter Lisa Riley Roche writes, “[t]he rest of the park, [will] also feature a visitors center, a gift shop and restaurant as well as walkways and landscaping.”

The decision to move forward with “Phase 2” of the *Cauldron Plaza Agreement* and build the visitors center seemed to take place rather effortlessly. The decision of what the visitors center would contain proved more complicated as the space itself underwent several transformations over the next several months. Some of the features mentioned by the local newspapers and discussed by the University/SLOC committee included a restaurant or café, a kid’s interactive center, a media interactive display, a gift shop, and a meeting space. One of the more popular ideas with the University was the suggestion of a gift shop that would incorporate an area for the University Bookstore where University merchandise could be sold alongside Olympic memorabilia. During the University/SLOC committee meetings, a great deal of time was spent discussing the design of the gift shop and making room for the bookstore within the footprint. The thought of including a café or restaurant in the visitors center was short lived and is not mentioned again after the groundbreaking in October. Ultimately, the café, the gift shop and bookstore kiosk went by the wayside after
the reality of economics reared its ugly head. After much discussion by both the University and SLOC, it was determined the cost to run a café or gift shop would far exceed any profits that could be earned. Although it was located by one of the busiest parking lots at the University, Earl Clegg, the director of the University Bookstore decided a kiosk would not be lucrative at that time.\textsuperscript{43} Ironically, now that the contract between SLOC and the University has ended and new discussions are taking place about converting the visitors center into a different capacity, the bookstore is revisiting the idea of placing a store or kiosk of some type in the visitors center space. It was eventually decided the only merchandise to be sold in the gallery would be a coffee table book on the creation of the 2002 Olympic Cauldron and this would be available through the ticket office windows, which is where tickets would also be sold for the eight-minute film to be shown every fifteen minutes in the theater.

While the visitors center underwent several changes in its content, one thing that remained constant in the plan was the theater. From the start, FFKR designed the visitors center to include a small, standing-room-only theater with a state-of-the-art theatrical system, which included three screens and a variety of special effects.\textsuperscript{44} In the theater, a short highlight film of the Games would be shown. This element was going to be the big wow factor of the visitors center and University and SLOC officials both anticipated it would also be the money maker. There would be a charge to view the movie, $3 for adults and $2 for children, and officials felt there would be enough visitors to the park annually it would pay for itself. The \textit{Deseret News} quoted President Machen saying, “the park should
make enough money to cover costs."^{45} Admission to the park itself would be free to everyone. Other than the theater, the visitors center, in the end, did not contain any other money-making elements other than the gallery space itself, which could be rented from the stadium for small functions of 100 people or less. The final design of the gallery contained a small interactive kiosk on which five short films on various aspects of the Games could be viewed, rolling wooden frames or movable walls upon which several photos of athletes and participants of the Games were mounted. The frames rolled so they could be removed when the gallery was rented for functions. Several photos also graced the walls of the gallery and a large wrap of an impressive skyline view of Salt Lake City during the Closing Ceremonies of the Games greeted visitors as they entered the gallery. Finally, there were two flat screen televisions mounted on the outside of the theater in which a fifteen-minute film presentation on the Olympic flame’s journey to the Salt Lake 2002 Olympic Winter Games was shown.

As construction on the park entered its final phase, one last element needed to go into place, and it was a big one. On the last day in July 2003, just twenty-three days before the opening of the park, the giant Hoberman Arch, weighing in at 30,000 pounds and standing thirty-five feet tall and seventy feet wide, was finally put into place on the southeast corner of the Olympic Cauldron Park.^{46} This mechanical giant had made quite a journey in the previous two years. It had gone from a showcase and audience stunner at the medals plaza during the Games to possibly becoming a backdrop for a new amphitheater at Pioneer Park, then onto Gallivan Center where first, it was to stand over a
reflecting pool and open and close every hour while Olympic music played. Then it was to become an enormous gateway for the entrance into Gallivan Plaza. Lastly, it came to rest at the University of Utah where it would not function in its original capacity. “Although it opens and closes much like the iris of an eye, the arch will remain static at the park.” 47 Apparently, SLOC obtained permission from the designer Chuck Hoberman to use his patented retractable dome and even signed a Consulting Agreement with him, but they did not obtain the machinery which operated the arch and caused it to open and close. In the end, SLOC felt the purchase of this machinery was cost prohibitive. 48 The arch instead was placed over a moat which was to be surrounded by water with a bridge so visitors could walk underneath the massive structure. It was also to be illuminated nightly by a colored light show, an idea left over from the Gallivan Center plan. 49 With the Hoberman Arch finally at rest and safely installed, all of the pieces were in place for SLOCs dream of a 2002 Olympic Winter Games Legacy Park to be realized.

The Olympic Cauldron Park was dedicated on August 22, 2003 in what was once again a ceremony of pageantry and nostalgia albeit a much more simple and less extravagant affair than the one-year anniversary had been. Although a short, summer thunderstorm threatened to dampen the spirit of the occasion, the show went on as planned with SLOC President Fraser Bullock walking a lighted torch from 2002 Olympic Winter Games across the plaza and handing it to Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney, who then turned the torch toward the cauldron, which once again roared to life. 50 In order to light the
cauldron for the second time in one year, the Ceremonies LLC had to obtain permission from the IOC. The public was not invited to the Thursday night ceremony; only community leaders, political dignitaries and former SLOC officials were asked to attend. The park would be officially opened to the public the next day with a ribbon cutting ceremony at 10:00 a.m. At last the community had a place to gather and pay homage to a magical time in the history of Salt Lake City. Just a few miles to the east, a large monument stands at the mouth of Emigration Canyon commemorating the moment when LDS Church prophet and leader, Brigham Young declared the Salt Lake valley to be the new home of the Mormon pioneers in 1847 by stating “this is the place.” Many citizens now felt the Olympic Cauldron Park was the new “this is the place” monument where Salt Lake could be remembered for more than just the Mormons. The creation of the new “this is the place” had been a story filled with many twists and turns in the plot. The park had gone from a small, simple display of the Olympic cauldron to a legacy park which now contained, not only the cauldron and the original reflecting pool, but an expanded water feature, the Hoberman Arch, seventeen story panels, and a 2002 Salt Lake Visitors Center which encompassed movable walls covered with pictures of the athletes, a video kiosk and a theater featuring an eight-minute film guaranteed to give an observer “goose bumps even if you planned not to.”

For SLOC, it was their last project of the 2002 Winter Olympic Games and they felt they had been successful in creating a legacy park where “visitors could take away a sense of how special that time was.” Mayor Anderson, along with SLOC CEO Fraser Bullock and University President Machen, took part in the
dedication ceremony, thus uniting the three major players in the saga of the legacy park now residing at the University of Utah. Although it might not have been the original plan for a 2002 Olympic Winter Games legacy, the Olympic Cauldron Park is one of a kind. As SLOC Creative Director Scott Givens stated “[w]e wanted to preserve the memory of 2002, Atlanta has its Olympic Park, but [former Olympic cities] haven’t built something like this.”\textsuperscript{55} All parties involved with the design, placement and construction of the park are in agreement that it has served its purpose well as a historical memory of the Games. Even, former City Council member, Eric Jergensen, who might have reason to be bitter over the decision to house the legacy park at the University of Utah instead of at a downtown location, expresses sentiment when talking about the park and stated that no matter how much time passes whenever he visits the park and views the film he is filled with emotion. He states, “I choke up every time.”\textsuperscript{56} When asked if he thought the Olympic Cauldron Park served as an appropriate legacy of the Games, architect Jim Lohse responded with an emphatic, “[a]bsolutely!”\textsuperscript{57} Perhaps the best way to describe what the Olympic Cauldron Park represents is expressed in an editorial that appeared in the \textit{Deseret News} stating, “[a]n Olympic city never really relinquishes that title. It remains a part of the city’s psyche, part of its collective identity and self-confidence, for generations. And typically, physical reminders are left in place as visual symbols of that legacy.”\textsuperscript{58} The Olympic Cauldron Park is a visual symbol of a “once in every lifetime” moment that defined Salt Lake City.
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CHAPTER 4

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

In the 1989 film, *Field of Dreams*, the young character of Karin exclaims to her father, “People will come,” to ensure him that people will come to visit their baseball field, which was built in the middle of a cornfield because Ray, the film’s main character, was told by a mysterious voice, “If you build it he will come.”¹ Both of these statements from this extremely popular baseball film can be compared to the vision the Ceremonies LLC, formerly known as SLOC (Salt Lake Organizing Committee) had for the legacy park, which had been recently completed at the University of Utah’s Rice-Eccles Stadium. After the dedication ceremony took place on August 23, 2003, SLOC officials stood back to admire their final project of the Salt Lake 2002 Olympic Winter Games. Now in the south plaza of the stadium, where the Opening and Closing Ceremonies had taken place, there existed a spectacular Olympic Cauldron Park and a shiny new 2002 Visitors Center complete with a theater, highlight film, photos, and an interactive kiosk. The new creation was the culmination of the legacy project SLOC had dreamed of giving Salt Lake City and officials believed that “if they [built] it,….people [would] come,”² and they did come, for a while.
During the short construction of the Olympic Cauldron Park, SLOC and University of Utah officials alike discussed at length what purpose the park would serve and how it would specifically function. Now the time had come to walk the talk, so to speak. With the dedication of the park, the time for talking was over and actual function had begun. It was at this point the University took over official control of this operation. During the building phase, SLOC had been fully in charge of the contractors and had made all decisions about the content and look of the park. As mentioned previously, University officials were certainly consulted on basic operational needs and functionality of the park as it related to other events and for the central ticket office which would share the space with the Salt Lake 2002 Visitors Center and theater, but there was no question that SLOC was the driving force in the creation of the Legacy Park and the University’s role was to provide the space to make the park a reality. As the doors opened officially to the park in August, 2003 no one was completely sure what would happen, but expectations were high.

According to Maggie Probst, a former SLOC creative consultant, the overall look and design of the park, including the theater, had turned out exactly as everyone involved in the creative process envisioned. Other expectations involved less tangible aspects of the park such as how many people would actually come, if the commemorative books would sell and how active the volunteer docents would remain over time. These effects were more difficult to predict. From the start, SLOC officials were optimistic about the visitation to the park of former volunteers, locals, and out-of-town visitors. “Organizers expect[ed]
at least 100,000 people [would] visit the park annually” with most of them hailing from out of town.⁵ The hope from the beginning with both SLOC and University officials was there would be enough visitors to sustain the costs associated with maintaining the park. Although SLOC was adamant that admission to the park be free to the public, they intended from the start to charge for the eight-minute movie, which cost 1 million dollars to produce. The cost was $3 for adults and $2 for children. Officials believed that nearly every visitor who came to the park would want to view the movie and would pay the reasonable price to do so.⁶ The fee from the movie is what would ultimately pay for the maintenance of the park. Fraser Bullock stated, “[w]e only need 50 to 60 people a day to be comfortable in our revenue stream.”⁷ He went on to say that they felt the annual cost to cover the maintenance would be about $50,000 a year.⁸ There were other forms of revenue generating plans introduced during the planning and construction of the visitors center such as a small café and a gift shop or kiosk where Olympic memorabilia would be sold, but unfortunately, those plans were scrapped because University officials believed it would be cost prohibitive to include these items and that they would possibly end up costing more money than they would generate.⁹

The novelty of the park was certainly evident during the opening weekend in August, 2003. There was a private ceremony in which the cauldron was lit on Thursday, August 21 to signal the opening of the park. The following day several hundred people gathered to witness the official ribbon cutting and explore the attractions. The cauldron stayed lit during the entire weekend and once again
park goers and passersby took advantage of the photo opportunity. Hours in the park were extended and it even stayed open on Sunday, which was not to take place in the future. During that inaugural weekend, over 5,000 visitors were expected to come to the park. Although there were no official records kept, it was estimated up to 10,000 people packed into the park during the first few weeks after it opened, but unfortunately, the novelty wore off quickly and by late September, the numbers had decreased to several hundred per day. Perhaps the more discouraging statistic, however, was the fact that only one in four visitors was paying the fee to see the movie. Stadium director, Mark Burk, made the observation that “[p]eople just come up and look around at the free part and take off.” With visitors avoiding the charge to see the movie, it quickly became evident the revenue flow expected from this element was not going to help with the maintenance costs of the park. Immediately there were red flags as to how much of a reality the original expectations of the park would be. The other source of revenue that would come from the sales of commemorative books dried up quickly as well. It seemed the only people who wanted to buy the book, which originally sold for $40, were the docents who were volunteering in the park and wanted to have some type of memorabilia.

