

**JOINT MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT**  
**REGIONAL POLICY**  
**ADVISORY COMMITTEE**                      **METRO POLICY**  
**ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1993**  
**5:00-6:30 P.M. ROOM 440, METRO CENTER**

## AGENDA:

## I. WELCOME/INTRODUCTIONS

## II. APPROVAL OF RPAC MINUTES FOR JANUARY 13, 1993 MEETING (MATERIALS ATTACHED)

### III. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

## IV. IMPLEMENTATION OF MPAC (MATERIALS ATTACHED)

## V. RECONSIDERATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT DUES (MATERIALS ATTACHED)

## VI. DISCUSSION OF URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY AND COLUMBIA RIVER SHORELINE

**All parking spaces are available for public use at 5:00 pm. Please let us know if you cannot make it. Thanks!!!**

**Regional Policy Advisory Committee**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**January 13, 1993**

Members in attendance included: Committee Chairman Jim Gardner, Jerry Arnold, Councilman Earl Blumenauer, Mayor Robert Drake, Councilor Richard Devlin, Councilman Jack Gallagher, Darlene Hooley, Chris Foster, Gretchen Kafoury, Richard Kidd, Robert Liddell, Peggy Lynch, Councilor Susan McLain, Mayor Gussie McRobert, Mayor Alice Schlenker, Councilman Bruce Thompson, Chris Utterback and Jim Zehren.

Others in attendance included: Councilor Mike Gates, Councilor John Kvistad, Commissioner John Reeves, Greg Chew, Jeff Condit, Andy Cotugno, John Fregonese, Clay Morehead, Vergie Ries, Al Siddall, Larry Shaw, Mary Weber and Mark Turpel.

RPAC was convened by Chairman Gardner at 5:12 p.m., Wednesday, January 13, 1993 in room 440, Metro Center.

I. Chairman Gardner asked for amendments to the meeting summary for the December 9, 1992 RPAC meeting as included in the packet. Hearing no changes, the meeting summary was approved as submitted.

II. Chairman Gardner asked if there were any communications from members of the public on items other than those on the agenda. Hearing none, he moved to the next agenda item.

III. Chairman Gardner asked Metro Senior Legal Counsel to brief the RPAC members about Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) and RPAC provisions.

Larry Shaw referred to the meeting packet that contained his January 5 memo. He summarized the memo and described the differences between the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO), which provided for the RPAC and its duties and responsibilities and the Metro Charter, which provided for similar, but different duties and responsibilities for MPAC.

Chairman Gardner stated that as of this evening, only a handful of MPAC appointments had been made and that it was likely that most would be completed by end of January.

Councilor Devlin asked if anything had been heard about appointments from the special districts.

Andy Cotugno indicated that in conversations with Noel Klein, the special district appointments were expected by the end of the month.

Larry Shaw stated he had talked to Burton Weast and that the three members had been appointed and they were waiting for an invitation to participate.

Mayor Schlenker stated that she had procedural questions. Where were the letters of

appointment to go, what would be the process for notification, etc? She asked who is in charge of MPAC, who is the contact?

Jim Gardner stated that these matters had not yet been decided, but for the present, the contact would be Andy Cotugno. Chairman Gardner also indicated that Metro would convene the first MPAC meeting and from then on, it would be up to MPAC members to decide what their process would be.

Mayor Schlenker asked whether there would be different staff support.

Councilor Devlin stated that Metro did not want to appear as though it was overpowering the MPAC committee and that as a consequence, some decisions were being deferred to MPAC. As a result, answers to some questions she raised were unclear at this time.

Chairman Gardner indicated that Metro was waiting for MPAC to make these types of decisions.

Mayor McRobert stated that as a member of the Charter Committee, it was felt that the Charter was not the place for administrative details that would unnecessarily lengthen and complicate the Charter. She stated there was no need to change the existing structure to accommodate MPAC, that it doesn't have to be complex.

Chairman Gardner stated that Metro is reluctant to say "this is MPAC". He indicated that MPAC membership could be many of the same people as RPAC, although MPAC included some representatives that RPAC did not and vice-versa.

Andy Cotugno stated that there had not been responses from the "cities of.." category members.

Councilman Kidd stated that it would take until the end of the month for Washington County.

Mayor Schlenker stated she and Heather Crissman would be representing Lake Oswego and that she thought that the cities of Clackamas County would have their representatives chosen by the end of the month.

IV. Chairman Gardner called for Andy Cotugno to make a presentation about the Region 2040 phase II work program.

Andy Cotugno stated that the work program assumes that the first 6 months of the fiscal year was funded by existing remaining funds already committed and that the second half of the work program for the first half of next fiscal year would be supplemented with federal transportation funds as well as financial commitments by existing funders at rates commensurate with the present fiscal year participation. He stated that the next step would be preparation of an RFP.

A revised version of the work program dated January 13, 1993 was distributed and Andy



Cotugno asked John Fregonese to present the program.

Councilwoman Kafoury asked what the difference was between the two versions.

