

TMAC - January 20, 2022
Hybrid Meeting – Zoom attendance recommended

Attending through Zoom:

TMAC Committee Members

- Clancy Black, Committee Chair
- Laurie Urquiaga – Also Planning Commission member
- James Hamula
- Greg MacFarlane – New At-Large Member, Academia
- Joy McMurray (joined at 1:00)

Others

- David Day – PW Engineer
- Quinn Peterson – Downtown Neighborhood Chair

Attending in Person:

- Gordon Haight, New City Engineer
- Rob Hunter – PW Engineer
- Judy Johnson – PW Admin Assistant
- Jeff McLaughlin – Provo resident

Mr. Black read Hybrid Meeting protocol which suggests limiting in-person meetings at this time. Mr. Haight introduced himself and explained that Public Works Engineering had been given responsibility to facilitate the TMAC Meetings; previously the TMAC Meetings were under the direction of Development Services.

- Item 1** - Welcome new Committee Member
- Item 2** - Action Item – Approve Minutes December 16, 2021
- Item 3** - Discussion – Review 2022 Meeting Schedule
- Item 4** - Discussion – Meeting format
- Item 5** - Discussion – Goals and objectives for 2022
- Item 6** - Discussion – Center Street Project
- Item 7** - Discussion – Tactical Urbanism
- Item 8** - Discussion – Timpview Drive
- Item 9** - Discussion – North Canyon Road

Item 1 – Welcome to Greg MacFarlane, TMAC Committee Academic member with voting rights. Greg comes highly recommended as a BYU Professor in the Civil Engineering Department. His teaching includes classes in Transportation Engineering, Traffic Simulation, Urban Transportation Planning, and others. A welcome was extended to Greg and a thank you mentioned for Mitsu Saito’s years of TMAC service; Mr. Saito is no longer a TMAC Committee member.

Item 2 – Minutes from the December 16, 2021 were approved after Mr. Hamula recommended approval and Mr. Black seconded the motion. Mr. Haight explained that after approval, minutes become an official record. Mr. Black reminded Committee members that minutes should be reviewed when sent out after each meeting.

Item 3 – The Committee recommended keeping the 2022 TMAC meetings on the same schedule. Which is the third Thursday of each month at 12:30. For those who will attend in person, lunch will be provided at 12:00. Ms. Urquiaga mentioned her term limit is ending soon; the Committee was encouraged to be looking for someone else to take her place.

Item 4 - Discussion of Meeting Format

- Mr. Hunter discussed the hybrid meeting format: In-person lunch at noon followed by the meeting at 12:30; a Zoom link is provided as an alternative way to join the 12:30 meeting. Provo's Channel 17 also offers viewing of the meeting on YouTube and Facebook. Following Provo City's current recommendation, holding the February meeting through Zoom was discussed.
- Mr. Hamula mentioned he would appreciate the video link also being made available to TMAC members. The Zoom link is now sent to Committee members.
- Mr. Haight explained that the in-person meeting location has been moved to Provo's Public Works Building at 1377 S 350 E; this change was made because Provo City Engineering is now facilitating the TMAC meetings. Currently there is an email address on the agenda for emailing comments to the Committee.
- Mr. Hamula understands that Committee members and Provo Staff would be able to comment during the meeting; the public will comment through email. After discussion, it was confirmed that the public would continue to comment through email.
- Discussion was held, including input from Quinn Peterson, Chair of Downtown Alliance. He pointed out that in some meetings, public comment is given before a motion is made.
- Mr. Black explained that the public joins by Facebook and YouTube; there are comment options available on those formats. Mr. Haight said it might be helpful for the Committee to monitor those comments.
- Mr. Hunter sent the Zoom link to a limited number of Staff and Committee members.
- Discussion continued regarding public input. Mr. Hunter pointed out that when significant items are recommended to the Council, they can be discussed in Council Meetings and items recommended to the Planning Commission will be discussed in those meetings; both have public comment periods. Mr. Black suggested that if the Committee gets to the point where it wants to make comments available, change could take place.

Item 5 - Goals and objectives for 2022

- Mr. Haight asked what the Committee feels is important to achieve this year.
- Mr. Black - Discussion on Center Street changes, including an organized list of scenarios, capital plans.
- Ms. McMurray - Active Transportation discussion; make list of actual projects and recommendations from the Transportation Master Plan (TMP). She would also like to discuss east-west mobility options.
- Mr. Hamula - Agrees with Mr. Black and Ms. McMurray and said transportation and mobility are connected to other discussions in the City and community; they are especially related to sustainability and land use decisions. Air quality is also related to transportation issues.
- Mr. MacFarlane - Zoning and parking requirements are related to transportation challenges. The Committee needs to be aware of other City discussions that are transportation related. Safe Routes to Schools, including carpooling and pedestrian access are also important issues.
- Mr. Black asked about the status of General Plan update and if the Committee would be able to comment on it. Mr. Haight explained that it is about two weeks away from approval and is close to being finalized.
- Ms. Urquiaga reported that the Planning Commission approved the General Plan with basic modifications in December and so the TMP needs to be discussed again considering the approval, even though it's not that old.
- Mr. Hunter talked about the City Conservation and Resiliency plan which is related to the General Plan. The Development Services Staff is working on it is a month or two behind the General Plan. He shared the link for the Conservation and Resiliency plan with the Committee and pulled up the General Plan Update. (<https://www.provogeneralplan.com/>)
- Mr. Haight said we may have a presentation on the Conservation and Resiliency Plan to this Committee next month.
- Mr. Hunter pulled up General Plan Update on the screen.
- Mr. Black referenced having a Downtown Master Plan discussion next month as mentioned by Quinn Peterson.

