

Table Noting Applicable Responses to Comments After Final PEIR and Final Draft PMPU were Published

Comments Provided During December 12, 2023 Virtual Public Meeting

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
The following comments have been duplicated from the chats and transcribed verbal comments received during the December 12, 2023, virtual public meeting.			
1	Kim Tolles	Port has been working side by side w/CCC. Does the Port think the CCC will make any changes?	A response was provided during December 12 th Virtual Meeting: Typically with all proposed amendments to the Port Master Plan, the District does see some level of change as a result of the California Coastal Commission (CCC) processing, whether it's minor word changes or if there are particular issues that coastal staff would like to see addressed in order to obtain their recommendation for approval in front of the Coastal Commission. So, District staff does anticipate there will be some changes to the PMPU while it is processed with CCC staff.
2	Stephanie Kaupp	PMPU, PD10.16 changed from No new hotel rooms are allowed, to No new hotel rooms are planned. No clarification for this change was included in the Final Draft PMPU. If additional hotel rooms are allowed in a Port addendum, this would be in violation of Coronado's City Code that specifies the maximum number of hotel rooms allowed.	<p>The Port has not changed its position on the issue involving hotel rooms.</p> <p>The assertion is referencing revisions in the December 2023, track changes draft of the PMPU under Section 5.10.2(C) titled "Planned Improvements." The referenced subsection of the PMPU does not regulate permissible uses, it lists planned improvements. Consequently, including a "use" regulation was improper. Similar edits were made elsewhere in the PMPU as discussed in the Final Program EIR (PEIR) Responses to Comments BT1-7 and BT19-18.</p> <p>The language revision in the Final Draft PMPU is to correct an internal conflict within the document (e.g., No new hotel rooms are proposed or allowed). The allowance of specific use types is dictated by land use designations. Hotel rooms or overnight accommodations are a Permitted Primary Use within the Commercial Recreation land use designation. By stating no new hotels are "allowed" in the subdistrict Planned Improvements, the language created an internal conflict within the document - specifically with the Commercial Recreation land use designation. As revised, the policy language in the Final Draft PMPU does not support the development of additional hotel rooms.</p> <p>In other words, additional hotel rooms are not included in any of the subdistrict's listing of Planned Improvements in the Coronado Bayfront, Silver Strand and Shelter Island Planning Districts. Furthermore, as discussed in PMPU Sections 1.3.3 and 2.3, the District has statutory jurisdiction over lands within its boundaries, "but the development standard and land use plan policies only pertain to properties within the District, and exclude those within the adjacent cities or federal lands." (See also Port Act, Section 19.)</p>
3	Bill Tippetts	Has PMPU modified its policy language to commit the Port to a net increase of	As discussed in Final PEIR Response to Comment O2-7 , the policies in the Ecology Element that are in both the PMPU and TLUP match each other.

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
		natural (wetlands/dunes) habitat with the District. That is what is included in the recent version of the Trust Land Use Plan (TLUP).	
4	Janet Rogers	Can you provide a reconciliation between the current Port Master Plan and the PMPU for open space, especially in the Embarcadero District. The reconciliation needs to show changes, like the elimination of the oval park, at the base of Broadway Pier.	<p>The PEIR Environmental Setting, Table 2-1 (p. 2-5), identifies both the existing PMP acreages and the subsequent recalculated acreages using the more accurate Geographic Information System (GIS) digital conversion of acreages for the planning districts, as a whole and specifically, the water and land use designations. The PEIR, in Table 2-1, provides detailed explanation regarding the differences between the certified PMP and the GIS-converted acreages (pp. 2-3 to 2-6). The PEIR Project Description then compares the GIS-converted acreages to the PMPU proposed water and land use designation acreages and depicts the net difference between the two (Table 3-3, pp. 3-15 to 3-17).</p> <p>Please see Table 3-7 of the Final PEIR (p. 3-52 of Project Description), which shows the Embarcadero ROS acreage in comparison to the PMP's acreages for Open Space and Park/Plaza. Please also see Final PEIR Responses to Comments A1-7, O10-2, O18-2, O15-3d, and O15-14 for discussion of acreage.</p> <p>Regarding the "elimination of the Oval Park", please see the Final PEIR, Project Description, p. 3-59, which provides an explanation of the 1.25 acres of park required at Broadway Pier and how option 1 in the Draft PEIR complies with the requirement of the NEVP Phase 1 CDP.</p>
5	Janet Rogers	How many parking spaces are planned in the North Embarcadero?	This question is addressed in the Final PEIR, particularly Responses to Comments O17-7, BT5-1, O15-24, O17-7, and O17-14 .
6	Janet Rogers	If there are no significant changes to the final EIR, How will you reduce the traffic, emissions and congestions problems identified?	<p>Final PEIR Sections 4.2, Air Quality and Health Risk, 4.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy, and 4.14, Transportation, Circulation, and Mobility describe the significant impacts and the mitigation measures that would be required to reduce impacts on air quality, GHGs, and transportation (respectively) to less than significant.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Draft PEIR did not identify any significant traffic congestion-related impacts. Please see Section 4.14.3, which summarizes State law and guidance (SB743, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA) regarding analysis of transportation-related impacts. Under Public Resources Code 21099(b)(2), a project's impacts on automobile delay, as described by level of service or vehicle capacity or traffic congestion, are not considered to be significant impacts on the environment. Additionally, Section 4.14.1 explains the analysis methodology.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
			<p>Where the analysis identifies the impact as significant and unavoidable (SU), the Final PEIR explains why the impact remains SU even after mitigation is incorporated. The District has also prepared Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations, the latter of which explains how significant and unavoidable impacts are outweighed by the project benefits. Final PEIR Responses to Comments A7-17 and A7-18 provide additional responsive information.</p>
7	Janet Rogers	<p>The Seaport project traffic impacts are not included in the SANDAG ABM VMT analysis. That will make this much worse. How will you stop the gridlock?</p>	<p>This issue was addressed in Final PEIR Responses to Comments M-1, O13-2, and O17-6. With regard to assertions of “gridlock,” under Public Resources Code section 21099(b)(2), a project’s impacts on automobile delay, as described by level of service or vehicle capacity or traffic congestion, are not considered to be significant impacts on the environment. Final PEIR Section 4.14.1 explains the transportation methodology for the PMPU; the Final PEIR did not identify any significant traffic congestion-related impacts.</p>
8	R. Vesterfelt	<p>SANDAG ABM transportation model doesn't include seaport project significant emission environmental impacts and traffic congestion. How does Port plan to address? Mobility Hubs likely increase vehicles to waterfront.</p>	<p>This comment raises the same issue as comment #7. Please see Final PEIR Responses to Comments M-1, O13-2, and O17-6. In addition, Final PEIR Responses to Comments O15-24 and BT5-1 address why Mobility Hubs are not anticipated to increase traffic in the project area (please see O15-24 and BT5-1).</p>
9	Janet Rogers	<p>Page 141 discusses the District "exploring" the creation of an infrastructure program impact fee program as an option to assist funding for future public infrastructure and amenities. Please explain this fee program. What would</p>	<p>Please see Final PEIR Response to Comment A4-3. The District would implement a VMT infrastructure mitigation program that would require project applicants to make a fair share contribution to help mitigate project-related and cumulative VMT impacts. The funds collected from the transportation impact fee program will be used to help fund and implement mobility hubs; transit facilities; bicycle improvements; pedestrian improvements; Bayfront Circulator or other similar option, hotel shuttle service, or comparable service; and/or other mobility-related infrastructure improvements and amenities, as specified in the proposed PMPU. However, since the specific timing of possible development is unknown, these impacts were identified as significant and unavoidable, as noted under the “Level of Significance After Mitigation” section on page 4.14-79 of the Draft PEIR.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the District would require all future developments within the tidelands that have the potential to result in a significant increase in VMT to contribute to the program identified in MM-TRA-1 or construct VMT reducing infrastructure to reduce project-related VMT impacts within the</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
		the offsets be? Not on prime waterfront since there won't be any left.	<p>tidelands that have the potential to result in a significant increase in VMT to contribute to the program identified in MM-TRA-1 or construct VMT reducing infrastructure to reduce project-related VMT impacts.</p> <p>As discussed in Final PEIR Response to Comment A7-19: Based on MM-TRA-1 and ECON Policy 1.2.6 in the PMPU, the District will establish an infrastructure program to fund and implement the multi-modal infrastructure identified in the PMPU. The District's infrastructure funding mechanism will apply to development within the District's jurisdiction and may be similar to the City of San Diego's Active Transportation In-Lieu Fee program, as well as the City's Mobility Development Impact Fee program, which the City uses to fund and implement the mobility infrastructure needs associated with future development.</p>
10	Paul ___* *Last name unknown	When can we hear more about the Industrial parks and Info about north of H St.? [this was CVBF reference]	Comment does not raise any specific comments related to the PMPU or the PEIR. As the PMPU does not propose industrial parks and H Street is outside of the PMPU Planning area (i.e., CVBF [Chula Vista Bay Front] and NCBF [National City Bay Front] are not part of the PMPU), the comment appears unrelated to the PMPU, and Final PEIR Master Response M-1 addresses CVBF as a cumulative project.
11	Janet Rogers	The current PMP and North Embarcadero Visionary Plan include Floor Area Ratio (FAR) as a measure of development density. It was used with both of the Lane Field hotels. The FAR needs to be included in the NE development standards. Hotels with the potential of 1,350 rooms between Ash and B Street are too dense.	This comment raises similar concerns as Comments A7-30.cc and O17-21 on the Draft PEIR. Please see the response to those comments in Final PEIR Volume 1, Chapter 2.
12	Janet Callow	Please address the concerns of the Outboard Boating	The District responded to comments from the Outdoor Boating Club in Final PEIR Response to Comment BT6-2 , including discussion of PD1.8.

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
		Club regarding the Shelter Island Launch Ramp as detailed particularly as it pertains to PD1.8 and access to the Launch ramp	
13	Susan Simon	Request more virtual meetings late January, after we can review the documents. Thousands of pages can't be digested in 6-8 days.	This comment is specific to the virtual meetings that occurred after publication of the Final PEIR and therefore was not addressed in the Final PEIR. No additional virtual meetings are anticipated at this time. This is consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088(b), which simply requires copies of the Final PEIR responses to be mailed to public agencies 10 days before certification. However, comments may be submitted for District consideration up to and during the Board of Port Commissioners (Board) hearing.
14	Janet Rogers	How do we submit more questions since we have only had 6 days to review the thousands of pages?	This comment is targeted to submitting comments on the published Final PEIR and the Final Draft PMPU and therefore is not expressly addressed in the Final PEIR's responses to comments. There is no comment period with formal responses as part of the Final PEIR preparation process. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15088(b).) However, comments may be submitted for District consideration up to the Board hearing.
15	Susan Simon	So are we not going to get answers to the questions we are posing? I am aware I can send comments until Feb 28th, thank you	The purpose of the virtual public meetings was to provide an overview of the PMPU process and next steps, review what changes were made as a result of public and stakeholder feedback, and to provide an opportunity for additional public feedback prior to the Board hearing. Feedback received during the virtual meetings was reviewed by District staff to determine if changes to the Final Draft PMPU were needed. Additionally comments will be provided to the Board for consideration in the decision-making process.
16	Janet Rogers	A development standard for the public land managed by the Port with goals of open access and public views shouldn't use the City's development standard of having a city wall on each block. The podiums described for the	This issue is addressed in detail in Final PEIR Responses to Comments 017-22, 015-19, 015-20, 017-19, 017-35.

