



## Office of the General Counsel

August 28, 2023

San Diego Superior Court  
Attn: Presiding Judge Michael Smyth  
Executive Office  
1100 Union Street, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Diego CA 92101

VIA MESSENGER

**RE: San Diego Unified Port District's Response to San Diego County Grand Jury Report: "Governance of San Diego Bay and its Tidal Lands and Regions"**

### A. Introduction

The following is offered in response to the 2022/2023 San Diego County Grand Jury Report filed June 7, 2023, regarding *Governance of San Diego Bay and Its Tidal Land and Regions* (Grand Jury Report or Report) in compliance with Penal Code Sections 933 and 933.05. The Citizen Civil Grand Jury (Grand Jury) based many of its recommendations along philosophical lines, with an expressed desire for more control from San Diego County and the member cities of San Diego Unified Port (Port) by granting San Diego County oversight of the Port through State Legislation, or an alternative form of governance. However, this desire is at odds with the Public Trust Doctrine, the intent of the Legislature and the legal purpose of the Port.

Consistent with the Public Trust Doctrine, the Port was created for the benefit of the entire State when in 1962, the Legislature enacted the San Diego Unified Port Act<sup>1</sup> (Port Act) and the voters of San Diego County approved its creation. The Port serves all Californians, not only those from our region – to do otherwise would turn the Port Act, California Coastal Act, and most importantly, the Public Trust Doctrine on their heads. The Public Trust Doctrine provides that tidal and submerged lands and other navigable waterways (collectively, Tidelands), such as in and around San Diego Bay, are to be held in trust by the State for the benefit of the people of California and not limited to the benefit or interests of local municipalities adjacent to Tidelands. As found by the California Supreme Court in the long-held *Mallon v. City of Long Beach* (1955) 44 Cal.2d 199 case, a grant of Tidelands is subject to the Public Trust for the benefit of the entire State and not a "municipal affair."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> San Diego Unified Port District Act, Harb. & Nav. Code, Appen. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Mallon, supra*, 44 Cal.2d at p. 209.

Many of the findings offered up by the Grand Jury may come from a lack of understanding and background about the legal principles that dictate the Port's governance pursuant to the Public Trust Doctrine and Port Act, the function of California State agencies such as the State Lands Commission and the California Coastal Commission, and other port commissions around California. It is the Port's hope that this response will provide a better understanding of the organization for future Grand Juries, as well as the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court that reviews the responses to the Report.

## **I. At the Heart of its Creation, Operation and Governance of the Port is the Public Trust Doctrine**

The Public Trust Doctrine is central to every decision made by the Port. Unlike the jurisdiction of a purely local or regional agency, San Diego Bay tidal and submerged lands **must** be managed “without subjugation of statewide interests, concerns, or benefits to the inclination of local or municipal affairs, initiatives, or exercises.”<sup>3</sup> One of the underlying themes of the Report is that local concerns should prevail over statewide concerns. This is as unlawful today as it was before formation of the Port.<sup>4</sup> As a trustee of Tidelands, the Port's primary Public Trust duty is to all people of the State, which includes local residents surrounding the Port.<sup>5</sup>

The Public Trust Doctrine goes back sixteen centuries with its basis in Roman law. It embodies the longstanding rule that states must exercise their sovereign power to manage certain public resources, namely Tidelands, for the common benefit of the people.<sup>6</sup> Under the equal footing doctrine, California acquired title as trustee to manage and administer its Tidelands for the benefit of all Californians upon its admission to the

---

<sup>3</sup> Pub. Resources Code, § 6009, subd. (d); See also *Institutes of Justinian 2.1.1* and State Lands Commission, “*Origins of the Public Trust, Policy Statements, SLC*” (the Public Trust Doctrine embodies the concept that some lands have such a distinctive value that the public's interest must be protected over private and other localized interests).

<sup>4</sup> Pub. Resources Code, § 6009, subd. (e); see also State Lands Commission Staff Report, *Consideration of a Request to Review the Consistency of the Timeshare Component of the Woodfin Suites Hotel Proposal with the Public Trust Doctrine*, (Dec. 14, 2006) Exhibit B, pp. 7-8 (“[U]ses that do not accommodate, promote, foster or enhance the statewide public's need for essential commercial services or their enjoyment tidelands are not appropriate uses for public trust lands. These would include commercial installations that could as easily be sited on uplands and strictly local or ‘neighborhood-serving’ uses that confer no significant benefit to Californians statewide. Examples may include hospitals, supermarkets, department stores, and local government buildings and private office buildings that serve general rather than specifically trust-related functions”) (available at [https://www.slc.ca.gov/Meeting\\_Summaries/2006\\_Documents/12-14-06/Items/121406R48.pdf](https://www.slc.ca.gov/Meeting_Summaries/2006_Documents/12-14-06/Items/121406R48.pdf)) (last visited August 8, 2023).

<sup>5</sup> See *City of Long Beach v. Morse* (1947) 31 Cal.2d 254, 257; Pub. Resources Code, § 6009, subd. (d).

<sup>6</sup> See *Illinois Cent. R. Co. v. State of Illinois* (1892) 146 U.S. 387, 452.

Union in 1850.<sup>7</sup> The State holds these resources for purposes that further the Public Trust, “freed from obstruction or interference by private parties.”<sup>8</sup> As expressed in the California Constitution and long-standing case decisions, the Public Trust Doctrine recognizes that some lands have such a distinctive value to all people of California that the public’s interest must be protected over private and other localized interests.<sup>9</sup>

Public Trust purposes were traditionally confined to navigation, commerce, and fisheries.<sup>10</sup> Over time, new trust purposes have been recognized to include the right to hunt, bathe, and swim, the right to use the bottom of navigable waters for anchoring and standing, and the right to enjoy Tidelands in their preserved and natural state.<sup>11</sup> Uses that encourage or enhance the public’s access to and enjoyment of Tidelands are also allowed, such as restaurants, hotels, visitor-serving shops, gas stations, and parking areas.<sup>12</sup> Additionally, the State or its grantees – like the Port – may, in turn, lease Tidelands to private parties, but only for those uses and purposes consistent with the Public Trust and the applicable granting statute – here, the Port Act.<sup>13</sup> However, trust lands may only be devoted to purposes unrelated to the trust if such purposes “are incidental to and accommodate trust uses.”<sup>14</sup> Residential or private uses are strictly prohibited.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> *People ex inf. Webb v. California Fish Co.* (1913) 166 Cal. 576, 584; *City of Berkeley v. Superior Court* (1980) 26 Cal.3d 515, 521; see also *Pollard v. Hagan* (1845) 44 U.S. 212, 230.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> Cal. Const., art. I, § 25, art. X, §§ 3 and 4, art. XVI, § 6; *National Audubon Society v. Superior Court* (1983) 33 Cal.3d 419, 441 (“[T]he public trust is more than an affirmation of state power to use public property for public purposes. It is an affirmation of the duty of the state to protect the people’s common heritage of streams, lakes, marshlands and tidelands, surrendering that right of protection only in rare cases when the abandonment of that right is consistent with the purposes of the trust”).

<sup>10</sup> *Mallon, supra*, 44 Cal.2d at p. 205.

<sup>11</sup> *Marks v. Whitney* (1971) 6 Cal.3d 251, 259–260; Pub. Resources Code, § 6009, subd. (a).

<sup>12</sup> *Citizens for a Sustainable Treasure Island v. City and County of San Francisco* (2014) 227 Cal.App.4th 1036, 1068 (depending on “surrounding circumstances,” a particular commercial, open space, recreational, or energy use could be deemed consistent with the trust); see, e.g., *Martin v. Smith* (1960) 184 Cal.App.2d 571 (sublease of Tidelands property for commercial purposes, including a restaurant, cocktail lounge, small shops, and a gas station deemed consistent with trust purposes).

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* (a trustee shall not approve uses found to be inconsistent with the trust).

<sup>14</sup> *Zack’s, Inc. v. City of Sausalito* (2008) 165 Cal.App.4th 1163, 1176.

<sup>15</sup> *San Francisco Baykeeper, Inc. v. State Lands Com.* (2018) 29 Cal.App.5th 562, 581. See, e.g., *Citizens for a Sustainable Treasure Island, supra*, 227 Cal.App.4th at p. 1067; *Atwood v. Hammond* (1935) 4 Cal.2d 31, 36–39.

Administration of State trust lands is a matter entrusted to the Legislature.<sup>16</sup> The Legislature, in turn, delegated primary authority over the State's Tidelands to the California State Lands Commission.<sup>17</sup> The Legislature, with State Lands Commission oversight, has granted the San Diego Bay Tidelands to the Port for uses and management consistent with the Public Trust and the Port Act.<sup>18</sup> The Port, as trustee of the granted lands, is subject to the same legal doctrines and laws that apply to the State.

Under California law, the Port is prohibited from delegating its Public Trust duties. A trustee of granted Public Trust lands – like the Port – has “[t]he duty to not delegate to others the performance of acts that the trustee can reasonably be required to perform and to not transfer the administration of the trust to a cotrustee.”<sup>19</sup> Even if the Port were to properly delegate a matter to an agent, it “has a duty to exercise direct supervision over the performance of the delegated matter.”<sup>20</sup> Similarly, the State Lands Commission retains oversight authority over the Port with respect to its management of granted lands, revenue accounting and other approvals and decisions. Pursuant to state law, “[g]ranted public trust lands remain subject to the supervision of the state and the state retains its duty to protect the public interest in granted public trust lands.”<sup>21</sup> In fact, promotion and implementation of statewide interest over municipal or local interest is so vital to the Public Trust that the State Lands Commission proactively opposed a local initiative that would have converted one of the Port's cargo terminals, the Tenth Avenue Marine Terminal, into other uses.<sup>22</sup> Additionally, State Lands Commissioner, Lt. Governor Cruz Bustamante, actively supported the Board's policy position to protect maritime commerce when a proposal was presented to redevelop the terminal with a stadium and other non-maritime uses.<sup>23</sup> In analyzing Public Trust law, the State Lands Commission recognized that:

The land use decisions that the Board [of Port Commissioners (Board)] makes concerning these public trust lands is a statewide affair and cannot be affected by the local initiative process.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> *County of Orange v. Heim* (1973) 30 Cal.App.3d 694, 707–708.

<sup>17</sup> Pub. Resources Code, §§ 6216–6217.6, 6301.

<sup>18</sup> Pub. Resources Code, §§ 6101–6378, 6701–6706, 7501–8030; San Diego Unified Port District Act, Harb. & Nav. Code, Appen. 1.

<sup>19</sup> Pub. Resources Code, § 6009.1, subd. (c)(13).

<sup>20</sup> *Id.*

<sup>21</sup> Pub. Resources Code, § 6009.1, subd. (a).

<sup>22</sup> State Lands Commission Staff Report, *Consideration of a Resolution Opposing the November 4, 2008 Ballot Measure (The Port of San Diego Marine Freight Preservation and Bay Front Redevelopment Initiative) that Attempts to Illegally Amend the Port of San Diego's Master Plan, Tenth Avenue Marine Terminal, City of San Diego, San Diego County* (Oct. 16, 2008) (available at [https://www.slc.ca.gov/Meeting\\_Summaries/2008\\_Documents/10-16-08/Complete\\_Items/R56.pdf](https://www.slc.ca.gov/Meeting_Summaries/2008_Documents/10-16-08/Complete_Items/R56.pdf)) (last visited August 8, 2023).

<sup>23</sup> *Id.* at p. 4.

<sup>24</sup> *Id.*



Thus, further oversight and administration of trust lands for more local purposes, as suggested by the Report, would be counter to the Public Trust Doctrine, the California Constitution, the Port Act and the California Public Resource Code, which sets forth the duties of the Port, as well as the duties and authority of the State Lands Commission.

## II. The Legislature and the Voters Recognized that a Unique Bay Required a Unique Governance Structure

Senate Bill 41 (1962) was introduced during the California Legislature's 1962 First Extraordinary Session by Senator Hugo Fisher to establish the Port and prescribe the organization, management, financing, and other powers and duties of the Port, including the method of formation, conveyance of Tidelands to the Port in trust, and upon specified conditions, development of Tidelands, taxation, and issuance of bonds. On May 8, 1962, the California Legislature approved the establishment of the Port when the Port Act was signed into law by Governor Edmond G. Brown. The Port Act went into effect on January 1, 1963. The Port and governing Port Act were established to satisfy the "longtime need" for such legislation to create a unified body to manage the San Diego Bay Tidelands. Prior to the Port Act's enactment, each city held Tidelands within its municipal boundaries, creating disjointed development and management of Tidelands. The uniqueness of San Diego Bay, and the numerous city jurisdictions, required an extraordinary solution – a unified Port – unlike any other port in the State of California (although it should be noted that every major California port must operate under the same Public Trust responsibilities). As set forth in the Port Act:

Because of the several separate cities and unincorporated populated areas in the area hereinafter described, ***only a specially created district can operate effectively in developing the harbors and port facilities.***<sup>25</sup>

As Governor Brown said at the time, the Port Act amounts to "a major step forward in breaking down some city and county boundary lines for the creation of a regional authority to [move forward] great San Diego development."<sup>26</sup> Creation of the Port was in furtherance of the Public Trust Doctrine under a unified approach for San Diego Bay. The Report's approach that the Port's governance disenfranchises voters contradicts the fact that the Port was created by the Legislature through the Port Act but the effectiveness of the Port Act only occurred ***after*** a vote of the people. In 1962, a majority of San Diego County voters approved of creation of the Port through the passage of Proposition D.<sup>27</sup> Unwinding the Port as the Report suggests would equally disenfranchise those voters that approved the establishment of the Port in San Diego County.

---

<sup>25</sup> San Diego Unified Port District Act, Harb. & Nav. Code, Appen. 1, § 2 (emphasis added).

<sup>26</sup> San Diego Union Tribune, *Senate Approves Port Bill; Brown Says He'll Sign It*, A-25 (April 12, 1962).

<sup>27</sup> See also, San Diego Unified Port District Act, Harb. & Nav. Code, Appen. 1, § 12.

The Grand Jury notes that the Port represents the interests of the Port. However, this is misplaced as the Port must represent the interests of the State of California in accordance with the Public Trust Doctrine. The Grand Jury correctly notes that the Port strongly endeavors to take into account the “perspectives” of the Port member cities. This is the balancing act that was anticipated when the Legislature passed the Port Act in 1962.

