

1 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION VISITOR MANAGEMENT**
2 **SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING HELD TUESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2020, AT 4:00 P.M.**
3 **THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED ELECTRONICALLY WITHOUT A PHYSICAL**
4 **LOCATION, AS AUTHORIZED BY THE GOVERNOR’S EXECUTIVE ORDER DATED**
5 **MARCH 18, 2020.**
6

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

10
11 **Staff:** CWC Executive Director Ralph Becker, CWC Deputy Director Blake
12 Perez, CWC Communications Director Lindsey Nielsen, Office
13 Administrator Kaye Mickelson
14

15 **1. WELCOME**

16
17 **a. Meeting will be Called to Order by Chair Annalee Munsey.**

18
19 Chair Annalee Munsey called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.
20

21 **2. VISITOR MANAGEMENT STUDY REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL**

22
23 **a. Craft and Review a Draft Request for Proposal.**

24
25 Chair Munsey stressed the importance of identifying who will be paying for things such as roads,
26 restrooms, and parking lots in the canyons.
27

28 Carl Fisher commented that whoever is hired to do the study will have better access to information
29 than members of the Central Wasatch Commission’s (“CWC”) Visitor Management
30 Subcommittee. He reported that the U.S. Forest Service has approximately \$.30 to spend per
31 visitor. Mr. Fisher wondered if that amount was adequate based on the infrastructure and trail
32 networks. He asked the Committee Members if they felt that the Visitor Management Study should
33 be conducted in one or two phases.
34

35 Office Administrator, Kaye Mickelson stated that there was ambiguity in the Request for Proposals
36 (“RFP”) because the Visitor Management Study could potentially be completed in a shorter period
37 of time. The prospectus listed the anticipated timeline as 18 months to two years. If someone with
38 a more sophisticated methodology responded to the proposal, the timeframe may be on the shorter
39 end of that anticipated timeline.
40

41 CWC Deputy Director, Blake Perez believed there was language in the draft RFP that mentioned
42 Phase 2. Ms. Mickelson clarified that in the timeline, there was a section for applicants to outline
43 the methodology that would be used. That would let staff know whether the applicant would
44 handle the full study or if the study would have a phased approach instead.
45

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

5
6 Chair Munsey asked if the Committee needed to indicate how the RFP applications would be
7 weighted. The RFP specified that the applications would be evaluated but did not offer specifics.
8 Ms. Mickelson explained that the CWC did not have the same procurement Code requirements as
9 other entities. She noted that Mr. Perez would work with the Selection Committee and the
10 applications would be weighted according to how the Selection Committee decided to weigh them.
11 Chair Munsey felt that past performance and knowledge of the canyons were both important
12 selection criteria to keep in mind.

13
14 There was discussion regarding the length of the RFP applications. Chair Munsey wondered if
15 there should be a page limit. Ms. Mickelson reported that the submissions could be between one
16 and 15 pages. That information was added to the draft. Chair Munsey asked how long the
17 applicants had to respond. Ms. Mickelson reported that the applicants have 30 days to submit their
18 proposals. Chair Munsey did not believe the applicants would need 30 days. The Committee
19 Members discussed what went into creating and submitting an RFP proposal.

20
21 It was noted that some proposals identified one designated person that applicants could reach out
22 to. They were prohibited from contacting members of the Selection Committee individually.
23 Ms. Mickelson noted that there were two contacts. If a question related to the proposal submission,
24 the applicant would contact Ms. Mickelson. If a question pertained to the project specifically, the
25 applicant would contact Mr. Perez.

26
27 Chair Munsey asked the Visitor Management Subcommittee to review the draft RFP and submit
28 any additional comments related to the mission or objectives to Ms. Mickelson. They would be
29 included at the Stakeholders Council Meeting on January 20, 2021. Chair Munsey asked that any
30 comments be submitted at least one week prior to the Stakeholders Council Meeting.

