



**WATERFRONT COMMITTEE  
SPECIAL MEETING  
MINUTES**

City Council Chambers  
September 18, 2007 – 7:30 pm.

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Parker at 7:30 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL**

Members Present:      Brian Parker                      Kathy Diehl  
                                    Bill Dann                              Clay Larson  
                                    Steve Granholm                      Jerri Holan  
                                    Eddy So (8 p.m.)

Members Absent:      None  
Staff Present:              Ann Chaney  
Others Present:          Don Neuwirth

**3. PUBLIC COMMENT**

**4. REPORTS**

**4-1. GGF Racetrack Resurfacing Project Soil Stockpiles - Update**

Chaney provided an update. The stockpiles will be used by East Bay Regional Park District at Eastshore State Park

**4-2. Albany Bulb Cleanup Efforts - Update**

Chaney provided an update. Maintenance staff and the Conservation Corps have cleaned debris from the unoccupied camps. No activity is planned at this time in the occupied camps. Staff is consulting with mental health experts and others prior to taking further steps..

**5. DISCUSSIONS AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON MATTERS RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING ITEMS, WHICH COULD INCLUDE REPORTS AND/OR PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS IF ANY:**

**5-1. Instant Runoff Voting – Presentation by Preston Jordan**

Presentation was provided by Preston Jordan, Steve Chessin, and Jim Lindsay. IRV allows for the opportunity for an advisory vote, and to winnow down plans to preferred plan making a majority decision regarding more than two choices during one election. Jurisdictions using or initiating IRV include San Francisco, Cambridge, MA, Burlington VT, Berkeley, Minneapolis, and San Leandro. IRV allows choices to be ranked, then ballots are sorted by the first choice. If results are close, bottom candidate is eliminated and votes are recounted. Bottom candidates are eliminated until a clear winner is evident. Money can be saved by deciding candidate in one election.

Parker asked how IRV has been used in land use planning.

Chessin stated he is not familiar with any to date, but IRV is perfectly suited for land use planning.

Jordan noted Los Osos used IRV to site a sanitary treatment plant. Benefits of using IRV include: the ability to select preferred plan for EIR purposes, motivates more campaigning, does not pre-empt other ideas, identified preferred plan, saves money.

Lindsay added that IRV helps eliminate negative campaigning, and gives early feedback. However, education regarding the process would be necessary and voting machines for IRV are not available until 2008.

Dann stated Measure C may not be applicable to IRV.

Larson stated he likes the opportunity to obtain feedback provided by an IRV process.

Parker stated the process could become overly difficult if there are arguments for and against the options being voted on.

Chessin replied that an impartial analysis of each option can be conducted that identifies pro and con arguments as well as rebuttals.

Holan stated she supports IRV because it has the potential to save money and allows for an advisory vote that ranks options.

Holan motioned that the City Council explore the IRV concept.

Seconded by Larson.

Vote – In Favor: Larson, Holan. Against: Dann, Diehl, Parker, So. Granholm abstained.

**5-2. Review Draft Waterfront Planning Process report with Don Neuwirth – formulate recommendation regarding report**

Larson stated support for Scenario 1 because staff is at capacity and the property owner has not indicated a desire to be involved, and he believed this was a significant issue.

So stated Scenario 2 is the worst, 1, 3, and 4 are ok.

Dann stated Scenario 2 is ok but short of a Measure C vote because it is conceptual.

Diehl stated the community would not be satisfied with Scenario 1; Scenario 2 would minimize the opportunity to guide the process; Scenario 3 seems the most open and educational; and Scenario 4 seems expensive and skewed towards development.

Parker stated Scenario 3 seems affordable and puts facts on the table.

**Public Comment**

Ed Moore: Suggests planning process identify what is worth preserving aesthetically with regard to the waterfront as a whole.

Howard McNenny: Advocates for IRV because of fair representation, suggests using IRV before spending a lot of money on process.

Diehl moved that the Committee recommend Scenario 3 to City Council, identifying pros of Scenario 3, and identify concerns with other Scenarios.

Dann seconded.

Vote – In Favor: Dann, Diehl, Parker, So. Against: Holan, Larson. Granholm abstained.

Parker asked if the work from Scenario 3 could be transitioned into something similar to Scenario 2, resulting in a Specific Plan.

Neuwirth replied that it is difficult to transition Scenario 3 into a Scenario 2 process because the property owner needs to be involved in that process, otherwise it would not be worth spending the public's money.

**6. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS**

**7. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

**7-1. Next Meeting October 4, 2007**

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

