



MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL ECONOMY SYSTEM COMMITTEE MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2025, AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS THE CWC OFFICES, LOCATED AT 311 SOUTH STATE STREET, SUITE 330, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

Committee Members: John Adams, Chair
John Knoblock, Co-Chair
Becca Gerber
Ed Marshall
Kim Doyle

Staff: Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director
Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations
Ben Kilbourne, Community Engagement Coordinator

OPENING

1. Chair John Adams will Open the Public Meeting as Chair of the Economy System Committee of the Central Wasatch Commission Stakeholders Council.

Chair John Adams called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council Economy System Committee Meeting to order at approximately 3:30 p.m. and welcomed those present. He reported that John Knoblock will serve as Co-Chair on the Committee but there was uncertainty about whether that appointment was made official at the last Stakeholders Council Meeting.

2. Review and Approval of the Minutes of the August 11, 2025, Meeting.

MOTION: Becca Gerber moved to APPROVE the August 11, 2025, Meeting Minutes. Ed Marshall seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

CANYON FUNDING NEEDS DISCUSSION

1. The Committee will Review Stakeholders Council Submissions for a List of Canyon Funding Needs.

2. The Committee will Discuss Potential Methods for Prioritizing the List of Needs.

1 **3. The Committee will Discuss Potential Funding Sources for the List of Needs.**

2
3 Chair Adams reported that at the last Economy System Committee Meeting, a list was created of
4 potential funding needs in the canyons. The ultimate goal is to bring suggestions to the CWC Board.
5 In addition to a list of potential funding needs, it is important to determine what the funding amount
6 would be for each item as well as potential sources of funding. He sent out the list to other members
7 of the Stakeholders Council and asked Stakeholders Council leadership to add it to a future meeting
8 agenda so there can be additional items included on the Canyon Funding Needs list. By the end of
9 October, the idea was that anyone who wanted to contribute would have done so.

10
11 The Canyon Funding Needs list was shared with the Committee. It was noted that there have been
12 several additions made since the last discussion. Co-Chair Knoblock added several items to the list
13 recently. Ed Marshall had another suggestion, which was the Millcreek Canyon shuttle. The updated
14 Millcreek Shuttle Feasibility Study was released on October 2, 2025, and there will be a Millcreek
15 Canyon Committee Meeting held on October 9, 2025, to discuss the document. It was estimated that
16 if fees in the canyon are not increased, it will cost \$300,000 to \$750,000 for a shuttle. It makes sense
17 to add this item to the Canyon Funding Needs list. Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, reported that
18 Committee Members can review the study document. There is a public comment period currently
19 open where comments can be submitted.

20
21 Becca Gerber noted that she previously mentioned employee housing as something that would
22 support the economy of the canyons, but she did not think the CWC would be able to fund employee
23 housing. She was not certain how the CWC could be involved in that work, but pointed out that
24 advocacy, study in collaboration with businesses, and general support might make sense. However,
25 employee housing itself would likely be out of reach for the CWC. While employee housing is on
26 the list of Canyon Funding Needs, it makes sense to think about what the funding request might look
27 like specifically. Co-Chair Knoblock pointed out that the Canyon Funding Needs list does not
28 necessarily anticipate the CWC funding each item on the list. There are different options to explore.
29 A column can be added to the chart to specify the most likely funding source. For example, the
30 column could be titled: “likely responsible party for funding” and that information could be added.

31
32 Chair Adams reported that there have been previous Economy System Committee discussions about
33 the tax revenue that is generated but does not necessarily go back into the canyons. In addition, there
34 are fees that are paid for certain land leases that are then put into a General Fund. Ms. Gerber stated
35 that a need in Summit County has to do with attracting and sustaining the workforce. She would be
36 interested in hearing what the main economic issues are from the businesses located in the canyons.

37
38 Co-Chair Knoblock discussed some of the items that he added to the Canyon Funding Needs list,
39 including the improvement of backcountry ski trailhead plowing. He explained that right now, it is
40 split between the U.S. Forest Service, County, and the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”).
41 If there was a way to improve that service, then it would benefit the backcountry skiers. Another item
42 that was added to the list related to bicycle and pedestrian lane improvements in Big Cottonwood
43 Canyon. He reported that there are a few locations where there is no pedestrian lane at all and the
44 pedestrians are forced into the lane of traffic. In addition, there are mines that still need to be closed.
45 It might be meaningful to have interpretive signage placed at some of the historic mine sites.

