



PROVO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

Redevelopment Agency Governing Board

Regular Meeting Agenda

5:30 PM, Tuesday, January 27, 2026

Council Chambers (Room 100)

445 W. Center Street, Provo, UT 84601 or

<https://www.youtube.com/provocitycouncil>

Roll Call

THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL AND ADMINISTRATION WERE PRESENT:

Councilor Becky Bogdin

Councilor Gary Garrett

Councilor Katrice MacKay

Councilor Jeff Whitlock

Chief Administrative Officer Scott Henderson

City Attorney Brian Jones

Councilor Craig Christensen (remote)

Councilor Travis Hoban

Councilor Rachel Whipple

Mayor Marsha Judkins

Council Executive Director Justin Harrison

City Recorder Heidi Allman

Conducting: Chair Katrice MacKay

Prayer – Jack McKinney

Pledge of Allegiance – Councilor Whipple

Presentations, Proclamations, and Awards

1 Provo City Employee of the Month - January 2026 (26-007) [00:00:01](#)

Justin Harrison, Council Executive Director, recognized Melia Dayley, Council Policy Analyst, as the Employee of the Month. He shared that Melia is a dedicated public servant who consistently comes to work with a positive attitude and a strong commitment to serving residents. He noted that she is always willing to help in any way she can and that her professionalism and approachability are evident in her daily work. Mr. Harrison stated that Melia is well respected across departments and serves as an example to others within the department and throughout the City. He expressed appreciation for her contributions and thanked her for her service.

Public Comment

Chair MacKay read the public comment preamble and opened the public comment period.

Chelsea Hicks, a Provo resident and community advocate for the Ruth and Nathan Hale Theater, addressed the Council. She shared that the theater, which opened last year and is commonly referred to as “the Ruth,” is highlighting cities within Utah County as part of an effort to elevate the arts in the community. She noted that Provo’s featured week will be April 20–25, during which *The Wizard of Oz* will be performed. Ms. Hicks stated that six VIP vouchers would be provided for the Mayor, City Council members, and any additional City employees designated by the Mayor to attend a performance during that week. She also offered to arrange a guided tour of the theater for City employees attending the

show, which she would personally lead. Additionally, Ms. Hicks requested the City's assistance in promoting a Provo-resident-only offer through City communications, including the City newsletter. The offer would provide a \$5 discount for Provo residents attending performances during the featured week, valid for up to six tickets per order. She clarified that the promotion is intended exclusively for Provo residents. Ms. Hicks thanked the Council for their time and invited them to attend the theater. Send the next section whenever you are ready, and I will keep the minutes consistent and clean.

Dallin Flake, a Provo resident, addressed the Council regarding concerns related to the City's use of the Flock Safety Network. He referenced comments he made at a prior meeting regarding constitutional and privacy concerns associated with what he described as warrantless surveillance and the effectiveness of the technology. Mr. Flake stated that he had since provided Council Members with additional information by email, including materials he said raised questions about the system's effectiveness, potential security vulnerabilities, and the risk of misuse. Mr. Flake noted that Councilor MacKay had responded to his concerns and expressed apprehension regarding reported security issues and whether the benefits of the system outweigh the risks. He stated that Councilor MacKay had suggested holding a Council work meeting to better understand the Flock contract and the safety of the data collected. Mr. Flake formally requested that the full Council support this request. He urged the Council to schedule a work session to review the system and to suspend use of the cameras until privacy and data security concerns could be addressed. Mr. Flake stated that other cities across the country have reconsidered or terminated similar contracts due to privacy, security, and constitutional concerns. He encouraged the Council to further review the issue and consider taking action to protect residents' privacy.

Chair MacKay closed public comment.

Action Agenda

2 An ordinance amending Provo City Code to clarify the duty to keep a proper lookout. (26-014) [00:07:21](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve Ordinance 2026-4, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Matthew Griffiths, Assistant City Attorney, presented. He explained that the Legal Department is proposing two amendments to City ordinances. The first proposed change would reclassify the offense of failing to keep a proper lookout from a Class B misdemeanor to an infraction. He stated that minor wording adjustments were also made and that the change is intended to better align the City ordinance with comparable state traffic laws. The second proposed amendment involves the City's battery ordinance. Mr. Griffiths explained that battery is largely addressed under the state assault statute. He noted that when conduct is covered by both state law and City code, officers are generally encouraged to charge under the state statute. To avoid duplication, the proposed amendment would revise the City ordinance language to address conduct not otherwise covered by state law. He stated that these changes were discussed previously during a work session.

Chair MacKay opened the public comment period. With no comments presented, she closed public comment.

