



8  
9 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**  
10 **COUNCIL ECONOMY SYSTEMS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD TUESDAY,**  
11 **NOVEMBER 28, 2023, AT 3:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-**  
12 **PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS THE CWC**  
13 **OFFICES, LOCATED AT 41 NORTH RIO GRANDE STREET, SUITE, 102, SALT LAKE**  
14 **CITY UTAH.**

15  
16 **Present:** Dave Fields, Chair  
17 Morgan Mingle, Co-Chair  
18 Nathan Rafferty  
19 Ed Marshall  
20 John Knoblock  
21 Dennis Goreham  
22 Patrick Nelson  
23  
24 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director  
25 Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations  
26

27 **OPENING**  
28

29 **1. Chair Dave Fields will Open the Meeting as Chair of the Economy Systems**  
30 **Committee of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council.**  
31

32 Chair Dave Fields called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council  
33 Economy Systems Committee Meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. He welcomed those present and  
34 explained that Committee Members and other participants could share comments during the  
35 discussions.  
36

37 **2. Review and Approval of the Minutes from the October 31, 2023, Meeting.**  
38

39 Ed Marshall referenced Line 33 on Page 4 of the Meeting Minutes and asked that the sentence,  
40 “He asked the Committee to think about actionable items...” be changed to reference Chair Fields.  
41

42 **MOTION:** Ed Marshall moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from the October 31, 2023,  
43 Economy Systems Committee Meeting, as amended. Morgan Mingle seconded the motion. The  
44 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.  
45

1 **MOUNTAIN ACCORD REVIEW**  
2

3 **3. Committee Members will Discuss the Mountain Accord and Its Relevance to the**  
4 **Current Economic Situation in the Central Wasatch, and Relevant Potential Updates**  
5 **to the Committee’s Goals.**  
6

7 Chair Fields reported that the Committee Members were asked to review the Mountain Accord  
8 document ahead of the Economy Systems Committee Meeting. He noted that at the latest  
9 Stakeholders Council Meeting there was a review of the history of the Central Wasatch National  
10 Conservation and Recreation Area Act (“CWNCRA”). That presentation was a solid reminder of  
11 the importance of the Mountain Accord work. Chair Fields asked the Committee Members to  
12 share comments about their review of the Mountain Accord. Co-Chair Morgan Mingle reported  
13 that she is new to Utah and the Central Wasatch community. As a result, she was likely the least  
14 familiar with the Mountain Accord process. After reviewing the document, she had a lot of  
15 questions. One had to do with economic development and how it relates to the transit systems. A  
16 lot of what was included in the Mountain Accord pertained to connecting economic centers in Park  
17 City to the Cottonwood Canyons and the rest of the Central Wasatch. Not much progress had been  
18 made on that front. She asked for more background information about what had happened.  
19

20 Nathan Rafferty pointed out that the Mountain Accord process took place several years ago. He  
21 had forgotten that it all started with SkiLink. It had been a long process over many years. Chair  
22 Fields shared information about the connectivity discussions during the Mountain Accord process.  
23 There was a lot of interest back then in improving access to Park City from the Salt Lake Valley.  
24 However, it was shot down by businesses and the political leadership in Park City at the time.  
25 There seemed to be concern that Park City would become the base for the Cottonwood resorts. At  
26 various times, there were references in the CWNCRA about preserving transportation corridors  
27 between Park City and the Cottonwoods. From the ski resort perspective, there was an initiative  
28 called ONE Wasatch that had some energy for a little while, but that initiative did not ultimately  
29 move ahead.  
30

31 John Knoblock reported that there was a point in time in the mid-90s when ski resort attendance  
32 was down and people were trying to ensure that the ski resorts had enough customers. The new  
33 pass systems had turned that around significantly and there seemed to be less concern about the  
34 numbers. Mr. Rafferty believed it had less to do with numbers now and had more to do with  
35 ownership of the ski areas. When ONE Wasatch was launched, there were seven ski areas in the  
36 Central Wasatch. Since that time, six of those seven ski areas had changed ownership, which  
37 impacted the movement. If the resort ownership continues to change, it might be possible for  
38 future connectivity discussions.  
39

40 Chair Fields explained that some of the transportation solutions that had been studied through the  
41 Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) process were now being considered for the Kimball  
42 Junction corridor. Mr. Knoblock mentioned the number of visitors to Alta that came from Park  
43 City. He was not sure whether that number was finalized through the UDOT process, but  
44 connectivity there might be useful to address the transportation issues. Co-Chair Mingle thought  
45 there was a seasonality component with Guardsman Pass being a seasonal road. That was by far  
46 the easiest connection from Park City to Alta. Mr. Rafferty believed a lot had to do with the snow

1 years. Last year, the skiing was good at all of the resorts. The resorts that were higher, like Alta  
2 and Snowbird, did better in the low snow years, because people needed to travel much higher to  
3 find better snow for skiing.

