

## **TMAC MEETING – October 23, 2025 - DRAFT**

### **Item 1 – Introductions – TMAC Chair**

- The meeting began at 12:30 PM with TMAC Chair, Beth Provence, conducting. Those present introduced themselves and are listed below.

### **Committee Members**

Beth Provence - District 3, Committee Chair  
Noah Gordon - District 4, Committee Vice Chair  
David Hurtado – District 1, Business/Community Representative  
Kendall Thurston - District 2 (Arrived late)  
David Keller - District 5  
Greg Macfarlane - Academia (At Large)  
Lisa Jensen – Planning Commission Member (At Large)

### **Provo City Staff**

Kaehan Shour - Public Works, Engineer  
Joseph Gandy - Public Works, Management Analyst/Public Information  
Justine Parham – Public Works, Permit Technician  
Hannah Salzl - Development Services Planner/Planning and Sustainability  
Boden Golding - Development Services – Parking Enforcement Supervisor  
Sergeant Brough - Provo Police (Arrived late)  
David Michelsen - Public Works, Engineer  
David Day - Public Works, Engineer

### **Action Item 2 – Approve Minutes from September 18, 2025**

Mr. Gordon moved to approve the minutes, and Ms. Jensen seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.

### **Action Item 3 – Recommendation to amend Provo City Code 15.03.200 (1)(a) and (d)(i) by removing the 54-foot local street right of way and 24-foot local street (public and private) asphalt width – David Day**

Mr. Day explained that in Provo City's current code, we have different widths for streets based on daily trip calculations. As part of a code change, the Council is looking at removing standards that allow a 24' local street asphalt width, which is 54' right-of-way width, to be built. This road width allows for parking on only one side of the street and is available for streets that average 400 trips or less a day. Mr. Day requested the TMAC's input on this proposal before it's taken to Planning Commission and City Council. The discussion included:

- Trip generation calculation as it pertains to determining street width.
- Difficulty of installing and maintaining utilities separations on narrow roads.
- The fact that narrow roads slow traffic, which contributes to safety; they may also contribute to more affordable homes.

- Fire code as it pertains to street widths.
- Areas in Provo where 24' asphalt widths are in use.
- Surveying people who live on the 24' width streets to determine if they perceive the width as a problem.
- Accident occurrence on 24' width streets; Mr. Day is not aware of any accidents.
- While parking on streets of this width has been self-regulating, "No Parking" signs may be installed to establish which side of the street can be used for parking. It is anticipated that complaints will increase once the signs are installed.
- Determining what the motivation is for the Council to consider this code change. Who is voicing concerns and what are the concerns?
- The fact that the TMAC feels it does not have enough information to be comfortable with the proposed change.

Phrasing of the motion was discussed at length. Mr. Macfarlane provided its finalized wording. Ms. Jensen made the motion to pass the motion as stated by Mr. Macfarlane; it was seconded by David Hurtado. The written motion was emailed to Mr. Shour by Mr. Macfarlane and is stated below:

*"TMAC does not feel comfortable advancing this proposal. The smaller streets are likely to make building housing more affordable, and the slower speed of traffic and shorter crossing distance is a benefit for safety. We recognize that there may be issues related to parking and utilities, but don't have enough information."*

*"As the Council considers this recommendation, we invite them to consider what the motivation is for this change, and to seek input from residents of streets where this design already exists."*

#### **Item 4 – Micromobility Ordinance Amendment Discussion – Beth Provence**

Ms. Provence introduced the discussion. Mr. Shour shared an email received from Council Member MacKay, who was not able to attend this meeting due to a conflicting meeting. The email stated, *"I have been receiving [a] lot of feedback [on] scooters, e-bikes and motorcycle little bikes. Citizens are very frustrated. So much illegal activity. Police do not do anything, and someone is going to die. Drivers terrified of these speeding kids not obeying laws and that they might accidentally hit one some day."*

It was agreed that these were concerns also shared by the TMAC. Another email was shown on the screen by Ms. Provence containing a response from Mr. Keeslar to Ms. Thurston addressing micromobility concerns. Many of the points listed in this communication were provided to Mr. Keeslar by Mr. Gordon; Mr. Keeslar then modified some of the material. A *pdf document containing this information is available with these minutes.*

During discussion on this item, it was concluded that many of these rules on micromobility are contained in City and State Ordinances, though some of the items listed in the email response

were more strict than those found in State Code. The issue is that knowledge of, communication about, and enforcement of these regulations need to increase. It was concluded that education could be provided during back-to-school nights and parent/teacher conferences to inform parents of the rules. Placing signs by bike racks and on trails detailing the rules could also be helpful. Other means of communication should also be considered.

