



MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS COUNCIL ECONOMY SYSTEM COMMITTEE MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 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
Hilary Arens
Kim Doyle

Staff: Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations

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.

2. Review and Approval of the Minutes of the October 8, 2025, Meeting.

Chair Adams reviewed the Meeting Minutes from October 8, 2025. At the last meeting, there was discussion about the Canyon Funding Needs document that was created. It was noted that Co-Chair John Knoblock suggested that the document be retitled to Wasatch Front Funding Needs or CWC Area Funding Needs. Chair Adams explained that at the last meeting, some Committee Members wanted to prioritize the items on the list, but it was determined that the list needs to be finalized first.

MOTION: John Knoblock moved to APPROVE the October 8, 2025, Meeting Minutes. Becca Gerber seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

CANYON FUNDING NEEDS DISCUSSION

1. The Committee will Review its List of Canyon Funding Needs and Discuss the Funding Amounts Needed for the Projects Listed, Including Whether Funding Already Exists.

2. The Committee will Discuss Potential Funding Sources for the List of Needs.

Chair Adams reported that Co-Chair Knoblock has done a lot of work on the Canyon Funding Needs document. The ultimate goal is to bring it to the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board once there is enough information. Feedback has been provided by the other System Committees on the shared document. Co-Chair Knoblock has begun to estimate what some of the funding amounts might be. The Canyon Funding Needs document was reviewed by the Committee.

Co-Chair Knoblock stated that the goal of the document is to show where there might be gaps or perceived gaps in funding. The document can demonstrate where money is coming into the Central Wasatch or where money generated by businesses within the CWC study area could fill those gaps. For example, if there is a \$10 million project that needs to be funded, it might be possible to bring that to the attention of whoever holds the funds. This area is generating money and some of it should be returned to the area to take care of the critical funding needs. Chair Adams confirmed that there are needs in the canyons that are not currently being funded. Revenue is generated from the businesses in the canyons that goes into the General Fund. Once that money is in a General Fund, it can be used in the canyons, but it does not necessarily have to be. Money in those funds is voted on to determine how it will be used. The idea is to determine whether some of that money could be allocated back to the canyons and prioritized based on the needs.

Chair Adams explained that it is important to determine whether there is an appetite to potentially reallocate some of the money that goes to the General Fund. There can be discussions about new sources of revenue or reallocating existing sources of revenue. Co-Chair Knoblock explained that all of the money that comes in is allocated somewhere. The idea is to see more of that allocated back into the canyons. The list will at least inform decision makers about the current canyon needs. Chair Adams stressed the importance of increased awareness about what is needed in the canyons. The Canyon Funding Needs document dovetails with the purpose of the CWC and Mountain Accord. It is intended to be forward-thinking to preserve all aspects of the canyons. There is value in both the natural environment and the built environment. Committee Members further reviewed the document.

Chair Adams reported that he looked at the items and broke them out into two tabs. One tab is focused on funding needed for maintenance items, such as revegetation and graffiti removal. These are not necessarily improvements, but are required for the canyons because of the use that occurs. The other tab is focused on improvement funding, such as air quality tracking and automating the fee booth in Millcreek Canyon. He asked for feedback on the way the items on the list have been broken out. Co-Chair Knoblock explained that he included some estimates for the different project costs, but Committee Members can do some research to better define those numbers. Chair Adams thought it made sense that the research be done by the Economy System Committee but noted that there might need to be some outreach to other Stakeholders Council

1 Members. Co-Chair Knoblock agreed that the Economy System Committee should handle the
2 research component and any necessary outreach.

3
4 Co-Chair Knoblock suggested that another column be added to the document to track which
5 Committee Member will look into the more concrete project cost numbers for each item. It was
6 noted that Kim Doyle has offered to look into the tire check costs. Co-Chair Knoblock asked
7 CWC Staff about the funding for tire checks. Director of Operations, Samantha Kilpack, did not
8 have information about that, but offered to ask Executive Director, Lindsey Nielsen, for additional
9 details.

