

Transportation Mobility Advisory Committee (TMAC) Meeting Minutes

Date: August 20, 2026

Location: Provo City Public Works/Virtual

Chair: Beth Provence

1. Introductions – TMAC Chair Beth Provence

Chair Beth Provence welcomed attendees to the August 20, 2026, meeting of the Transportation and Mobility Advisory Commission (TMAC). The meeting was called to order, and introductions were conducted. Members were asked to disclose any conflicts of interest. No conflicts of interest were reported by the participating members.

- **TMAC Members Present:**

Beth Provence - District 3, Committee Chair

Noah Gordon – District 4, Committee Vice Chair

Ryan Koller – District 4 (Alternate)

David Keller – District 5

Kendall Thurston – District 2

Greg MacFarlane – Transportation Academia

David Hurtado – District 1, Business Community Representative

Jim Brookart – District 5 (Alternate)

- **Provo City Staff and Guests Present:**

Ashley Suyak – Public Works, Executive Office Assistant

Joseph Gandy – Public Works, Management Analyst/Public Information

Vern Keeslar – Public Works, Traffic Manager

Kaehan Shour - Public Works, Engineer

Hannah Salzl – Development Services, Planner/Planning and Sustainability

Katrice MacKay – City Council

Rachel Whipple – City Council (Virtual)

Sergeant Brough – City Police Department

Lynn Morrison - Pleasantview Neighborhood

Kathleen Lewis - Pleasantview Neighborhood

Richard Jensen – Pleasantview Neighborhood

2. Action Item – Approve Minutes from June 11, 2026

The Commission reviewed the minutes from the June 11, 2026, meeting.

Motion: A motion was made by Kendall Thurston to approve the June 11, 2026, meeting minutes.

Second: Greg McFarlane seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously, with no opposition recorded.

3. East-West Accessibility Analysis – Greg MacFarlane

Presenter: Greg MacFarlane, BYU Civil Engineering

Greg MacFarlane presented an illustrative analysis of east-west accessibility in Provo. The presentation explored how transportation networks and the location of community destinations affect residents' ability to access essential services and activities.

A. Mobility and Accessibility

The presentation distinguished between mobility and accessibility:

- **Mobility** refers to the movement of people and vehicles through the transportation system, including traffic flow and travel speeds.
- **Accessibility** refers to the ability to reach desired destinations, such as schools, grocery stores, parks, retail establishments, and transportation nodes, within a reasonable travel time.

Mr. MacFarlane emphasized that transportation planning should consider both the movement of traffic and the ability of residents to reach the places they need and want to go.

B. Illustrative Accessibility Methodology

The analysis used hypothetical travel-time thresholds and selected destinations to demonstrate how accessibility could be measured. The presenter explained that the analysis was intended as an illustration rather than a finalized study or basis for immediate policy decisions.

The destinations and illustrative travel-time thresholds included:

Destination	Illustrative Travel-Time Threshold
Elementary schools	5 minutes
Transportation nodes, including I-15 interchanges and FrontRunner stations	15 minutes
Retail stores	10 minutes
Grocery stores	10 minutes
Parks	5 minutes

The analysis used destination data from OpenStreetMap and a highway network from the Wasatch Front Travel Demand Model based on its 2019 calibration scenario. The presenter noted that the network and destination data had limitations and did not include every local street or reflect the most current conditions.

C. Baseline Accessibility Findings

The presentation examined existing accessibility throughout Provo and identified variations among neighborhoods.

Key observations included:

- Grocery store accessibility was generally stronger near Orem and in central Provo, while some areas, including the southeast portion of Provo, had more limited access.
- Central Provo demonstrated strong access to elementary schools due to the number of schools and their distribution.
- Neighborhoods near the city's edges generally had fewer accessible elementary schools within the selected travel-time threshold.
- The Oak Hills and Tree Streets neighborhoods demonstrated relatively poor access to transportation nodes.
- Some areas of west Provo had strong access to transportation nodes.

