



AMERICAN FORK CITY COUNCIL
OCTOBER 21, 2025
WORK SESSION MINUTES

Members Present:

Bradley J. Frost	Mayor
Ryan Hunter	Council Member
Ernie John	Council Member
Clark Taylor	Council Member
Tim Holley	Council Member

Members Absent:

Staci Carroll	Council Member
---------------	----------------

Staff Present:

David Bunker	City Administrator
Camden Bird	Assistant City Administrator
Christina Tuiaki	Executive Assistant
Terilyn Lurker	City Recorder
Stephanie Finau	Deputy Recorder
Patrick O'Brien	Development Services Director
Sam Kelly	PW Director
Al Scott	Assistant PW Director
Derek Rykert	Community Service Director
Heather Schriever	Legal Counsel
Cameron Paul	Police Chief
Ben Hunter	Engineer
Cody Opperman	Development Planner II

Also present: Deb Anderson and George Brown

The American Fork City Council held a work session on Tuesday, October 21, 2025, in the City Administration Conference Room, located at 51 East Main Street, commencing at 4:00 p.m.

WORK SESSION

The purpose of the City Work Sessions is to prepare the City Council for upcoming agenda items on future City Council Meetings. The Work Session is not an action item meeting. No one attending the meeting should rely on any discussion or any perceived consensus as action or authorization. These come only from the City Council Meeting.

1. Discussion on Open Public Meetings annual training and Government Records Access and Management Act training.

Mayor Frost stated that Council Member Carroll was out of town and would not be in attendance. He noted that the council would follow the agenda, which included discussion and training on the OPMA (Open and Public Meetings Act) and GRAMA (Government Records Access and Management Act).

Ms. Shriever began the OPMA (Open and Public Meetings Act) training. She explained that this annual training for the city council is required by the state to review the purposes and provisions of the Act. This year's training focused on how OPMA relates to the City Council's ability to communicate outside of official meetings, particularly through email communications with one another and with city staff.

Ms. Shriever stated that the purpose of OPMA is to promote transparency and accountability in government by ensuring that all City Council decisions and deliberations are conducted in a public forum, allowing the public to understand the reasoning behind Council actions. She noted that exceptions exist for closed meetings as provided within OPMA, which the Council utilizes from time to time in accordance with the law. She then discussed the provision of OPMA addressing electronic message transmissions and noted that OPMA is codified in Utah Code Title 52, Chapter 4, sections 101.

Mayor Frost inquired about staff emails and if they are subject to GRAMA requests.

Ms. Schriever confirmed that they are potentially subject to GRAMA and explained the distinction between OPMA and GRAMA. She noted that OPMA applies when a quorum of the City Council (three members) convenes—physically or electronically—to discuss city business, which may constitute a meeting. GRAMA, on the other hand, governs the public's access to government records, which are defined broadly to include any material (emails, voicemails, texts, documents, or metadata) related to the conduct of public business that is prepared, received, or retained by the city or its employees.

Ms. Schriever added that GRAMA classifies records into four categories, which would be discussed later in the training. She explained that under GRAMA, all records are presumed public unless otherwise specified by statute. She noted that the city follows a municipal ordinance aligned with state law for retention.

Council Member Taylor observed that the city's policy differs somewhat from the states, and Council Member Hunter added that the city has approved its own retention schedule for various record types.

Ms. Schriever confirmed this distinction and clarified that while retention schedules may differ, record classifications—public, private, protected, controlled, or exempt—are governed by state statute. She explained that not all record types are specifically defined in GRAMA, especially as new forms such as metadata have emerged. In such cases, the city must determine the most appropriate classification. She emphasized that records are presumed public unless they contain information that warrants protection, such as personal data or materials related to ongoing investigations. She concluded that both the

OPMA and GRAMA can apply simultaneously, noting that documents or email communication exchanged during a convened meeting may be subject to GRAMA.

Ms. Schriever explained that any discussion or conduct of public business, whether during a formal meeting or outside of it, is likely subject to GRAMA. She highlighted ongoing concerns regarding the use of private devices to conduct city business, noting that attempts to use personal devices to avoid disclosure under GRAMA have occurred in this state and others. She emphasized that the key consideration is whether an individual is conducting public business, regardless of device type—personal phone, tablet, city-issued device, or public device. If public business is conducted, the records generated could be subject to GRAMA.

Council Member John asked whether this includes communications from residents via personal email or text. Ms. Schriever confirmed that if communication pertains to city business, it could indeed be subject to GRAMA. Council Member Taylor discussed the nuance of “conducting public business,” using the example of responding to a resident’s request regarding city irrigation.

