



MINUTES
Meeting 12

Aviation Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Oakland International Airport
Thursday, May 4, 2006

This meeting of the Aviation Stakeholder Advisory Committee (the Committee) was the twelfth in a series which originally focused on development of the Oakland International Airport (OAK) Master Plan. The Master Plan was adopted by the Board of Port Commissioners in March 2006, and the Committee has continued meeting to give input on Master Plan implementation and other projects of interest at OAK. These minutes correspond to an Agenda that was distributed at the meeting; a copy of the Agenda is provided on the OAK planning web site. New postings to the web site will be accompanied by email notices to Committee members. The web site address is www.oaklandairport.com/planning.

Attendees:

See sign-in sheet (to be used as distribution list); a copy of the sign-in sheet is provided on the OAK planning web site.

Handouts:

- Agenda
- Terminal A diagrams presented on large sheets; not distributed per se
- Runway safety area (RSA) diagrams
- Runway 27L/MALSR diagrams
- Taxiway W overlay diagram

Following introductions, Mr. Doug Mansel stated that the meeting was being recorded so that meeting minutes can eventually be made; the last meeting was recorded for the same purpose; minutes are not complete for that meeting as yet, but will be done from the recording.

Agenda Item:

Third Terminal Planning Update

Mr. Doug Mansel presented the status of the Terminal A scenarios, the planning assumptions on which they were based, and the development process through which the planning team was going.

The assumptions were translated into square feet by breaking the building into its logical components for arrivals and departures processing, and developing the square footage required for ticket counters, passenger queuing, airline ticket offices, baggage claim, passenger security screening, outbound baggage screening, concessions, Port and other offices, building services, mechanical/electrical/plumbing, and walls.

Reviewing the list of square footage comparisons, Mr. Mansel noted that an interesting difference between Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 is that the scenario with Southwest Airlines (with twice as many passengers and four more gates) needs less space than the scenario with multiple airlines. This is due to the efficiency of having a one-airline operation rather than a multi-airline operation. The approach proposes a large concessions program in order to satisfy passenger timing needs, and maximize revenue opportunities. Mr. Mansel stated that depending on which scenario plays out the requirement is between 500,000 (Scenario 2) and 580,000 (Scenario 1) square feet, and that this would fit nicely in Area 2. Ms. McKenney clarified that these figures are very preliminary and may change.

Mr. Dave Needle asked what other considerations were taken into account aside from passenger traffic. Are there other services that Southwest offers to their customers that would help put them all in one space that would require accommodation? Port Staff said no, Southwest provides the same basic passenger and cargo service. Mr. Needle clarified that there is facility-sharing that occurs in the existing terminal. What if you put one airline, such as Southwest, in the new terminal, and they grow beyond the capacity of the terminal? Another stakeholder re-iterated the concern that a separated terminal has constraints for an airline. Ms. McKenney stated that a reasonably forecasted level of traffic was used as the basis; expandability was a factor in the development of the alternatives, and a terminal can be expanded; if the airline in Terminal A grew beyond the capacity, they could potentially be moved back.

Mr. Mansel presented general layouts and described them as the next level of development after the diagrams in the Master Plan, and as very preliminary. The general layouts indicate adjacencies of functions inside the building, and how the organization of the pieces shapes the building. The layouts assume a single level curbside roadway to keep it simple for the passenger and keep the costs lower.

Per Mr. Mansel, the general layouts represent three families of terminal concepts. The first concept family is a unit terminal, not attached to Terminal 1; the second concept family is connected to Terminal 1; the third concept family is an enhanced roadway concept.

Mr. Mansel reviewed Concept Alternative Number 2. One downside noted was that all traffic to existing Terminals 1 and 2 would have to drive past the new terminal. As considered in the Master Plan sketches, the existing cargo building would have to move. This alternative includes a pushback zone to allow the aircraft to push off of the gate without blocking an active taxiway. All of the options include a taxiway parallel to Taxiway B, which is necessary to keep flow to the terminal and to North Field moving; the concept has a dashed in parking garage structure as a preliminary thought for; the Staff is just starting to look at the issues for a garage, but it would likely service passengers and employees.