### **III. The Port Act Provides for Equitable Representation on the Board and Inherent Accountability of Port Commissioners**

Section 16 of the Port Act provides that each of the City Councils of the Cities of Chula Vista, Coronado, Imperial Beach, National City and San Diego hold the authority to appoint Port Commissioners to the Board. While the City of San Diego gets to appoint three Port Commissioners, as envisioned by the version of SB 41 first introduced to the California Senate, the City of San Diego has the largest population of all five cities. Additionally, this very fact was debated by the Legislature, but ultimately it was approved in the Port Act and by voters.<sup>28</sup> Moreover, if the voters or residents of a Port member city are dissatisfied with a Port Commissioner, they may contact their City Council requesting the Port Commissioner not be re-appointed after a Commissioner’s four-year term, which provides inherent oversight and accountability.

While the Port’s governance structure is unique because it includes representatives from five member cities, the fact that the Board is appointed is far from unique. Most of the major California ports have appointed governing boards and govern within the same constraints contained with the Public Trust Doctrine and their individual grants. For example, the Port of Los Angeles has five Commissioners appointed by the City’s mayor and confirmed by its City Council.<sup>29</sup> The Port of Long Beach also has five Harbor Commissioners, appointed by the mayor and confirmed by the City Council.<sup>30</sup> The Port of San Francisco is the same – it has five Commissioners – also appointed by the mayor and confirmed by the city’s City Council.<sup>31</sup> The Port of Oakland has seven Commissioners, also nominated by the City’s mayor and appointed by its City Council for four-year terms.<sup>32</sup> Finally, the Port of Stockton is governed by a seven-member board of commissioners, four commissioners are appointed by the City of Stockton and three commissioners are appointed by San Joaquin County.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> See San Diego Union Tribune, “*State Senate OKs Unified Port Bill*,” p. A-1 (April, 5, 1962) (Senator Deberg asserts that each city should have equal representation on the Port Board, but is overturned).

<sup>29</sup> See <https://www.portoflosangeles.org/commission/board-members> (last visited July 16, 2023).

<sup>30</sup> See <https://polb.com/commission> (last visited August 7, 2023).

<sup>31</sup> See <https://sfport.com/about/port-commission> (last visited August 7, 2023).

<sup>32</sup> See <https://www.portofoakland.com/port/board-of-commissioners/> (last visited on July 25, 2023).

<sup>33</sup> See <https://www.portofstockton.com/commission/> (last visited August 7, 2023).



In addition to California ports having appointed governing boards, there are numerous State and regional boards or commissions that follow this best practice. For example, the California Coastal Commission is made up of twelve voting members, with four members appointed equally by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The California Air Resources Board has 16 members, and 12 are appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the State Senate and the other four are appointed by the State Senate and Assembly.

#### IV. The State and State Lands Commission Oversee the Port as Required by Law

The State's grant of Tidelands to the Port did not end California's supervision and control of the San Diego Bay Tidelands. California remains the ultimate trustee of the granted lands and, as dictated by the Public Trust Doctrine, retains oversight of Tidelands.<sup>34</sup> As described by the Court of Appeal:

Upon grant to a municipality subject to the public trust, and accompanied by a delegation of the right to improve the harbor and exercise control over harbor facilities, *the lands are not placed entirely beyond the supervision of the state, but it may, and indeed has a duty to, continue to protect the public interests.*<sup>35</sup>

The Grand Jury correctly states that the State Lands Commission has oversight of the Port. Pursuant to state law, “[g]ranted public trust lands remain subject to the supervision of the state and the state retains its duty to protect the public interest in granted public trust lands.”<sup>36</sup> In turn, the State has given the State Lands Commission the authority to oversee trustees such as the Port.<sup>37</sup> The State Lands Commission consists of the Lieutenant Governor, Controller, and the Director of the Department of Finance.<sup>38</sup> Such State Lands Commission oversight includes, but is not limited to, review of submitted detailed accounting of generated trust revenues, as well as administration of Public Trust lands granted to the Port and Port actions to insure they are consistent with the Public Trust Doctrine and the Port Act.<sup>39</sup> Allowable uses on the lands granted are

---

<sup>34</sup> *Illinois Cent. R. Co.*, *supra*, 146 U.S. at p. 453-454; *People ex rel. San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission v. Town of Emeryville* (1968) 69 Cal.2d 533, 549; *Mallon*, *supra*, 44 Cal.2d at p. 208-209; *City of Coronado v. San Diego Unified Port Dist.* (1964) 227 Cal.App.2d 455, 473-474.

<sup>35</sup> *City of Coronado*, *supra*, 227 Cal.App.2d at p. 474 (emphasis added).

<sup>36</sup> Pub. Resources Code, § 6009.1, subd. (a).

<sup>37</sup> Pub. Resources Code, § 6009.1, subd. (c).

<sup>38</sup> Pub. Resources Code, § 6301 (“All jurisdiction and authority remaining in the State as to tidelands and submerged lands as to which 21 grants have been or may be made is vested in the commission”).

<sup>39</sup> Pub. Resources Code, § 6306, subd. (c); *Graf v. San Diego Unified Port Dist.* (1992) 7 Cal.App.4th 1224, 1231 fn. 9; San Diego Unified Port District Act, Harb. & Nav. Code, Appen. 1, § 87, subd. (j).

also monitored by the State Lands Commission and proposed amendments to the Port's planning document such as the Port Master Plan Update, are examined by State Lands Commission staff. Additionally, the Port submitted its "Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment & Coastal Resiliency Report" for State Lands Commission review and consideration.<sup>40</sup> Accordingly, the State Lands Commission exercises oversight of the Port and routinely reviews the Port's actions in both formal and informal ways.

For example, when the Port recently signed onto an intergovernmental services agreement with the U.S. Navy, the Port sought State Lands Commission permission to enter into such an agreement.<sup>41</sup> Additionally, in relation to the proposed redevelopment of an area commonly known as Seaport Village, the Port sought a preliminary Public Trust consistency determination that analyzed proposed uses for the site. More input from the State Lands Commission is ongoing for the development. The State Lands Commission will have to consider and decide whether to approve the Trust Lands Use Plan, which must be prepared pursuant to Senate Bill 507 (2019) for the Tidelands granted to the Port on January 1, 2020.

In addition to the State Lands Commission, the Port is subject to the jurisdiction of other regulatory bodies. The California Coastal Commission is required to certify the Port Master Plan or any amendment thereto and has the ability to appeal certain discretionary Coastal Development Permits.<sup>42</sup> The California Air Resources Board evaluates and regulates many of the air emission impacts from the Port's maritime activities. Permits from the Army Corp of Engineers and the San Diego Regional Water Control Board are required for much of the Port's in-water work.

In some cases, the Port must obtain permission from the Legislature itself. Unlike cities and other special districts who work with their Local Agency Formation Commission on jurisdictional and boundary issues, the Port requires legislative approval to move lands into or out of the trust. For instance, in order to complete the necessary land swap to move the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan (CVBMP) forward, not only did the Port have to request assistance from the State Lands Commission, but the Legislature also had to pass AB 2646 in 2018.

## **V. Funds and Taxes Generated on Tidelands Cannot be Diverted for Municipal Purposes Including to a City or County General Funds or Off Tidelands, with Limited Exceptions**

The broad, statewide interests in the Public Trust are evident, in the strict requirements on administration and use of revenues derived from granted trust lands. In

---

<sup>40</sup> San Diego Unified Port District, *Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment & Coastal Resiliency Report* (June 2019).

<sup>41</sup> State Lands Commission Staff Report, *Staff Report 60* (Oct. 25, 2022) ([https://slcprdwordpressstorage.blob.core.windows.net/wordpressdata/2022/10/10-25-22\\_60.pdf](https://slcprdwordpressstorage.blob.core.windows.net/wordpressdata/2022/10/10-25-22_60.pdf)).

<sup>42</sup> Pub. Resources Code, §§ 30714, 30715.



*City of Long Beach v. Morse* (1947) 31 Cal.2d. 254, the California Supreme Court held that the proceeds from Tidelands that are held in trust are likewise subject to the trust. In this case, the City of Long Beach sought to use proceeds derived from the production of oil and gas from its granted Tidelands for the city's general public improvement fund.<sup>43</sup> The Court held that the oil drilled from the city's granted Tidelands could only be used in furtherance of the trust purpose.<sup>44</sup> The city had no right to devote such proceeds to general municipal improvements unconnected with the trust purposes.<sup>45</sup> The State Lands Commission monitors trustees' finances for such illegal diversions.<sup>46</sup>

Similarly, there are specific limits and obligations that come with administration of trust lands within the Port. For example, Section 30.5 of the Port Act (*Exercise of Powers off Tidelands*) allows the Port to undertake activities off Tidelands only when (a) such activity is located adjacent to the Port's jurisdiction, (b) the Board finds that adequate areas for these activities do not presently exist, and (c) the activities are necessary or incidental to carrying out the purposes for use of Tidelands held in trust by the Port. This practice is exemplified through the Port's Maritime Industrial Impact Fund (MIIF), a program used to fund off-Tidelands projects that mitigate impacts from the Port's maritime terminals and industry. The MIIF's funding source is the Port's maritime industrial revenues. MIIF projects must be located off Tidelands within disproportionately impacted communities in proximity to the Port's marine terminals and maritime industries. Examples of impacts that MIIF funded projects can mitigate include, but are not limited to, diminished air quality, visual impacts, heavy movement of vehicles or equipment through adjacent commercial or residential areas, and/or disproportionate degradation or use of public infrastructure such as roads, streets or sidewalks. Member cities and other public entities, as well as charter and non-traditional public schools located in the member cities, may propose projects to be considered for MIIF approval.

## **B. Response to Findings**

### ***Duties, Responsibilities and Powers***

**Findings 01 through 05 are premised on a misunderstanding of the facts and law.**

***Finding 01:*** Port Commissioners are only required to represent the perspectives, not the interests of the Port City appointing them to the Board of Port Commissioners.

Disagree. By law, Port Commissioners, as described above in the *Introduction*, incorporated herein by reference, have a duty to all Californians, which includes the interests of member cities along with the duties specified in the Public Trust Doctrine, the

---

<sup>43</sup> *City of Long Beach, supra*, 31 Cal.2d at p. 255.

<sup>44</sup> *Id.* at p. 259.

<sup>45</sup> *Id.* at p. 257.

<sup>46</sup> Pub. Resources Code, § 6306, subd. (c).



Port Act, and Public Resources Code.<sup>47</sup> To require subversion of such statewide interests to the “interests of the Port City appointing them to the Board of Port Commissioners” would be contrary to established law. In accordance with the California Public Resources Code, the Port, as trustee, including each Commissioner, has fiduciary duties to the State and people of California. Other duties include:

- (1) The duty of loyalty.
- (2) The duty of care.
- (3) The duty of full disclosure.
- (4) The duty to keep clear and adequate records and accounts.
- (5) The duty to administer the trust *solely in the interest of the beneficiaries*.
- (6) The *duty to act impartially in managing the trust property*.
- (7) The duty to not use or deal with trust property for the trustee’s own profit or for any other purpose unconnected with the trust, and to not take part in a transaction in which the trustee has an interest adverse to the beneficiaries.
- (8) The duty to take reasonable steps under the circumstances to take and keep control of and to preserve the trust property.
- (9) The duty to make the trust property productive under the circumstances and in furtherance of the purposes of the trust.
- (10) The duty to keep the trust property separate from other property not subject to the trust and to see that the trust property is designated as property of the trust.
- (11) The duty to take reasonable steps to enforce claims that are part of the trust property.
- (12) The duty to take reasonable steps to defend actions that may result in a loss to the trust.
- (13) *The duty to not delegate to others the performance of acts that the trustee can reasonably be required to perform and to not transfer the administration of the trust to a cotrustee*. If a trustee has properly delegated a matter to an agent, the trustee

---

<sup>47</sup> Pub. Resources Code, § 6009, subd. (c) (tidelands and submerged lands granted by the Legislature to local entities remain subject to the Public Trust, and remain subject to the oversight authority of the state by and through the State Lands Commission), § 6009, subd. (d) (grantees are required to manage the state’s tidelands and submerged lands consistent with the terms and obligations of their grants and the Public Trust, without subjugation of statewide interests, concerns, or benefits to the inclination of local or municipal affairs, initiatives, or excises), § 6009.1, subd (a) (granted Public Trust lands remain subject to the supervision of the state and the state retains its duty to protect the public interest in granted Public Trust lands), § 6009.1, subd. (b) (the state acts both as the trustor and the representative of the beneficiaries, who are all of the people of this state, with regard to Public Trust lands, and a grantee of Public Trust lands, including tidelands and submerged lands, acts as a trustee, with the granted tidelands and submerged lands as the corpus of the trust).

has a duty to exercise direct supervision over the performance of the delegated matter.<sup>48</sup>

Hence, the Port Commissioners – like every Tidelands trustee in the State – are not “required to represent ...[their] perspectives” but those of the people of California, including the County of San Diego and cities of Chula Vista, Coronado, Imperial Beach, National City and San Diego. Such representation must be in accordance with the Public Trust Doctrine, the California Constitution, California law and the Port’s fiduciary duties. To require Commissioners to represent only the “interests of the Port City appointing them” would be in direct contradiction to the law.

**Finding 02:** The Port District acts as an independent special district without direct oversight from local city or county governments.

Partially disagree. As discussed at length in the *Introduction*, hereby incorporated by reference, the Port is an independent special district created by the Legislature and voters of the County of San Diego. The Port was required:

Because of the several separate cities and unincorporated populated areas in the area hereinafter described, *only a specially created district can operate effectively in developing the harbors and port facilities.*<sup>49</sup>

It would be improper for the County government to have oversight over the Port because the Port’s jurisdiction is State Tidelands, granted to the Port, not the County. To the Port’s knowledge, the only Tidelands that the County holds around the San Diego Bay are those where its administration building and County waterfront park are located.<sup>50</sup> Had the Legislature and voters wanted the County of San Diego to have direct oversight over the San Diego Bay Tidelands, it would have so provided in the Port Act, but it did not. Additionally, to restructure the Port would run afoul of the Legislature’s intent that only a special district could effectively manage the San Diego Bay Tidelands.<sup>51</sup>

However, the Port Commissioners are appointed by local city governments. In this manner, cities have oversight of Board appointees – they can decide not to reappoint a Commissioner if they or their voters disagree with a Commissioner. Additionally, Port Commissioners regularly meet with their City Councils to update and receive feedback from their city’s respective council:

---

<sup>48</sup> Pub. Resources Code, § 6009.1, subd. (c) (emphasis added).

