

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

A RESOLUTION APPROVING AN ADDITION) RESOLUTION NO. 93-1833
OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM CLARK)
COUNTY AND VANCOUVER,)
WASHINGTON TO THE METRO POLICY) Introduced by
ADVISORY COMMITTEE) Councilor Devlin

WHEREAS, Metro's regional planning program requires a partnership with cities, counties, and citizens in the region; and

WHEREAS, the region, if defined by economic, social, and physical measures, includes Southwest Washington as an integral part of the region; and;

WHEREAS, the Metro Charter, in references to Metro's Future Vision and Regional Framework Plan, calls for coordination of planning and growth management efforts; and;

WHEREAS, The Metro Charter requires a Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) for coordination of growth management and planning of the region; and

WHEREAS, the members of MPAC have unanimously approved this change in the membership composition of MPAC as authorized by Section 27(2) of the 1992 Metro Charter and so recommend said changes to the Metro Council; and

WHEREAS, The 1992 Metro Charter requires approval of a majority of the Metro Council for any change in membership for MPAC; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council hereby concurs with the MPAC recommendation and approves the amendment of the membership of MPAC. The Metro Council welcomes the representatives from Clark County and Vancouver, Washington as liaison members of MPAC.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this 9th day of September, 1993.



Judy Wyers, Presiding Officer

STAFF REPORT

RESOLUTION 93-1833, A RESOLUTION APPROVING AN ADDITION OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM CLARK COUNTY AND VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON TO THE METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

August 5, 1993

By: John Fregonese

BACKGROUND

The Metro Charter has created a Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) and the Charter stipulates the committee's membership and representation. There is no representation for any of Southwest Washington stipulated in the Charter. However, the charter does mandate that a representative from Clark County be a member of the Future Vision Commission and it requires that the Regional Framework Plan include coordination with Clark County as an element.

Recently, correspondence from representatives of Southwest Washington local governments requested consideration of membership on the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC).

MPAC, after discussion of the proposal, has recommended that the MPAC membership be augmented by 1 representative from Clark County, Washington and 1 representative from Vancouver, Washington. This is consistent with MPAC's basic structure of a representative from each county and from the largest city in each county. It is MPAC's intent that these representatives would participate in all MPAC activities, but would not have voting status.

An action of this type must be acted on by both the MPAC and the Metro Council in order to have effect. At their July 14, 1993 meeting, MPAC considered membership revision and unanimously agreed to the change, recommending it to the Metro Council.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolution 93-1833, approving a change of composition to the Metro Policy Advisory Committee.



1351 Officers' Row
Vancouver, Washington
98661

206 / 737-6067
206 / 696-1847 fax

Member Jurisdictions

Clark County
City of Vancouver
City of Camas
City of Washougal
City of Battle Ground
City of Ridgefield
Town of Yacolt
Town of La Center
C-TRAN
Washington DOT
Port of Vancouver
Port of Camas-Washougal
Port of Ridgefield
METKO
Oregon DOT

May 10, 1993

Mayor Gussie McRobert
Chair, Metro Policy Advisory Committee
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Dear Mayor McRobert:

As you are well aware, the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan region is facing a number of growth related issues that require the development of new land use and transportation policies. These policies must address needs within each community as well as issues that impact the whole region. From our perspective, major issues such as bi-state transportation accessibility, planning for a north/south high capacity transit corridor, and the development of policies to help direct where growth occurs are all of a scope that require broad participation by jurisdictions across the metropolitan region.

Clark County and the seven cities within the county are currently engaged in a major land use planning process as required by the Growth Management Act (GMA). The interrelationship between the GMA process in Clark County and Metro's 2040 land use planning process is critical to developing metropolitan-wide transportation and land use policies that are mutually supportive. In order to broaden this policy setting base, the RTC Board of Directors is requesting voting membership on the Metro Policy Advisory Committee. This membership request is for two members from Clark County. One position would represent the City of Vancouver, the second would represent Clark County. We feel that these two positions are important in order to adequately represent the diversity of interests within Clark County. The Vancouver seat would represent the central city interests, while the county seat would represent the suburban and rural interests.

We look forward to your consideration and response to this request for membership on the Metro Policy Advisory Committee. Please call if you have questions or would like further information.