Councilor Whitlock explained, in plain terms for the benefit of those present and watching online, that the proposed changes address how certain existing laws are applied. He noted that under the current

City Code, a minor traffic incident, such as striking a mailbox, could be charged as a Class B misdemeanor, which he described as more severe than comparable violations in other cities. He stated that the proposed amendment would reduce the penalty to better match common practice. Councilor Whitlock also explained that the current City definition of battery closely mirrors the state's assault statute and does not clearly cover lower-level conduct. He stated that the proposed changes would provide law enforcement with a clearer option to address less severe conduct, such as unwanted touching, which does not rise to the level of assault or sexual battery. He further referenced a concern raised during the prior work meeting regarding whether reclassifying the traffic offense would reduce accountability for unsafe driving, particularly in situations involving pedestrian safety. Councilor Whitlock stated that the City Attorney had clarified that incidents involving pedestrians would likely be charged with more serious offenses and that the proposed infraction would generally not apply in those circumstances.

Chair MacKay called for a vote.

Vote: The motion passed 7:0 with Councilors Bogdin, Christensen, Garrett, Hoban, MacKay, Whipple, and Whitlock in favor.

3 An ordinance amending Provo City Code regarding the criminal offense of battery. (26-015)
00:07:33

Motion: An implied motion to approve Ordinance 2026-5, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Agenda Items 2 and 3 were read into the record, discussed by the Council, and opened for public comment concurrently.

Char MacKay called for a vote.

Vote: The motion passed 7:0 with Councilors Bogdin, Christensen, Garrett, Hoban, MacKay, Whipple, and Whitlock in favor.

4 A resolution approving an interlocal agreement between Provo City and Utah County regarding funding for State Street trail improvements from 300 South to 900 South. (26-004) 00:12:43

Motion: An implied motion to approve Resolution 2026-3, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

Vern Keeslar, Traffic Manager, explained that the agreement would support construction of the trail along the east side of State Street from 900 South to 300 South. He noted that the segment from 900 South to Slate Canyon Drive has already been completed. Mr. Keeslar stated that, in the prior year, the City worked with UDOT to install a traffic signal at 900 South near the cemetery. He explained that the proposed next phase would extend the trail north to 300 South. He noted that the interlocal agreement is required because Utah County funds are being used through the Mountainland Association of Governments. Mr. Keeslar also shared that UDOT has committed, pending approval by the Transportation Commission, to contribute several hundred thousand dollars toward new curb and

gutter improvements along the project corridor. He expressed enthusiasm for the project and noted that it involves collaboration among four partner agencies.

Councilor Whitlock asked clarifying questions to better explain the project for the public. He confirmed that the proposed multi-use path is intended for pedestrian and bicycle use and that it would continue along the east side of State Street.

Mr. Keeslar confirmed that the trail would be a continuation of the existing path on the east side.

Councilor Whitlock asked whether the project would impact on-street parking.

Mr. Keeslar stated that parking would not be affected. He explained that driveway access would be temporarily affected due to the installation of new curb and gutter, noting that standard curb and gutter (not deep-well) would be installed and that property owners would receive new driveway approaches between the sidewalk and the street.

Councilor Whitlock also asked whether the project would change the roadway itself.

Mr. Keeslar responded that there would be no changes to the street crown or striping and noted that the corridor already includes buffered bike lanes along that section.

Chair MacKay opened the item for public comment.

Aaron Wheatley, of Provo, spoke in support of the proposed State Street Trail project. He shared a recent personal experience biking on State Street with his young children and described feeling unsafe due to traffic conditions. He stated that the experience increased his awareness of the challenges faced by cyclists and pedestrians, particularly those who travel the corridor regularly. He also noted concerns about accessibility for individuals using wheelchairs. Mr. Wheatley expressed appreciation for the proposed trail improvements and encouraged the Council to approve of the project. He stated that, while he does not live directly in the area, the improvements would significantly benefit nearby residents and help create a safer environment along a high-traffic roadway. He emphasized the importance of providing space for all users to travel safely throughout the city.

Ethan Unklesbay, of Provo, spoke in support of the proposed State Street Trail project. He echoed the previous speaker's comments and shared that, although he does not live in the south Provo neighborhood, he uses the area while biking during the summer months. He noted that he travels through the corridor to access Bicentennial Park and library story time activities with children. Mr. Unklesbay stated that the trail improvements would benefit residents who live in the area as well as other Provo residents who use the corridor for recreation and daily activities. He expressed appreciation for the project and thanked the Council for considering the improvements.

Chair MacKay closed public comment and invited a council discussion.

Councilor Bogdin asked why the proposed segment of the State Street Trail was being completed later in the project timeline and whether it might have been more effective to complete this section earlier.

Mr. Keeslar responded that he was not involved during the initial phases of the project and could not speak to the original sequencing decisions. He explained that the current proposal addresses a

remaining gap in the trail system, similar to other gap-completion projects in the City and noted that nearby sections have already been completed.