John Fregonese stated that there were only two differences the newer version contained a budget and the newer version included a reference to the Future Vision, as Metro Charter provision. He summarized the memo and included a description of the sketch modeling work that would allow for several variations to the overall growth concepts to be built and evaluated. He also described the timeline, and how hypothetical illustrations of growth concepts would be prepared so that people would have a visual image of how each growth choice might work.

Jim Zehren asked about the difference between Future Vision, as described in the Metro Charter and the Region 2040 process.

Andy Cotugno stated that it was a question of details. He indicated that the Charter defines the Future Vision as conceptual, not as a land use decision, as a basis of the framework plan. He stated that he was not sure where you draw the line between the two, that the two efforts would will be integrated.

Chairman Gardner asked what was the timing on completion of evaluation criteria.

John Fregonese stated that some evaluation criteria would be part of the sketch level work and be ready for consideration right away. The balance of criteria would be completed by a consultant and that he expected that work to begin in March.

Councilor Devlin stated that there was a great deal of diversity throughout the region and asked whether there will be an effort to make visual examples include a variety of natural landforms and land use patterns, so that people can have some identification with the concepts.

John Fregonese stated every attempt would be made but that there were limitation to illustrations of 1 square mile in size to show all possible land form and land use pattern combinations.

Andy Cotugno stated the budget is based on 4 scenarios, but that the Committee may want to look at 2-3 square mile areas evolving over time. He also indicated an interest in having this work better describe what these concepts look and feel like, perhaps using some of the results from the Visual Preference Survey (VPS).

Mayor Liddell asked when the VPS flyer went out.

Mark Turpel responded that it was made available to all of the planning directors of the region last Friday.

Jim Zehren stated that the process is driven by type and number of growth options and that he



was concerned that evaluation criteria are seen as a technical process. He indicated that he believed that the evaluation criteria are a decision for regional community. He stated that the *Oregon Benchmarks* were not mentioned and that to define community values, there should be an effort to do so in terms of the most critical issues such as air quality, housing affordability, etc.

John Fregonese stated values were included in the work program memo and that the agreed that these criteria were not this is not just a technical issue, rather one of broader concern, when the more detailed concepts were considered.

Councilor McLain stated that the criteria must be made available upfront, before starting evaluation, adjusting as we evaluate the growth concepts.

Andy Cotugno stated that the work program should describe the evaluation criteria and the point when the concepts were culled as decisions points, not just as activities.

Mayor Schlenker stated that she was very interested in how the Region 2040 process affected the Urban Growth Boundary and stated that the decisions here will drive urban reserves decisions in 1994.

John Fregonese said the state calls for an urban reserves decision in 1994, that this could not be determined until a decision is made about the preferred urban form and shape.

Mayor Schlenker stated that she'd like the 1 square mile illustration to include a stretch of the Willamette River - as it touches many communities in the region.

Andy Cotugno stated he would like to build on UGB decision(s) at end of Phase II. He indicated that the list of decisions to be made at the end of Phase II is huge. He stated that the Urban Reserve decision was a parcel-by-parcel decision and that there was a need for a preferred concept decision to be made first, with finer and finer levels of detail in later decisions.

Councilman Kidd stated that there was little discussion of urban resources in Phase I or Phase II.

Andy Cotugno stated the idea was that in the Phase II work effort the urban form decision would be made and then in the Phase III work effort, the overall urban form decision would be converted into a parcel-by-parcel decision.

Chairman Gardner stated says that some cynics have said that for all of this work to be completed, it will take too long. Can there be a basic decision sooner?

Andy Cotugno responded that it could, that nothing prevented the acceleration of some elements, if deemed critical. He also indicated that in only 11 months, the region would be asked to make

some very fundamental decisions, such as, is the Stafford Basin "off limits", or some portion, etc.

Chairman Gardner stated that discussion ought to involve as many citizens as possible, but the urgency that some people in this room may agree about the problem may not be shared by everyone in the region.

Mayor Liddell stated that he was at Robinwood neighborhood meeting in West Linn with Mark Turpel last night and that there were concerns expressed about growth. However, he stated that there is a need to have an ongoing factual information flow about what is going on - don't hide information. He stated that the time is now to begin informing people about these decisions.

Chairman Gardner stated that he agreed that public involvement is very important, but that there was a need to be careful with resources. He stated that he is asking Metro's Citizen Coordination and Involvement committee (CCI) about how best to provide for public involvement.

Councilor Devlin stated that there was a common frustration with planning, that is, plans are finished and put on a shelf. In contrast, he indicated that the RUGGO were dynamic and depicted some of the values of the community. He indicated that community values were always a primary concern in the work effort and would continue to be.

Mayor Drake stated that the City of Beaverton neighborhood organizations were very useful, but that they shouldn't rely too heavily on them to get the message out. He stated that there was a need for a media blitz or something to get the word out, many people don't want to know about an issue unless its in their own backyard.