Item 6 – Center Street Project

- Mr. Haight mentioned approval of Center Street changes as discussed by the Council.
 - Archway – looking at budget and design; Downtown Alliance is also in favor of the archway.

- Discussed temporary changes to Center Street that would last through the summer.
- Recognize that businesses need access, but we also need to accommodate bikes and scooters.
- Center Street design: test may include one lane in each direction dedicated to bikes & scooters; pedestrians on sidewalk.
- Implement reverse-angle parking
- Also looking at expanding locations where outdoor dining areas could be added to some businesses.
- Important to keep some parking for businesses.
- If successful, may expand sidewalk 4-5' out and put bike lane next to travel lane.
- We're conscientious of new City Center construction. The old building will be torn down; need to move quickly in conjunction with new City Center.
- Next month will show design of archway and what proposed changes would look like.
- Discussed businesses having a one-day permit to close areas for activities/venues.
- Plans will be presented to Quinn Peterson and others before showing them to TMAC Committee; The Committee could then make comments.
- Currently we have approval to make temporary changes to Center Street, so will move forward.
- Mr. McFarlane commented that he has only seen reverse-angle parking on one side. He would like to know if other locations have used that parking on both sides and if we could access lessons learned by others.
- Mr. Haight has seen the reverse-angle parking on both sides; the public would need to be educated on how it would work. We will draw it up and model it.
- Ms. McMurray mentioned she and others spent a lot of time working on plans for Center Street. She would appreciate knowing which ideas are being implemented and why; i.e. limiting travel lanes to one in each direction was far down on the list – would like know how recommendations were decided on.
- Mr. Haight said the list was reviewed and City Council also gave input on which ideas they wanted to implement in the temporary trial phase.
- Mr. Hunter said that two highly ranked ideas were raised crosswalks and raised intersections. The raised crosswalks can be done on a temporary basis, but there is no good way to do a temporary raised intersection. Also, temporary improved lighting is not an option. He explained that some ideas that are moving forward were selected because they were able to be tested on a temporary basis; other ideas did not meet that criteria. More details will be provided after designs are completed.
- Mr. Haight said the reason to put emphasis on one lane is because that will have the most impact on both businesses and the public; He made clear that we want to be methodical and careful. Ultimately the City Council will have to approve any Center Street changes; they will be paying for it. He said that the temporary changes will be watched carefully to make sure that businesses are not adversely impacted.
- Mr. MacFarlane would like to see speed data on Center Street, 100 North, 300 South and other street.
- Mr. Hunter said that speed tests were done on both 100 N and Center St. (?) The plan is to put in speed trailers after snow season so the plows don't move temporary objects.
- Mr. Black totally agrees with the idea that the old City Center block needs to be rebuilt.
- Ms. McMurray appreciates working with Rob Hunter and Gordon Haight. However, she mentioned that if too many variables are introduced at once, it may be difficult to measure impacts.
- Mr. Haight assured the Committee that we can change things.

Item 7 – Tactical Urbanism

Item 8 – Timpview Drive

Item 9 – North Canyon Road

- Mr. Hunter said that questions about a couple of roadways were discussed last month. Temporary items were tested on 1450 E and on Slate Canyon Dr; we want to take the test results & move forward. The Bike Walk Committee wants Tactical Urbanism on Timpview Drive. If we use paint and traffic panels for temporary measures, then when we overlay Timpview Dr, we won't keep those changes if that is the decision.
- Discussion was held regarding Canyon Rd - rehab is scheduled this year on the south end from Univ Parkway to 2230 N - slightly narrower lanes and put in bike lanes on side. Rehab also scheduled this year for north of 4800 N

(Foothill Dr) – plan generally is to replace what is already there. Plan to get with LTAP this year to update their pavement and sidewalk scoring for rehab needs. Schedule for remainder of Canyon Road will be determined after that study is completed.

- Mr. Haight mentioned that there is interest in active transportation on Canyon Rd and Timpview Dr, including a parking conflict issue. Canyon Road residents are fearful of losing parking. In trying to balance different viewpoints, it is good to show something and then have input. Designs will be given to this Committee next month. Think about these roads; residents are dependent on parking while others feel need for a continuous bike lane. There is a lot of pressing interest on these roads. The old-school method was to overlay a road and replace striping the way it was. Now we are trying to be more creative by going to the TMAC Committee.
- Ms. Urquiaga said the area seems to be long enough for multiple options: protected bike lanes for 1/2 mile, bulb-outs for another 1/2 mile, etc.
- Mr. Haight said that idea could be part of the plan and emphasized that TMAC input is requested to help develop a plan moving forward. Today's discussion is to get the Committee thinking of these discussion items before next month's meeting. Provo Staff may email some ideas to you.
- Mr. Black would appreciate an email to the Committee when the ideas are ready.
- Mr. Hunter mentioned that by doing the north side of Canyon Road this year, not a lot of parking would be affected. The controversy could be that given the width of Canyon Road, it needs to stay a three-lane section to accommodate the volume of traffic. There is not room to put a dedicated bike lane and dedicated parking strip on both sides of the road; we are working through plans.
- Mr. Haight said it will be easier to see when the plans are presented.

Final Comments

- Mr. Haight mentioned that if urgent items are on the agenda, they should be prioritized, and other items could be bumped to a subsequent meeting.
- Ms. Urquiaga emailed the Planning Commission. They will wait until after 17th to talk about the Sustainability Plan, so that item needs to be on TMAC's Feb 17 agenda.
- Mr. Haight said that we are excited for 2022; lots of good things are happening.
- Ms. McMurray asked who plans to attend in person next month and who will attend over Zoom. Most agreed that either format is fine, but it may be good to wait until we're closer to February 17 to determine which format would be best; a hybrid format is likely to continue.
- The meeting was adjourned; the next meeting is Thursday, February 17th at 12:30.