It was perplexing to those involved in the operation of the park as to why its popularity seemed to wane so quickly. During the one-year anniversary celebration, thousands of people, most of whom were former volunteers, turned out to relive the memories of the Games and to try to capture the emotion which was felt during that seventeen-day time period. Nearly everyone in the crowd
that night expressed the same sentiment, Salt Lake had accomplished something extraordinary and it should not be forgotten.\textsuperscript{12} Civic pride still swelled in the hearts of the citizens of Salt Lake and the Olympic Cauldron Park (OCP) was a place where the collective memory of the Games could be shared with others, but somehow it did not translate over to the out-of-town tourists who, in the beginning, were the majority of the visitors to the park. It was evident the local people were always supportive of the large celebrations such as the one-year anniversary and the ribbon-cutting ceremony for the park, but they did not come on a day-to-day basis. The number of tourists continued to steadily decline and soon went from a few hundred a day to a few hundred per week. As visitors began to wane, so did docent participation. It quickly became apparent to the Rice-Eccles Stadium management, the University of Utah department that was in charge of the operation of the Olympic Cauldron Park, that some things would need to change and fast.

The visualization of how the park would function and the actuality of what was taking place were vastly different. SLOC’s vision of the park before it was opened was that 100,000 people annually would visit the park, the reality of the first year was that approximately 10,000 visitors, not including the opening weekend, came to the park and only one-in-four of them were buying tickets to see the movie and even less were buying commemorative books. Some adjustments had to be made. The first change implemented was the hours of operation. The original hours were Monday through Thursday 10 a.m. to 6 p.m., Friday and Saturday 10 a.m. to 10 p.m., closed on Sundays. The thought was
visitors would want to come up later in the evening on weekends, especially in the summer when it would be hot outside in the majority of the park, which was mostly cement. It turned out that Fridays and Saturdays were not more popular than any other day of the week and it soon became difficult to justify staying open later on the weekends when maybe two or three and sometimes no visitors would show up the entire time. Saturdays were not much better and management began to question whether or not it was worth it to pay a staff person to be there during the later hours on Friday and all day on Saturday. It was beneficial that the docents who greeted visitors and showed them through the park worked as unpaid volunteers, but because the Stadium ticket office shared the space of the 2002 Salt Lake Visitors Center and tickets for the movie were sold at the ticket office windows, it was necessary to have a ticketing employee on site whenever the Olympic Cauldron Park was in operation. The ticket office hours prior to the opening of the Olympic Cauldron Park had been Monday through Friday, 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. At first, management thought there should be a ticket office manager or supervisor on site at all times when the park was open, but when it became evident that hardly any supervision was needed from the ticket office for the park, the policy was altered so a part-time employee could work those additional shifts and extended hours, thus saving money. However, with so few visitors on Saturday, even the cost of a part-time employee eventually became too much. Within the first four months of operation, it was decided the Friday and Saturday hours should be shortened from a closing time of 10 p.m. to 8 p.m. A few more months went by and management decided a
more drastic change was needed. After the park had been in operation for a year, it was decided the Olympic Cauldron Park would no longer be open late on Friday and it would not be open on Saturday at all. In other words, the park would be open the same hours as the ticket office had originally been set at prior to the opening of the park, which was weekdays 10 a.m. to 6 p.m.\textsuperscript{13}

The second major change that was implemented in order to bring the vision of the park more in line with the reality of the operation of the park was to eliminate the charge for the movie. This change was more difficult to make and required more time to play out as management attempted to maintain this sole money-making feature of the park and tried to continue charging for as long as possible. Once thought to be the major revenue source that would sustain the park, it never quite materialized. Instead, the stirring, spectacular highlight film and highly technical theater sat unused day after day. Some days it was not used because all of highly technical special effects were difficult to keep in operation and were not functioning from time to time, but mostly it was because visitors simply did not view the movie as something important enough to spend their money on the price of the ticket. So rather than have the theater remain under utilized for the amount of repair work it was demanding, Stadium management decided to eliminate the charge for the movie and allow all visitors to see it at will. In an attempt to continue to make some money on the film and the park in general, it was decided to fashion a clear podium that was being used for a visitor’s registration book holder into a donation box with a plea to visitors to make donations to help in the operations of the park. In March of 2006, the fee
for the movie was officially terminated and according to the Rice Eccles Stadium accounting department, the first quarter after the movie charge was eliminated and the donation box was implemented more money was earned from donations than had ever been earned for the movie in the past. This is dependent, of course, on whether or not the past records were accurate. This trend has not continued to be the case, but the donation box remains in place and recently saw its most lucrative donation month ever during the February 2012 ten-year anniversary celebration.

Even after the elimination of the fee, the movie still has not become a priority for park goers. Docents report that most people must be told about the movie and encouraged to go into the theater before they will actually venture in.\textsuperscript{14} Perhaps it is the fact that the theater is not readily noticeable and is located down a somewhat darkened hallway, but more likely, the film is not what the average visitor views as an important aspect of the park, especially since it is an unknown. Instead, they seem more drawn to the physical or interactive aspects of the park that they can readily see, such as the overwhelming presence of the cauldron, the story panels and the photographs of the athletes. No doubt there are many tourists who come to the park on days the docents are not working who never see the film or even know it exists since there is no one to convey the message. The other revenue source, the commemorative book, was originally priced at $40 but when the sales at that price were practically nonexistent, stadium management decided to drop the price by fifty percent and the books continued to be sold at a price of $20 for quite some time, but due to the sheer
lack of public interest, it eventually died away. A recent housecleaning of some storage space at the stadium uncovered a few cases of unsold books that were distributed to the staff and donated to the University of Utah J. Willard Marriott Library. There are still several cases in the stadium ticket office awaiting their fate. The book, which actually proved to be far more popular than the cauldron commemorative book, was one that contained photos of various aspects of the Games and not just the Olympic cauldron. These books sold out rather quickly in spite of the $40 price, which would indicate people were more interested in the Games as a whole and not just one feature such as the cauldron.

With the revenue-making aspects of the park gone asunder, the cost of the maintenance of the cauldron and the park became a glaring reality. The issue of park maintenance is where the deepest division between vision and reality can be demonstrated. As mentioned previously, SLOC CEO Fraser Bullock believed that $50,000 per year would cover the expenses of the park and that it would be easily funded by annual revenue from the movie and sales of the book.15 As the revenue sources dried up, so did the ability to keep up with the cost to operate the park. There was also the issue that SLOC had underestimated the cost to maintain the park by at least as much as $50,000 per year. Stadium director Mark Burk has struggled every year with the challenge of how to pay for the expenses of the Olympic Cauldron Park, which costs more in the neighborhood of $75,000 to $100,000 to maintain than the $50,000 SLOC had predicted. In spite of the funding difficulties, the park has remained a priority for Arnie Combe, the Vice President of Administrative Services, which is the department that
oversees the stadium and other auxiliary services at the University of Utah. Because of the importance of the legacy park, stadium management tries to keep up with the burgeoning financial cost and keep the park in commission at the highest level possible with limited resources.\textsuperscript{16} When SLOC turned over the operation of the park to the University, they also provided a sum of $750,000 to help cover the operating costs.\textsuperscript{17} Of course this original amount was supposed to be supplemented by annual revenue of at least $50,000 and when those revenue goals fell short year after year, this initial donation quickly disappeared. There was also an undisclosed amount of contingency money donated by SLOC to the University for other projects that has been dipped into by the vice president’s office from time to time to assist the stadium with the OCPs often overwhelming overhead.\textsuperscript{18} The operating costs became difficult to manage because once again, there was a large difference between the vision of what the park would be and what it actually was.

When the University took over the actual function of the park, officials had no idea the new, beautiful park would in some ways become a maintenance nightmare. The first unknown entity was the cauldron itself. Shortly after the 2002 Olympic Winter Games were complete and discussion had begun on keeping the cauldron at Rice-Eccles Stadium in some capacity, Randy Turpin, former Assistant Vice President for Administrative Services, expressed concern over how the cauldron would be maintained by stating, “[i]t could have been made out of materials that would have lasted indefinitely without any maintenance, but it was not.”\textsuperscript{19} In the same article however, he continues on to say that he is
basically confident the University can keep up with the workload and that “[t]here are ways to get around that maintenance issue.” Just as Randy Turpin predicted, the cauldron proved to be tricky to keep looking ceremony ready for one main reason. It was not made out of materials designed to last in harsh winter weather. Ironically, although the cauldron was designed for the Olympic Winter Games, much of the material it was made of was not able to withstand severe winter and summer weather year after year. The painted glass panels have faded as well as the steel structure itself. Applying a new coat of preservative-enhanced paint every year or two would have solved the problem but proved to be too expensive. The double-pane glass which made up the bowl of the cauldron and provided the special effect of water cascading down while the fire inside burned were also problematic as they expanded and contracted in the hot summer heat and freezing cold, allowing debris to become lodged in between the panes of glass, which can only be removed by completely disassembling the cauldron bowl. Pigeons often perch on top of the bowl and have added to the problem of keeping the cauldron clean and presentable. Each time the cauldron is lit for an anniversary or special occasion, the cost of getting the cauldron ready is enormous. Much of the cost in this case, however, is covered by the Ceremonies LLC, which has replaced SLOC as the organization which oversees all 2002 Olympic celebrations. Still, the stadium staff spends countless hours both internally and externally with contractors such as Oasis Stage Werks and Wet Design, the company who designed and built the cauldron, in order to get it ready as well as the OCP for a lighting ceremony.
The fountain in which the cauldron sits has also been extremely problematic. The design of the fountain led to frequent glitches with the pumping system. It was soon discovered that more than just water could be pulled into the small filtering space where the water cascades down a wall into the pumping system, which is supposed to keep the water generating back through the waterfall. Debris as small as leaves and twigs and as large as dead birds have been cleaned out of the system and, as a result, countless burned up motors have been replaced. It was soon discovered by University Plant Operations experts that the pumping system was not installed in a way to sustain the overall water flow of the fountain and there was a loss of pressure due to water seepage. In spite of repeated efforts to repair, mend, and bandage the leaks, the water stopped cascading down the side steps of the fountain after approximately two years. The wear and tear of freezing weather on the pumps, motors, and mechanics for the fountain finally resulted in the decision to shut down the fountain during the winter months after 2009. In 2011, the system had deteriorated to the point that the only thing which would solve the problems would be to completely tear out the current pumping system and install a new one. Because there is no funding available to bring in a new system, the cauldron fountain only flows during special events such as football games and Olympic celebrations. Other than those dates, the fountain remains dry. Another challenge was the lighting in the reflecting pool at the base of the cauldron. Although the fountain was not supposed to freeze up even in the winter months, temperatures would often drop to a point where it was inevitable. The freeze
would crack the lights, thus allowing water into the wiring and causing the lights to stop functioning altogether even if the light itself was replaced.