Peggy Lynch stated that this concern is part of the Visual Preference Survey and media blitz. She stated that the CCI provides a network and large potential for getting the word out.

V. Chairman Gardner stated that there was a need to address one more agenda item, local government dues. He stated that statutory authority to collect them remained through the end of the existing fiscal year. He stated that and that there may be interest in seeking to continue this. He stated that in the past, Metro has used RPAC and JPACT as advisory committees to consider this kind of action.

Mayor McRobert stated that on page 5 and 6 of the Charter, the Charter committee had discussed dues and the concept was that only those taxes explicitly listed would be those which Metro would be authorized to collect and that list doesn't include dues. She stated that local government dues would have to be authorized by the State Legislature and this seemed contrary to the spirit of the Metro Charter, which was to have the people of the region decide issues, not the Legislature.

Mayor Schlenker stated that there was a need to have this issue examined by legal authorities.

Andy Cotugno stated that he had heard another version of why the dues were not mentioned in the charter. He stated that at one time a charter draft explicitly said that dues were not to be collected and that this language was deleted.

Chairman Gardner stated that he saw a need to have an attorney look at the issue.

Councilor McLain stated that the January 23rd work session of the Metro Council was scheduled for a discussion of taxes and that the Metro Councilors would appreciate some help about what RPAC members visualize as possible solutions so that Metro Councilors will be better prepared for the work session.

Mayor Schlenker stated that Greg Chew could provide documents about the legislative intent.

Councilor Devlin stated there was need of further research and that there may be a need for further statutory authority.

Chairman Gardner stated that the purpose on putting on this issue on the agenda was the need to begin the discussion. He stated that there seemed to be a need for further information.

Andy Cotugno stated to meet the March 1 deadline, it meant starting right away - next week - to get onto mailings and committee agendas.

Chairman Gardner stated that there were also priorities to the programs and that the issue will come back at February RPAC meeting.

Commissioner Hooley asked what would be the process. Would there be a joint meeting, a combination MPAC/RPAC? She asked whether RPAC would vote to transition to MPAC.

Chairman Gardner stated that to accomplish this change would need an amendment to the RUGGO, and that this would require coordination with RPAC.

Peggy Lynch stated that she was reluctant to have only one committee until there was a decision about membership.

Chairman Gardner stated that it was possible to hold a joint meeting.

Councilman Kidd stated MPAC does not have RPAC authority. He stated that Unless Metro Council approves a change he didn't see MPAC running full bore until the issue was resolved.

Councilor Devlin stated that it could be done quickly and easily. He indicated that RUGGO changes have to go to RPAC.

Larry Shaw stated that he would prepare a draft ordinance for consideration at the next RPAC



meeting.

Peggy Lynch asked if there could be two names or versions of the ordinance.

Larry Shaw responded there could be blanks that could be filled in as the committee saw fit.

Peggy Lynch stated that the February 3rd VPS in Hillsboro was not listed on the VPS flyer.

Chairman Gardner adjourned the meeting at 6:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Mark Turpel.

DRAFT

## Metro Policy Advisory Committee By-Laws

### Article I

This Committee shall be known as the METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (MPAC) created by Section 27 of the 1992 Metro Charter.

### Article II Mission and Purpose

Section 1. The mission of MPAC is consultation and advice on the regional framework plan and any other duties that the Council prescribes as part of a participatory regional planning partnership. MPAC has the further responsibility of acting on Metro assumption of a local government function.

Section 2. The purposes of MPAC are as follows:

- a. To provide advice and recommendations for the development and review of Metro's regional planning activities, including implementation of the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives, development of new functional plans, and periodic review of the region's urban growth boundary.
- b. To create a forum for identifying and discussing areas and activities of metropolitan significance.
- c. To involve all cities, counties, and other interests in the development and implementation of growth management strategies.
- d. To coordinate its activities with the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) so that regional transportation planning is linked and consistent with regional growth management efforts.
- e. To review and comment, as needed, on the regional land use and growth management issues affecting or affected by local comprehensive plans or plans of state and regional agencies. MPAC is not intended to routinely review land use decisions or plan amendments in the region.
- f. To discuss and make recommendations on land use and growth management issues of regional or subregional significance.
- g. To establish a coordinating link with Vancouver and Clark County, Washington, and other parts of the state of Oregon to address land use and growth management issues of common interest.

Article III  
Committee Membership

Section 1.     Membership

- a.     The Committee will be made up of representatives of the following:

Multnomah County Commission	1
Second Largest City in Multnomah County	1
Other Cities in Multnomah County	1
Special District in Multnomah County	1
 City of Portland	 2
 Clackamas County Commission	 1
Largest City in Clackamas County	1
Other Cities in Clackamas County	1
Special District in Clackamas County	1
 Washington County Commission	 1
Largest City in Washington County	1
Other Cities in Washington County	1
Special District in Washington County	1
 Metro Council	 2
 Tri-Met	 1
 State Agency Council	 1
 Citizens of Metro	 <u>3</u>
 Total	 21

b.     Members representing jurisdictions shall be appointed from among members of the governing body.

c.     Alternates qualified to be members shall be appointed to serve in the absence of the regular members.

d.     Members and alternates shall be capable of representing the policy interests of their jurisdiction, agency, or constituency at all meetings of the Committee.