46
47 Co-Chair Knoblock mentioned the Tri-Canyon Trails Master Plan that should be completed soon.
48 There will likely be a number of projects that come out of that plan. He noted that there are areas in

1 the canyons where pedestrians cross the road and it would be beneficial to have signage placed there.
2 Another item that was added to the list is free bus service in the canyons year-round to incentivize
3 transit use. Co-Chair Knoblock mentioned a Tri-Canyons Visitor Center. When the gravel pit is
4 developed, there could be a visitor center added so information can be shared with those interested.
5

6 Chair Adams asked if there would be Committee support for the eventual consolidation of the Canyon
7 Funding Needs list. Once the list has been consolidated and organized, it would then be possible for
8 some sort of ranking to be done. Co-Chair Knoblock discussed the possible prioritization process.
9 When it comes to the overall goal of this exercise, he believes it is to show the CWC Board,
10 Legislature, and others, the amount of money generated by businesses in the canyons as well as the
11 money that is needed to make necessary improvements in the canyons related to the use.
12

13 Chair Adams confirmed that this discussion started because the Committee was considering the
14 money generated by the economy of the canyons. Committee Members identified a lot of needs in
15 the canyons and pointed out the fact that the money generated was not necessarily returned to support
16 those needs. The idea of prioritizing the list is so something can be brought to the CWC Board for
17 consideration. Co-Chair Knoblock understood the value of prioritizing the listed items based on the
18 importance of the work or the costs associated with the work. Discussions were had about
19 prioritization. Chair Adams noted that it is possible to consider whether something is sizeable,
20 solvable, or sorely neglected. The scores from each of those three items can be added up. Each
21 canyon funding idea on the list would then have a score that could be used to rank the various ideas.
22

23 Mr. Marshall explained that whenever the items are prioritized, it is important to have clear criteria
24 in place. He pointed out that some of the items on the Canyon Funding Needs list are somewhat
25 broad. One of the criteria could be how much money it will take to solve the problem. Another
26 criteria could be whether that money is readily available and there are funding sources to solve that
27 particular issue. The third criteria could be related to solvability and whether someone was willing
28 to work on the issue. The listed items are not necessarily beneficial to the businesses in the canyons,
29 but the listed items look at what the canyons need to promote recreation, environment, transportation,
30 and the economy. This is not simply an Economy System Committee list, but one that all of the
31 System Committees have interest in. As a result, it might make sense to consider whether there are
32 people on relevant System Committees that might be willing to work on some of the items. Mr.
33 Marshall stressed the importance of having specific criteria outlined before prioritization occurs.
34

35 Co-Chair Knoblock agreed that there needs to be a focus on funding source availability, cost,
36 feasibility, how many people are impacted, and so on. He noted that there can be both a quantitative
37 and qualitative process that takes place. Ms. Gerber asked whether the list should focus more on the
38 economic needs rather than all of the other systems. She wanted clarification about whether the other
39 System Committees are also contributing to this list. Chair Adams reported that the other System
40 Committees have been asked to contribute to the list. At this time, some have contributed and some
41 have not. Discussions were had about the Mountain Accord process and how the listed items can
42 improve the CWC study area. Co-Chair Knoblock suggested that another column be added to the
43 Canyon Funding Needs list to describe the Mountain Accord system that each item is related to.
44

45 Chair Adams noted that a few months back, there was a discussion about a Canyon Purpose Trust.
46 He shared information about the Great Salt Lake Watershed Enhancement Trust, which is a trust that
47 already exists and is managed by a Trust Council. Ms. Nielsen reminded the Economy System
48 Committee that the CWC goes to the State each year to make an appropriations request. She could

1 see some items from the list being brought forward as appropriation requests if more planning and
2 prioritization was conducted and if there was support from the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board.
3 Chair Adams stated that the costs associated with the items on the brainstormed list still need to be
4 determined. It will take some time to determine the amounts needed for each of the listed items.

5
6 Co-Chair Knoblock believed it is possible to determine the funding need estimates. It might be best
7 to ask the person who made the original suggestion to look into the numbers. Chair Adams pointed
8 out that the list can indicate whether something is a one-time cost or an ongoing cost. Co-Chair
9 Knoblock noted that the costs be broken down into two columns: one-time costs and ongoing costs.
10 For example, for the Millcreek Canyon shuttle, there will be a one-time cost related to the parking lot
11 improvements at the base of the canyon, but then there would be ongoing costs for the operators.

12
13 Chair Adams thought it made sense to have a Breakout Session to review the list once it has been
14 completed. He reiterated that the idea is to have all of the ideas submitted by the end of October. In
15 the meantime, it is possible for the Economy System Committee to look into cost estimates for the
16 ideas that have been submitted so far. For example, Co-Chair Knoblock can look into the ideas that
17 he suggested for the Canyon Funding Needs list. Chair Knoblock stated that when it comes to the
18 amount of money generated by the businesses in the Central Wasatch area, he believes it can be
19 determined in part by the Tourism, Recreation, Culture, and Convention (“TRCC”) taxes collected.

