**MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION VISITOR MANAGEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING HELD TUESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2020, AT 4:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY WITHOUT A PHYSICAL LOCATION, AS AUTHORIZED BY THE GOVERNOR’S EXECUTIVE ORDER DATED MARCH 18, 2020.**

**Present:** Chair Annalee Munsey, Mike Marker, Nat \_\_\_\_\_, Jan Striefel, Patrick Nelson, Carl Fisher, Will McCarvill, Nate Furman, Sandy Wingert, Kyle Maynard, Kirk Nichols, Helen Peters, Dave Fields, Alex Schmidt

**Staff:** CWC Executive Director Ralph Becker, CWC Deputy Director Blake Perez, CWC Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, Office Administrator Kaye Mickelson

1. **WELCOME**
   1. **Meeting will be Called to Order by Chair Annalee Munsey.**

Chair Annalee Munsey called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

1. **VISITOR MANAGEMENT STUDY REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL**
   1. **Craft and Review a Draft Request for Proposal.**

Chair Munsey stressed the importance of identifying who will be paying for things such as roads, restrooms, and parking lots in the canyons.

Carl Fisher commented that whoever is hired to do the study will have better access to information than members of the Central Wasatch Commission’s (“CWC”) Visitor Management Subcommittee. He reported that the U.S. Forest Service has approximately $.30 to spend per visitor. Mr. Fisher wondered if that amount was adequate based on the infrastructure and trail networks. He asked the Committee Members if they felt that the Visitor Management Study should be conducted in one or two phases.

Office Administrator, Kaye Mickelson stated that there was ambiguity in the Request for Proposals (“RFP”) because the Visitor Management Study could potentially be completed in a shorter period of time. The prospectus listed the anticipated timeline as 18 months to two years. If someone with a more sophisticated methodology responded to the proposal, the timeframe may be on the shorter end of that anticipated timeline.

CWC Deputy Director, Blake Perez believed there was language in the draft RFP that mentioned Phase 2. Ms. Mickelson clarified that in the timeline, there was a section for applicants to outline the methodology that would be used. That would let staff know whether the applicant would handle the full study or if the study would have a phased approach instead.

Chair Munsey stated that the contract requirements asked the applicant to gather available information, synthesize the data, and assess it. Mr. Fisher commented that the Committee would receive significant pushback to include Millcreek Canyon in the Visitor Management Study. Ms. Mickelson made note of his comment.

Chair Munsey asked if the Committee needed to indicate how the RFP applications would be weighted. The RFP specified that the applications would be evaluated but did not offer specifics. Ms. Mickelson explained that the CWC did not have the same procurement Code requirements as other entities. She noted that Mr. Perez would work with the Selection Committee and the applications would be weighted according to how the Selection Committee decided to weigh them. Chair Munsey felt that past performance and knowledge of the canyons were both important selection criteria to keep in mind.

There was discussion regarding the length of the RFP applications. Chair Munsey wondered if there should be a page limit. Ms. Mickelson reported that the submissions could be between one and 15 pages. That information was added to the draft. Chair Munsey asked how long the applicants had to respond. Ms. Mickelson reported that the applicants have 30 days to submit their proposals. Chair Munsey did not believe the applicants would need 30 days. The Committee Members discussed what went into creating and submitting an RFP proposal.

It was noted that some proposals identified one designated person that applicants could reach out to. They were prohibited from contacting members of the Selection Committee individually. Ms. Mickelson noted that there were two contacts. If a question related to the proposal submission, the applicant would contact Ms. Mickelson. If a question pertained to the project specifically, the applicant would contact Mr. Perez.

Chair Munsey asked the Visitor Management Subcommittee to review the draft RFP and submit any additional comments related to the mission or objectives to Ms. Mickelson. They would be included at the Stakeholders Council Meeting on January 20, 2021. Chair Munsey asked that any comments be submitted at least one week prior to the Stakeholders Council Meeting.