## Section 2.     Appointment of Members and Alternates

a.     Members and alternates from the City of Portland, the counties of Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington, and the largest cities of Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington Counties, excluding Portland, shall be appointed by the jurisdiction. The member and alternate will serve until removed by the appointing jurisdiction.

b.     Members and alternates from the cities of Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington Counties, excluding Portland and the remaining largest city from each county, will be appointed jointly by the governing bodies of those cities represented. The member and alternate will be from different jurisdictions. The member and alternate will serve two-year terms unless other action is taken by the appointing authority. In the event the member's position is vacated, the alternate will automatically become member and complete the original term of office.

c.     Members and alternates from the special districts with territory in Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington Counties will be appointed by \_\_\_\_\_. The member and alternate will serve two-year terms unless other action is taken by the appointing authority. In the event the member's position is vacated, the alternate will automatically become member and complete the original term of office.

d.     Members and alternates from the Metro Council will be appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Metro Council and will represent a broad cross-section of geographic areas. The members and alternates will serve until removed by the Presiding Officer of the Metro Council.

e.     Members and alternates representing citizens will be appointed by the Metro Executive Officer and confirmed by the Metro Council consistent with Section 27(1)(m) of the 1992 Metro Charter.

f.     Members and alternates from the Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon will be appointed by the governing body of that District. The member and alternate will serve until removed by the governing body.

g.     Members and alternates from the State Agency Council will be chosen by the Chairperson of that body. The member and alternate will serve until removed by the Chairperson.

Article IV  
Meetings, Conduct of Meetings, and Quorum

- a. Regular meetings of the Committee shall be held monthly at a time and place established by the Chairperson. Special or emergency meetings may be called by the Chairperson or a majority of the members of the Committee.
- b. A majority of the members (or designated alternates) shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of business. The act of a majority of those present at meetings at which a quorum is present shall be the act of the Committee.
- c. Subcommittees to develop recommendations for MPAC may be appointed by the Chairperson. The Chairperson will consult with the full membership of the Committee at a regularly scheduled meeting on subcommittee membership and charge. Subcommittee members shall include MPAC members and/or alternates, and can include outside experts.
- d. All meetings shall be conducted in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised.
- e. The Committee may establish other rules of procedure as deemed necessary for the conduct of business.
- f. Unexcused absence from regularly scheduled meetings for three (3) consecutive months shall require the Chairperson to notify the appointing body with a request for remedial action.
- g. The Committee shall make its reports and findings public and shall forward them to the Metro Council.
- h. Metro shall provide staff, as necessary, to record the actions of the Committee and to handle Committee business, correspondence, and public information.

Article V  
Officers and Duties

- a. The Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson shall be designated by \_\_\_\_\_.
- b. The Chairperson shall preside at all meetings, and shall be responsible for the expeditious conduct of the Committee's business.
- c. In the absence of the Chairperson, the Vice-Chairperson shall assume the duties of the Chairperson.

Article VI  
Technical Advisory Committees

- a. The Committee shall solicit and take into consideration the alternatives and recommendations of the appropriate technical advisory committees in the conduct of its business.
- b. Existing technical advisory committees for solid waste, urban growth management, water resources, and natural areas will be continued to advise on their respective subject areas.
- c. The Metro Council or the Committee can appoint special technical advisory committees as the Council or Committee determine a need for such bodies.

Article VII  
Amendments

- a. These By-Laws may be amended by a majority vote of the full membership of the Committee.
- b. Written notice must be delivered to all members and alternates at least 30 days prior to any proposed action to amend the By-Laws.

dr  
1535



DRAFT

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE  
REGIONAL URBAN GROWTH GOALS  
AND OBJECTIVES (RUGGO)  
ORDINANCE TO SUBSTITUTE MPAC  
FOR RPAC

) ORDINANCE NO. \_\_\_\_\_  
)  
) Introduced by  
) \_\_\_\_\_  
)

WHEREAS, The Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGO) in Metro Ordinance No. 91-418B were adopted September 21, 1991; and

WHEREAS, Goal I, Objective 2 establishes a Regional Policy Advisory Committee (RPAC) for a regional partnership approach; and

WHEREAS, The 1992 Metro Charter made a new Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) effective January 1, 1993; and

WHEREAS, MPAC has approved a change of composition under Metro Charter Section 27(2); and

WHEREAS, The Metro Council desires to substitute MPAC for RPAC as the regional partner advisory committee in RUGGO; now, therefore,

THE METRO COUNCIL ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. RUGGO, Goal I, Objective 2 is amended to read:

"Objective 2. Regional Metro Policy Advisory Committee

The 1992 Metro Council shall Charter has established a Regional the Metro Policy Advisory Committee to:

- 2.i. assist with the development and review of Metro's regional planning activities pertaining to land use and growth management, including review and implementation of these goals and objectives, present and prospective functional planning, and management and review of the region's urban growth boundary;
- 2.ii. serve as a forum for identifying and discussing areas and activities of metropolitan or subregional significance; and
- 2.iii. provide an avenue for involving all cities and counties and other interests in the development and implementation of growth management strategies.