<sup>49</sup> San Diego Unified Port District Act, Harb. & Nav. Code, Appen. 1, § 2 (emphasis added).

<sup>50</sup> See <https://www.slc.ca.gov/granted-public-trust-lands/grantees/san-diego-county/> (last visited August 8, 2023).

<sup>51</sup> *Jurcoane v. Superior Court* (2001) 93 Cal.App.4th 886 (“[i]n interpreting statutes, our primary goal is to give effect to the Legislature’s intent in enacting the law”).

- The National City Commissioner meets and reports to her City Council at nearly every noticed and public City Council meeting.
- The City of Chula Vista Commissioner met with her City Council during their July 25, 2023, June 7, 2022, and August 23, 2022 noticed public meetings. Additionally, the Chula Vista Commissioner met with the Joint Exercise Powers Authority (JEPA) for the Chula Vista Bayfront on five occasions in 2022 at noticed public meetings to discuss issues related to the Chula Vista Bayfront and six JEPA meetings in 2021. At attendance were the Mayor of Chula Vista and another City Council member.
- The City of San Diego Commissioners provide annual reports to the San Diego City Council's Committee on Economic Development and Intergovernmental Relations (ED&IR) at a noticed and publicly held meeting as required by City Council policy as well as ED&IR. The most recent ED&IR report occurred on March 8, 2023.
- The Commissioner from Imperial Beach met with his City Council on June 16, 2021, January 19, 2022, and June 7, 2023.
- The Commissioner from Coronado meets and gives public presentations annually or bi-annually to his City Council.

Nonetheless, it would be improper for local or county governments to have direct oversight over the Port in its management of sovereign Public Trust lands to serve local interests. As discussed above in the *Introduction*, incorporated herein by reference, the Port has a duty to manage Public Trust resources for the common benefit of all people of the State, not just those who reside near its jurisdiction. Further, under State law, the Port is prohibited from delegating its Public Trust duties.<sup>52</sup> Given this prohibition against delegating administration of the trust, it would be improper for city or county governments to have direct oversight over the Port and would operate as an improper delegation of the Port's Public Trust duties.

**Finding 03:** Because the interests of residents of Port Cities and the County of San Diego are subject to the interpretations of the unelected Board of Port Commissioners, their interests may not be heard, prioritized or represented accurately.

Disagree and would like to note that this Finding is similar to Finding 01. The Port is governed by all the same laws around public participation that drive cities and counties, including the Brown Act, the State's open meeting law that requires local governments and agencies to conduct business in a way that enables the public to scrutinize government decision-making. Public comment from citizens, residents and elected officials are regularly given at open Board meetings.<sup>53</sup> The notion that Port Commissioners misrepresent or don't listen to the public is unsubstantiated. The finding that Commissioners are appointed so they behave differently could then be applied to

<sup>52</sup> Pub. Resources Code, § 6009.1, subd. (c)(13).

<sup>53</sup> See also response to Finding 04 regarding public participation where robust public participation occurred by the public and elected officials.



any number of State agencies and governmental boards - elected or unelected - throughout the State.

Additionally, this finding appears to suggest that the Port should prioritize the municipal interests of the Port member cities, the County and the private interests of their residents. This suggestion is unlawful for the reasons set forth in the *Introduction*. The Port, in its administration of the Public Trust Doctrine, is expressly prohibited from subjugating statewide interests to local or municipal affairs.<sup>54</sup> While the Port's primary Public Trust duty is to the people of the State, the Port represents the interests equitably of the residents of the five member cities and San Diego County. The Grand Jury Report goes on to recommend that the County lobby the legislature to introduce legislation granting the County shared Public Trust duties over sovereign lands in the San Diego Bay.<sup>55</sup> However, this recommendation neglects to acknowledge that should the County be granted Public Trust duties over sovereign lands, the County's duty in administering the Public Trust would be the same as the Port's - to the people of the State of California, not its or any cities' residents. Furthermore, Port Commissioners would be appointed not elected to the Board. Even if the Grand Jury's recommendations regarding local interests were lawful, this approach would not resolve the matter because prioritizing local interests is fundamentally at odds with the Public Trust Doctrine and the fiduciary duties of the Board as enumerated in the *Introduction*.

**Finding 04:** Briefings by Port Commissioners to Port City Councils in noticed public meetings regarding issues affecting their jurisdictions, will increase the level of public participation and knowledge regarding Port District activities, Port Master Plans, Master Plan Updates, Port Master Plan amendments or additions.

Disagree. Port Commissioners regularly present to City Councils or in the case of the City of San Diego, to the Council's Economic Development and Intergovernmental Relations Committee.<sup>56</sup> The timing and frequency of these briefings is left to the discretion of the appointing City Council. Additionally, it would undermine the discretion of the member cities' City Councils to dictate when and how often a Commissioner should report to its City Council.

The Port also has a tradition of robust public engagement with member cities, stakeholders and the public. For example, the Port Master Plan Update (PMPU) effort has consistently emphasized the importance of public outreach and stakeholder engagement as an essential component of the process to ensure the PMPU reflects the needs and desires of Californians and local visitors to the waterfront and the community. The PMPU is being developed through an award-winning outreach and engagement approach for "Integrated Planning," which is a sustainable approach to planning that builds relationships, aligns the organization, and emphasizes preparedness for change. Through the Integrated Planning approach, Port staff conducted public outreach related

---

<sup>54</sup> Pub. Resources Code, § 6009, subd. (d).

<sup>55</sup> Grand Jury Report, Recommendation 23-95, p. 17.

<sup>56</sup> See Response to Finding 02, above.

to the PMPU Discussion Draft after the draft was released for public review in April 2019, and additional public outreach after the Revised Draft PMPU was released in October 2020. The public outreach has included meetings with the public in the form of open house events and meetings with groups and individuals. At a minimum, every open house event was advertised on the Port's webpage and social media, as well as emails sent directly to interested parties that have signed up on the Port's Integrated Planning mailing list. Stakeholder engagement has been in the form of land and water tours, meetings and charettes, and has reached federal, state and local agencies, special districts, and interested parties. As summarized in the attached summary report (see Attachment A, incorporated herein by reference), the public outreach and stakeholder engagement has been robust and comprehensive.

Since the inception of the Integrated Planning process in 2013, the drafting of the PMPU has been based on comprehensive engagement, informed by community and stakeholder input from over 10 years of collective public outreach, including:

- 25.8 million points of contact (2017-current; not quantified before 2017)
- Over 6,300 respondents to two online surveys
- Nearly 3,000 comment letters on the PMPU Discussion Draft in 2019
- Nearly 400 comments on the Revised Draft PMPU in 2020
- Over 475 meetings with key stakeholders and partner agencies
- 40 public Board workshops/meetings
- 19 open houses and community meetings

The Port has invested more than ten years into public and stakeholder outreach as a part of the Integrated Planning process, and there is over 20 years of North Embarcadero related outreach focused on achieving a shared vision for this stretch of waterfront. This Integrated Planning outreach and engagement approach has been recognized with the awards listed below:

- 2019 Silver Bernays Award of Excellence – Integrated Communications (Port of San Diego/Nuffer, Smith, Tucker), Public Relations Society of America, San Diego/Imperial Counties Chapter
- 2018 Gold International MarCom Award, PMPU Public Outreach & Engagement (Category: Strategic Communications, Communications/Public Relations – Communications Program) Association of Marketing and Communications Professionals
- 2018 Award of Excellence - Community Education/Outreach (Port Master Plan Update), American Association of Port Authorities (AAPA)
- 2018 (CAPIO) Excellence in Public Information and Communications (EPIC) Award
- 2017 Silver Bernays Award of Excellence – Community Relations (Port of San Diego/Nuffer, Smith, Tucker), Public Relations Society of America, San Diego/Imperial Counties Chapter
- 2017 National Environmental Excellence Award, National Association of Environmental Professionals



- 2016 National Planning Excellence Award for a Planning Advocate (Commissioner Ann Moore), American Planning Association
- 2016 Silver Bernays Award of Excellence – Public Affairs (Cook and Schmid), Public Relations Society of America
- 2016 President’s Award (HKS Urban Design Studio/Randy Morton), American Institute of Architects San Diego

Another notable example of robust public engagement is the effort that transpired for the National City Balanced Plan, a Port Master Plan Amendment. From 2015 to 2022, eight Board meetings were held specific to this project. Additionally, from 2015 through the present, the Port leadership has conducted standing monthly meetings with City of National City leadership, including the current Mayor and various councilmembers. To date, over 40 public meetings have occurred where a number of topics, mostly National City-focused, were discussed.

A significant component of the National City Balanced Plan is the enhancement and expansion of Pepper Park. To ensure that the park improvements reflect the desires of the community, the Port conducted public outreach including three workshops, both virtual and in-person, “pop-up” workshops in different parts of National City, and also two online surveys. The workshops were held in English, with simultaneous interpretation in Spanish and Tagalog. Together, the workshops and pop-up events had a total of nearly 400 participants, and over 300 surveys were completed. Additional public outreach awards associated with the Balanced Plan include:

- 2022 Best in Show, Silver Excellence Awards, (Port of San Diego/Nuffer, Smith, Tucker), DEI Drives Pepper Park Community Input Project, Bernays Awards, Public Relations Society of America, San Diego/Imperial Counties Chapter
- 2022 – Silver Excellence Award (Port of San Diego/Nuffer, Smith, Tucker), Diversity, Equity & Inclusion in Communications for DEI Drives Pepper Park Community Input Project, Bernays Awards, Public Relations Society of America, San Diego/Imperial Counties Chapter
- 2023 – Award of Distinction, Special or Community Event – Recurring or Series (Port/Nuffer, Smith, Tucker) for DEI Drives Port of San Diego Community Input for Pepper Park Project, CAPIO – California Association of Public Information Officers

The Port’s commitment to public outreach extends to specific projects, not just plans. As part of the public engagement effort for the redevelopment of Seaport Village, the Port hosted an open house where over 1,000 members of the public interacted with and commented on the proposals of several developers.

**Finding 05:** Currently, the Board of Port Commissioners does not have term limits. Considering term limits would foster democratic principles by providing more opportunities for diverse and talented individuals to serve, prevent the accumulation of influence, and uphold the Public Trust by keeping the Board representative responsive to its community.

Disagree. The Legislature left discretion to the Port member cities to determine the length of service of their respective Port Commissioners. Granting member cities discretion over the number of terms fosters democratic principles such as freedom of political participation and expression. To mandate term limits would take this freedom of governance away. Section 16 of the Port Act (*Government of District; Appointment of Port Commissioners; Qualifications; Exercise of Powers and Duties*) states that “each city council... shall appoint the commissioner or commissioners to which it is entitled... to represent that particular city on the Board.” Section 17 of the Port Act (*Term of Commissioners; Vacancies; Oath; Certificate; Removal*) furthers the responsibility granted to member cities by specifying that “the term of each commissioner shall be four years” but that “a commissioner may be removed from the Board by a majority vote of the city council which appointed the commissioner.” Additionally, member cities, a local agency, may not limit the terms limits of a Port Commissioner as the number of terms served is set by State law – the Port Act.

### ***Initial Opposition to Port District Formation***

***Finding 06:*** With three of seven port commissioners appointed to the Board of Port Commissioners by the City of San Diego, the potential exists for the City of San Diego to exert dominance over the priorities, resources and decisions of the Port District.

Disagree. Commissioners often cite the fact that it is the “*Unified Port District*” and endeavor to view decision making through a lens considering all the Port as a whole rather than parochial interests. There are numerous examples of that being the norm. The Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan and associated development projects, the National City Balanced Plan, the Maritime Clean Air Strategy (MCAS), electrification of the Port’s cargo terminals and leading the way against Tijuana River Pollution are just a few examples of where City of San Diego Commissioners joined with others on major initiatives that benefitted the State, as well specific member cities. Also, while the City of San Diego has three votes, it does not have a majority of the votes on the Board. In a number of circumstances, including Port Master Plan amendments, a two-third vote is required for the item to pass. Additionally, the vast majority of the Board decisions are voted up or down unanimously. Finally, as explained in the *Introduction*, incorporated hereby reference, the Board and individual Port Commissioners, as the trustee of State Tidelands, have a primarily duty to the people of California and cannot prioritize any specific member city over another.

### ***Port District Potential Source of Bias***

***Finding 07:*** The Port District is incentivized to maximize revenue to fund its operations, a goal that may create conflicts of interest in the priorities, allocation of resources and other decisions made by the Port Commission.

Disagree. The Port acts for the benefit of the public on behalf of the State of California. As explained in the *Introduction*, incorporated herein by reference, revenues generated on Tidelands can only be reinvested in the Tidelands or adjacent when a nexus

exists (e.g., MIF projects as explained above under *Section VI of the Introduction*). Moreover, these revenues have traditionally supported a portfolio of benefits for the State of California since the establishment of the Port including, but not limited to, creation of and improvements to recreational parks and amenities, coastal access via beaches, walkways, and promenades, integrated environmental preservation and management of San Diego Bay and its environs, and maintenance and development of port and harbor facilities for a deepwater seaport. As a public agency, the Port makes land use decisions that may generate operating income through sources including lease rent or waterborne trade, just as a city or county makes land use decisions that may generate tax revenue including transient occupancy, property and sales tax. Although the Port has the power to tax, it has not done so since 1970.

The Port's land use decisions often result in the construction of new parks, promenades, and recreational opportunities at no cost to taxpayers. Public amenities such as these are maintained through Port revenue. Since its inception in 1962, the Port has funded or constructed 22 public parks with an additional two new parks on the way in Chula Vista. It also has funded several environmental initiatives such as habitat preservation and restoration, environmental education and Tidelands and sediment clean up, and has spent a significant amount of resources decreasing air pollution around the Bay through the MCAS and electrification of Port operations (as described below). While revenues drive these Port initiatives, tax revenues in counties and cities do the same in their jurisdictions.

Additionally, the Port regularly develops the Tidelands with important co-benefits. In the case of the CVBMP, for example, the Port carefully balanced the interests of all Californians, the City of Chula Vista and its community, the environment, labor, the Coastal Commission, and the State Lands Commission. The Coastal Commission unanimously approved the CVBMP. One of the most creative and essential features of the CVBMP was a land exchange between the Port and a private developer, Pacifica. This concept emerged from a robust public planning process resulting in the CVBMP. To deliver both an economic catalyst for the overall bayfront and to create an environmentally superior land use plan, the Port initiated a land exchange with Pacifica. The land exchange resulted in Pacifica receiving 35 acres of commercial land in the Harbor Planning District and the Port receiving in exchange 97 acres of environmentally sensitive habitat within the Sweetwater Planning District, which shall remain a preserve. This dual approach, seeking both economic development and environmental preservation, achieves the policy and purpose of the State of California as enacted by the Legislature in the Port Act and as approved by the voters.