Councilor Bogdin expressed support for completing the gap and asked whether the new curb and gutter improvements would improve accessibility under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Mr. Keeslar confirmed that the project would include new ADA-compliant curb ramps at intersections and improved curb and gutter design to better manage water runoff and reduce pooling, resulting in improved accessibility and safety.

With no other discussion, Chair MacKay called for a vote.

Vote: The motion passed 7:0 with Councilors Bogdin, Christensen, Garrett, Hoban, MacKay, Whipple, and Whitlock in favor.

5 An ordinance amending Provo City Code regarding development standards for the year 2026. (PLOT20250658) [00:18:58](#)

Motion: An implied motion to approve an Ordinance, as currently constituted, has been made by council rule.

David Day, Assistant City Engineer, explained that the item before the Council included two components. The first involved routine updates to the City's engineering standards, which are typically reviewed and updated annually. He noted that, based on the prior work session discussion, there did not appear to be significant questions or concerns regarding those standard updates. The second component involved proposed changes to certain roadway cross sections, including the removal of the lowest cross-section option. Mr. Day stated that it appeared the Council may prefer to retain that cross section as currently configured, though he acknowledged he did not want to assume the Council's position. He concluded by offering to answer any questions and noted his intent to keep the presentation brief in consideration of the Council's time.

Councilor Garrett asked whether adoption of the proposed amendment would limit or restrict the City's ability to consider a 24-foot street width for infill projects or for special developments where a narrower street may be justified based on site-specific conditions.

Mr. Day stated that retaining the 24-foot street width would be appropriate for low-volume streets, provided no parking is enforced on one side. He explained that this option is used sparingly, generally for infilling streets or small cul-de-sacs with fewer than 400 vehicles per day. He noted that developers typically prefer a 30-foot street width to allow parking on both sides and that the 24-foot option would not become a default standard.

Mr. Jones explained that removing the 24-foot street width from the code would eliminate it as a viable option. He stated that exceptions can only be granted when expressly allowed by the code and that discretion must be guided by clear criteria. He cautioned that allowing discretion without defined standards could create legal risk, including claims of unequal application of the code.

Mr. Day explained that a 24-foot roadway width is the minimum that still allows for adequate fire access, noting that the City's alley standard is also 24 feet. He stated that the standard was not reduced further to ensure emergency vehicle access. He added that when curb dimensions are included, the total width from face of curb to face of curb is approximately 27 feet. He explained that even with a vehicle parked along one side of the street, sufficient clearance would remain to meet fire access requirements, noting that 20 feet is considered the minimum acceptable width for fire access.

Councilor Whitlock asked how the proposed changes to street width standards would affect the City's ability to implement bulb-outs at intersections as a safety feature.

Mr. Day explained that the 24-foot roadway width effectively functions as a bulb-out width, as it represents the narrowest standard used. He stated that on wider, 30-foot roads, the City already narrows the roadway at intersections to improve safety, creating a similar effect. He noted that the roadway is not narrowed further than 24 feet due to fire access requirements. Mr. Day explained that turning analyses have been completed to ensure emergency vehicles, including fire trucks, can safely navigate intersections without driving over curbs. He stated that the proposed standards would not limit the City's ability to implement bulb-outs where appropriate.

Councilor Bogdin asked how sanitation trucks operate on narrower roads.

Mr. Day shared that the harder vehicles to navigate on would be a snowplow.

Councilor Whipple asked if there are any streets that are less than 24' wide within the city.

Mr. Day referenced older neighborhoods, such as the Shakespeare neighborhood south of Center Street, as examples of streets with narrow roadway widths. He stated that those streets are approximately 24 feet wide, though he noted he would need to verify the exact measurements. He added that these areas represent some of the narrowest roadway widths he is aware of within the City.

Councilor Whipple shared feedback from residents of the Shakespeare neighborhood, noting that many appreciate the narrower streets, which she described as more human-scale and conducive to slower vehicle speeds. She stated that the combination of narrow streets, on-street parking, and street trees contributes to a safer and more pleasant environment for walking and neighborhood travel. She emphasized that the neighborhood is well established, functions effectively, and benefits from having a variety of street designs within the city. Councilor Whipple stated that while she was not advocating for reducing all residential streets to that width, she viewed maintaining flexibility and variety as an asset for Provo.

Mr. Day responded that street width standards are largely driven by anticipated traffic volumes based on future development. He noted that traffic volumes in older neighborhoods such as Shakespeare are expected to remain relatively static. He also explained that the neighborhood benefits from rear alleys, which reduce driveway access from the street and improve overall functionality, livability, and drivability.

Councilor Whipple acknowledged the existing approach of managing emergency access through parking restrictions on one side of the street and questioned why the 24-foot street option would be removed from the code if it is already functioning well and could be appropriate in limited or exceptional circumstances.