This same problem persisted with all the lighting in the park, including the Hoberman Arch lights and the lighting on the seventeen story panels. The Hoberman Arch lighting proved to be the most detrimental as the nightly light show reflecting on the Hoberman was the sole attraction of the legacy piece other than its sheer size as the giant retractable dome had been welded shut and was no longer operational after its installation at the Olympic Cauldron Park. The colored, theater spotlights set to timers also suffered from the extreme swings in temperature in the Utah climate and the lights were soon broken, rendering a light show of beautiful colors on the arch impossible to keep going. The spotlights were extremely expensive to replace and just like the cauldron fountain have only been replaced for special events. Not only did the lights suffer from unforgiving sun and snow but so did the plaques displayed all around the park. Although they were made of a tempered plastic material, and in the case of the seventeen days plaques were covered with a rust-resistant vinyl coating, after years of exposure to beating sun and freezing temperatures, the vinyl has started to peel and the plaques underneath are either rusting or cracking. Restoration is badly needed on these plaques, but again, it would be extremely expensive and impossible to accomplish since budget money is needed to take care of higher priority elements in the stadium and within the park itself. One of those elements, which has always had a higher priority because of its potential revenue generating role, is the theater in the 2002 Visitors Center.
The theater was designed to produce special effects that would enhance the visitor’s experience. It was equipped with special lights that would dim and brighten on cue at the beginning and end of the movie. There were other lighting effects that gave the illusion of fire and light. Various recorded quotes were heard by the audience as they waited in the dimly lit circular space for the movie to begin. The theater was constructed with three wide screens that would play the film elements individually or together for special effects. Each screen had its own individual projector and computer file that operated the portion of the movie that ran on that particular screen. Finally, the crowning special effect was fog that came out from underneath the screens to create the illusion of clouds which was part of what was being shown on the screen as well. All of these elements if functioning correctly produced quite a stunning effect, but because of the highly technical nature of these elements, they proved to be quite temperamental and were often malfunctioning if working at all. The University had technicians from Electrosonic, the company who created the theater system flown in several times from California over the years to address timing issues, reprogram computers and fix broken lights as well as the fog machine.

Finally, the expense became too great to have the company constantly coming in to fix problems and it was decided the University would take the maintenance in-house. A training session was arranged for with Electrosonic and the University electronics department who has done an adequate job of maintaining the theater since that time. The timing of the computers were also a delicate issue as they were programmed to turn the movie on at a certain time,
play it during certain hours and shut the movie off at an exact time. When groups wanted to rent out the 2002 Visitor Center, the theater and showings of the movie were offered as a bonus feature to their event for an additional cost. In the case of afterhour’s events, the timing of the computers had to be overridden. The over-riding process never worked out well and inevitably, a high-ranking SLOC or University official would be in attendance at the event where the movie was not working and after many complaints it became obvious, action had to be taken. The next step was to have a University electronics tech work the event to override the computer system manually so the movie would play. Again, to keep an employee at an event on overtime pay was too much cost for the University to absorb and patrons did not want to pay the extra fee involved to see the movie so eventually, the movie was taken off the options offered to customers if they rented the visitors center.

When it came to maintenance of the Olympic Cauldron Park, one thing was quite clear; the park itself required a full time maintenance supervisor and crew to keep it up to the standard it was originally designed to be and this was a cost that no one had anticipated. Neither SLOC nor the University had the funds to pay for additional full-time or part-time employees, whose sole priority would be the operation and preservation of the park. Perhaps the additional duties could have been handled by a facilities manager and crew who had the responsibility of a smaller building along with the OCP, but the stadium facilities crew had the responsibility of the largest and one of the most difficult buildings on campus to maintain. The stadium itself requires a tremendous amount of up keep
and attention. Then add onto it the unique nature of the Olympic Cauldron Park and the 2002 Salt Lake Visitors Center and the job becomes overwhelming. Choices had to be made constantly on whether to prepare the stadium for an upcoming football game or replace the fog machine in the theater first. Repairs were usually prioritized in favor of the more important event at the moment. In 2010 a new position of facility building manager was created in addition to the facilities event manager and this has helped to improve the situation of attention to the park. The supplementary position has added much needed man hours to the work load that the stadium and park demand and some of the long-standing maintenance issues are finally being addressed. The decline of the OCP over the years has been noticeable, especially to those who were familiar with the park since its inception, such as the docents, former volunteers and SLOC employees. Maggie Probst, who worked on the video elements of the Visitors Center Gallery expressed with a disappointed tone that she “wished it had been maintained better.”

Although the overall upkeep of the park might be a concern to a person who has come to actually see it, it certainly is not a reason to keep potential guests from coming in the first place. So the question must be asked, why do they not come? Here is a beautiful park that is reasonably maintained and fulfills its purpose of keeping the legacy of the Salt Lake 2002 Olympic Winter Games alive and yet hardly anyone comes now to share in the legacy. They had built it, but no one was coming. It cannot be that people simply do not care. The support shown by the community during anniversary celebrations and the overall attitude
of the city negates this suggestion. Canadian writer Rod Mickleburgh made a visit to Salt Lake in 2009 and found out even after seven years, the community still spoke favorably about the Olympic experience and Mr. Mickleburgh spoke to more than just the token SLOC officials and government representatives. He asked docents volunteering at the park, a group of downtown construction workers and a waitress in a bar how they felt about the 2002 Games. The responses ranged from “[i]t was a once-in-a-lifetime experience” to “they were great. Loved it” and “[t]hey were awesome.”

Again, the question where are the people? If this same inquiry is made to the docents of the park their response is unanimous, “No one knows about it!”

All three docents interviewed for this project expressed remorse that more had not been done over the years to sufficiently market the park to the public and felt more could have been done by the docents if they were only given the chance. Although they do their best to spread the word by telling everyone they come in contact with about the park, the marketing by word of mouth approach has not been enough. The advertising of the park has suffered from the same misfortune as the maintenance aspect did; there was too much work to be done to be absorbed into the jobs of the existing stadium staff positions. This is not to say that many attempts have not been made to get the word out to the public. When the park first opened, the marketing responsibilities fell to the Director of Marketing and Licensing whose department also reported to the Associate Vice President of Auxiliaries as did Rice-Eccles Stadium. This was in addition to all the other responsibilities this position already shouldered for the auxiliaries department and the University in general.
This position at the time started out by producing a number of promotional brochures that were then distributed to local businesses, the Salt Lake Convention & Visitors Bureau and the Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce. This practice was continued for quite some time with the stadium guest services intern traveling around to these locations once a month to make sure the brochures were well stocked. There was also a cross promotion brochure that was distributed at both the OCP and the Utah Olympic Park in Park City to encourage those visiting one or the other location to take in both Olympic legacy sites and not just one. The brochures marketing plan was the longest running strategy and it did seem to work from the distribution side of things as they were often gone from the business where they were being dispersed but did not seem to help with actually drawing people to the venue. After quite some time the demand on money and time with all parties involved was too great and the brochures were no longer created and distributed.

The marketing director also joined the Foothill Cultural District, which included Hogle Zoo, This is the Place Monument, the Fort Douglas Museum, University of Utah Museum of Fine Arts and Museum of Natural History in an attempt to piggyback on the cultural district marketing efforts. It was also an effort to try to gain some additional funds through the ZAP Tax that zoos, parks and other arts organizations are eligible to receive. The exposure and the money were positive aspects, but the attendance still remained low. Local tour companies such as Grey Line Tours and Lewis Brother Stages were also contacted and even paid a commission to add the Olympic Cauldron Park as a
destination on their local tour routes. The problem was the distance was too far to be included in a downtown tour and seemed like an awkward stop on the Park City Tour so it never was a popular addition to local tours. This seemed to solidify the fears that Salt Lake City Council members had when a location could not be found for the legacy park downtown. The University was simply too far away from downtown for tourists to be interested even though the TRAX light rail system provided easy access from downtown. Funding again became an issue and after money was no longer offered as commission, the local bus tours removed the park from their destination stops. Tour busses still frequent the park on occasion, but they are usually busses carrying tourists from foreign countries such as Japan or Germany and are on their way through Utah on their way to Wyoming to see Yellowstone Park.

For a long while the busses that showed up to the park most often were big, yellow school busses. About two years into the operation of the park, a program was implemented by the auxiliaries marketing director and the stadium guest services department to visit elementary and middle schools around the valley to encourage them to schedule student field trips to the park. Local school boards were contacted and the Olympic Cauldron Park was submitted as an approved destination for field trips. Initially, the idea was not that popular when schools were informed they would not be allowed to bring food into the park, thus forcing the students to eat their lunch on the bus as field trips usually encompass the lunch hour. This policy was implemented to keep the clean-up of the park at a minimum to save on costs. After this restriction was lifted, the program gained in
popularity and there were many schools that took advantage of the program. The trip not only included a visit to the park but a tour of the stadium as well under the direction of the guest services staff. The tour culminated by taking the kids out on the field and allowing them to play on the collegiate field. Although this particular program was extremely successful, it too has gone by the wayside as demands on the personnel involved have not left them with enough time to successfully market the program to the school boards, administrators and most importantly, teachers.

The one area where the marketing of the park has remained consistent is found in the advertising of the Olympic Cauldron Park and the 2002 Visitor Center Gallery as spaces that can be rented for private events such as meetings, banquets and receptions. These areas are featured on the stadium website along with pricing and pictures of the area and displays showing event set-ups, but even the rental of these spaces have been sporadic at best with the more elegant spaces in the stadium tower with the spacious west views of Salt Lake City being the more popular rental areas. Although the OCP has always been advertised as a location for private parties, the focus of the park has always been on public attendance and on how to lure more tourists from the downtown area up the hill and local patrons out of the comforts of their home. The citizens of Salt Lake City and the state of Utah appear to be the most untapped resource of potential guests to the park. The current docents all agreed that the most frequent visitors to the park since its opening have been local residents who have had family or friends visiting from out of town who want to see the sites of Salt
Lake so they finally make the trip up to the park in order to entertain their guests. Once at the park, the residents usually make the comment that they “had no idea that the park existed” until they started searching for things to show visitors. Perhaps just as with the maintenance of the park if there would have been more money and man power made available to the University to properly market the OCP, the numbers of visitors would have reflected the effort. At the same time when it came to marketing and advertising, the argument can be made that there was a built-in workforce that was never fully utilized, and it was the same workforce that had made the Olympics so successful in the first place, the volunteers.

During the construction of the park, the call went out to the former volunteers in all areas of the Games that there would be another chance to volunteer for the Olympic effort and this would be in the capacity of a docent at the Olympic Cauldron Park and 2002 Visitors Center. All they needed to do was sign up and as Deseret News writer Lee Benson expressed, “supply again exceeded demand. Within no time, the 80 or so volunteers needed to keep the Games’ legacy alive had signed up.” The volunteers were given a purple polo shirt with the Olympic Cauldron Park logo emblazoned on it and were immediately put to work by SLOC with their first big event being the dedication of the OCP. According to Benson, volunteers were everywhere when he went to visit the park on opening weekend. They were ready and willing to help and eager to answer questions just as they had been during the Games. The volunteers were initially organized by SLOC but after the park opened the care of the docent program
was turned over to the guest services manager of Rice-Eccles Stadium. The volunteers were originally organized into groups of four who worked a half day shift every other week because of the sheer number of volunteers who had signed up. Rather than the eighty or so volunteers Mr. Benson wrote about, Jean Beck and Joyce and Ben Brown, the park’s three remaining docents remember the beginning number being more like thirty or forty, far less than eighty total volunteers reported at the first meeting for docents.\textsuperscript{27} They also remembered at that first meeting they were given a purple “Barney” shirt with the OCP logo on it and a docent manual that provided them with vital information about the park so they could answer frequently asked questions easily. They were also trained on what their role would be as docents, but other than that first meeting, they have not received any other formal training. With so many interested in volunteering at the start of the park’s operation, it is hard to comprehend a number that had once been possibly as high as eighty is down to three as of July 2012: three extremely dedicated souls. The interest in volunteering has waned just as the attendance to the park has decreased.

When asked what has kept them coming back so long, docents Ben and Joyce Brown give the same answer that they gave to a reporter who interviewed them in October, 2009, “to keep the fire going within you.”\textsuperscript{28} Jean Beck responded in a similar fashion to Deseret News reporter Cathy Free, stating, “[t]his was a way to relive the memories any time I felt like it.”\textsuperscript{29} Similar sentiments were certainly the motivating factor for all of the docents when they first signed up for the job, but over the years it was not enough to keep most of
them coming back. The Browns believe low attendance at the park and lack of actual duties caused many of the docents to leave their positions. Some were simply victims of life’s sudden twists and turns such as job relocation or schedule changes, health problems and even death, but overall, the majority of them ceased to be docents because there was nothing for them to do. This is perhaps where the University could have stepped in and better utilized the willingness of the volunteers to perform additional duties. Joyce Brown said she heard time and time again from the stadium staff that there was not enough money for brochures or advertising materials. She wondered why one of the volunteers could not be given a small budget for materials and then asked to create brochures on their own home computer. She believed that many volunteers would have been willing to do that along with working in many other marketing capacities such as keeping the school field trip program going or visiting local businesses and hotels with brochures.

