

## **Citizen Input Committee**

Missouri Regional Transit Plan

*Kathleen Rose, Chair- Riverside, Mayor*

### **AGENDA**

*9:30 AM, June 9<sup>th</sup>, 2008*

*Mid-America Regional Council*

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Review of May 30<sup>th</sup> Regional Transit Summit meeting
3. Review and Clarify Committee Purpose:

*Purpose: to conduct citizen input meetings and gather input/reaction throughout the region.*

4. Briefly review recent transit engagements and public feedback
5. Identify Citizen Input Needs
6. Identify Process Strategies, Alternatives, and Preferences
7. Begin Formalization of Citizen Input Process
8. Review and Outline Schedule & Next Steps

## **Regional Transit Citizen Input Committee**

Meeting Summary – June 9, 2008

### **Attendees**

MARC –Tom Gerend, Karen Clawson, Julie Wittman, Gerri Doyle, Daniel Cash

KCATA – Jarred Gulbranson

Riverside – Kathy Rose

Raytown – David Bower

Independence – Don Reimal

Lee's Summit – Karen Messerli

Clay County – Craig Porter

Platte County – Tom Pryor

Weatherby Lake – Jerry Bos

### **Review of May 30 meeting**

No Comments

### **Major issues discussed**

The committee discussed the public engagement efforts around the Smart Moves Vision and whether that citizen input could be leveraged for this more specific plan. It was determined that the input from Smart Moves would need to be supplemented by more specific feedback about a formalized plan and regional priorities.

Members of the committee discussed preferences towards planning for a quality engagement process over meeting a deadline for the November ballot. Members thought it would take between 45 and 60 days to complete the public engagement process. At least one month would be needed to assess the plan and answer technical questions before it was released to the public.

Process needs:

- The plan needs to be built on a bottom-up approach. Past experiences in cities like Lee's Summit and Riverside show that public engagement is the key to successful initiatives. The public engagement process may need to be tailored for each community, but should generally follow the same format and ask the same questions. The process should yield feedback beyond approval or disapproval of the plan, but what the different needs in each community are.
- It was noted that elements of the proposed plan may be changed before it goes out to the public for feedback. There are many technical questions that need to be addressed first.
- It was acknowledged that not all parts of the counties will receive service right away. It will be important to convey to outlying communities that any proposal will be a part of a longer-term transit vision and that they would eventually see benefits.
- There was general consensus that the public engagement process should try to capitalize on the momentum around the transit issue.
- The process needs to be inclusive of all stakeholders including state and federal elected officials, chambers, and local businesses.

- The plan needs a name that can be carried through a public participation process and a ballot measure.

Other discussion:

- There was discussion about a need for park and ride lots in many communities. Park and ride lots would provide benefits to communities who may not be directly served by transit service right away. Park and ride lots need to be convenient and accessible to those who live near the lots but also to those commuters who must drive from outlying areas.
- There is a need for a more direct source of information going to local electeds. It was suggested that MARC present regional transit issues to local councils and commissions.

### **Committee assignments**

MARC staff volunteered to draft a preliminary outline for a public engagement process based on committee feedback. This outline will be sent out to committee members prior to the next Citizen Input meeting.

### **Schedule**

Upcoming Citizen Input Committee meetings:

June 16, 2008    9:30    Lewis and Clark Meeting Room, Mid-America Regional Council