



---

## BAR-GC Council Structure Sub Committee

Please Review and Provide Input To:  
Pat DeTemple: [PDeTemple@ci.berkeley.ca.us](mailto:PDeTemple@ci.berkeley.ca.us)

The original proposal suggested a BAR Council composed of representatives from:

- Each of the 9 counties
- ABAG, MTC
- BAAMA
- 2 from state agency regional offices
- State OES, CalTrans
- 1 Parks, 1 Utilities, 3 Cities, and 1 educational

**Total = 22 persons**

In addition there was to be an advisory council meeting with the BAR council consisting of Vendors, Consultants, Data Providers and Non-profit orgs. The proposal was non-specific regarding selection method.

After some discussion of issues related to selection criteria, method for selection, number of available slots for various sectors etc. it was decided to continue the discussion of governance to a sub set of the meeting.

In order to cut through some of the usual issues that come up whenever the “who gets to sit at the table” question arises; a suggestion was made at the last meeting that governance structure flow from the requirements of the BAR. It was suggested (and this appeared to get some support) that what the BAR needed from a Board was a) legitimacy, and b) work/commitment/creativity and leadership.

The requirement for legitimacy means that at least some representation the BAR board should be reserved for those institutions without whom a claim to regional representation would be open to clear challenge. The second requirement mandates the possibility of including representatives who do not necessarily fall into the first group but who bring obvious energy, skills, commitment and leadership to the table.

In an ideal world these two requirements might overlap neatly and a Council consisting of representatives from only the leading institutions might also be the hardest working, best informed and most engaged Council around. We all know that this is unlikely.



A proposal that flows from this perspective and which was generally articulated at the meeting follows:

To assure legitimacy, a core group of :

- One representative from each of the 9 counties
- One representative from MTC, ABAG and BAAMA each
- Representatives from Oakland, San Jose and SF (SF being already represented as a county)

To assure active engagement, an appointed “at large” group of :

- 11 additional representatives to be drawn from the public sector (Federal, State, County, City) .

**Total Council number = 25**

The core group would be selected by the relevant organization (which, in practice, might mean executive ratification of the appointment of the respective representative) while the “at large” members would be appointed by the Council (subject to ratification of their respective organizations). A suggested term would be one year – no term limits.

The advisory council structure suggested in the initial proposal might require refinement but would basically complement the above structure in the same way as that suggested in the draft.

There are variations that could be developed for each of these models but I think that the two set forth above (all allocated to particular organizations or sectors vs. some allocated and some appointed at large) are the two realistic alternatives. All “at large” has not been suggested by anyone.

The core group membership is based on the assumption that the absence of any of these organizations could call the legitimacy of the project into question whereas the other organizations do not present such issues (e.g. a body in which the City of Berkeley is not directly represented might, nonetheless, have legitimacy).

Comments and specific suggestions for modification? Barring major disagreements this will be put before the group on the 20<sup>th</sup> as a motion.

Pat DeTemple  
Sub-Committee Lead  
BAR-GC Council Structure Sub-Committee