Another area she felt certain the docents could have stepped into and run with competence and ease was a merchandise kiosk. She grew weary of hearing from visitors to the park that they wished there was something to purchase to remember their experience by other than the expensive commemorative book. When told the University had decided not to install a kiosk in the visitors center because it would have been too cost prohibitive to staff every day, she thought the kiosk could have been run by volunteers who could also be responsible for ordering inventory and general upkeep of the merchandise. She felt that the docents could be trusted in running such an operation even though it involved
money and merchandise because as she put it “we all had to go through a security check to become volunteers in the first place.” Obtaining the merchandise, however, might have been a bit tricky as the merchandise license had run out with the IOC and USOC for Salt Lake and the “hats and pins and t-shirts with the 2002 Winter Games logo [were] finally dwindling away and no new ones [were] being made.” Joyce believed any type of Olympic merchandise would have sold even if it represented other Games than the ones held in Salt Lake or just had the Olympic logo on it. Joyce Brown and her husband thought more docents would have continued in their roles as volunteers if they would have been given more opportunity to improve the park either through advertising, merchandise sales or by performing small maintenance jobs. They might have felt more invested in their jobs and the additional responsibility would have given them a reason to come every day or once a week, depending on their commitment level.

Jean Beck’s personal feelings are that some of the docents left because they expected to receive more perks from the job such as more attire like the uniforms, coats, pants, gloves, etc. that many volunteers received during the games. When there were no handouts or free meals, they lost interest. She also thought that some were in it for personal recognition rather than for what she defined as the “right reasons,” that is the genuine desire to help the guests who came to the park. There were actually only two shirts issued to active docents during their stint and those were distributed within the first two years of the park’s operation and none have been issued since. The Browns still wear their yellow
short-sleeved polo shirts during their shifts, which were given to them after the purple shirt. The purple shirts were distributed by SLOC, the yellow shirts by the University. The yellow shirts were also embroidered with a red block U to show the University’s involvement in the docent program, but even the University’s role with the docents has diminished with time.

When the docent program was first started, there were monthly meetings held to address the concerns of the volunteers and gain feedback for the stadium management. The stadium representatives included the guest services manager to whom the docents directly reported, the stadium facilities manager and the ticket office manager. Notes from the November 2003 meeting dealt with topics that ranged from the operations hours being shortened on Saturday to various concerns over maintenance and requests for better distribution of information. Soon the monthly meetings became a platform for constant complaints from the docents and there was simply not enough time and money to solve all of the wishes and desires of the volunteers. Expectations placed on the stadium staff from the docents became a source of frustration for both parties. It was frustrating for the docents because they were emotionally involved with the park in their position and for them it was not about finance or funding; they merely wanted the OCP to look the best it could possibly look and for more efforts to be made by the stadium management to inform the public of the park’s existence in order to lure more visitors to it so they could do their jobs. They saw the stadium staff as patronizing and disinterested in their cause. The stadium management in turn became aggravated because they could not possibly meet all of the
demands placed on them by the docents in addition to their other duties. To the staff, the park was a second thought when compared to the larger picture of the stadium itself. Demands by docents to bring in more visitors were secondary to more pressing ones such as the University Athletic Department’s demands to improve customer service at football games. It should also be noted that after the Olympic Games were complete, the decision was made to place the Jon M. Huntsman Center, where all of the University basketball games and gymnastics meets were held, under the same management as the stadium. Now instead of being responsible for the events in just one venue, the staff was now in charge of all events in two major venues. Because of the demand on their time for current events, stadium staff often looked on the docents as overzealous, single-minded individuals who were caught in the past.

In an effort to improve relations with the docents, the stadium guest services staff organized a series of potluck lunches and dinners where all of the docents would be invited to come and bring food to share and the stadium staff would absorb the costs for setting the space up and cleaning after the gatherings. This way both parties could mingle and obtain feedback from one another. At the beginning, the gatherings were held monthly and were well attended, but as time went on interest diminished and the gatherings were reduced to quarterly affairs and eventually faded away altogether. Since 2008, which is when the agreement between the University and Ceremonies LLC to keep the 2002 Visitors Center open and operating terminated, the stadium staff has had little to do with the docents, who are still volunteering their time albeit
once a week, other than to keep them informed of changes in policy or upcoming events. The docents who remain are well liked by the stadium staff and admired for their dedication to the park and the 2002 Olympic Winter Games. Jean Beck is also a die-hard University of Utah football fan so her dedication to the stadium is two-fold, Olympic fan and football fan, which probably explains her longevity.\textsuperscript{36}

Both the Browns and Jean are reluctant to talk about the pending future of the park. They have all been informed the contract is up on the 2002 Visitors Center and at any moment an agreement could be reached with former SLOC administration to turn the visitors’ center into office and conference space. They are also aware that one day the University is planning on expanding the stadium which would cause the Olympic Cauldron Park to be destroyed completely. They are reluctant because the emotions the Olympics brought for them still run deep because of their involvement in the park. They are still invested in the legacy the park was built to establish. Jean’s voice cracks with emotion and her eyes fill with tears when she tries to describe how she will feel when the Olympic Cauldron Park ceases to exist. She prays the day will not come before she is gone from this earth or the winning of another Olympic bid gives her the opportunity she needs to “light the fire within.”\textsuperscript{37} It is clear, however, that the docents who first began with the park ten years ago and the docents who still remain felt the Olympic Cauldron Park would serve and has served its purpose in preserving the legacy of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games and wanted to be a part of it.
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“It’s a celebration, celebrate, good times, come on! Celebration.” ¹ A catchy pop tune by the R & B group Kool & the Gang released in 1980 perfectly captures the emotion of the citizens of Salt Lake after the 2002 Olympic Games had departed from their city. The Olympics were good times for the participants, volunteers and observers of the Games and after the glow of hosting the largest sporting event in the world began to diminish, citizens wanted to find a way to capture a glimmer of the excitement again by departing from the drudgery of everyday life. What better way to do that than through a celebration and what better time to hold that celebration than during the marking of an anniversary of the Games. In his book, Remaking America; Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century, John Bodnar suggests society holds celebrations to commemorate great accomplishments from those who came before us.² Certainly, the hosting of an Olympic Games would qualify as one of those great accomplishments and although it was not that far in the past, Utahns still wanted to celebrate this achievement. Contrary to the pioneers that Bodner presented as the impetus to many local celebrations, these celebrations commemorated a joyful time rather than one of hardship and sorrow. The theme
of sacrifice still runs through the both types of remembrance. With Bodner, the pioneers sacrificed comfortable lives, warm homes and often life itself to blaze a trail for the future. Those who organized and participated in the 2002 Olympic Winter Games sacrificed their time, sleep, and financial gain; in fact many volunteers lost pay at their regular jobs in order to take time off and work for no pay in a position with very little glory. They also sacrificed their warm homes and beds to spend countless hours out in the cold and snow, which is required of a volunteer at an Olympic Winter Games. Although no life or limb was lost in the planning and execution of the Games and cannot possibly be compared on the same level as the pioneers, there was still much sacrifice made on the part of the volunteers, citizens, the City of Salt Lake, and the State of Utah in order to stage a successful Olympic Winter Games.

The first celebration of a job well done came at the end of the seventeen days of competition that culminated with the closing ceremonies, which by tradition is a big party for all the athletes who participated in the Games and a time for the world to come together in a symbolic celebration. Salt Lake celebrated as well as the evening ended with simultaneous fireworks shows being staged throughout the valley. It was a time of sheer joy and many volunteers manifested their happiness by breaking into spontaneous dance along with the athletes and audience attending the closing ceremonies on that chilly February evening. As a post-Games depression settled over the city, SLOC officials almost immediately began to plan for the one-year anniversary celebration of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games as a remedy to the dullness that
life had become after the exhilaration of the Olympics. The question now had to be addressed as to where this celebration would take place? The site where the pageantry of the opening and closing ceremonies was staged seemed the most likely spot, but almost immediately after the Games ended, Olympic Stadium, as it had been referred to during the Games, became Rice-Eccles Stadium once again and began to transform back into its former self, which was a collegiate football field for the University of Utah. The anticipation of where the celebration would be held did not last long as plans were soon announced. The cauldron that had burned brightly in the south bleachers of the Stadium would be modified and relocated inside an Olympic Cauldron Park in the south plaza area of Rice-Eccles Stadium. According to former SLOC administrator Grant Thomas and his assistant Peggy Gooding, there was no discussion within the ranks of the remaining SLOC officials to hold the first anniversary celebration anywhere else but the Olympic Cauldron Park. It was, of course, the perfect location and part of the reasoning behind the construction of the park was to stage anniversary celebrations. Much of the legacy of the park is that it has hosted or been a part of every 2002 Olympic Winter Games anniversary celebration that has been held.

The first anniversary celebration was far and away the most ambitious undertaking by SLOC since the Games themselves and remains the most spectacular anniversary celebration the Cauldron Park has hosted. It was held exactly one year to the date of the 2002 opening ceremonies on Saturday, February 8, 2003. The celebration was divided into three parts: a reunion for the
volunteers held in the stadium’s west parking lot, pre-show entertainment with free hot chocolate and door prizes offered to the first 10,000 visitors to the park, and finally the main program that was billed by SLOC in the Deseret News press release as “a tribute to the 2002 Games and its legacy in which the greatest moments of the Games will come alive again, followed by a commemorative lighting of the Olympic Caldron.” There was also the promise of a fireworks show “to be even bigger than the Games’ opening ceremony.” The celebration was in essence a mini opening ceremony containing many of the same elements found in the original opening ceremonies one year prior. The Mormon Tabernacle choir sang, Olympic and Paralympic athletes spoke, but this time instead of prescribed oaths they were able to express their sentiments regarding their Olympic experience in Salt Lake. There were appearances by the usual dignitaries, IOC President, Jacques Rogge and former SLOC CEO Mitt Romney, which delighted the crowd although their presentations came in the form of taped video messages. There were also some new faces stepping into the spotlight such as newly appointed SLOC President Fraser Bullock and Ann Romney, Mitt’s wife who both made speeches in person and praised the people of Salt Lake who as Mrs. Romney put it “were the heart of the Games.” Just as in the opening ceremonies the cauldron was lit toward the end of the program and the entire evening culminated with a breathtaking fireworks show that was “twice as large as the one during the Feb. 8 opening ceremonies.”

The weather that had cooperated so beautifully in 2002 for the opening ceremonies by producing what could be called a balmy evening for February was
not quite so amiable in 2003 as the temperatures for the anniversary celebration
dipped well below freezing. The frigid temperatures did not deter the crowds,
however, as many people started arriving well before the 5:30 p.m. start time.
The street running south of the stadium named 500 South was closed, for the
last time, from 1300 South to Guardsman Way, equivalent to about three city
blocks, to provide the public gathering area. The stage was constructed facing
500 South with the unfinished Olympic Cauldron Park providing the backdrop. At
the time of the first anniversary celebration, the fencing and the story boards that
now line the south perimeter of the stadium parallel to 500 South had not yet
been installed, leaving the area open to the street. This was the last time that
500 South would be closed down for more than an hour. Apparently, the traffic
snarl caused by the closing of 500 South for an entire day to allow the public to
view the celebration resulted in UDOT informing the stadium management that
they would never again allow 500 South to be closed for any significant amount
of time and under no circumstances would it be used again as a staging area. As
a direct result of this anniversary celebration, the stadium management to this
day is only allowed to close 500 South for the span of forty-five minutes
maximum in order to exit people out to the stadium following large events such
as football games. This was one of the few negative results of the anniversary
celebration. For some reason it was alright for the city to shut down 500 South
for three weeks during the Olympics but not for a one-day anniversary
celebration.
The most popular activity of the evening was the staff and volunteer reunion that took place in the stadium’s west parking lot where a village of tents was staged, “each one designated as a meeting place for people who had worked at specific venues or functions.” The only requirement for entrance into the tented area was the wearing of one’s Olympic uniform or ceremonies costume. Although SLOC wanted to show appreciation to the staff and volunteers of the massive undertaking that took place exactly a year before, they were careful to draw boundaries about who was eligible for the goodies by stating in the Deseret News that guests of the volunteers not wearing uniforms would not be allowed into the reunion area. The public, however, was invited to the program and cauldron lighting, but the majority of the attendees were the staff and volunteers who ventured from their celebration in the west parking lot to the standing-room-only public area along 500 South. Just as the majority of the crowd were volunteers and staff from the SLOC, the main theme of the evening was directed toward thanking all of the people who had made this enormous event possible and generally patting all Utahns on the back for pulling off a miracle just when the post-9/11 world needed it most.