Councilor Christensen expressed concerns about the parking impacts associated with limiting on-street parking to one side of the street in new neighborhoods. He noted that while residents could be informed of the restrictions during development, the City frequently hears from neighborhoods that parking limitations are a source of frustration and create ongoing challenges. He stated that reducing available on-street parking could further exacerbate parking difficulties for residents and visitors. Councilor Christensen questioned whether maintaining or expanding the use of narrower street standards would contribute to existing parking issues and emphasized the importance of considering neighborhood parking needs when evaluating the proposed standards.

Mr. Day stated that he generally advises developers to use a 30-foot street width so that parking can occur on both sides of the street. He explained that the City's code allows a 24-foot width only in limited circumstances, typically on low-volume streets, and that no-parking restrictions are usually placed on the side of the street with fire hydrants to ensure emergency vehicle access. He acknowledged the parking challenges raised by the Council and shared a personal example from his own neighborhood, noting that wider streets can better accommodate parking and larger vehicles. Mr. Day stated that while wider streets offer more flexibility for parking, the City's standards attempt to balance parking needs, emergency access, and overall livability depending on street type and traffic volume.

Councilor Christensen stated that he supports retaining the 24-foot roadway option when it is tied to clear guidelines, particularly vehicle count thresholds, as this helps determine when its use is appropriate. He noted that having defined criteria provides reassurance and structure for applying the standard. He also acknowledged that while the 24-foot option can be appropriate in limited circumstances, it involves trade-offs, particularly related to on-street parking, and may create different challenges that should be carefully considered.

Char MacKay opened public comment.

Alexander Monson, of Provo, expressed concerns about proposed changes to street width standards. He spoke in support of 24-foot streets, citing the Shakespeare neighborhood as an example of a safe, walkable, and family-friendly area. He stated that narrower streets contribute to a higher quality of life and traffic safety and urged the Council to carefully consider the trade-offs before making changes to the standard.

Jacob Wixom, of Provo, spoke in support of narrower, human-scale streets. He shared that he and his family recently moved to Provo in part because of the City's neighborhood character. He stated that narrower streets, such as 24-foot roads, help create shared spaces that encourage slower traffic, neighborhood interaction, and a stronger sense of community. Mr. Wixom expressed concern that wider street standards prioritize vehicle convenience over human connection and can unintentionally undermine the qualities that make neighborhoods feel safe, welcoming, and livable. He urged the Council to consider how street design impacts community life and neighborhood acceptance of new development.

Ethan Unklesbay, of Provo, spoke regarding the discussion on street width standards and parking restrictions. He shared a personal experience receiving a parking warning and stated that residents are capable of understanding and following parking rules when they are clearly established and enforced. Mr. Unklesbay expressed concern that removing or limiting the 24-foot street option assumes residents will not comply with no parking restrictions. He stated that existing rules already address parking on

narrower streets and emphasized that creating additional regulations may introduce new problems rather than solve existing ones. He urged the Council to trust residents to follow established rules and to consider the implications of removing flexibility from the code.

Barbie DeSoto, of Provo, spoke in support of retaining 24-foot street standards. She stated that some of Provo's most walkable and desirable neighborhoods, including the Shakespeare neighborhood, feature narrower streets and tend to have higher home values. She emphasized that family-friendly neighborhoods require streets where children can safely walk and play. Ms. DeSoto shared concerns about wider streets encouraging higher vehicle speeds, which she said can make neighborhoods feel unsafe and less stable. She cautioned against making permanent infrastructure changes based on temporary construction needs and encouraged the Council to keep 24-foot streets as an available option, particularly in areas planned for increased density. She urged the Council to consider how street design impacts safety, neighborhood stability, and long-term community value.

Susan Kruger-Barber, of Provo, spoke in support of narrower residential streets and street-calming measures. She shared her experience working with the City on street diets in her neighborhood, noting that wider streets are associated with higher speeds and increased pedestrian and bicycle safety concerns. Ms. Kruger-Barber referenced examples from other cities, including Chicago and Boulder, where narrower streets, traffic-calming features, and lower speed limits have improved safety and community vitality. She cited research and national best practices that support residential street widths narrower than traditional standards and encouraged the Council to prioritize people-focused street design, safety, and livability in residential areas.

Emily Weatherhead, a resident of the Shakespeare neighborhood in Provo, spoke in support of retaining narrower street standards. She described her neighborhood as feeling safe, walkable, and family-friendly, noting that many families with young children regularly spend time outside and that residents feel comfortable walking throughout the area. She emphasized that the tree canopy and street design contribute to the neighborhood's character and sense of safety. Ms. Weatherhead stated that she has observed emergency vehicles operating in the neighborhood without issue and expressed concern that widening streets could negatively impact the livability of established neighborhoods. She also noted that parking challenges are often related to rental properties and off-street parking compliance, rather than street width. She urged the Council to maintain minimum standards that allow neighborhoods like hers to continue to be built and supported, particularly as the City considers higher-density development.