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
		hotels need to be vastly reduced in both height and width, so a city wall is not created.	
17	Janet Rogers	Page, 3.5.2(C) discusses Healthy Environment and that, "The District serves as an environmental steward of Tidelands and as such, is committed to improving the quality of Tidelands' and its surrounding environment." Creating demand that overwhelms the Districts "surrounding environment" and dramatically increases GHG emissions and VMT does not promote a Healthy Environment. How do you reconcile these two positions?	<p>The comment is an opinion regarding impacts of the PMPU related to the "surrounding environment" and claims that "dramatically increase[ing] GHG emissions and VMT does not promote a Healthy Environment."</p> <p>No source, evidence, or methodology is identified for concluding that the District would be "overwhelmed." As explained in Final PEIR Response to Comment 017-6, most development would occur in Transit Priority areas, which <i>reduces</i> VMT and GHG emissions. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b); OPR's VMT Technical Advisory pp. 78-81 ["Evidence Demonstrates that Projects Located Near Transit Are Likely to Reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled."] Please also see Final PEIR Response to Comment 015-2 for discussion of the balance of trust uses.</p>
18	R. Vesterfelt	Walling the waterfront to any sightline like what was done at convention center is terrible.	Similar comment to #16 above. The issue is addressed in Final PEIR Responses to Comments 017-22, 015-19, 015-20, 017-19, and 017-35.
19	Janet Rogers	The responses should be to the public too, not just the	A response was provided at the December 14, 2023, virtual meeting: "We are recording and noting all of the comments made today. As also mentioned, volume one of the final PEIR contains all of our formal responses to the comment letters previously submitted. So we'll take a look at all of the comments and if

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
		commissioners at the end of the time.	any have not been previously responded to, we'll make sure we summarize the comments here today, and we'll provide responses as part of the information that's conveyed to our board in the staff report and in the presentation at the February 28th hearing."
20	Steven Bailey	My question is about the mobility hubs. I don't quite, I'm reading the plan. I'm not sure what that is. It sounds like it's a parking lot, and I wonder why the port is not prioritizing, prioritizing making the, uh, parking lots underground to give us as much ground level as possible for poor, for, uh, parks and, uh, the, uh, recreational open areas.	<p>The District will consider underground parking on a project-by-project basis. Final PEIR Responses to Comments BT5-1, O15-24, O17-7, and O17-14 provides a detailed discussion of underground parking and Mobility Hubs.</p> <p>As discussed in Final PEIR Response to Comment O18-7: "A Regional Mobility Hub is intended to serve visitors and employees as they access and travel throughout Tidelands. They are intended to be used to consolidate public parking in the area, which will allow for existing on-street and/or surface parking to be repurposed as Recreation Open Space, such as esplanades, promenades, and plazas, and to connect to multimodal facilities, dedicated transit lanes, bicycle facilities (Class II Bike Lanes, Class IV Cycle Tracks, or Class I Multiuse Paths), and other waterfront uses. (See Figure 4.1 of the PMPU.)"</p>
21	Paul ___* *Last name unknown	I don't know if this is in District six, I believe Chula Vista, some of the previous documents I saw talked about Industrial Park. Will, will there be any more updates about any industrial parks like north of eighth Street in Chula Vista and all down through there by the boatyard where they're building the new hotel? Um, I know it's just would be a	This comment is similar to Comment #10. CVBF and NCBF are not part of the PMPU. Please see Final PEIR Master Response M-1 .

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
		comment. I was hoping to hear, hear some information about that.	
22	Susan Simon	Would love to know, uh, to a, receive an explanation why the Port believes separating the Central Embarcadero Seaport project from the PMPU, after the 2019 Discussion Draft, is not a violation of CEQA prohibition on piecemealing a project to reduce the environmental impact.	This comment was addressed in Final PEIR Master Response M-1 .
23	Susan Simon	The other piece is, is that I was, uh, I had a question about the recreational open space rec, excuse me, recreation open space figure of 63.33 acres, uh, in District 3. That before title, uh, excuse me, totaled 56.82 acres. Just curious for the additional 6.51 acres comes from.	<p>With the inclusion of the 6.3 acres of Recreation Open Space (ROS) associated with the Convention Center Expansion, and additional ROS associated with the South Embarcadero Public Access Pier (0.21 acre), which was unintentionally omitted from the PEIR and Draft PMPU, the total comes to an additional 6.51 acres for a total of 63.14 acres of ROS in the Embarcadero Planning District.</p> <p>Table 3-7 has been revised in the PEIR Errata to correct the number, as well as Table 3.1.1 and Table PD3.1 in the Final Draft PMPU Errata.</p>
24	Susan Simon	Page 2-20, section 5.3, 0.3 C3 states. The district shall allow permits of development to modify or replace in	This issue was addressed in Final PEIR Master Response M-1 . The cited policy addresses biological impacts of shading on water. No such biological impacts occur from “impacts of water views from street level” which appears to be referencing views from land of the water. Furthermore, for discussion of views, please see Final PEIR Responses to Comments 017-22, 015-19, 015-20, 017-19, and 017-35 . For discussion of shading on land, please see Response 110 below in this document.

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
		<p>kind existing commercial fishing facilities in this subdistrict. Provided there is no unmitigated increase in shading or fill. Uh, this portion should have included verbiage that the fish processing facility must not block existing water views from street level. As the Port is aware, the Seaport project plans to relocate the fish processing plant to the G Street mole where that facility office space and a market wall tower 65 feet high and run most of the length of the tuna harbor side of the G Street mole, which is the last street level view of the water from the G Street Mole.</p>	
25	Susan Simon	<p>I also would like to know why there are no building standards in the South Embarcadero. Uh, how can the Port not provide building standards for development? Especially because</p>	<p>Please see Final PEIR Master Response M-1 and Response to Comment 015-20 for discussion of the Seaport Village Project. Please also see Final PEIR Response to Comment 015-3g for discussion of the Convention Center. As also discussed in Final PEIR Response to Comment 017-28: “...although the PMPU does not identify subdistrict-specific development standards for the South Embarcadero Subdistrict, future projects, therein, would still be required to comply with the PMPU’s Baywide Development Standards. To illustrate this, please see the information box on page 281 in the PMPU, immediately following the South Embarcadero Vision Statement. Please refer to the PMPU, Chapter 4 – Baywide Development Standards for a list of standards that all future project-proponents must comply with.”</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
		<p>there's a lot of discussion about convention center build-out that is strung up in the courts. So, if we're talking that the PMPU is a policy document and not a plan document, why are we talking about plans for the Convention Center in the policy document and not talking about the Seaport project?</p>	
26	Susan Simon	<p>I guess I'm a little confused because this has been billed this virtual session as an opportunity to yes, learn about the process, but in varying things out of your mouth and written emails. Also call it a Q & A session. So, I'm not quite clear if there are still questions, actually, some of which have been raised by the changes that you've made. It does not sound like we're gonna have an opportunity to get those questions answered. And some of these are</p>	<p>A response was provided at the December 14, 2023, virtual meeting: We are recording and noting all of the comments made today. As also mentioned, volume one of the final PEIR contains all of our formal responses to the comment letters previously submitted. So we'll take a look at all of the comments and if any have not been previously responded to, we'll make sure we summarize the comments here today.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
		<p>longstanding questions and we still don't have answers and I appreciate very much. I know you guys have put in a ton of work, so it's not, this is not directed at you, but it is a little frustrating for us who are trying to understand and get answers to very specific things. And this is no better than when we go to the meetings and talk for three minutes and we never get a response then either. So, I don't understand. This seems like a dumb drill.</p>	

Table Comments Provided During December 14, 2023 Virtual Public Meeting

[See Next Page]

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
The following comments have been duplicated from the chats and transcribed verbal comments received during the December 14, 2023, virtual public meeting			
27	Don Wood	Does the final EIR address all the environmental impacts the proposed draft PMPU will have on the Central Embarcadero, including the G Street Mole and Seaport Village? Does the final EIR fully address all the impacts proposed redevelopment of the Central Embarcadero will have on PMPU and the rest of the Bayfront around San Diego Bay?	Please see Final PEIR Master Response M-1 .

<p>28</p>	<p>Susan Simon</p>	<p>While the Embarcadero Coalition appreciates all the hard work port staff undertook in putting these documents together, port staff should appreciate that the public also put a lot of work into this process because we care enough to sacrifice so much personal time without remuneration. It is, therefore, unfair of staff to advise they aren't answering questions about these quote unquote final documents when these two virtual meetings were billed as such, by the Port's own emails, it's also disingenuous to say that questions aren't being answered because none of the questions are quote unquote new. Some of the questions are new and arose from the port's most recent changes also questions persist because they have never been answered by the board. Despite over 10 requests for both a diagram detailing the cited recreation open</p>	<p>The District has responded to all comments received on the Draft PEIR, including many which were comments only on the PMPU. Please see Volume 1, Chapter 2, of the Final PEIR for the District's responses to public comments on the draft documents.</p> <p>Response provided at the December 14, 2023 virtual meeting: We are recording and noting all of the comments made today. As also mentioned, volume one of the final PEIR contains all of our formal responses to the comment letters previously submitted. So we'll take a look at all of the comments and if any have not been previously responded to, we'll make sure we summarize the comments here today, and we'll provide responses as part of the information that's conveyed to our board in the staff report and in the presentation at the February 28th hearing.</p> <p>Regarding the reference to "cited open space numbers," the PEIR Environmental Setting, Table 2-1 (p. 2-5), identifies both the existing PMP acreages and the subsequent recalculated acreages using the more accurate Geographic Information System (GIS) digital conversion of acreages for the planning districts, as a whole and specifically, the water and land use designations. The PEIR, in Table 2-1, provides detailed explanation regarding the differences between the certified PMP and the GIS-converted acreages (pp. 2-3 to 2-6). The PEIR Project Description then compares the GIS-converted acreages to the PMPU proposed water and land use designation acreages and depicts the net difference between the two (Table 3-3, pp. 3-15 to 3-17).</p> <p>Please see Table 3-7 of the Final PEIR (p. 3-52 of Project Description), which shows the Embarcadero ROS acreage in comparison to the PMP's acreages for Open Space and Park/Plaza. Please also see Final PEIR Responses to Comments A1-7, O10-2, O18-2, O15-3d, and O15-14 for discussion of acreage. Regarding the "elimination of the Oval Park", please see the Final PEIR, Project Description, at p. 3-59, which provides an explanation of the 1.25 acres of park required at Broadway Pier and how option 1 in the Draft PEIR complies with the requirement of the NEVP Phase 1 CDP.</p> <p>Final PEIR Response to Comment O15-12 provides a discussion of recreational open space policies.</p>
-----------	--------------------	--	---

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
		space numbers in the Embarcadero, as well as a definition and consistency as to what constitutes recreation open space, we still do not have that information.	

<p>28 (cont.)</p>	<p>Susan Simon (cont.)</p>	<p>This becomes more important because the final PMPU draft now states recreation open space of 63.33 acres, where previously it was 56.82. This is an additional 6.51 acres that the footnote says is not from above grade recreation open space. Where did these 6.51 acres come from while we salute additional recreation recreational open space, that does not include above grade areas.</p> <p>The concern is the type, is it concrete walkways in favor of green open space and location for such areas?</p> <p>We would not be requesting the embarcaderos recreation open space reconciliation from port staff if it was available from their website. The current PMP does not provide that breakdown and port staff must have it to cite these figures. Please provide the recreation open space breakdown for the Embarcadero.</p>	<p>This comment raises similar concerns as comment #23, above, regarding the additional 6.51 acres of recreation open space in PD3. Please see the response above to that comment. Please also see responses to #23 above, and Final PEIR Master Response M-1.</p>
-----------------------	------------------------------------	--	---

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
		<p>To us, this is public information being withheld, also stating that the central Embarcadero remains as it is today in this document ensured the public would not be able to comment on port proposed changes to development policies in the central Embarcadero like we did in the Northeast Embarcadero policies. This gives the appearance that there are no concerns with the SEC Central Embarcadero section. This is emphasized when the anticipated changes to the central Embarcadero weren't included in the PMPU EIR.</p>	

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
29	Lisa ____* *Last name not known	The district in two years, from 2017 to 2019 almost doubled the economic output in the county and they expect that number to continue to grow. Why is there such a push to develop almost the entirety of the Embarcadero for private corporate interests with hotels? The PMPU should be correcting and improving the current situation for use and access to public guidelines, not creating a wall of hotels.	Please see Final PEIR Response M-1, Volume 1 of 4, 017-22 and 017-35 . Please also see Final PEIR Response to Comment 015-2 for discussion of the balance of trust uses.