Will McCarvill asked about the process moving forward. He believed the next steps would include the Visitor Management Subcommittee voting to recommend approval of the RFP. It would then move to the Stakeholders Council. The Stakeholders Council would then forward a recommendation of approval to the CWC Board. Mr. Perez explained that the prospectus had already been approved by the Stakeholders Council and the CWC Board. He did not believe the RFP needed to be approved further. The RFP would move on to the Stakeholders Council and would be published a few days after receiving Stakeholders Council review.

Ms. Mickelson noted that when the actual proposals come in, the Selection Committee would review them and make the final selection. That recommendation would go to the Visitor Management Subcommittee and then move forward to the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board. Mr. Perez felt this would slow down the process. They would need to wait for the Stakeholders Council and the CWC Board to meet in order for the decision to be approved. Ms. Mickelson felt that it was important to follow all rules and procedures as outlined by the Council.

Mr. McCarvill read out the names for the proposed Selection Committee, which included:

* Jeff Silvestrini;
* Harris Sondak;
* Annalee Munsey;
* Jan Striefel;
* Lance Kovel;
* Carl Fisher;
* Will McCarvill;
* Patrick Nelson; and
* Helen Peters.

The Visitor Management Subcommittee discussed potential timelines. Chair Munsey noted that according to the proposed timeline, the Selection Committee would have one week to review the proposals and make an appropriate selection. The project start date was anticipated to be March 1, 2021. Mr. Fisher wondered if the one-week turnaround was unrealistic. He suggested reducing the submission timeline by one week rather than extending the start date. Ms. Mickelson noted that staff could change the deadline for the proposals to mid-February 2021. There was discussion related to the length of the submissions. The Committee Members felt it was best to keep the length at one to 15 pages.

Mr. Fisher asked about the deliverables of the project. He wondered if there would be a report or if the data would be used to determine specific recommendations. Ms. Mickelson stated that this was a study and report. However, the information gathered could be used to create recommendations in the future. There was further discussion regarding whether the project would have one or two phases. Ms. Mickelson believed the answer would come down to the selected applicant. The RFP was technically written as Phase 1, but staff included the possibility that an applicant could complete the full study in one phase rather than there being a two-phase approach.

Mr. McCarvill did not believe that specific data gathering or management plans would be included. He noted that the budget was between $30,000 and $50,000. That would not be a significant amount of contractor time. He felt that the Visitor Management Study would determine information, trends, and include a summarization of the data. Mr. McCarvill suggested that academic institutions with grad students may be able to do more with the funds than a commercial contractor.

Mr. Fisher commented that the Visitor Management Subcommittee may want to prepare for discussions with the Stakeholders Council. He wondered if the RFP was something the Committee felt good about or if there were additional questions to consider. Mr. Fisher noted that there had been discussions related to the scope. For instance, the Committee needed to decide whether the Visitor Management Study should include only Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon or if the scope should be broader. Mr. Fisher believed that quality was better than quantity. It was noted that the process originally began because the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) was not addressing the number of people visiting the canyons.

Mr. McCarvill asked if the Visitor Management Subcommittee wanted input from the Stakeholders Council or if they would present the RFP as a complete document. The Committee Members stated the RFP would be recommended for adoption. Chair Munsey believed there would not be an issue as long as the Committee Members explained the reasons behind their decisions. For example, a focus on quality rather than quantity. The study could not be spread out over the entire canyons. Instead, there needed to be a focus on where there were transportation and watershed concerns. The Visitor Management Subcommittee agreed that the scope should be limited to Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood Canyon. Mr. McCarvill noted that additional areas could be studied at a later date.

Chair Munsey thanked the Committee Members for attending the meeting and for their input.

1. **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

There were no additional comments.

1. **ADJOURNMENT**

The Central Wasatch Commission Visitor Management Subcommittee adjourned at approximately 5:15 p.m.
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