



8
9 **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WASATCH COMMISSION (“CWC”) STAKEHOLDERS**
10 **COUNCIL ECONOMY SYSTEMS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD, THURSDAY,**
11 **AUGUST 8, 202, AT 3:30 P.M. THE MEETING WAS CONDUCTED BOTH IN-PERSON**
12 **AND VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM. THE ANCHOR LOCATION WAS CWC OFFICES**
13 **LOCATED AT 311 SOUTH STATE STREET, SUITE 330, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.**

14
15 **Committee Members:** Morgan Mingle, Chair
16 John Adams, Co-Chair
17 Ed Marshall
18 Patrick Shea
19 John Knoblock

20
21 **Staff:** Lindsey Nielsen, Executive Director
22 Samantha Kilpack, Director of Operations

23
24 **OPENING**

25
26 **1. Chair Morgan Mingle will Open a Public Meeting of the Economy Systems Committee.**

27
28 Chair Morgan Mingle called the Central Wasatch Commission (“CWC”) Stakeholders Council
29 Economy Systems Committee Meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. and welcomed those present.

30
31 **2. Review and Approve the Minutes from the July 11, 2024, Meeting.**

32
33 **MOTION:** Ed Marshall moved to APPROVE the July 11, 2024, Meeting Minutes. John Adams
34 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

35
36 **MOUNTAIN ACCORD DISCUSSION**

37
38 **1. The Committee will Discuss the Mountain Accord and How Varying Definitions of**
39 **Economy Would Relate to the Goals of the Accord.**

40
41 Chair Mingle reported that there is a desire to have central principles for the Economy Systems
42 Committee. She shared a document that was created based on discussions that took place at the last
43 meeting. The link to the document was added to the Zoom chat box. Chair Mingle explained that
44 she attempted to synthesize some central themes that came out of the last meeting. She pointed out
45 that it is possible to make additions, remove language, or reframe anything that does not best represent
46 the Committee. Chair Mingle read some of the language included in the current version of the
47 document as follows:
48

- 1 • The Committee embraces all sizes of businesses, property owners, and workforce as the
2 central economic community for the area;
- 3 • The Committee recognizes that the Central Wasatch businesses have a vested interest in the
4 health of the Wasatch environment as a major component of the products they offer;
- 5 • The Committee respects that economic activity is the engine that generates funding for
6 environmental and infrastructure projects that support a thriving Central Wasatch region;
- 7 • The Committee agrees that the economic perspective should expand beyond the confines of
8 the original Mountain Accord document, embracing fresh ideas and data-driven solutions.
9

10 Chair Mingle asked for initial feedback about the proposed language. Co-Chair John Adams asked
11 if there was a specific reason for the different words used, such as embrace, recognize, respect, and
12 agree. Chair Mingle denied this. Ed Marshall asked to add one principle that has been discussed in
13 the past, which is to broaden the definition of recreation to include outdoor dining and events. While
14 that broader definition is not being actively pursued by the Recreation Systems Committee, the
15 Committee Members are willing to support the inclusion of less active forms of recreation. Chair
16 Mingle noted that the broader definition can be folded into the fourth bullet point. She proposed:

- 17
- 18 • The Committee agrees that the economic perspective should expand beyond the confines of
19 the original Mountain Accord document, embracing fresh ideas, expanded understandings of
20 economy and recreation, and data-driven solutions.
21

22 Chair Mingle believed the broader definition of recreation is similar to what is stated in the fourth
23 bullet point because it mentions the idea of thinking beyond the original confines. John Knoblock
24 asked Mr. Marshall if there was wording he would prefer. He also asked about the original issue with
25 having restaurants included under recreation. Mr. Marshall explained that there are two kinds of
26 businesses in the canyons: the ski resorts and restaurants. He noted that the restaurants are Silver
27 Fork Lodge, Log Haven, Ruth's Diner, and the restaurants located at the various ski resorts.
28 Mr. Knoblock pointed out that lodging is another kind of business that exists in the canyons.
29 Mr. Marshall did not see that lodging fits into the definition of recreation in the same way that
30 restaurants would.
31