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
30	Don Wood	<p>How can you call the proposed PMP “comprehensive” when it fails to address planned redevelopment of the Central Embarcadero? The latest draft PMPU asserts that nothing is going to happen on the Central Embarcadero even though the Port staff has received a proposal, a proposed project description from 1HWY1 development group and has issued a project EIR Notice of Preparation. Unless the final PMPU details proposed changes to the Central Embarcadero, it will be incomplete and cannot be called “comprehensive” again.</p>	<p>Please see Final PEIR Master Response M-1 on the relationship between the PMPU and cumulative projects such as the San Diego Seaport Project.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
31	Janet Rogers	<p>In previous versions of the PMPU only ground level locations were included in recreation open space.</p> <p>You have changed the number in the Embarcadero to include rooftop acreage that was previously segregated. Is that correct and if so why?</p> <p>The report mentions adding rooftop spaces in addition to the minimum requirements for ROS. We are happy to get more ROS, but we haven't seen a breakdown or explanation of the minimum ROS requirement. The way this is presented now, the rooftop numbers appear to be part of the basis. Going forward the rooftop looks like part of the minimum.</p>	<p>With the inclusion of the 6.3 acres of Recreation Open Space (ROS) associated with the Convention Center Expansion, and additional ROS associated with the South Embarcadero Public Access Pier (0.21 acre), which was unintentionally omitted from the PEIR and Draft PMPU, the total comes to an additional 6.51 acres for a total of 63.14 acres of ROS in the Embarcadero Planning District. Table 3-7 has been revised in the PEIR Errata to correct the number, as well as Table 3.1.1 and Table PD3.1 in the Final Draft PMPU Errata.</p> <p>As also discussed in Final PEIR Response to Comment 015-3g, the Convention Center rooftop park is approved in the existing certified PMP and is not newly proposed by the PMPU.</p>
32	Janet Rogers	<p>We need a breakdown of the ROS calculations and a reconciliation from the current PMP to the Final PMPU.</p>	<p>This comment raises similar concerns as Comments 4 and similar to Comments 28 and 79. Please see the responses to those comments.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
33	Janet Rogers	Did you say at the Tuesday meeting that all of your mitigation efforts for the last 2 years to the Draft EIR did not change any Significant Impact classifications in the Final EIR? Are all of the Significant Impacts in the Draft EIR still there? If there are significant changes, where are they?	<p>The comment is correct. All significant impacts identified in the Draft PEIR remain in the Final PEIR, as indicated in Volume 1 and 2 of the Final PEIR (shown in strikeout/<u>underline</u>). The rationale for the significance determinations are contained within the Draft PEIR and Final PEIR. However, mitigation measures were clarified in the Final PEIR to help ensure their feasibility for implementation as projects are proposed in the future.</p> <p>As the comment does not identify any specific significant impacts and does not present any evidence that requires modification to the Final PEIR, no additional response is provided.</p>
34	Janet Rogers	Did you say there would be another virtual meeting later in January after we have a chance to read the material? What do you see is the purpose these meetings?	The District is not holding any additional meetings before the Board hearing.
35	Lisa	This plan completely destroys the natural environment and the beauty of this harbor. In addition, the city does not have the infrastructures to support this huge number of hotels.	This comment provides an opinion without identifying any supporting evidence. Volume 2, Chapter 4, Section 4.1, <i>Aesthetics and Visual Resources</i> , and 4.4, <i>Biological Resources</i> , and Section 4.15 Utilities and Service Systems, provides a complete analysis of the impacts associated with aesthetics, biological resources, and utilities if the PMPU is approved and implemented.

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
36	Janet Rogers	Mitigation agreements - needs follow-up We need a list of all the mitigation agreements in the Embarcadero and the whole Port. For instance, the Navy Pier Park was mitigation for the Midway blocking views. There is a mitigation agreement for not building the Oval Park at the foot of Broadway at Harbor Drive. What is it and how much has been mitigated and what is left to do? What are the other mitigation agreements? Updating the PMP does not erase these legal agreements.	<p>The comment relates to agreements associated with past projects. The mitigation agreements are not connected to approval and implementation of the PMPU. The mitigation requirements of the PMPU are contained with the Final PEIR, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), and the Findings of Fact.</p> <p>Responses to comment on these topics were included in the Final PEIR, including Responses to Comments 014-4, 018-11, and 015-9 which discuss the Navy Pier and U.S.S Midway CDP; Responses to Comments 015-3b, 015-3j, and 015-8 which address the MOU for the park at Navy Pier and NE mitigation parcels; Responses to Comments 015-3c and 015-3d related to Broadway Landing Park / the formerly proposed oval-shaped park/plaza at the foot of Broadway; and Response to Comment 015-18 addressing prior commitments through the project options.</p>
37	Terry Kraft	USS Midway and Chris Neils did extensive coordination years ago to include veteran's park footprint and description in the master plan. It is not in there for some reason. Lesley is aware that this should be included.	The Freedom Park is referenced in Final PEIR Response to Comments A1-16 and 014-4.

<p>38</p>	<p>Mark Ranyak</p>	<p>According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) technical document, <i>National Management Measures to Control Nonpoint Source Pollution from Marinas and Recreational Boating</i>, “gasoline, oil, diesel fuel, acids from batteries and cleaning compounds, and surfactants and solvents involved in boat maintenance (such as methylene chloride, tetrachloroethane, trichloroethene, and trichloroethylene) can wash into lakes, rivers, and coastal areas.” Many of these pollutants, particularly some of the heavy metals, become bonded to sediment or find their way into the food chain through either plankton or other organisms and then concentrate through the food chain and that’s a major environmental threat, as well as a major human health issue when it comes to fish consumption. How can the Port justify the</p>	<p>The PMPU does not propose any specific projects, including an “enormous proposed new marina.” Therefore, the District believes the question is referring to the Seaport San Diego Project, which is a project separate and distinct from the PMPU, and is addressed in Final PEIR Master Response M-1.</p> <p>The question is also referring to an EPA technical document. The document referenced indicates within its Introduction on page 1-1 that “[t]he guidance is intended to provide technical assistance to state program managers and others on the best practicable means of reducing nonpoint source pollution of surface waters from marinas and recreational boating...[t]he guidance can assist marina managers in identifying possible sources of nonpoint source pollution and offers potential solutions. Finding a solution to nonpoint source pollution problems at a marina requires taking into account the site specific factors that together compose the setting of a marina. The best management practices (BMPs) presented in Section 4 of this guidance are recommended based on their successful application at many marinas nationwide. Their applicability to any particular marina or situation, however, must be determined based on site specific factors. The applicability of the individual BMPs and combinations of BMPs should be considered within the overall context of the location, environment, design, and needs of the marina. Marina managers should make informed decisions, based on the circumstances at their particular marina, as to whether the BMPs in this guidance or others would be most effective for controlling nonpoint source pollution.” Therefore, the document is intended to be used by operational marinas to minimize water pollution through incorporation of BMPs identified in Section 4 of the document, which would then be specific to site location, the environment, design, and needs of the marina.</p> <p>The Final PEIR analyzes the effects of the PMPU and potential increases in gasoline, oil, diesel, other fuels, and heavy metals. Future development under the PMPU includes analysis of soil, sediment, or groundwater disturbance (Impact-HAZ-1). Furthermore, the Final PEIR analyzes the PMPU’s effects on undocumented contamination during reasonably foreseeable construction activities (Impact-HAZ-2), the potential to encounter lead or organochlorine pesticides in the soil during reasonably foreseeable construction activities (Impact-HAZ-3), and the potential to encounter contamination on the site due to listing on hazardous materials database (Impact-HAZ-4). Please also see Final PEIR Section 4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality.</p>
-----------	--------------------	--	---

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
		risk to the environmental the enormous proposed new marina will create for our Bay and tidal lands?	
39	Mark Ranyak	In the Final PEIR, the SANDAG Activity Based Model (ABM) transportation model doesn't include the impacts from the Seaport Project, which will make the transportation impact significantly worse, and the Port knows this. That is one reason why CEQA doesn't allow separating parts of a big project. The Port can't just build everything out with high density and then say, "we don't know what will happen", and ignore the environmental impact of the traffic and the huge amount of carbon it pumps into the atmosphere. A master plan must honestly acknowledge the environmental damage it will cause in terms of Greenhouse Gas emissions it will create	Please see Final PEIR Master Response M-1 , and Responses to Comments 013-2, and 017-6 . As also explained in Final PEIR Response to Comment 017-6 , most development would occur in Transit Priority areas, which <i>reduces</i> VMT and GHG emissions. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b); OPR's VMT Technical Advisory pp. 78-81 ["Evidence Demonstrates that Projects Located Near Transit Are Likely to Reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled."].)

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
40	Mark Ranyak	<p>The California Government Code defines open space for outdoor recreation as follows: "Including but not limited to, areas of outstanding scenic, historic and cultural value; areas particularly suited for park and recreation purposes, including access to lakeshores, beaches, and rivers and streams; and areas which serve as links between major recreation and open-space reservations, including utility easements, banks of rivers and streams, trails, and scenic highway corridors." How does the PMPU define Recreational Open Space (ROS) and how is that reconciled with the legislated California Government Code when much of the proposed ROS in the PMPU consists of paved concrete, non-public marina docks, rooftops, and other spaces without recreational value?</p>	<p>The section of the California Government Code presumedly referenced (i.e., CA Govt Code Section 65560) applies to cities and counties and is specific to the open space element of a county or city general plan. Further, the definition of open space in the CA Government Code is not intended to be inclusive of all potential types of open space uses, given that it uses the language "Including but not limited to..." when defining open space. As described on page 59 of the Final Draft PMPU, ROS is defined as "Land areas primarily for visitor-serving, public open spaces that provide public access, public views, activating features, or access to coastal areas. Active and passive uses are allowed in the Recreation Open Space designation, unless other location-specific requirements are stated in Chapter 5, Planning Districts. This designation includes golf courses and associated facilities. This designation is complementary to the Recreational Berthing, Conservation/Intertidal, and Open Bay/Water use designations."</p> <p>Final PEIR Response to Comment 015-12 provides a discussion of recreational open space policies.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
41	Lisa ___* *Last name unknown	ECON Policy 2.5.2 on page 137 talks about the District periodically assessing the water and land use needs of the recreational, commercial, and industrial sectors on Tidelands and how they will conduct surveys of existing occupants, tenants, and permittees, as well as economic forecasts. The public and local residents of the area HAVE to be included in these surveys and the surveys should be constructed by an impartial and unbiased third party whose business is developing and conducting surveys.	<p>The District currently includes extensive public engagement when considering policy issues. The PMPU includes policies that further promote this, including WLU Policy 8.1.2 and WLU Policy 8.1.3, as restated below.</p> <p>WLU Policy 8.1.2 - The District shall provide opportunities for the public to learn about the District’s mission and projects through community engagement, participation, and communication.</p> <p>WLU Policy 8.1.3 - The District shall continue to provide opportunities for interested and affected parties (including but not limited to tenants, agencies, stakeholders, and the general public) to engage in early, active, and ongoing participation in public decision-making processes.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
42	Mark Ranyak	<p>In recent public meetings the Developer for the Seaport Village project stated that impacts to traffic beyond the boundaries of their proposed development was not his problem. Yet the PMPU states that the "District shall require certain development, as applicable, to develop and comply with project-specific Transportation Demand Management (TMD) guidelines and require development to comply with such guidelines." How can the Developer claim the traffic impacts was not his problem when the PMPU clearly requires a well-coordinated traffic planning effort?</p>	<p>Please see Final PEIR Master Response M-1, which explains the relationship between the PMPU and cumulative projects, such as the Seaport San Diego Project.</p>

<p>43</p>	<p>Mark Ranyak</p>	<p>Explain why the Port believes separating the Central Embarcadero Seaport Project from the PMPU after the 2019 Discussion Draft is not a violation of CEQA's prohibition on Piecemealing a project to reduce the environmental impact. It is disingenuous to pretend the enormous Seaport project is appropriate as a future small amendment rather than being included in a really thorough and comprehensive master plan update. A good master plan should not ignore the impact this huge project will have.</p> <p>Page, 3.5.2(C) discusses Healthy Environment and that, "The District serves as an environmental steward of Tidelands and as such, is committed to improving the quality of Tidelands' and its surrounding environment." Creating demand that overwhelms the</p>	<p>Please see Final PEIR Master Response M-1, located in Volume 1, Chapter 2, <i>Comments Received and District Responses</i>, of the which explains the relationship between the PMPU and cumulative projects such as the Seaport San Diego Project.</p> <p>This comment is similar to comments #17 and #22 above. Please see the responses to those comments.</p>
-----------	--------------------	--	--

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
		District's "surrounding environment" and dramatically increases GHG emissions and VMT and clearly does not promote a Healthy Environment. How do you reconcile these two positions?	