Councilor Garrett asked if residents park on both sides of the street and if emergency vehicles were able to pass.

Ms. Weatherhead clarified that in her area of the Shakespeare neighborhood, residents regularly park on both sides of the street, and she is not aware of posted parking restrictions limiting parking to one side. She stated that, despite this, emergency vehicles are able to pass through the street without issue. She shared a specific example from her block, noting that emergency responders were able to access the street during a medical emergency at a nearby home. Ms. Weatherhead also noted that many homes on her street are rental properties, resulting in a high concentration of parked vehicles, yet emergency access has still been maintained.

Laura Levitt, of Provo, spoke in support of narrower, human-scale streets. Drawing on her background in user experience design, she described street narrowing as an intuitive and effective way to naturally slow vehicle speeds. She shared concerns about wide streets in her neighborhood, particularly along

collector roads, where high speeds make it unsafe for children to play or travel independently. Ms. Levitt noted that wide streets across Provo have repeatedly been identified as safety concerns in neighborhood meetings, citing examples near schools and along high-speed corridors. She emphasized that these concerns are broadly shared among residents and encouraged the Council to view narrower streets as a practical safety tool rather than a niche preference.

Tyler Fleishman, of Provo, spoke in support of narrower street design, stating that he believes it improves driving behavior, safety, and overall quality of life. He shared perspectives from a city council member in Falls Church, Virginia, who described how that city experienced population growth while reducing overall traffic by investing in walking, biking, and street designs that naturally slow vehicles. He stated that these design choices reduced cut-through traffic and improved neighborhood safety without relying heavily on enforcement. Mr. Fleischman expressed the view that traffic congestion and safety outcomes are influenced by design decisions, not inevitabilities. He stated that wider streets prioritize speed and that through traffic at the expense of families and neighborhoods, and he encouraged the Council to consider returning to more traditional, human-scale street designs similar to those found in older Provo neighborhoods.

Aaron Wheatley, of Provo, spoke in support of narrower streets and traffic-calming design. He shared personal observations that even on lower-volume streets, wider roadways encourage faster driving, including his own experience unintentionally exceeding posted speeds. He stated that street design has a strong influence on driver behavior, often more so than posted limits alone. Mr. Wheatley also encouraged the Council to focus on enforcing existing rules, such as parking restrictions, rather than adding new regulations. He expressed concern that adding layers of rules without consistent enforcement can create confusion for residents and reduce public confidence. He urged the Council to prioritize clear, enforceable standards that promote safety and are easy for residents to understand and follow.

Grace Tueller, of Provo, shared her support for retaining 24-foot street options. She shared that she had walked every public street in Provo and, based on that experience, she found narrower streets to be more pleasant, walkable, and livable. She cited the Shakespeare neighborhood as an example of a street design that supports a positive walking experience and encouraged the Council to keep 24-foot roads as an available option to allow similar neighborhoods to be built in the future.

Aaron Skabelund, of Provo and representative of Bike Walk Provo and the Utah chapter of Families for Safe Streets, advocated for street designs that improve safety and accessibility for people of all ages and abilities. He stated that narrower streets are among the most effective traffic-calming measures and significantly enhance safety, particularly for children and older adults. Mr. Skabelund expressed opposition to the proposed ordinance, stating that eliminating or restricting 24-foot street options in new developments could increase safety risks and complicate efforts to retrofit existing streets. He urged the Council to retain narrower street options and to vote against the ordinance in order to prioritize safety and livability.

Brooklyn Lorence, of Provo, spoke in support of narrower street design. She shared that she and her child primarily bike throughout the city and have experienced both the benefits and safety challenges of Provo's streets. She described living on a wide roadway near Pioneer Park that has recently experienced increased cut-through traffic, which she stated encourages higher speeds and creates safety concerns, particularly when biking. Ms. Lorence expressed support for planning decisions that prioritize narrower roads, improved safety, and alternative transportation options. She encouraged the Council to consider

how street design choices can support future growth, public transit, higher-density housing, and long-term livability for residents.

Jonathan Handy, a Provo resident, shared his support of human-scale street design and narrower streets. He stated that widening streets to accommodate vehicles often comes at the expense of space for people and neighborhood livability. He noted that emergency vehicle access, while important, is an infrequent need and suggested that alternative approaches, such as smaller emergency vehicles, could be considered in the future.