**2.1. Regional Metro Policy Advisory Committee Composition.** The Regional ~~initial Metro~~ Policy Advisory Committee (RMPAC) shall be chosen according to the ~~by laws adopted by the Metro Council. The voting membership shall include elected officials of cities, counties and the Metro Council, as well as representatives of the state of Oregon and citizens~~ Metro Charter and, thereafter, according to any changes approved by majorities of MPAC and the Metro Council. The composition of the Committee shall reflect the partnership that must exist among implementing jurisdictions in order to effectively address areas and activities of metropolitan significance, ~~with a majority of the voting members being elected officials from within the Metro district boundaries.~~

**2.2. Advisory Committees.** The Metro Council, or the Regional ~~Metro~~ Policy Advisory committee consistent with the RMPAC by-laws, shall appoint technical

advisory committees as the council or the Regional Metro Policy Advisory Committee determine a need for such bodies.

**2.3. Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT).** JPACT, with the Metro Council, shall continue to perform the functions of the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization as required by federal transportation planning regulations. JPACT and the Regional Metro Policy Advisory Committee shall develop a coordinated process, to be approved by the Metro Council, to assure that regional land use and transportation planning remains consistent with these goals and objectives and with each other."

Section 2. RUGGO, Goal I, Objective 3.iii. is amended to read:

"3.iii. The Regional Metro Policy Advisory Committee may identify and propose issues of regional concern, related to or derived from these goals and objectives, for consideration by cities and counties at the time of periodic review of their adopted and acknowledged comprehensive plans."

Section 3. RUGGO, Goal I, Objective 3.3 is amended to read:

"3.3. **Periodic Review of Comprehensive Land Use Plans.** At the time of periodic review for comprehensive land use plans in the region the Regional Metro Policy Advisory Committee:



3.3.1. Shall assist Metro with the identification of functional plan provisions or changes in functional plans adopted since the last periodic review for inclusion in periodic review notices as changes in law; and

3.3.2. May provide comments during the periodic review of adopted and acknowledged comprehensive plans on issues of regional concern."

Section 4. RUGGO, Goal I, Objective 5.2 is amended to read:

"5.2. New Functional Plans. New functional plans shall be proposed from one of two sources:

5.2.1. The Regional Metro Policy Advisory Committee may recommend that the Metro Council designate an area or activity of metropolitan significance for which a functional plan should be prepared; or

5.2.2. The Metro Council may propose the preparation of a functional plan to designate an area or activity of metropolitan significance, and refer that proposal to the Regional Metro Policy Advisory Committee.

Upon the Metro Council adopting factual reasons for the development of a new functional plan, the Regional Metro Policy Advisory Committee shall oversee participate in the preparation of the plan, consistent with these goals and objectives and the reasons cited by the Metro Council. After preparing preparation of the plan and seeking broad public and local government consensus, using existing citizen involvement processes established by cities, counties, and Metro, the Regional Metro

Policy Advisory Committee shall ~~present~~ ~~review~~ the plan and its ~~make a~~ recommendations- to the Metro Council. The Metro Council may act to resolve conflicts or problems impeding the development of a new functional plan and may act ~~to oversee preparation of the plan should such conflicts or problems prevent complete~~ the plan if the Regional ~~Metro~~ Policy Advisory Committee from completing its work is unable to complete its review in a timely or orderly manner.

The Metro Council shall hold a public hearing on the proposed plan and afterwards shall:

5.2.A. Adopt the proposed functional plan; or

5.2.B. Refer the proposed functional plan to the Regional ~~Metro~~ Policy Advisory Committee in order to consider amendments to the proposed plan prior to adoption; or

5.2.C. Amend and adopt the proposed functional plan; or

5.2.D. Reject the proposed functional plan. The proposed functional plan shall be adopted by ordinance and shall include findings of consistency with these goals and objectives."

Section 5. RUGGO, Goal I, Objective 5.3.2. through 5.3.4 is amended to read:

"5.3.2. After Metro staff review, the Regional ~~Metro~~ Policy Advisory Committee shall consult the affected jurisdictions and attempt to resolve any apparent or potential inconsistencies.

5.3.3. The Regional Metro Policy Advisory Committee shall conduct a public hearing and make a report to the Metro Council regarding instances and reasons why a city or county has not adopted changes consistent with recommendations in a regional functional plan.

5.3.4. The Metro Council shall review the Regional Metro Policy Advisory Committee report and hold a public hearing on any unresolved issues. The council may decide to:

5.3.4.a. Amend the adopted regional functional plan; or

5.3.4.b. Initiate proceedings to require a comprehensive plan change; or find there is no inconsistency between the comprehensive plan(s) and the functional plan."