Enhanced public access to Port Tidelands has been a significant aspect of the PMPU effort, which is not driven by revenue. The Draft PMPU proposes to increase the amount of and accessibility to recreational facilities and features within the proposed PMPU area by 14.03 acres over the existing acreage designated for recreation open space (259.62 acres) for a new total of 273.65 acres.



Another example of the Port utilizing its revenue to give back to the community is the Port's investment in electrifying maritime operations. In October 2021, the Board adopted the MCAS, which includes a vision of *Health Equity for All* with specific aspirational goals and objectives to reduce pollution from maritime-related activities and industries.<sup>57</sup> In support of this vision, the Port, in collaboration with Port tenants and stakeholders, has been hard at work advancing electrification initiatives that support zero emissions (ZE) equipment and operations. As of the close of FY23, the Port has committed an investment of over \$58 million to electrification efforts, in addition to Port tenants who have also committed over \$27 million. To put the Port's investment into context, the agency's annual operating budget is around \$200 million.

### ***Chula Vista Convention Center and Hotel***

***Finding 08:*** Success in the development of the Chula Vista Hotel and Convention Center has been obtained because of a close collaboration and alignment of interests between the Port District and the City of Chula Vista.

Agree. The Gaylord Pacific Resort and Convention Center is under construction now and will become a reality because of a close collaboration and alignment of interests between the Port, and the City of Chula Vista, and importantly the public. The project is the catalyst and anchor for development of the larger 535-acre Chula Vista Bayfront redevelopment. This effort envisions a world-class destination in the South Bay – a unique place for the people of California to work and play. It is designed to create new public parks and recreational adventures, improve the natural habitat, offer new dining and shopping options, provide a world-class hotel and convention center, and more – all for the people of the State of California including the local community. The CVBMP envisions:

- 70 acres of new parks (100 acres total, including existing parks);
- 120 acres of open space, habitat replacement, wetlands and ecological buffers to protect wildlife habitat, species and other coastal resources;
- Shoreline promenade, walking trails and a bicycle path network;
- 2,850 total hotel rooms;
- 600,000 square feet of restaurant, retail and marina-support uses;
- 220,000 square feet of mixed-use commercial recreation/marine-related office uses; and
- 1,100 – 3,000 space parking facility.

### ***Dole Fruit Company Proposal***

***Finding 09:*** The Port Commissioners' decision to move short-haul truck staging for local deliveries of Dole Fruit products relocated a source of pollution from the Barrio Logan community to communities in National City.

---

<sup>57</sup> San Diego Unified Port District, MCAS, (October 2021) (available at [www.portofsandiego.org/mcas](http://www.portofsandiego.org/mcas)).

Disagree. In 2012, the Port facilitated the move of Dole's warehousing and distribution facility from Barrio Logan to the Port-owned National Distribution Center (NDC) in National City. However, the decision to move the facility was at the discretion of Dole and its third-party warehouse operator, who elected to terminate its warehouse lease in Barrio Logan. Alternative warehousing was available at the Port-owned NDC at the time, and Port staff negotiated with Dole to lease warehouse space at the NDC as a relocation site for the facility.

This action did not trigger a relocation of a source of pollution, the NDC in National City was already in operation as an established warehouse and distribution use on Tidelands, and trucks routinely made deliveries to and from this location. Additionally, the Barrio Logan operation was located on Main Street, directly across the street from the Mercado Apartments, a residential development and sensitive receptor, while NDC is located further away (over 1,200 feet) from the nearest residential use.

### ***Mitsubishi Cement Corporation Proposal***

***Finding 10:*** The controversy surrounding the Mitsubishi Cement Corporation Project's potential health effects on the Barrio Logan neighborhood and other nearby residents damaged the Port District's community relations with these communities and contributed to the decision to discontinue the project.

Disagree. The Mitsubishi Cement Corporation (MCC) Project was discontinued when MCC chose to walk away from negotiations with the Port. MCC asserted that they were compliant with the MCAS, but Port Commissioners and staff felt that the MCC Project was not aligned with the goals and objectives of the MCAS. In particular, MCC would not meet the MCAS's goal of reaching 100% ZE trucks calling to Tenth Avenue Marine Terminal by 2030. The Port insisted that MCC incorporate ZE trucks into their proposed project, but after a lengthy negotiation, MCC walked away because they could not meet that term. While the Grand Jury Report stated that the Port would be willing to reopen negotiations, the Report left out the important context that reopening would only happen if MCC was willing to address the MCAS and incorporate ZE trucks into its project. Ultimately, the Port feels that this decision to keep course with the vision of the MCAS will actually strengthen the relationship with the community because it shows the Port's commitment to *Health Equity for All* and reducing the use of diesel trucks in the area.

***Finding 11:*** Oversight of the Mitsubishi Cement Corporation project by the City of San Diego or San Diego County governments might have given greater priority to the health concerns of community members and resulted in a more equitable balance between economic and health concerns earlier in the project's evaluation process.

Disagree. There is no basis for this Finding. The Port's MCAS is the strongest emission reduction blueprint of any port in the State and nation. The Board adopted the MCAS in 2021, with a vision of *Health Equity for All* and ambitious, aspirational goals to reduce emissions and criteria pollutants from multiple mobile sources (e.g., vessels,



cargo handling equipment, trucks, etc.). In fact, the Port has set goals in advance the State of California. In particular, the MCAS's goals for the transition to ZE trucks is five years, and in some cases fifteen years, ahead of the State. These ZE truck goals are a large contributing factor as to why MCC walked away from their proposed project. Absent these goals, City of San Diego or County oversight may have resulted in a project adoption without early use of ZE trucks.

Additionally, the Port Act expresses that the Port may “protect, preserve, and enhance all the physical access to the bay, the natural resources of the bay, including plant and animal life, and the quality of water in the bay.” The Port consistently embraces this authority as an environmental champion and steadfast advocate for improving environmental quality for air, land, water and wildlife, through first-of-kind plans, like the Climate Action Plan (2013) and MCAS. Additionally, under both the California Coastal Act and the Public Trust Doctrine, water dependent developments – like the MCC project where vessels import cargo – are priority uses.<sup>58</sup> If the City or County were to have oversight over these types of projects, they would still be driven by these same water dependent development priorities, absent the MCAS with goals for proposed projects to reduce emissions at an expedited rate beyond State regulations.

### ***Coronado Cottages at the Cays Proposal***

***Finding 12:*** The Port's decision to approve the Cottages at the Cays development proposal could negatively impact access to San Diego Bay and approving the plan favors those willing or able to pay costly hotel rates typical of the Coronado area.

Disagree. This finding is inaccurate. The Port did not “approve” the Cottages at the Cays (Cottages or Cays) proposal. The Board directed staff to commence environmental review and prepare a draft Port Master Plan Amendment, which must be approved before the Cottages can be developed. This is only the beginning of a long entitlement process. The Board reserved all discretion to approve, approve with conditions, or deny the Cottages proposed project. Both the public generally and City of Coronado residents specifically did comment and will have several opportunities to comment, to present objections, and to request changes to the project including, but not limited, to a request of denial of the Cottages proposed project. Additionally, if the Board approved the Port Master Plan Amendment, which would require a two-thirds vote, the California Coastal Commission must either certify or deny the Cottages' Port Master Plan Amendment. In either case, the public will be able to fully participate.

The overnight rate of the Cottages' units has not been set. The applicant is proposing the development to be lower-cost overnight accommodations. Under the

---

<sup>58</sup> Joseph L. Sax, *The Public Trust in Stormy Western Waters* (October 1997); Pub. Resources Code, § 30001.5, subd. (d) (“The Legislature further finds and declares that the basic goals of the state for the coastal zone are to...[e]nsure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast”).

California Coastal Act public access is a priority in the coastal zone.<sup>59</sup> Article 2 of the California Coastal Act addresses public coastal access policies and Section 30213 of that Article states that “[l]ower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred.”<sup>60</sup> The Coastal Commission has interpreted Section 30213 to include lower-cost overnight accommodations. The Cays project proposes both lower-cost overnight accommodations and recreational amenities in the form of park improvements and improved recreation path around the island. Thus, meeting both recreational and lower-cost overnight accommodations mandates of Coastal Act Section 30213.

Also, the proposed project site is currently a dry boat storage yard as allowed by the Port Master Plan, the lease and the Port Act. Most members of the public currently have no access the site; however, if successfully redeveloped, even as an RV Park, the property will be more accessible to the public than it is today.

A trustee, like the Port, is not bound to choose a trust-consistent use over another and is free to choose among them provided it is consistent with the Public Trust Doctrine and trustee’s grant from the State – here, the Port Act.<sup>61</sup> Hence, the Port does not need to prioritize passive recreation – requested by one small neighborhood adjacent to Cottages project site – over recreational improvements and lower-cost overnight units. But again, the Port has not approved the project.

### **Public Participation**

**Finding 13:** Given a preference for informal channels of communication by Port City councils and mayors with their appointed Port District representatives, neither Port Commissioners nor Port City Councils maintain completely open and transparent relationships allowing for public involvement or awareness of Port District activities.

Disagree. The Board, as already identified in this response, has a number of formal channels of communication including reports to City Councils or committees. Further, the Port operates under the Brown Act which facilitates open meetings and finally, has an extensive public outreach presence to receive input.

### **Master Plan Documents and Updates**

**Finding 14:** In its current form, the Port Master Plan and Master Plan Update documents published by the Port District are overly complex, difficult to understand and too broad in

---

<sup>59</sup> Pub. Resources Code, § 30210.

<sup>60</sup> Pub. Resources Code, § 30213.

<sup>61</sup> *Marks, supra*, 6 Cal.3d 251, 259-260; *Citizens for East Shore Parks v. State Lands Com.* (2011) 202 Cal.App.4th 549, 576-577; *Higgins v. City of Santa Monica* (1964) 62 Cal.2d 24, 30; see also *Monterey Coastkeeper v. Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board* (2022) 76 Cal.App.5th 1, 21.

scope to foster meaningful comprehension by Port City residents, elected municipal or county officials.

Disagree. A Port Master Plan is required by the Port Act and the California Coastal Act. The Port is one of four California ports required to have a port master plan. The Ports of Los Angeles, Long Beach and Hueneme are also required to have port master plans in accordance with the California Coastal Act. The contents of the PMPU, which is legally an amendment to the existing Port Master Plan, have been prepared in accordance with the requirements of section 30711 of the California Coastal Act and the Port Act.

The contents of the PMPU closely model the structure of General Plans for cities and counties, which should be easy to understand for residents and elected municipal or county officials familiar with city and county planning. Specifically, the PMPU contains Baywide Elements with goals, objectives and policies specific to topics such as Water and Land Use, Mobility, Ecology, Safety and Resiliency, Environmental Justice, and Economics. In addition, the PMPU contains a chapter on Baywide Development Standards and a chapter containing Planned Improvements and Development Standards specific to each of the Port's ten Planning Districts.

Early in the process, a key objective for the PMPU effort was to modernize and streamline the Port Master Plan, so that it would be more user-friendly and easier to read, digest, and understand. The public's ability to digest and comprehend the plan is evidenced by the significant volume of substantive and detailed comments on specific content in the document as noted below:

- Nearly 3,000 comment letters received on the PMPU Discussion Draft in 2019
- Nearly 400 comment letters received on the Revised Draft PMPU in 2020
- Nearly 400 comment letters received on the Draft PMPU released as part of the Draft EIR in 2021

Further, in an effort to ensure changes made from the 2020 Revised Draft PMPU to the 2021 Draft PMPU were easy to discern and understand, the Port prepared a track-changes version of the document to clearly reflect the revisions made. These track changes were made available to the public with the publication of the Draft PMPU. Additionally, the Port created a hand-out summarizing the revisions to the document to make it even easier for the public to digest. This hand-out was circulated to interested parties and posted on the Port's website.

**Finding 15:** Ratification of Port Master Plans, Master Plan Updates or Master Plan Amendments would allow residents of Port City Planning districts and San Diego County to acknowledge and confirm their understanding of Port District development plans and projects within their municipal and county boundaries and provide reliable documents for communities to plan for the future.



Disagree. As more fully explained in the *Introduction*, incorporated herein by reference, the Legislature created the Port because only a unified special district could manage and develop Tidelands around San Diego Bay. Section 19 of the Port Act gives the Port the sole authority to adopt or amend the Port Master Plan with State Lands Commission oversight when needed. Chapter 8 of the California Coastal Act gives the Port the authority to adopt or amend the Port Master Plan and the California Coastal Commission the authority to deny or certify a Port Master Plan or amendment thereto.<sup>62</sup> This ensures cohesive development, environmental preservation and recreational opportunities on Tidelands. Having multiple levels of ratification of the Port Master Plan or amendments thereto would complicate the approval process, require amendments to the Port Act and Coastal Act, and would defeat the Legislative intent in creating the Port – a unified development and habitat preservation strategy for San Diego Bay Tidelands. Additionally, it may create a conflict with the Public Trust Doctrine whereby local governmental may prioritize local interests over statewide interest as required by law.

This finding also presumes the existing process does not allow participation from local residents, member cities and the County when in practice, that is not the case. Please see Responses to Findings 04 and 14. The current process allows for ample opportunities for Port member cities and their residents to plan for the future under the same Brown Act public meeting principals that govern municipal and county meetings.

### C. Recommendations

**23-97: Institute formal policies or procedures allowing for appeal of any action taken by the Board of Port Commissioners, including decisions, ordinances, or project approvals.**

The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.

As noted in the *Introduction* above, hereby incorporated by reference, the State Lands Commission has oversight of the Port. Pursuant to state law, “[g]ranted public trust lands remain subject to the supervision of the state and the state retains its duty to protect the public interest in granted public trust lands.”<sup>63</sup> In turn, the State has given the State Lands Commission the authority to oversee trustees such as the Port.<sup>64</sup> Accordingly, the State Lands Commission exercises oversight of the Port and routinely reviews the Port’s actions. There is no regulation or law that allows for Port decisions to be appealed to a member city or the County. Additionally, if an appeal resulted in local interests trumping statewide interest, it would violate the Public Trust Doctrine. This would also complicate approval of decisions and make operations of the Port extremely burdensome.