Ms. Schriever clarified that the determining factor is whether the council member is acting in their official capacity as a city council member. She advised that when communicating with the public, other council members, or city staff, individuals may be “wearing different hats,” such as acting as a city council member, a private citizen, or a candidate. She emphasized that if a council member is acting in their official capacity on an issue that could come before the Council, the communication may be subject to GRAMA. She noted the importance of transparency with the public, explaining that withholding records could lead to public frustration.

Council Member Taylor commented that maintaining honesty in communications is the best approach. Ms. Schriever agreed, suggesting that communications should be conducted as if they could be shared publicly or reviewed in a legal context.

Regarding practical application, Ms. Schriever recommended that any communications pertaining to city business, including emails or texts received on personal devices, should be transferred to city accounts or devices to ensure proper record maintenance. She explained that the city has an obligation to maintain public records, and transferring such communications helps staff determine which records must be preserved.

Ms. Schriever also addressed litigation concerns related to accessing personal devices, noting that the city does not seek to compel officials to turn over personal devices. She referenced the State of Washington’s approach using a NISN (National Integrated Service Network) affidavit, whereby the device owner reviews a GRAMA request, determines responsive content, and signs an affidavit stating whether responsive records exist.

Ms. Schriever noted that Utah has not yet implemented a formal process like the NISN affidavit for personal devices, and she is not aware of any city that has done so. She briefly reviewed the key points regarding OPMA and GRAMA. She clarified that GRAMA is Utah’s equivalent of the federal FOIA and governs public access to government records. OPMA requires public bodies to deliberate and make decisions in

open meetings, such as the City Council's regular Tuesday night sessions. Ms. Schriever commended the council and staff for consistently meeting the statutory requirements for noticing and conducting public meetings. She concluded that these were the main issues she wanted to address.

Council Member John asked whether replying to a group email that includes the entire City Council constitutes a quorum. Ms. Schriever explained that a quorum could potentially be created if council members are deliberating, making decisions, or discussing issues before them via email. She clarified that routine administrative communications, such as scheduling meetings or sharing information where all members are carbon copied, do not constitute a quorum.

Council Members John and Taylor confirmed that the same principle applies to text messages.

Ms. Schriever further explained that sending information, such as a constituent letter or memo, without discussion does not constitute a meeting. However, if council members begin discussing matters that could come before the Council, that could create a quorum and fall under OPMA. She emphasized that communications between only one or two council members, where no deliberation occurs, does not constitute a quorum or a meeting under OPMA.

Council Member Hunter commented that for public bids, RFQs, and RFPs, it is useful to submit a redacted version of documents alongside the original. This ensures that, in the event of a GRAMA request, the city can provide the redacted version without delay, particularly when confidentiality is claimed.

Ms. Schriever noted that GRAMA includes provisions for business confidentiality records (section 305), requiring the submitter to identify information as confidential and explain why it qualifies as a trade secret or confidential business information. This pre-classification allows the city to handle GRAMA requests appropriately. She recommended including a note in RFQs and RFPs instructing submitters to identify confidential information upfront.

Ms. Schriever also explained recent changes to the GRAMA appeals process. Previously, appeals could go to the city administrator, the district court, or the State Records Committee. The 2024 legislative update eliminated the State Records Committee and replaced it with a state records director, a legally trained administrative law judge. She noted that American Fork City will have its first GRAMA appeal heard by the state records director in December. She concluded that there were no other significant updates regarding GRAMA or OPMA that the Council needed to be aware of.

2. Discussion on bicycle lanes.

Mr. Rykert provided an overview of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, noting that it was originally adopted in July 2013 and is in need of updating. He emphasized that the plan sets the community vision for trails and multi-modal pathways, including use by bicyclists, pedestrians, scooters, and equestrians, such as a potential horse trail through Metro Hollow.

Mr. Rykert explained that the updated plan would be reviewed by the Parks and Recreation Committee, which includes passionate trail users, before being brought back to the City Council for review and approval. He highlighted that the plan includes goals, objectives, and a digital map used to guide development and trail connectivity.

Mr. Rykert also noted a specific upcoming project: in spring 2026, a trail connecting Riverwalk to the Murdock Canal will be constructed. Because this trail was included in the Master Plan, it received support and funding from MAG. He concluded that the plan is a living document that is updated as development opportunities arise, ensuring ongoing connectivity and funding support for trail projects.

Council Member Hunter raised the idea of considering a nature trail through the wetlands as part of future updates to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. He clarified that this was only a suggestion and not a committed project, noting that it could include equestrian use or other compatible activities.

Mr. Rykert acknowledged the comment and noted that the staff was prepared to address related questions. He highlighted recent improvements to 100 West, including adjustments to the road layout and the addition of an important north-south bike lane. These improvements connect to existing east-west bike routes, such as 1100 South, and provide access to the Boat Harbor.

Council Member Hunter asked if the improvements to 100 West were included in the existing Master Plan, to which Mr. Rykert affirmed that it was.