4  
5 The best data that Chair Fields had seen regarding people coming over was cell phone tracking  
6 data. Mike Maughan had commissioned a company to study that in the past. Though that data  
7 was a few years old now, there was some data out there about people who came to the area. Ms.  
8 Mingle thought there might be potential to utilize that technology more to better understand  
9 economic movement as well as the general movement patterns of people in the area. After reading  
10 the Mountain Accord, she felt that information about the workforce (workforce supports and  
11 impacts) was missing. She thought the document might have overcentered the experience of  
12 visitors and residents. It would make sense for the Economy Systems Committee to prioritize the  
13 workforce needs as well.

14  
15 Dennis Goreham shared information about the Economy Systems Group outcomes. There was  
16 encouragement at that time to be a little broader. He explained that there were additional goals at  
17 different phases of the discussions, but those had been synthesized into the ones included in the  
18 final report. The first goal still captured the quality of life for residents and the quality of the  
19 experience for both residents and visitors. The three bullet points in the final version were chosen  
20 in an attempt to be broad enough that the economy-related goals could be captured and achieved.  
21 Chair Fields noted that the goals did not box in the Economy Systems Committee, but did not  
22 provide much of a roadmap either. Mr. Goreham noted that a lot had changed since the time of  
23 the Mountain Accord, so it might be beneficial that the goals were broader in nature. It meant  
24 those could be interpreted differently.

25  
26 Chair Fields reported that he received a submission from someone unaffiliated with the CWC. It  
27 outlined their recommendation of what should be studied. For example, doing counts on  
28 Cottonwood Canyons ski amenities, downhill biking and other mountain biking, shuttle service,  
29 rock climbing gear, and hiking gear. The submission also asked the Economy Systems Committee  
30 to focus on high-dollar items, identify growth opportunities, and look into the taxes and fees that  
31 were generated. The submission came from someone interested in the work that the Committee  
32 was doing.

33  
34 At the first meeting, the Economy Systems Committee had discussed whether it made sense to  
35 refresh data. Chair Fields explained that doing so could be costly in terms of time and money. He  
36 wondered how other Council Members felt about pursuing more data. Co-Chair Mingle noted that  
37 there were some services, like Zartico, that looked at cell phone tracking and visitor spending.  
38 That information could overlap with a few different data sources. What was beneficial about  
39 something like Zartico was that it would not be time-intensive. It would correlate the data in  
40 dashboards that were reported every month. There was normally a fast turnaround time, but she  
41 was not certain what the associated costs were. She shared information about Zartico in the Zoom  
42 chat box for reference.

43  
44 Chair Fields wondered what the Economy Systems Committee would do with additional data. For  
45 instance, if the Committee thought it would be best to refresh the data and present that to the  
46 Stakeholders Council. Mr. Knoblock thought that if there were clear numbers about the total

1 revenue and total tax generation, there would be a better platform to potentially lobby others to  
2 reinvest money into the industry. Mr. Rafferty reported that State and local tax revenue from the  
3 ski industry last year was over \$250 million. That number was not broken down from resort to  
4 resort or region to region, but the vast majority of that took place between Big Cottonwood  
5 Canyon, Little Cottonwood Canyon, and Park City. Mr. Knoblock asked if that was sales tax and  
6 transient room tax (“TRT”). Mr. Rafferty did not know the breakdown. It might be possible to  
7 obtain more detailed information. Mr. Marshall believed that a breakdown of that large number  
8 should be a focus for the Committee. That data was relevant in terms of cause and action, whereas  
9 small items such as the amount of rock climbing gear sold as the result of activity in the canyons,  
10 were less likely to be relevant overall.

11  
12 Mr. Rafferty reported that some states charged a tax on outdoor recreational equipment as a user-  
13 based fee. Utah did not do that. He discussed search and rescue costs. The search and rescue  
14 teams were mostly rescuing Utah residents, not people who were visiting the area. Asking people  
15 out of state to pay for something that was not being utilized by them did not make sense. A more  
16 equitable way to address that would be to have a user tax on purchases of outdoor recreational  
17 equipment. Chair Fields wondered whether additional information could be provided on that topic  
18 at a future Economy Systems Committee Meeting. Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen,  
19 confirmed this.

20  
21 Chair Fields noted that there was a discussion at the last Stakeholders Council Meeting about the  
22 Ski Hill Resources for Economic Development (“SHRED”) Act. There seemed to be a lot of  
23 interest in that. He recommended that at the next meeting, the Economy Systems Committee share  
24 a brief history of the SHRED Act and explain where it currently stood. There were a lot of  
25 questions during the Council Meeting about what the funds could be used for, so additional clarity  
26 would be beneficial. It was determined that Chair Fields and Mr. Rafferty would work on a brief  
27 presentation. Chair Fields wanted to see the CWC Board take an interest in the SHRED Act and  
28 advocate for that. Mr. Rafferty reported that there was a score attached to it from the Office of  
29 Planning and Budget. Anything with a score meant that the government had to spend some money.  
30 There was a hope that the SHRED Act could be attached to a larger recreation bill. Mr. Rafferty  
31 had heard some discussions about there being a solution to the score, but he was not sure exactly  
32 what that meant.