Phineas Jensen, of Provo, spoke in opposition to the proposed ordinance, stating that it affects future design options rather than existing streets. He argued that restricting 24-foot street options would limit the City's ability to create neighborhoods similar to those residents' value, citing the Shakespeare neighborhood as an example of narrow streets functioning successfully. Mr. Jensen also addressed comments made during a prior work session, stating that research and experience show narrower streets encourage slower driving. He noted that roadways perceived as "narrow" but still exceeding 40 feet in width can continue to promote higher speeds. He urged the Council to retain the 24-foot street option for future development.

Clark Davis, of Provo, spoke remotely regarding the impact of street width standards on infill development. He shared that he has lived in Provo for nearly 20 years and would like to pursue infill housing in his neighborhood rather than leaving the area. He explained that, based on his design experience and work on potential infill concepts, requiring a 30-foot street width would make some infill projects infeasible, particularly on constrained sites. Mr. Davis stated that narrower street options are important to enable high-quality, detached single-family infill housing that can add stability to established neighborhoods. He suggested that, for certain infill situations, the City consider allowing a 20-foot roadway with no on-street parking, noting that such a configuration is permitted under the International Fire Code. He encouraged the Council to consider flexibility in street standards to support infill opportunities.

Dallin Flake, of Provo, spoke in support of narrower street design after hearing the discussion. He stated that street design influences driving behavior and that narrower streets naturally reduce vehicle speeds, improve safety, and lessen the need for traffic enforcement. Mr. Flake expressed concern about limiting future development options and questioned why the City would remove an approach that is well regarded by residents of neighborhoods with 24-foot streets. He shared personal observations walking through the Shakespeare neighborhood, noting that it feels noticeably safer and more comfortable than adjacent areas with wider streets. He encouraged the Council to retain narrower street options as a way to promote safe, enjoyable neighborhoods and reduce traffic over time.

Chair MacKay closed public comment and invited a council discussion.

Councilor Garrett asked staff for perspective on how the 400-vehicle-per-day threshold for 24-foot streets compares to traffic volumes on existing streets. He referenced 500 North and asked whether, based on staff's general knowledge, it would likely exceed that threshold.

Mr. Keeslar responded that 500 North would likely exceed 400 vehicles per day but noted that a review of traffic data would be required to confirm.

Councilor Garrett also referenced other streets, including Timpview Drive and 700 East, and Mr. Keeslar indicated that those streets carry significantly higher traffic volumes. Councilor Garrett then invited Mr. Keeslar to share any additional thoughts on the issue while he was at the podium.

Mr. Keeslar stated that his primary focus is providing safe travel options for all modes of transportation, including walking, biking, scooters, vehicles, and emergency services. He emphasized the importance of supporting mode choice while ensuring safety for all users. He expressed support for retaining the option of narrower street designs, noting that they can achieve many of the community benefits discussed. Mr. Keeslar stated that his primary concern is not the 24-foot street width itself, but ensuring compliance with the existing requirement for no parking on one side of the street. He emphasized that maintaining clear access is critical so emergency responders can safely and quickly reach residents during fire or medical emergencies. He concluded by stressing the importance of balancing thoughtful street design with the City's responsibility to support emergency services and public safety.

Councilor Hoban thanked members of the public for their comments and stated that he appreciated the care expressed for safety, neighborhoods, and quality of life in Provo. He shared personal experiences raising young children and living on both busy and quieter streets, noting that he understands concerns about speeding and neighborhood safety. Councilor Hoban then sought clarification on the specific issue before the Council. He explained his understanding that the discussion centers on whether streets would have approximately the same drivable width—about 18 feet—regardless of whether parking is allowed on one side or both sides of the street. He stated that, from his perspective, the current decision is less about narrowing streets further and more about whether parking would be restricted to one side in order to maintain emergency access. He questioned whether some public comments may be addressing a broader policy discussion about street narrowing that is outside the scope of the item currently under consideration. Councilor Hoban acknowledged that traffic speeds can increase when wider streets lack parked vehicles and noted that in newer, denser developments, streets are more likely to have cars parked on both sides, whereas in some older or lower-density areas this may not always be the case. He thanked staff and fellow Council Members for helping to clarify the issue as he worked through the considerations.

Chair MacKay expressed concerns about parking enforcement and emergency access on existing 24-foot streets. She explained that Fire Marshal requirements mandate parking on only one side of these streets, but residents were not always informed of this restriction and currently park on both sides. She noted that enforcing one-side parking would significantly reduce available parking and has already generated concern from residents. She stated that while she supports retaining 24-foot streets in limited situations, such as infill projects, she is concerned about their use in areas with ample developable land. She emphasized that emergency access must be protected and that reliance on street parking is increasing due to denser development, smaller homes, and multi-generational households. Chair MacKay stressed that the issue is long-term neighborhood parking and sustainability, not temporary construction impacts.

