

Baird

oceans
engineering
lakes
design
rivers
science
watersheds
construction

Proposed Cruise Berthing Facility, Grand Cayman
Environmental and Engineering Consultancy Services
Environmental Statement
Appendix R – Response to Public Comments

September 15, 2015
12214.101



Proposed Cruise Berthing Facility, Grand Cayman
Environmental and Engineering Consultancy Services
Environmental Statement
Appendix R – Response to Public Comments

Prepared for



**Ministry of District Administration Tourism & Transport
and The Port Authority of the Cayman Islands**

Prepared by

Baird

W.F. Baird & Associates Coastal Engineers Ltd.

*For further information please contact
Dave Anglin at 1-608-273-0592*

12214.101

This report was prepared by Baird for the Cayman Islands Government. The material in it reflects the judgment of Baird in light of the information available to them at the time of preparation. Any use which a Third Party makes of this report, or any reliance on decisions to be made based on it, are the responsibility of such Third Parties. Baird accepts no responsibility for damages, if any, suffered by any Third Party as a result of decisions made or actions based on this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Public Consultation Process	1
1.2	Scope of EIA Study	2
2.0	PREVAILING TOPICS IN PUBLIC COMMENTS.....	3
3.0	IMPACTS ON REEFS AND WRECKS IN GEORGE TOWN HARBOUR	4
3.1	General Comments	4
3.1.1	<i>Compilation of Public Comments</i>	<i>4</i>
3.1.2	<i>Response to Public Comments.....</i>	<i>4</i>
3.2	Marine Resource Valuation.....	5
3.2.1	<i>Compilation of Public Comments</i>	<i>5</i>
3.2.2	<i>Response to Public Comments.....</i>	<i>5</i>
3.3	Direct Impacts – Spatial Extent of Reefs in Project Footprint.....	5
3.3.1	<i>Compilation of Public Comments</i>	<i>5</i>
3.3.2	<i>Response to Public Comments.....</i>	<i>5</i>
3.4	Indirect Impacts – Turbidity Plumes during Construction and Operations.....	6
3.4.1	<i>Compilation of Public Comments</i>	<i>6</i>
3.4.2	<i>Response to Public Comments.....</i>	<i>6</i>
3.5	Mitigation Measures.....	8
3.5.1	<i>Compilation of Public Comments</i>	<i>8</i>
3.5.2	<i>Response to Public Comments.....</i>	<i>8</i>
4.0	FEASIBILITY/SCOPE/COST OF CORAL AND WRECK RELOCATION.....	9
4.1	Compilation of Public Comments	9
4.2	Response to Public Comments.....	9
5.0	PROJECT ALTERNATIVES	10
5.1	Project Site.....	10
5.1.1	<i>Compilation of Public Comments</i>	<i>10</i>
5.1.2	<i>Response to Public Comments.....</i>	<i>10</i>
5.2	Project Alternatives.....	11
5.2.1	<i>Compilation of Public Comments</i>	<i>11</i>
5.2.2	<i>Response to Public Comments.....</i>	<i>11</i>

5.3	Alternative CBF Layouts	11
5.3.1	<i>Compilation of Public Comments</i>	11
5.3.2	<i>Response to Public Comments</i>	12
6.0	IMPACTS ON WAVES AND COASTAL PROCESSES	14
6.1	Compilation of Public Comments	14
6.2	Response to Public Comments.....	14
6.2.1	<i>Study Period for Weather Conditions</i>	14
6.2.2	<i>Wave Action along GT Waterfront</i>	14
6.2.3	<i>Seven Mile Beach</i>	15
6.2.4	<i>Requirement for Maintenance Dredging</i>	15
6.2.5	<i>Lack of Geotechnical Information</i>	15
7.0	AIR QUALITY/NOISE POLLUTION/ STORM WATER/WATER QUALITY	16
7.1	Compilation of Public Comments	16
7.2	Response to Public Comments.....	16
7.2.1	<i>Air Quality</i>	16
7.2.2	<i>Noise Pollution – Blasting and Pile Driving</i>	17
7.2.3	<i>Storm Water/Water Quality</i>	17
8.0	GEOLOGY AND SOILS	18
8.1	Compilation of Public Comments	18
8.2	Response to Public Comments.....	18
9.0	BERTHING VERSUS TENDERING	19
9.1	Need for Cruise Berthing Facility	19
9.1.1	<i>Compilation of Public Comments</i>	19
9.1.2	<i>Response to Public Comments</i>	19
9.2	Other Comments	21
9.2.1	<i>Compilation of Public Comments</i>	21
9.2.2	<i>Response to Public Comments</i>	21
10.0	PEDESTRIAN AND VEHICULAR TRAFFIC	22
10.1	Compilation of Public Comments	22
10.2	Response to Public Comments.....	22

11.0	ECONOMIC IMPACTS.....	23
11.1	OBC Assumptions and Projected Trends.....	23
	11.1.1 <i>Compilation of Public Comments.....</i>	23
	11.1.2 <i>Response to Public Comments.....</i>	23
11.2	Skepticism/Uncertainty Regarding Projected Economic Impacts.....	24
	11.2.1 <i>Compilation of Public Comments.....</i>	24
	11.2.2 <i>Response to Public Comments.....</i>	24
11.3	Relative Importance of Stay Over versus Cruise Tourism	25
	11.3.1 <i>Compilation of Public Comments.....</i>	25
	11.3.2 <i>Response to Public Comments.....</i>	25
12.0	SOCIAL IMPACTS.....	26
12.1	Compilation of Public Comments.....	26
12.2	Response to Public Comments.....	26
13.0	CARRYING CAPACITY	27
13.1	Compilation of Public Comments.....	27
13.2	Response to Public Comments.....	27
14.0	COST/PRIORITIES	29
14.1	Compilation of Public Comments.....	29
14.2	Response to Public Comments.....	29
15.0	CARGO FACILITY	30
15.1	Compilation of Public Comments.....	30
15.2	Response to Public Comments.....	30
16.0	ROLE OF CRUISE LINES.....	31
16.1	Compilation of Public Comments.....	31
16.2	Response to Public Comments.....	31

APPENDIX R.1 - TABULAR SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

APPENDIX R.2 – PUBLIC COMMENTS (NO. 1 - 473)

APPENDIX R.3 – ADDITIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION ON SELECTED TOPICS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Public Consultation Process

The Environmental Statement (ES) for the proposed cruise berthing facility (CBF) in George Town Harbour (GTH) was released on June 4, and was presented to the public on June 9. The ES summarizes the results of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) study undertaken by Baird/SWI/TEMN/MMM (the Consultants) for the Cayman Islands Government (CIG).

A comprehensive public consultation process was undertaken as part of the EIA study, in accordance with Performance Standard 1 of the International Finance Corporation of the World Bank Group (IFC, 2012). In addition to the stakeholder engagement and public consultation effort undertaken during the EIA study (as described in Chapter 6 and Appendix 1 of the ES), a one month long public consultation period was held following release of the ES (June 4 through July 3, 2015). A total of 473 written comments were received by the Department of Environment (DoE).

Of the 473 public comments received, 347 (~ 73%) objected to the project, 111 (~ 24%) supported the project and 15 (~ 3%) were neutral/unclear/undecided. Of the 347 respondents objecting to the project, 142 (~ 41%) were residents and 205 (~ 59%) were visitors. Of the 111 respondents in favour of the project, 110 (~ 99%) were residents and one was a visitor.

This document, to be included as an appendix to the ES, presents the comments received from the public and responses to the comments developed by the Consultants. The document is organized as follows:

- Chapter 2 - list of prevailing topics contained in public comments;
- Chapters 3-16 - compilation of public comments, and overall response to these comments, for each prevailing topic;
- Appendix R.1 - tabular summary of public comments, highlighting key topics raised in each;
- Appendix R.2 - copies of the actual public comments (No. 1 - 473);
- Appendix R.3 - additional technical information on selected topics;

The public consultation process represents a critical part of the EIA process, and has provided valuable insight from both Caymanians and visitors. The extent and level of engagement by the public has been significant, and is acknowledged and appreciated.

This document represents the completion of the public consultation process for the EIA study for the proposed CBF. The public comments and responses contained herein will need to be taken into account in the decision-making process for the project by the Cayman Islands Government, in accordance with the requirements of IFC (2012).

1.2 Scope of EIA Study

The scope of the EIA study is defined in the Final EIA Terms of Reference (EIA ToR) prepared for the CIG by Mott McDonald in December 2013. The development of the EIA ToR also benefitted from a public consultation process.

The EIA study was undertaken by the Consultants in accordance with the requirements of the EIA ToR. The overall scope of the EIA study included the following tasks:

- Stakeholder and public consultation;
- Review of alternatives considered in the Outline Business Case (OBC) prepared by PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) in 2013;
- Assessment of baseline conditions for 14 key considerations, as defined in the ToR;
- Identification, assessment and quantification (to the extent possible) of the potential environmental and socio-economic impacts associated with the construction and operation of the proposed project for each of the 14 key considerations;
- Identification of possible mitigation measures to reduce adverse impacts associated with the construction and operation of the proposed project for each of the 14 key considerations.

It is noted that the project site (George Town Harbour) was specified in the EIA ToR. As such, the EIA study did not include any assessment of alternative project sites. Also, while not specifically required by the EIA ToR, the Consultants developed a refined project layout (as compared to the OBC layout specified in the EIA ToR) that provides a significant reduction in environmental impacts and improved functionality as compared to the OBC layout.

The EIA study provides a comprehensive assessment of baseline conditions and the potential impacts, both positive and negative, of the development of a cruise berthing facility in George Town Harbour. However, the scope of the EIA study was limited by both time constraints and financial considerations. As such, uncertainty remains in some key areas; these areas have been noted, and the ranges in possible outcomes have been estimated where possible.

2.0 PREVAILING TOPICS IN PUBLIC COMMENTS

As noted earlier, the public comments were dominated by several prevailing topics. Appendix R.1 provides a tabular summary of the 473 public comments, highlighting the prevailing topics raised in each. Appendix R.2 includes copies of the actual comments (No. 1 - 473).

The prevailing topics contained in the public comments are listed below:

- Impacts on reefs and wrecks in George Town Harbour (Chapter 3);
- Feasibility/scope/cost of coral and wreck relocation program (Chapter 4);
- Project alternatives (Chapter 5);
- Impacts on waves and coastal processes (Chapter 6);
- Air pollution/noise pollution/storm water (Chapter 7);
- Geology and soils (Chapter 8);
- Berthing versus tendering (Chapter 9);
- Pedestrian and vehicular traffic (Chapter 10);
- Economic impacts (Chapter 11);
- Social impacts (Chapter 12);
- Carrying capacity (Chapter 13);
- Costs/priorities (Chapter 14);
- Cargo facility (Chapter 15)
- Role of cruise lines (Chapter 16).

A compilation of the public comments received, and responses to these comments, is provided in separate chapters for each of the prevailing topics.

3.0 IMPACTS ON REEFS AND WRECKS IN GEORGE TOWN HARBOUR

A large number of public comments were received regarding the potential impacts of the proposed project on coral reefs and ship wrecks in George Town Harbour. These comments, and the associated responses of the Consultants, have been grouped under several subheadings, as summarized below.

3.1 General Comments

3.1.1 *Compilation of Public Comments*

- Damage caused by existing operations (offshore anchoring, ships remaining on power, tender traffic) is not addressed.
- Coral reefs are ecologically critical to the CIs, the Caribbean region and the world, are under stress everywhere, and are irreplaceable.
- Image/reputation of CIs is at stake:
 - CIs have an international reputation for protecting the environment;
 - CIs are a premiere dive destination;
 - Project is located within a protected Marine Park Area (MPA);
<https://www.caymanislands.ky/divecayman/dive-sites/marine-conservation/marine-parks.aspx>
 - Project is incompatible/inconsistent with the principals of sustainable development;
 - Project is incompatible with the CIs' National Biodiversity Action Plan (2009) and National Conservation Law (2013);
 - CIG must lead by example.
- Project will cause irreparable damage to the primary attraction that brings tourists to the CIs (coral reefs and marine habitat), with long-term negative impacts on both cruise and stay-over tourism.

