



**Date:** August 15, 2001

**To:** Inter-Regional Partnership

**From:** IRP Staff

**RE:** Co-Chair Structure

---

### **Introduction**

At the June IRP meeting, the Partnership adopted a co-chair structure to facilitate the meetings. The Partnership also determined the conditions that should be met under the co-chair structure and offered suggestions as to how successor co-chairs might be appointed:

- 1) Co-chairs will be balanced with one Bay Area representative and one Central Valley representative acting jointly as chairpersons.
- 2) Co-chairs should be made up of one city representative and one county representative. As chairperson positions rotate within the Bay Area and Central Valley members, each sub-group should rotate county and city chairpersons, i.e. city to county and county to city.
- 3) Chair rotation should be staggered so that process continuity can be maintained by avoiding having to replace both chairpersons at once.
- 4) The term for chairpersons is one year.
- 5) Mayor Dan Bilbrey, City of Tracy, and Supervisor Mark DeSaulnier, Contra Costa County, will serve as the co-chairs for the first term.

### **Discussion**

Staff has identified several issues related to the IRP's co-chair structure and is requesting clarification and direction from the IRP.

- Staggering the terms of the co-chairs will provide continuity to the IRP process by always having the participation of at least one experienced chairperson. Since the initial chair terms begin at the same time however, there is the need for one co-chair to serve either an initial two-year term or an initial six-month term in order to be able to stagger the terms in the future. If an initial six-month term is chosen, in the future there will be an overlap of six months; if an initial two-year term is selected, in the future there will be an overlap of one year.
- Rotating from city representative to county representative, and vice versa, will ensure that both viewpoints will be served in the process. However, this procedure results in either every other six-month or one-year period, depending upon length of initial term, the co-chairs being at the same jurisdictional level, i.e. county/county or city/city.
- Having co-chairs will help represent the diversity of viewpoints. It has not, however, been determined how the two chairs will share their responsibilities. Should the chairs rotate each meeting or agenda item?

- At the end of a co-chair's term, or if that individual can no longer serve as co-chair, how will a new co-chair be identified? Should the new chairperson be elected or pre-determined through a staggered rotation list?

### **Recommendation**

Staff requests the IRP discuss the issues identified above and provide appropriate direction. Following is a summary of issues and recommendations.

1. Co-chairs' terms should be staggered.  
*Recommendation:* Have the initial term for one co-chair be six-months and the other one-year. After the initial six-month term, the term of the replacement co-chair converts to a one-year term.
2. Co-chairs should represent both county and city.  
*Recommendation:* Rotate representation between county/city and city/county but recognize that every other six months the representation will necessarily be county/county or city/city. The regional representation, however, will always be Bay Area/Central Valley. *Note: The IRP may wish to avoid this situation by eliminating the staggered term concept.*
3. Procedures for chairing of the IRP meetings need to be established.  
*Recommendation:* Rotate the chairing of the meetings.
4. At the end of a co-chair's term, or if a co-chair no longer wishes to serve in that capacity, the position needs to be filled by another IRP member.  
*Recommendation:* The IRP members from the applicable region (Bay Area counties or Central Valley counties) would, by consensus, name a new co-chair.