The fireworks were impressive, but the cauldron was the star of the show, even though it stood alone in the midst of a construction zone and had only come to rest in its permanent location a few weeks prior to the celebration. To commemorate the seventeen days of the games, the cauldron burned for each of those days until it was extinguished in a formal ceremony on Monday, February 24. The ceremony contained much less fan fare than the previous year when the
Olympic closing ceremonies marked the day. To extinguish the flame, SLOC invited representatives of the five American Indian nations of Utah.\textsuperscript{12} The ceremony began in the late afternoon at approximately 5:00 p.m. and after a drum circle and a tribal prayer were performed “the flame slowly flickered out.”\textsuperscript{13} The ceremony was a direct contrast to the extravaganza that took place a few weeks prior to mark the start of the one-year anniversary. SLOC spent an estimated $700,000 on the commemoration and at the end of it all, Frasier Bullock claimed that SLOC was out of money for future anniversary parties by stating, “[w]e blew our budget this year, [t]his is it.”\textsuperscript{14} He apparently was talking strictly about anniversary celebrations because later that same year at the end of August, SLOC once again hosted a gala to commemorate the official opening of the Olympic Cauldron Park. The cauldron was lit once again. There was a ribbon cutting ceremony and the public was invited to attend once more. No anniversary celebration held since the historic one-year anniversary has been as extravagant nor has there been an official closing to the celebration as there was for that first anniversary. Fraser Bullock was somewhat speaking the truth when he said the budget had been blown on the one-year celebration as there would be no official anniversary celebration for three years. The cauldron was lit the following January but not for an Olympic commemoration; instead, it was for the opening ceremonies of the Moscow-Utah Youth Games.

When the cauldron came under the ownership of the University of Utah in the form of the Olympic Cauldron Park, the University President at the time, Bernie Machen, stated [i]t’s our expectation that we’ll fire up the caldron at least
That prophecy rang true as the cauldron was lit not once but twice in 2003, once for the one-year anniversary celebration in February and again in August for the opening of the Olympic Cauldron Park. The expectation continued as the cauldron was lit the following January, but this time it was not for an Olympic celebration but for much smaller, practically unknown games. Then in 2005, the cauldron was lit at the end of February to commemorate two things: the third anniversary of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games and the Luge World Championships that were taking place at the same time in Park City. Hardly any media attention was paid to this cauldron lighting with only two short articles appearing as general interest listings rather than full blown articles in the *Deseret News*. The cauldron was lit for only three days in recognition these two significant events. A more elaborate celebration was being planned for the following year when the Olympic flame would officially be lit in another city and Salt Lake would no longer be the last city to host the Olympic Winter Games. Again this celebration to mark the lighting of the cauldron in Torino, Italy was rather understated when compared to the one-year anniversary celebration.

The commemoration also took on a decidedly different flavor in 2006 as the focus of the event was more on the Olympics taking place in another city. What seemed to be happening in this scenario was Salt Lake’s attempt to remind its citizens and the world that just like Torino, the newest city to join the Olympic ranks, Salt Lake too was a part of this elite club. As mentioned in the preface of this thesis, Richard Cashman points out in his article there had only been seventeen cities in the world to stage the Olympic Winter Games at the time of
his writing in 2001. By lighting the cauldron, and holding a celebration in conjunction with the lighting of the flame in Torino, the Olympic Cauldron Park was preserving the legacy Salt Lake had created in 2002 and celebrated it once again in 2006. This celebration was much different from the previous ones as it was the only one to take place during the day. In order to light the 2002 cauldron at the same time as the Torino cauldron, the event was held on Friday, February 10, and the lighting of the cauldron took place at approximately 2:00 p.m. Just as with the third-year anniversary, the cauldron would burn for only three days instead of the seventeen days during which the Olympics would be taking place. Due to the time of day the ceremony was held, and perhaps because the interest in anniversary celebrations was waning with each passing year, there were only about 100 people gathered at the Olympic Cauldron Park on that windy afternoon. Although they were small in numbers the crowd made up for it in enthusiasm by cheering and clapping when the cauldron was lit. There was no official pageantry or speeches made at this ceremony, just the lighting of the cauldron and a pin trading event held in the 2002 Visitors Center that the public was invited to attend. The commemoration was a low key if not uneventful celebration and was held mainly because SLOC still held the right according to the contract with the University as well as with the IOC (International Olympic Committee) and USOC (United States Olympic Committee) to light the cauldron when the Olympics are taking place in other parts of the world.

Perhaps it was the lack of interest by the public or the mounting expenses of preparing the cauldron to be lit and stay lit that discouraged SLOC from
staging any additional anniversary events until February 2012. When the ten-year anniversary rolled around, the Olympic Cauldron Park was once again called upon to serve as the primary location to memorialize the legacy of the 2002 Salt Lake Winter Games. No mention of a ten-year anniversary celebration had been made to the Rice-Eccles Stadium management until a mere six weeks prior to the actual celebration, although an article had appeared in the Deseret News stating the Olympic Cauldron would once again be lit on February 8, 2012 to mark the ten-year anniversary of first lighting of the cauldron. Unlike the one-year anniversary, the larger celebration would take place at two downtown venues, starting with a reunion event being held at the Olympic Legacy Plaza in the Gateway shopping center and later that evening moving to the Energy Solutions Arena for a presentation being billed as the “Salt Lake 2002 Stars on Ice” show. For the first time ever, a ticket was required for entrance into an anniversary celebration as tickets were being sold for the ice show.

Again the celebration for the ten-year anniversary reflected a vastly different message than the original anniversary event. This time although the public was invited to attend the celebration, the focus was more on the media and the VIP event held in the Tower at Rice-Eccles with its spectacular view of the Salt Lake Valley. This was the first occasion that as much planning and attention was paid to the indoor event as it was to the outdoor lighting of the cauldron. This foresight probably rescued the evening as this time the lighting of the cauldron proved to be a giant debacle from start to finish. Due to the tardiness of SLOC, now known as Ceremonies LLC, to begin planning for the
celebration, things were a little behind schedule from the beginning. The stadium facility coordinator was hard pressed to try to get the cauldron, which had not been lit in six years, and the dilapidated fountain ready in time for the celebration. This required working with the company who had designed and built the cauldron and later planned the fountain in which it resided.

Wet Design had played an extremely active part in the life of the cauldron during the preliminary stages of its creation having won the coveted prize of designing the most important symbol of the Olympic Games. They attended to it night and day as it served its role during the 2002 Olympic Winter Games, making sure that its orange flame glowed brightly throughout the seventeen days as a beacon to the world and then extinguished it in dramatic fashion at the closing ceremonies. Afterwards they took great interest in making sure the cauldron had a stunning water backdrop for its final resting place and were active in the modification and installation of the cauldron in the south plaza, making sure all of the elements were in place to light the cauldron over and over again for future commemorations. At the end of the Games, Wet Design even published a book recounting their experience in creating the cauldron. The man who was primarily responsible for the cauldron after the bid had been won from SLOC was an engineer named Jim Doyle. Serving as the Director of Technology for Wet Design on the cauldron project, Doyle worked endless hours in the two years prior to the 2002 Olympics to ensure the most important element of the Games was perfect. The project was his baby and no one knew the workings of the cauldron better than Jim Doyle. After the Olympic Cauldron Park was built
and ownership of the cauldron itself turned over to the University of Utah, it was now up to the stadium facilities management to maintain the cauldron, which as mentioned previously in this thesis, was no small task. After all, how exactly does an organization maintain a structure that stands seventy feet in the air and is made of painted glass and carefully molded steel both, elements that do not weather well when left untreated over time, especially when it was completely exposed to the elements and extreme weather conditions in the south plaza area of the stadium.

Due to the intense environment and the years that would pass between lighting the cauldron and also because he was the only man who knew how to actually light the structure, Jim Doyle from Wet Design had to be contracted to come and prepare the cauldron for lighting as well as performing the actual lighting during the ceremony each time it was lit. The problem was getting the man to come to Salt Lake to perform the service. Although he resides along with the company in nearby Las Vegas, Nevada, it might as well have been a half a world away as the deadline to get the cauldron ready for the 2012, ten-year celebration rapidly approached. As mentioned before, Doyle and Wet Design were quite attentive in the early years of the cauldron, during the Games and the initial commemorations, but as the years went by, the sense of urgency on the part of the company and crew became less and less until finally by the ten-year anniversary, Doyle did not show up in Salt Lake until the weekend prior to the lighting of the cauldron the following Wednesday. The weekend also unfortunately coincided with one of the most severe winter windstorms the Salt
Lake Valley has ever experienced. This is where the trouble began. In order to test all of the elements of the cauldron, it must be inspected from top to bottom, and this included the glass bowl at the top of the cauldron. Doyle and another employee from Questar used a high ranger lift to go up and inspect the glass where the high winds caused a collision of some sort and a pane of glass was broken in the double-paned bowl. Both panes of glass are required for the water element to function properly as it cascades down between the two panes and keeps the structure cool. Without the water component the flame quickly heats up the steel, plastic, and rubber elements that hold the cauldron together and the entire structure would quickly begin to melt without it. This development became a critical point of concern because there was no way the highly specialized glass could be replaced in such a short time and without the glass being intact, the lighting of the cauldron for the ten-year anniversary was suddenly in jeopardy.

Planning for the event went forward as other strategies were considered as to how the lighting of the cauldron could be simulated including shooting off a firework from inside the cauldron bowl to represent the lighting. After many hours of trepidation and discussion it was finally determined the cauldron could be lit but only for a few minutes. Gone were the plans to burn the cauldron for the seventeen days of the Games just as it did for the one-year anniversary. Instead, it was decided a powerful spotlight would be brought in and set up at the base of the cauldron to shine up into the night sky as a symbolic light similar to the lights that shine up into the New York City sky representing the missing World Trade Center Twin Towers. Although it was good news the cauldron could
still be lit and would be a part of the celebration, the trouble did not end there. As mentioned previously, Fraser Bullock and the planning committee decided to make this celebration a media event and set the start time of the celebration to coincide with the broadcast of the evening news. All of the local television stations covered the event, but as an NBC affiliate, the broadcast entity which had been awarded the rights to cover the Olympic Games through 2016, KSL television had the rights to exclusive live coverage of the event and constructed a temporary news desk inside the Olympic Cauldron Park with the cauldron in the background and prepared to broadcast live from Rice-Eccles Stadium for their 6:00 p.m. and 6:30 p.m. news shows. The public was once again invited but it was not highly publicized as this event was to be lower key this time because the major celebrations for staff and volunteers planned for later in downtown locations on February 18.