3.1.2 *Response to Public Comments*

- Impacts associated with existing operations were not assessed in the EIA; impacts associated with offshore anchoring, ships remaining on power and tendering will continue if the CBF is not constructed.
- The critical importance of coral reefs to the CIs and beyond is acknowledged.
- The role of the EIA study was to identify, assess and quantify (to the extent possible) the potential environmental and socio-economic impacts (positive and negative) associated with the construction and operation of the proposed project.
- The decision to proceed with the project is the responsibility of the CIG. The results of the EIA study are a critical input to the decision making process.

3.2 Marine Resource Valuation

3.2.1 *Compilation of Public Comments*

- Some say the economic value of the reefs and the environmental impacts of the proposed project have been underestimated (i.e. value of Eden Rock, Devil’s Grotto, Soto’s Reef and the wreck of the *Balbao* are “immeasurable”, “they are irreplaceable”), while others say it has been overestimated (i.e. “most of the corals are dead”).
- The long term cost of environmental impacts has been underestimated.

3.2.2 *Response to Public Comments*

- The marine resource valuation (ES Appendix J.2) provides a preliminary estimate of the economic value of marine ecosystem goods and services provided by the coral reef habitat present in GTH; the uncertainty in these estimates is acknowledged. In addition, the following comments are noted:
 - The marine resource valuation was undertaken to estimate the potential economic impacts of reef loss/degradation associated with the CBF on the water sports industry (diving and snorkeling) in GTH;
 - The estimates are based on current spend rates, and need to be converted to Gross Value added for inclusion in the overall economic evaluation of the project.
 - The anticipated diversion/displacement of activities from within GTH to other locations and/or activities/attractions in George Town and around Grand Cayman was identified, but not considered in the valuation;
 - The potential long-term impact on dive and stay over tourism was identified, but not considered in the valuation;
 - The EIA recommended that the OBC be updated to reflect these considerations.

3.3 Direct Impacts – Spatial Extent of Reefs in Project Footprint

3.3.1 *Compilation of Public Comments*

- The estimate of 15 acres of “coral reef habitat” within the project footprint is too high.
- What is the actual area of live coral reef suitable for relocation?

3.3.2 *Response to Public Comments*

- As stated in the ES, approximately 15 acres of “coral reef habitat” will be directly impacted by the project. This area includes hard pan and sandy bottom areas located amongst/ between the reef features, as these areas are part of the functional ecosystem within the project footprint.
- A preliminary estimate of the spatial extent of “coral substrate” that could be harvested for relocation is ~10 acres, including spurs, patch reefs and individual coral heads (refer to additional information provided in Appendix R.3-1).

- The marine ecology assessment undertaken for the EIA was designed to define baseline conditions, to assess environmental impacts arising from the project, and to identify possible mitigation measures, such as coral relocation.
- The marine ecology assessment was not designed to establish the objectives, scope and cost of a coral relocation program (refer to Chapter 4 for further discussion on coral relocation).

3.4 Indirect Impacts – Turbidity Plumes during Construction and Operations

3.4.1 Compilation of Public Comments

- The ES presents “worst case scenarios” for dredge plumes, and does not consider mitigation measures.
- The impact of the offshore disposal operation has been inadequately quantified.
- The model simulations of sediment re-suspension by props/thrusters are incorrect:
 - Only one thruster?
 - 15 minute duration is not realistic.
- Provide tug assistance to reduce/eliminate the need to use bow thrusters.

3.4.2 Response to Public Comments

Dredge Turbidity Plumes

- The 90 day model simulations presented in ES Section 11.4.1.2 (and Appendix D.2) represent the combined results of simulations with the dredge operating for 30 days at each of three different locations within the project footprint.
- The 90 day duration is reasonable for a mechanical dredge (BHD); the duration for hydraulic dredging (CSD) would be significantly less (~ 30 days).
- The images of model results presented in the ES (Figures 11.12-18), and similar figures in App. D.2, show the maximum estimated extent of turbidity plumes over the 90 day model simulation period for 1 hr and for a 24 hr “rolling mean”.
- The extent of typical (i.e. day to day) turbidity plumes would be less than what is shown in these figures.
- The animation included in Appendix R.3-2 (as presented at the public meeting) shows an example of the typical extent of the turbidity plume generated by a mechanical dredging operation without mitigation measures in place (two day model simulation for BHD assuming mass loss rate of 0.5 kg/s).

Offshore Disposal Operations

- Model simulations were undertaken to estimate turbidity plumes associated with offshore disposal operations by pipeline or barge (refer to ES Section 11.4.1.3 and Appendix D.2).
- These simulations focused on the potential for adverse impacts on the reefs in GTH.
- The scope of the EIA did not include an assessment of baseline conditions, or the potential impacts of offshore disposal operations, on the deep water marine and benthic habitat on

“The Wall” and beyond. The anticipated impacts would include turbidity in the water column and smothering of benthic flora and fauna in/around the disposal zone.

Sediment Re-Suspension by Ships

- The model simulations that are included in the ES (Section 11.4.1.4 and Appendix D.3) and that were shown at the public meeting were for a typical cruise ship, berthed bow-in at the north pier, with the bow thrusters (three) running at 100% power for 15 minutes.
- Based on the results of navigation simulations (nav sims) recently undertaken at the STAR Centre, the assumption of 100% thruster power for 15 minutes (with the vessel stationary at the berth) is overly conservative.
- Review of the nav sim results suggests that the bow thrusters would typically be run in short bursts, with the power level and duration dependent upon the wind speed/direction at the time, as summarized below:
 - For wind speeds up to 15 knots (average annual exceedance of 5%, or ~440 hrs/yr), thruster use was 60-80% power for up to 1 minute.
 - For wind speeds up to 20 knots (average annual exceedance of 0.5%, or ~44 hrs/yr), thruster use was 100% power for 1-3 minutes.
- Feedback from the Captains involved in the simulations indicates that the simulator is "conservative". Specifically, the additional sensory use available in real life means that the ship is easier to handle in reality than it is in the simulator.
- Based on this information, additional model simulations were run with a 1 minute duration of main props or thruster action (three thrusters) during periods of typical North and South currents, as follows:
 - Bow-in berthing, bow thrusters (100% for 1 minute);
 - Bow-in berthing, main (stern) props (50% for 1 minute);
 - Bow-out berthing, bow thrusters (100% for 1 minute);
 - Bow-out berthing, main (stern) props (50% for 1 minute).
- The results of these simulations are presented in Appendix R.3-3.
- Turbidity plumes in these simulations are significantly less severe than those presented in the ES and shown at the public meeting, due to the reduction in the duration of applied power in the model from 15 minutes to 1 minute.
- Duration of applied power of 1 minute is generally representative of that expected to be necessary during berthing/de-berthing manoeuvres in the navigation simulations under typical to moderate wind speeds (up to 15-20 knots).
- The use of tugs is not considered to be a practical alternative for the following reasons:
 - Suitable tugs are not presently available in the Cayman Islands, and the cost to acquire them would be significant;
 - The project layout does not provide sufficient space for tug assistance; particularly for the two inner berths (the dredging footprint has been minimized to reduce environmental impacts and capital costs).

3.5 Mitigation Measures

3.5.1 *Compilation of Public Comments*

- Even if every precaution is taken and mitigation measures are implemented, the damage will be significant/irreparable.
- If the project proceeds, the CIG should implement all mitigation measures possible to minimize impacts.
- Environmental Management Plan (EMP) is not included in ES.
- Best Management Practices (BMPs) – are these in the public domain?

3.5.2 *Response to Public Comments*

- The EIA study identified a range in possible mitigation measures that could be employed to reduce or eliminate adverse impacts on coral reefs in GTH (refer to ES Section 11.6).
- For recommended mitigation measures, the Rapid Impact Assessment Matrix (RIAM) was used to estimate the reduction in impact associated with each mitigation measure.
- The scope of the EIA study did not include development of costs for mitigation measures.
- If the project proceeds, the CIG will decide which mitigation measures will be implemented based on an assessment of costs and benefits.
- A draft of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) has been prepared and submitted to the CIG; however, the EMP cannot be finalized without knowing which mitigation measures will be adopted. A decision to proceed with the project will need to include definition of the mitigation measures to be employed; once this has been done, the EMP can be finalized before the project goes out to tender.
- Best Management Practices (BMPs) for dredging and marine construction works are available in the public domain from various sources (for example, CIRIA, IADC, PIANC).

4.0 FEASIBILITY/SCOPE/COST OF CORAL AND WRECK RELOCATION

4.1 Compilation of Public Comments

- Most comments express concern that coral relocation will be very expensive, with no guarantee of success, and may not even be feasible.
- Other comments refer to success of coral relocations programs in other locations.
- If the project proceeds, an extensive coral relocation program should be undertaken to minimize the impacts.
- Where will the corals be relocated? Will they be accessible?
- The *Balboa* is a cultural treasure and should not be moved.
- The feasibility of relocating the *Balbao* requires additional study.

4.2 Response to Public Comments

- Coral relocation is considered to be a feasible mitigation measure; however, it will not fully replace lost habitat (i.e. it does not provide 1:1 compensation/replacement), and success is not guaranteed.
- Coral relocation has been undertaken at numerous locations around the Caribbean (for example, Kingston Harbour, Falmouth, Grand Turk, Roatan, Cozumel) and beyond (for example, Florida, Hawaii, Qatar, UAE, Singapore). It is generally a very complex, time-consuming and extensive process. In addition, the success rate varies, and is dependent upon numerous site specific factors.
- The marine ecology assessment undertaken for the EIA was not designed to define the objectives/scope/cost of a coral relocation program, nor the location of a suitable recipient site. Additional investigations are required to do so, as discussed in ES Section 16.6.2 and Appendix J.1, Sub-Appendix 3.
- The actual cost of the coral relocation program will depend on many factors. As noted in ES Section 16.6.2, costs of coral relocation programs undertaken elsewhere have varied from US\$250/m² to US\$1,800/m² (~ CI\$20-140/ft²), with a median in the order of US\$1,000/m² (CI\$80/ft²).
- The actual cost of the coral relocation program will be dependent upon the objectives and scope of the program, which have not been defined at this time.
- The project cost estimate of CI\$156M includes a CI\$9M allowance for coral and wreck relocation (note: both numbers include a 27% contingency allowance).
- The cultural heritage of the *Balbao* is acknowledged.
- Depending upon its structural integrity, relocation of the *Balbao* may be feasible; additional studies are recommended to map the wreck and assess its structural integrity in order to identify the best method for its relocation (refer to ES Section 17.6.1).

5.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

A large number of public comments were received regarding alternatives to the project concept as presented in the ES. These comments, and the associated responses of the Consultants, have been grouped under several subheadings, as summarized below.

5.1 Project Site

5.1.1 *Compilation of Public Comments*

- Why is GTH the best location?
- GTH is the designated port area for Grand Cayman, as per CI Law and PACI regulations.
- GTH is located within a protected Marine Park Area (MPA).
- Cayman needs a CBF, but not in GTH (reduced impacts and downtime at other locations).
- EIA should have considered/assessed alternative locations (Barkers, Red Bay, Spotts).
- Provide piers at more than one location to spread the economic benefits around the island.

5.1.2 *Response to Public Comments*

- The GTH site was specified by the CIG based on the results of earlier studies; the scope of the EIA did not include the evaluation/assessment of alternative sites.
- Key advantages of the GTH site include the following (refer to ES Section 7.2):
 - Natural environment already compromised by years of shipping and port activities;
 - Significantly greater dredging (with associated environmental impacts) at other sites;
 - Capital cost of facility will be significantly lower in GTH;
 - Proximity to George Town business district.
- Regarding dredging volumes at other sites, PBSJ (1994) estimated dredging volumes of 13.8M cy at Barkers/North Sound, and 6.3M cy at Red Bay/South Sound. Preliminary calculations by the Consultants suggest that a 50-100% increase in these dredging volumes would be required to account for the significant increase in cruise ship sizes that has occurred over the past 20 years.
- The estimated dredging volume for the proposed CBF in GTH is 333,000 cy. Considering the information above, the dredging volumes associated with the development of a similar facility at the Barkers or Red Bay sites would be at least twenty times larger. The much larger volumes at these other sites are due to the shallower water depths and the requirement for a dredged access channel and turning basin.