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
44	<p data-bbox="285 199 415 228">Lisa ____*</p> <p data-bbox="285 586 422 646">*Last name unknown</p>	<p data-bbox="457 199 726 1317">Both SANDAG and MTS complained about the Port creating so-called "Mobility Hubs" in the Embarcadero, which have no relationship to the Mobility Hubs in the regional transportation plan or to the MTS transit system. There is concern that these are just glorified parking lots and they will induce more traffic downtown, which is contrary to VMT reduction and Climate Change goals. Why are you still including the Mobility Hubs with car parking? How much car parking is included in the Embarcadero in the PMPU, by subdistrict? How are you all planning to build so much WALLS of HEAVY CONCRETE in an area that has an active geological faults? A complete disregard of local ecosystems</p>	<p data-bbox="747 199 1869 415">The comment claims that SANDAG and MTS have "complained" about the proposed Mobility Hubs that are identified in the PMPU. However, there is no evidence provided that confirms this claim. In addition, the comment claims the Mobility Hubs "have no relationship to the Mobility Hubs in the regional plan or the MTS transit system." On the contrary, the Mobility Hubs have been modeled based on SANDAG's Mobility Hub guidance and placed in strategic locations throughout the District tidelands to maximize access to the waterfront. Please also see Final PEIR Section 4.5 for analysis of seismic hazards.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
45	Don Wood	<p>While Port staff may have found two points in the California Coastal Act that they claim allows piecemeal planning and environmental assessment of individual projects outside the comprehensive PMPU process, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) contains no such allowances. All program and project EIRs are required to fully detail and analyze all the long-term comprehensive impacts of nearby or adjacent proposed projects. Failure to fully address the Central Embarcadero redevelopment process in the final EIR would invite CEQA lawsuits from affected parties.</p>	<p>Please see the District's comprehensive Final PEIR Master Response M-1 on the relationship between the PMPU and cumulative projects such as the San Diego Seaport Project.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
46	Don Wood	Simply reading parties' comments into the record without responding to or answering questions raised in those comments is not responsive and makes a mockery of the idea that these webcasts are intended to accept and respond to public comments on the final PMPU and EIR. When and how does staff propose to fully respond to and answer parties' questions and comments?	The District responded at the meeting, and explained that the meeting was being recorded and the District was noting all of the comments made today. Volume one of the Final PEIR contains the formal responses to the comment letters previously submitted.

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
47	Susan Simon	<p>These lands are for the use of all Californians. Tourism statistics cite that only 20% of all visitors to San Diego are Californians and the primary destination are area beaches. There are no beaches in the Embarcadero so why is the Port developing policies that will make the Embarcadero the DENSEST section of hotels on the coast in the ENTIRE state of California. We don't want this distinction, nor should the Port aspire to this designation. The Port has 34 miles of coastline. Spread these out.</p>	<p>Comment provides a personal opinion related to density along the Downtown waterfront and makes claims without providing evidence. Please see Final PEIR Responses to Comments 015-2 and 017-4 for discussion of the balance of uses within the PMPU.</p>
48	Susan Simon	<p>What would it take for the Port to become a taxing entity so that they will leave these limited lands alone and the public could resume some control over how the lands are managed.</p>	<p>This comment/question is for Board consideration. It does not relate to PMPU or PEIR.</p>
49	<p>Robert ___*</p> <p>*Last name unknown</p>	<p>It's essential to get the answers to these comments to the public well before the 28th meeting.</p>	<p>See responses to comments #15, #26, and #46, above.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
50	Don Wood	When and how does staff propose to fully respond to and answer party's questions and comments before February 28th? Please answer the question	Responses to comments on the Final PEIR are not required under CEQA. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.) However, this additional information has been prepared as part of the agenda packet for the PMPU.
51	Susan Simon	The answers to these comments should be to the public before the 28th because we are going to do written comments to the port. We need to understand what we need to be responding to. So it would be very helpful and much appreciated.	Responses to comments on the Final PEIR are not required under CEQA. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.) However, this additional information has been prepared as part of the agenda packet for the PMPU.

Table Comments Received after December 6, 2023, and Outside of Virtual Public Meetings (comment numbers correspond to the comments included in the document titled “Final Draft PMPU and Final PEIR Comments Received, as of February 15, 2024” which can be found as Attachment E to Agenda File No. 2024-0049 or on the Port’s webpage at www.portofsandiego.org/pmpu)

[See Next Page]

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
Embarcadero Coalition Comments forwarded to District, by email – These comments are either the same as, or similar to, those provided above in the Virtual Public Meetings chats and verbal comments.			
52		Request more virtual meetings late January after people have had time to read the documents. Thousands of pages can't be digested in 6-8 days.	This comment is the same as comment #13, above. Please see the response to that comment.
53		Define Public Realm beyond Recreation Open Space (ROS). Does it include parking lots and walkways within a shopping area?	A definition of “public realm” is provided on page 400 in the Glossary of the Final Draft PMPU. As noted in the definition, public realm includes the exterior space around and between structures and facilities that are publicly accessible. This includes streets, sidewalks, and other accessways that facilitate public access.
54		Define Recreation Open Space (ROS). How does the Port calculate ROS and what elements are considered ROS? Why did you change your mind and include rooftop locations in the ROS calculations? Is that because ground level views will be so compromised, especially in the Central Embarcadero with all the docked boats?	As described on page 59 of the Final Draft PMPU, ROS is defined as “Land areas primarily for visitor-serving, public open spaces that provide public access, public views, activating features, or access to coastal areas. Active and passive uses are allowed in the Recreation Open Space designation, unless other location-specific requirements are stated in Chapter 5, Planning Districts. This designation includes golf courses and associated facilities. This designation is complementary to the Recreational Berthing, Conservation/Intertidal, and Open Bay/Water use designations. Final PEIR Response to Comment 015-12 provides a discussion of recreational open space policies. As also discussed in Final PEIR Response to Comment 015-3g , the Convention Center rooftop park is approved in the existing certified PMP and is not newly proposed by the PMPU.

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
55		<p>Can you provide a reconciliation between the current Port Master Plan and the PMPU for open space, especially in the Embarcadero districts? The PMP for Center City has all the sub-districts lumped together, and acreage divided between items like the Promenade and Park/Plaza. The PMPU just has ROS for subdistricts, minus the Central Embarcadero. For transparency and to make sure we aren't just trading green space for concrete walkways, we need this information. We need to see the amount of parks/plaza and promenade in the new plan by sub-districts, like the North Embarcadero. The reconciliation needs to show changes, like the elimination of the oval park at the base of Broadway.</p>	<p>This comment is the same as comment #4, above. Please see the response to that comment.</p>
56		<p>What, exactly, does the Port mean in its comments on page 147 when talking about ROS and natural resource areas that, "the District may integrate these open spaces with development to increase the overall value from a financial and usability perspective." It reads that ROS will be developed which will reduce ROS.</p>	<p>A complete reading of this text box indicates that ROS areas will be incorporated into development sites, as a "value-added component [of project or development]" that could "integrate these open spaces with development..." Use of the word "integrate" implies that non-ROS development will include, not intrude upon, the ROS areas.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
57		<p>The PMPU states the "District shall require certain development, as applicable, to develop and comply with project-specific Transportation Demand Management (TDM) guidelines and require development to comply with such guidelines." Does this mean the Port is shifting the responsibility for the TDMs onto the/any Developer? How would the Developer manage any required tie-in to area government managed systems?</p>	<p>The responsibility for developing and complying with project-specific TDM guidelines would be the responsibility of the project proponent, which could include both tenants as well as the District.</p>
58		<p>The District, in two years (2017-2019) almost doubled its economic output in the county and they expect that number to continue to grow. Why is there such a push to develop almost the entirety of the Embarcadero for private corporate interests with hotels? The PMPU should be correcting and improving the current situation for use and access to public tidelands, not creating a wall of hotels.</p>	<p>This comment is the same as comment #29, 16, 18, 24, 29, 44, 70, and 74, above. Please see Final PEIR Responses to Comments 015-2 and 017-4 for discussion of the balance of uses within the PMPU. Please also see Final PEIR Responses to Comments 017-22 and 017-35 for discussion of views.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
59		<p>Page, 3.5.2(C) discusses Healthy Environment and that, "The District serves as an environmental steward of Tidelands and as such, is committed to improving the quality of Tidelands' and its surrounding environment." Creating demand that overwhelms the Districts "surrounding environment" and dramatically increases GHG emissions and VMT does not promote a Healthy Environment. How do you reconcile these two positions?</p>	<p>This comment is the same as comment #17, above. Please see the response to that comment.</p>
60		<p>Page 141 discusses the District "exploring" the creation of an infrastructure program impact fee program as an option to assist funding for future public infrastructure and amenities. Please explain this fee program. What would the offsets be? Not on prime waterfront since there won't be any left.</p>	<p>This comment is the same as comment #9, above. Please see the response to that comment.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
61		<p>ECON Policy 2.4.4 on page 147 states, "The District shall promote and support a diversified hotel portfolio and corresponding elements of the hospitality industry and encourage their expansion." What number of hotels and other "hospitality industry" development will satiate the Port? In District 3 alone, which comprises the North, Central and South Embarcaderos, the Port wants to develop an additional 3,400-hotel rooms plus meeting and restaurant spaces. That number is in addition to what exists today and would be accomplished by the building of a minimum of 9 new hotels but possibly more. The composition of land uses may be "well-planned" by the Port but they aren't balanced.</p>	<p>The PMPU estimates 750 hotel rooms in North Embarcadero, 600 in South Embarcadero (100 net new rooms above the number of rooms approved under the previously certified Port Master Plan in 2013 – see PD3.72 of Final Draft PMPU), and does not propose additional hotel rooms in Central Embarcadero. Please see Final PEIR Responses to Comments 015-2 and 017-4 for discussion of the balance of uses within the PMPU.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
62		<p>ECON Policy 2.5.2 on page 137 talks about the District periodically assessing the water and land use needs of the recreational, commercial, and industrial sectors on Tidelands and how they will conduct surveys of existing occupants, tenants, and permittees as well as economic forecasts. The public should be included in these surveys and the surveys should be constructed by an impartial and unbiased third party whose business is developing and conducting surveys.</p>	<p>This comment is the same as comment #41, above. Please see the response to that comment.</p>
		<p>North Embarcadero</p>	
63		<p>Under parking in the Embarcadero, it needs to be stated that new parking lots need to be underground. From the Central Embarcadero to the County Waterfront Park, all the parking is underground except for the SpringHill Suites, where the Port allowed a short term financial situation to impact a long term project. Why isn't underground parking required in the standards?</p>	<p>This comment raises similar concerns as comment #20, above. Please see the response to that comment. The District will consider underground parking on a project-by-project basis. Final PEIR Responses to Comments BT5-1, O15-24, O17-7, and O17-14 provide detailed discussion of underground parking and Mobility Hubs.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
64		<p>Both SANDAG and MTS complained about the Port creating so-called "Mobility Hubs" in the Embarcadero, which have no relationship to the Mobility Hubs in the regional transportation plan or to the MTS transit system. There is concern that these are just glorified parking lots and they will induce more traffic downtown, which is contrary to VMT reduction and Climate Change goals. Why are you still including the Mobility Hubs with car parking? How much car parking is included in the Embarcadero in the PMPU, by sub district?</p>	<p>This comment is the same as comment #44, above. Please see the response to that comment.</p>
65		<p>The public land in the North Embarcadero extends from Pacific Highway to the water, not just from Harbor Drive to the water. Section 30001.5 of the Coastal Act states that "basic goals of the state are to assure orderly, balanced utilization and conservation of coastal zone resources..." There is no balance with most of the land in private commercial hands. We don't want the North Embarcadero separated from the community like the South Embarcadero is with the convention center.</p>	<p>This comment is similar to comments #29 and #58 regarding opinion that there is a preference for commercial development. Please see Final PEIR Responses to Comments 015-2 and 017-4 for discussion of the balance of uses within the PMPU.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
66		View corridors down the middle of streets and views are not the same. In the North Embarcadero the PMPU should be opening views from Pacific Highway. Why should we trust the Port when the view corridor at C Street between the two Lane Field hotels consists of a short hotel entrance, nothing like a view corridor, and the hotels that were built do not resemble what was presented to the public? We want better views of our bay at ground level.	This comment raises similar concerns related to view corridors as Comments 017-10, 017-11, and 017-35 in Volume 1, Chapter 2, Comments Received and District Responses, of the Final PEIR. Please see the responses to those comments.

