

TMAC Meeting Notes

October 21, 2021 @ 12:00 pm

Online Meeting via Zoom and In-Person at ComDev Conference Room

In Attendance

- TMAC Members: Clancy Black, Joy McMurray, Mitsu Saito (left the meeting at 12:50), James Hamula, David Arnold, and Dave Harding (Council Representative)
- Staff: Bill Peperone, Rob Hunter, Melissa McNalley, Javin Weaver, David Day, Shane Winters, Dixon Holmes, and Robert Mills
- Guests from BYU – BYU Provo Lab Class

Item 1 Discussion of Gateway Project Areas by BYU Provo City Lab Students

Item 2 Discussion and Finalizing Center Street Improvements Recommendation Letter to Council

Since the BYU class doesn't begin until 12:30 the committee will begin with item 2.

Item 2 - Discussion and Finalizing Center Street Improvements Recommendation Letter to Council.

Suggestions from Ms. Urquiaga via email included clustering items that logically go together to make them more manageable. She also recommended visual cues (font or color changes) to indicate the items that may be more controversial. She also recommended the group list their top 10 items, and then rank the items one to five years so the rankings don't look like a 'punch list'.

Mr. Black suggested picking a set of solutions to present to council that make sense. Rather than going through the list like a sort of punch list. He also proposed adding language to the memo to suggest refining the list as a next step.

Mr. Arnold suggested letting the council give direction to the committee on next steps moving forward.

Ms. McMurray suggested the memo include that the committee does not think that all items should happen along Center Street.

Mr. Mills. -important to emphasize that the list is a prioritized list and not a chronological one.

Ms. McMurray –The first column shows the number in order of review. The column should either be hidden or replaced with the ranking order so as not to confuse users of the list. When talking about Entry Arch, the thought was that it was on the west end, but it's written as coming from the east end.

Mr. Arnold suggested leaving the position of the entry arch open for the council to decide where it would be most appropriate.

Mr. Saito – The water feature that will be at the new city center will serve as an entry arch at the west end.

The done/in process items should be updated so that council is aware of that progress. Mr. Hunter stated that all except the signal timing are completed.

Mr. Mills – pause this item and move to item 1.

Item 1 – Discussion of Gateway Project Areas by BYU Provo Lab Students.

Mr. Mills introduced the class explaining that every year Professor Jamin Rowan invites Provo City to participate in his Lab class. This fall semester Provo asked the class to look at elements of the gateways into Provo.

Thomas introduced the project stating the Provo is successful as being more than a college town. He introduced 5 of the gateways in Provo the class are currently studying: Provo Canyon and University Avenue, Geneva Road, Provo Center Street, Lakeview Parkway, South State Street.

Currently the gateways are great at getting cars through. They are also border vacuums that are placeless, underutilized and disconnected from the City.

The Center Street gateway is an example of an unappealing entrance into the city that does not represent the active and vibrant lifestyle found here. You really don't get a sense of the atmosphere of the city until you reach 500 West where people start to get a sense of what makes Provo unique. The freeway at this gateway also serves as a barrier and a disconnect between east and west Provo.

Another issue the class is working on with the gateways is the lack of pedestrian safety. The gateways are primarily car-centric and not pedestrian friendly. The gateway at North University Avenue leading into Provo Canyon was cited as having wonderful amenities with the Provo River Trail but underutilized because of the unsafe feeling for pedestrians. There is no crosswalk and portions of the trail are rundown and overgrown.

The class is working on creative solutions to turn the gateways from border vacuums to nodes.

Mr. Mills pointed out that working on these gateways the class is focusing on more than just aesthetics. The intent of the class study is to turn it over to a consultant in the future to work on an overall gateway plan.

Mr. Hamula stated that he likes this next step regarding a gateway plan, and it dovetails well into the general plan.

Mr. Arnold suggested that the gateways not be uniform but suggests they be unique and speak to their surrounding history and function. He also cautioned against forgetting about the frontrunner gateway as it is not car centric and to make sure pedestrian spaces are remembered as a gateway.

Moving back to item 2:

TMAC members revised the wording of the memo to council, providing clarifying language to the ranks that were given to items and that the ranks do not consider practical implementation and should not be taken as suggestions to implement in a certain order.

Mr. Black wanted to make sure that the message is conveyed that TMAC does not feel that all the projects on the list should be done.

TMAC is supportive of the language and sending the memo and the recommendations to council. Mr. Black asked that the memo be finalized and sent to all members before proceeding to council. Mr. Black stated that if he takes the item to council next week (October 26) he will need to present remotely.

Ms. McMurray stated that she would accompany Mr. Black as the vice chair to the council meeting.

Mr. Black adjourned the meeting.