The ceremony itself was to be brief but stylish and contained all the usual suspects such as dignitaries, Fraser Bullock, Former Mayor, Rocky Anderson, Former Utah State Governor, Mike Leavitt and current governor, Gary Herbert. There were former Olympic and Paralympic U.S. medal winning athletes, many of whom had participated in previous anniversary celebrations. These included Daniel Parra, Shannon Bahrke, Chris Waddell, and Jimmy Shea and of course there were the children of light dressed in the familiar furry, white coats, and hats. These were newly recruited children of light as the original children were all grown up and were ten years older. The evening began with speeches by Fraser Bullock and former as well as current dignitaries. All gave short speeches
recalling the success of the Games and reminiscing about the good times and the positive recognition it brought to Salt Lake City, but Governor Herbert received the loudest cheer from the crowd when he mentioned he was putting together a committee to investigate the possibility of bidding for the 2022 Olympic Winter Games. It seemed that Salt Lake City is eager and anxious to do this all again just a short twenty years later. After the speeches, there was a short ceremony that included the former Olympic and Paralympic athletes and the children of light. The children each brought an original lantern that had been carried by the children of light during the ceremonies up on the stage, followed by the athletes passing a torch to one another as they approached the stage while the loudspeakers played the Mormon Tabernacle Choirs familiar words, “Citius, Altius, Fortius” from the 2002 Olympic theme in the background. The ceremony was supposed to culminate in a giant burst of fireworks cascading up the fountain and then the cauldron flame whooshing back to life except there was no whooshing instead there was simply silence. Several awkward moments passed in which the crowd stood staring at the cauldron that remained dark and cold instead of vibrant with light and flame. As the minutes ticked by, everyone grew anxious, including Fraser Bullock, who went to the podium and told the crowd to be patient and that they were experiencing technical difficulties. In the background, Jim Doyle and his crew worked frantically to try and figure out the problem and see if they could get the cauldron lit. Earlier in the afternoon, the cauldron roared to life in a rehearsal of what would take place later in the evening, but now that timing was everything and KSL was live to the television
audience, all elements failed. It was just another bad omen that perhaps the times of lighting the cauldron were soon to go away permanently. After about ten minutes, Fraser Bullock finally charged over to the area where the team was working to revive the cauldron and angrily demanded to know whether or not it was going to light. Doyle said he didn’t know and Fraser went back to the podium to tell a disappointed crowd that the cauldron was not going to be lit that night. Just as he uttered the words and KSL had started to wrap up for the evening and prepared to go off the air the cauldron sprang to life and a cheer went up from the crowd. What looked like a disappointing ending to the ten year anniversary celebration suddenly took on a dramatic flair with the cauldron being lit at the last possible moment. The cauldron only burned for fifteen minutes, during which the crowd and spectators along the outside fence of the stadium took pictures of the impressive structure once again.23

After the bizarre events that took place earlier with the lighting of the cauldron, the VIP reception held up on level four of the Tower in the Scholarship Room seemed a little bland. The rest of the evening consisted of former athletes, dignitaries, and officials eating, socializing, and enjoying a performance of another children’s choir who sang the theme song of the Games, Light the Fire Within. The soloist who performed with the choir was the girl who originally sang the theme song for the opening ceremonies, now a grown up young woman returned home from college to take part in the celebration. As for the cauldron, the flame was extinguished within the proper amount of time as not to damage the structure and was not lit again during the other anniversary celebrations that
took place during the month of February. As each anniversary of the Games was marked, people have come to witness the commemoration and to “celebrate good times” as the song says. Even those who were not directly involved in the 2002 Olympics came to be a part of what was an extraordinary time in the history of Salt Lake. Melanie Bower missed out on the chance to volunteer for the 2002 Olympics but did not want to miss the ten year celebration. She borrowed a 2002 blue Olympic coat and came to the event. Impressed by the showing at the celebration she said, “[i]t says a lot about our community that all these people showed up in their coats and berets. It’s like a family reunion.” The Olympic Cauldron Park provided the place for the family to come and gather.

Although the types of celebrations and the messages they conveyed have changed over the years since the cauldron park was erected, one thing has not changed, the fact that the park has served as the place where the anniversaries and landmark events of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games were commemorated. It was a location where people could gather and remember the extraordinary feat accomplished by the community and State of Utah in 2002. Whether the celebration was large, small, or hardly noticed at all, they were all held at a location that lent itself to the Olympic atmosphere. One has to wonder if the commemorations would have had the same sentimental air attached to them if they had been held at a downtown hotel or reception center instead of in the Olympic Cauldron Park with the stadium, where the opening and closing ceremonies were held, looming in the background and the story boards dotting the perimeter of the park reminding attendees of what took place on each day of
the Olympics. The cauldron itself is a powerful reminder of what took place in the community during the Games. The emotions of the public are summed up in a *Deseret* News editorial which appeared on January 27, 2003, “[t]hey remember the tears of the athletes, the image of a pileup of speedskaters on the ice and a last-place Australian who suddenly found himself holding gold, and many other things, good and bad…that forever will be associated with Salt Lake City and Utah. The cauldron brings all of that to mind – not just during celebrations such as the one to be held on the anniversary of the Games, but at all times.” In this aspect the Olympic Cauldron Park has served well in its role of preserving the legacy of the Salt Lake 2002 Olympic Winter Games. Each and every anniversary celebration has been held at the park, although only ten short years have passed since the Games took place. Whenever it was called on to host the public, volunteers, staff, officials or media it has done so in “grand fashion” just as Utahns did during the Games.
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CHAPTER 6

THE FUTURE OF A LEGACY

What do you do after the party is over but the guests do not want to go home? In 2008 the contract between Ceremonies LLC and the University of Utah for the operation of the Salt Lake 2002 Visitors Center was officially terminated, but up until August of 2012, the Visitors Center along with the theater continued to function just as it always had. It lasted just long enough to see the ten-year anniversary celebration. On an uneventful day in August, one of the video cards in the software which runs the eight-minute movie in the theater failed. This rendered one of the three projectors, necessary to show the film on all three screens, obsolete. The system which operates the film is a delicate as well as complex menagerie of audio, video, and special effects. When one of the elements fails, the entire system shuts down refusing to run until all of the elements are working perfectly again. It was at this point the Rice-Eccles Stadium management and other administration at the University of Utah decided to call it quits on the theater inside the gallery. The video card was quite expensive to replace and after years of extensive repairs, money, and nursing the ailing system along, it was time to let it go. After all, it had served its purpose well beyond the original target date of August 2008.
The theater however, was not the first piece of the Olympic Cauldron Park to die a slow death. As mentioned in previous parts of this narrative, the fountain itself is in a state of decline and, although it still partially functions, the day is soon approaching when it will need to either remain off permanently or be torn out and completely remodeled, as the current edifice is unstable due to water seepage into the foundation. The cauldron itself became a victim of the harsh elements and the wear and tear that ten years can put on a structure that was not designed to last much beyond the 2002 Winter Olympic Games. One of the glass panes in the cauldron bowl shattered during a high wind storm as it was being readied to be lit again for the ten-year anniversary celebration. The broken glass meant that the cauldron too was only capable of being lit for a short time and plans were scrapped to have it burn for several days in honor of the ten-year anniversary. There are other repairs that could be made to the park such as replacement of lights and Plexiglas panels, but ironically, the most exciting, thrilling, and worthwhile elements of the park are the ones currently not functioning. It should not come as a big surprise that the OCP is not up to par these days. The structures were not designed to last indefinitely. Fraser Bullock even acknowledged the park’s temporary status at the University by stating, “[t]he park was never intended to be a permanent feature,…[a]n agreement is in place to keep the Olympic Cauldron Park in place until 2015.”¹ All of this disrepair is coming on the heels of talk about expanding Rice-Eccles Stadium to keep up with the growing demand for University of Utah football tickets and to continue to compete with other venues in the Pac 12 Athletic Conference, which
is the University's current sports conference affiliation. Currently, there is only one stadium in the Pac 12 conference that seats less than Rice-Eccles Stadium where the University of Utah's football team plays their games and that stadium is Martin Stadium at Washington State, which is currently under construction to enlarge the venue and increase the seating capacity tremendously.²

Although there is pressure to expand the stadium now that the University of Utah is a part of the Pac 12, Dr. Chris Hill, Director of Athletics for the University of Utah, insists that expanding the stadium is not a top priority for him or the Utah Athletics Department. "It’s still not on the front burner for me." Hill said of any plans to revamp the stadium. "Eventually we have looked at expanding by eight or nine thousand, but that is in the very, very preliminary stages."³ Expansion of the stadium is not being driven solely by the University's football program; it seems there are other factors at work here and one of them is the possibility of hosting another Olympic Winter Games in Salt Lake City. At the ten-year anniversary celebration, dignitaries announced the creation of a committee to see if it would be feasible for Salt Lake to bid on the Games again for 2022 or even 2026. “When [Utah Governor] Herbert told hundreds of spectators at the cauldron relighting of the plan it set off the second loudest cheer of the evening."⁴ Apparently after ten years, the magic of the Olympic Games still captures the imagination of those who experienced the event firsthand. Even the University of Utah administration has jumped on board with the plan to expand Rice-Eccles Stadium in order to enhance the chances of a bid process for a future Olympic Winter Games. According to the Salt Lake Tribune,
a recent report was presented to current University of Utah President, David Pershing by a twelve-member committee of school officials that all but guaranteed a “stadium expansion would be completed by 2022 as part of a possible bid for the 2022 Olympics…at a cost of $68 million.” Of course Dr. Hill would not turn down seed money if it were given to him to speed up a stadium renovation “[b]ut he maintains he wants athletic funds to be used to upgrade other facilities before funding any stadium changes.”

Dr. Hill and the committee who presented President Pershing with the study regarding a possible expansion of the stadium, as well as other University officials and of course Utah football fans, are in favor of the new development. The stadium director and management are also in favor of expansion in order to solve a number of storage and space problems that continue to frustrate the staff as more and more events are held in the stadium bowl as well as the reception areas located in the tower portion of the stadium. Mike Perez, Associate Vice President for Facilities Management at the University of Utah, revealed the University has conducted some feasibility studies on a possible stadium expansion. He cited several reasons for the interest in such a large project. “In addition to competing in the Pac 12, the school is motivated by a desire to improve the Clark Building, which along with the bleachers constitutes the south end of the stadium and is in disrepair.” The current stadium management would agree with Perez’ assessment of the Clark Building, which is the oldest part of the current stadium and was not updated during the 1997-1998 renovation of the stadium for the 2002 Olympic Winter Games. The building was constructed
during the 1980 Rice Stadium renovation and has had few improvements since that time. Thirty years later, it is certainly showing its age and its functionality is poor. This building would be destroyed if the stadium expansion were to become a reality and would be replaced by a south bleacher area that would enclose the bowl and add additional seating as well as new locker rooms, press, and multimedia space and reception areas. The enclosed bowl would increase seating capacity in the stadium by 10,000, which would include additional suites and club seating for Crimson (booster) Club members.9

Such a large expansion project would certainly encroach on the current Olympic Cauldron Park and would more than likely eliminate it altogether. Preliminary plans drawn up for the University by Jim Lohse from the FFKR architectural firm shows the footprint for the expansion and enclosure of the south bowl taking all of the south plaza area and Olympic Cauldron Park and extending to the current perimeter fencing where the seventeen story board panels are located. The only part of the park that would not be affected directly by expansion would be the 2002 Salt Lake Visitors Center and theater but there are many University entities currently licking their chops over the possibilities that space presents. If the expansion occurs, then it would certainly destroy the current location of the cauldron and its fountain backdrop, but it does not mean the cauldron would disappear completely from the stadium landscape. Architect Jim Lohse shares that he has promised Spence Eccles he will keep the cauldron in some capacity in the expansion plans.9 It is important to remember that Spence Eccles is the person who is responsible for the funding of the cauldron
and the stadium renovation for the 2002 Olympic Winter Games. Lohse and Eccles are not the only ones who would like to see the cauldron incorporated into the stadium infrastructure in some way. This support comes from an unlikely source who would like to see the cauldron relocated as soon as possible.