5.2 Project Alternatives

5.2.1 *Compilation of Public Comments*

- CBF design as proposed is not sustainable – find a better option.
- Improved tender service not adequately considered.
- Permanent offshore moorings should be considered.
- Floating dock should be considered.

5.2.2 *Response to Public Comments*

- Maintaining the existing tender operation (i.e. “do nothing”), or providing an improved tender operation, are both possible alternatives to a CBF. These options are discussed in ES Chapter 7.5.
- The “do nothing” alternative was rejected in the OBC, but was used as the baseline condition for the EIA study.
- An improved tender operation should be considered if the CIG decides not to proceed with the CBF. The details and cost of an improved tender operation were not assessed in the EIA study, but could include new tender vessels, a sheltered landing area (protected by a breakwater) and various landside improvements.
- The offshore moorings presently used by cruise ships may be considered “permanent”, as they have been in place/use for many years. The EIA did not assess alternative mooring configurations/designs.
- A preliminary technical assessment of a floating pier concept was undertaken as part of the EIA study (Ch. 7.4 and App. A.4, Sub. App. A-4). Numerous technical challenges were identified, with significant investigation and analyses required to prove that the concept is technically and economically feasible at this location. The preliminary technical assessment was shared by the CIG with the proponents of the floating dock concept, but no response had been received by the Consultants at the time this report was prepared.

5.3 Alternative CBF Layouts

5.3.1 *Compilation of Public Comments*

- Consider two berths rather than four to reduce costs and environmental impacts.
- Move piers into deeper water to reduce dredging and associated impacts.
- Weighting factors used to assess alternatives are questionable, and render the assessment meaningless.
- Alternatives assessment did not consider the scope/cost of coral relocation; had this been included, Alternative B might be less expensive.

5.3.2 Response to Public Comments

- The EIA TOR specified the requirement for a CBF with four berths; the OBC evaluated, and rejected, a CBF with only two berths. As such, a two berth concept was not considered in the EIA study.
- The scope of the EIA was to assess the impacts of OBC layout; the development and assessment of alternative CBF layouts was outside the scope of EIA study.
- Regardless, the Consultants assessed a large number of alternative CBF layouts (refer to ES Appendix A), ultimately leading to development of a refined layout that meets the requirements defined in the OBC, significantly reduces dredging and environmental impacts associated with the project, and provides improved cargo facilities with only a marginal increase in cost.
- The development of alternative layouts considered several significant site constraints. As noted in Section 4.3 of the ES, key spatial constraints include the presence of coral reefs within the harbour, particularly to the North and South of the port area, and the proximity of a steep drop off to very deep water ("The Wall") to the west of the site.
- The water depth represents an important constraint with respect to the proposed piers and associated dolphin structures. Specifically, the design and construction of such structures becomes significantly more expensive in greater water depths due to increased exposure to hurricane waves, the requirement for longer piles and reduced lateral stability. In addition to water depth, proximity to "The Wall" is a potential concern with respect to geotechnical and seismic design issues. Considering these factors, as well as practical experience in the design and construction of similar structures, a water depth in the order of 50-60 ft was assumed as a reasonable upper limit for the conceptual designs considered in the EIA study. It is possible that a functional project design could be developed that extends the piers into marginally deeper water, perhaps 80-100 ft. However, there will be a practical limit to the maximum water depth, and more detailed engineering investigations would be required to confirm the design and cost implications. It is noted that the water depth also represents an important consideration in the design of a floating pier, a concept which was also reviewed as part of the EIA study (refer to ES Section 7.4 and Appendix A.4).
- Several alternative project layouts were developed with the piers in deeper water (refer to ES Appendix A). While these alternatives reduced the dredging footprint and volume, they also resulted in reduced functionality for the CBF (navigation, downtime and proximity to shore) and increased capital costs. The functional issues, as well as the fact that two piers with different orientations would not be functionally or commercially equivalent, were raised as significant concerns by the cruise lines that were consulted.
- The comparative assessment of alternative layouts (refer to ES Appendix A, Section 2.2.2) include the development of various evaluation criteria (functional, environmental and socio-economic) and weighting factors. The evaluation criteria and weighting factors were developed by the Consultants and incorporated input from the CIG Steering Group. As noted in the ES, it is acknowledged that there is some subjectivity in the comparative evaluation, and that the weights applied to specific criteria, as well as the rankings/scores applied to different alternatives, may vary depending on one's perspective on various issues.

- The comparative assessment of alternative layouts was undertaken early in the EIA study (June-July, 2014), as it was necessary to identify a preferred alternative in order to advance the detailed modeling and analyses required to complete the EIA study. The project footprint, direct impact on reefs, dredging volume and disposal volume were all considered in the comparative assessment. However, the cost of possible mitigation measures (such as coral relocation) was not considered in the assessment.
- The comparative assessment led to the selection of three alternative layouts to present to the cruise lines, one that prioritized functionality (Concept A), one that prioritized the environment (Concept B) and a third that represented a “middle ground” (Concept C). These three concepts were presented in separate meetings to four cruise lines in October 2014. All four cruise lines acknowledged the reduced environmental impacts with Concept B (due to reduced dredging and disposal). However, the functional issues with Concept B (navigation, downtime and proximity to shore), as well as the fact that two piers with different orientations would not be functionally or commercially equivalent, were raised as significant concerns by the cruise lines. In addition, the estimated cost of Concept B was approximately CI\$25M higher than the other Concepts.
- Following the meetings with the cruise lines, the CIG selected Concept C as the preferred layout. The detailed assessment of anticipated project impacts and possible mitigation measures was undertaken for the preferred layout only.

6.0 IMPACTS ON WAVES AND COASTAL PROCESSES

6.1 Compilation of Public Comments

- What was the study period for weather conditions?
- Concern regarding increased wave action along GT's waterfront (coastal erosion and flooding).
- Skepticism regarding EIA's conclusion of no impact on 7MB; what if modeling is wrong?
- Concern regarding the potential frequency/cost/impacts of maintenance dredging.
- Concern regarding uncertainties due to lack of geotechnical information (borings and samples).

6.2 Response to Public Comments

6.2.1 *Study Period for Weather Conditions*

- Long term wind data were available from the airport, and also from the CFSR atmospheric model. Short term wind data were also available from the Government Administration Building.
- Regional current data were available from the HYCOM global ocean model.
- Field measurements of waves and currents were collected at four locations in the vicinity of the project site for periods of up to ten months. These data were augmented by measured data available from previous studies on the west coast of Grand Cayman. The measured data were used to calibrate numerical models of nearshore waves and hydrodynamics.
- The calibrated wave model was used to develop 25 year (1980-2014) database of waves at the project site. This information was used as input the assessment of coastal processes and sediment transport (refer to ES Chapter 10 and Appendix D.1), as well as the assessment of operational downtime for the CBF (refer to ES Section 19.5.3.2 and Appendix M).
- The calibrated hydrodynamic model was used to simulate an extended period, with the results leading to the identification of typical nearshore flow conditions for use in the dredge plume modeling (refer to ES Chapter 11 and Appendix D.2).
- The use of numerical models calibrated against measured data is standard practice in the fields of coastal and marine engineering. The metocean databases developed for the EIA study are comprehensive, and address long term and seasonal variations in weather patterns. In addition, the anticipated impacts of climate change were considered throughout the EIA.

6.2.2 *Wave Action along GT Waterfront*

- Numerical model simulations of wave action in GTH were undertaken for NW and SW storm events, and also for selected hurricane events (refer to ES Sections 10.4.1.1 - 2 and App.D.1, Section 5.1).
- The model results show that the impact of the project on wave action along GT's waterfront will be localized/limited, and increased frequency/flooding of George Town is not expected.

6.2.3 *Seven Mile Beach*

- A comprehensive review/assessment of 7MB was undertaken for the EIA study, including analyses of a historical database of beach survey data (beach planforms and profiles from 2003 to 2014), and numerical modeling of coastal processes under typical and severe storm conditions (refer to ES Chapter 10 and Appendix D.1). Key conclusions include:
 - The primary source of sand for 7MB is the north coast of Grand Cayman Island, with waves and currents transporting the sand around NW Point and onto 7MB;
 - Sand transport is generally towards the south during the winter (due to Nor'westers), and to the north during the summer (due to storms from the SW);
 - 7MB is prone to large variations in beach width (locally up to 30 to 60 ft) due to seasonal and inter-annual variations in the wave climate;
 - The prominent headland at the south end of 7MB at Crescent Point acts as an effective barrier to sand transport between 7MB and GTH.
- These conclusions are consistent with results of an earlier study undertaken for the DoE (Seymour, 2000).
- The results of these analyses support the conclusion that development of the proposed project will not have any significant impact on 7MB.

6.2.4 *Requirement for Maintenance Dredging*

- Numerical modeling of sediment transport in GTH, including sedimentation of the dredged berthing area, was undertaken for both typical and severe storm conditions (refer to ES Chapter 10 and Appendix D.1).
- The results of the model simulations indicate that sedimentation of the dredged berthing area will be insignificant under typical conditions, but may be significant during extreme events (hurricanes).
- Based on this information, the ES concludes that there will be a potential requirement for intermittent (not regular) maintenance dredging after severe storms.
- The environmental impacts associated with maintenance dredging would be similar to those for the initial dredging (i.e. elevated turbidity and sedimentation levels in the area surrounding the work); however, the extent and duration of the impacts would be less, as the volume to be dredged would be substantially lower.

6.2.5 *Lack of Geotechnical Information*

- The existing geotechnical information includes numerous seabed borings and jet probes in GTH, and numerous sediment samples in GTH and along 7MB (refer to ES Chapter 9 and Appendix 2).
- The existing information was sufficient to meet the requirements of the EIA study, including characterization of the seabed sediments as required to define input conditions for the modeling and analyses of coastal processes, sediment transport and dredge plumes.
- Additional subsurface investigations are recommended to support engineering and design should the project proceed.

7.0 AIR QUALITY/NOISE POLLUTION/ STORM WATER/WATER QUALITY

7.1 Compilation of Public Comments

- What is the impact of carcinogens?
- Can the cruise ships use shore power rather than their engines while at berth?

- Underwater noise is not adequately addressed
- Is blasting required?
- What is the expected duration of pile driving?

- Will project increase polluted runoff?
- How will discharges from cruise ships (ballast water, bilge water, sewage, black and grey water) be addressed?

7.2 Response to Public Comments

7.2.1 Air Quality

- The potential impacts of the project on air quality are discussed in ES Chapter 14. As per the ToR, the EIA study focused on certain pollutants (NO₂, SO₂, PM₁₀ and CO₂); the potential impact of carcinogens was not specifically assessed.
- The results of the EIA study indicate that development of the project would result in increased emissions of these pollutants; however, the impact on onshore air quality was not assessed. The following points are also noted:
 - The impact of ship emissions on shore-based receptors, under both existing and proposed conditions, are/would be mitigated, to some degree, by the prevailing Easterly (offshore) trade winds;
 - The assessment did not include the impact of future reductions in emissions levels associated with the implementation of progressively more stringent requirements on sulphur content in shipping fuels (MARPOL Annex VI, IMO, 2008);
 - Dispersion modeling would be required to quantify the change in emission levels in onshore air quality.
- A preliminary review of shore power requirements for cruise ships, and existing electrical infrastructure on Grand Cayman Island, suggests that significant infrastructure improvements would be required to provide shore power to cruise ships. In addition, many cruise ships do not have shore power connections; significant investment would be required to retrofit these ships.
- The cruise industry is progressively reducing emissions through the use of low sulphur fuel, scrubbers and other technology, as required to meet the requirements of MARPOL Annex VI (IMO, 2008). In addition, some new cruise ships are using Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG), which results in even lower emissions (for example, the four new mega cruise ships (6,600 passengers) recently ordered by Carnival will use LNG). These changes are expected to

provide significantly greater reductions in emissions than the use of shore power (Peisley, 2014; Pynn, 2014).