---

<sup>62</sup> Pub. Resources Code, § 30714.

<sup>63</sup> Pub. Resources Code, § 6009.1, subd. (a).

<sup>64</sup> Pub. Resources Code, § 6009.1, subd. (c).

In addition to the State Lands Commission, the Port is subject to the jurisdiction of other regulatory bodies such as the California Coastal Commission, which has the ability to appeal certain Coastal Development Permits and reviews Port Master Plan Amendments for certification whereby they either approve or deny amendments.<sup>65</sup>

**23-98: Institute formal policies to enable Port Cities and County of San Diego to ratify the Port Master Plans, proposed Port Master Plan Updates or amendments to the Port Master Plan for Port District planning districts within each city's and county boundaries.**

The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.

As more fully explained in the *Introduction*, incorporated herein by reference, the Legislature created the Port because only a unified special district could manage and develop Tidelands around San Diego Bay. Section 19 of the Port Act gives the Port the sole authority to adopt or amend the Port Master Plan with State Lands Commission oversight when needed.<sup>66</sup> Chapter 8 of the California Coastal Act gives the Port the authority to adopt or amend the Port Master Plan and the California Coastal Commission the authority to deny or certify a Port Master Plan or amendment thereto.<sup>67</sup> Vested authority with the Port does exactly what the Legislature intended – it ensures cohesive development, environmental preservation, and recreational opportunities on Tidelands. Having multiple levels of ratification of the Port Master Plan or amendments thereto would complicate the approval process, require amendments the Port Act and Coastal Act and would defeat the Legislative intent. Additionally, it may create a conflict with the Public Trust Doctrine whereby local governmental may prioritize local interests over statewide interest. Moreover, this could only create gridlock and incentivize self-interest.

The contents of the Port Master Plan or amendment thereto (like the PMPU) have been prepared in accordance with the requirements of Section 30711 of the California Coastal Act and in accordance with the Port Act. This recommendation and related Finding 15, seem to presume the existing process does not allow for public notice and participation by Port member cities and the County, which is not the case (see also Response to Finding 14).

**23-99: Directly inform each of the five City Councils at officially scheduled City Council meetings open to the public how the proposed updated Port Master Plan affects areas within their jurisdictional boundaries.**

The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.

---

<sup>65</sup> See <https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/assets/cdp/appeals-faq.pdf>.

<sup>66</sup> San Diego Unified Port District Act, Harb. & Nav. Code, Appen. 1, § 19.

<sup>67</sup> Pub. Resources Code, § 30714.



To reiterate the Responses to Findings 14 and 15, incorporated herein by reference, member cities and local residents have engaged in such processes during workshops, one-on-one meetings, stakeholder outreach and Brown Act noticed open session meetings.

**23-100: To increase the coordination of Port District activities with the Port Cities and their staffs, institute a policy of including staff from each of the five Port Cities and County of San Diego on each of the Port District’s advisory committees.**

The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.

Board Advisory Committees are advisory to the Board and do not have any authority for decision-making. They are governed by Board Policy No. 018,<sup>68</sup> which identifies its purpose as “to advise the Board... [and] shall be advisory in nature and shall have no authority to negotiate for, represent, or commit the [Port] in any respect.” The policy further identifies that “the Chairman of the Board shall appoint members of the committees” and “committee meetings shall be noticed and open to the public... [and] shall be conducted according to applicable California State rules and regulations.” Already, the Port engages with a number of key stakeholders on each Advisory Committee. As the Advisory Committees are public, staff from each member city and the County are welcome to participate, but the Port will not dictate a policy that requires mandatory participation by member cities or the County. Doing so violates their discretion as to when Port member cities, the County and their staffs deem it proper to get involved with the Advisory Committees.

**23-101: Post meeting minutes and agendas of each of the Port District’s advisory committees.**

The recommendation is already practiced at the Port, consistent with the Brown Act and existing Board Policy No. 018, advisory committee meeting agendas and minutes are publicly accessible.

The Port has traditionally electronically posted the agendas for committee meetings on the Port’s website at: <https://www.portofsandiego.org/people/other-public-meetings>. During COVID, those meetings that were streamed through our agenda management software were posted in Granicus as well. Pre- and post-COVID, all committee agenda are posted outside the administration building and at the location of the meeting, if offsite, in compliance with the Brown Act.

---

<sup>68</sup> See <https://pantheonstorage.blob.core.windows.net/administration/BPC-Policy-No-018-Board-Advisory-Committees.pdf>

Per the Brown Act, there is not a requirement to publicly post Advisory Committee meeting minutes unless an “emergency meeting” has been called.”<sup>69</sup> Port Advisory Committees are advisory to the Board and do not have any authority for decision making. They are governed by Board Policy No. 018, which states that: “Summary reports of each Committee meeting shall be prepared by [Port] District staff supporting the Committee. The summary reports shall be forwarded to the Board and Committee updates may be reported at Board meetings.” To that end, Committee summary reports are included in the Information to the Board package as applicable, which is maintained as a public record.

Although this recommendation is already practiced, the Port is currently undertaking implementation of a new agenda management software. The current plan with the new system is to begin posting all Advisory Committee agendas and potentially the summary reports (which act as minutes) in this new system beginning late 2023.

**23-102: In consultation with the City Councils of San Diego, Chula Vista, Coronado, Imperial Beach and National City, consider placing a two-term limit on the number of terms that a Port Commissioner can serve (as already enacted for the City of Coronado).**

The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.

It is up to the discretion of each member city to set their own policies around commissioner appointments. Section 16 of the Port Act states that “each city council... shall appoint the commissioner or commissioners to which it is entitled... to represent that particular city on the Board.”<sup>70</sup> Section 17 of the Port Act furthers the responsibility granted to member cities by specifying that “the term of each commissioner shall be four years” but that “a commissioner may be removed from the Board by a majority vote of the city council which appointed the commissioner.”<sup>71</sup> As discussed above in response to Finding 5, incorporated by reference, term limits would require an amendment to the Port Act and the Legislature left discretion to the member cities to determine the length of service of their respective commissioners. It is also unreasonable to assert that member cities have too little voice in Port affairs and then to take away their discretion regarding such matters as length of term.

**23-103: Institute ordinances or formal policies requiring the appointed Commissioners from each city be required to give at a minimum, quarterly updates to the City Councils at officially scheduled city council meetings open to the public.**

---

<sup>69</sup> Gov. Code, § 54956.5.

<sup>70</sup> San Diego Unified Port District Act, Harb. & Nav. Code, Appen. 1, § 16.

<sup>71</sup> *Id.*, at § 17.

The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.

Please see Response to Finding 4 above, incorporated herein by reference. Port Commissioners regularly present to City Councils or in the case of the City of San Diego, to the Council's Economic Development and Intergovernmental Relations Committee. The timing and frequency of these briefings is left to the discretion of the appointing City Council as should be done.

**23-104: In consultation with the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, explore an alternate form of governance for the Port District allowing for participation in, and oversight of Port District activities and decision by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors and the elected city councils of the five Port Cities.**

The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable.

As explained at length in *Introduction*, incorporated herein by reference, this recommendation is at odds with the Public Trust Doctrine and the intent of the Legislature in creating the Port. Consistent with the Public Trust Doctrine, the Port was created for benefit of the entire State when in 1962, the California State Legislature enacted the Port Act, and the voters of San Diego County ratified its creation by passing Proposition D. Such a recommendation would disenfranchise the very voters that created the Port. Additionally, the oversight recommended the Grand Jury Report may result in prioritization of municipal affairs and interest contrary to the Public Trust Doctrine and the Port Act. The Port must manage Tidelands "without subjugation of statewide interests, concerns, or benefits to the inclination of local or municipal affairs, initiatives, or exercises."<sup>72</sup> As a trustee, the Port's primary Public Trust duty is to all people of the State,<sup>73</sup> and therefore, endorsing an alternative form of governance conflicts with this paramount duty.

---

<sup>72</sup> Pub. Resources Code, § 6009, subd. (d); See also *Institutes of Justinian 2.1.1* and State Lands Commission, "*Origins of the Public Trust, Policy Statements, SLC*" (the Public Trust Doctrine embodies the concept that some lands have such a distinctive value that the public's interest must be protected over private and other localized interests).

<sup>73</sup> See *City of Long Beach*, 31 Cal.2d at p. 257; Pub. Resources Code, § 6009, subd. (d).



Thank you for your interest in the governance of the San Diego Bay Tidelands and San Diego region.

Sincerely,



---

Randa Coniglio  
Unified Port of San Diego  
Acting-CEO/President



---

Thomas A. Russell  
Unified Port of San Diego  
General Counsel  
(As to Form and Legality)

Attachment A: PMPU Public Outreach & Stakeholder Engagement Summary

# **ATTACHMENT A**



**PORT of  
SAN DIEGO**  
Waterfront of Opportunity


---

**PMPU Public Outreach & Stakeholder Engagement  
Summary Report**

*February 2013 – June 2023*

- As of June 2, 2023 -





*This page intentionally left blank*



# PMPU Public Outreach & Stakeholder Engagement

## Introduction

The importance of public outreach and stakeholder engagement has consistently been emphasized as an essential component of the Integrated Planning effort to ensure the PMPU reflects the needs and desires of visitors to the waterfront and the community. Continuing the award-winning outreach and engagement approach for Integrated Planning, staff conducted public outreach related to the PMPU Discussion Draft after the draft was released for public review in April 2019, and additional public outreach after the Revised Draft PMPU was released in October 2020. The public outreach has included meetings with the general public in the form of open house events and meetings with groups and individuals. At a minimum, every open house event was advertised on the District’s webpage and social media, as well as emails sent directly to interested parties that have signed up on the District’s Integrated Planning mailing list. Stakeholder engagement has been in the form of land and water tours, meetings and charettes, and has reached federal, state and local agencies, special districts, and interested parties. As summarized in this summary report, the public outreach and stakeholder engagement has been robust and comprehensive. Since the start of the Integrated Planning process in 2013, the PMPU team has had:

- **40 BPC Meetings and Workshops,**
- **19 public events** (e.g., open houses, community meetings, stakeholder gatherings),
- **478 stakeholder meetings or presentations** (e.g., meetings that are one-on-one, with stakeholder groups, and with organizations and agencies)

The District has invested more than eight years into public and stakeholder outreach as a part of the Integrated Planning process, and there is over 20 years of North Embarcadero-related outreach focused on achieving a shared vision for this stretch of waterfront.

## List of Acronyms

<b>BPC</b>	Board of Port Commissioners
<b>EAC</b>	Environmental Advisory Committee
<b>EIR</b>	Environmental Impact Report
<b>PMPU</b>	Port Master Plan Update

# PMPU Public Outreach & Stakeholder Engagement

## Summary Table

Year	BPC Meetings and Workshops	Public Events	Stakeholder Meetings and Presentations	Points of Contact*
2013	5	2	55	<i>Not quantified prior to 2017</i>
2014	7	5	30	
2015	3	-	12	
2016	2	-	16	
2017	10	5	72	5.1 million
2018	5	-	52	2.5 million
2019	5	7	114	11.4 million
2020	3	-	72	6.8 million
2021	-	-	42	
2022	-	-	13	
2023	0	0	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>478</b>	<b>25.8 million</b>





# PMPU Public Outreach & Stakeholder Engagement

BPC MEETINGS AND WORKSHOPS	
Date	Meeting Type
<b>2013</b>	
2/12/2013	BPC Meeting
4/9/2013	BPC Meeting
8/13/2013	BPC Meeting
12/10/2013	BPC Meeting
12/12/2013	BPC Workshop
<b>2014</b>	
3/19/2014	BPC Workshop
6/24/2014	BPC Workshop
7/8/2014	BPC Meeting
8/12/2014	BPC Meeting

## Topic

Initial Scoping Discussion and direction to staff to begin preparation of a solicitation for consultant teams to conduct Analysis and Develop a Strategy and Work Plan for a Comprehensive Integrated PMPU

Resolution Authorizing Issuance of a Request for Qualifications for a consultant team to Conduct Analysis and Develop a Strategy and Work Plan for a Comprehensive Integrated PMPU

Resolution Selecting and Authorizing an Agreement for Professional Consulting Services to complete Phase I of the Comprehensive Integrated Planning PMPU in substantial form and conformance with the RFQ and selected proposal

Resolution Adopting Board of Port Commissions (BPC) Policy No. 752 - Guidelines for Conducting Project Consistency Review, related to the Integrated PMPU

Integrated PMPU: Phase I Visioning Workshop

Integrated PMPU: Phase I Vision Plan Workshop #2: Guiding Principles

Integrated PMPU: Phase I Vision Plan Workshop #3: Vision Statement and Guiding Principles

Integrated Planning PMPU: Phase I Vision Plan further discussion on Draft Guiding Principle B

Resolution Accepting Integrated Planning Phase I Vision Statement, Guiding Principles, and Assessment Report and Directing Staff to Apply the Integrated Planning Vision to Phase IA of the Integrated Planning Effort

BPC MEETINGS AND WORKSHOPS		
Date	Meeting Type	Topic
10/8/2014	BPC Workshop	Integrated PMPU: Phase IA Preliminary Workshop #1 - Public Realm
11/20/2014	BPC Workshop	Integrated PMPU: Phase IA Preliminary Workshop #2 - Leasable and Developable Areas
12/9/2014	BPC Meeting	Presentation and Progress Report on Integrated Planning, Phase 1A: Recap of 2014 Preliminary Planning Workshops and Preview of Upcoming Major Milestones
<b>2015</b>		
3/10/2015	BPC Meeting	Integrated Planning - PMPU and Direction to Staff: A) Phase IA Status, B) Recommend Developing a "Framework for Planning" as the Foundation for Future Phases, C) Recommend an Evaluation Process for Prioritizing Preliminary Concepts for Further Study, D) Discussion of Early Action Work Plan to Address Certain Existing and Possible Future Long Range Planning Efforts Around the Bay Concurrently with Phase II of the PMPU, E) Recommend Commencing Expedited Planning Work on the North Bay's "East Basin Industrial" Subarea of the Harbor Island Planning District and Continuing Planning Work for Pond 20, F) Discussion on the Resources Needed to Advance Integrated Planning, Including Concurrent and Expedited Planning for Certain Planning Districts and Focused Planning Areas, and Subsequently Complete Any Work as Directed
7/22/2015	BPC Workshop	Integrated Planning PMPU - Study Session on Approach and Content: A) Integrated Planning Status Update, B) Presentation and Direction to Staff on Proposed Port Master Plan Outline, C) Presentation and Direction to Staff on Resources Needed to Advance Integrated Planning
11/17/2015	BPC Meeting	Presentation and Direction to Staff on the Draft Integrated Planning Framework
<b>2016</b>		
5/10/2016	BPC Meeting	Presentation and Direction to Staff on the Integrated Planning PMPU – Status Update