Ann Argust, Associate Athletic Director over Marketing for the University of Utah Athletics Department, has expressed interest in moving the cauldron inside the stadium bowl in some fashion where it could be seen by the fans during a game. Recently, she attended the Utah vs USC football game held in the Coliseum in Los Angeles, which was the site of the 1932 and 1984 Olympic Games. It is a tradition at all USC football games to light the Olympic cauldron which sits atop the bowl in the Coliseum. The extravagant presentation followed by the lighting of the cauldron in between the third and fourth quarters of the football game attracted her attention and she has since been lobbying for the cauldron to move somewhere inside the stadium and to be reconstructed in a way that would make it less difficult to light and extinguish than the present system allows. Support from the Utah Athletics Department as well as the man whose name the stadium bears are just the sources needed to save the cauldron as part of the stadium where the opening and closing ceremonies of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games took place. The same cannot be said for other structures in the park. There is a great deal of discussion currently being conducted between the University and the Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation and the Ceremonies LLC as to exactly what will happen to other elements of the park.
such as the Hoberman Arch and the seventeen story panels which depict the daily occurrences of the Games as well as the theater.

The first area up for grabs at the moment, however, is the space in which the 2002 Salt Lake Visitors Gallery and theater is contained. This space has been considered prime real estate from its inception. As discussions began as to what the gallery would contain, numerous entities vied for a portion of the space including the University Bookstore, who wanted to run a kiosk, where Olympic as well as University and Athletics merchandise would be available for purchase.

There was once the possibility of running a small café in the space as well but this idea fell victim to simple economics when it was determined the cost of running such an operation would far exceed any profit that might be gained. The concept of using some of the area for offices or a conference room was a suggestion that has been revisited from time to time, particularly by the Utah Athletics Department and stadium management. The Utah Athletics Department has been the most verbal in its quest to convert the gallery into something useful for their staff and donors. Over the years, there has been much talk and speculation as to what should be done with the space. Ideas ranging from a Utah football museum that would serve as a legacy piece for the Utah football program to office space for the employees of the Crimson Club, which is the Athletics Department booster organization. The University Bookstore has also expressed interest on occasion over the years of once again placing a small outlet store in the space. This concept became a real possibility with the development in the last few years of bookstore outlets called the Red Zones being opened off
campus in suburban locations north and south of the University but for some reason the plan to sell merchandise in the gallery space has yet to come to fruition.

As far as the pictures, videos, and interactive kiosk elements located inside the gallery, the first interest in relocating these items came during the celebration of the ten-year anniversary of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games. It was at this time the stadium director Mark Burk was approached by the Ceremonies LLC about taking the rolling wooden picture panels down to the Gateway for display during the former staff and volunteer celebration in February 2012. After they were done with the wooden panels, which contain pictures of 2002 Olympic athletes and interesting moments of the Games, they would have them relocated to the Utah Olympic Park in Park City, Utah some twenty-five miles from downtown Salt Lake. If the committee running the celebration would have carried out the plan, the wooden rolling panels would have been the first element to be removed from the park permanently. Unfortunately, the arrangement fell through in all of the frantic planning that took place during the ten-year anniversary. What the idea did manage to do, however, was spark a discussion about the relocation of gallery items and more importantly, the eight-minute movie and theater to another Olympic park. There have been many discussions and meetings between the officials of the Olympic Legacy Foundation and University administration as to what would be the best plan for the movie, photos, and other elements inside the Visitors Center because the University is ready to move forward with the plans to convert the gallery into
office space. The current plan is to transfer the Utah Athletics Group Sales Department to cubicles inside the gallery. The location is optimal for this department as they work closely with the ticket office director and staff whose offices are located adjacent to the gallery in the stadium’s main ticket office and they would be able to take advantage of the close proximity to the stadium seating to show to potential season ticket holders. Currently this department is located in the back of the ticket office at the Jon M. Huntsman Center, the basketball arena on the University of Utah campus, but since football is king of the collegiate sporting world at the moment, it would be much more advantageous to be located close to the football stadium. This plan however, is still quite tentative and may not be the direction the Athletics Department will want to move in the end. If not, then the suggestions of using it for a new bookstore, Red Zone location, or simply converting it into additional reception space for the stadium to rent to the public will be revisited.

As far as the space where the theater is currently located is concerned, no one other than the stadium management seems to be interested in the area. Currently it is serving as a quasi-command center for the contracted security department during Utah football games and other large events. Stadium management will more than likely convert the space to a conference room or small meeting area when the theater elements are finally removed. Relocating the movie will not be an easy task and the project will involve a great deal of expense, so it could still be months before the relocation actually takes place and even at that, the movie could look quite different when it is placed in its new
home at the Utah Olympic Park. The three screens and projector system will probably be replaced with a much less expensive single screen and projector set-up. The fact that there are discussions to take the film to another legacy park is an indication there is still interest in the community and in particular to preserve a legacy of the Salt Lake 2002 Olympic Winter Games. The film, which provides a thrilling eight-minute ride through the highlights of the games, might be the most important piece of the Olympic Cauldron Park to preserve as has been mentioned several times during this narrative. The movie is perhaps the best element of the entire park. As images flash across the screen and the music swells throughout the theater the film seems to connect with visitors on an emotional level as well as documenting an important moment in time for Salt Lake City and the State of Utah. This experience is perhaps best summed up by an article that appeared in the Deseret News at the time the Olympic Cauldron Park was dedicated: “plenty of (sic) viewers emerged from the small special-effects theater with red eyes…the teary-eyed types (sic) who needed the tissue provided at the theater exit.”

While there have been numerous discussions about the future of the Olympic Cauldron Park, it remains just that – discussion - as there are no definite plans at the moment to move forward with the construction of office space or expansion of the stadium. So for the time being, the OCP continues to operate at status quo with the exception of the film, which is no longer working and the fountain, which is running only during large events such as football games or Olympic celebrations. The park itself will probably continue to function as is until
2015 when the contract between the Ceremonies LLC and the University of Utah for the OCP is terminated. This may change before 2015, however, as once again there has been dialogue between officials from those same entities that when the film and other gallery elements are relocated the Hoberman Arch and the story panels will also be moved at the same time to accomplish the shift of focus to Utah Olympic Park in one fell swoop. Currently, the only plan that seems imminent is the placing of new large video wall on the north end of the stadium. The Utah Athletics Department wants to install a new state of the art video board before the 2015 football season. It is unclear if the south video wall and scoreboard would be removed if a new video wall is installed on the north end. If the south video wall is taken down, then the large SLOC signature snowflake logo that branded the Salt Lake 2002 Olympic Winter Games would come down as well. If this occurs, the Olympic Cauldron Park will be reduced to the sole component of the cauldron standing against the small backdrop of the fountain, which is only occasionally operational. Ironically, this was the original plan for the cauldron at Rice-Eccles Stadium at the close of the 2002 Games. This plan existed long before any thoughts were conceived of constructing a larger scale legacy park, which is what it became when plans to locate such a park in the downtown area fell apart.¹²

Irony is also evident in the fact that every Thursday night during the months of July and August, for the past few years, a twilight concert series has been held in Pioneer Park in downtown Salt Lake City. In order for that concert series to take place, there is a large temporary amphitheater constructed and
portions of the park are shut down for at least two days as the area is secured and the concert is presented. Tickets are sold which means Pioneer Park does not function as an open public park during these events. The twilight series is wildly popular, which is just what SLOC CEO Fraser Bullock and Mayor Rocky Anderson predicted it would be when they first proposed the idea to the Salt Lake City Council in 2002 shortly after the Olympics. The plan at the time was to place the Hoberman Arch as a backdrop in a permanent amphitheater that would host concerts during the summer months. The park would remain open to the public except on days when there was a concert presented. It seems the concerns that the amphitheater would ruin the feel of the park as a legacy to the Utah pioneers have disappeared under the success of a concert series which benefits the city and helps to improve the image of the park as something other than a drug-infested, transient population hangout, but unfortunately, this is only on days in which events are held. Moreover, most of the citizens of Salt Lake and of the State of Utah in general have no idea there are even legacy monuments to Utah’s pioneers located in the park. Most people believe those types of monuments exist only at the This is the Place Monument in Emigration Canyon located on the east bench of Salt Lake City. In hindsight, it seems silly now that the legacy park plan was nixed because of petty concerns of special interest groups only to go forward a few years later in the form of a concert series. In another ironic twist, the Gallivan Center no longer holds a concert series at all. The concern which finally killed the plan to put the legacy park in Gallivan Plaza was that the Olympic displays would have to be covered up on more than half of
the days of the year in order to accommodate the sponsorship of a private concert series, which now no longer exists. If either of the proposals would have been approved for an Olympic Legacy Park in downtown at Pioneer Park or the Gallivan Center, the Ceremonies LLC, the Olympic Legacy Foundation, and the University of Utah would not be facing the question of the future of the Olympic Cauldron Park and how to continue the legacy of the Games when the cauldron park one day ceases to exist.

Fraser Bullock indicated that SLOC knew the location at Rice-Eccles Stadium would not remain permanently.\textsuperscript{14} Seldom do football stadiums stay status quo for more than ten to twenty years as ticket demands, new technology, and general deterioration usually warrants some type of expansion or renovation, but at the time SLOC had little choice if they wanted to locate a legacy park anywhere near the downtown area.\textsuperscript{15} Perhaps a legacy park is no longer needed. Maybe a ten- to thirteen-year run for the Olympic Cauldron Park was long enough to pay homage to the 2002 Olympic Winter Games, but the evidence suggests otherwise. Visitation to the park increased during the London 2012 Olympic Games and on an afternoon in November a tour bus pulled up to the 2002 Visitors Center and people began pouring out taking pictures and pointing at the cauldron. In August 2012, a mother who had brought her two young sons up to see the park was disappointed the film was no longer working; strangely enough it had broken just that morning. When asked why she had brought her children to see the park she replied she wanted to show her oldest son what had taken place in their community when he was just a few months old and to convey
to both boys that it was a special time for everyone involved.\textsuperscript{16} Hundreds of people showed up to the ten-year anniversary celebration and responded enthusiastically when asked if they were ready to host another Olympic Winter Games in 2022.\textsuperscript{17} In addition, the willingness of the Olympic Legacy Foundation to try to relocate some of the elements currently housed in the 2002 Visitors Center Gallery and theater shows they believe these items still have value and need to be displayed for current and future generations. All of these factors seem to indicate Utah is not ready to give up on preserving the memory of their Olympic experience. They do not want the party to be over, but the future of the Olympic Cauldron Park appears to be quite shaky as plans for expansion and improvements are formed. It may not happen right at the stroke of midnight in 2015 on the exact day when the contract expires, but the park just like Cinderella’s fantasy will dissolve into the background when the expansion hour finally strikes.
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“There’s no place like home, there’s no place like home.” Dorothy chants this phrase over and over as she clicks the heels of her ruby red slippers together at the end of the movie classic, *The Wizard of Oz*. Just as Dorothy longed to go home to Kansas, the concept of a 2002 Olympic Legacy Park has yet to find a home. The story of the Olympic Cauldron Park began with uncertainty as to where a 2002 Olympic legacy park would reside permanently and the story will end ironically, on a similar note, with the majority of the contents of park still in search of a lasting home. Since August, 2003, the legacy of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games resided at the Olympic Cauldron Park at Rice-Eccles Stadium and more specifically within the cauldron, 2002 Salt Lake Visitors Center Gallery, and Hoberman Arch, but as the initial contracts terminated and the equipment grew old and worn, it was time for the legacy to move on and find a location that would become its final resting place. That place is the Utah Olympic Park just outside of Park City Utah at a crossroads known as Kimball Junction. It was here that the ski jumping, bob sledding, luge, and skeleton competitions were held during the 2002 Olympic Winter Games. The Utah Olympic Park is operated by the Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation under
the direction of Colin Hilton.\textsuperscript{2} The Legacy Foundation is responsible for operation and maintenance of the venues built and funded specifically for the 2002 Olympic Winter Games. Those venues include the Utah Olympic Park and the Utah Olympic Oval, a speed skating venue located in Kearns, a suburb southwest of Salt Lake City. The Salt Lake Organizing Committee's bid for the 2002 Olympic Winter Games was unique in many ways, but one of the more specific reasons was the city and the committee itself decided to take a chance and go ahead and build the Olympic venues that were needed to host a Winter Games before the bid was actually won. The gamble paid off when the bid for 2002 was secured, but after the Olympics were over, these two specific venues were left to the care and ownership of the Olympic Legacy Foundation where the other venues such as the Energy Solutions Arena, where the figure skating competitions were held, returned back to the original business owners or in the case of Rice-Eccles Stadium, part of a state institution of higher learning.