32 Mr. Marshall reported that Bob Bonar was the President/CEO of Snowbird for a long time. He
33 previously told him that the ski resorts are different than the other businesses and the other businesses
34 need to speak for themselves. That is the reason he is speaking specifically about the need to expand
35 the recreation definition to include other forms of recreation, such as dining at a restaurant. Rather
36 than something vague, as proposed in the expanded fourth bullet point, he would prefer that there be
37 a separate point that specifically supports the restaurant businesses in the canyons. Co-Chair Adams
38 wondered whether something that specific would fall outside the category of the Committee
39 principles. Mr. Marshall noted that it would be acceptable to have further definitions written below.
40

41 Mr. Knoblock wanted to understand why it is important to have restaurants considered to be part of
42 recreation. Mr. Marshall believes one way to reduce polarization is to recognize that businesses other
43 than the ski resorts, such as restaurants, contribute to the environment, do not create traffic problems,
44 and are a form of recreation. He pointed out that restaurants are a form of recreation that anyone of
45 any age and ability can enjoy. Dining is a legitimate form of recreating in the canyons. He would
46 like this to be stated in the document to acknowledge that there are different types of businesses in
47 the canyons. Chair Mingle believes this is relevant to the Recreation Systems Committee.

1 Mr. Knoblock informed those present that this matter has already been discussed by the Recreation
2 Systems Committee and there was support for the broadened definition proposed by Mr. Marshall.

3
4 Mr. Marshall explained that he would like the Economy Systems Committee to support restaurant
5 contributions to the economy as well. It is important to look beyond the ski resorts. It was noted that
6 the first bullet point might be a more appropriate place to include that broader definition. Chair
7 Mingle pointed out that it is not the place of the Economy Systems Committee to define what
8 recreation is or is not, but it is important not to overemphasize the resorts. It is necessary for small
9 businesses that offer different types of amenities and different types of recreation to feel seen.
10 Mr. Marshall asked that it be included as a separate bullet point because the restaurants are not often
11 viewed as a form of recreation. He would like it clearly identified as a form of recreation.

12
13 Mr. Marshall reported that there were previous challenges dealing with bureaucracy since restaurants
14 are not recognized as a form of recreation. That is one of the reasons he believes this issue is important
15 and wants to see restaurants specifically referenced. Mr. Marshall discussed the zoning issue that
16 Silver Fork Lodge dealt with in the past. There were restrictions as a result of a new Zoning Director
17 redefining the meaning of a 50-year-old zoning ordinance. A lot of unnecessary time and expense
18 was spent dealing with that situation. He reiterated the need to recognize the fact that restaurants
19 contribute to recreation. That recognition could be meaningful to those who enforce zoning.

20
21 Patrick Shea noted that he has watched not-for-profit organizations unconsciously drift into areas that
22 are not their primary focus. This can dilute their effectiveness in addressing the primary focus. He
23 does not believe it would be consistent with the CWC or the Mountain Accord to wade into matters
24 related to zoning. Mr. Shea also pointed out that the word “economy” immediately makes people
25 think about profits and losses or dollars spent, but the economy is a fairly robust word. He does not
26 want the Economy Systems Committee to be limited to the dollar flows in and out of the canyon. It
27 would make sense to look at the economy in terms of the number of visitors and money spent as well
28 as the ecosystem. For example, there could be a precise definition of what kind of water the
29 consumers in the valley, at the resorts, or at the restaurants, can expect so that proper plans can be
30 made.