Councilor Whitlock stated that the primary issue before the Council is whether to remove 24-foot streets with parking on one side as an option for future development, not whether to allow narrower streets with parking on both sides. He emphasized that infill development is a priority for the City and referenced prior discussions and examples showing that some infill projects would not be feasible if a 30-foot street width were required in combination with existing setback standards. Councilor Whitlock expressed discomfort with eliminating the 24-foot option, noting that if additional requirements are needed, those could be added without removing the option entirely. He stated his understanding that

the Administration and Fire Marshal are neutral on the issue. He also noted that, when accounting for the actual width of modern vehicles, a 24-foot street with parking on one side may provide comparable or greater clearance for emergency access than a wider street with parking on both sides.

Councilor Bogdin requested that Fire Marshal Hubbs come to the podium to address questions related to emergency access. She asked whether there have been instances where ambulances were unable to fit down narrower streets, requiring emergency personnel to remove equipment or gurneys and respond to calls on foot due to access limitations.

Fire Marshal Hubbs shared that there have been instances where emergency crews were unable to drive an ambulance down a street, including a situation where snow conditions prevented access and personnel had to carry a gurney down the street to reach a patient.

Councilor Bogdin asked whether smaller emergency vehicles, similar to those used in Europe, are an option in the United States.

Fire Marshal Hubbs responded that, to his knowledge, they are not. He explained that while some smaller ambulances exist, they do not provide adequate interior space for medical care. He noted that European-style emergency vehicles are typically custom conversions and are not widely available as standard purchase options in the United States. He also stated that he is not aware of any smaller fire truck options currently available for U.S. fire departments.

Councilor Bogdin stated that the Council works to preserve neighborhood character and avoid removing on-street parking whenever possible, noting that parking is only removed when absolutely necessary. She referenced prior projects where parking was eliminated, such as along Fifth West and Slate Canyon, and described the significant challenges those changes created for residents. She also noted the impacts of increased parking permit fees and acknowledged that, despite existing requirements for off-street vehicle storage, parking remains a persistent challenge for many households. Councilor Bogdin stated that she does not believe the City is at a point where eliminating on-street parking broadly is feasible, nor where narrow streets can safely accommodate parking on both sides. She emphasized the importance of ensuring adequate access for fire and ambulance services, expressing respect for emergency responders and support for maintaining street designs that allow them to perform life-saving work effectively.

Mayor Judkins thanked the public and Council for their thoughtful input and acknowledged the complexity of balancing parking needs, street design, and safety. She clarified that, regardless of the Council's decision, parking restrictions on 24-foot streets would still be implemented to meet Fire Marshal requirements. She noted that, moving forward, residents would be aware of one-sided parking restrictions from the outset, which would help avoid confusion. Mayor Judkins expressed concern that removing the 24-foot street option entirely would limit the Council's and future Councils' ability to support infill projects where that width may be necessary. She stated that retaining the option and using it more strategically would preserve flexibility while still addressing safety and emergency access concerns.

Councilor Whipple stated that she supports preserving the 24-foot street option and does not support removing it from the City code. She acknowledged agreement on the importance of retaining this option for infill and redevelopment projects and emphasized that narrower streets provide daily, non-monetary benefits, including improved walkability, safety, and neighborhood character. She stated that narrower

streets allow for greater housing density, more green space, and a higher overall quality of life, and she emphasized prioritizing space for people over space for vehicles. Councilor Whipple noted that while emergency access is critical, the everyday safety and livability benefits for residents should carry significant weight in the Council's decision-making. She also expressed concern that removing the 24-foot option would reduce the City's flexibility to implement future traffic-calming measures such as road diets, bulb-outs, or other design solutions recommended by traffic engineers.

Chair MacKay noted that during the Planning Commission meeting, the Fire Chief and Fire Marshal stated a preference for 30-foot streets and did not recommend 24-foot streets. She also shared feedback from residents in her neighborhood, stating that some are frustrated with narrower streets due to parking constraints, difficulty passing vehicles, and challenges during events when parking demand is high. She noted that residents are particularly concerned about the anticipated removal of on-street parking. Chair MacKay acknowledged that there are differing perspectives within the community and stated that balancing these competing priorities is challenging.

Councilor Whitlock requested that Chief Headman be asked to share his position and perspective on the proposed street width standards to help inform the Council's discussion.

Chief Headman stated that the Fire Department's position is to support whatever street design best serves the development, provided that fire code access requirements are met. He explained that the Fire Code requires a minimum of 20 feet of clear access and that the Department is comfortable with any design approach that maintains that standard. He noted that there have been rare occasions when emergency crews were unable to access a medical call due to street conditions but stated that this has not occurred during a fire response. He characterized such situations as exceptions rather than common occurrences.

