

**pat@patflannery.com**

---

**From:** rhodes@laplayaheritage.com  
**Sent:** Friday, September 03, 2010 7:25 PM  
**To:** Charles Wurster  
**Cc:** nevp@portofsandiego.org; mvalerio@portofsandiego.org; jhelmer@portofsandiego.org; scushman@portofsandiego.org; rvalderrama@portofsandiego.org; mbixler@portofsandiego.org; lburdick@portofsandiego.org; whall@portofsandiego.org; rspane@portofsandiego.org; skirkpat@portofsandiego.org; bstup@portofsandiego.org; dthompson@portofsandiego.org; dlee@coastal.ca.gov; ssarb@coastal.ca.gov; dlilly@coastal.ca.gov; scott300@earthlink.net; chris70@cox.net; drbcoombs@msn.com; dwood8@cox.net; graham\_here-30@sbcglobal.net; harrywz@san.rr.com; warburto@sonic.net; cory@briggslawcorp.com; marco@coastlawgroup.com; marti.k@cox.net; pat@blogofsandiego.com; pat@patflannery.com; JW\_August@10news.com; Kristen\_Castillo@10news.com; rhodes@laplayaheritage.com; Felicia\_Kit@10news.com  
**Subject:** North Embarcadero Visionary Plan Comments  
**Attachments:** Water\_Main\_Breaks\_Downtown\_SD\_Rose\_Canyon\_Fault\_Zone.pdf

Hello Mr. Wurster:

Thank you for this information, and thank you for making the law clear.

This is the exact kind of information others have been requesting. I am sure the public would like to get the areas approved for Cruise Ships by the Coast Guards and Homeland Security on a SANGIS map as soon as possible so the law is clear for everyone in San Diego.

I will send this off to the Navy Broadway Complex Coalition, and Mr. Flannery who brought up their concern regarding our nation's Homeland Security as they relate to Cruise Ship Operations.

At previous meetings I had with Mr. Holman and the Project Manager Mr. Valerio, the Port stated that they have gotten in touch with the California Geological Survey (CGS) and the State Geologist's Office in Sacramento, California to confirm the intent and local responsibilities for standard minimum Regulatory review of fault investigations for surface or subsurface improvements, and Capitol projects.

What did the California Geological Survey and State Geologist say regarding the requirement for valid fault investigations in Seismic Hazards Zones, like liquefaction and the downtown Special Fault Zone at the CEQA and NEPA stage?

Attached please find the start to a literature review for the active Coronado strand of the active Rose Canyon Fault Zone (RCFZ) and liquefaction in relation to Water Main breaks in the North Embarcadero, both within the City and the Port's Jurisdiction.

The Lindbergh Field 16 inch Cast Iron Main Replacement and Harbor Drive Pipeline (Cast Iron) projects as related to the active Spanish Bight fault of the RCFZ and liquefaction will be analyzed as well.

I look forward to resolving all our outstanding issues.

Regards,

Katheryn Rhodes  
619-523-4350

On Fri, 03 Sep 2010 15:42:08 -0700, Charles Wurster wrote:  
Dear Ms. Rhodes,

I believe the below email may have been intended for you.

I offer some corrections to the information "scott300" provided below. I served in the Coast Guard 37 years. Also, the 100 yard security zone is the standard guideline and is most important on the surface of the water. (This space allows distance and time for security forces to make shoot/don't shoot decisions--regarding possibly hostile approaching vessels--during times of high alert.) Ashore, the practicalities of existing infrastructure are taken into account by the Coast Guard "Captain of the Port" who may approve a plan that provides adequate security with less set-back. That is the case for us here in San Diego.

Have a great holiday weekend,

Charles D. Wurster  
President/CEO  
Port of San Diego  
(619) 686-6201  
[cwurster@portofsandiego.org](mailto:cwurster@portofsandiego.org)

>>>

**From:** <scott300@earthlink.net>  
**To:** Charles Wurster <cwurster@portofsandiego.org>  
**Date:** 9/2/2010 11:51 AM  
**Subject:** Re: North Embarcadero Visionary Plan Comments

Hi Katheryn,

This is great!

I think Wurster is a 20 yr Coast Guard vet. The CG is responsible for implementing 33CFR Homeland Security regulations for U.S. ports. Regs state there must be minimum 100 yard setbacks from both cruise ships and cruise ship terminals. On the Embarcadero and in the bay. I measured the setback at B St. pier at just *75 feet* - building edge to farthest out concrete truck bomb barrier.

