

Two Questions and Answers regarding proposed changes:

QUESTION 1:

Alan,

It looks good. One thing I wonder about is the 1st, 2nd and 3rd choices; is this to ease conflict resolution? Seems like this will create lots of conflicts, i.e. applicant X's 1st choice conflicts with applicant Y's 3rd choice etc. Seems no one is likely to give up 1st choice to another's 3rd but maybe they will if they go to mediation and can't agree? Or does 1st automatically have priority? Or does party automatically have to take a 1st, 2nd or 3rd if there is no conflict in one of those choices? Maybe I'm missing something.

Clay V.

ANSWER 1:

Hi Clay, thank you for asking this question!

The method of starting with multiple choices can help to identify possible solutions by priority. If you have several target choices, it makes it possible to determine the priorities of that event director.

The applicant may need a certain group of dates, yet be more flexible in holding period length, or alternatively they may not care about date but be firmer about holding period length. Also the applicant may become flexible in how many days of competition (i.e. 1st choice = 4 days of comp; 2nd choice = 3 days of comp; 3rd choice = 2 days of comp).

Alan L.

=====
QUESTION 2:

Gil R.,

Alan,

I would have to crunch up some examples to see how it would work and I have zero time for that these days. Nevertheless, it does seem like it might work and it should be considered.

Since the goal of this format is to consider diversity for the entire schedule, as opposed to diversity of events head-to head, I have one question specific to your proposal.

Supposing that an event is requested and not in conflict, could this event be bumped later by another event that survived conflict resolution and was deemed more diverse? e.g., suppose the Pipe Masters were not in conflict and was set aside, on hold. Then the

Women's Pro Surfing International event beats out all others and is the only female event left to consider. Would it knock out the Pipe Masters? If so, I see a fatal flaw, as nobody would accept that verdict.

Gil R.

ANSWER 2:

Hi Gil,

Thank you for asking this question!

The only way the Pipeline Masters can be at risk is if someone applies against its time period.

The proposed method is a change in procedure leading up to and during the conflict resolution.

Currently, none of the applicants receive any feedback as to whether they are in conflict until it is too late to mitigate (i.e. mediate, alter application date or any other form of REAL resolution).

The changes described in the proposal, will red-flag calendar conflicts BEFORE city mandated conflict resolution; additionally, it solves at least one obvious flaw in the city method of dealing with the conflicts using the existing criteria. It does not change the criteria, however the city needs to understand and define diversity.

By this I mean, the City DPR is confusing and interchanging the word diversity between Internal and External diversity.

Internal diversity, for our purposes, would be the measure of diversity within ONE event. External diversity, for our purposes, would be the measure of diversity within the entire calendar of events.

The true measure should be the external diversity of the calendar as it is composed by unique events. Therefore, if the calendar is full of bodysurfing contests, and there is a conflict between a surfing event and a surfing event, it is logical and equitable, for the purposes of diversity, to award the permit to the surfing event. That will make the calendar MORE diverse.

Alan