31
32 Mr. Marshall responded to the comments shared. He clarified that he had not asked for anything
33 relating to zoning and simply answered questions posed by Mr. Knoblock. The CWC does not have
34 land use authority, so he agrees that nothing related to zoning should be included. Chair Mingle
35 explained that she envisions the economic principles as being somewhat broad in nature. The
36 principles can be considered when thinking through more individual and nuanced action items. From
37 her perspective, the idea of redefining recreation does not feel like a central high-level principle for
38 the Committee. She made an adjustment to the first bullet point, so it now reads as follows:

- 39
40
- The Committee embraces all sizes of businesses, property owners, and workforce as the
41 central economic community for the area, with the specific intention to uplift
42 underrepresented economic voices.
- 43

44 Co-Chair Adams agreed with Chair Mingle and noted that the principles should guide the work the
45 Economy Systems Committee does. Additionally, he agreed with some of the comments shared by
46 Mr. Shea. Many types of businesses should be included in economy-related discussions. He does
47 not see why a restaurant would not be considered. Mr. Marshall explained that he would like to see
48 his request included as an action item. Chair Mingle stated that she has written down comments

1 made, including reaffirming how non-resort businesses are defined and the economy of the
2 environment.

3
4 Chair Mingle offered to email the draft document to Committee Members after the Economy Systems
5 Committee Meeting. She explained that this will give everyone the opportunity to review what has
6 been drafted so far. At the next meeting, the principles can be finalized. There was support for this
7 approach. Chair Mingle asked to next discuss some potential action items for the Committee. When
8 it comes to the Environmental Dashboard, she believes it should be more like a systems dashboard.
9 Ultimately, it makes sense to look at the economic health of the canyon as well so there is context.
10 Mr. Shea pointed out that this was the original idea of the Environmental Dashboard. It was intended
11 to provide a balance sheet of the ecosystem, including flora and fauna, air quality, and water quality.
12

13 Co-Chair Adams noted that the ecosystem includes human impacts, systems impacts, and so on.
14 Chair Mingle explained that in Park City, the term used to represent the holistic idea of sustainability
15 is “destination stewardship.” Finding the right terms might be worthwhile in order to potentially
16 redefine the Environmental Dashboard so it includes some broader metrics. She stressed the
17 importance of having a holistic understanding of the canyon. This is something the Economy Systems
18 Committee can propose in the future and potentially pursue as an action item. Co-Chair Adams likes
19 the term stewardship because it makes individuals think outside of themselves. He acknowledged
20 that it is difficult for a large company to be a steward of the land in the same way an individual is.
21

22 Chair Mingle believes there is a general consensus that the Environmental Dashboard should be
23 expanded to include a broader data set, which could have some economic data. She asked whether
24 an official motion needs to be made before this is presented to the Stakeholders Council. Executive
25 Director, Lindsey Nielsen, suggested that the Economy Systems Committee wait until there is a solid
26 proposal ready. Committee Members can workshop this at the next Economy Systems Committee
27 Meeting. It can be voted on at that time and then the proposal can move to the Stakeholders Council.
28

29 Mr. Shea asked that Chair Mingle create a Resolution for potential distribution to the Stakeholders
30 Council. The Economy Systems Committee can review that Resolution, share edits, and then the
31 item can be voted on. Something he feels should be advocated for is a capacity study of the canyons.
32 Chair Mingle asked for clarification about what he meant by a capacity study. For instance, if he
33 means a limit of acceptable change study or a carrying capacity study. Mr. Shea explained that he is
34 advocating for what the U.S. National Park Service and BLM do, which is looking at how long the
35 present use can be sustained. If it cannot be sustained, the study looks at what variables are
36 contributing most significantly to the decline of its ability to sustain that activity. Chair Mingle
37 believed that sounds like a limit of acceptable change study. Discussions were had about study types.
38

39 Co-Chair Adams asked whether a limit of acceptable change study or a carrying capacity study would
40 be better in this scenario. Chair Mingle explained that with carrying capacity, data is pulled, and
41 judgments are made based on one point in time. It is a more rigid study, but it is also easier to execute.
42 Carrying capacity looks at current conditions and current resources to determine how much load that
43 system can take before the resources are depleted. As for the limits of an acceptable change study, it
44 takes more variables into account and is built with the understanding that there is no hard and fast
45 limit. It acknowledges that there is a gray area where the system functions and is acceptable.
46

47 Chair Mingle explained that the limits of acceptable change study is probably more appropriate for
48 the canyons because the limits as far as visitation will depend on a lot of factors. This includes