7.2.2 Noise Pollution – Blasting and Pile Driving

- Based on a review of available geotechnical information, recent experience with dredging in similar materials and discussions with several dredging contractors regarding the capabilities of modern dredges, blasting is not expected to be necessary for this project. Should the project proceed, and pending the results of additional subsurface investigations required to support engineering and design, it is suggested that the tender documents specify that blasting will not be permitted.
- The potential impacts of underwater noise are discussed in ES Section 15.4.3. Additional comments are provided below:
 - In the absence of blasting, pile driving is the primary issue of concern; the noise (above and below water) generated by pile driving will be dependent upon numerous factors, including the pile type, pile driving method and equipment and subsurface conditions;
 - A recent study (Bailey et al, 2010) assessed the impact of pile driving noise on bottlenose dolphins, with the results showing auditory injury would only occur within 330 ft of the operation, while modifications in behaviour could occur up to 30 miles away;
 - In addition to the selection of pile type, method and equipment to reduce the sound level at the source, other mitigation measures are available to attenuate the underwater propagation of sound, including bubble curtains (Wochner, 2012), which can also be used as a turbidity barrier, and various commercial systems (refer to de Jong, 2012).
- The duration of pile driving is expected to be in the order of nine to twelve months.

7.2.3 Storm Water/Water Quality

- A storm water assessment was undertaken as part of the EIA study (refer to ES Chapter 13 and Appendix F); as per the requirements of the ToR, this assessment included the development of a storm water drainage master plan for the proposed project. Numerical model simulations of storm water runoff were completed for both existing and proposed conditions; the results of these simulations demonstrate that the storm water drainage master plan will provide an improvement over existing conditions.
- Regarding discharges from cruise ships, the ES recommends that the CIG monitor/enforce compliance with IMO/MARPOL regulations (refer to ES Chapter 16).

8.0 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

8.1 Compilation of Public Comments

- Various concerns were expressed regarding uncertainties due to lack of geotechnical information, including:
 - Uncertainty in results of coastal processes modeling;
 - Risk of liquefaction of fill during earthquake.

8.2 Response to Public Comments

- As noted earlier in this document (Section 6.2.5), the available information on geology and soils (including results from previous geotechnical investigations, as well as jet probes and soil samples collected for the EIA study – refer to ES Chapter 9) provided sufficient information for modeling and assessment of environmental impacts.
- The available information is not sufficient to support detailed design of the project; additional subsurface investigations (geotechnical, geophysical and probabilistic seismic hazard assessment) are recommended if the project proceeds
- Liquefaction of fill materials is an important design consideration, as discussed in ES Chapter 8; further investigations of this issue are recommended if the project proceeds.

9.0 BERTHING VERSUS TENDERING

A large number of public comments were received regarding the need for a cruise berthing facility, and the impacts of berthing versus tendering. These comments, and the associated responses of the Consultants, are summarized below.

9.1 Need for Cruise Berthing Facility

9.1.1 *Compilation of Public Comments*

- There is no evidence to support the statement that tendering is viewed as a “high risk, negative passenger experience by cruise lines and passengers alike”.
- The cruise lines want a CBF; what about cruise passengers?
- Tendering is unique (an added attraction) and not a concern for most passengers.
- The *Oasis* can be moored offshore and tendered, but does require onshore security screening of its passengers.
- The CBF on its own won't increase cruise traffic; a better tourist product will.
- If the passenger disembarkation rate is not improved with berthing, why bother?
- Tendering works, although improvements are possible.

9.1.2 *Response to Public Comments*

- Discussions with the cruise lines held over the course of the OBC (PwC, 2013) and the EIA study confirm that the cruise lines generally prefer berthing to tendering; the following advantages were noted by the cruise lines:
 - Faster disembarkation/embarkation, with less queuing (the cruise lines did not provide specific data to support this statement);
 - Improved accessibility for aging and disabled passengers (a market segment which the cruise lines indicate has been growing significantly);
 - Increased flexibility and convenience for passengers;
 - Increased safety (although the Cayman tender operation is rated very highly by the industry, there is a greater risk of a fall/injury transferring between a ship and tender as compared to between a ship and pier/shore).
- The cruise industry's preference for berthing was confirmed by the F-CCA in July 2015.
- Cruise passengers were targeted for surveys during as part of the EIA study's stakeholder and public consultation process; however, attempts to interview cruise passengers were unsuccessful due to accessibility issues at the port, and time constraints associated with shore-based activities. As such, passenger and crew surveys completed by BREA (2012) for the FCCA were used to inform the EIA study. The unique nature of the tender operation, and the added attraction it represents to some passengers, is acknowledged.
- The *Oasis* does require onshore security screening of its passengers. The existing port does not presently have these facilities; it is understood that PACI has discussed the requirements with RCCL, but has not invested in the required equipment at this time.

- While tendering is possible for the *Oasis*, there are significant logistical challenges associated with tendering such large vessels. It is noted that the four megaships recently ordered by CCL have a larger passenger capacity (6,600) than the *Oasis*.
- RCCL has advised that they do not include Grand Cayman on the western Caribbean itineraries of their larger ships due to the challenges associated with tendering them, as well as the absence of an onshore security screening facility. In October 2014, RCCL indicated that these itineraries represent approximately 400,000 passengers per year.
- The benefit of improving landside infrastructure and attractions is acknowledged in the ES, but was outside the scope of the EIA.
- There is some uncertainty related to the difference in disembarkation rates for berthing and tendering, as no measured data were available. The following comments are noted:
 - The disembarkation rates (% of passengers) assumed in the OBC and ES are based on information presented in BREA (2012). The cruise lines noted that disembarkation rates are generally higher for berthing than tendering, but did not provide any data/information to support this statement.
 - The disembarkation rates (pax/hr) presented in the ES (Ch. 19) are estimated/theoretical maximums based on anecdotal information provided by the cruise lines (no actual data were provided), information on the existing tender fleet and operations provided by CMS, and observations/measurements collected as part of the traffic and pedestrian study undertaken as part of the EIA.
 - Typical disembarkation rates will generally be lower than the maximums presented in the ES. In particular, the disembarkation rate for the tender operation is affected by the number/size of tenders available, the passenger management strategy onboard the ship and prevailing weather conditions (a tender operation is more susceptible to adverse weather conditions).
- While four ships unloading simultaneously at a berthing facility would be faster than four ships being tendered, it is expected that there will be a +/- 30 minute separation between ships as they complete their berthing maneuvers. Hence, with a berthing facility, disembarkation of passengers from the fourth ship would not start until approximately 1.5 hours after disembarkation from the first ship started. As a result, the maximum "theoretical" disembarkation rate (pax/hr) with four ships at berth will not be achieved. This delay will be offset, to some degree, at the end of the day, as passengers would be able to return to the ships later due to more direct/faster loading with piers as compared to the tender operation.
- As noted earlier, an improved tender operation is possible, and should be considered if the CIG decides not to proceed with the CBF. The details and cost of an improved tender operation were not assessed in the EIA study, but could include new tender vessels, a sheltered landing area (protected by a breakwater) and various landside improvements.

9.2 Other Comments

9.2.1 *Compilation of Public Comments*

- The CBF, as designed, cannot accommodate four ships.
- How far is the walk with the CBF?
- Tendering will still be required with the CBF on busy days (more than four ships).
- Risk of downtime still exists with berthing during Nor'westers.
- Tender operation is more flexible/responsive to changing weather conditions.

9.2.2 *Response to Public Comments*

- The CBF layout assessed in the EIA study is designed to accommodate four large cruise ships, including two *Oasis* class vessels. The ability to accommodate four large cruise ships was confirmed through navigation simulations recently completed at the STAR Centre.
- As noted in ES Section 19.5.3.1, the walking distance from a cruise ship at berth to Harbour Drive will range from approximately 1,200 to 1,800 ft, as compared to 450 ft with the existing tender operation.
- As noted in ES Section 19.5.3.3, the requirement for tendering will be reduced to approximately 5 to 15% of existing levels with the CBF. The CIG will need to make suitable arrangements with CMS or others to provide a suitable tendering service on busy days (i.e. when greater than four ships call at George Town).
- The CBF will be subject to downtime due to adverse weather conditions, but the downtime will be significantly less than that with the existing tender operation. As noted in ES Ch. 19.5.3.2 and App. M.2, downtime for the CBF is estimated at 0 to 8% during the cruise season, while that for the tender operation is estimated at 5 to 15%.

10.0 PEDESTRIAN AND VEHICULAR TRAFFIC

10.1 Compilation of Public Comments

- The CBF will make existing traffic issues even worse.

10.2 Response to Public Comments

- As noted in the ES (Chapter 18), background growth in vehicular traffic is expected regardless of whether the CBF is constructed.
- Road network improvements are required to handle this background growth in traffic, as recognized by the NRA's "priority for road network improvements".
- The impact of the proposed CBF on traffic is expected to be limited, and is primarily related to increased pedestrian traffic in downtown George Town and increased excursion traffic (i.e. buses and taxis) – refer to ES Ch. 18.4.1.5.
- The impacts of the project on traffic can be mitigated by through various measures (refer to ES Ch. 18.5), most notably through appropriate landside planning for the new land area, and the implementation of pedestrian priority options along Harbour Drive. These measures will improve vehicle flow without restricting vehicle access, and will significantly enhance the pedestrian experience.
- Should the CBF project proceed, the development of the landside master plan should be integrated with the GTRP in order to ensure synergy between the two projects.

11.0 ECONOMIC IMPACTS

A large number of public comments were received regarding the anticipated economic impacts of the proposed project. These comments, and the associated responses of the Consultants, have been grouped under several subheadings, as summarized below.

11.1 OBC Assumptions and Projected Trends

11.1.1 *Compilation of Public Comments*

- Are projections for cruise traffic realistic (i.e. 1-3%/year decrease without the project, versus 1-3%/yr increase with the project)?
- Was inflation/interest considered in the economic analysis?
- Will the trend towards larger ships continue/will the facility need to be expanded?
- What about the trend towards ecotourism and sustainable development (many people prefer smaller ships)?

11.1.2 *Response to Public Comments*

- The EIA study adopted the OBC assumptions regarding projected the decline/growth in cruise traffic without/with the project; it is acknowledged that they are assumptions, and are subject to uncertainty. The EIA study did not evaluate the OBC assumptions and methodologies.
- The economic analysis presented in the OBC assumed a discount rate of 3.5%/year; this discount rate was adopted in the EIA study to estimate the net present value of economic losses due to anticipated project impacts on marine ecosystem goods and services.
- Available information indicates that the trend towards the use of larger ships in the Caribbean region will continue. For example:
 - RCCL noted that they have removed their *Voyager* class from the region (overall length, LOA ~ 1,020 ft), and that their *Freedom* and (new) *Quantum* classes (LOA ~ 1,110 ft and 1,140 ft respectively) are their “workhorses” in the region.
 - CCL has recently ordered four new ships (LOA ~ 1,105 ft) with a maximum passenger capacity of 6,600; this is a higher capacity than RCCL’s *Oasis* (maximum 6,360 passengers), but the vessel dimensions are smaller.
 - At this time, the *Oasis* class (LOA ~ 1,185 ft, beam ~ 154 ft, draft ~ 30 ft, gross tonnage, GT = 227,000) is the largest cruise ship in operation. RCCL is presently building two more *Quantum* and *Oasis* class vessels, for a total of four each.
 - There are presently 60 ships larger than 100,000 GRT in service, with another 31 vessels larger than 100,000 GT under construction or planned within the next six years (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_the_world's_largest_cruise_ships).
 - At this time, there are no ships under construction that are larger than the *Oasis*.