Section 6. RUGGO, Goal I, Objective 6 is amended to read:

**"Objective 6. Amendments to the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives**

The Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives shall be reviewed at regular intervals or at other times determined by the Metro Council after consultation with or upon the suggestion of the Regional Metro Policy Advisory Committee. Any review and amendment process shall involve a broad cross-section of citizen and jurisdictional interests and shall be conducted by involve the Regional Metro Policy Advisory Committee consistent with Goal I: Regional Planning Process. Proposals for amendments shall receive broad public and local government review prior to final Metro Council action.



**6.1. Impact of Amendments.** At the time of adoption of amendments to these goals and objectives, the Metro Council shall determine whether amendments to adopted functional plans or the acknowledged regional urban growth boundary are necessary. If amendments to adopted functional plans are necessary, the Metro Council shall act on amendments to applicable functional plans. The council shall request recommendations from the Regional Metro Policy Advisory Committee before taking action. All amendment proposals will include the date and method through which they may become effective, should they be adopted. Amendments to the acknowledged regional urban growth boundary will be considered under acknowledged urban growth boundary amendment procedures incorporated in the Metro Code.

If changes to functional plans are adopted, affected cities and counties shall be informed in writing of those changes which are advisory in nature, those which recommend changes in comprehensive land use plans and those which require changes

////

in comprehensive plans. This notice shall specify the effective date of particular amendment provisions."

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 1993.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Judy Wyers, Presiding Officer

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk of the Council

dr  
1113

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

DRAFT

A RESOLUTION APPROVING A CHANGE  
OF COMPOSITION FOR METRO POLICY  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

)  
)  
)  
)

RESOLUTION NO. 93-1801

Introduced by Metro Policy  
Advisory Committee

17 90

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

WHEREAS, That partnership has been described in Goal I of the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives, adopted September 21, 1991; and;

WHEREAS, Implementation of that partnership was intended to occur, in large part, through the creation of an ongoing Regional Policy Advisory Committee (RPAC) to advise and recommend actions to the Metro Council on ways to address areas and activities of metropolitan significance; and

WHEREAS, The Metro Charter requires a Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC); and

WHEREAS, A majority of the initial members of MPAC have approved this change in the membership composition of MPAC as authorized by Section 27(2) of the 1992 Metro Charter; and

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

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council hereby concurs with the majority of initial members of



MPAC that the membership of MPAC shall include all initial members as stated in Section 27(1) of the 1992 Charter with the following additional members:

1 Representative of the State Agency Council

2 Metro Councilors

2. That MPAC members and alternates from the Metro Council will be appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Metro Council and will represent a broad cross-section of geographic areas. The members and alternates will serve until removed by the Presiding Officer of the Metro Council.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 1993.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Judy Wyers, Presiding Officer



# METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue  
Portland, OR 97201-5398  
503/221-1646

# Memorandum

Date: January 21, 1993  
To: TPAC  
From: ~~X~~ Andrew C. Cotugno, Planning Director  
Re: Local Government Dues

Historically, Metro has levied an assessment of dues on local governments to help support its planning functions. At present, 43¢ per capita is assessed, providing \$583,846 which is being spent in the following general program areas:

Transportation Planning . . . . .	\$194,299
Data Resource Center. . . . .	\$281,425
Land Use Planning . . . . .	\$108,122

None of these funds are used for Metro general government purposes.

The legislation enabling Metro to levy the dues expires June 30, 1993. In addition, the recently passed Metro Charter does not provide for the dues. The Metro Charter does provide for alternate taxing powers that could be used for planning purposes. However, an extended period of time is required to adopt these sources, including consultation with a Charter-required "Tax Commission," adoption of a Metro ordinance, and a 90-day waiting period after adoption. In addition, it is necessary to better understand the cost implications of the planning requirements mandated by the Charter. As such, this is a source that will not be available in FY 93-94.

In order to levy the dues on a mandatory basis, it would be necessary for the Legislature to act to reauthorize them. If this were to occur, notification of dues assessment would need to be adopted by the Metro Council by their February 25 meeting in order to meet the 120-day notification requirement in law.

In lieu of seeking legislative authority, Metro could request a voluntary dues contribution from local governments (plus Tri-Met and the Port of Portland). Further discussion is needed of this matter with TPAC, JPACT, RTAC and RPAC/MPAC.

Attached are the assessment levels by jurisdiction at 35¢, 43¢ and 51¢.