A stakeholder asked if a 16-gate building could be built. Ms. McKenney stated that, early-on, a pre-supposition was not made about which airlines would go over. If other carriers went over there to reach the 20 MAP, they would not have to build the extra 4 gates. Looking at the forecasted growth and statistics, it is more likely that the airport would build 20 gates, Southwest would move over, and the other airlines would have room to grow at the existing terminals. Additionally, decisions are still subject to discussions with the airlines corporate offices regarding their long term intentions. The purpose is to build to meet a reasonable planning level. Mr. Needle stated that from a community perspective, he would be in favor of building the right number of gates based on the planning in order to not exceed the runway capacity.

Mr. Needle asked if the RON positions would be lost. Mr. Mansel answered that the plan needed more work, but that the goal would be to maintain the existing count, and, if possible, get a few more. Mr. Needle stated that his interest would be in maintaining the dual taxiways all the way through.

A stakeholder asked if there were plans to accommodate the A380. Mr. Mansel indicated that the forecast do not indicate the operation of an Airbus A380 at OAK, except perhaps for FedEx, which would be parked at the metroplex, or an international flight, which would be parked at Gate 1. An A380 diverted from San Francisco would be parked on the ramp.

The second family of alternatives, as shown by Concept Alternative 5, puts a terminal contiguous with Terminal 1 further south. A benefit is that it gives more room to orient the replacement cargo building more efficiently; a big downside is that the curbside roadway activity would be very compressed. The concept includes a pushback zone and a potential structured parking garage.

The final concept is the most intriguing to the Staff because it solves a lot of the roadway circulation problems. The layout separates the ticketing and bag claim functions from the concourse, and puts roadways between the separated buildings. All of the traffic going to the existing terminals would bypass Terminal A. This concept would be more expensive due to more building perimeter and more complicated baggage delivery systems. Although more expensive, the concept goes a long way to solving the roadway circulation problems. Staff is not as enamored with the airside layout on this concept alternative (no pushback zone). Staff still has a lot of work to do to flush them out and meld the best of the different alternatives. For example, they could take the airside from Concept Alternative 2 and put it with the roadway from Concept Alternative 7. Discussion occurred regarding the functions represented by various colors.

A stakeholder asked if parallel taxiways are the same in the different concepts. Mr. Mansel indicated that they might vary slightly but that they are all designed to have a single Group V taxiway (accommodates traffic up to a 747) and a single Group IV taxiway (accommodates traffic up to a 767 and an MD-11).

A stakeholder thanked the Staff for including the Bart connector in the thinking. The Bart alignment and station are still being developed. Port Staff will figure out how to connect to them as efficiently as they can wherever it ends up.

Mr. Needle asked what part the Staff wants the Stakeholders to play in the development process. Staff indicated that stakeholder feedback is important, such as their support of parallel taxiway and concern for 16 vs. 20 gates.

One stakeholder asked about a previously raised concept of off-site ticketing and check-in. Ms. McKenney indicated that it depends on the situation. For example, you might pursue that idea if you are trying to serve more passengers without building, or are trying to get fewer cars into the area. Las Vegas was mentioned as a good example of needing to accommodate so many visitors. Ms. McKenney stated that the need and economics are probably not there to justify the cost of off-site accommodation.

Mr. Needle asked where the Port would look for money to build the terminal. Ms. McKenney indicated that something like this is financed, and that the major funding sources are revenues, Passenger Facility Charges, AIP grants from the FAA, and rates and charges of the tenants.

Next steps for the Port Staff include further development of the concepts, financing analyses, and evaluation of existing environmental approvals vs. new environmental reviews.

Runway Safety Area (RSA) Improvements Update (NEPA / CEQA) (HANDOUT)

Mr. Mansel updated the group the previously discussed RSA study. The FAA funded a study to look at the condition of the Runway Safety Areas at OAK. The results indicated deficiencies at all of the runways. Mr. Mansel provided diagrams with red dashed lines defining the required RSAs.

The RSA at Runway 29 is over 500ft short, with constraints of the dike and San Francisco Bay. Issues at Runway 11/29 include wetlands and soft soils. The soils along the side of the runway need to be able to accommodate weight of aircraft, without causing damage, and emergency vehicles. Alternative 6 is the recommended correction to improve the 11/29 RSAs and is based on the idea of incremental improvement. The first step is to take care of the wetlands and to get the soils stabilized. The second step is to install a nonstandard engineered materials arresting system (EMAS). When the aircraft goes into EMAS, the aircraft sinks, the material acts as an arrestor and the runway ramps up. Mr. Needle has the concern that there are no warranties or testing. Mr. Mansel indicated that the FAA has done some

testing and that there are some actual usages of EMAS, twice in New York. Mr. Needle asked if there were examples of airplanes landing short; the answer was no. In order to install the EMAS this close to the threshold, the Port is proposing a 35-foot setback. The Port will have to have visual vertical guidance systems (precision approach path indicators/PAPIs and/or other electronic vertical guidance). Mr. Mansel also indicated that the air carriers have a really good track record of not landing short; but not such a good track record of not landing long.