- The CBF layout presented in the EIA is designed to accommodate four large cruise ships, including two *Oasis* class vessels. Given site constraints, future expansion of the facility to accommodate more, or larger, vessels is unlikely to be practical.
- It is acknowledged that some proportion of the tourist market is focused on ecotourism and sustainable development. However, it is noted the cruise industry continues to experience strong growth in the Caribbean region and beyond (refer to www.f-cca.com/research.html, www.cruisemarketwatch.com).

11.2 Skepticism/Uncertainty Regarding Projected Economic Impacts

11.2.1 *Compilation of Public Comments*

- CBF on its own won't increase cruise traffic, better tourist product will.
- Short term gains associated with increased cruise traffic do not offset long-term losses associated with destruction/damage to GTH reefs and CIs' reputation (i.e. decline in stay over and dive tourism)
- Economic benefits will be limited, as the CBF will not increase disembarkation rate.
- Economic benefits will be limited, as the cruise lines dominate the sale of shore excursions.
- The project will be an economic strain on the CIs.
- Easy off means easy on, so cruise passengers will return to ships for lunch.
- What can we learn from other projects in the region?
- What happens when Cuba opens up?
- The economic benefits of project are not clear, and are uncertain/overestimated/underestimated (all three noted in public comments).

11.2.2 *Response to Public Comments*

- As noted earlier, it is acknowledged that the CBF itself may not increase cruise traffic on its own, and that improved landside infrastructure and attractions are important. However, it is noted that the ability to more efficiently accommodate larger vessels may result in increased passenger numbers. For example, RCCL has advised that they do not include Grand Cayman on the western Caribbean itineraries of their larger ships due to the challenges associated with tendering them, as well as the absence of an onshore security screening facility. In October 2014, RCCL indicated that these itineraries represent approximately 400,000 passengers per year.
- The marine resource valuation (ES Appendix J.2) provides a preliminary estimate of the economic value of marine ecosystem goods and services in GTH; the uncertainty in these estimates is acknowledged. In addition, the following comments are noted:
 - The marine resource valuation was undertaken to estimate the potential economic impacts of reef loss/degradation associated with the CBF on the water sports industry (diving and snorkeling) in GTH;
 - The estimates are based on current spend rates, and need to be converted to Gross Value added for inclusion in the overall economic evaluation of the project.

- The anticipated diversion/displacement of activities from within GTH to other locations and/or activities/attractions in George Town and around Grand Cayman was identified, but not considered in the valuation;
- The potential long-term impact on dive and stay over tourism was identified, but not considered in the valuation;
- The EIA recommended that the OBC be updated to reflect these considerations.
- As noted earlier, there is uncertainty related to the difference in disembarkation rates (% of passengers, and pax/hr) between a tender and a berthing operation.
- The role of the cruise lines in the sale of onshore excursions is acknowledged.
- The improved ease of returning to the vessel with the CBF is acknowledged.
- A study to assess the socio-economic impacts of cruise berthing facilities at other locations would be informative, but was outside the scope of the EIA study.
- There are various opinions regarding the potential impact of Cuba opening up on the cruise industry in the Caribbean; given the speculative nature of the matter and associated uncertainty, it was not considered in the EIA study.
- The OBC was drafted prior to the completion of the EIA study. It is understood that the OBC is presently being updated to incorporate results of EIA study, including the anticipated impacts of the project on ecosystem goods and services associated with the GTH reefs, as well as the anticipated diversion/displacement of activities from within GTH to other locations and/or activities/attractions in George Town and around Grand Cayman.

11.3 Relative Importance of Stay Over versus Cruise Tourism

11.3.1 *Compilation of Public Comments*

- Stay over tourism is more important to CIs' economy than cruise tourism.
- CIs should focus on high end tourism product (smaller/boutique cruise ships and stay over tourism).
- What is the CIG's long term vision/strategy/policy for tourism?

11.3.2 *Response to Public Comments*

- ESO (2013) data for the past five years show that revenue/economic value of stay over tourism is significantly higher than that of cruise tourism.
- The question regarding the CIG's long term vision/strategy/policy for tourism is deferred to the Ministry of Tourism.

12.0 SOCIAL IMPACTS

12.1 Compilation of Public Comments

- The social impacts of the project were inadequately addressed (impacts on different groups, such as Caymanians, tender operators, water sports operators, downtown merchants, etc).
- Construction jobs will go to ex-pats, not locals.
- What can we learn from other projects in the region?
- Why 7.7 acres of new land; what is planned for the new land?
- Carrying capacity inadequately addressed (see Chapter 13).

12.2 Response to Public Comments

- Social impacts on different groups are summarized in ES Ch. 6, 16 and Ch. 20, with additional detail provided in ES App. 1 and N. In addition, ES Ch. 20.8 And App. N, Ch. 8 present suggested mitigation measures to address adverse impacts on different groups, including tender operators (owners and employees), water sports operators (diving and excursions), and downtown merchants (retail and other services).
- While project construction will require ex-pats for certain roles, the project will create job opportunities for suitably qualified locals, potentially including administrative staff, labourers, divers, skilled tradesmen, operators, foremen, engineers and project managers. The OBC estimated employment net benefits of 491 FTE (man years) during construction.
- A study to assess the socio-economic impacts of cruise berthing facilities at other locations would be informative, but was outside the scope of the EIA study.
- The assessment of project layout alternatives included consideration of new land reclamation areas varying in size from 2 to 12 acres (refer to ES Appendix A). An additional land area of 3.5 acres was deemed the minimum necessary to support the CBF alone. The 7.7 acres included in the proposed project layout was the result of several key considerations, including environmental impacts (minimize dredging and disposal volumes), capital costs (a trade-off between dredging/disposal volumes and the length of shoreline protection) and landside functional requirements. In addition, the following comments are noted:
 - The refined layout developed in the EIA study provides a significant reduction in dredging and disposal requirements (and associated environmental impacts) as compared to the OBC layout, and also provides improved functionality for both cruise and cargo operations;
 - The CIG has indicated that the CBF will not include any new commercial development; the new land area will serve cruise and cargo operations;
 - Landside planning/design was not part of the EIA study; should the CIG decide to proceed with the project, the development of a landside master plan will be required.
- Carrying capacity is addressed in Chapter 13.

13.0 CARRYING CAPACITY

13.1 Compilation of Public Comments

- The EIA does not adequately address the carrying capacity of the island.
- Can George Town/Grand Cayman Island handle more cruise ship passengers?
- Impact of population growth not addressed.
- Infrastructure, facilities, attractions and natural environment are already stressed.
- Improvements to land-based attractions does not make sense, when the main attraction is in the water.
- EIA does not adequately address cumulative and interactive impacts of CBF with other planned/possible projects (i.e. airport, dump and road network improvements, GTRP).

13.2 Response to Public Comments

- While the EIA ToR required that the EIA study considered carrying capacity, a detailed carrying capacity study was outside the scope of the EIA. As such, the EIA included a review/assessment of available information on carrying capacity, including the following:
 - Cruise passenger traffic to Grand Cayman peaked at 1.9M passengers in 2006 (it is likely that this peak was partially due to hurricane damage to piers in Cozumel causing cruise traffic in the Western Caribbean to be redirected);
 - During the stakeholder consultation process, two CIG entities referred to a carrying capacity of 2M tourists/year;
 - A preliminary assessment of carrying capacity of tourist attractions was undertaken as part of the EIA study, and is presented in ES Ch. 19.4.5;
 - Carrying capacity was identified as an issue that warrants further investigation (refer to ES Section 20.8 and Appendix N).
- The stress on existing infrastructure and facilities is acknowledged. The CIG is presently studying potential improvements to the airport and dump, as well as the revitalization of downtown George Town (GTRP); in addition, the NRA has identified priorities for road network improvements. These projects fall outside the scope of the EIA study.
- The comment regarding the critical/dominant importance of the marine environment to tourism is acknowledged.
- Regarding cumulative and interactive impacts, the following points are noted:
 - The EIA ToR notes the requirement to discuss/assess cumulative impacts associated with a private proposal to develop a cargo, mega yacht and tall ship berthing facility and land reclamation area immediately to the north of the CBF site. It is assumed that the CIG would not allow this project to proceed if the CIG proceeds. As such, there are no cumulative impacts associated with it.
 - The EIA ToR also notes that “there are no other consented or pending proposals which could have an impact on the EIA for the preferred option from the OBC”. No such proposals were identified over the course of the EIA study.

- Regarding the landside infrastructure projects that the CIG is considering (i.e. improvements to the airport, dump, road network and the GTRP), the scheduling and sequencing of these projects requires careful consideration to limit the impacts on residents and tourists associated with multiple construction projects proceeding in parallel. In addition, the carrying capacity study recommended above should consider the impact of the CBF on cruise tourism as well as the impact of airport improvements on stay over tourism.
- Given the potential synergies between the CBF and GTRP projects, these two projects should be considered integrally if/as they proceed towards implementation.

14.0 COST/PRIORITIES

14.1 Compilation of Public Comments

- The CBF is not worth the cost (economic and environmental) given marginal/questionable economic benefits. Where is the cost-benefit analysis?
- An improved tourist product (landside attractions, infrastructure, etc) is required to attract more tourists, not a new CBF.
- The project will damage the most important/best attraction the island has to offer (coral reefs, clear water and marine life).
- The CIs have other priorities (airport, dump, GTRP, roads), and cannot afford to do everything.
- The EIA does not consider the cost of other infrastructure improvements.
- Who will pay for CBF and other infrastructure improvements?

14.2 Response to Public Comments

- As noted earlier, the OBC was drafted prior to the completion of the EIA study. It is understood that the OBC is presently being updated to reflect the results of the EIA study, including the following:
 - Updated estimate of construction cost;
 - Allowance for possible mitigation measures;
 - Estimated economic impacts of reef loss/degradation associated with the CBF on the water sports industry (diving and snorkeling) in GTH, including conversion of the EIA estimates from current spend rates to Gross Value Added;
 - Anticipated diversion/displacement of activities from within GTH to other locations and/or activities/attractions in George Town;
 - The potential long-term impact on dive and stay over tourism.
- The importance of improvements to landside attractions and infrastructure is acknowledged.
- The comment regarding the critical/dominant importance of the marine environment to tourism is acknowledged.
- The establishment of priorities for infrastructure improvements, and well as the strategies to finance/fund them, is outside the scope of the EIA.
- The CIG must assess the competing demands for limited funds and determine how best to spend these funds to maximize the benefit to the CIs.

15.0 CARGO FACILITY

15.1 Compilation of Public Comments

- Acknowledge the need for improvement/expansion, but should have been addressed separately.
- Longer cargo dock cannot accommodate larger cargo ships without dredging in Hog Sty Bay, which was not assessed in EIA.
- An alternate location should be considered for the cargo port (East End).

15.2 Response to Public Comments

- As noted in the OBC, the key requirements of the CBF relative to the cargo operation were that the CBF must not reduce the area available for cargo operations, and effective separation must be maintained between cruise and cargo operations. Improvements to the cargo facility were outside the scope of the EIA study.
- The Consultants developed alternative project layout that meets the requirements as stated in the OBC. In addition, it significantly reduces dredging and environmental impacts, and provides improved cargo facilities with only a marginal increase in cost.
- The proposed extension of the south cargo dock will extend into deeper water, such that deeper draft vessels will be able to use the outer end of the dock. It is acknowledged that additional dredging would be required to accommodate deeper draft vessels along the existing cargo dock; in addition, reconstruction of the existing dock wall would be required to accommodate the increased water depth. This potential improvement was discussed with the CIG during the EIA study, but was not assessed.
- The scope of work for the EIA did not include an assessment of alternative locations for the cruise or cargo facilities. The development of new cargo facility at another location is possible, and may eventually be required. It is anticipated that the scope, costs and environmental impacts of such a project would be generally similar to those of the proposed CBF.

16.0 ROLE OF CRUISE LINES

16.1 Compilation of Public Comments

- Who is “at the table”?
- What are their demands/ultimatums with respect to a cruise berthing facility?
- What are they providing to the project/CIs (funding, passenger volume commitments)?

16.2 Response to Public Comments

- The role of the cruise lines in the CBF, and negotiations between the CIG and the cruise lines, are outside the scope of the EIA.
- These matters fall within the remit of the Outline Business Case.