33  
34 Mr. Marshall had a question about the SHRED Act. He noted that Chair Fields had previously  
35 referred to the SHRED Act as revenue from a canyon staying within that canyon. In the limited  
36 reading he had done, it referred to revenue within a National Forest with a ski resort staying within  
37 that National Forest. Chair Fields confirmed that his reading was accurate. His understanding was  
38 that it stayed within the forest. In this case, the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest would retain  
39 the ski fees garnered from the ski resorts in the area. He thanked Mr. Marshall for catching that.  
40 Chair Fields stated that he and Mr. Rafferty would put together a presentation for the Stakeholders  
41 Council. It might be possible to share that presentation with the CWC Board in the future as well.  
42 It might also be possible for the Council to ask for a letter of support from the CWC Board at a  
43 later date.

44

1 **PROJECTS DISCUSSION**

2  
3 **4. Committee Members will Discuss Potential Projects for the Committee to Pursue.**

4  
5 Chair Fields asked the Committee Members to share suggestions that the Economy Systems  
6 Committee could consider looking into. Mr. Marshall had a few ideas. The first was relevant to  
7 all of the Systems Committees, which was to actively support fire prevention. The Forest Service  
8 now had funding to engage in that work. Whether the area of focus was recreation, economy, or  
9 ecology, there was nothing more important than preventing fires. There were decades of  
10 accumulated debris on a lot of the Forest Service lands. At the time that the Mountain Accord was  
11 drafted, the issue was not as widely discussed as it is now. He wanted fire prevention to be a goal  
12 for the Committee.

13  
14 Mr. Marshall believed fire prevention had relevance to the CWNCRA. One of the major impacts  
15 of the CWNCRA was that it would create more wilderness, as 8,000 acres of new wilderness were  
16 proposed. His understanding was that it was put in as a tradeoff for the land exchanges that were  
17 no longer included. Wilderness areas did not allow for mechanized tools, so it was a disadvantage  
18 in reducing fuels because the cost was five to six times as much. That increased the fire risk. He  
19 wanted to see the goal expressed in the following manner: “The Economy Systems Committee  
20 supports all efforts to reduce fuels and other forms of fire prevention in the Wasatch Canyons.”  
21 Patrick Nelson noted that there was an issue with contractors and the capacity to actually get the  
22 treatments done.

23  
24 Mr. Knoblock asked about proactive work with mechanized tools in Wilderness areas. Mr. Nelson  
25 explained that there were a number of factors that would limit the ability to use those in the  
26 Wilderness. A lot of those factors had to do with the terrain, as certain areas were too steep to use  
27 the tools there. That being said, he had seen permitted work in Wilderness areas to repair  
28 backcountry dams. Mr. Marshall wanted to see fire prevention included as one of the desired  
29 outcomes in an updated version of the Mountain Accord. There needed to be a larger focus on the  
30 issue given climate change.

31  
32 Mr. Marshall noted that recreation was often equated with some form of athletics. It did not have  
33 to be that way. He thought it was important to broaden the definition of recreation. The ski  
34 industry benefited from the current definition, because skiing was an athletic activity, but there  
35 were restaurants there that contributed to recreation experiences as well. Mr. Marshall wondered  
36 whether other Committee Members were interested in broadening the definition of recreation so  
37 restaurants and other kinds of uses were recognized forms of recreation. Chair Fields wondered  
38 where that definition would be changed. Mr. Marshall explained that he was specifically talking  
39 about the Mountain Accord document. The Committee could create awareness of the existing  
40 issue and incorporate a broader definition of recreation into the Mountain Accord work. Mr.  
41 Goreham thought that suggestion would fit in well with the bullet point in the document related to  
42 quality of life.

43  
44 Mr. Marshall shared an additional suggestion with the Committee. The map for the idealized  
45 version of the economic system did not include a transit stop at the base of Millcreek Canyon. He  
46 believed that needed to be amended. If a loop was created from Park City to Little Cottonwood

1 Canyon, there needed to be a stop at the base of Millcreek Canyon that would connect to the shuttle  
2 that was being discussed for Millcreek Canyon. That stop would reduce the need for as much  
3 shuttle parking. One of the issues facing the potential shuttle was having enough parking at the  
4 base of the canyon. If the loop shown in the idealized system was ever created, he felt there should  
5 be a transit stop at the base of Millcreek Canyon to accommodate the shuttle that was being  
6 discussed.