Although the Olympic Cauldron Park and the Utah Olympic Park are owned and operated by two different entities, both venues have faced similar challenges, namely how to survive on an endowment given by SLOC at the end of the Olympics, which in both cases fell woefully short of the money needed to maintain and operate these Olympic legacy parks and venues.\textsuperscript{3} Colin Hilton, President of the Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation, expressed these sentiments and indicated that he and his staff are constantly searching for ways to spark public interest in the venues and museums that in return might generate the additional revenue so desperately needed to keep these places from falling into
disrepair and ruin. Passionate about his job, Hilton is genuinely interested in keeping the legacy of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games alive. Perhaps this is why the former CEO of SLOC, Fraser Bullock, appointed Hilton to act as the chief negotiator between the University and the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) to decide the fate of the contents of the 2002 Salt Lake Visitors Center Gallery and theater once the contract between the two entities expired in August 2008. In August 2012, the University finally decided to exercise its option to terminate operation of the gallery and theater in favor of using the space for other purposes more suited for the University currently. Hilton was a regional executive for SLOC during the planning and hosting of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games. He oversaw all of the venues and Olympic events that took place in the Park City area. After the games were over, he stayed on with SLOC until it dissolved in the fall of 2002, at which time he then became the President of the Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation.

Hilton began assessing what portions of the Salt Lake 2002 Visitors Center Gallery might be of use to the Utah Olympic Park during the ten-year anniversary celebration in February of 2012. He believed some of the items might fit in nicely with the efforts to expand the visitors attraction at the park. It was immediately decided that the rolling wooden picture display panels and the interactive kiosk would be easily relocated in the Eccles 2002 Olympic Winter Games Museum. The film and the theater were a different story. Hilton, his executive assistant Lisa Valiant, Connie Nelson, Executive Director of the Engen Ski Museum and Eccles 2002 Olympic Winter Games Museum, and other Utah
Olympic Legacy employees came to view the film to evaluate whether or not this would be an element they wanted to incorporate into one of the museums at Utah Olympic Park. As fate would have it, they came on the same day as the young mother mentioned earlier, who brought her sons to see the Olympic Cauldron Park and found that the film, one of the most popular and most well-received aspects of the 2002 Visitor Center Gallery, had broken down just that morning for the last time ever. Fortunately a digital copy of the film existed and was given to Hilton from a former SLOC employee and, although it lacked the special effects of the theater in the gallery, it was enough to convince him and the others they wanted to relocate the film in some aspect in either the Eccles 2002 Olympic Winter Games Museum or the Engen Ski Museum located on the first floor of the Joe Quinney Winter Sports Center, all of which is contained within the Utah Olympic Park.

Immediately plans began to form to make the film part of a project already in progress to redesign an interactive ski area that had previously allowed the participant to watch a film that simulated the view of a downhill skier as they raced through a competition course. The display was extremely outdated and the technology of the film was poor and in low definition. The new display was designed to look like a quad ski lift chair and the screen in front of the participant would give them the feeling of soaring high over the snowy Utah scenery similar to Disney’s Adventureland’s ride entitled “Soarin’ California.” The new display, however, is not in the Eccles 2002 Olympic Winter Games Museum. It is instead located on the first floor toward the back of the Engen Ski Museum around the
corner from the stairs, which visitors would then climb to the second floor to
where the 2002 Games museum is located. Hilton believes he can find a way to
incorporate the film into the new interactive theater area, especially since the
eight-minute film begins and ends high above the earth's atmosphere looking
down from a heavenly perspective and takes the viewer on a breathtaking ride
through the 2002 Games in between.

Since February 2012, negotiations have continued with the University of
Utah, the Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation, and the USOC to relocate the film
with all its equipment and special effects machinery to the Quinney Winter Sports
Center. Currently, the Utah Olympic Legacy Foundation will take full financial
responsibility for the relocation of the film and repair of the computers, LCD
projectors, and fog machines. They will also pay for the wooden panel picture
displays and the interactive kiosk to be moved to the second floor of the Quinney
Winter Sports Center and into a display area located in the Eccles 2002 Olympic
Winter Games Museum. Connie Nelson, Executive Director and acting curator of
the museums contained within the Quinney Winter Sports Center, is overjoyed at
the possibilities of the film and other elements coming to reside permanently in
the facility. On a tour of the museum, she enthusiastically points to where the
new film display will be located and presents the mock-ups of how the finished
product will appear, according to the firm who has been hired to oversee the
installation. She also demonstrates how the rolling picture panels and the
interactive kiosk will be squeezed into an empty corner of the Eccles 2002
Olympic Winter Games Museum. The elements will find a home next to the
displays where the gold, silver, and bronze 2002 Olympic and Paralympic medals are exhibited. Of course some of the pictures will have to be updated and the kiosk brought up to speed in design and technology, she explains, but these are minor setbacks in the overall plan and she seems genuinely thrilled to welcome the abandoned artifacts into the museum. She is just as passionate about these cast offs from another museum as she is about all things Olympic.6

Not all of the people who work at the Quinney Winter Sports Park are as passionate as Connie, Lisa, and Colin, which is evident when Connie took a moment during her tour of the facility to scold one of the employees for not turning on all of the lights to the displays in the museum when they arrived that morning. The park does not have volunteers like the Olympic Cauldron Park; instead, they have a staff of part time employees who work at the front counter and greet visitors, conduct tours, and sell Olympic merchandise found in the store located in the lobby. The park and museum also contains a small café where visitors and employees alike can enjoy a snack and a soft drink. It also contains all of the elements that were originally planned for the gallery area of the Olympic Cauldron Park but never made the cut due to costs. The legacy money given to run this venue was much greater than the amount given to the University of Utah, but this facility has no contractual deadline and must find a way to sustain itself well into the future in order to keep the legacy of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games alive. As one walks through the Engen Ski and the 2002 Eccles Winter Games museums filled with exhibits mounted against boards done in the colors from the 2002 marketing and branding pallet, one has the distinct feeling
that there among the giant hanging heads of the buffalo and bear costumes used in the 2002 opening ceremonies held at Rice-Eccles Stadium, the elements from the Salt Lake 2002 Visitors Center contained in the Olympic Cauldron Park have found a home at last.

As for the rest of the Olympic Cauldron Park, the cauldron will remain exactly where it is currently located, with the fountain limping along at half capacity and only being turned on for Utah football games or other large events held at Rice-Eccles Stadium. The USOC also refuses to relinquish the contract on the display of the large 2002 Olympic Winter Games snowflake logo mounted on the back of the large scoreboard structure in the south end zone of the stadium. This is much to the chagrin of the Utah Athletics Marketing Department, which covets that space for its prime real estate value and marketing power to all those who drive up and down the busy street of 500 South located next to the stadium. For now the logo and the tagline text “Light the Fire Within” will stay atop the scoreboard until the contract is up in the summer of 2015.

Due to its prominent location, there is no doubt that this is one element of the park that will not come down until the moment the contract is up. The Hoberman Arch and the seventeen story panels located along the south side of the park will suffer a much earlier fate. In the summer of 2013, the story panels will either come down and be destroyed or be revamped with displays relating to Utah football instead of Olympic memories. No one wants the panels in their present dilapidated state. There is no appropriate space for them at the Utah Olympic Park and the outside conditions there are even harsher than their
current location at the stadium, making the maintenance of these panels nearly impossible. So unless a last-minute entity steps up to claim the story panels, they will cease to exist. The scenario for the Hoberman Arch is similar. Currently, there is no one willing to take on the giant monster of a structure that is no longer functioning as it was originally designed. Colin Hilton has volunteered to shop it around to his counterparts in the events industry in Utah, but once again it is doubtful that there is an individual or entity willing to take on the task of relocating the heavy, cumbersome structure. If there are no takers by May of 2013, the arch will be disassembled and sold for scrap metal.\textsuperscript{7} This is a sad demise for one of the most innovative and technologically advanced elements of the 2002 Olympic Winter Games and it is a shame it could not be placed in a location where it could continue in its original function. Its removal however, will free up some much valued space needed for a hospitality area for donors and recruits during Utah football games. By the end of the summer in 2013, the Olympic Cauldron Park will be reduced to exactly what the structure had originally started out to be, the cauldron from the 2002 Olympic Winter Games featured in some type of water element. It is ironic that after all of the ups and downs and restructuring of the 2002 Olympic legacy vision, which included the expansion of the Olympic Cauldron Park, the park itself has come back to its original form, as it was first discussed by SLOC, Spence Eccles, and the University of Utah.

The Salt Lake 2002 Visitors Center Gallery will continue to function in another capacity once the Olympic elements have been cleared out in May. A feasibility study has just been completed by the architectural firm of FFKR and
presented to the Director of Rice-Eccles Stadium and the Facilities Planning and Campus Design and Construction Department of the University of Utah on two possibilities for the gallery. One is to convert the area into office space and the other is to turn it into a campus merchandising store for the University Bookstore. The bookstore has expanded its focus recently and opened a few satellite stores in the Salt Lake suburbs of Sandy, West Jordan, and Layton. They have enjoyed such enormous success at these stores that they are willing to once again look at a second location on the main University of Utah campus where access would be easier than their current spot in the interior of campus. FFKR has presented the layouts for both scenarios and the costs for conversion to either plan are comparable with the total costs coming in at approximately $145,000.00 for each.\textsuperscript{8}

Still to be decided by the University of Utah administration is the direction the gallery will take and how much of the Salt Lake 2002 Olympic Winter Games legacy they will retain in the gallery itself. For example, there is a large panoramic picture of downtown Salt Lake City during the closing ceremonies fireworks mounted into the wall as one walks in the front doors of the 2002 Visitors Gallery. Will the University wish to maintain that striking picture or will they want to brand it with Utah Athletics, the bookstore, or University logos and if they decide to maintain it, will the USOC allow them to do so now that the elements inside the gallery will be extremely un-Olympic in nature: perhaps some small reminders such as the torch from the 2002 Olympic torch run mounted on the wall just before one enters the theater or the picture on the wall of a smiling
Sarah Hughes captured just as she landed a big jump in the ladies figure skating competition. Hughes went on to skate a near perfect program and stole the gold medal away from the more seasoned veterans in the competition that year, becoming an instant celebrity. These small items might be enough to remind the future occupants and visitors to the gallery space that the 2002 Olympic Winter Games actually took place in Utah and more specifically in Salt Lake City and that Rice-Eccles Stadium was a large part of that extraordinary experience.

As the debate continues over what will become of the gallery space, a concept that is often contested in the area of public history comes to mind. This is the notion of the difference between space and place. Space serves a function, a factory produces goods, and the suburbs are towns in which those goods are consumed. Spaces are parking lots, classrooms, open fields, apartments, and houses. Space is utilitarian and may or may not be aesthetically pleasing. A place, on the other hand, is a location, just as space is but now that space has emotion tied to it. It is the emotion that converts a space into a place. A place has memories, good and bad, and we are reminded of those memories when we visit that place. A place is created when a house is occupied by a family creating memories and now the ordinary house becomes a home. Places are always aesthetically pleasing because of the memories tied to it by the participant. As the Salt Lake 2002 Visitors Center Gallery and theater begins its conversion to some other function, it will become a space, but for ten years it was a place. A place where visitors could come and look at photos, listen to short presentations, and for eight exhilarating minutes be transported back to a time when the entire
world paused and looked at Salt Lake City as a place; the place where Olympic dreams were fulfilled, medals won and lost, and heroes both expected and unlikely were created; a place where countries large and small united through sport for eighteen days in February, 2002, a mere five months after the world seemed to be coming apart at the seams on 9/11. The Olympic Cauldron Park is a place where the legacy of those Olympic Games has been preserved and it has served its purpose well. As the park moves forward into uncertainty as to what it will become, the community of Salt Lake City will be forever grateful for the memories it has provided and for the role it played in keeping that “once in every lifetime moment” alive.
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