31
32 Will McCarvill asked about the process moving forward. He believed the next steps would include
33 the Visitor Management Subcommittee voting to recommend approval of the RFP. It would then
34 move to the Stakeholders Council. The Stakeholders Council would then forward a
35 recommendation of approval to the CWC Board. Mr. Perez explained that the prospectus had
36 already been approved by the Stakeholders Council and the CWC Board. He did not believe the
37 RFP needed to be approved further. The RFP would move on to the Stakeholders Council and
38 would be published a few days after receiving Stakeholders Council review.

39
40 Ms. Mickelson noted that when the actual proposals come in, the Selection Committee would
41 review them and make the final selection. That recommendation would go to the Visitor
42 Management Subcommittee and then move forward to the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board.
43 Mr. Perez felt this would slow down the process. They would need to wait for the Stakeholders
44 Council and the CWC Board to meet in order for the decision to be approved. Ms. Mickelson felt
45 that it was important to follow all rules and procedures as outlined by the Council.

1 Mr. McCarvill read out the names for the proposed Selection Committee, which included:
2

- 3 • Jeff Silvestrini;
- 4 • Harris Sondak;
- 5 • Annalee Munsey;
- 6 • Jan Striefel;
- 7 • Lance Kovel;
- 8 • Carl Fisher;
- 9 • Will McCarvill;
- 10 • Patrick Nelson; and
- 11 • Helen Peters.

12
13 The Visitor Management Subcommittee discussed potential timelines. Chair Munsey noted that
14 according to the proposed timeline, the Selection Committee would have one week to review the
15 proposals and make an appropriate selection. The project start date was anticipated to be
16 March 1, 2021. Mr. Fisher wondered if the one-week turnaround was unrealistic. He suggested
17 reducing the submission timeline by one week rather than extending the start date. Ms. Mickelson
18 noted that staff could change the deadline for the proposals to mid-February 2021. There was
19 discussion related to the length of the submissions. The Committee Members felt it was best to
20 keep the length at one to 15 pages.

21
22 Mr. Fisher asked about the deliverables of the project. He wondered if there would be a report or
23 if the data would be used to determine specific recommendations. Ms. Mickelson stated that this
24 was a study and report. However, the information gathered could be used to create
25 recommendations in the future. There was further discussion regarding whether the project would
26 have one or two phases. Ms. Mickelson believed the answer would come down to the selected
27 applicant. The RFP was technically written as Phase 1, but staff included the possibility that an
28 applicant could complete the full study in one phase rather than there being a two-phase approach.
29

30 Mr. McCarvill did not believe that specific data gathering or management plans would be included.
31 He noted that the budget was between \$30,000 and \$50,000. That would not be a significant
32 amount of contractor time. He felt that the Visitor Management Study would determine
33 information, trends, and include a summarization of the data. Mr. McCarvill suggested that
34 academic institutions with grad students may be able to do more with the funds than a commercial
35 contractor.
36

37 Mr. Fisher commented that the Visitor Management Subcommittee may want to prepare for
38 discussions with the Stakeholders Council. He wondered if the RFP was something the Committee
39 felt good about or if there were additional questions to consider. Mr. Fisher noted that there had
40 been discussions related to the scope. For instance, the Committee needed to decide whether the
41 Visitor Management Study should include only Big Cottonwood Canyon and Little Cottonwood
42 Canyon or if the scope should be broader. Mr. Fisher believed that quality was better than quantity.
43 It was noted that the process originally began because the Utah Department of Transportation
44 (“UDOT”) was not addressing the number of people visiting the canyons.
45

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

10
11 Chair Munsey thanked the Committee Members for attending the meeting and for their input.

12
13 **3. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

14
15 There were no additional comments.

16
17 **4. ADJOURNMENT**

18
19 The Central Wasatch Commission Visitor Management Subcommittee adjourned at approximately
20 5:15 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*
2 *Wasatch Commission Visitor Management Subcommittee Meeting held Tuesday, December 15,*
3 *2020.*

4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes

7 T Forbes Group

8 Minutes Secretary

9

10 Minutes Approved: _____