10
11 There was discussion about the trailhead restroom maintenance. Co-Chair Knoblock believed the
12 CWC consolidated restroom cleaning contract is only for cleaning and not for pumping out the
13 vault toilets. Ms. Kilpack clarified that there are several funding partners. The CWC administers
14 the contracts for many of the restrooms in the Central Wasatch, but not all of them. The pumping
15 has also changed a little bit because of some U.S. Forest Service changes. The CWC will be
16 stepping in to help administer the pumping. While she knows some of the associated costs, there
17 are a lot of different parties funding the restrooms in the canyons. CWC Staff can provide the
18 information that is known. Co-Chair Knoblock asked if it would be appropriate to list CWC Staff
19 in the column that was added to the document. Ms. Kilpack confirmed that CWC Staff can look
20 into the numbers for that project cost.

21
22 Ms. Kilpack asked about the restrooms that some of the ski resorts handle. Chair Adams believed
23 Hilary Arens previously stated that Snowbird takes care of the White Pine restroom. Ms. Kilpack
24 pointed out that the Forest Service likely knows who handles each of the restrooms. It is possible
25 that she can obtain that information from the Forest Service, but the timeline is uncertain because
26 of the furlough. She offered to look into this further and report back to the Economy System
27 Committee.

28
29 Co-Chair Knoblock noted that the document does not clarify what the existing total cost is versus
30 what additional funds are needed. There are certain items that might require some more
31 clarification. Chair Adams explained that the idea is that the document will highlight how much
32 additional funding is needed. As an example, there is the wag bag line item. If wag bags are
33 already being used and there is an associated cost, but there are not currently enough wag bags,
34 the document should highlight how much additional funding is needed. However, based on the
35 feedback from Co-Chair Knoblock, it sounds like there is a desire to include the total funding
36 amount needed and what is still needed.

37
38 Ms. Kilpack suggested that the spreadsheet include a column for the source of the funding needs
39 estimates. It is important to document where the data is coming from. Chair Adams made
40 additions to the spreadsheet so information about the source, overall costs, and funding needs could
41 be added. Becca Gerber left a comment in the Zoom chat box asking if there is already funding
42 dedicated or work being done in these areas. Ms. Kilpack believed the document was attempting
43 to determine that.

44
45 Chair Adams used the tire checks as an example of what is currently known. There is a certain
46 amount of funding that the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) provided so officers

1 from Sandy and Cottonwood Heights could conduct tire checks. If the Economy System
2 Committee believes the tire checking that is being done with that funding is sufficient, then the
3 column related to funding needs would state: "not applicable." If the Committee believes another
4 officer is needed for the tire checks, then the cost of another officer could be determined and added
5 as an annual funding need.

6
7 There was additional discussion about the items that have been added to the Canyon Funding
8 Needs document. Chair Adams noted that a few items have been crossed off on the document and
9 asked about the rationale. Committee Members did not know why those items had been crossed
10 off.

11
12 Chair Adams wanted to assign some of the listed items to Committee Members so the project cost
13 numbers could be determined. He asked Committee Members to add their name to some of the
14 items they are willing to look into. There was Committee Member support for the Economy
15 System Committee handling the research component that has been outlined. Co-Chair Knoblock
16 offered to look into the trail maintenance and signage item. Ms. Kilpack asked who handles graffiti
17 removal in the canyons. She wanted to know if multiple groups handle that work. Co-Chair
18 Knoblock believed it is only Wasatch Graffiti Busters who does that work. Ms. Arens confirmed
19 that it is all handled by them. It was noted that the CWC funds approximately \$5,000 of the
20 Wasatch Graffiti Busters work. Ms. Arens reported that Snowbird has also funded the Wasatch
21 Graffiti Busters' work in the past.

22
23 Items on the spreadsheet were assigned to different Committee Members. Ed Marshall was under
24 the fuels mitigation item, and Ms. Arens expressed support for looking into the graffiti-related
25 item. Co-Chair Knoblock offered to look into the revegetation item and reach out to the
26 Cottonwood Canyons Foundation. As for the geological signs item, that is something that Barbara
27 Cameron has done a lot of research on. She is not on the Economy System Committee, but it is
28 work that she is familiar with. Chair Adams stated that he would reach out to Doug Tolman about
29 one of the items.