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
67		<p>Explain how the SANDAG travel model ABM, Final EIR, was utilized to reflect all the additional traffic from the increased hotel rooms and moving the Harbor Drive traffic to Pacific Hwy? How will the Port mitigate all the additional traffic, emissions and congestion caused by this plan? The transportation study still states that since the future isn't known the Port's EIR response is VMT-related impact in the North Embarcadero would be cumulatively considerable and unavoidable. That isn't good enough. You must prepare for the future, that is the point. The PMPU development guidelines must protect against a significant negative transportation impact. You need to change what you are planning to avoid the negative impact.</p>	<p>Similar to comment #6 and #17, above, as it relates to a general concern about impacts associated with VMT, air quality, and GHGs. Please see the responses to those comments. Please also see Volume 2, Chapter 4, Section 4.14, Transportation, Circulation, and Mobility, for a discussion on the methodology used to model PMPU-related VMT.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
68		<p>In the Final PEIR, the SANDAG ABM transportation model doesn't include the impacts from the Seaport Project, which will make the transportation impact significantly worse, and the Port knows this. That is one reason why CEQA doesn't allow separating parts of a big project. The Port can't just build everything out with high density and then hide behind "we don't know what will happen", and ignore the environmental impact and create a traffic, congestion and emission nightmare anyway. How will the Port keep the significant negative transportation impacts from happening?</p>	<p>This comment raises similar concerns as comment #7 and #8, above.</p>
69		<p>The current PMP and North Embarcadero Visionary Plan include Floor Area Ratio (FAR) as a measure of development density. It was used with both of the Lane Field hotels. The FAR needs to be included in the NE development standards. Hotels with the potential of 1350 rooms between Ash and B Street are too dense.</p>	<p>This comment is the same as #11 and raises similar concerns as Comments A7-30.cc and O17-21 in Volume 1, Chapter 2, Comments Received and District Responses, of the Final PEIR. Please see the response to that comment.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
70		A development standard for the public land managed by the Port with goals of open access and public views shouldn't use the City's development standard of having a city wall on each block. The podiums described for the hotels need to be vastly reduced in both height and width so a city wall is not created.	This comment is the same as #16 and raises similar concerns as Comment 017-22 in Volume 1, Chapter 2, Comments Received and District Responses, of the Final PEIR. Please see the response to that comment.
		Central Embarcadero	
71		The Port states in their Final PMPU Draft that the development both landside and waterside includes a conceptual site plan indicating the location of all proposed development, including buildings, streets, etc., but states conditions will stay the same in the CE when they have been planning prior to 2016 to re-develop the CE. How can the Central Embarcadero be excluded, when an honest description would include the massively dense development with the Seaport Project.	Please see the District's comprehensive response M-1 on the relationship between the PMPU and cumulative projects such as the San Diego Seaport Project. The response is located in Volume 1, Chapter 2, Comments Received and District Responses, of the Final PEIR.

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
72		<p>Explain why the Port believes separating the Central Embarcadero Seaport Project from the PMPU after the 2019 Discussion Draft is not a violation of CEQA's prohibition on Piecemealing a project to reduce the environmental impact.</p>	<p>This comment is the same as comment #22, above. Please see the response to that comment.</p>
73		<p>Page 161, item 2 states that , "Development that includes scenic vista area(s) shall: a. Not obstruct the designated scenic vista area(s); b. Preserve or enhance physical access to the scenic vista area(s); c. Not directly obscure the physical access to, and views from, a scenic vista area". The Port must include a section that sets forth the rules/policy when a development REPLACES an existing scenic vista area with buildings.</p>	<p>If the PMPU is adopted and certified, future projects would need to demonstrate consistency with its policies and baywide and planning district development standards. A project that would interfere or block a scenic vista identified in the PMPU would be in conflict with the PMPU and would either need to be revised to eliminate the interference or a PMPA would be required to amend the certified PMP.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
74		<p>Page 160 4.3.3 Standards for Walkways states, "To create a pedestrian sense of scale along with the waterfront and avoid a walling-off effect, development shall be designed to integrate public access through the siting of walkways." Emphasis must be placed on ALL development being human scale and avoiding a walling-off effect along the waterfront creating a separation of the water from the city and the city from the water.</p>	<p>This comment raises similar concerns as Comment 017-35 in Volume 1, Chapter 2, Comments Received and District Responses, of the Final PEIR. Please see the response to that comment.</p>
75		<p>The Port acknowledges on Page 205 that three residential communities are adjacent to their lands in the Embarcaderos (Little Italy, Columbia District and Marina District) yet the Port discounts these neighbors' input and tells them they "don't count" because Port lands are for the benefit of ALL Californians. The Port must study the tourism statistics that show that Californians only account for 20% of all visitors to San Diego and most come for the beaches. There are no beaches in the Embarcaderos.</p>	<p>This comment raises similar concerns as comment #47, above. Please see the response to that comment.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
76		Page 206 provides an updated ROS figure of 63.33 acres that before totaled 56.82. Where did the additional 6.51 acres come from?	This comment is similar to comment #23, above. Please see the response to that comment.

77	<p>Page 218 lays out the vision for the Central Embarcadero Subdistrict and states, "With the exception of the existing restaurant of G Street Mole (currently, the Fish Market) and roadway improvements along Harbor Drive, the PMPU does not propose any new uses, development or change in intensity of development in Central Embarcadero. Rather, the continuation of the existing uses, with potential maintenance of and minor improvements to existing development, such as Seaport Village and Tuna Harbor, could be allowed under the PMPU. Accordingly, the proposed vision in the PMPU reflects the existing state of the Central Embarcadero." And later, on page 219 section 5.3.3 (C) states, "The Subdistrict, which is mostly made up of Seaport Village, shall remain as existing conditions with the exception of maintenance,..." This is patently false. The developer for the Seaport Project was selected by the Port in 2016 after a Port issued RFP. The Port has had a detailed project description from the developer for several years. It is now 2023 and the Seaport Project CEQA NOP has gone out,</p>	<p>Please see the District's comprehensive master response M-1 on the relationship between the PMPU and cumulative projects such as the San Diego Seaport Project. The response is located in Volume 1, Chapter 2 of the Final PEIR.</p>
----	--	---

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
		<p>received public input, and its EIR is being drafted. The Seaport Project is ENORMOUS and the Port is abrogating its responsibility to provide the development standards for the Central Embarcadero but, instead, is letting the developer set his own standards. The Port has the RESPONSIBILITY to set these standards.</p>	
78		<p>Page 220, section 5.3.3(C)-III states, "The District shall allow permittees of development to modify, or replace in-kind, existing commercial fishing facilities in this subdistrict provided there is no unmitigated increase in shading or fill." This portion must include verbiage that the fish processing facility must not block existing water views from street level. As the Port is aware, the Seaport Project plans to relocate the fish processing plant to the G Street Mole where that facility, office space and a market will tower 65' high and run most of the length of the Tuna Harbor side of the G Street Mole - which is the last street level view of the water from the G Street Mole.</p>	<p>This comment raises similar concerns as comment #24, above. Please see the response to that comment.</p>
		South Embarcadero	

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
79		<p>Section 5.3.4 discusses the vision for the South Embarcadero and mentions the expansion of the Convention Center and that the intensity of commercial development is expected to increase to accommodate new hotel rooms, meeting, restaurant and retail space. However, the court has yet to decide if the Convention Center expansion will be allowed. This section also mentions adding 11.1 acres of ROS to the SE with the expansion. How does/can building out the Convention Center, hotel rooms and retail space across existing ROS expand ROS? If it is expanded, the Final PMPU Draft says the Convention Center will have a rooftop ROS of 5 acres but that is not enough to expand existing ROS to 11.1 acres. What is the breakdown and how does the Port know the potential new Convention Center design in order to calculate ROS in this area? What happens if the court rules against the expansion?</p>	<p>This comment is related to #31, but focuses on the convention center ROS and the net change. Please also see Final PEIR Response to Comment 015-3g for discussion of the Convention Center.</p> <p>As discussed on PMPU Page 283: PD3.59 Add at least 11.1 acres of Recreation Open Space as part of the expanded Convention Center, as generally depicted in Figure PD3.2. The Recreation Open Space shall include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Approximately 4.80 acres at-grade; b. Approximately 6.30 acres above-grade, which consists of the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An approximately 5-acre park on the rooftop of the expanded convention center that shall be completed before issuance of a final certificate of occupancy for the San Diego Convention Center Expansion, and shall be publicly accessible approximately 85 percent of the year; 2. At least six access points from the ground level, including access from elevators, as well as an approximately 1.3-acre inclined walkway from the ground-level to the rooftop; and 3. At least five scenic vista areas, which shall face the Bay. <p>Additionally, the PMPU does not approve any specific development or improvement, but does provide water and land use policies and standards for potential development. As with any future project, there is no certainty that it will be approved by the decision-makers and/or otherwise developed.</p> <p>If a court rules against the Convention Center expansion, and a different use is subsequently proposed in the Convention Center Expansion area, it is likely that a Port Master Plan Amendment would be needed to implement another project.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
80		<p>Page 225, PD3.67 and PD3.68 states the plan to develop a marina and additional boat berthing slips for up to 65 various sized boats. The development of another marina, additional berthing along with the Seaport Project plan would make the Central and South Embarcaderos one continuous concrete walkway of boats that will further diminish water views and the water experience. Currently, we have several unobstructed water views in these areas. How will you protect the scenic water views?</p>	<p>Please see Final PEIR Master Response M-1, and Responses to Comments 09-1, 015-19, and 015-20 for discussion of aesthetic impacts.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
81		<p>Page 226 Views PD3.74 discusses preserving scenic vista areas in the following locations: Marriott Marina from the waterside promenade, west of the Convention Center; View of the Bay, from the fishing pier at Embarcadero Marina Park South; View of the Bay, from the South Embarcadero public access mole pier; and Five scenic areas on the rooftop of the expanded Convention Center. The scenic vista of the Marriott Marina only allows us to "keep" the blocked water boat view of the Marriott Marina but not the open, unobstructed views opposite the Convention Center. There are presently more expansive scenic views of the Bay in this location than exist "from the fishing pier". Clarify what is meant by scenic vista in the descriptor "View of the Bay, from the South Embarcadero public access mole pier". And it is premature to include the Five scenic areas on the rooftop of the expanded Convention Center as it may not be approved.</p>	<p>The comment identifies scenic vistas shown in the existing certified PMP which have been carried into the PMPU. This comment is similar to #79, above, in that it asks what if the Phase III Convention Center Expansion is not approved. Please also see Final PEIR Response to Comment 015-19 for discussion of scenic vistas.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
82		Section 5.3.4(D)-(II) Building Standards states, "There are no building standards specified in the South Embarcadero Subdistrict." How can the Port not provide building standards for development? There must be building standards setting the parameters to guide development or redevelopment.	This comment raises similar concerns as comment #25, above. Please see the response to that comment.