Ben Hunter provided details on the design and implementation of the bike lanes along 100 West. He confirmed that the bike lanes were included in the existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. He explained that the existing road width in the project area was approximately 40 feet from lip of gutter to lip of gutter, with existing curb and gutter in place. In designing the improvements, staff aimed to provide minimum 5-foot bike lanes in each direction, accounting for buffers and safety considerations, including potential door swings from parked cars. Due to width constraints, the original plan of 6-foot bike lanes, 10-foot travel lanes, and 8-foot parking on one side required adjustments. In some sections, parking was reduced on one side to accommodate the new bike lanes. Prior to the improvements, no formal striping existed except at railroad crossings and left-turn lanes into storage units.

Ben Hunter explained that the bike lanes along 100 West were implemented to align with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. He shared observational data from a recent weekend: 23 bicyclists and scooter users were recorded on Saturday, and 4 users on Sunday, demonstrating that the lanes are being utilized despite some resident concerns about lost parking.

Council Member Hunter asked about alternatives to dedicated bike lanes, such as shared lanes with travel lanes. Ben Hunter confirmed that shared lanes, or “sharrows,” with appropriate signage are an option. He noted three general categories of bikers:

- Diehard cyclists who ride regardless of lane type.
- Recreational cyclists who ride when a safe area is available.

- Families with children who seek safer areas for biking or small scooters.

He emphasized that designated bike lanes are preferred because they provide added safety and encourage usage among recreational cyclists and families, though shared lanes remain a viable alternative if needed.

Council Member Hunter noted that while some neighbors had expressed concerns, parking in the area has a long history and he was unsure how many residents were actually displaced due to the new bike lanes.

Ben Hunter reported receiving two or three complaints from residents who lost on-street parking when it was shifted to the opposite side of the street. He added that similar complaints likely would have occurred regardless of which side was chosen, as residents often view the space in front of their homes as their personal parking even though it is public right-of-way.

Mayor Frost stated that the city may need to continue following the existing Master Plan while considering resident feedback. He suggested that staff bring back potential adjustments through committee review but emphasized staying the course with the current plan unless there is strong reason to change direction.

Council Member Holley asked whether there were photos of the completed roadway with bike lanes painted or only images from the construction phase. Mr. Hunter replied that there was.

Council Member Taylor raised concerns about motorized scooters being used by young children on city trails and sidewalks. He noted that some of the scooters reach speeds of 25–30 miles per hour and are often operated without helmets, sometimes carrying multiple riders. He expressed safety concerns, particularly on narrower trails such as those near Art Dye Park and along the Murdock Canal Trail.

Council Member Holley agreed, adding that the city may need to clarify whether motorized vehicles should be allowed in bike lanes or trails intended for non-motorized use. He questioned whether high-speed e-bikes and scooters are appropriate in those areas given potential safety risks.

Council Member John mentioned that the State recently classified e-bikes into three categories, noting that legislation was enacted in May.

Chief Paul explained that enforcement is challenging, particularly on portions of the Murdock Canal Trail that are privately owned or under the jurisdiction of the Water Conservancy District. He stated that existing statutory authority for enforcement is unclear, and local law enforcement agencies are exploring a possible countywide approach.

Council Member Hunter added that similar issues occur along the trail by the golf course on 200 North, which is heavily used due to its proximity to the park and schools.

Council Member Taylor reiterated his concerns about children operating high-speed scooters near intersections, emphasizing that it poses a serious safety risk. He noted that enforcement is difficult because the scooters move quickly and are often gone before officers can respond.

Chief Paul acknowledged that the Police Department receives pushbacks from parents regarding enforcement efforts. Council Member Taylor responded that public concern often increases only after an accident occurs.

Council Member Hunter stated that he agreed with the mayor's earlier comment about evaluating the city's overall approach moving forward. He expressed concern about the bright green paint used to designate bike lanes, calling it visually unappealing and questioning the ongoing maintenance costs. He noted that in the TOD area, the paint has already begun peeling within several years of application and asked what the long-term maintenance expenses might be.

Council Member Holley added that some of the green-painted areas now have weeds growing through them.

Council Member Hunter continued that while dedicating space to cyclists is important, he would like to know the additional cost of enhanced striping and buffers compared to standard road striping. He reiterated that he does not support using lime green paint for future bike lanes, suggesting that it may discourage riders from using the lanes.

Council Member Taylor commented that he regretted supporting the TOD-style design features in earlier projects, expressing concern about their long-term practicality. He agreed, noting that residents have expressed confusion about whether the green areas are meant for cycling or pedestrian use.

Ben Hunter explained that green paint and complex striping layouts are more expensive to install and maintain. Any increase in these features would require higher ongoing maintenance budgets. He stated that both cyclists and pedestrians have been observed using the green-painted lanes in the TOD area and noted that each design approach—painted lanes, curb-separated lanes, or standard striping—has its pros and cons. He also mentioned that in other road reconstruction projects, some residents have questioned why planned bike lanes shown in the Master Plan were not included.