The presenter explained that accessibility scores could be combined into a composite measure using different weights for various destination categories. The weights used in this illustration were hypothetical and could be adjusted in a future analysis.

D. East-West Corridor Scenarios

Mr. MacFarlane evaluated three existing east-west corridors to illustrate how roadway performance could affect accessibility:

1. 2200 North between University Parkway and Timpview Drive.
2. 700/800 North between Geneva Road and 900 East.
3. Center Street between Geneva Road and 900 East.

The analysis examined hypothetical changes to roadway speeds and congestion. The presenter clarified that the scenarios represented simplified roadway conditions and did not model all intersection delays or detailed traffic operations.

2200 North

The analysis indicated that improving roadway speeds along 2200 North would provide relatively small accessibility benefits concentrated among a limited number of households, particularly near the mouth of Rock Canyon and the Oak Hills area.

The presenter also demonstrated that significantly worsening roadway conditions could produce broader and more substantial negative impacts on accessibility.

700/800 North

The analysis showed that improving roadway conditions along 700/800 North could provide benefits across a wider area of Provo, including access to parks, schools, retail, and transportation nodes.

Compared with the 2200 North scenario, the effects appeared more broadly distributed across the city.

Center Street

The analysis examined a hypothetical increase in roadway speeds along Center Street. The presenter noted that some residents could experience accessibility improvements, while others might see limited benefits or decreases, depending on their location and proximity to the corridor.

The discussion recognized that improving traffic flow along Center Street could have implications for downtown businesses and the character of the corridor.

E. Land Use and Grocery Store Accessibility

The presentation also explored how changes in land use could affect accessibility without modifying the roadway network.

Three hypothetical grocery stores were added to the analysis:

- West Center Street, west of I-15.
- Near 900 East, in the vicinity of the VASA location.
- On State Street in the southeast portion of Provo.

The analysis indicated that adding grocery stores in these locations could substantially improve grocery store accessibility for residents throughout the city. The presenter explained that locating destinations closer to residents could reduce the need for longer trips and potentially reduce transportation demand.

Commission members discussed the relationship between grocery store locations, consumer preferences, business viability, and the role of cities in influencing land use and development.

F. Discussion and Commission Comments

Commission members discussed several implications of the analysis:

- Accessibility analysis can help identify who benefits from transportation improvements and how widely those benefits are distributed.
- Traditional level-of-service analysis primarily evaluates traffic flow and roadway performance, whereas accessibility analysis can provide additional insight into residents' ability to reach destinations.
- Transportation improvements should be evaluated alongside land-use decisions, including the location of grocery stores, employment, and other essential services.
- Downtown Provo requires careful consideration of both transportation access and the potential effects of increased vehicle speeds on businesses and the pedestrian environment.
- Transportation planning should consider access to major transportation nodes, including freeway interchanges and rail stations.
- Employment accessibility is more complex to measure because residents have different job locations and employment needs.

- An activity-based transportation model could provide more detailed information about how network changes affect individual residents' actual daily trips.

The Commission discussed the potential value of using accessibility analysis alongside traditional transportation studies to support more comprehensive planning decisions.

G. Follow-Up and Potential Distribution

The Commission expressed interest in sharing the presentation with the Provo City Council for informational purposes.

Mr. McFarland agreed to provide a PDF version or link to the presentation. The Commission also discussed the importance of considering accessibility and land use in future transportation planning and engineering analyses.

No formal motion to transmit the presentation was recorded in the transcription.

4. Engineering Project Updates – Engineering Staff

Engineering staff provided updates on several ongoing projects.

A. State Street Trail Update

Staff reported that the project encountered a storm drain issue requiring redesign. The redesign took approximately two weeks, and work resumed following approval of the change.

B. 600 South Trail Update

The trail project extending from 100 East/100 West toward 800 East was reported to be progressing through construction. Staff noted that the railroad had cooperated with the project.