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
<p>The following comments reflect letters and emails that the District received since the publishing of the Final PEIR and Draft Final PMPU, on December 6, 2023. The associated comment letters are bracketed using the numbers in column one, below. The bracketed comment letters are found under separate cover as an attachment to the February 28, 2024, Board hearing agenda sheet (report).</p>			
83	Bill Tippets	<p>I have reviewed the Final PMPU that was referenced in the Port's announcement of the Notice of Completion for the PMPU/EIR on December 6, 2023. I also participated in a Port-sponsored public participation event (video meeting) later in December to express my concerns about several aspects of the draft final PMPU that I believe need to be revised before or as part of the Port Commissioner's approval of the PMPU and certification of the EIR.</p>	Noted.
84	Bill Tippets	<p>These comments and recommendations only address certain sections of the final PMPU, focusing on the Water and Land Use, Ecology and Planning District 3 sections of the PMPU. Port staff and its consultants have incorporated important recommendations that I and other environmental representatives have suggested over the 10 years that the PMPU has been in process, which will provide for more effective conservation of and potentially increases to important tideland habitats.</p>	Noted.
85	Bill Tippets	<p>I request that the following changes be made to the final draft before it is approved by the Commissioners, or these changes should be made as conditions of the PMPU approval by the Commissioners.</p>	Noted.

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
86	Bill Tippets	<p>Pages 28, 30, 31, 45 (et seq.). The Coastal Act (https://www.coastal.ca.gov/coastact.pdf) does not include a definition of "coastal-enhancing use". This term appears to have been coined by the Port to expand on the kinds of "allowable uses" on tidelands that are not covered by "coastal-dependent" or "coastal-related" development or use, both of which are defined in the Coastal Act. The PMPU's definition ("WLU Policy 1.2.1.c. Coastal-enhancing: Any development or use that does not require a location directly near marine or coastal waters to be able to function but that provides visitor-serving functions and contributions that enhance the Public Trust responsibilities of the District") is so vague that it would allow many uses and activities purporting, but questionably qualifying, to meet the Port's Public Trust responsibilities. The term should be removed from the PMPU and only those project elements that are necessary to implement coastal-dependent and coastal-related developments/uses should be allowed under the PMPU. If the Port retains the term, it must be much more clear and limiting in the types of development/activities/uses that would qualify - such as identifying criteria for what (additional) contribution they must provide to the coastal-dependent and coastal-related developments.</p>	<p>This comment has been included in the record for Board consideration.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
87	Bill Tippetts	<p>Page 33. WLU Policy 2.4.1 uses the terms "Conservation/Intertidal" and "Conservation Open Space" and describes them in Table 3.1.4, which should be referenced here. The PMPU does not define these terms in the Glossary - add their definitions to the Glossary so that the public and stakeholders can easily find them. While these descriptions provide general guidance on allowable uses, the PMPU must clarify that because they are essentially the (only) areas where natural resource (i.e., habitat) protection, restoration, and enhancement activities will be implemented, then all developments, uses or activities that would impact them will not be allowed. An exception could be made if the impact is unavoidable to implement an essential coastal-dependent use, and the impact is fully mitigated. Additionally, Table 3.1.1 (Baywide Water and Land Uses) does not include the term "Conservation Open Space", which further complicates and adds uncertainty to the use of the term in the PMPU, and the table must be revised to include all acreage that meets the definition. The PMPU must delineate on the maps - including Figure 3.1.1, 3.3.1, and provide the acreages of all Conservation Open Space areas. Without that information, it is impossible for the Port - and stakeholders who evaluate Port projects - to verify and ensure that there is no net loss of Conservation/Intertidal and Conservation Open Space areas (which is the PMPU WLU Policy 2.4.1 commitment) when projects are proposed.</p>	<p>All descriptions of water/land use designations are in the WLU Element. The descriptions are: Conservation / Intertidal: Water areas primarily reserved for the management of habitat, wildlife conservation, and environmental protection. This designation allows scientific research, education and other uses that support environmental protection and restoration. This designation is complementary to land use designations of Conservation Open Space, Open Bay/Water, and Recreational Open Space, which may involve public access points or piers where appropriate. Marine Technology permitted as a secondary use in this designation must be consistent with California Coastal Act Section 30233.</p> <p>Conservation Open Space: Land and open space primarily reserved for the management of habitat and wildlife conservation and environmental protection. This designation supports the Conservation/Intertidal and Open Bay/Water use designations. This designation allows scientific research, education, and other uses that support environmental protection and restoration.</p> <p>Tables 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 expressly reflect which use types are permitted as a primary use or secondary use, and which use types are not permitted in these designations.</p> <p>There are not Conservation Open Space designated areas in the PMPU Area, as depicted on Figure 3.1.1 and Table 3.1.1.</p> <p>Item 6 under Section 3.1.7 Additional Requirements, states: "Habitat management and Wildlife Conservation: Uses consistent with this use type may be permitted in additional water and land use designations." Thus, Conservation / Intertidal and Conservation Open Space are not the only designations that would support these types of uses. In addition, the Ecology Element further identifies Ecology Opportunity Areas where there is potential for shallow subtidal and intertidal habitat, restoration, creation, or enhancement. Please refer to the Ecology Element for more details (Figure 3.3.1, ECO Policy 1.1.15, and subsequent text box).</p> <p>This comment has been included in the record for Board consideration.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
88	Bill Tippets	<p>To be very clear, the Port has current acreages for specific resources such as eelgrass, acreages for each subtidal, intertidal, and marsh habitat type, and other categorized types of acreage within all of the tidelands. Because the Port has created the overlay term "Conservation Open Space", and does not delineate specifically which habitat types and other areas that includes, but commits to no net loss, it needs to specify the current acreages - and locations - of all the areas that fall within that defined term. If (when) in the future those habitat areas shift, the Port will have to report such changes (location and acreages) and describe how it will retain no net loss of Conservation Open Space - as well as Conservation/Intertidal areas.</p>	<p>The PMPU is a policy-level document. Other efforts at the Port collect and inventory this information, and in the future may help to inform future development, along with the PMPU policies. This comment has been included in the record for Board consideration.</p>
89	Bill Tippets	<p>Page 65. There is no apparent justification for including "Golf Course" as an allowable recreational use on tidelands (Table 3.1.5), as it is neither coastal-dependent nor coastal-related. If it is necessary to denote and "grandfather" a golf course or portion thereof that predated the Port Act, then make that clear. Otherwise, remove the term as an allowable recreational use.</p>	<p>This recreational use, along with "Attractions," is consistent with the Public Trust Doctrine. Further, the PMPU WLU Allowable Use Types Table (Table 3.1.2) allows golf courses and attractions, within the ROS Land Use Designation.</p> <p>This comment has been included in the record for Board consideration.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
90	Bill Tippetts	<p>Page 237, et seq. (East Harbor Island Subdistrict). This section does not include any reference to its potential value to contribute to conservation open space or creation of wetlands/intertidal habitats. This portion of the tidelands currently supports minimal development and has significant potential to expand the intertidal/shoreline habitat zone as well as expand shallow subtidal habitat. The bay waters are protected by the jetty/marina to the south, which attenuates waves and is eminently suitable for creating living shoreline features. The text and Figure PD2.10 should be modified to identify conservation open space and conservation/intertidal areas along the shoreline and landward areas (i.e., along Liberator Way) where Recreation Open Space is currently shown that would allow for expansion of natural resource/habitat uses.</p>	<p>Note that CIT is designated near this area, as well ecological opportunity area.</p> <p>Note Vision for East Harbor Island: Future efforts to enhance coastal resiliency through coastal flooding adaptation strategies are also envisioned in this subdistrict and should be in accordance with applicable PMPU policies and standards, including but not limited to: Chapter 3.1 Water and Land Use Element (e.g., Tables 3.1.2 and 3.1.3) and policies within Chapter 3.3 Ecology Element, ECO Goal 1 and Chapter 3.4 Safety and Resiliency Element, SR Goal 3.</p> <p>The suggestions are included in this document for the District's consideration.</p>
91	Bill Tippetts	<p>Page 389. Add the terms Conservation/Intertidal and Conservation Open Space to the Glossary</p>	<p>Please see response to comment 87, above.</p> <p>The suggestions are included in this document for the District's consideration.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
92	Outboard Boating	<p>Proposed Cross Over</p> <p>This is the section of the lower parking lot for a proposed cross over pedestrian path. There are 13 boat/trailer parking spaces in this area from the proposed cross over to the Bali Hai.</p> <p>Boaters who are parked in this area have launched and will later be retrieving their boats; they are in their designated parking lot and their designated parking space and are not looking for sudden pedestrian appearances where there were none before.</p> <p>A safer boating environment could be realized if the Port would move the 13 boat/trailer parking spaces from this section of the parking lot to the upper launch ramp parking lot.</p>	<p>PMPU is a programmatic document and the level of detail being requested is project level. If and when a project is proposed in this area, the project review will consider the potential safety impact to pedestrians, proposed parking design, and ensure there is no conflict with PMPU policies that would protect and maintain water dependent coastal uses, such as the boat launch ramp and related facilities.</p> <p>Please also see Final PEIR Response to Comment BT6-2.</p>

<p>93</p>	<p>Outboard Boating</p>	<p>2. Pedestrian Path</p> <p>The proposed pedestrian path ends at the entrance to the boat launch ramp which encourages pedestrians, bikes, scooters etc. to enter the boat launch area.</p> <p>The pedestrian users in this area are not likely to turn around and go back to the proposed cross over. This will directly impact efforts to create a safe boat launch environment for the 50,000 + boaters a year that use the Shelter Island Launch Ramp. Signage will not fix this, a fence will not fix this, flashing lights will not fix this either. A better solution would be to end this lower pedestrian path at the cross over and turn it into a loop.</p> <p>The safety of pedestrians and boaters is compromised by the proposed pedestrian pathway that encourages pedestrians to cut through the launch ramp. Launch ramp users are not focused on pedestrians during the launch and retrieve process. They are looking in their rear-view mirror to make sure their trailer is lining up correctly to launch or looking in their rear-view mirror to make sure their boat is attached correctly to the trailer when leaving the launch ramp area.</p> <p>This is the entrance to the launch ramp at the end of the pedestrian path. (referencing embedded image)</p> <p>This is the same view from across the street showing the pedestrian path. There is nowhere for a pedestrian to go here except across the launch ramp entrance or across the launch ramp itself or back to the cross over.</p> <p>The Ports response to Comment BT6-2</p>	<p>Regarding Final PEIR Response to Comment BT6-2, the PMPU has been revised over time to limit pedestrian access to the boat launch. After discussion with the Outboard Boating Club, on February 7, 2024, a further revision was made to pedestrian access to discourage pedestrian use of the boat launch, as reflected in a replacement Figure 1.4 included in the Final Draft PMPU Errata.</p> <p>Further, the Final Draft PMPU is a programmatic document and the level of detail being requested is project level. If and when a project is proposed in this area, the project review will consider the potential safety impact to pedestrians, proposed parking design, and ensure there is no conflict with PMPU policies that would protect and maintain water dependent coastal uses, such as the boat launch ramp and related facilities.</p>
-----------	-------------------------	--	--

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
		<p>“The comment expresses concern regarding potential conflict between existing boat launch activities and proposed pedestrian pathways. However, site-specific design of the improvements contemplated in PD1.8 would be subject to the PMPU Baywide Development Standards, including those set forth in Section 4.3.1 Standards for Promenades. These standards include, among other things, provisions which authorize the District to consider alternatives to the proposed alignment of a waterside promenade if the proposed alignment is infeasible due to safety concerns or would interfere with a water-dependent coastal use.”</p> <p>There is no indication that the District has considered protecting launch ramp users in this area from the encroachment and distraction of pedestrians.</p>	