ACC:lmk  
Attachment



**METRO**

2000 S.W. First Avenue  
Portland, OR 97201-5398  
503/221-1646

# Memorandum

Date: January 27, 1993  
To: TPAC/RTAC  
From: Andrew C. Cotugno, Planning Director  
Re: FY 93-94 Local Government Dues

The following are the programs proposed to be funded in next year's budget with local government dues at the 43¢ level:-

Data Resource Center	
RLIS/Database Maintenance/Forecast . . . . .	\$209,875
Local Government Data Services . . . . .	66,000
Transportation Planning	
Surveys Monitoring and Model Refinement. . . . .	69,033
Local Government Technical Assistance. . . . .	11,097
RTP Update . . . . .	18,116
TDM Program. . . . .	8,176
Willamette River Crossing Study. . . . .	45,500
Transportation Improvement Program . . . . .	12,118
Land Use Planning	
Region 2040 - Phase II . . . . .	125,000
Urban Reserves Designation . . . . .	<u>35,000</u>
	\$599,915

ACC:lmk

CC: John Fregonese



FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY  
NOT TO BE RELEASED

JURISDICTION	POP EST 1992	IN METRO 1992	U.S. CENSUS 1990	IN METRO 1990	ASSESSMENT @ \$0.35	ASSESSMENT @ \$0.43	ASSESSMENT @ \$0.51
CLACKAMAS CO. (Unincorp.)	165411	95303	159773	92055	\$33,356.12	\$40,980.38	\$48,604.64
Barlow	130	0	118	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Canby	9565	0	8983	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Estacada	2020	0	2016	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Gladstone	10930	10930	10152	10152	\$3,825.50	\$4,699.90	\$5,574.30
Happy Valley	1910	1910	1519	1519	\$668.50	\$821.30	\$974.10
Johnson City	620	620	586	586	\$217.00	\$266.60	\$316.20
Lake Oswego	29575	29575	28317	28317	\$10,351.22	\$12,717.21	\$15,083.21
Milwaukie	19550	19550	18692	18692	\$6,842.50	\$8,406.50	\$9,970.50
Molalla	3680	0	3651	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Oregon City	16810	16810	14698	14698	\$5,883.50	\$7,228.30	\$8,573.10
Portland	724	724	707	707	\$253.39	\$311.31	\$369.23
Rivergrove	266	266	267	267	\$93.12	\$114.40	\$135.69
Sandy	4360	0	4152	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Tualatin	2065	2065	1756	1756	\$722.71	\$887.90	\$1,053.09
West Linn	17645	17645	16367	16367	\$6,175.75	\$7,587.35	\$8,998.95
Wilsonville	9239	9239	7096	7096	\$3,233.82	\$3,972.98	\$4,712.14
TOTAL	294500	204638	278850	192212	\$71,623.14	\$87,994.14	\$104,365.14
MULTNOMAH CO. (Unincorp.)	58693	53423	64146	58386	\$18,697.96	\$22,971.78	\$27,245.60
Fairview	2975	2975	2391	2391	\$1,041.25	\$1,279.25	\$1,517.25
Gresham	72210	72210	68235	68235	\$25,273.50	\$31,050.30	\$36,827.10
Lake Oswego	2304	2304	2253	2253	\$806.36	\$990.67	\$1,174.98
Maywood Park	780	780	781	781	\$273.00	\$335.40	\$397.80
Portland	456328	456328	435415	435415	\$159,714.81	\$196,221.05	\$232,727.29
Troutdale	8790	8790	7852	7852	\$3,076.50	\$3,779.70	\$4,482.90
Wood Village	2920	2920	2814	2814	\$1,022.00	\$1,255.60	\$1,489.20
TOTAL	605000	599730	583887	578127	\$209,905.38	\$257,883.75	\$305,862.12
WASHINGTON CO. (Unincorp.)	155351	128279	149177	123181	\$44,897.78	\$55,160.14	\$65,422.49
Banks	570	0	563	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Beaverton	58785	58785	53310	53310	\$20,574.75	\$25,277.55	\$29,980.35
Cornelius	6425	6425	6148	6148	\$2,248.75	\$2,762.75	\$3,276.75
Durham	8000	8000	748	748	\$2,800.00	\$3,440.00	\$4,080.00
Forest Grove	14010	14010	13559	13559	\$4,903.50	\$6,024.30	\$7,145.10
Gaston	605	0	563	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Hillsboro	40350	40350	37520	37520	\$14,122.50	\$17,350.50	\$20,578.50
King City	2065	2065	2060	2060	\$722.75	\$887.95	\$1,053.15
Lake Oswego	6	6	6	6	\$2.17	\$2.67	\$3.16
North Plains	1025	1025	972	0	\$358.75	\$440.75	\$522.75
Portland	1223	1223	1197	1197	\$428.05	\$525.89	\$623.73
Rivergrove	29	29	27	27	\$10.13	\$12.45	\$14.76
Sherwood	3635	3635	3093	3093	\$1,272.25	\$1,563.05	\$1,853.85
Tigard	31265	31265	29344	29344	\$10,942.75	\$13,443.95	\$15,945.15
Tualatin	16640	16640	13257	13257	\$5,824.00	\$7,155.20	\$8,486.40
Wilsonville	16	16	10	10	\$5.43	\$6.67	\$7.91
TOTAL	340000	311753	311554	283460	\$109,113.56	\$134,053.81	\$158,994.05
Local Assessment		1116120			\$390,642.08	\$479,931.69	\$569,221.31
Port of Portland					\$48,830.26	\$59,991.46	\$71,152.66
Tri-Met					\$48,830.26	\$59,991.46	\$71,152.66
TOTAL PROPOSED ASSESSMENT					\$488,302.60	\$599,914.62	\$711,526.64





METRO

2000 S.W. First Avenue  
Portland, OR 97201-5398  
503/221-1646

# Memorandum

DATE: January 14, 1993

TO: Member Jurisdictions of the  
Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC)

FROM: Councilor Judy Wyers, Presiding Officer

RE: Membership and First Meeting of MPAC

As you know, the newly approved 1992 Metro Charter calls for creation of the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC). Enclosed is a copy of Section 27 of the Charter identifying the membership of MPAC.