1 economic factors and management under the current system. What the limits of acceptable change
2 study does is take all of the variations into account, which makes it possible to change visitor behavior.
3 She explained that this type of study allows for more fluidity in the system overall, which is beneficial.
4

5 Chair Mingle reported that it is more difficult to conduct a limits of acceptable change study. As a
6 result, there are instances where a hybrid study is conducted. She explained that with fluidity there
7 are a lot more data points and a lot more variables that need to be taken into account. That is why
8 people will often do a carrying capacity calculation, but with clarification that certain changes could
9 occur. Mr. Knoblock referenced the Visitor Use Study. He wondered how that relates to the limits
10 of acceptable change study. Chair Mingle noted that she has not looked at the updated version yet,
11 because the file was not working for her. She would need to look at the information again. However,
12 typically, a visitor use study is able to inform a capacity study, but it tends to focus more on what is.
13

14 Discussions were had about the Visitor Use Study and sample data. Co-Chair Adams believed the
15 Economy Systems Committee should discuss the value of the study and some of the limitations.
16 Mr. Marshall pointed out that Bekee Hotze previously stated that one of the mandates of the U.S.
17 Forest Service is to make the forests available to as many people as possible. That being said, it is
18 essential to consider whether visitors are loving the land to death. The environmental impacts must
19 be considered. The Forest Service has a different way of looking at the issue than the subcommittees.
20 Chair Mingle believed a properly conducted study would take various perspectives into account.
21

22 Mr. Knoblock reported that the Recreation Systems Committee Meeting took place earlier. During
23 that meeting, there was a discussion about the Visitor Use Study and the need to flesh it out more.
24 There is a desire to see data about visitation to the canyons as it relates to the number of backcountry
25 skiers, mountain bicyclists, road bicyclists, rock climbers, and so on. Patrick Morrison is a member
26 of that committee but also works for the Utah Office of Outdoor Recreation. Mr. Morrison stated that
27 he believes that data would be important when it comes to State funding for infrastructure.
28

29 Ms. Nielsen reminded Committee Members that there was previously a Capacity Committee at the
30 Stakeholders Council level. That was where the idea for the Visitor Use Study originated, so a
31 capacity study has been investigated at the Stakeholders Council level before. Chair Mingle
32 wondered whether there is a desire for more capacity-centric data. Something she has seen done
33 elsewhere is to take a handful of data points and set trigger data. If certain numbers are hit, then it
34 becomes clear that action needs to be taken. Since it sounds like the Stakeholders Council has tried
35 to focus on capacity in the past, it might make sense to look at areas where there is solid benchmark
36 data. Trigger points could then be set for those areas. Chair Mingle informed the Committee that
37 this kind of approach would be far less labor-intensive than a full carrying capacity study.
38

39 Ms. Nielsen reported that the original goal of the Environmental Dashboard was to produce a
40 functional report card for the various environmental elements in the Central Wasatch. Through the
41 various iterations of the Environmental Dashboard, the CWC Board decided that there was a desire
42 to present raw data rather than make a commentary on the functioning health of the mountains. That
43 being said, the Environmental Dashboard includes keystone species in the wildlife element. If those
44 keystone species are present within an ecosystem, that means the ecosystem is functioning well. If
45 those keystone species are not present, then it signifies that the ecosystem is not functioning well. If
46 there is a desire to add data, as previously suggested by Chair Mingle, that would require a decision
47 at the CWC Board level. A proposal can be forwarded to the Stakeholders Council for consideration.
48

1 Chair Mingle clarified that she is not necessarily advocating for different data but noted that it is
2 possible to define what the critical points are and when action is needed. Mr. Knoblock referenced
3 the Mountain Accord. Item 3.15.5 states: “It is recommended that either the NEPA process or a
4 separate study analyze the capacity of the environmental resources (biological, flora, fauna,
5 watershed) in the Cottonwood Canyons to remain healthy under increasing recreational use. The
6 study should include an evaluation of the social capacity of recreation amenities such as trails to
7 handle increasing use while maintaining a range of recreational experiences.” That is why the
8 Recreation Systems Committee had discussions about future data gathering and various studies.