**APPENDIX R.1
TABULAR SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Cayman CBF - Summary of Public Responses to EIA

General Information				Primary Topics of Concern							Other Comments/Concerns					
ID#	Date Rec'd	Name	Organisation	Support or Object	Damage/ Destruction of Coral Reefs	Money Could be Better Spent Elsewhere			Image & Reputation of the Cayman Islands	Economic Impact (Tourism)	Impacts on 7MB	Focus on Alternative Options		Other #1	Other #2	Other #3
						Georgetown Revitalization	Airport	Improved Tendering				Other site	Floating dock			
1	4-Jun-15	Edward Clarke	Visitor	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
2	4-Jun-15	Sammie Ward	Former resident & dive instructor	Object	Yes				Yes							
3	5-Jun-15	Nicholas Young	Visitor	Object	Yes	Yes	Yes					Yes				
4	8-Jun-15	Brian Tomlinson	Resident	Object	Yes						Yes		Geotechnical/Dredging parameters			
4	9-Jun-15	Brian Tomlinson	Resident	Object								Yes	Limit number of cruise arrivals			
5	9-Jun-15	Richard Apple	Visitor	Object	Yes				Yes	Yes-neg						
6	9-Jun-15	Patricia A. Sinclair	Visitor	Object	Yes				Yes	Yes-neg				DUPLICATE OF RESPONSE #5		
7	9-Jun-15	Marty Bennett	Visitor	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
8		Kate Holden		Unclear	Yes					Yes-neg						
9	10-Jun-15	Brad Bennett	Visitor	Object	Yes				Yes					Moving the reef is too costly		
10	10-Jun-15	Thomas Shropshire	Off the Wall Divers	Object			Yes									
11	10-Jun-15	Jeremy Ellis	Visitor	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
12	11-Jun-15	Anonymous/Bodden	Resident	Object	Yes									Conservation and long-term sustainable development is more important		
13	11-Jun-15	Catherine Healy	Resident and diver	Object	Yes					Yes-neg				Smart marketing re: environment as opposed to "big business"		
14	11-Jun-15	David Carmichael	Caribbean Marine Services	Object	Yes						Yes			Redevelop port, put in more top deck ramps and shaded docks		
15	12-Jun-15	Keith Doyle		Unclear						Yes	Yes-unclear			Requests more information regarding the cruise companies' involvement		
16	12-Jun-15	Rodney McDowall	Red Sail Sports	Object	Yes		Yes			Yes-neg				Treat the cargo needs as separate, what about ongoing maintenance costs?	The island can only handle so many tourists per year (concerns about the infrastructure)	
17	12-Jun-15	Anonymous		Unclear										Challenges section 19.2 of the EIA, finds the report misleading		
18	12-Jun-15	Aidan Hew	Upper Elementary MBTS	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
19	12-Jun-15	Aidan	Upper Elementary MBTS	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
20	12-Jun-15	Anonymous	Upper Elementary MBTS	Object	Yes											
21	12-Jun-15	Eva	Upper Elementary MBTS	Object	Yes											
22	12-Jun-15	Jayda	Upper Elementary MBTS	Object	Yes											
23	12-Jun-15	Kiran	Upper Elementary MBTS	Object	Yes											
24	12-Jun-15	Emma	Upper Elementary MBTS	Object	Yes				Yes					Spend money on saving wildlife		
25	12-Jun-15	Kiara	Upper Elementary MBTS	Object	Yes											
26	12-Jun-15	Seane	Upper Elementary MBTS	Object	Yes											
27	12-Jun-15	Cammy	Upper Elementary MBTS	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
28	12-Jun-15	Clare	Upper Elementary MBTS	Object	Yes											
29	12-Jun-15	Marleigh	Upper Elementary MBTS	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
30	12-Jun-15	Tahiti	Upper Elementary MBTS	Object	Yes											
31	12-Jun-15	Brady	Upper Elementary MBTS	Object	Yes											
32	12-Jun-15	Robert Hamaty	Tortuga Rum Company Ltd	Support						Yes-pos				Tendering is worse for environment than the impact of a new pair		
33	12-Jun-15	Lindy Huber	Visitor	Object												
34	12-Jun-15	Robin Crowley	Visitor	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
35	13-Jun-15	Candida Whicker	Resident	Object	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes-neg				Promote high end stay-over tourism instead		
36	13-Jun-15	S. Gail McLeod	Resident	Object	Yes				Yes	Yes-neg		Yes		Promote more stay-over tourism	Cost is too high with no guarantee	
37	14-Jun-15	Elizabeth Sherman	Biologist and visitor	Object												
38	14-Jun-15	Paul Naish		Unclear	Yes									large floating Immigration Islands, self propelled, provide mooring for multiple tenders and activity boats		
39	14-Jun-15	Ellen Prager	Visitor	Object	Yes				Yes	Yes-neg		Yes				
40	15-Jun-15	Joanna Boxall	New Resident Magazine	Object	Yes									Cost is not justifiable		
41	16-Jun-15	Martina Jackson	Resident	Object	Yes											
42	16-Jun-15	Satina M. DaCosta	Resident	Object	Yes					Yes-neg				To much cost/damage, for no promise of gain		
43	16-Jun-15	M. Ratcliffe	Royal Walter Business Owner	Support						Yes-pos				Important for future generations		
44	16-Jun-15	Arthur Hunter		Object	Yes		Yes			Yes-neg	Yes					
45	16-Jun-15	Anonymous		Object						Yes-neg				The impacts of dredging to the surrounding ecosystem		
46	17-Jun	Paul Burke	Marine Science teacher	Object	Yes				Yes	Yes-neg	Yes			Considering the little benefit to the cruise tourists, it does not seem worth it	Should no be bullied by Cruise companies, and cargo should not be considered	
47	18-Jun-15	Michael Ferguson	Investment Adviser & long term vi	Object	Yes				Yes	Yes-neg						

Cayman CBF - Summary of Public Responses to EIA

General Information				Primary Topics of Concern							Other Comments/Concerns					
ID#	Date Rec'd	Name	Organisation	Support or Object	Damage/ Destruction of Coral Reefs	Money Could be Better Spent Elsewhere			Image & Reputation of the Cayman Islands	Economic Impact (Tourism)	Impacts on 7MB	Focus on Alternative Options		Other #1	Other #2	Other #3
						Georgetown Revitalization	Airport	Improved Tendering				Other site	Floating dock			
48	19-Jun-15	Anonymous		Object	Yes					Yes-neg	Yes		Promote stayover tourism		Insufficient infrastructure to accommodate that many cruise passengers	
49	19-Jun-15	Noel March	Watersports Business	Support												
50	19-Jun-15	Stuart Freeman	Watersports & Retail Business	Object	Yes					Yes-neg	Yes		George Town cannot handle 16000 passengers landing at one time			
51	19-Jun-15	Anonymous	Eden Rock Dive Centre	Object	Yes							Yes				
52	19-Jun-15	Nathaniel Robb	Indepth Watersports	Object	Yes				Yes				Focus more on overnight guests			
53	20-Jun-15	Ellen Schwartz		Object	Yes	Yes	Yes						Focus more on overnight guests, move dump, not worth cost or damage to environment			
54	21-Jun-15	Scott Prodahl	Resident	Object	Yes					Yes-neg	Yes					
55	21-Jun-15	Robin Todd	Dive Instructor	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
56	22-Jun-15	n/a	Former resident	Support												
57	22-Jun-15	Wendy Ledger	Captain Marvin Watersports	Object	Yes						Yes		The tender operation polutes the waters			
58	22-Jun-15	Don Fosters	Cayman News Service	Object	Yes					Yes-neg			Too much cost, no guarantees			
59	22-Jun-15	Don Fosters	Don Fosters Dive	Object	Yes					Yes-neg			It will be crowded, focus on stay over tourists			
59	22-Jun-15	Miachel Maes	Wildlife Filmmaker	Object	Yes					Yes-neg			Too much damage/money, too little reward			
60	16-Jun-15	Anonymous		Object	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes-neg	Yes		Government should consider expected trends in the cruise industry (big vs small vessels)		Concerned about long term environmental damage and costs	
61	22-Jun-15	Svetlana Frolova		Object	Yes											
62	22-Jun-15	Anonymous	Teacher	Object	Yes		Yes			Yes-neg						
63	22-Jun-15	Elizabeth Ritter		Object	Yes			Yes								
64	23-Jun-15	Cathy Robinson		Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
65	23-Jun-15	Amander Nicholson	Resident	Object	Yes								Find alternative solution			
66	23-Jun-15	Shari Fujimoto	Visitor	Object	Yes											
67	23-Jun-15	Vivian Duff	SCUBA Dive Industry Representati	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
68	23-Jun-15	Amander Stigliano		Object	Yes					Yes-neg			Going to hurt deep sea fishing			
69	23-Jun-15	Joyce Berube	Carnival Cruise Ship visitor	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
70	23-Jun-15	Fiona Cunningham		Object	Yes								Going to destroy local fishing population			
71	23-Jun-15	Fritzi Olsen	Visitor	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
72	23-Jun-15	Chris Burroswood		Object				Yes								
73	23-Jun-15	Donna Hill		Object	Yes			Yes		Yes-neg						
74	23-Jun-15	Jeffrey Massetti	Visitor	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
75	23-Jun-15	Lori Hagins	Visitor	Object	Yes											
76	23-Jun-15	Heather Harnischfeger		Object				Yes								
77	23-Jun-15	Andy Skuntz	SCUBA Diver	Object	Yes											
78	23-Jun-15	Nancy Bradford	Cruise Ship Visitor	Object	Yes											
79	23-Jun-15	Lynne Besse	Travel Agent	Object	Yes											
80	23-Jun-15	Anna Grundstrom	Visitor	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
81	24-Jun-15	Chase de Jong	Previous Residents	Object	Yes											
82	24-Jun-15	Tom Greenwood	Tourism Industry	Object	Yes											
83	24-Jun-15	Francoise Desoutter	Previous Local Dive Industry	Object	Yes					Yes-neg			Spend the money to build permanent moorings in the depth			
84	24-Jun-15	Paul Brewer		Object	Yes											
85	24-Jun-15	Arikka Ebanks	Resident	Object	Yes					Yes-neg		Yes				
86	24-Jun-15	Laurie Wilson		Object	Yes				Yes	Yes-neg			There is insufficient infrastructure to handle such a large amount of people			
87	24-Jun-15	Jenny Hickman	Dive Tourism Industry	Object	Yes				Yes	Yes-neg						
88	24-Jun-15	Sandy Dennis	Dive Tourism Industry	Object	Yes											
89	24-Jun-15	Dennis Monroe	Dive Tourism Industry	Object	Yes											
90	24-Jun-15	Beth McCrea	Visitor	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
91	24-Jun-15	Ben Berry		Object	Yes				Yes	Yes-neg						
92	24-Jun-15	Adam Riback		Object	Yes							Yes				
93	24-Jun-15	John MacKenzie	West Indian Marine	Support									It is unlikely that the majority of the coral destroyed will be "live coral"	Dredging and turbidity is the biggest concern		
94	25-Jun-15	Nick Meier	Visitor	Object	Yes				Yes							
95	25-Jun-15	Shery Berger		Object	Yes				Yes	Yes-neg						
96	25-Jun-15	Dorota Osinki	Visitor/ Scuba Diver	Object	Yes											
97	25-Jun-15	Richard Webb	Visitor/ Scuba Diver	Object	Yes				Yes	Yes-neg			Cost is not justified			
98	25-Jun-15	Paul Holden	Divers Down	Object	Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes-neg			Improve existing pair			
99	25-Jun-15	Sue Hacker	Visitor	Object	Yes											
100	25-Jun-15	Jenny Berry	Cruise Ship Visitor	Object	Yes											
102	25-Jun-15	Mally Stewart	Visitor	Object	Yes				Yes							