30
31 The improvements related to items in the document were reviewed. Chair Adams mentioned one
32 of the Mountain Accord deliverables, which is the purchase of private lands for protection from
33 development. There have been discussions about this and whether it is something the CWC is able
34 to take on. Chair Adams reminded those present that the list is not full of items that the Economy
35 System Committee is asking the CWC to fund. The list is simply pointing out current canyon
36 funding needs. Co-Chair Knoblock stated that his name can be added to the document for this
37 item. Some possible partners include Utah Open Lands, Salt Lake County Open Space, and Trust
38 for Public Land.

39
40 Co-Chair Knoblock mentioned the shuttle bus service line item and noted that there is a similar
41 suggestion at the bottom of the list related to free ski bus service up the canyons and free summer
42 season transit up the canyons. The potential partners were listed as UDOT, Utah Transit Authority
43 ("UTA"), and High Valley Transit. Chair Adams asked if the idea is that there would be free
44 transit available. Co-Chair Knoblock explained that it is a potential concept to incentivize transit
45 use. Ms. Kilpack did not believe that the suggestion had been discussed by the Transportation
46 System Committee.

1
2 Chair Adams asked the Committee Members to view the shared document and add their name to
3 the items that they will research. It was noted that there is a spreadsheet with all of the Stakeholders
4 Council contact information. If there are questions about some of the suggestions that have come
5 from other System Committees, it is possible to conduct some outreach. Chair Adams reminded
6 those present that Economy System Committee Members can sit in on other meetings as well. Ms.
7 Gerber had a question about one of the suggestions that was added by Kelly Boardman. Chair
8 Adams reported that Ms. Boardman is the Chair of the Environment System Committee.
9 Discussions were had about how to access the Google Drive folder for the Stakeholders Council.

10
11 Ms. Kilpack mentioned Line 7 of the document, which pertains to do adding water quality time
12 series plots to the Central Wasatch Dashboard. That is in progress within the existing maintenance
13 contract, so that will not cost anything to handle. As a result, it can likely be removed from the
14 list.

15
16 Chair Adams shared something from the Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute with the Committee. It
17 is a report related to the ski industry in Utah. The 15 ski resorts in the 2024/2025 season generated
18 \$2.5 billion in spending, which resulted in \$342 million in tax revenue. Last year, the tax revenue
19 was listed as \$197 million, so there was a significant increase this past year. This document was
20 added to the Economy System Committee Meeting folder recently, so it is available for Committee
21 review. Chair Adams pointed out that there were 6.5 million skier days, but the year before, it was
22 7.1 million. That means there were approximately half a million fewer skiers but double the tax
23 revenue. He was not certain why that would be but noted that the document breaks down some
24 information like car rentals, equipment rentals, lift passes, lodging, restaurants, and so on. There
25 is a lot of information to review.

26
27 Co-Chair Knoblock noted that there is a separate report from the Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute
28 related to the Tourism, Recreation, Culture, and Convention (“TRCC”) funding that is collected
29 Statewide. He explained that it is from rental car tax, transient room tax, airport taxes, and
30 restaurant taxes. Co-Chair Knoblock reviewed both reports to make sure everything made sense,
31 but he has a few questions still. He wants to find out who worked on the reports and ask about
32 some of the numbers. It might be possible to gain some additional insight and confidence in the
33 numbers shared.

34
35 Co-Chair Knoblock reported that the Millcreek Canyon fee booth collects approximately \$1
36 million per year. That is what the County has in its 2026 budget. Co-Chair Knoblock shared
37 information about the fire risk reduction work in the Wasatch Back. He did not believe it was
38 Forest Service land. Ms. Gerber confirmed that it was not Forest Service land. When the land
39 was bonded for there was some additional money included for maintenance, which includes fire
40 mitigation. Co-Chair Knoblock asked where it would be possible to find information about the
41 Park City side of the funding for that work. Ms. Gerber offered to look through some of the old
42 agenda items and budget items for clarity. She explained that there has been a collaborative effort
43 between the city and the resorts when it comes to fire mitigation. The city currently has municipal
44 funds dedicated to that work. Ms. Gerber asked if any of the Cottonwood Canyons ski resorts
45 have invested money into fire mitigation. Ms. Doyle did not believe the resorts have directly paid
46 for the fire mitigation efforts at this point.

