



October 4, 2006

To: Metropolitan Policy Committee  
From: Byron Vanderpool  
Subject: Item 5.e: Alternate MPO Dispute Resolution Mechanisms

## **Action Recommended: Direction to Staff.**

### **Status Report**

At its August 2006 meeting, the MPC discussed several alternative dispute resolution mechanisms for use in its MPO deliberations, and directed staff to bring it proposed bylaws language to address a possible “quorum boycott” situation. This proposed language is attached.

It should be remembered that changes only need to address the MPC’s MPO duties. Staff requests the MPC provide it direction to develop one or more draft MPC bylaws changes to address the original alternative dispute resolution issue, in addition to adopting alternative quorum language.

Changes to the MPC bylaws require a simple majority of the voting members – in this context likely 2 members from Eugene, 2 from Springfield, 2 from Lane County, 2 from LTD, 1 from Coburg and 1 from ODOT. At least one affirmative vote is required from each of Eugene, Springfield and Lane County. In addition, notice of proposed bylaw changes needs to be given to the MPC members and “councils and Board of Commissioners” at least 30 days in advance of action. Also, “any Council or Board objections to the proposed amendments shall be forwarded to MPC within 30 days of receipt.”

### **Current MPC/MPO Voting and Quorum Requirements:**

**Voting Members:** 2 Each from Eugene, Springfield, Lane County, LTD; 1 Each from Coburg and ODOT.

**Quorum:** 5 Voting Members, Including at Least 1 Each from Eugene, Springfield, Lane County and LTD.

**To Pass a Motion:** Simple Majority, Including at Least 1 ‘Yes’ Vote Each from Eugene, Springfield and Lane County.

**Attachment:** Attachment 1 – Draft amended MPC Bylaws