94	<p>3. Parking and Staging in the Upper Launch Ramp Parking Lot Parking is everything to the Shelter Island Launch Ramp. The Outboard Boating Club remains concerned about the proposed language in PD1.8 and would like the Port to restate “Reconfigure Shelter Island Drive between the Shelter Island Roundabout and the Yokohama Friendship Bell Roundabout” to “Reconfigure Shelter Island Drive west of the Shelter Island Launch Ramp Exit to the Yokohama Friendship Bell Roundabout.”</p> <p>The Shelter Island Launch Ramp main entrance and upper parking lot should not be folded into a reconfiguration that replaces off street boat trailer parking with on street parking and adding a pedestrian path that cuts through the upper launch ramp main entrance, parking lot and staging area.</p> <p>The Ports response to Comment BT6-2 “...any future redesign of this parking lot would no result in a reduction of the total number of existing parking spaces or interfere with use of the boat launch. In addition, this comment will be included in the record for consideration by the Board of Port Commissioners when it makes it decision whether to adopt the PMPU.”</p> <p>There is no indication that the District has considered protecting the space needed to successfully prepare and launch a boat as well as the parking space to keep the trailers in the launch ramp area after the launch.</p> <p>The upper launch ramp parking lot is the only place for boats/trailers to stop and get the boat ready to launch before approaching the launch ramp. This area is used again to put the boat back together</p>	<p>Please see the Final Draft PMPU Errata, PD1.37 with strike-out/<u>underlined</u> text that indicates deleted and new text added, respectively, after the December 6, 2023, publishing of the Final Draft PMPU. Further, please also see Final PEIR Response to Comment BT6-2.</p> <p>Additionally, the Final Draft PMPU is a programmatic document and the level of detail being requested is project level. If and when a project is proposed in this area, the project review will consider the potential safety impact to pedestrians, proposed parking design, and ensure there is no conflict with PMPU policies (e.g., Section 4.3.1 of the PMPU) that would protect and maintain water-dependent coastal uses, such as the boat launch ramp and related facilities.</p>
----	--	---

before getting on the road. Most boats approach the launch ramp through the main entrance, stop and prepare the boat in the staging area and then proceed to launch. Preparing to launch is to transfer gear from the truck to the boat, transfer children/passengers from the truck to the boat, put the drain plug in, get ice, put the coolers, fishing gear and safety equipment in the boat. There is no stopping on the launch ramp itself, all the curbs are red. The curbs are red because boats/trailers need room to maneuver.

This satellite view shows the launch ramp main entrance, staging area and route to launch. The launch ramp staging area is critical to the operation of the launch ramp. It is vital to keep this area fully functional and available to launch ramp users. This area needs three lanes: one dedicated lane to stage boat preparations, one lane for boats proceeding directly to the launch ramp and one for through traffic or cars/trailers to back out of their parking spot.

The complete upper parking lot has a total of 49 boat/trailer parking spaces and 65 public parking spaces and PD1.8 proposes to move off street parking to on street parking, eliminating boat/trailer parking in this area.

There is an abundance of public parking in the vicinity of the launch ramp.

Access to general public parking in the Bali Hai parking am/or Koehler Kraft parking excludes boat/trailer parking. The Bali Hai parking lot has 159 public spaces.

On the other side of the Bali Hai parking lot, there is a modest but substantial lot with 67 public parking spaces. This is a

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
		<p>photo from the Bali Hai parking lot looking directly at the entrance to the smaller but conveniently located parking lot. There is more public parking here (referencing embedded image), just on the other side of launch ramp exit. This section has 72 public parking spaces. There is enough public parking in the immediate launch ramp area to relocate the 13 launch ramp parking spaces from the lower launch ramp parking lot cross over area to the upper launch ramp parking lot.</p>	

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
95		<p>To summarize</p> <p>The main launch ramp staging area is vital to the operation of the launch ramp facility. Boaters need this area to stop in and prepare the boat prior to launch. 50,000+ boaters use the Shelter Island launch ramp and would be better served by preserving and improving this area as critical to the operation of the launch ramp. The Outboard Boating Club requests the Port start diagonal parking on the far side of the upper launch ramp parking lot thus preserving the launch ramp staging area and critical parking availability. For the safety of both pedestrians and boaters alike, turn the Pedestrian Path into a loop rather than ending at the entrance to the launch ramp.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and attention to the preservation of the Shelter Island Boat Launch facility parking, staging and pedestrian path which represents safe access to enter and exit the Shelter Island Launch Ramp.</p> <p>Janet Callow Staff Commodore Outboard Boating Club of San Diego</p>	<p>Please see responses to Comments 92 through 94, above.</p>

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
96	Outboarding Boating	<p>The Outboard Boating Club of San Diego is a non-profit corporation organized to promote safe boating recreation. The Outboard Boating Club began as the local chapter of the Outboard Boating Club of America in 1953 and continues to support and promote safe boating today. The principal duty of the Outboard Boating Club is to supervise direct and assist in the use of the Shelter Island boat launch ramp facilities including the retrieving of boats and the parking of trailers and cars in the parking lots near and adjacent to the boat launch ramp. As the Port moves forward with developing plans for Shelter Island parking, the Outboard Boating Club continues to have unresolved concerns about the existing and conceptual parking plan for the Shelter Island Launch Ramp area.</p>	<p>This comment does not require a response as it is informational in nature and is an introduction to comments that follow.</p>

97	Outboard Boating	<p>PD1.8</p> <p>This conceptual plan is stated in the Port Master Plan Update Draft which will be finalized this year, 2023.</p> <p>The Outboard Club has submitted multiple letters to the Port defending access to the Shelter Island Launch Ramp and Launch Ramp parking.</p> <p>Parking is everything to the Shelter Island Launch Ramp. The Outboard Boating Club remains concerned about the proposal PD1.8.</p> <p>PD1.8 proposes to move off street parking to on street parking, which would eliminating boat/trailer parking in the upper boat launch ramp parking lot: <u>“Reconfigure Shelter Island Drive between the Shelter Island Roundabout and the Yokohama Friendship Bell Roundabout.”</u></p> <p>The main street entrance to the launch ramp and upper parking lot is the most important section of the entire Shelter Island launch ramp facility.</p> <p>The upper launch ramp parking lot is the only place for boats/trailers to stop and get the boat ready to launch before approaching the launch ramp. This area is used again to put the boat back together before getting on the road.</p> <p>Most boats approach the launch ramp through the main entrance, stop and prepare the boat in the staging area and then proceed to launch. Preparing to launch is to transfer gear from the truck to the boat, transfer children/passengers from the truck to the boat, put the drain plug in, get ice, put the coolers, fishing gear and safety equipment in the boat.</p>	<p>The comments provided in Comment 97 are similar to Comments 92 through 95, above. Please see responses to those comments.</p>
----	------------------	--	--

	<p>There is no stopping on the launch ramp itself, all the curbs are red. The curbs are red because boats/trailers need room to maneuver. This satellite view shows the launch ramp main entrance, staging area and route to launch.</p> <p>The launch ramp staging area is critical to the operation of the launch ramp.</p> <p>It is vital to keep this area fully functional and available to launch ramp users. This area needs three lanes: one dedicated lane to stage boat preparations, one lane for boats proceeding directly to the launch ramp and one for through traffic or cars/trailers to back out of their parking spot. The other half of the upper parking, near the launch ramp exit, fills up with boats/trailers that have already launched. This section has 34 boat/trailer parking spaces and 15 public parking spaces.</p> <p>The complete upper parking lot has a total of 49 boat/trailer parking spaces. And 65 public parking spaces and PD1.8 proposes to move off street parking to on street parking, eliminating boat/trailer parking in this area.</p> <p>The Shelter Island Launch Ramp needs all of its existing parking. The 2021 Department of Boating and Waterways Guidelines suggest the typical minimum parking space ration is 20 to 30 vehicle/trailer parking spaces per launching lane. The Shelter Island Launch Ramp has 10 launch lanes. The lower parking lot has a total of 111 boat/trailer parking spaces and 116 public parking spaces.</p> <p>There is no provision for a staging area in the lower parking lot. If boats/trailers were to stop in a lower parking lot lane to</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>prepare their boat for launching, the entire lane would be blocked.</p> <p>This is the section of the lower parking lot for a proposed cross over pedestrian path. There are 13 boat/trailer parking spaces in this area. The big lot on the left is the Bali Hai parking lot which excludes trailer parking.</p> <p>The proposed crossover creates a juxtaposition of vehicles with boats on trailers and pedestrians on foot, on bikes, scooters, or skateboards and does not provide a safe boating launching environment in the Shelter Island Boat Launch Ramp Facility.</p> <p>A proposed pedestrian pathway that cuts through the launch ramp boat/trailer parking endangers the safety of pedestrians and boaters.</p> <p>Boaters who are parked in this area have launched and will later be retrieving their boats; they are in their designated parking lot and their designated parking space and are not looking for sudden pedestrian appearances where there were none before.</p> <p>A safer boating environment could be realized if the Port would move the 13 boat/trailer parking spaces from this section of the parking lot to the upper launch ramp parking lot.</p> <p>There is an abundance of public parking in the vicinity of the launch ramp.</p> <p>Access to general public parking in the Bali Hai parking lot excludes boat/trailer parking.</p> <p>The Bali Hai parking lot has 159 public spaces. On the other side of the Bali Hai parking lot, there is a modest but substantial lot with 67 public parking</p>	
--	---	--

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
		<p>spaces. This is a photo from the Bali Hai parking lot looking directly at the entrance to the smaller but conveniently located parking lot.</p> <p>There is more public parking here, just on the other side of upper launch ramp parking lot. This section has 72 public parking spaces.</p> <p>There is enough public parking to refocus allocating boat/trailer parking in main areas near the launch ramp entrance and exit where it is needed. The Outboard Boating Club continues to have unresolved concerns regarding creating diagonal parking on Shelter Island Drive. The 80,000 boaters using Shelter Island Drive to access the launch ramp will be facing dangerous jack knife situations when cars suddenly and blindly back out of diagonal parking spaces. Sudden breaking for a car towing a trailer with a boat on it will generate problems, including the dislodging of boats, a situation not easily remedied. One trailer accident will block the entire of Shelter Island Drive and make it impossible for emergency vehicles, Harbor Police, Marina Tenants and Hotel Guests to get into or out of Shoreline Park. Shelter Island Drive is the main corridor, the only approach to the Shelter Island Launch Ramp and the area where the Port proposes to insert diagonal parking. The cars/trailers are parked here waiting to launch at the Shelter Island Launch Ramp because all the parking spaces have been filled.</p>	

98	Outboard Boating	<p>To summarize</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The main launch ramp staging area is vital to the operation of the launch ramp facility. Boaters need this lane to stop and prepare the boat prior to launch, a passing lane for other boaters who are ready to launch and proceeding to the ramp and a lane for boaters who are returning from the ramp with their empty trailers looking for a place to park 80,000 boaters using the Shelter Island launch ramp would be better served by preserving and improving accessibility to the launch ramp. The upper parking lot needs all of its off-street parking space for boat/trailers and for associated boaters. The Shelter Island Launch Ramp has a total of 160 boat/trailer parking spaces and 181 public spaces with an abundance of public parking in the vicinity.• Parking space in the upper parking lot of the Shelter Island Launch Ramp should not be compromised or limited by inserting a pedestrian promenade through the middle of it. This proposed change challenges the ability of the launch ramp facility to provide a safe passage for boaters to prepare, launch and park their boats. Although it looks like there is a lot of wasted space here, every inch of it is used by boaters. <p>The Outboard Boating Club requests the Port reconsider reconfiguring Shelter Island Drive between the Shelter Island roundabout and the end of the upper launch ramp parking lot.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Outboard Boating Club requests the Port further reconsider adding diagonal parking to the main access corridor for the Shelter Island Launch Ramp.	<p>This comment is a summary comment of comment 97. Please see the response to Comment 97, above.</p>
----	------------------	--	---