Sgt. Brough estimated that 100 e-motorcycle vehicles have been impounded since school started. When communicating with parents, they do not seem to have any idea what the rules and regulations are; they simply aren't educated. Mr. Macfarlane does not think we need additional rules; instead, they need to be communicated and enforced. Others believe that more rules could be helpful.

#### **Item 5 – Engineering Projects Update – Engineering Staff**

- a. 820 North Bridge Replacement Update – David Michelsen**
- b. University Avenue Bridge Replacement Update – David Michelsen**
- c. October Pedestrian Safety Month Update – Kaehan Shour**

Mr. Michelsen informed the TMAC that work will start on November 10, 2025 on the 820 N Bridge. A Meet the Contractor night was held last week with many attending. Information was shown on the site [www.provoriverbridge.com](http://www.provoriverbridge.com) – updates will be posted. The closures will last for six to seven months and will include pedestrian and trail movements.

Mr. Michelsen then showed information from the UDOT website on the University Avenue Bridge project. This can be accessed at [udotinput.utah.gov/universityavebridge](http://udotinput.utah.gov/universityavebridge) - he explained that the project is well underway; potholing and bridge surface repairs have been done. Modifications on State Street and Lakeview Parkway, which will be a main detour route during this project, are also ongoing. One lane in each direction will remain open during the duration of the project. Both 500 South and 600 South will be closed during the project, while 400 South will have a left-turn lane onto University Avenue.

Mr. Shour shared the fact that October is recognized as Pedestrian Safety Month by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). Public and private agencies and contractors submit projects to be considered for nationwide publication in the ITE Journal. Provo's 800 North – 500 East Project was highlighted in the Journal. Provo projects from previous years were also highlighted by ITE. Mr. Gandy explained that these projects and many others done in Provo City are publicized on Provo's social media outlets.

#### **Item 6 - Adjourn**

Ms. Provence adjourned the meeting at 1:40 PM. The next meeting will be held on November 20, 2025 at 12:30 PM.

A full video/audio recording of this meeting can be found on YouTube at the link below:

[TMAC | October 23, 2025](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HJyfJyfJyfJ)

MR. VERN KEESLAR RESPONSE TO MS. KENDALL THURSTON

RE: MICROMOBILITY DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Provo City Code 9.32.170 Micromobility Devices already provides good information about limiting the uses on sidewalks under certain conditions and speed. It also prohibits micromobility devices on University Avenue between 400 North and 100 South and Center Street from 100 East to 500 West.

The Transportation and Mobility Advisory Committee is concerned about the safety and use of micromobility devices on public sidewalks and public streets. We believe that the following issues should be better addressed in Provo City Code:

1. Safety and Age Requirements

- a. Consider Raising Minimum Age: Set the minimum legal age for operating a motorized conveyance (e-scooters, e-bikes under certain classifications, etc.) on public streets or pathways to higher than 14.
- b. Consider Mandatory Helmets: Require all riders under the age of 18 to wear an approved safety helmet while operating the device. This is a common requirement in jurisdictions with lower age limits.

2. Riding Location and Speed

- a. Consider how to balance micromobility use on sidewalks.
- b. Designated Riding Areas: Micro-mobility devices must be operated on:
  - Bicycle lanes or multi-use paths.
  - Streets with a posted speed limit of 25 mph or less.
  - Riders must keep as far to the right as practicable.
- c. Consider establishing a citywide maximum operating speed for micro-mobility devices at 15 mph (25 km/h), aligning with the international standard.
- d. Require shared (rental) device operators to implement geofencing that automatically reduces the operating speed to a "walking pace" (e.g., 6 mph or 10 km/h) in designated high-pedestrian traffic areas, such as Downtown sidewalks, parks, and university-designated walking zones.

3. Traffic Adherence and Equipment

- a. Traffic Law Compliance: Clearly state that micro-mobility riders are subject to all provisions of the Utah Traffic Code, including:
  - Making a full and complete stop at all stop signs and red traffic signals.
  - Yielding to pedestrians and vehicular traffic where required.
  - Signaling turns.
- b. Mandatory Equipment: Require all devices to be equipped with a functional white front light and red rear reflector or light for use between sunset and sunrise.
- c. Parking Regulation: Establish clear rules requiring devices to be parked upright and in designated zones, or parallel to the curb, ensuring they do not block pedestrian right-of-way (the sidewalk clear zone).