1
2 Chair Adams noted that at the last Economy System Committee Meeting, there was agreement
3 that the numbers in the Canyon Funding Needs document need to be better defined before anything
4 is forwarded to the Stakeholders Council and CWC Board. He asked if it would be worth bringing
5 the concept forward before the numbers are determined to see if there is some level of support, as
6 there will need to be a lot of time and effort put into the finalized numbers. Ms. Kilpack suggested
7 that the Economy System Committee ask the Stakeholders Council Chair, Maura Hahnenberger,
8 to bring this to the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee for initial feedback. There could be some
9 communication with Ms. Hahnenberger about the Canyon Funding Needs document and what it
10 is intended to do. As the Chair of the Stakeholders Council, she attends the
11 Executive/Budget/Audit Committee Meetings. Chair Adams liked the suggestion and offered to
12 reach out to Ms. Hahnenberger about the document.
13

14 **ECONOMIC OUTLOOK STUDY DISCUSSION**

15 16 **1. Chair John Adams will Discuss the Idea of Commissioning an Economic Outlook** 17 **Study for the Central Wasatch.** 18

19 Chair Adams shared a document related to the Great Salt Lake. He explained that there are
20 currently efforts underway to save the Great Salt Lake. He noted that there are economic costs
21 associated with failure to do so. He mentioned a report that was done in 2018, which was recently
22 updated. A third-party was used to look at all of the economic costs to the State of Utah associated
23 with the decline of the lake. The Governor had agreed to sign a bill to put \$40 million into trying
24 to stop the decline from happening. Somehow, it was possible to reallocate \$40 million toward
25 this effort because of the significant economic impact. When it comes to the canyon-related
26 discussions at the Economy System Committee level, the idea is to prevent significant issues from
27 happening. He wondered whether a similar kind of report could be commissioned for the canyons.
28 The goal in the Great Salt Lake document was to provide policymakers, planners, and stakeholders
29 with grounded data-driven insights to inform sustainable decisions. Chair Adams pointed out that
30 this is also what the Canyon Funding Needs document is focused on. He reviewed highlights from
31 the Great Salt Lake report.
32

33 Chair Adams explained that the Great Salt Lake report outlined what would happen if the lake
34 continued to decline. It looked at initial effects, intermediate effects, and the resulting costs. It is
35 the resulting costs that tend to lead to action. He likes that this report looks at things systemically
36 and holistically rather than discussing one problem at a time. It shows how the different issues are
37 interrelated. Chair Adams shared some example scenarios included in the Great Salt Lake report.
38

39 The methodology of the Great Salt Lake report was discussed. Chair Adams pointed out the loss
40 of cultural values. The different ways that cost was measured stood out to him. The report also
41 included some images to show how the lake has receded over the years. He explained that the
42 report was comprehensive and was done with a system-focused view, which ties into the Mountain
43 Accord and CWC. The organization acknowledges the interconnectedness of the different
44 systems. He asked Committee Members to review the report and prepare comments ahead of the
45 next meeting.
46

1 Co-Chair Knoblock thought the Great Salt Lake report was interesting. He appreciated the
2 insights. There could be a similar economic report created for the Central Wasatch area. When
3 the Chair of the Stakeholders Council speaks to the Executive/Budget/Audit Committee, it might
4 be possible to mention the Great Salt Lake report. Chair Adams reminded Committee Members
5 to add their name to items on the Canyon Funding Needs list. There will be another meeting held
6 in December 2025.

7
8 **OTHER ITEMS**
9

10 There were no additional discussions.
11

12 **CLOSING**
13

14 **1. Chair Adams will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Economy System Committee**
15 **Meeting.**
16

17 **MOTION:** John Knoblock moved to ADJOURN the Economy System Committee Meeting. John
18 Adams seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.
19

20 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 on*
3 *Wednesday, November 12, 2025.*
4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes

7 T Forbes Group

8 Minutes Secretary

9

10 Minutes Approved: _____