Cayman CBF - Summary of Public Responses to EIA

General Information				Primary Topics of Concern						Other Comments/Concerns						
ID#	Date Rec'd	Name	Organisation	Support or Object	Damage/ Destruction of Coral Reefs	Money Could be Better Spent Elsewhere			Image & Reputation of the Cayman Islands	Economic Impact (Tourism)	Impacts on 7MB	Focus on Alternative Options		Other #1	Other #2	Other #3
						Georgetown Revitalization	Airport	Improved Tendering				Other site	Floating dock			
159	1-Jul-15	Blu Rivard	Honorary board of Governors	Object	Yes											
160	1-Jul-15	Heber Arch	PADI and Project Aware/ Ocean Artist Society	Object	Yes							Yes				
161	1-Jul-15	Paul Naish	Resident & Civil Engineer	Object	Yes								Concerned about GT not being able to handle a large number of tourists			
162	1-Jul-15	Linda Landau	Resident & tourism professionl	Object	Yes			Yes	Yes-neg							
163	1-Jul-15	Jeff Simpson		Support										GC has more coral to lose than other islands, more cruise ships should go there to prevent destruction elsewhere		
164	1-Jul-15	James TerHark	PADI course instructor & visitor	Object	Yes											
165	1-Jul-15	Michael Strong	Tour operator to Cayman from US	Object	Yes				Yes-neg							
166	1-Jul-15	Susan Hall	visitor	Object	Yes											
167	1-Jul-15	Jim Aden	Underwater Videographer	Object												
168	1-Jul-15	Brynley Davies	Resident	Support										Tendering is inconvenient and people are not going to want to cruise to GC because of it		
169	1-Jul-15	LeRoy Wickham	visitor	Object	Yes				Yes-neg							
170	1-Jul-15	Patrick Newman	cruise Ship Visitor & diver	Object	Yes											
171	1-Jul-15	Janet Czapski	Tour operator to Cayman from US	Object	Yes				Yes-neg							
172	1-Jul-15	Mike Nelson	Sea Elements	Object	Yes			Yes	Yes-neg				If the peir is built, the passengers have to walk a long way	Concerned about GT not being able to handle a large number of tourists		
173	1-Jul-15	Michael Watts	visitor	Object	Yes								Concerns about dredging	Too much money for little reward		
174	1-Jul-15	Seth Davidson	vistor	Object	Yes											
175	1-Jul-15	Jermaine Sharpe	Object	Object	Yes						Yes					
176	1-Jul-15	Dennis Grundman	visitor	Object	Yes											
177	1-Jul-15	Darrell Dougherty	Object	Object	Yes											
178	1-Jul-15	Ruth Hummell	visitor	Object	Yes											
179	1-Jul-15	Sieg Stahl	Tour operator to Cayman from US	Object	Yes											
180	1-Jul-15	Amanda Perry	Object	Object	Yes											
181	1-Jul-15	Bill Northrup	Object	Object	Yes				Yes-neg							
182	1-Jul-15	jim cooper	visitor	Object	Yes				Yes-neg							
183	1-Jul-15	Scott Shelley	Former resident	Object	Yes				Yes-neg							
184	1-Jul-15	Steve Weaver	Tour operator to Cayman from US	Object	Yes			Yes	Yes-neg							
185	1-Jul-15	Richard Damian	visitor	Object	Yes				Yes-neg							
186	1-Jul-15	scott kaufman	Tour operator to Cayman from US	Object	Yes				Yes-neg							
187	1-Jul-15	William Schmidt	visitor	Object	Yes				Yes-neg							
188	1-Jul-15	lashay ellis	visitor	Object	Yes											
189	1-Jul-15	Michelle Baxter	property owner	Object	Yes				Yes-neg				With a new peir it will become too crowded			
190	1-Jul-15	Julene Banks	resident	Object	Yes						Yes		Extension to the cargo facility is more essential			
191	1-Jul-15	Melissa Lanham	visitor	Object	Yes											
192	1-Jul-15	Anonymous	Resident- Chef	Object												
193	1-Jul-15	Anonymous	Resident	Object												
194	1-Jul-15	Crystal Marshall	Resident	Object	Yes				Yes-neg							
195	1-Jul-15	Jolene Nelson	Resident- Administration	Object	Yes											
196	1-Jul-15	Anonymous	Resident	Object	Yes				Yes-neg							
197	1-Jul-15	Anonymous	Resident- Hotelier	Support												
198	1-Jul-15	Anonymous	Resident- Hotelier	Object	Yes											
199	2-Jul-15	Ralph J. Ariza	Resident- Tour Guide	Object	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes-neg				Promote stay-over guests	Conservation Law		
200	2-Jul-15	Ithena M. Parchment	Resident	Object												
201	2-Jul-15	Christopher Bodden	Resident- Student	Unclear												
202	2-Jul-15	William A. Bodden	Resident- Student	Unclear												
203	2-Jul-15	Gary M. Bodden	Resident- Businessman	Unclear												
204	2-Jul-15	Gretchen Peters	Visitor- Scuba Diver	Object	Yes											
205	2-Jul-15	Howard Finlason	Resident- Contractor	Support									Excited about the profit of the head-tax alone			
206	2-Jul-15	Anonymous	Resident- Tourism	Object									believe if the store owners and the Cayman's port / Caymans Future truly believe in the port project then They should put up 1/3 of thethe money			
207	2-Jul-15	Kevin Solomon	Resident	Object									Look into extending the Sprott dock to cater to smaller ships			
208	2-Jul-15	Nadine S. Holness	Resident- Accountant	Object	Yes						Yes		Too much congestion in GT			
209	2-Jul-15	Shane Willis	Previous Resident	Object												
210	2-Jul-15	Nancy Taylor	Visitor	Object	Yes			Yes	Yes-neg							

Cayman CBF - Summary of Public Responses to EIA

General Information				Primary Topics of Concern							Other Comments/Concerns					
ID#	Date Rec'd	Name	Organisation	Support or Object	Damage/ Destruction of Coral Reefs	Money Could be Better Spent Elsewhere			Image & Reputation of the Cayman Islands	Economic Impact (Tourism)	Impacts on 7MB	Focus on Alternative Options		Other #1	Other #2	Other #3
						Georgetown Revitalization	Airport	Improved Tendering				Other site	Floating dock			
265	3-Jul-15	Kimberly Ferran	Marine Scientist	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
266	3-Jul-15	Andrew Pederson	Underwater Photographer	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
267	3-Jul-15	Billie Jo Malyk		Support										general support		
268	3-Jul-15	Sherrie Hall	Resident	Object		Yes		Yes		Yes-neg				tender process adds to "Cayman experience," improve Georgetown	focus on stay over tourism	
269	3-Jul-15	Gary Davis	Visitor- Scuba Diver	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
270	3-Jul-15	Amber Bothwell	Resident	Object	Yes	Yes										
271	3-Jul-15	Dana Polites	Visitor- Scuba Diver	Object	Yes											
272	3-Jul-15	David Arnold	Visitor	Object	Yes											
273	3-Jul-15	Paula Wythe	Scuba Diver	Object	Yes											
274	3-Jul-15	Peter Davey	Vice Chairman National Trust for	Object	Yes									questioned why design 4B was included in EIA		
275	3-Jul-15	Paula Blane		Object	Yes											
276	3-Jul-15	Craig Putnam	Visitor- Scuba Diver	Object	Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes-neg						
277	3-Jul-15	Neil Cox		Support										general support		
278	3-Jul-15	Dr. Mikki McComb-Ko	Visitor- Dive Industry	Object	Yes			Yes		Yes-neg				cruise ships devalue tourism	will impact status as tax haven	
279	3-Jul-15	Jackson	Intends to visit	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
280	3-Jul-15	Trudi Y. Myles		Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
281	3-Jul-15	Andrea C. Bothwell	Resident	Object	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes-neg						
282	3-Jul-15	Bob Stowe		Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
283	3-Jul-15	Tara Dolan	Visitor	Object	Yes			Yes		Yes-neg						
284	3-Jul-15	Peter Balls	Resident	Object	Yes						Yes	Yes				
285	3-Jul-15	Adam Steen	Visitor- Scuba Diver	Object	Yes											
286	3-Jul-15	Andre Saldanha De Ol	Resident	Object	Yes			Yes		Yes-neg				very detailed reply, feels a pier is needed but that EIA was flawed		
287	3-Jul-15	Drew Richardson	President & CEO of PADI Worldw	Object	Yes									reply on behalf of PADI		
288	3-Jul-15	Sondra Lovett		Object										general opposition		
289	3-Jul-15	Barry Bodden	Chamber of Commerce	Unclear	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes-unclear	Yes			Cayman Chamber of Commerce response, includes summary of 67 responses to their own survey		
290	3-Jul-15	Heather Roffey	Resident	Object	Yes					Yes-neg	Yes			market unique tender operations	use global attention to say no to cruise lines	
291	3-Jul-15	Selina Tibbetts	Resident	Object	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes-neg				cruise tourism could soon be outdated	focus on dump	
292	3-Jul-15	Courtney Platt	Resident- Underwater photographe	Object	Yes			Yes		Yes-neg	Yes			Government own and operate tendering		
293	3-Jul-15	Wayne Ross	Financial Services	Support										general support		
294	3-Jul-15	Cally Clark	Don Fosters Dive	Object	Yes			Yes						cruise passengers willing to go through tender process in order to experience healthy coral		
295	3-Jul-15	Vassel Johnson Jr.	Atlantis Submarine	Object	Yes		Yes			Yes-neg				support cruise tourism in a managed way, address Cayman's "carrying capacity"	security screening for larger vessels, more hotel construction	
296	3-Jul-15	Kathryn Lohr	Previous Resident- Marine Scientis	Object	Yes					Yes-neg	Yes					
297	3-Jul-15	Mark Hall	Resident- Scuba Diver	Object	Yes					Yes-neg				cruise companies don't want to share customers with islands		
298	3-Jul-15	Kareen Watler	resident	Object	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes-neg						
299	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Resident	Support										Cruise passengers become stayover tourists		
300	3-Jul-15	Judy Singh	Resident	Object	Yes						Yes					
301	3-Jul-15	Kim Johnson	Visitor- Scuba Diver	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
302	3-Jul-15	Barbara Marotta	Visitor- Cruise passenger	Object	Yes			Yes		Yes-neg				enjoys tender experience		
303	3-Jul-15	Jarrett Nicholson	Visitor- Scuba Diver	Object	Yes						Yes					
304	3-Jul-15	Michelle Courington	Travel Agent- Dive Industry	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
305	3-Jul-15	Jade Arch	Resident	Object	Yes					Yes-neg				focus on quality tourism rather than quantity		
306	3-Jul-15	Katie O'Neill	Resident	Object	Yes									requests national referendum		
307	3-Jul-15	Gene Thompson	Developer	Support						Yes-pos	Yes					
308	3-Jul-15	William Jones	Resident	Object	Yes		Yes							focus on dump, stayovers		
309	3-Jul-15	Mel Allende		Object	Yes											
310	3-Jul-15	Dean Murray	Resident	Object	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes-neg						
311	3-Jul-15	Aline Wood	Resident	Object	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes-neg	Yes			create a second dock area		
312	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Resident	Object	Yes									Port facilities should be improved, but not to such a magnitude		
313	3-Jul-15	Susan Dasher	Resident- Dive Industry	Object	Yes											
314	3-Jul-15	Walter Goldberg	Marine Scientist	Object	Yes									project should be scaled back		
315	3-Jul-15	Aline Wood	Resident	Object								Yes		build a jetty in West Bay	cruise companies should pay at least half of costs	
316	3-Jul-15	Chase Kuehl	Visitor- Scuba Diver	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						