20
21 Co-Chair Knoblock pointed out that the title of the spreadsheet document is Canyon Funding Needs.
22 He asked whether it should be CWC Study Area Funding Needs instead. Chair Adams noted that this
23 is in support of the Mountain Accord, so the updated title might make more sense. The needs are
24 different across the various areas. Co-Chair Knoblock explained one challenge that had faced the
25 CWC is that there is a tendency to gravitate toward the tri-canyons during certain discussions.

26
27 Chair Adams asked about Park City and noted that there is a strong focus on tourism there. Ms. Geber
28 explained that the tourism taxes and sales taxes are tracked. There is work done with the County to
29 track all of the sales taxes that come in and there are monthly updates on how much Transient Room
30 Tax is coming in as well as all of the different sales taxes. In addition, there is work done with Park
31 City on the local sales tax tracking. There are also a lot of discussions about home ownership.
32 Ms. Gerber explained that primary residents pay only 55% of the property tax rate and second home
33 owners pay 100%. In Park City specifically, almost 70% of the homes are second homes. In the
34 County overall, it is approximately 50% of the properties that are second homes. She shared
35 information about Transient Room Taxes and the State Legislation requirements. Ms. Gerber noted
36 that there was an expansion in how Transient Room Tax can be used, which means there is more
37 flexibility.

38
39 There was additional discussion about Transient Room Taxes (“TRT”) and the tracking that currently
40 takes place. Co-Chair Knoblock offered to check in with Nathan Rafferty at Ski Utah about this. It
41 might be possible for Ski Utah to obtain information about TRCC revenue generated from the ski
42 industry. He will find out whether or not Ski Utah has access to that information and report back to
43 the Economy System Committee. Ms. Gerber shared a link to House Bill (“H.B.”) 456 – Transient
44 Room Tax Amendments in the Zoom chat box for reference. She reiterated that there was an
45 expansion in what counties can use the money for, so there is now more flexibility provided. There
46 could be a conversation with Salt Lake County about whether there are different opportunities
47 available.

1 Chair Adams asked Kim Doyle for feedback about the Canyon Funding Needs list. Ms. Doyle
2 believes the Economy System Committee is moving in a positive direction. She offered to look into
3 the tire check costs, which are currently included on the list. Mr. Marshall pointed out that the list is
4 not intended to promote or assist businesses directly. Based on earlier comments, this is an approach
5 where businesses might benefit indirectly. Once the list is developed, the items need to be separated
6 out among the various System Committees. There is a Stakeholders Council Meeting next week.

7
8 Co-Chair Knoblock thought it might make sense for the Canyon Funding Needs list to state which
9 system the item impacts most. For example, employee housing would be most impactful to the work
10 of the Economy System Committee whereas water quality data would be most impactful to the
11 Environment System Committee. Chair Adams expressed concerns about that kind of breakdown.
12 He reminded those present that the purpose of the Mountain Accord was to look at all of the systems.
13 The interconnectedness of the different systems should continue to be taken into account.
14 Mr. Marshall clarified that it is not a matter of someone only caring about one system, but making
15 sure those who care most about a system are devoting their time and energy to the associated work.
16 He feels strongly that the Canyon Funding Needs list should not be presented to the CWC Board until
17 there is communication at the Stakeholders Council level. It is possible to forward items to the CWC
18 Board in batches or one at a time. Chair Adams agreed that it makes more sense to share fully vetted
19 items with the CWC Board rather than presenting a list that does not have a lot of information.

20
21 Chair Adams asked that anyone on the Economy System Committee who submitted ideas to the
22 Canyon Funding Needs list do some additional research to determine the potential costs. There can
23 be a discussion with the full Stakeholders Council and additional suggestions can be added to the list.
24 He asked if this would be an agenda item at the next Stakeholders Council Meeting. Ms. Nielsen
25 believed that agenda is already set. However, it could be added to a subsequent meeting agenda. It
26 might be beneficial to take some time to discuss the list at the System Committee level first.

27
28 Co-Chair Knoblock asked if there will be time at the next Stakeholders Council Meeting for each
29 System Committee to share a summary of the work conducted recently. Director of Operations,
30 Samantha Kilpack, denied this. The aim was to share that kind of summary in the newsletter so the
31 Stakeholders Council Meeting time was focused on more interactive discussions. However, the
32 Canyon Funding Needs list can be included in the newsletter so Council Members are made aware.

33 **OTHER ITEMS**

34
35
36 There were no additional discussions.

37 **CLOSING**

38 **1. Chair Adams will call for a Motion to Adjourn the Economy System Committee** 39 **Meeting.**

40
41
42
43 **MOTION:** John Adams moved to ADJOURN the Economy System Committee Meeting. John
44 Knoblock seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

45
46 The Economy System Committee Meeting adjourned at approximately 4:33 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 System Committee Meeting held Wednesday,*
3 *October 8, 2025.*
4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes
7 T Forbes Group
8 Minutes Secretary
9

10 Minutes Approved: _____