7  
8 Mr. Knoblock noted that there was a reference to year-round recreation at recreation nodes in the  
9 Mountain Accord. There was a desire to increase developed recreation at the ski resorts where  
10 there was already parking, restrooms, restaurants, and emergency medical services. Chair Fields  
11 pointed out that as the population of Utah changed and expanded, it was important to remember  
12 that not everyone wanted to recreate in active ways. There should be enough variety to  
13 accommodate different desires. Mr. Knoblock reported that the Mountain Accord also talked  
14 about hotels. Those promoted economy and also reduced vehicle trips up and down the canyon,  
15 so he felt it made sense to consider how to promote that element of the Mountain Accord. Chair  
16 Fields liked the suggestions.

17  
18 Ms. Mingle referenced the TRT. She was surprised at how little was diverted to the canyons.  
19 Something that the Committee might want to consider in the future was exploring how that TRT  
20 was allocated. The Committee could determine whether it was possible to lobby for a more  
21 appropriate percentage of the canyons and canyon infrastructure. Discussions were had about the  
22 TRT allocation.

23  
24 Chair Fields pointed out that there had been suggestions made by Committee Members to focus  
25 on: active support of fire suppression, broadening the definition of recreation, TRT allocation, a  
26 transit stop at the mouth of Millcreek Canyon if the idealized system came to pass, continued focus  
27 on developed recreation sites, and exploration of lodging opportunities in the canyons. He  
28 wondered whether anyone on the Committee objected to those items being priorities. Mr. Rafferty  
29 asked if the SHRED Act would also be included on that list. Chair Fields stated that the SHRED  
30 Act was on the to-do list as there would be a presentation made to the Stakeholders Council at the  
31 next meeting.

32  
33 Chair Fields was looking for consensus on the recommendations that had been made. Ms. Mingle  
34 did not have any objections to what had been shared but had one potential addition. There had  
35 been a brief discussion on seasonality and supporting a more year-round income stream and  
36 workforce. Chair Fields thanked her for pointing that out and added it to the list of suggestions  
37 that were shared. He was now entertaining a motion for the Committee to approve the pursuit of  
38 those priorities.

39  
40 **MOTION:** Ed Marshall made a motion to APPROVE the pursuit of the priorities outlined by  
41 Chair Fields during the November 28, 2023, Economy Systems Committee Meeting. Morgan  
42 Mingle seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

43  
44 Chair Fields reviewed the Committee priorities, which included: active support of fire suppression,  
45 broadening the definition of recreation, TRT allocation, a transit stop at the mouth of Millcreek  
46 Canyon if the idealized system came to pass, continued focus on developed recreation sites,

1 exploration of lodging opportunities in the canyons, and supporting a more year-round income  
2 stream and workforce. As for the to-do list items, there would be a presentation made by Chair  
3 Fields and Mr. Rafferty at the next Stakeholders Council Meeting about the SHRED Act. CWC  
4 Staff would work to obtain data from the Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute related to tax revenue  
5 breakdowns.

6  
7 Ms. Nielsen asked that Committee Members set the date for the next Economy Systems Committee  
8 Meeting. Director of Operations, Samantha Kilpack, explained that if the Committee wanted to  
9 continue to meet on the fourth Tuesday of every month, she could send those calendar invites out.  
10 However, there would be a conflict next month as it would be the day after Christmas. In 2024,  
11 one of the meeting dates would fall on Christmas Eve. There were no other holiday conflicts. She  
12 shared the current schedule with Committee Members. Mr. Marshall pointed out that it was  
13 preferable to have the subcommittee meetings before the Stakeholders Council Meeting. This was  
14 because Action Items needed to be considered and approved by the Stakeholders Council to move  
15 forward to the CWC Board. He suggested that the Economy Systems Committee meet before the  
16 Stakeholders Council Meeting took place. Discussions were had about how to accommodate  
17 holidays. It would be possible to reschedule the December meeting to a different day. Chair Fields  
18 suggested pushing the next meeting to January 2, 2023, and then resuming the previous schedule,  
19 which was the fourth Tuesday of each month. Several Committee Members had conflicts. It was  
20 determined that the meetings would take place on the second Thursday of the month from 3:30  
21 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.

22  
23 **CLOSING**

24  
25 **5. Chair Fields will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Economy Systems Committee**  
26 **Meeting.**

27  
28 **MOTION:** Ed Marshall moved to ADJOURN the Economy Systems Committee Meeting. There  
29 was no second. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

30  
31 The meeting adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the Central*  
2 *Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council Economy Systems Committee Meeting held Tuesday,*  
3 *November 28, 2023.*

4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes

7 T Forbes Group

8 Minutes Secretary

9

10 Minutes Approved: \_\_\_\_\_