

Visitor Capacity Committee Meeting
Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council
Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City and Sandy
3430 Danish Rd, Cottonwood Heights, UT 84093
Date: September 25, 2019
Meeting start time: 4 p.m.
Meeting end time: 5 p.m.

Committee members present: Carl Fisher, Mike Marker, Mike Maughan, Will McCarvill, Annalee Munsey, Barbara Cameron, Brian Hutchinson, Kirk Nichols, Dave Fields, Kelly Bricker, Sarah Bennett : reference sign in sheet for accurate attendance (attached)

CWC staff present: Ralph Becker, Blake Perez, Kaye Mickelson

Reference: Agenda provided/Capacity Study Proposal

Blake; did review of items and issues that relate to moving forward as a committee. CWC response to questions being asked - "we have no funding associated with this project (capacity)" - conflict of interest reference Kelly Bricker" - we are looking at CWC procurement policy - we do have special option/single source and bid. Blake indicates he will follow up with legal counsel and also with chair of cwc regarding an appropriate approach - "

Jan: what is commission preferred direction ? likes a consultant option.

Blake: we have options for pursuing a capacity study to put on the table - Kellys proposal is just Kellys proposal.

Kelly: would prefer knowing options rather to appear as sitting with only this proposal. Does not want this to get in the way of discussions yet to occur - would prefer to be able to say here's "a" proposal for discussion.

Will: liked idea of proposal and thanked Kelly for doing the work/the interagency guideline book portion very valuable. Asked question regarding ski areas - curious about the jurisdictional issues.

Kelly: some questions can increase the complexity; public lands focus/anything coming in and out of the ski areas would be included as they are capacity corridors - what about the numbers of those not involved with ski areas.

Will: thinks it's time for ski areas to give capacity projections, we now have a better feel for other area usage.

Barbara; our feasibility study for Brighton was not able to get that information - did not realize there was no effort to put human aspect into dashboard.

Kelly: thinks 6 years ago we did discuss this but forest department was going to do their own thing.

Barbara; like Kelly's proposal to include human element - Phase 2 may help.

Kirk: phase two may not contain that.

Pat: indicated there was UDOT information which could come - CWC could ask for.

Kirk: UDOT has capacity to project numbers in cars to assist in capacity projections.

Brian: outdoor recreation asked for these numbers previously, addressed Kelly regarding proposal as being not just for her organization but also as being from stakeholders.

Kelly: I am in territory we've never been in before - our researchers do this type of work.

Brian; can we use this proposal as a building out foundation?

Kelly: I would say, it's public, if someone else were to do this we could take this and build it out.

Ralph: if someone/an entity was to say we are going to host and have the funding for such a proposal, write a scope of work from what has become sponsor/put out a request for proposal

Annalee; we could use this information to building out a proposal.

Pat: could we not do special designation/sole source.

Ralph: we can do that, however it's discouraged - any governmental institution have certain kind of services we can sole source depending on the service' attorneys discourage.

Brian: amount of detail in Kelly's proposal would be great format for creating request.

Pat: sometimes we get caught up in the legal process and overlook an option

Ralph: you are right Pat, there are times we can do this (gave examples)

Jan: could we do that with this? There are all types of conflict of interest.

Ralph: not a conflict of interest, more process of how to handle it to avoid a potential conflict.

Annalee: there are other organizations that could do that but they are at a distance.

Pat: seems there's options.

Sarah: infrastructure is an item I just keep coming back to/if we had nodes for where individuals are able to have experiences

Kelly: say we don't have information regarding usage, by definition- you get the data, come back with the information and ask if this capacity picture works - folks can then make a decision.

Kelly: look at the pressure points and where degradation occurs/ then you can make changes in management plan - what we would be looking for is class use and are you going to manage for that class - that's where capacity makes a difference/gives you data for a variety of usage and gives you options to manage.

Kelly - would need a year of data -

Ralph - unless there is already existing data

Kelly - there's some

Ralph - there _does exist some___ information/studies which could be used.

Sarah: would be a massive study.

Kelly: however, you have one point of entry/exit - we do have the ability to track using trackers; gave an example of where tracking option is available and has been used in other wilderness usage studies. Current management plan does not provide threshold capability.

Will: that's where I see dashboard being a big help.

Pat: so what do we have to do next?

Blake: perhaps Ralph you can be helpful here - does not want to appear as though we are moving along with Kelly's proposal - shall we ask commission if there is information to do a single source.

Ralph: commission has not officially taken this up - sense is, that within the commission they think doing a capacity study could be great work, there's been no discussion regarding funding, the commission is not in a position to fund such.

Ralph: Should we do it/if this group says we should pursue this further - commission could say yes".Next step is to determine who would be responsible for it .. maybe CWC and where would the funding come from.Clear UDOT not interested/they have a specific direction from the legislature, they have a pretty clear mandate - however, are there other jurisdictions that could possibly fund to do this work?Local jurisdictions could come together/collaboration.

Pat: any idea of cost?

Kelly: possible \$30,000 for first phase - range would be, based on other studies \$150,000 per canyon -

Ralph: we won't want to underestimate.

Blake: would you do phase 1 and 2

Kelly: said would be best

Jan: would phase 1 determine conditions

Kelly: phase 1 would determine the balance of study -help us know what to feed into the components -

Will: I would suggest we read the most current county plan - and how they are building in a whole bunch of human elements.

Annalee: county is responsible for some units

Will: they do have things underway.

Brian: CWC meetings I have attended have included conversations regarding whole area so that Summit County and Park City might contribute -

Ralph: that's certainly an option - what does Flats area need and might be a way to bring together with cottonwood - just in thinking about budget into what decisions are anticipated and timeframe - capacity study casting a wider net.

Barbara: I MOVE that we request CWC to move forward with capacity study and seek funding.

Will: SECOND - it's important to the other plans to be developed - (named alternative plans and interested parties)

Sarah: also would help with public, we are going to change a lot how we interact with the canyons.'

Will: would be great if public knew CWC was concerned and working on their behalf.

Kelly:RECOMMENDATION/RESOLUTION: from this committee - CWC move forward with visitor capacity study and locate funding.

Will and Barbara both SECOND.

Annalee: when I look at legislation it talks about managing human experience - so this could be a way to pitch it .. as a tool.

Kelly/Ralph: very much a part of Mountain Accord - (Ralph quotes Mountain Accord regarding dashboard development and human use comments/this really is a way of meeting a portion of Mt Accord.)

Blake: this could also help with single sourcing.

Kirk: quoted Brendle Group doing research -was that single sourcing?

Ralph: we can check back on this - asked Pat and Curt - not sure whose money was used for that groups study.

Kirk: there's just enough parallels to see if we could not head down that way again.

Ralph: is CWC the appropriate entity?

Kelly: All in favor of the recommendation/resolution: PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Has to become an action item - for Stakeholders

Brian; hopefully folks won't get caught up on the \$30,000 item ..

Ralph: nope, we'll work on the budget piece of it.

Will: will this then be presented to Stakeholders Group

Ralph - let's talk with Greg about how this comes to CWC

Brian; there's no conflict with the concept

Ralph - right, so we can work ahead.

Public service - Barbara - affordable housing issues coming up

Saturday/September see flyer for event (attached).

Adjourned