A stakeholder asked if mitigation measures are required to fill the small wetlands. Mr. Mansel said yes, and stated that the port received another grant from the FAA to issue an RFP for consultants to prepare the environmental reviews.

North Field has similar problems in the RSAs. Approach to Runway 27R has fencing along Airport Drive and has wetlands. Approach to 9R has a water body and Harbor Bay Parkway. In addition to the wetlands, the ground along the side of the runway contains soft, clay soils. The recommended solution is to fill the wetlands and stabilize the soils, the latter of which is the biggest component of the work at North Field.

Runway 15/33 has a small roadway in the RSA. Based on analysis, it is actually cheaper to shift the runway toward the south rather than move the road. The recommended solution is to move the runway 75 feet south. It involves some striping and moving of lights.

Next steps include issuing an RFP for consultants to prepare environmental documents and to conduct preliminary engineering for these projects.

Instrument Landing System (ILS) / Medium intensity Approach Light System with Runway alignment indicator lights (MALSR) – Runway 27L (NEPA / CEQA) (HANDOUT)

An FAA contractor provided an update on the project to install the ILS at Runway 27L and its associated approach light system. The environmental portion of the process was kicked off with the consultant company, ESA. The handout included project location and aerials, list of ILS/MALSR components, list of issues, and contact information. Stakeholder and community people can contact him for additional information.

A schematic was provided for how the ILS system works. The ILS is a navaid that provides electronic course guidance to the cockpit/aircraft in terms of the runway centerline and proper descent path. The main components of the ILS are: distance measuring equipment/DME (provides a fixed point location for the aircraft), the localizer (provides centerline information of runway) and the glide slope (provides the proper descent path for the aircraft).

The FAA is proposing to locate the localizer about 800 feet off the end of the runway. A localizer is typically located about 1,000 feet to 1,050 feet off the end of the runway; however, due to the roadway and perimeter fencing, that is not possible in this case. The DME will be collocated with the equipment shelter, which is straight across from the localizer antennae. The glide slope antennae will be located to the interior of the runways next to the existing glide slope for Runway 27R. In answer to a stakeholder question, it was indicated that the localizer structure will be a new one.

The MALSR is the medium-intensity approach lighting system with runway alignment indicator lights, consisting of a series of 12 light stations, typically spaced at 200 foot intervals, extending approximately 2,400 feet from the runway threshold. There are some constraints with the alignment with the MALSR alignment on 27L. There is a wetlands area to be concerned with, and they are hoping for only temporary disturbance. There is the possibility of needing to put a light station in the wetland. There is some variation allowed in the spacing, up to plus or minus 20 feet. Regarding the second constraint, the FAA would like to get away from putting a light station on the roadway, as they are hard for the technicians to service. The main constraint is the golf course location. About a year to a year-and-a-half ago, the Port hired Ricondo & Associates to develop various concepts for the MALSR, resulting in three basic alternatives. The FAA has been working on refinements to those, and has been working with the Port

and the golf course. There is a solution that the golf course might accept, adding strategic (and one additional) light stations in order to allow the removal of last two flashing light stations, one of which is the most problematic to the golf course.

An Alameda stakeholder asked if the ILS/MALSRS is a safety device. In answer, the system provides navigation signals allowing a pilot to do a precision approach and land with lower minimums. Compared to landing today with visual flight rules, it does help San Leandro in achieving quieter skies at night. At night, they would be able to divert the flights to 27L, further away from neighborhoods, and more over industrial areas when planes get lower. Redundancy of the light system is also important: if a light standard goes down, the system can still be used, rather than rendering the whole system inoperable. The impact to Alameda consists of the end of a fence and an innocuous 8'x10' building. The benefit of having two ILSs is much greater.

Ms. McKenney indicated that the Port would like to work through the Stakeholders to let the community know about projects that are part of the Master Plan, as well as projects that are independent of the master plan process.