Council Member Holley asked whether the approximately 23 cyclists observed on a recent Saturday were using the bike lanes primarily for transportation or recreation. He stated that if the lanes are being used mostly by recreational riders rather than as a transportation alternative to reduce vehicle traffic, he would be less inclined to support the loss of roadway or parking space to accommodate them.

Council Member Taylor asked how the city could effectively monitor or distinguish between recreational and transportation-based bicycle use.

Council Member Holley clarified that his concern was not about enforcement but about the purpose of the infrastructure. He stated that based on recent observations—such as the 23 cyclists recorded on a Saturday, he believed all were recreational users rather than

individuals using bicycles for transportation. He expressed that this undermines the intended purpose of dedicated, painted bike lanes, which are meant to reduce vehicle traffic by promoting alternative transportation.

Council Member Holley added that local culture in Utah County remains heavily automobile-oriented, with most residents continuing to use cars for daily transportation and bicycles primarily for recreation. He cautioned against expanding costly, painted bike lanes without stronger evidence of transportation-based use.

Mayor Frost compared the current development of bike lanes to the City's trail-building process, noting that some trails initially appear underused or disconnected but later form important links as development progresses. He emphasized that while connectivity may not yet be fully realized, the City's Master Plan anticipates future growth that will tie existing bike routes together, improving access to the TOD and other destinations.

Council Member Taylor acknowledged that a growing segment of residents does use bicycles for transportation. He cited examples of community members and advisory board participants who regularly commute by bike and advocate for cycling as a practical mode of transport.

Mayor Frost asked whether any bike lanes outside the TOD currently use the special green textured surface, expressing concern about long-term maintenance, snow removal, and the need for continual upkeep.

Ben Hunter responded that 620 South, near the western boundary of the TOD, includes the green-painted cross-section connecting areas such as Harbor Village and Stone Creek. Outside of that, he said, those are the primary examples of green-painted lanes. He acknowledged that most of the 23 cyclists counted on Saturday were likely recreational users but noted that during the workweek, he has observed several bicyclists using 200 South to access the Frontrunner station. He stated that usage varies by day and purpose, with both recreational and transportation-based riders utilizing the lanes.

Mr. Bird stated that the recently observed count of 23 cyclists should be viewed as the baseline, emphasizing that usage will continue to grow as the city implements the Council-approved active transportation plan. He explained that the plan extends along 100 West, connecting south to the Boat Harbor, around Utah Lake, and north to the Murdock Canal, with coordination efforts currently underway with the MAG to strengthen regional connectivity. He stressed the importance of maintaining progress, noting that once opportunities for connectivity are lost, they are difficult to regain. While the 100 West segment presents challenges due to its narrow right-of-way and older development pattern, the corridor widens farther south, providing adequate space for bike lanes, parking, and travel lanes.

Mr. Bird emphasized that addressing the corridor now prevents it from becoming a future bottleneck and allows for long-term flexibility—potentially using shared lanes in the near term while transitioning to fully dedicated bike lanes over time. He encouraged the Council to consider the broader context of the City's active transportation and parks Master Plans, which are being aligned to reduce redundancy, eliminate underused or unnecessary trail segments, and focus resources on key routes such as this corridor. He

concluded that City staff are committed to “defending” these essential connections to ensure a cohesive, efficient system for future growth and recreation.

Mayor Frost commented that the long-term goal includes creating a continuous trail around the perimeter of Utah Lake. He anticipated that American Fork could become the first city to complete its portion, with Lehi and other communities contributing as development advances. While the full project may take decades, he noted that the resulting regional trail system would be an exceptional recreational and transportation asset.

Mr. Rykert expressed optimism that the regional trail connections would eventually be completed, though it may take many years.

Council Member Hunter stated that while he supports installing dedicated bike lanes where roadway width allows, narrower sections may be better suited for shared lanes between vehicles and cyclists. He emphasized the importance of flexibility and context-specific design, suggesting that the city considers shared-use configurations in constrained areas rather than forcing full lane separations.

Council Member Hunter also requested additional information regarding the ongoing maintenance costs associated with the green-painted bike lanes, noting that those funds might be more effectively used on other infrastructure needs such as sidewalks. He referenced the 200 South Frontage Road sidewalk connection between 100 East and 100 West, which was previously removed from the Parc Tax grant funding list, and expressed that he would prefer to see projects like that completed over adding more green-painted bike or parking lanes.

3. Adjourn.

Mayor Frost thanked the participants for the discussion and noted that the conversation provided helpful reminders regarding ongoing transportation and infrastructure planning.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Stephanie Finau".

Stephanie Finau, Deputy Recorder