Best

-----Original Message-----

From: Charles Wurster

Sent: Sep 1, 2010 1:15 PM

To: dlee@coastal.ca.gov, dlilly@coastal.ca.gov, ssarb@coastal.ca.gov, rhodes@laplayaheritage.com, Brian Stup , John Helmer , Lee Burdick , Michael Bixler , Matthew Valerio , rspane@portofsandiego.org, Robert Valderrama , Stephen Cushman , Stephen Kirkpatrick , whall@portofsandiego.org, dthompson@potofsandiego.org

Cc: Felicia\_Kit@10news.com, JW\_August@10news.com, Kristen\_Castillo@10news.com, pat@blogofsandiego.com, cory@briggslawcorp.com, marco@coastlawgroup.com, chris70@cox.net, dwood8@cox.net, marti.k@cox.net, scott300@earthlink.net, drbcoombs@msn.com, pat@patflannery.com, harrywz@san.rr.com, graham\_here-30@sbcglobal.net, warburto@sonic.net

Subject: Re: North Embarcadero Visionary Plan Comments

Dear Ms. Rhodes,

Thank you for your email and for clarifying your concerns. I have asked my staff to arrange a meeting with you in the near future. I look forward to listening to your views on these important topics.

Sincerely,

Charles D. Wurster

President/CEO

Port of San Diego

(619) 686-6201

[cwurster@portofsandiego.org](mailto:cwurster@portofsandiego.org)

>>>

**From:** <rhodes@laplayaheritage.com>

**To:** <nevp@portofsandiego.org>, <mvalerio@portofsandiego.org>, <jhelmer@portofsandiego.org>, <cwurster@portofsandiego.org>, <scushman@portofsandiego.org>, <rvalderrama@portofsandiego.org>, <mbixler@portofsandiego.org>, <lburdick@portofsandiego.org>, <whall@portofsandiego.org>, <rspane@portofsandiego.org>, <skirkpat@portofsandiego.org>, <bstup@portofsandiego.org>, <dthompson@potofsandiego.org>, <dlee@coastal.ca.gov>, <ssarb@coastal.ca.gov>, <dlilly@coastal.ca.gov>

**CC:** <scott300@earthlink.net>, <chris70@cox.net>, <drbcoombs@msn.com>, <dwood8@cox.net>, <graham\_here-30@sbcglobal.net>, <harrywz@san.rr.com>, <warburto@sonic.net>, <cory@briggslawcorp.com>, <marco@coastlawgroup.com>, <marti.k@cox.net>, <pat@blogofsandiego.com>, <pat@patflannery.com>, <JW\_August@10news.com>, <Kristen\_Castillo@10news.com>, <rhodes@laplayaheritage.com>, <Felicia\_Kit@10news.com>

**Date:** 8/31/2010 7:32 PM

**Subject:** North Embarcadero Visionary Plan Comments

Dear Port of San Diego and the California Coastal Commission San Diego Office:

We have been trying to set up a meeting with President Wurster of the Port of San Diego regarding our ongoing concerns regarding seismic safety, active faulting, inadequate parking, and

lack of park and open space in the North Embarcadero area. However, President Wurster informed us that we have a lawsuit against the Port of San Diego, therefore, we are not allowed to meet with Port Officials. We told President Wurster that we are not involved in any lawsuit, but we are still being shut out of the process by the Port of San Diego.

The Port of San Diego stated that they would work with detractors of their North Embarcadero Visionary Plan (NEVP). According to news accounts, the Port did meet with some, but refuse to view our legitimate concerns on seismic issues, parking, and park land as valid.

We are asking for a meeting with Port Official and the California Coastal Commission staff following Geologist Michael Kennedy of the California Geologic Survey's June 2007 requirement that "public safety makes it imperative that the exact location of these youthful faults be mapped onshore prior to any development." The Coronado Fault of the Rose Canyon Fault Zone (RCFZ) is the youngest and has the potential to be the most destructive active fault in San Diego.

Again, the exact location of the youthful faults has to either be confirmed or denied in the North Embarcadero area before surface or subsurface improvements are planned. We have also studied water main and sewer main breaks on Port Tidelands on SANGIS maps that show a definitive correlation between active faults and continuously broken Public Utilities on North Harbor Drive.

As of today, we are planning on Appealing any decision the Port makes without address our ongoing, 4 year old concerns. If we can get a meeting and have our issues resolved we would appreciate the opportunity.

Linked below is our June 29, 2009 report on our outstanding concerns for the NEVP that is too large some email accounts.

[https://docs.google.com/leaf?id=0B\\_fHftxFXfhyNzVjOTJlZjAtYTQwZi00Nzg4LTk3M2QtNjNkNTM0ZDEyZTM2&hl=en](https://docs.google.com/leaf?id=0B_fHftxFXfhyNzVjOTJlZjAtYTQwZi00Nzg4LTk3M2QtNjNkNTM0ZDEyZTM2&hl=en)

Previously the FBI stated they could not investigate the hiding of seismic evidence important to our National Security while State and Federal lawsuits are outstanding. If we do not hear from the Port of San Diego, and if all lawsuits are completed, we will again contact the FBI to start the investigation of corruption from the City of San Diego, CCDC, and now the Port of San Diego.

Regards,

Katheryn Rhodes and Conrad Hartsell MD  
371 San Fernando Street, San Diego, California 92106  
619-523-4350  
rhodes@laplayaheritage.com