9
10 Chair Mingle asked if there are any other action items that the Economy Systems Committee should
11 consider. Mr. Shea noted that at the end of the last meeting, he asked why the ski resorts were no
12 longer participating in the Economy Systems Committee. He wanted to know what could be done to
13 reach out to those representatives. Ms. Nielsen noted that the ski resorts are prioritizing their
14 schedules. However, there is still work being done with the ski resorts. At the last CWC Board
15 Meeting, there was a discussion about potentially adding a representative of the Cottonwood Canyon
16 resorts to the CWC Board as an Ex-Officio Member. Additionally, the General Manager for Solitude
17 Mountain Resort, Amber Broadaway, consistently attends Transportation Systems Committee
18 Meetings. Mr. Shea felt it was important for other ski resort representatives to participate in the CWC.

19
20 Mr. Marshall pointed out that if the principles discussed earlier will be general in nature, then the
21 action items should be much more specific. For example, there should be more specificity about what
22 a more holistic data set refers to. He asked that his previous request be listed under the action items.
23 Chair Mingle asked him to draft language that would reflect his request. Mr. Marshall confirmed that
24 he is willing to do so. Chair Mingle wanted to better understand the end goal for that action item.
25 Mr. Marshall believed it will be an educational tool, which is an important function of the CWC. In
26 order to decrease polarization, the overall understanding needs to be increased. This is a perspective
27 that deserves to be expressed and understood. At the next meeting, Chair Mingle stated that she wants
28 to discuss how that perspective can best be shared and to outline some concrete action items.

29
30 Chair Mingle noted that she has written down some of the proposed action items for the Economy
31 Systems Committee. This includes some sort of central bookkeeping system. Mr. Knoblock asked
32 for additional clarification about what that means. Mr. Shea explained that he believes there should
33 be two sets of records, as there could be some interesting correlations between the financial side of
34 things and the biological side of things. Chair Mingle asked whether that sentiment is accurately
35 reflected in the language related to the Environmental Dashboard. Mr. Shea believed it could be
36 added there, but does not believe that is represented in the current language that has been drafted.

37
38 Chair Mingle proposed that each Committee Member think about what the expanded data set could
39 look like. She asked that those suggestions be brought to the next Economy Systems Committee
40 Meeting. Mr. Marshall noted that the suggestions can be circulated ahead of the next meeting as well.
41 There was support for that approach. Chair Mingle asked that Google Docs be used so there can be
42 collaboration in real-time rather than Committee Members exchanging emails back and forth.
43 Mr. Knoblock reported that there is now a Google Drive for the Stakeholders Council. Within that,
44 there are folders for each of the different subcommittees. The document could be added to that folder.

45
46 Co-Chair Adams mentioned items in the Mountain Accord that are not completed. He wondered
47 whether there should be future discussions about the Central Wasatch National Conservation and
48 Recreation Area Act (“CWNCRA”) or if that should be discussed at the Stakeholders Council level.

1 Mr. Knoblock suggested that another document be added to the Google Drive folder where
2 Committee Members can share ideas about additions to the Mountain Accord or the CWNCRRA.

3
4 Mr. Marshall believes an important focus for all of the subcommittees is to support fire prevention.
5 That work impacts the economy as well as all of the other focus areas such as recreation,
6 transportation, and environment. This is an action item the Committee can emphasize in the future.
7 Chair Mingle wanted to identify some clear actions that can be taken at the next Committee Meeting.

8
9 **OTHER ITEMS**

10
11 There were no additional items discussed.

12
13 **CLOSING**

14
15 **1. The Chair will Call for a Motion to Adjourn the Economy Systems Committee Meeting.**

16
17 **MOTION:** Morgan Mingle moved to ADJOURN the Economy Systems Committee Meeting. There
18 was no second. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Committee.

19
20 The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:36 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 Thursday,*
3 *August 8, 2024.*

4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes

7 T Forbes Group

8 Minutes Secretary

9

10 Minutes Approved: _____