Motion: Councilor Garrett made a substitute motion to continue the item and requested that staff explore the possibility of creating exceptions to allow 24' roads for the purpose of redevelopment or infill. Councilor Bogdin seconded the motion.

Councilor Hoban expressed uncertainty about whether changes to the code are necessary, noting that the City already allows 24-foot streets but requires no parking in order to meet fire code access standards. He stated that the primary issue appears to be enforcement of existing rules rather than the absence of an option in the code. Councilor Hoban sought clarification on whether the Council's intent would be to generally maintain 30-foot streets with parking on both sides, while allowing 24-foot streets with one-side parking only in limited circumstances such as infill or redevelopment. He indicated that, if that were the intent, staff would likely need additional time to return with a clear recommendation and specific code language outlining when that option would apply. He asked whether the appropriate action would be to continue the item to allow staff to develop that recommendation.

Councilor Christensen stated that he is not in favor of withdrawing the 24-foot street option. He expressed his view that the current code already provides sufficient flexibility and protection, including the ability to allow exceptions for infill and similar projects. He stated that he does not see a need to make changes at this time and supports keeping the existing language as it is.

Mr. Jones asked for clarification on the proposed standards, specifically whether the 400 vehicles-per-day threshold is the sole requirement for allowing a 24-foot street, or if additional criteria would apply.

Chair MacKay stated that, in addition to the 400 vehicles-per-day threshold, additional criteria would need to be included for the use of 24-foot streets. She explained that this option should be limited to infill, redevelopment, or apartment projects where narrower streets are necessary to make a project feasible. She emphasized that this would not apply to large, greenfield developments with ample space and that factors such as the size and context of the development should be considered.

Councilor Whipple confirmed that the substitute motion under discussion would involve adding additional restrictions to the existing requirements for allowing a 24-foot street. She indicated that she is not in favor of adding those additional restrictions.

Chair MacKay called for a vote on the substitute motion.

Vote: The motion passed 4:3 with Councilors Bogdin, Garrett, Hoban, and MacKay in favor. Councilors Christensen, Whipple, and Whitlock opposed.

Councilor Whipple noted that the ordinance includes multiple code updates beyond the discussion related to 24-foot streets. She stated that, to her knowledge, there has been no Council objection to the other proposed changes and emphasized that the item under consideration is broader than the single issue of street width.

Mr. Jones suggested that the Council may want to separate Part One of the ordinance from Part Two when coming back with the requested language. He stated that doing so could allow the Council to address and approve the other proposed updates more efficiently, apart from the discussion related to street width standards.

Melia Dayley, Council Policy Analyst, asked for clarification on what criteria the staff should explore.

Chair MacKay stated that the intent of allowing narrower street options should be limited to situations where they are necessary to make a project feasible, such as unique or constrained infill developments. She referenced past projects where narrow streets were appropriate and still functioned safely with police and fire access. She emphasized that the option should not be used simply for cost savings or developer preference, but rather in cases where the design is required to achieve a viable project. She noted that development professionals are capable of determining when such conditions apply.

Mr. Harrison suggested that council staff work with public works and development services and bring the findings back to a work session to discuss.

Councilor Whipple noted that narrower streets can also be appropriate in areas with steep grades or sloping terrain, where reduced street width can limit excavation and hillside disturbance. She stated that these situations may not fit neatly within an infill or redevelopment category but still justify the use of narrower streets. She also recommended clearly defining the term “redevelopment,” noting that converting large agricultural parcels into housing could technically qualify as redevelopment, even though that may not be the intent. She encouraged careful clarification of terminology to ensure the standards align with the Council’s goals.

With no objections, the Provo Municipal Council adjourned and reconvened as the Redevelopment Agency Governing Board of Provo City with Chair Whipple conducting.

Redevelopment Agency of Provo

6 The election of the Redevelopment Agency of Provo City Chair and Vice Chair. (26-013) **01:55:33**

Mr. Harrison presented. He explained that the RDA bylaws provide that the Chair and Vice Chair of the Municipal Council serve as the Vice Chair and Chair of the RDA Board, respectively. He noted, however, that Provo City Code Title 2.05.020 also allows the RDA Board to elect a Chair and Vice Chair if those Council officers do not wish to serve in the corresponding RDA roles. Mr. Harrison clarified that while the bylaws establish the default arrangement, the RDA Board may elect alternative officers if the Council Vice Chair or Chair declines to serve in the RDA positions.

Board Member Christensen confirmed his willingness to serve as Chair of the Redevelopment Agency Board, and Board Member MacKay confirmed her willingness to serve as Vice Chair of the RDA.

As the default officer assignments under the bylaws were accepted, no election or further action by the RDA Board was required.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by unanimous consent at approximately 7:33 PM.

These minutes were approved by unanimous consent on the 10th day of February, 2026.

X

Heidi Allman
City Recorder