As you can see, the Charter requires that the "governing bodies" of member jurisdictions appoint members and alternates for most of the seats on MPAC. Our interpretation of this is that such appointment would best be made by resolution of the governing body or by some indication of official action (e.g. letter with a copy of approved minutes). For those seats representing multiple jurisdictions (e.g. cities within one county), we need some written and signed document indicating the process of selection and final vote. Metro will appoint the citizen members. To date, we have received the appointments of the City of Gresham and the Special Districts.

The Regional Policy Advisory Committee (RPAC) met last night and has asked for the first meeting of MPAC to be a joint MPAC/RPAC meeting. That meeting will take place February 10, 1993 at 5 PM in Room 440 at Metro Headquarters. It is our hope that all members can be selected by that time.

If possible, please send your confirmations of appointments by February 1, 1993 to:

Paulette Allen  
Clerk of the Council  
Metro  
2000 SW First, Suite 210  
Portland, OR 97201

JW:GR  
enclosure

c: Gussie McRobert, City of Gresham (member)  
Rob Mitchell, Tualatin Valley Water District (member)  
Bill Bloom, Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue (alternate)  
Chuck Petersen, Oak Lodge Sanitary District (member)  
John Reese, Damascus Water District (alternate)  
Bud Farm, Powell Valley Road Water District (member)

# MEMBERSHIP COMPARISON

METROPOLITAN POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (MPAC) (18 members)	REGIONAL POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (RPAC) (17 members)
Commissioner Darlene Hooley (Clackamas County)	Commissioner Darlene Hooley (Clackamas County)
To be appointed (Multnomah County Commissioner)	To be appointed (Multnomah County Commissioner) Fred Neal, alternate
To be appointed (Washington County Commissioner)	Commissioner Roy Rogers (Washington County) Commissioner Linda Peters, alternate
To be appointed (Lake Oswego City Councilor)	Mayor Alice Schlenker (Lake Oswego) Councilman Ed Marcotte, alternate
Mayor Robert Liddell (West Linn) from remaining Clackamas County cities within Metro boundary Councilor Jean Schreiber (Milwaukie), alternate	Mayor Robert Liddell (West Linn) from remaining Clackamas County cities Mayor Craig Lomnicki (Milwaukie), alternate
Commissioner Charles Hales (Portland)	Commissioner Earl Blumenauer (Portland)
Commissioner Gretchen Kafoury (Portland)	Commissioner Gretchen Kafoury (Portland)
*Mayor Gussie McRobert (Gresham) *Councilman Jack Gallagher, alternate	Mayor Gussie McRobert (Gresham) Councilman Jack Gallagher, alternate
Councilor Bruce Thompson (Troutdale) from remaining Multnomah County cities within Metro boundary Councilman Roger Vonderharr (Fairview), alternate	Councilor Bruce Thompson (Troutdale) from remaining Multnomah County cities Councilor Roger Vonderharr (Fairview), alternate
To be appointed (Beaverton City Councilor or Mayor)	Mayor Robert Drake (Beaverton)
Councilor Judith Fessler (Tigard) from remaining Washington County cities within Metro boundary Councilor Richard Kidd (Forest Grove), alternate	Councilor Richard Kidd (Forest Grove) from remaining Washington County cities Councilor John Godsey, alternate
*Chuck Petersen (Oak Lodge Sanitary District, Clackamas County) *John Reeves (Damascus Water District), alternate	Councilor Jim Gardner, Chair (Metro)
*Bud Farm (Powell Valley Road Water District, Multnomah County)	Councilor Richard Devlin, Metro Councilor Susan McLain, alternate
*Rob Mitchell (Tualatin Valley Water District, Washington County) *Bill Bloom (Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue), alternate	
Arnold Polk, Citizen (confirmation pending)	Chris Utterback, Clackamas County Citizen Sharon Cohen, alternate
Sandra Suran, Citizen (confirmation pending)	Jim Zehren, Multnomah County Citizen Chris Foster, alternate
Jim Zehren, Citizen (confirmation pending)	Jerry Arnold, Washington County Citizen Peggy Lynch, alternate
*Loren Wyss (Tri-Met Board) *Bill Robertson, alternate	Richard Benner, Director DLCD, State Agency Council

\*Officially documented appointment