C. 820 North Bridge Update

The 820 North bridge and trail ribbon-cutting event was scheduled for Saturday, August 22, 2026.

The planned event schedule included:

- 11:00 a.m. — Bike decorating.
- 11:30 a.m. — Remarks from the Mayor and Public Works Director.
- 11:45 a.m. — Ribbon cutting, followed by a ride beneath the bridge.

Staff noted that the project was completed approximately three weeks later than anticipated for the roadway and six weeks later than anticipated for the trail. The extended closure helped protect artwork installed beneath the bridge during construction.

The project was reported to be under budget. Dave Michelsen was recognized for his work as project manager.

D. University Avenue Bridge Replacement Update

Staff provided a brief update on the bridge replacement project near the university. The discussion noted the ongoing placement of bridge beams and continued progress on construction.

E. 2026 Sidewalk Improvements Update

Engineering staff presented updates on sidewalk, curb and gutter, and ADA ramp improvement projects.

- **Franklin Neighborhood CDBG Project**

The project targeted 12 intersections in the Franklin neighborhood and included:

- Installation of 32 new ADA ramps.
- Improvements to sidewalks at the targeted intersections.

The project was reported to have received approximately \$150,000 in CDBG funding. Staff indicated that approximately \$35,000–\$40,000 in remaining funding was transferred to another CDBG application for the Foothills neighborhood.

- **Foothills Neighborhood Improvements**

The Foothills project, located near the new Wasatch Elementary School, included:

- Installation of 14 new ADA ramps.
- Sidewalk, curb, and gutter improvements.
- Improvements along 1250 East.
- Spot improvements at selected intersections.
- Corrections to drainage and ADA compliance issues.

Staff explained that improvements along 1250 East addressed sidewalk and driveway slope requirements and improved accessibility and drainage conditions.

Additional residents expressed interest in receiving similar improvements on other portions of the street. Staff indicated that future funding applications could support additional improvements, subject to available funding.

- **900 East and 900 South Sidewalk Improvement Project**

The 900 East and 900 South project was funded through the City's capital funding rather than a CDBG application.

Improvements included:

- New sidewalk.
- New curb and gutter.
- ADA ramp improvements.
- Two new driveway accesses in response to resident requests.
- Installation of a new cross gutter.
- Improvements addressing a significant sidewalk connectivity issue.

Staff reported that the project was completed successfully and that residents on the opposite side of the road had expressed interest in similar improvements.

- **Upcoming CDBG Projects**

Staff reported that two additional CDBG applications had been approved for future projects.

- **Southeast Provo Neighborhood**

- Approximately \$250,000 in funding.
- Improvements associated with a proposed private development and surrounding city intersections.
- Anticipated improvements include curb and gutter, driveways, stormwater work, ADA improvements, and related intersection improvements.

- **Dixon Neighborhood**

- Approximately \$150,000 in funding.
- Proposed improvements similar to those completed in the Franklin neighborhood.

- Approximately 80 ADA ramps were identified for improvement or replacement, including locations where ramps are missing or do not meet current standards.

Staff indicated that design work for these projects was anticipated for the following year.

- **ADA Ramp Design Considerations**

Commission members and staff discussed the complexity of designing ADA ramps and related improvements within existing neighborhoods.

Staff explained that retrofit projects often require careful coordination with existing sidewalks, driveways, curb and gutter, drainage, and roadway grades. The discussion highlighted the additional challenges associated with bringing existing infrastructure into compliance compared with designing new infrastructure.

Staff described how the 1250 East improvements required transitions and adjustments to meet slope requirements while minimizing the amount of curb and gutter replacement due to funding limitations.

5. Adjourn

The Chair asked Commission members to consider the information presented throughout the year regarding east-west connectivity and prepare their final thoughts, major points, potential ideas, and recommendations for discussion at the next meeting. The meeting was adjourned following completion of the agenda at 1:31 PM.