Sincerely,

John C. Magnano
Chair, Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Clark County Commissioner

**METRO**

June 8, 1993

The Honorable John C. Magnano, Chair
Southwest Washington Regional
Transportation Council
P.O. Box 5000
Vancouver, WA 98668

Dear Commissioner Magnano:

On behalf of the new Metropolitan Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC), we are encouraged by your interest in coordinating Oregon and Washington growth management efforts. In response to your request, I am submitting to MPAC a change in membership for their consideration (attached) for the addition of two non-voting members. In light of the relationship MPAC has to Metro's planning and service delivery functions, I feel that Clark County voting status on these issues would be inappropriate (a full analysis of the charter as it relates to MPAC is attached). However, I am very interested in having two Clark County representatives be full participants in the MPAC meetings so that we can more effectively deal with the extent to which Oregon land use actions affect Clark County and vice versa.

I have every confidence that we will find this a constructive working relationship. At some time in the future, I think it would be worthwhile revisiting the role of MPAC to provide advice on both Metro and Clark County land use issues and, therefore, the voting status of the two Washington representatives.

Sincerely,

Gussie McRobert, Chair
Metropolitan Policy Advisory Committee

GM:lmk

Enclosures

CC: Metro Council
Rena Cusma



METRO

Date: June 7, 1993
 To: Mark Turpel, Senior Regional Planner
 From: Larry Shaw^{llk}, Senior Assistant Counsel
 Regarding: MPAC BY-LAWS - CLARK COUNTY PARTICIPATION
 Our file: 7.§2.Y

Introduction

As requested by Andy Cotugno, here is a proposed form of MPAC By-Law amendment to add Vancouver-Clark County participation to MPAC in response to their May 10 letter request.

By-Laws Amendment Required

The By-Laws require written notice to all members and alternates at least 30 days prior to proposed action. MPAC members present would receive notice at the meeting. Others could be mailed the proposal to begin the 30 days. The By-Laws contain MPAC membership, including Section 1.d. with non-voting liaison delegates. Therefore, the following form of By-Law amendment is consistent with current By-Laws:

Article III, Section 1, new e. is added as follows:

"e. Clark County, Washington, will participate with the Committee membership with two non-voting liaison delegates, one appointed by the Clark County Commissioners and one appointed by the City Council of the City of Vancouver.

"f. The composition of the MPAC may be changed at any time by a vote of both a majority of the MPAC members and a majority of all Metro Councilors (Section 27 (2))."

MPAC Change of Composition Vote Required

Metro Charter § 27(2) provides for a majority vote of all MPAC members, not just members present, for a "change in composition." Therefore, when this By-Law change is voted, ten (10) votes will be needed. The Metro Council, then, votes to confirm the addition of non-voting delegates under § 27(2).

ds 1614

cc: Andy Cotugno

PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 93-1833, A RESOLUTION APPROVING AN ADDITION OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM CLARK COUNTY AND VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON TO THE METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Date: August 24, 1993

Presented By: Councilor Kvistad

Committee Recommendation: At the August 24 meeting, the Planning Committee voted unanimously to recommend Council adoption of Resolution No. 93-1833. Voting in favor: Councilors Van Bergen, Devlin, Gates, Kvistad, Monroe, and Moore.

Committee Issues/Discussion: Andy Cotugno, Planning Director, presented the staff report. He explained that the resolution was generated by a request from Washington representatives asking for membership on the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC). MPAC discussed the request and voted to allow two "liaison" members; one from the City of Vancouver and one from Clark County, Washington. The Metro Council must jointly approve the change in membership.

As "liaison" members, these members will have all rights except voting; the same as Metro Councilors. There was discussion at MPAC about allowing the new members voting privileges but the idea was rejected because of some of the specific authorities of MPAC.

Councilor Van Bergen asked whether the Bi-State Policy Advisory Committee continues to exist or was it absorbed by creation of MPAC. Councilor Devlin and Andy Cotugno explained that the Bi-State PAC does still exist although it does not meet regularly. It was originally appointed to provide an arena with equal representation between Oregon and Washington. This was intentionally weighed. Membership on MPAC does not allow such equality.

There was no further discussion and the resolution was approved as written. Councilor Van Bergen asked staff to prepare a communication to both the Presiding Officer and to Councilor Ruth McFarland, the Metro Councilor assigned to the Bi-State PAC, asking their opinion as to whether the Bi-State PAC should continue to exist now that MPAC is operational.