Environmental issues that are known include a noise component. The FAA and ESA are working to develop the operating assumptions and expectations; the process should be complete within the next two to three weeks. Other issues to be aware of include, off of the 27L approach, wetland area, biological resources and habitat. USDOT regulation regarding Section 4(f) land requires federal agencies, specifically the FAA, not to take any public park land, wildlife refuges, or land of that nature; a public golf course would typically fall within that resource. They would need to work with the golf course to get a letter stating that there would be no degradation or minor degradation of that resource. Additionally, the golf course was built on top of a landfill, and has restrictions on what can and cannot be built. They would have to work closely with the Water Control Board, so that foundations or duct banks do not penetrate the cap; or if they do penetrate, to make sure that they do not expose pathways of contamination to the groundwater or soil.

In terms of the EA process, a brief list of some of the major milestones was provided. They would typically start out with a scoping letter to the agencies, stakeholders and the public. The Draft EA will have a 30 day review period. A public review meeting will be set up during that 30-day period. Then, depending on the comments, they will respond to comments, finalize the EA and prepare a FONSI/ROD (Finding of No Significant Impact/Record of Decision) if the findings support that decision.

Schedule-wise, they would anticipate sending out the scoping letter within a few weeks. The Draft EA would be out by late summer; the Final EA would be out by fall. Construction is likely to occur in spring/summer of next year. The project may be phased (ILS first, MALSRS later) due to funding issues.

Taxiway W Overlay Project (HANDOUT)

Mr. Mansel explained that, as stated in the Master Plan document that, over the course of several years coming up, the Port will be rehabilitating a lot of the pavement. One section of pavement that is in need of overlay is Taxiway W

Mr. Tony Godkin passed out graphics with the location of Taxiway W. The overlay will improve the surface and give another 10 to 15 years of life. There are many ways to approach the project. The preferred scenario is closing the area for 76 hours straight and doing all the work at once. Another scenario includes two day closure, with a detour of W, and a closure of approx 56 hours. The third has two non-consecutive blocks of closures. The closures will keep all traffic away from that area of the airport. In all of the scenarios, they anticipate using Taxiway U, which gives a shorter runway. The aircraft that cannot take off on that length would either back-taxi or take a weight penalty. A stakeholder asked if they could operate taking off the other direction. Mr. Mansel explained that, based on operations and discussions with the FAA, this would not be possible. There is a possibility in congested times, there may be arrivals on North Field. The impacts to community are small. Work is anticipated to occur in late

August, early September. The project is a federally funded AIP project with a matching of federal and local funds.

Mr. Needle requested that notice be sent to the newspapers with plenty of advance notice.

San Leandro Noise Barrier Update

Mr. Mansel explained that the Port staff met with the Airport Committee of San Leandro City Council and walked them through the noise barrier options developed in the Master Plan. There was a joint conclusion that this would not be a successful project, and would not improve quality of life. Tony Santos said he would take that message back to the community. A stakeholder said that a formal decision needed to be documented in a letter from the Port. The Port will work on such a letter.

A stakeholder said that there was one more idea the Councilmember would like to have considered or an opinion from the FAA. Building a sound wall around the perimeter (due to noise in the recording, minutes could not be taken of this topic). It was stated that there would not likely to result in noise, and that results would be the same or worse than the alternative around the dike.

Airport Ground Traffic Study Update

Mr. Mansel stated that the ground traffic study is beginning to be discussed. The Port staff needs to sit down with city traffic engineers, preferably with Alameda, San Leandro and Oakland together, to develop the parameters and scope of the project. Mr. Hugh Johnson will be managing the study.

Corporate Jet Noise Abatement Procedure Deviation Study Update

Mr. Mansel indicated that the Port is beginning the Corporate Jet Noise Abatement Procedure Deviation Study. The Port staff is developing the scope for stakeholder review. The purpose is to research the 2% of non-compliant operations of this voluntary procedure. A stakeholder stated that, from a community perspective, single event results would be more telling than the percentage. Mr. Needle sees two issues to solve: how do we make it better and how do we talk about it.

A discussion revolved around the medical flights that should not be using their exempt status on departure, after the medical item has been delivered. Hayward found a reduction after this was addressed.

Wrap-up

Regarding scheduling, the Stakeholders' Committee was to convene twice a year. It was agreed that the group would meet a minimum of twice a year, and would meet as needed in addition to that. September 7th date was set. Additional people can be involved if a topic requires it.

Parking validation was taken care of.