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
		<p>Thank you for your time and attention to the preservation of the Shelter Island Boat Launch facility parking and planning for a safe access corridor to the Shelter Island Launch Ramp. I would appreciate support for this request.</p> <p>Janet Callow Jr. Staff Commodore Outboard Boating Club of San Diego</p>	
99	Kim Tolles	<p>Congratulations on your incredible job of getting all these materials finalized. Just amazing! I plan on attending both virtual meetings and we will of course be submitting comments. I try to review everything online, but would love to see a hard copy of everything. Will you be providing copies to the Coronado Library (or other libraries around the bay) or to the CCHOA? I also wanted to make sure that the CCHOA comments on the TLUP were included in the Port's official record. When I checked online awhile ago, I didn't see our letter.</p> <p>Thank you and congratulations again,</p>	<p>Availability of the Final PEIR is discussed in the Notice of Completion & Public Hearing. Comments from Coronado Cays HOA are included in Final PEIR Response to Comment 05.</p>
100	Mary Berube	<p>Congratulations Lesley, Long time working and I hope it gets signed off on February!</p>	<p>Comment does not require a response.</p>

101	Marilyn Field	<p>Dear Mayor Bailey, City Council Members and Commissioner Urtasun,</p> <p>I am forwarding the below letter which I wrote to the City Council two years ago on this subject. It is relevant again because the Port has, at the last minute, changed the language in the Final Draft PMPU concerning the prohibition on new hotel rooms.</p> <p>The last draft of the PMPU said "No new hotel rooms are planned or allowed." It has been changed to "No new hotel rooms are planned." This would open the door for the Port to consider a proposal to expand the number of hotel rooms in North Coronado.</p> <p>This exact issue was considered by the Council in January, 2022 because the Marriott sought Council support to expand. The Council received about 100 comment letter opposing relaxing the prohibition on new hotel rooms and decided not to support the Marriott's request for more hotel rooms.</p> <p>I am re-sending my 2022 comment letter because several of you were not on the Council in 2022 and this issue has a long and complicated history.</p> <p>I urge you to submit written comments to the Port re-stating the Council's position that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) no new hotel rooms should be permitted in North Coronado; and2) the Port should continue to honor its agreement with the City, which was required by the Coastal Commission, to honor the standards in the City ordinance known as the TOZ (Tidelands Overlay Zone).	Please see Response 2, above.
-----	---------------	--	-------------------------------

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
		The Port intends to finalize this document at a special meeting on February 28, 2024.	

102	Marilyn Field	<p>I have done a quick read of the tracked changes in the final PMPU and I was surprised and dismayed to see the language about new hotel rooms in the North Coronado subdistrict had been changed from “No new hotel rooms are planned or allowed” to No new hotel rooms are planned.” That is a big change because it leaves the door open to adding new hotel rooms.</p> <p>Adding new hotel rooms at the Marriott would violate Coronado’s TOZ limit of 300 hotel rooms. While the TOZ is a Coronado ordinance, the standards of the TOZ were incorporated into the PMP in accordance with an agreement between the Port and the City of Coronado (referred to as the 1979 MOU) which was required by the Coastal Commission; it is not solely by the Port’s good graces that the standards of the TOZ have been respected for more than 40 years.</p> <p>Two years ago the City of Coronado considered a request from the Marriott to ask the City to support such a change to the PMPU to add more hotel rooms. The Council voted to not support the Marriott’s request.</p> <p>I am concerned that there is inadequate time for comment on these last minute changes, particularly given the lead time a City needs to prepare and submit comments. With just two short virtual meetings for the entire PMPU held at very busy time of the year I don’t think it is possible for the Port to have adequate public comment on such unexpected and significant last minute changes.</p> <p>The Port appears to be rushing to meet a seemingly arbitrary timetable for approval of the PMPU. Because of the long</p>	Please see Response 2, above.
-----	---------------	--	-------------------------------

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
		<p>term significance of the PMPU it is more important to get it right rather than get it done fast. Please reconsider your proposed public comment schedule or at least reopen public comment on the issue.</p> <p>Marilyn Field</p>	
103	Jeanne Smith	<p>... hoping they keep our treasure of a waterfront open to public... walking... biking ...swimming relaxing ..enjoying the bayfront viewsand gathering families on the harbor with no charge. Harbor Drive used to be my favorite drive....hope they don't squeeze as much as they can on our waterfront....and are mindful of our treasure of a waterfront...that's all....</p> <p>~jeanne smith...</p>	Please see responses to Comments 16, 18, 24, 29, 44, 58, 70, and 74, above.
104	Save Our Access	<p>This is a request to suspend the Port Master Plan Update (PMPU) EIR process pending:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Full port board disclosure of project details as slated for the car rental lots, 1220 Pacific Highway, and Seaport Village. 2. Delivery of a mark-up copy of the current Coastal Commission-approved Port Master Plan with the final draft of the PMPU. 3. Located legally-required mitigations for the existing PMP's Local Coastal Program's North Embarcadero "two major parks", Broadway Pier privatization terminal, and the announced Lane Field 1.25 noncontiguous park acres. 	Please see Final PEIR Master Response M-1 , which addresses the issue of piecemealing and cumulative projects. This comment has been included in the record for Board consideration. Please see also Final PEIR Response to Comment O18-6 [1220 Pacific Highway parcel subject to a lease with U.S. Navy.]
105	Save Our Access	<p>Port bundling of all major San Diego Bay parcels from Liberty Station to Chula Vista for commercial hoteliers is now revealed the board's intention under a decades-long "revisioning".</p>	This comment has been included in the record for Board consideration.

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
106	Save Our Access	The resultant over ten new bayfront high-rise hotels exceed the number on the original Las Vega Strip, calling into question board trustees oversight.	This comment has been included in the record for Board consideration.
107	Save Our Access	It has taken public legal pressure for the board to finally move to implement the required Navy Pier memorial park.	This comment has been included in the record for Board consideration.
108	Save Our Access	The required N. Embarcadero 2 major parks will require major underground parking to allow traffic to pull off area roadways instead of circulating endlessly around a dense wall of bayside skyscrapers.	Please see Final PEIR Responses to Comments O17-14 and I15-6 regarding underground parking.
109	Save Our Access	Further, San Diego Bayfront's commercial hotel-created traffic demands continuous tram loop service to alleviate area traffic and to reduce downtown's known pollution pocket.	These issues are addressed in Final PEIR Sections 4.2, Air Quality and Health Risk, 4.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy, and 4.14, Transportation, Circulation, and Mobility.

<p>110</p>	<p>Save Our Access</p>	<p>Whether created voluntarily or under CCC or public civil action, the board must address the fact any Harbor Drive park mitigation and Ruocco Park are threatened by the enshadowments, these from new towers proposed by Seaport Village hoteliers, the new Wyndham owners. and Lankford/China Lane Field developers at 1220 Pacific Highway.</p>	<p>As discussed in Final PEIR Master Response M-1, Seaport Village is not associated with the PMPU. See also Final PEIR Response to Comment O15-3d, which also explains that Lane Field is separate from the PMPU. See also Final PEIR Response to Comment O17-10 for discussion of the Wyndham.</p> <p>Furthermore, Aesthetics and Visual Character were analyzed Section 4.1 of the Final PEIR. The commenter assumes that any shadows must be considered adverse, however shade can provide benefits including reduced heat during the summers. (See Draft PMPU Section 4.3.2 Standards for Amenity Zones.) Further, shadows are an inherent component of any building height, and consequently any reference to height and more intense development in that analysis is inclusive of “shadows.” As discussed in the DEIR, the District is within an urbanized area. (DEIR p. 4.1-60) Central Embarcadero is located adjacent to Downtown San Diego and the Gaslamp Quarter, which are dominated by dense urban development of mainly high- and medium-rise residential, and office buildings, along with restaurant and retail buildings.” (DEIR p. 2-11, 4.1-17.) Consequently, shadows are typical for the urban environment in, and around the Port. The analysis acknowledges that more intense development would occur in PD3, but that most of this development would be infill and would consistent with the existing uses. (DEIR p. 4.-65.) Such development would also be required to comply with height and setback requirements. (DEIR p. 4.1-65.) As also explained in and O17-19, additional aesthetics analysis will be performed as part of subsequent CEQA analysis when project specific details are known.</p> <p>As explained on page 4.1-66 of the Final PEIR, Volume 1, the PMPU contains standards for public realm development and buildings. Buildings would need to abide by the height and setback requirements. PMPU-wide development standards establish requirements for all aspects of development, including building side, setbacks, location, orientation, spacing, access points, massing, and height. The standards ensure that new development maintains appropriate spacing between structures, setbacks from the road, proper widths for walkways, sidewalks, roadways, and view corridors. The PMPU specifically states that setbacks and other design features can reduce shadow. (see Final Draft PMPU p. 403.) The standards would serve to minimize any enshadowment of nearby parks that could be caused by future projects. Cumulative projects currently in the planning phase or proposed for the future would need to comply with the PMPU development standards (both Baywide and those that apply to the subdistrict). As part of future project review, a project proponent of a high rise building would need to submit shading study as part of the project and design review to demonstrate how the project may shade sensitive water or land uses, such as parks.</p>
------------	------------------------	--	--

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
			As also explained in Final PEIR Responses to Comments 015-19 and 017-19 , many areas of the PMPU, including PD3, occur within transit priority areas, and allow densities and employment center uses making such development statutorily exempt from aesthetics analysis. (See also Pub. Res. Code § 21099(d).)
111	Save Our Access	For these reasons full board project disclosure and relevant document mark-up is required prior to delivery of the PMPU for consultant studies and public review comments.	This comment has been included in the record for Board consideration.
112	Save Our Access	Once trustee due diligence is delivered SOA requests in-person public meetings akin to prior gatherings by the port and public to allow for informed public review of San Diego Bay's public tidelands. Scott Andrews V.P. Save Our Access	This comment has been included in the record for Board consideration.

<p>113</p>	<p>Susan Varco (Arthur Engle) February 12, 2024</p>	<p>Varco & Rosenbaum Environmental Law Group LLP represents Arthur Engel, a current resident of the La Playa community on Shelter Island. On behalf of Mr. Engel, our firm has submitted several prior comments letters and have attended workshops and public meetings associated with the proposed Port Master Plan Update (PMPU). We have received and reviewed a copy of the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (Final PEIR) prepared for the proposed Port Master Plan Update, as well as the Final Draft Port Master Plan Update (PMPU) document.</p> <p>While we have submitted multiple prior letters, each with attachments, addressing the deficiencies in the Final PEIR and PMPU, we note that only one of our comment letters (dated January 7, 2022), without attachments, is included in the comment letters listed in the Final PEIR. Consequently, with this letter, we again submit each of our prior comment letters, with full attachments, and ask that they be included in the administrative record for the Final PEIR and PMPU.</p> <p>As our prior comments have indicated, my client is particularly concerned with the prohibition of the construction of new piers in the La Playa area of the West Shelter Island Subdistrict: “No new quasi-private/quasi-public piers or docks associated with residential properties, or for residential use, shall be allowed.” (Emphasis added; Final PEIR, p. 3- 31; PMPU p. 204, PD1.3.) This prohibition is inconsistent with Port District policies and the California Coastal Act. Our previously submitted comment letters (attached)</p>	<p>All attachments to previous comment letters received during public review were intended to be included in the Final PEIR, Volume 1 of 4 of the PEIR, including Ms. Varco’s attachments to the February 2024, letter. Please note that the attachments were inadvertently omitted from the PEIR published on December 6, 2023. They are now included with the PEIR Errata attached to the Board report for the February 28, 2024, special Board PMPU public hearing.</p> <p>Additionally, the comments by Ms. Varco that were sent during the public review period for the Final PEIR, are included in the PEIR Volume 1 of 4, as Comments I13-1 to I13-9. Each of these comments is responded to and particularly, please reference responses to Comments I13-4, -5, and -7 that are directly applicable to Ms. Varco’s February 12, 2024, letter.</p>
------------	---	--	---

No.	Commenter	Comment	Response
		<p>have detailed these policies and the conflict presented by the PMPU prohibitory language.</p> <p>The District's prohibitory language ignores the express actions of the Coastal Commission in allowing for the construction of new piers while ensuring continued public access to the ocean, shoreline, and scenic vistas. PMPU PD1.3, which prohibits the construction of new piers in the La Playa area of the West Shelter Island subdistrict, should be removed. We appreciate the Board's consideration of these comments.</p>	
*	<i>Various</i>	<i>(refer to comment)</i>	Comments identified with * do not raise an environmental issue.