Cayman CBF - Summary of Public Responses to EIA

General Information				Primary Topics of Concern							Other Comments/Concerns					
ID#	Date Rec'd	Name	Organisation	Support or Object	Damage/ Destruction of Coral Reefs	Money Could be Better Spent Elsewhere			Image & Reputation of the Cayman Islands	Economic Impact (Tourism)	Impacts on 7MB	Focus on Alternative Options		Other #1	Other #2	Other #3
						Georgetown Revitalization	Airport	Improved Tendering				Other site	Floating dock			
317	3-Jul-15	Joan Penn	Visitor- Scuba Diver	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
318	3-Jul-15	Sherry Agellon	Visitor	Object	Yes				Yes							
319	3-Jul-15	Randy Harwood	Visitor- Scuba Diver	Object	Yes				Yes	Yes-neg						
320	3-Jul-15	Katie Heisler Blitzstein		Object	Yes			Yes					enhance tenders			
321	3-Jul-15	Freya Eyley	Resident	Object	Yes											
322	3-Jul-15	Kelly Reineking	Resident- Naturalist	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
323	3-Jul-15	Monique	Resident	Support						Yes-pos						
324	3-Jul-15	Graham Casden	Dive Industry	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
325	3-Jul-15	Philip Wight	Resident	Support									general support			
326	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Resident	Support									general support			
327	3-Jul-15	Timothy Adam	Cayman Islands Turtle Farm	Support						Yes-pos						
328	3-Jul-15	Shane Troughton	Resident- Scuba Diver	Object	Yes			Yes		Yes-pos						
329	3-Jul-15	Ross Tibbetts	Resident	Object	Yes	Yes		Yes			Yes		cruise industry is not permanent	improve dump		focus on education
330	3-Jul-15	Gerardo Ochoa-Varga	Resident- Scuba Diver	Object	Yes											
331	3-Jul-15	Robert Kuehl	Visitor- Scuba Diver	Object	Yes			Yes		Yes-neg						
332	3-Jul-15	Jerrica Wood	Resident	Object	Yes	Yes		Yes								
333	3-Jul-15	Rachael Williams		Object	Yes											
334	3-Jul-15	Hannah Reid	Resident	Object	Yes			Yes		Yes-neg			pier would be an economic strain			
335	3-Jul-15	Russell Hartridge	Don Fosters Dive	Object	Yes			Yes		Yes-neg			cruise goes don't mind tender process			
336	3-Jul-15	Justin Miller	Resident- Tourism Industry	Object	Yes											
337	3-Jul-15	Mark Thorn	Visitor- Dive Industry	Object	Yes								use funding to protect natural resources			
338	3-Jul-15	Sally Coppage	Resident- Dive Industry	Object	Yes			Yes		Yes-neg						
339	3-Jul-15	Amanda Evans	Advisory Council on Underwater A	Object	Yes								submitted by Kimberly Faulk, on behalf of			if Balboa is moved, must be documented
340	3-Jul-15	Aline Wood	Resident	Object	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes-neg	Yes		Advisory Council on Underwater			Archaeology
341	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Resident	Object	Yes			Yes		Yes-neg	Yes		REPEAT SURVEY			
342	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
343	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
344	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes					Yes-pos	Yes		concern about storm season			
345	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes					Yes-pos			Cruise and cargo need the pier			
346	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Object	Yes					Yes-neg			keep money in general economy			
347	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
348	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
349	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Unclear						Yes-unclear						
350	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
351	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
352	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes					Yes-pos						
353	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
354	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes					Yes-pos						
355	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
356	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
357	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
358	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
359	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
360	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
361	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
362	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes					Yes-pos						
363	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
364	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
365	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes					Yes-pos						
366	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
367	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
368	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
369	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						general support
370	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes											
371	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
372	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support									general support			
373	3-Jul-15	Conrad Allison	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
374	3-Jul-15	Robert Anderson	Kirk Freeport	Support									general support			
375	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes					Yes-pos						
376	3-Jul-15	Kevon Benton	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
377	3-Jul-15	Landy Bodden	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
378	3-Jul-15	Joseph Brown	Kirk Freeport	Support									general support			
379	3-Jul-15	Kimberlie Bush	Kirk Freeport	Support									general support			
380	3-Jul-15	Venice Bush Arch	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
381	3-Jul-15	Carlos Viera	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos			need to compete with Cuba			

Cayman CBF - Summary of Public Responses to EIA

General Information				Primary Topics of Concern							Other Comments/Concerns					
ID#	Date Rec'd	Name	Organisation	Support or Object	Damage/ Destruction of Coral Reefs	Money Could be Better Spent Elsewhere			Image & Reputation of the Cayman Islands	Economic Impact (Tourism)	Impacts on 7MB	Focus on Alternative Options		Other #1	Other #2	Other #3
						Georgetown Revitalization	Airport	Improved Tendering				Other site	Floating dock			
382	3-Jul-15	Christopher Kirkconnell	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes					Yes-pos						
383	3-Jul-15	Revelino Coutinho	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes					Yes-pos						
384	3-Jul-15	Deborah Kirkconnell	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes					Yes-pos						
385	3-Jul-15	Celine	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes					Yes-pos						
386	3-Jul-15	Denver Douglas	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes					Yes-pos						
387	3-Jul-15	Sheryl Edwards	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes					Yes-pos				support conditional on environmental protection		
388	3-Jul-15	Beverley Gayle	Kirk Freeport	Support										general support		
389	3-Jul-15	Sayda Hernandez	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes					Yes-pos						
390	3-Jul-15	Susan Hinds	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
391	3-Jul-15	Marley Howell	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes			Yes		Yes-pos						
392	3-Jul-15	Irma Hurlston	Kirk Freeport	Support										general support		
393	3-Jul-15	John Arch Jackson	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
394	3-Jul-15	Kayleigh	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
395	3-Jul-15	Renee Langevin	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes					Yes-pos						
396	3-Jul-15	Nkrumah Lawrence	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
397	3-Jul-15	Maria Vieira	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
398	3-Jul-15	Donna Mendez	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
399	3-Jul-15	D Miller	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
400	3-Jul-15	Geoffrey Mogg	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
401	3-Jul-15	Neil Bodden	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
402	3-Jul-15	Oddy	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
403	3-Jul-15	P.J. Palmer	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
404	3-Jul-15	Bozidar Pavlovic	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
405	3-Jul-15	Chaz Phelps	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes					Yes-pos						
406	3-Jul-15	Marques Riddick	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
407	3-Jul-15	Jennifer-Ann Scott	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes					Yes-pos				add tour bus station		
408	3-Jul-15	Scott	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
409	3-Jul-15	Debbie Walker	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
410	3-Jul-15	Tonja Wight	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
411	3-Jul-15	Atthea Williams	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
412	3-Jul-15	Gerald Kirkconnell	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes					Yes-pos		Yes				
413	3-Jul-15	Mariflur Ponce	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
414	3-Jul-15	Eldon Kirkconnell	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes					Yes-pos						
415	3-Jul-15	Patricia Kirkconnell	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes					Yes-pos						
416	3-Jul-15	Odey Clarke	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
417	3-Jul-15	Maxine Wynten	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
418	3-Jul-15	Pauline Walker	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
419	3-Jul-15	Joan Walker	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
420	3-Jul-15	Derrick Miller	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
421	3-Jul-15	Lasscells Powell	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
422	3-Jul-15	Eunice Patterson	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
423	3-Jul-15	Sonia Glazebrook	Kirk Freeport	Support	Yes					Yes-pos						
424	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support			Yes			Yes-pos				move forward with port and airport		
425	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Kirk Freeport	Support										general support		
426	3-Jul-15	Sandra Bodden	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
427	3-Jul-15	A.C. Bodden	Kirk Freeport	Support						Yes-pos						
428	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Ambassador Divers	Object	Yes											
429	3-Jul-15	Oliver	Ambassador Divers	Object	Yes											
430	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Ambassador Divers	Object	Yes											
431	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Ambassador Divers	Object	Yes					Yes-neg				update tenders		
432	3-Jul-15	Roger Holloway	Ambassador Divers	Object	Yes					Yes-neg	Yes					
433	3-Jul-15	Elleta Soto	Resident	Object								Yes		locate dock at Spotts- includes details and a drawing		
434	3-Jul-15	Anonymous	Resident	Object	Yes							Yes		look at South Sound/Red Bay instead		
435	3-Jul-15	Jennifer Woodford	Resident	Object	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes-neg	Yes			fix traffic flow		
436	3-Jul-15	John Wilson	Resident	Support						Yes-pos				general support		
437	9-Jun-15	Anonymous	Resident	Support												
438	9-Jun-15	Anonymous	Resident	Support						Yes-pos	Yes					
439	9-Jun-15	Anonymous	Resident	Unclear	Yes					Yes-unclear				would like a pier, but not at the expense of natural environment		
440	9-Jun-15	Anonymous	Resident	Object	Yes					Yes-neg	Yes					
441	9-Jun-15	Anonymous	Resident- Journalist	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
442	9-Jun-15	Anonymous		Support												
443	9-Jun-15	Capt. Harris A. McCoy	Resident	Object								Yes		general support		
444	9-Jun-15	Errol Reid	Resident	Support						Yes-pos				move to Red Bay		
445	9-Jun-15	John W. Ebanks	Resident- Construction	Support						Yes-pos	Yes			move to Spotts		
446	9-Jun-15	Karen Perkins	Resident	Object	Yes			Yes		Yes-neg						

Cayman CBF - Summary of Public Responses to EIA

General Information			Primary Topics of Concern							Other Comments/Concerns						
ID#	Date Rec'd	Name	Organisation	Support or Object	Damage/ Destruction of Coral Reefs	Money Could be Better Spent Elsewhere			Image & Reputation of the Cayman Islands	Economic Impact (Tourism)	Impacts on 7MB	Focus on Alternative Options		Other #1	Other #2	Other #3
						Georgetown Revitalization	Airport	Improved Tendering				Other site	Floating dock			
447	9-Jun-15	Mike Pickthorne	Resident- Marine Surveyor	Unclear												
448	9-Jun-15	Paul Burke	Resident- Teacher	Object	Yes							Yes	leave GT as commercial port, cruise pier in Red Bay	focus on adventure and eco-tourism		
449	9-Jun-15	Peter Milburn	Resident- Dive Industry	Object												
450	9-Jun-15	Petrokotze	Resident	Object	Yes											
451	9-Jun-15	Sergio Coni	Resident- Dive Industry	Object	Yes				Yes	Yes-neg						
452	23-Jun-15	Lindsay Battles	Scuba Diver	Object	Yes											
453	29-Jun-15	Rick Yanito		Object												
454	30-Jun-15	Nancy Easterbrook	DiveTech	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
455	30-Jun-15	Nicholas Sykes	Resident	Unclear	Yes					Yes-unclear						
456	30-Jun-15	Jeff	Home owner	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
457	1-Jul-15	Anne O'Shell	Visitor- Scuba Diver	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
458	1-Jul-15	Crystal Gravitt		Object	Yes				Yes							
459	1-Jul-15	Nancy Hall		Object	Yes											
460	1-Jul-15	Patty Cooper	Visitor- Scuba Diver	Object	Yes											
461	2-Jul-15	Ronald Slooter		Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
462	2-Jul-15	Bob Brayman		Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
463	2-Jul-15	Philip M.	Diamond Marquise	Support						Yes-pos						
464	2-Jul-15	Andrea Schmidt		Object	Yes											
465	2-Jul-15	Mark Angiolillo		Object	Yes											
466	2-Jul-15	Anonymous		Object	Yes				Yes							
467	2-Jul-15	Kamala Shadduck	Visitor- Dive Industry	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
468	2-Jul-15	Scuba Center	Scuba Center	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
469	2-Jul-15	Dan Orr	Visitor- Dive Industry	Object	Yes				Yes							
470	2-Jul-15	Monika Wojtkiewicz	Creations	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
471	3-Jul-15	Caitlin Molloy	Visitor- Scuba Diver	Object	Yes											
472	3-Jul-15	Adela G. White		Object	Yes											
473	3-Jul-15	Daniel Merselis	Marine Scientist	Object	Yes					Yes-neg						
				Totals	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Totals	Total	Total	Total			
				Support	348	21	16	19	87	Positive	31	17	5			
				111						86						
				Object						Negative						
				345						172						
				Unclear						Unclear						
				15						5						

APPENDIX R.2
PUBLIC COMMENTS (NO. 1 - 473)

APPENDIX R.3
ADDITIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION ON SELECTED TOPICS