BPC MEETINGS AND WORKSHOPS		
Date	Meeting Type	Topic
7/27/2016	BPC Meeting (Consent Agenda)	Resolution Selecting and Authorizing Agreement with ICF Jones & Stokes, Inc. for Environmental Review Services for the Integrated Planning PMPU in an Amount Not to Exceed \$1,000,000 for an Agreement Term of August 1, 2016 Through December 31, 2018
<b>2017</b>		
1/10/2017	BPC Meeting	Presentation and Direction to Staff on the PMPU – Progress Report, Forecast of the 2017 Work Plan
3/9/2017	BPC Workshop	Integrated Planning PMPU: Board Workshop No. 1 Regarding the Draft PMPU: Draft Goals for the Land and Water Use Element
4/27/2017	BPC Workshop	Integrated Planning PMPU: Board Workshop No. 2 Regarding the Draft PMPU: A) Draft Goals for Mobility Element and Economic Development Element, B) Draft Goals and Draft Land and Water Use Maps for the Planning Districts
5/25/2017	BPC Workshop	Integrated Planning PMPU: Board Workshop No. 3 Regarding the Draft PMPU: A) Draft Goals for Resiliency and Safety Element, B) Draft Goals for Natural Resources Element, C) Draft Goals for Coastal Access and Recreation Element
7/11/2017	BPC Meeting	Presentation and Direction to Staff Regarding the Modified Work Plan for the PMPU
8/8/2017	BPC Workshop	Presentation and Direction to Staff on the PMPU Draft Policy Concepts: Mobility Element; Economic Development; Resiliency and Safety; and Natural Resources
11/14/2017	BPC Workshop	Presentation and Direction to Staff on the PMPU Draft Policy Concepts and Regarding the Following Topics: Land and Water Use and Coastal Access and Recreation
11/14/2017	BPC Workshop	Presentation and Direction to Staff on the PMPU Regarding the Following Topics: Planning Districts 10, 9, 8, & 7
12/5/2017	BPC Workshop	Presentation and Direction to Staff on the PMPU Regarding the Following Topics: Planning Districts 4 & 5
12/12/2017	BPC Workshop	Presentation and Direction to Staff on the PMPU Regarding the Following Topics: Planning Districts 6,2, & 1



<b>BPC MEETINGS AND WORKSHOPS</b>		
<b>Date</b>	<b>Meeting Type</b>	<b>Topic</b>
<b>2018</b>		
3/28/2018	BPC Workshop	Presentation and Direction to Staff on the PMPU Regarding the Following Topics: Baywide Land and Water Uses, Glossary, and Planning District 3
7/17/2018	BPC Workshop	Presentation and Direction to Staff on the PMPU Regarding the Following Topics: Policy Discussion Considering Small Format Informational and Wayfinding Signage, Including Digital Integration and Paid Advertising
8/14/2018	BPC Meeting	Presentation and Direction to Staff on the PMPU Regarding the Following Topics: Upcoming Policy Discussion Topics for the Remainder of 2018 and a Look Ahead to Next Year
11/1/2018	BPC Workshop	Presentation and Direction to Staff on the PMPU Regarding the Following Topics: Draft Goals and Policy Concepts for the Environmental Justice Element
12/18/2018	BPC Workshop	Presentation and Direction to Staff on the PMPU Regarding the Following Topics: Work Plan for Completing the Discussion Draft
<b>2019</b>		
2/12/2019	BPC Workshop	Presentation and Direction to staff on the PMPU - Embarcadero Planning District Public Outreach Results and Follow-up Draft Policy Concepts Specific to Commercial Fishing
2/25/2019	BPC Workshop	Presentation and Direction to Staff on the PMPU: Follow-Up Items from the February 12, 2019 Workshop: A) Planning Commitments and Previous Studies for North Embarcadero Sub-District, B) Draft Policy Concepts and Recommended Land and Water Use Configuration for North Embarcadero Sub-District
3/14/2019	BPC Workshop	Presentation and Direction to Staff on the Port Master Plan Update: A) Follow-Up Draft Policy Concepts Specific to Commercial Fishing, B) Draft Policy Concepts and Recommended Land and Water Use Configuration for the Central Embarcadero Sub-District, C) Draft Policy Concepts and Recommended Land and Water Use Configuration for the South Embarcadero Sub-District



# PMPU Public Outreach & Stakeholder Engagement

BPC MEETINGS AND WORKSHOPS		
Date	Meeting Type	Topic
4/30/2019	BPC Workshop	Presentation on the PMPU Discussion Draft and provide direction to staff, including, but not limited to, circulation of the PMPU Discussion Draft for public review
9/16/2019	BPC Meeting	Presentation and Direction to staff on the PMPU: Summary of public comments received during the 90-day review period and staff recommendations for approaching revisions to the draft PMPU
2020		
8/4/2020	BPC Workshop	Presentation on the PMPU Discussion Draft with a focus on North Embarcadero
10/9/2020	BPC Meeting	Presentation on the PMPU: Summary of updates reflecting current status prior to the upcoming four-week public review period for the revised draft PMPU
12/7/2020	BPC Workshop	Presentation and direction to staff on the PMPU, including an overview of the comments received on the Revised Draft PMPU and staff's approach to revising the document





# PMPU Public Outreach & Stakeholder Engagement

## PUBLIC EVENTS

Date	Meeting Type	Topic
<b>2013</b>		
12/3/2013	Stakeholder Gathering	Integrated Planning Vision Plan – Public Input (Port Pavilion)
12/4/2013	Stakeholder Gathering	Integrated Planning Vision Plan – Public Input (MLK Community Center)
<b>2014</b>		
2/18/2014	Community Workshop	Integrated Planning Vision Plan – Public Input
2/19/2014	Community Workshop	Integrated Planning Vision Plan – Public Input
4/16/2014	Open House	Integrated Planning Vision Plan – Guiding Principles
4/22/2014	Open House	Integrated Planning Vision Plan – Guiding Principles
4/30/2014	Open House	Integrated Planning Vision Plan – Guiding Principles
<b>2017</b>		
3/23/2017	Open House	PMPU Overview and Draft Goals for Elements
4/12/2017	EIR Scoping Meeting	Scoping Meeting for PMPU Programmatic Environmental Impact Report
5/11/2017	Open House	PMPU Overview and Draft Goals for Elements
8/10/2017	Open House	PMPU Draft Policy Concepts for Elements (Mobility, Economic Development, Resiliency and Safety, Natural Resources)
11/15/2017	Open House	PMPU Draft Policy Concepts for Elements (Land and Water Use, Coastal Access and Recreation)
<b>2019</b>		
1/30/2019	PMPU Open House	PMPU – Embarcadero Planning District
6/6/2019	Community Outreach Session	PMPU Discussion Draft – Port of San Diego Administration Building
6/12/2019	Community Outreach Session	PMPU Discussion Draft – La Mesa Community Center
6/20/2019	Community Outreach Session	PMPU Discussion Draft – Rancho Bernardo Education Center
6/27/2019	Community Outreach Session	PMPU Discussion Draft – Tijuana River National Estuarine Research Reserve





# PMPU Public Outreach & Stakeholder Engagement

7/15/2019	Community Outreach Session	PMPU Discussion Draft – Coronado Community Center
8/28/2019	Community Outreach Session	PMPU Discussion Draft – Portuguese Hall in Point Loma

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS**

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
<b>2013</b>		
10/4/2013	California Coastal Commission staff	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
10/4/2013	City of Chula Vista - Planning Staff	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
10/23/2013	Agencies and Organizations	Integrated Planning Vision Input – Boat Tour/Workshop
10/24/2013	Agencies and Organizations	Integrated Planning Vision Input – Bus/Land Tour
11/4/2013	City of National City – Councilmember Mona Rios	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/4/2013	City of National City - Planning Staff	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/4/2013	City of Chula Vista - Planning Staff	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/4/2013	City of National City - City Manager	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/4/2013	City of Chula Vista - Planning Staff	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/4/2013	City of Chula Vista - Mayor	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/4/2013	City of National City - City Manager	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/4/2013	National City - City Manager's Office	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/4/2013	City of Chula Vista Staff	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/4/2013	City of Chula Vista Staff	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/4/2013	City of Chula Vista Redevelopment & Housing	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/5/2013	City of Imperial Beach Staff	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/5/2013	City of Imperial Beach - Community Development Director	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/5/2013	City of Imperial Beach - Mayor	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/5/2013	City of Imperial Beach - City Manager	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/5/2013	City of San Diego - Barrio Logan Community Plan Update Project Manager	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/7/2013	City of Coronado - Director	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview



**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS**

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
11/7/2013	City of Coronado - City Manager	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/12/2013	City of San Diego Planning & Neighborhood Restoration Department	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/12/2013	City of San Diego - Planning Staff	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/13/2013	California Coastal Commission- Deputy Director	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/14/2013	Wildlife Advisory Group	Presentation of Port 50-year Vision Planning Process
11/15/2013	South County Economic Development Council	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/19/2013	City of San Diego - Mayor	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/19/2013	National City - City Council	Integrated Planning Vision Overview/Input
11/20/2013	Solar Turbines	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/20/2013	Regional Water Quality Control Board - Executive Officer	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/20/2013	Regional Water Quality Control Board – Healthy Waters Branch	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/20/2013	Environmental Health Coalition	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/20/2013	The San Diego Foundation	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/20/2013	National Marine Fisheries Services	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/20/2013	Industrial Environmental Association	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/20/2013	San Diego Coastkeeper	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/20/2013	Sun Harbor Marina	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/20/2013	Sportfishing Association of California	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/20/2013	Center for Sustainable Energy	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/20/2013	California Coastal Conservancy – Regional Manager	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/20/2013	California Coastal Conservancy – Project Manager	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview





**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS**

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
11/20/2013	San Diego State University/Public Health	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/20/2013	Fish & Wildlife	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/20/2013	Energy Policy Initiatives Center	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/20/2013	San Diego Regional Airport Authority – Board Member	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
11/21/2013	San Diego Regional Airport Authority – Chairman of the Board	Integrated Planning Vision Overview/Input
12/2/2013	Maritime Alliance	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
12/2/2013	Civic San Diego Staff	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
12/4/2013	San Diego Regional Airport Authority – Manager of Airport Planning	Integrated Planning Vision Input/Interview
12/11/2013	Port Tenants Association	Integrated Planning Vision Input
12/11/2013	Downtown San Diego Partnership	Integrated Planning Vision Overview/Input
12/11/2013	San Diego County Board of Supervisors (Giametta and Roberts)	Integrated Planning Vision Overview/Input
12/18/2013	San Diego County Board of Supervisors (Cox and Murphy)	Integrated Planning Vision Overview/Input
12/22/2013	San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce	Integrated Planning Vision Overview/Input
<b>2014</b>		
1/7/2014	San Diego County Hotel and Food Service Workers Union	Integrated Planning Vision Overview/Input
1/8/2014	U.S. Navy Staff	Integrated Planning Vision Overview/Input
1/8/2014	SANDAG Staff	Integrated Planning Vision Overview/Input
1/8/2014	Otay Mesa Nestor Community Planning Group	Integrated Planning Vision Overview/Input
1/11/2014	Imperial Beach Beautification	Integrated Planning Vision Overview/Input
1/14/2014	Chula Vista Community Collaborative	Integrated Planning Vision Overview/Input

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS**

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
1/14/2014	National City Rotary	Integrated Planning Vision Overview/Input
1/15/2014	North Bay Community Planning Advisory Committee	Integrated Planning Vision Overview/Input
1/16/2014	Peninsula Community Planning Group (Point Loma)	Integrated Planning Vision Overview/Input
1/21/2014	Imperial Beach Kiwanis Group	Integrated Planning Vision Overview/Input
1/22/2014	Downtown Community Planning Council	Integrated Planning Vision Overview/Input
2/10/2014	California Coastal Commission Staff	Integrated Planning Vision Overview/Input
2/10/2014	Environmental Advisory Committee	Integrated Planning Vision Overview/Input
7/18/2014	California Coastal Commission Staff	Integrated Planning Vision Update
7/24/2014	C3 Environmental and Design Council	San Diego Waterfront and Integrated Planning Vision
10/7/2014	City of National City Staff	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
10/7/2014	City of San Diego Staff	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
10/7/2014	California State Lands Commission Staff	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
10/9/2014	Environmental Health Coalition	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
10/9/2014	Port Tenants Association	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
10/9/2014	U.S. Navy Staff	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
11/17/2014	SANDAG Staff	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
11/17/2014	San Diego County Supervisor Cox	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
11/17/2014	Terramar	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
11/18/2014	BNSF and Dixieline	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
11/18/2014	City of San Diego Staff and Civic San Diego Staff	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
11/18/2014	City of National City Staff	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
11/21/2014	City of Imperial Beach Staff	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
11/21/2014	California Coastal Commission Staff	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview





**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS**

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
12/17/2014	Environmental Advisory Committee	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
<b>2015</b>		
1/26/2015	City of Imperial Beach Staff	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
1/27/2015	U.S. Navy Staff	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
1/27/2015	City of San Diego Councilmember Lorie Zapf	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
1/27/2015	Civic San Diego Staff	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
1/28/2015	SANDAG, Metropolitan Transit System, and Civic San Diego Staff	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
1/28/2015	City of San Diego Staff and Civic San Diego Staff	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
1/29/2015	San Diego Regional Airport Authority Staff	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
6/29/2015	Port Tenants Association Environmental Committee Meeting	Integrated Planning Framework Report Overview/Input
8/30/2015	SANDAG Staff	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
11/5/2015	U.S. Navy Staff	Integrated Planning Framework Report Input/Interview
11/9/2015	San Diego County Supervisor Cox	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
11/10/2015	City of San Diego Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
<b>2016</b>		
1/27/2016	Community News Network	Integrated Planning Vision and Port Master Plan Update Overview
3/28/2016	California Coastal Commission Staff	Integrated Planning Vision and Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
6/1/2016	San Diego Regional Airport Authority Staff	Integrated Planning Vision and Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
6/2/2016	San Diego Architectural Foundation Context 3	Integrated Planning Vision and Port Master Plan Update Overview
7/22/2016	California Coastal Commission Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input



## STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
8/16/2016	U.S. Navy Staff	Integrated Planning Vision and Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
8/17/2016	Downtown Community Planning Group	Integrated Planning Vision and Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
8/19/2016	California Coastal Commission Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
8/30/2016	City of National City Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
9/9/2016	University Club – Distinguished Speakers Series	Panel on Integrated Planning Vision and Central Embarcadero
9/27/2016	Urban Land Institute Breakfast -San Diego and Tijuana Chapter	Panel on Port Integrated Planning Vision and Port Master Plan Update
9/30/2016	California Coastal Commission Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
10/11/2016	Urban Land Institute - San Diego and Tijuana Chapter	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
10/28/2016	California Coastal Commission Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
11/2/2016	Environmental Advisory Committee	Integrated Planning Vision and Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
12/7/2016	Department of Transportation Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
<b>2017</b>		
1/20/2017	California Coastal Commission Staff	Port Master Plan Update Input – Draft Element Goals
3/2/2017	California Coastal Commission Staff	Port Master Plan Update Input – Draft Element Goals
3/3/17	SANDAG Regional Planning Committee	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
3/22/2017	California Coastal Commission Staff	Port Master Plan Update Input - Additional Review Opportunities/Collaboration
3/23/2017	California Special Districts Association	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
4/5/2017	Environmental Advisory Committee	Port Master Plan Update Input – Draft Element Goals
4/13/2017	Coronado Cays Homeowners/Grand Caribe Task Force	Port Master Plan Update Input – Draft Element Goals
4/13/2017	Downtown San Diego Partnership Planning and Public Policy Committee	Integrated Planning Vision and Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
4/14/2017	City of San Diego Staff	Port Master Plan Update Input – Draft Element Goals

**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS**

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
4/18/2017	Bill Tippetts	Port Master Plan Update Input – Draft Element Goals
4/19/2017	Wildlife Advisory Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
4/20/2017	San Diego Port Tenants Association	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
4/20/2017	California State Lands Commission	Integrated Planning Vision and Port Master Plan Update Overview
4/20/2017	San Diego Navy Broadway Complex Coalition/ San Diego Waterfront Coalition	Port Master Plan Update Overview – North Embarcadero
4/25/2017	SANDAG Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
4/28/2017	California Coastal Commission Staff	Port Master Plan Update Input – Draft Element Goals
5/8/2017	1HWY1	Port Master Plan Update Input and Central Embarcadero
5/8/2017	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	PMPU Commercial Fishing
5/10/2017	Chula Vista Chamber of Commerce	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
5/10/2017	Don Wood, Mike McCoy, Jim Peugh	Sea Level Rise PMPU Meeting
5/10/2017	Convention Center	PMPU
5/15/2017	City of San Diego Staff	PMPU- Elements, Planning District, and Timeline
5/17/2017	Bill Tippetts and Don Wood	Sea Level Rise PMPU Meeting
5/17/2017	Eric Chavez – National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	Draft goals for the Resiliency and Safety, Natural Resources, and Coastal Access and Recreation Elements
5/22/2017	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
5/23/2017	Environmental Health Coalition (Joy Williams)	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input - Draft Element Goals
5/23/2017	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Sandy Vissman)	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input - Draft Element Goals



**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS**

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
5/31/2017	City of Imperial Beach Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input & Local Coastal Program Amendment Coordination
6/5/2017	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
6/6/2017	South County Economic Development Committee	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
6/7/2017	Environmental Advisory Committee	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input - Draft Natural Resource Element Goals
6/8/2017	Perry Dealy and Chris Neils	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Grand Caribe Sub-District
6/9/2017	California Coastal Commission Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input - Draft Element Goals
6/14/2017	City of Imperial Beach Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input & Local Coastal Program Amendment Coordination
6/14/2017	San Diego Navy Broadway Complex Coalition/San Diego Waterfront Coalition	Port Master Plan Update Overview – North Embarcadero
6/19/2017	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
6/19/2017	SANDAG – San Diego Military Working Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
6/22/2017	Shelter Island Tenants	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Shelter Island Focus
6/22/2017	City of Imperial Beach Chamber of Commerce	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Imperial Beach Focus
6/23/2017	City of San Diego Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – San Diego Focus
7/6/2017	San Diego Regional Airport Authority Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Harbor Island Focus
7/7/2017	California Coastal Commission Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Draft Policy Concepts for Elements



**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS**

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
7/17/2017	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
7/20/2017	Ann Fox -CALTRANS	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
7/26/2017	Mac McLaughlin - Midway	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Embarcadero Focus
7/31/2017	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
8/3/2017	City of San Diego Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Mobility Focus
8/17/2017	California Coastal Commission Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Draft Policy Concepts for Elements
8/21/2017	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
8/29/2017	Bill Tippetts, Lesley Handa, Jim Peugh and Don Wood	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Resiliency and Safety Element Focus
9/5/2017	Maritime Stakeholder Forum	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
9/6/2017	San Diego Regional Airport Authority Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – ALUCP Coordination
9/6/2017	Environmental Advisory Committee	Port Master Plan Update Overview and Update
9/6/2017	U.S. Navy Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input and Coordination Naval Facilities
9/11/2017	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
9/13/2017	San Diego Regional Airport Authority Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – ALUCP Coordination
9/14/2017	1HWY1	Port Master Plan Update Overview and Update
9/18/2017	Environmental Advisory Committee: 2017 Sea Level Rise Ad-Hoc Committee	AB691 and PMPU - background information on sea level rise science, projections, models, and vulnerability assessments
9/20/2017	Solar Turbines	Port Master Plan Update Overview and Update

## STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
9/25/2017	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
10/4/2017	San Diego Regional Airport Authority Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
10/5/2017	Coronado Cays Homeowners/Grand Caribe Task Force	PMPU Progress Update
10/9/2017	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
10/18/2017	Environmental Advisory Committee: 2017 Sea Level Rise Ad-Hoc Committee	AB691 and PMPU – feedback on selected coastal flooding and inundation model, projects, and asset categories to assess sea level rise impacts
10/23/2017	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
11/6/2017	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
11/13/2017	Coronado Cays Homeowners	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
11/27/2017	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
11/30/2017	Port Tenants Association	Preview of 12/5/2017 BPC Workshop
12/7/2017	Environmental Advisory Committee: 2017 Sea Level Rise Ad-Hoc Committee	AB691 and PMPU – feedback on progress and schedule on the sea level rise vulnerability assessment
12/8/2017	San Diego Port Tenants Association	Preview of 12/12/2017 BPC Workshop
12/19/2017	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing

2018





**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS**

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
1/8/2018	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
1/17/2018	Wildlife Advisory Group	PMPU Progress Update
1/17/2018	City of San Diego Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Planning District/Community Plan Coordination
1/22/2018	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
1/29/2018	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
1/30/2018	California Coastal Commission Staff	PMPU Progress Update
2/5/2018	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
2/6/2018	Downtown San Diego Partnership	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Embarcadero Focus
2/14/2018	Sandra Keller, Commodore of Outboard Boating Club Catherine Miller, Outboard Boating Club	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Shelter Island Focus
2/26/2018	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
2/27/2018	California Coastal Commission staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Embarcadero Focus
3/2/2018	City of San Diego Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Embarcadero Focus
3/12/2018	San Diego County Supervisor Ron Roberts	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Embarcadero Focus
3/12/2018	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
3/21/2018	City of San Diego Councilman Chris Ward	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Embarcadero Focus
3/22/2018	Wyndham (Michele Vives)	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Embarcadero Focus



**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS**

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
3/22/2018	Midway	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Embarcadero Focus
3/22/2018	Coronado Cays Homeowners	PMPU Progress Update
3/26/2018	Port Tenants Association	Preview of 3/28/18 BPC Workshop
3/26/2018	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
3/29/2018	San Diego Broker/Sales Forum	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
4/12/2018	Downtown San Diego Partnership	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Embarcadero Focus
4/16/2018	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
4/30/2018	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
5/14/2018	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
5/16/2018	Urban Land Institute San Diego and Tijuana Chapter	Integrated Planning Vision and Port Master Plan Update Overview
5/22/2018	California Coastal Commission Staff	Port Master Plan Update Input – Embarcadero Focus
5/24/2018	Maritime Museum	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
5/29/2018	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
6/11/2018	City of San Diego Council Member – Chris Ward	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input
6/20/2018	Environmental Advisory Committee	PMPU Progress Update
6/25/2018	1HWY1	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
6/25/2018	California Coastal Commission Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Central Embarcadero Focus



## STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
6/25/2018	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
7/9/2018	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
7/23/2018	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
7/31/2018	Port Tenants Association	Port Master Plan Update Input – Embarcadero Planning District
8/6/2018	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
8/17/2018	Port Tenants Association	Port Master Plan Update Input – Embarcadero Planning District
9/18/2018	Environmental Advisory Committee: 2018 Sea Level Rise Ad-Hoc Committee	Background information on the District's sea level rise planning efforts and feedback on preliminary vulnerability assessment results
9/24/2018	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
9/27/2018	Port Tenants Association	Port Master Plan Update Input
10/15/2018	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
10/17/2018	Barrio Logan Community Planning Group	PMPU Environmental Justice Element
10/22/2018	City of Imperial Beach Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input & Local Coastal Program Amendment Coordination
10/29/2018	Wildcoast	Preview of 11/1/18 BPC Workshop – Environmental Justice
10/29/2018	Port Tenants Association	Preview of 11/1/18 BPC Workshop – Environmental Justice
10/31/2018	Coronado Cays Homeowners/Grand Caribe Task Force	PMPU Progress Update



**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS**

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
11/14/2018	Environmental Advisory Committee: 2018 Sea Level Rise Ad-Hoc Committee	Feedback on the District's Sea Level Rise Planning Approach
12/5/2018	California Coastal Commission staff	PMPU/PD3 - Upcoming Workshops
12/6/2018	Environmental Advisory Committee: 2018 Sea Level Rise Ad-Hoc Committee	Feedback on sea level rise monitoring and indicators to evaluate change
12/17/2018	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
<b>2019</b>		
1/7/2019	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
1/10/2019	Tom Driscoll	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
1/14/2019	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
1/28/2019	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
1/30/2019	Fish Market	Port Master Plan Update Input – Embarcadero Planning District
1/30/2019	1HWY1	Port Master Plan Update Input – Embarcadero Planning District
1/30/2019	Midway and 1HWY1	Port Master Plan Update Input – Embarcadero Planning District
1/30/2019	Midway and 1HWY1	Port Master Plan Update Input – Embarcadero Planning District
2/1/2019	Midway, 1HWY1, Port Tenants Association, Pacific Gateway	Port Master Plan Update – Embarcadero Parking and Mobility
2/4/2019	Wyndham	Port Master Plan Update Input – Embarcadero Planning District
2/5/2019	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
2/6/2019	Tom Driscoll	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing



## STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
2/7/2019	California Coastal Commission staff	PMPU: Update and Feedback re Embarcadero Planning District
2/7/2019	Port Tenants Association	Preview of 2/12/19 BPC Workshop
2/13/2019	City of San Diego Staff	Port Master Plan Update Input – Embarcadero Planning District
2/15/2019	Port Tenants Association	PMPU – Embarcadero Parking and Mobility
2/19/2019	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
2/21/2019	Port Tenants Association	Preview of 2/25/19 BPC Workshop
2/27/2019	Solar Turbines	PMPU and North Harbor Drive Mobility and Access Study
2/28/2019	SANDAG	Port Master Plan Update Overview
3/1/2019	SANDAG's Airport Connectivity Planning Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview
3/4/2019	San Diego Navy Broadway Complex Coalition/San Diego Waterfront Coalition	Port Master Plan Update – Public Outreach
3/5/2019	Manchester Pacific Gateway	PMPU: North Harbor Drive and Mobility
3/6/2019	1HWY1	Port Master Plan Update Input – Central Embarcadero
3/6/2019	Port Tenants Association/San Diego Fisherman's Working Group	Preview of 3/14/19 BPC Workshop
3/11/2019	Port Tenants Association/San Diego Fisherman's Working Group/Sportfishing Association	Preview of 3/14/19 BPC Workshop – follow up
3/27/2019	Sunroad Development and Carrier Johnson	PMPU: East Harbor Island
3/27/2019	Port Tenants Association and La Playa Residents	PMPU: La Playa Policies Preview
4/2/2019	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
5/2/2019	San Diego Appraisal Symposium	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
5/9/2019	Downtown San Diego Partnership – Policy and Planning Committee	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
5/15/2019	Barrio Logan Community Planning Group	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview



**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS**

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
5/16/2019	California Coastal Commission Staff	PMPU Discussion Draft – Planning Districts
5/16/2019	City of San Diego Council Member – Dr. Jen Campbell	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
5/20/2019	City of San Diego Planning Department Staff	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
5/21/2019	Chamber Transportation and Land Development Committee	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
5/21/2019	City of San Diego Council Member – Chris Ward	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
5/21/2019	The Grande at Santa Fe North and South Home Owners Association "Huddle"	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
5/23/2019	Ocean Protection Council	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
5/28/2019	Audubon Society	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
5/29/2019	U.S. Navy Staff	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
5/29/2019	Wildlife Advisory Group	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
5/29/2019	Tom Gorey – Coronado Resident	PMPU Discussion Draft Questions
5/30/2019	John Laun	PMPU Discussion Draft Questions
5/30/2019	Executive Staff from City of San Diego and Civic San Diego	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
6/5/2019	Environmental Advisory Committee	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
6/6/2019	Arab American Association for Engineers and Architects	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
6/12/2019	Coronado Grand Caribe Task Force	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
6/13/2019	City of Coronado – Richard Grunow, Director of Community Development	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
6/13/2019	Coronado Chamber of Commerce	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
6/17/2019	Bill Tippetts	PMPU Discussion Draft Questions – Safety and Resiliency
6/17/2019	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Inpurt – Commercial Fishing
6/18/2019	Point Loma Nazarene University	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview





**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS**

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
6/19/2019	San Diego Convention Center Corporation Executive Team	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
6/19/2019	California State Assembly – State Senator Toni Atkins	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
6/19/2019	San Diego Downtown Community Planning Council	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
6/21/2019	California Coastal Commission Staff	PMPU Discussion Draft - Elements
6/24/2019	MTS	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
6/24/2019	Port Tenants Association	PMPU Discussion Draft - Embarcadero
6/25/2019	Maritime Stakeholders Group	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
6/25/2019	City of Imperial Beach Staff	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
6/25/2019	SANDAG Staff	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview - Mobility
6/25/2019	Tom Gorey – Coronado Resident	PMPU Discussion Draft Questions
6/27/2019	Caltrans District 11	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
7/1/2019	Port Tenants Association	PMPU Discussion Draft Questions
7/1/2019	California Coastal Commission Staff	PMPU Discussion Draft - Elements
7/1/2019	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
7/1/2019	State Lands Commission	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
7/16/2019	Convention Center Board	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
7/16/2019	Don Wood	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
7/17/2019	San Diego Tourism Authority Board	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
7/17/2019	Midway-Pacific Highway Community Planning Group	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
7/17/2019	Assembly Member Todd Gloria	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
7/18/2019	Airport Authority Executive Board	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
7/18/2019	American Planning Association	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
7/18/2019	Peninsula Community Planning Group	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
7/19/2019	Rear Admiral Bette Bolivar	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
7/19/2019	San Diego Bike Coalition	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview – Mobility



**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS**

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
7/22/2019	Port of San Diego Ship Repair Association	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
7/22/2019	California Coastal Commission Staff	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
7/23/2019	P3: Point Loma People for Progress	PMPU Input – Shelter Island Planning District
7/25/2019	San Diego County Supervisor Cox	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
7/25/2019	Bill Tippetts, Jim Peugh, Jan Chatten-Brown	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
7/25/2019	City of San Diego District 8 – Councilmember Vivian Moreno	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
7/29/2019	Outboard Boating Club	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
7/29/2019	Coronado Cays Resort, LLC	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
7/30/2019	City of San Diego Staff	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
8/6/2019	U.S. Navy Staff (Steve Chung and MaryBeth Dreusike)	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
8/6/2019	Point Loma-OB Monthly magazine (Savanah Duffy)	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
8/15/2019	Point Loma Stakeholder Discussion	PMPU Input – Shelter Island Planning District
8/22/2019	Bill Burgess – Embarcadero Resident	PMPU Questions Regarding the Embarcadero
8/29/2019	Coronado Stakeholder Discussion	PMPU Input – Coronado
9/9/2019	Tom Gorey and Kirk Henry – Coronado Residents	PMPU Input – Coronado
9/13/2019	Margie Rapp – North Embarcadero Resident	PMPU Input – North Embarcadero
9/26/2019	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
10/1/2019	North Embarcadero Residents	PMPU Input – North Embarcadero
10/4/2019	Urban Design Committee	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
10/21/2019	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
10/22/2019	North Embarcadero Residents	PMPU Input – North Embarcadero
11/6/2019	North Embarcadero Residents	PMPU Input – North Embarcadero

## STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
11/12/2019	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
11/14/2019	Coronado Cays Resort, LLC	PMPU Input – Grand Caribe
11/19/2019	North Embarcadero Residents	PMPU Input – North Embarcadero
11/19/2019	California Coastal Commission Staff	PMPU Discussion Draft - Restructuring
12/4/2019	Environmental Advisory Committee	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview – Ecology
12/5/2019	North Embarcadero Residents	PMPU Input – North Embarcadero
12/5/2019	Driscoll's and Tuna Harbor Commercial Fishermen	PMPU Input – Commercial Fishing
12/11/2019	Grande South Homeowners Association	PMPU Input – Embarcadero Planning District
12/16/2019	Bayside Homeowners Association	PMPU Input – Embarcadero Planning District
12/18/2019	Grande North Homeowners Association	PMPU Input – Embarcadero Planning District
12/19/2019	U.S. Navy Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input and Coordination Naval Facilities
12/19/2019	California Coastal Commission Staff	PMPU Discussion Draft Overview
12/19/2019	Brezza Homeowners Association	PMPU Input – Embarcadero Planning District
12/20/2019	Sapphire Homeowners Association	PMPU Input – Embarcadero Planning District
2020		
1/7/2020	Embarcadero Residents	PMPU Input – Embarcadero Planning District
1/7/2020	Downtown Community Planning Group	PMPU Input
1/13/2020	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
1/14/2020	Embarcadero Residents	PMPU Input – Embarcadero Planning District
1/15/2020	Downtown San Diego Partnership	PMPU Input – Embarcadero Planning District
1/27/2020	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	PMPU Input – Embarcadero Planning District
1/27/2020	California Coastal Commission Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Commercial Fishing
1/29/2020	Savina Homeowners Association	PMPU Input – Embarcadero Planning District
2/14/2020	Coronado Cays HOA	Port Master Plan Update Overview/Input – Silver Strand Planning District



## STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
2/20/2020	U.S. Navy Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/In/put and Policy Coordination
2/28/2020	California Coastal Commission Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/In/put – Revised PMPU Update
3/16/2020	National Marine Fisheries Service Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/In/put – Ecology Element
5/21/2020	U.S. Navy Staff	Port Master Plan Update – Revised PMPU Update
6/3/2020	Environmental Advisory Committee	Port Master Plan Update Overview/In/put – Ecology Element
7/23/2020	San Diego Audubon	Port Master Plan Update Overview – Ecology Element
7/24/2020	Point Loma Rotary Club	Port Master Plan Update
7/27/2020	California Coastal Commission Staff	Port Master Plan Update Overview/In/put – Revised PMPU Update
7/28/2020	RLJ (Wyndham)	PMPU Input – North Embarcadero
7/30/2020	Port Tenants Association	Preview of 8/4/2020 BPC Workshop
7/30/2020	North Embarcadero Residents	PMPU Input – North Embarcadero
7/30/2020	Midway Museum	PMPU Input – North Embarcadero
8/5/2020	San Diego Airport Staff	Port Master Plan Update
8/11/2020	USS Midway	Navy Pier
8/12/2020	Navy Pier Ad-Hoc Committee	Navy Pier
8/26/2020	USS Midway	Navy Pier
8/28/2020	USS Midway	Navy Pier
8/31/2020	USS Midway	Navy Pier
9/11/2020	Navy Pier Ad-Hoc Committee	Navy Pier
9/15/2020	Green Marine GreenTech Conference	Creative Community Engagement
9/16/2020	Coronado Rotary Club	Port Master Plan Update
9/17/2020	Navy Pier Ad-Hoc Committee	Navy Pier
9/18/2020	San Diego Metro Real Estate Association	Port Master Plan Update
9/23/2020	Navy Pier Ad-Hoc Committee	Navy Pier
9/30/2020	Columbia Community Foundation Board	Revised Draft PMPU



**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS**

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
10/5/2020	Waterfront Activation Rec Feasibility Coordination	Revised Draft PMPU
10/8/2020	Downtown Partnership Policy Committee	Revised Draft PMPU
10/12/2020	City of San Diego	Revised Draft PMPU
10/12/2020	Port Tenants Association	Revised Draft PMPU
10/12/2020	City of San Diego Councilmember Moreno	Revised Draft PMPU
10/13/2020	San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce	Revised Draft PMPU
10/15/2020	North Embarcadero Resident	Revised Draft PMPU – North Embarcadero
10/16/2020	Coronado Cays Resort, LLC	Revised Draft PMPU – Grand Caribe
10/20/2020	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Revised Draft PMPU
10/20/2020	Chamber Transportation and Land Development Committee	Revised Draft PMPU
10/21/2020	Convention Center	Revised Draft PMPU
10/26/2020	Little Italy Association Project Review Subcommittee	Revised Draft PMPU
10/26/2020	California Coastal Commission	Revised Draft PMPU – Navy Pier
10/27/2020	San Diego Regional Airport Authority	Revised Draft PMPU
10/28/2020	City of San Diego Councilmember Campbell	Revised Draft PMPU
10/28/2020	Gaslamp Quarter Association Board	Revised Draft PMPU
11/3/2020	Little Italy Association Board	Revised Draft PMPU
11/3/2020	AB 617 Maritime Clean Air Strategy Subcommittee	Revised Draft PMPU
11/4/2020	San Diego Regional Airport Authority Staff	Revised Draft PMPU
11/5/2020	City of San Diego Councilmember Gomez	Revised Draft PMPU



**STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS**

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
11/5/2020	East Village Association Board	Revised Draft PMPU
11/9/2020	Embarcadero Residents	Revised Draft PMPU – North Embarcadero
11/9/2020	Commercial Fishing Steering Group	Revised Draft PMPU
11/10/2020	Wyndham	Revised Draft PMPU
11/12/2020	Downtown San Diego Partnership	Revised Draft PMPU
11/12/2020	State Lands – Controller Yee	Revised Draft PMPU
11/12/2020	Port Tenants Association	Revised Draft PMPU
11/12/2020	Southwestern Yacht Club	Revised Draft PMPU
11/13/2020	SANDAG Transportation Committee	Revised Draft PMPU
11/16/2020	Environmental Health Coalition	Revised Draft PMPU
11/17/2020	Maritime Stakeholders Forum	Revised Draft PMPU
11/17/2020	City Center Business District Board	Revised Draft PMPU
11/17/2020	Embarcadero Residents	Revised Draft PMPU – North Embarcadero
11/17/2020	City of Imperial Beach Senior Staff	Revised Draft PMPU
11/24/2020	SANDAG	Revised Draft PMPU
12/2/2020	Port Tenants Association	Revised Draft PMPU
12/14/2020	Host Hotels	Revised Draft PMPU – Coronado Bayfront
12/17/2020	Embarcadero Residents	Revised Draft PMPU – North Embarcadero
<b>2021</b>		
1/6/2021	California Coastal Commission Staff	Revised Draft PMPU Comments
1/7/2021	Outboard Boating Club	Revised Draft PMPU Comments – Shelter Island
1/13/2021	Environmental Stakeholders	Revised Draft PMPU Comments – Ecology Element
2/3/2021	City of San Diego Staff	Revised Draft PMPU Comments
2/3/2021	California Coastal Commission Staff	Revised Draft PMPU Comments
2/8/2021	City of Coronado Staff	Revised Draft PMPU Comments
2/16/2021	Port Tenants Association	Revised Draft PMPU Comments
3/3/2021	California Coastal Commission Staff	Revised Draft PMPU Comments

## STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
3/3/2021	Environmental Health Coalition	Revised Draft PMPU Comments – Environmental Justice
3/29/2021	Environmental Health Coalition	Revised Draft PMPU Comments – Environmental Justice
4/8/2021	Port Tenants Association Environmental Committee	Revised Draft PMPU Comments – Ecology and Environmental Justice
4/9/2021	California Coastal Commission Staff	Revised Draft PMPU Comments
4/14/2021	Port Tenants Association	Revised Draft PMPU Comments
4/20/2021	Port Tenants Association	Revised Draft PMPU Comments
4/26/2021	Commercial Fishing Stakeholders	Revised Draft PMPU Comments – Commercial Fishing
5/13/2021	Port Tenants Association	Revised Draft PMPU Comments
5/17/2021	California Coastal Commission Staff	Revised Draft PMPU Comments
5/19/2021	Outboard Boating Club	Revised Draft PMPU Comments – Shelter Island
6/2/2021	California Coastal Commission Staff	Revised Draft PMPU Comments
6/23/2021	Port Tenants Association	Revised Draft PMPU Comments
7/14/2021	California Coastal Commission Staff	Revised Draft PMPU Comments
7/16/2021	Embarcadero Stakeholders	Revised Draft PMPU Comments - Embarcadero
8/4/2021	California Coastal Commission Staff	Revised Draft PMPU Comments
8/13/2021	1HWY1	Revised Draft PMPU Comments
9/1/2021	California Coastal Commission Staff	Revised Draft PMPU Comments
9/8/2021	Environmental Stakeholders	Revised Draft PMPU Comments – Ecology Element
9/22/2021	Environmental Health Coalition	Revised Draft PMPU Comments – Environmental Justice
9/23/2021	Environmental Stakeholders	Revised Draft PMPU Comments – Ecology Element
9/29/2021	California Coastal Commission Staff	Revised Draft PMPU Comments
10/11/2021	Port Tenants Association	Revised Draft PMPU Comments
10/25/2021	RLJ (Wyndham)	Revised Draft PMPU Comments – North Embarcadero
11/3/2021	San Diego Regional Airport Authority	Revised Draft PMPU Comments
11/3/2021	California Coastal Commission Staff	Revised Draft PMPU Comments
11/3/2021	Driscolls Wharf	Revised Draft PMPU Comments – Commercial Fishing
11/5/2021	City of San Diego	Revised Draft PMPU



## STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS

Date	Stakeholder/Organization	Topic
11/18/2021	Coronado Yacht Club	Revised Draft PMPU – Coronado
11/22/2021	Embarcadero Coalition	Draft PEIR and Draft PMPU – Embarcadero
12/1/2021	Environmental Advisory Committee	Draft PEIR and Draft PMPU – Ecology Element
12/1/2021	California Coastal Commission Staff	Revised Draft PMPU and Draft PMPU Comments
12/6/2021	EHC	Draft PEIR and Draft PMPU Comments – Environmental Justice
12/15/2021	RLJ (Wyndham)	Draft PEIR and Draft PMPU Comments – North Embarcadero
12/20/2021	Latino Equity	Draft PEIR and Draft PMPU Comments – Environmental Justice
<b>2022</b>		
1/6/2022	City of San Diego Staff	Draft PEIR and Draft PMPU Comments
1/14/2022	California Coastal Commission Staff	Revised Draft PMPU and Draft PMPU Comments
2/2/2022	California Coastal Commission Staff	Revised Draft PMPU and Draft PMPU Comments
3/28/2022	Port Tenants Association	Draft PMPU
4/6/2022	Embarcadero Coalition	Draft PMPU – North Embarcadero
5/4/2022	California Coastal Commission Staff	Revised Draft PMPU and Draft PMPU Comments
5/4/2022	U.S. Navy Community Planning Liaison Officers	Draft PMPU
7/7/2022	San Diego Working Waterfront	Draft PMPU and East Harbor Island
7/11/2022	California Coastal Commission and San Diego Working Waterfront	Shelter Island Walking Tour
7/13/2022	1HWY1 and SDFWG	Commercial Fishing
9/7/2022	San Diego Working Waterfront	Draft PMPU
10/27/2022	Embarcadero Coalition	North Embarcadero
12/7/2022	Environmental Advisory Committee	Draft PMPU and Draft PEIR Update