



MINUTES
Meeting 13

Aviation Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Oakland International Airport
Thursday, September 7, 2006

This meeting of the Aviation Stakeholder Advisory Committee (the Committee) was the thirteenth 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
- Discussion draft diagram of Rehabilitation of Run-up Pad at Runway 11/29
- Draft scopes of work

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:

Update for Terminal 2 renovation/extension and Terminal roadways/curbside projects

Ms. Kristi McKenney said that the purpose of the update is to keep stakeholders informed of the major Airport Development Program (ADP) projects, as the airport development is a long term commitment.

Ms. McKenney indicated that the Terminal 2 extension is largely complete, and that the first four gates on the end of the building will be open in about a month and a half (mid-October). At that point the project does not add any gate capacity, because existing gates on Terminal 2 will be closed for renovation. Ms. McKenney invited the stakeholders to visit the baggage claim; it is already open and does not require a boarding pass. The baggage claim area gives a feel for the modernization efforts; it still has three claim devices and provides essentially the same services; however, it has more space, has convenient

bathrooms, and has customer level of service and aesthetic improvement. The renovation will continue until next spring; the rest of the concourse will also open about that time.

Ms. McKenney pointed out two things to look out for on the concourse. The terminal will have some dramatic, perhaps controversial, art. The terminal will have an educational program along the window wall, where you look out onto the bay, about the human history of the bay, in terms of the earliest native peoples, through massive fill and development, to the slightly higher consciousness of our interaction including the Save the Bay movement and where we are now.

In Terminal 2 you are starting to see some disruption from the renovation: new security checkpoint is being built where the old baggage claim was; once that is completed, the old security checkpoint will turn into ticket counters, etc. over the next five months or so.

The roadway project is in full force. It has been relatively painless up till now, as the work has been to the side of and outside of the existing roadway system. Now will start to see the first interaction, where, depending on how you are getting into the airport, you may have to make some different movements to get into certain places. The changes are temporary during construction and the Airport is attempting to (1) put out advertisements about that, and (2) have signage to help folks with that. There will be hiccups as things are not the way they have been year after year.

The Port has opened the fourth curb and started closing the third curb. This is a ripple effect where we opened new curbside, close old and redo it, marching up to the face of the terminal. The project is actually adding 10 feet of sidewalk and a double-wide pick-up and drop-off lane, a major improvement on the curbside. It will get more painful as we will be experiencing times where sections of the first curb are closed while we do the sidewalk. Mr. Hugh Johnson stated that we have just completed the first of four phases; each phase is about a six-month duration, so there would be another year and a half before completion. The roadway work will extend considerably longer than the terminal work.

Mr. Dave Needle asked if there is a drawing of how the roadway will look when it is done and if the stakeholders can get one. He is looking for information that will help people understand the lane structure, so can stave off questions/complaints/arguments by presenting number of lanes, etc. Port Staff will arrange for a drawing.

Mr. Needle stated that the signage has been confusing and asked who to send a note to in order to advise where the problem points are, even when following the signs. Ms. McKenney stated that because there are different people depending on the sign location, it would be best to send it to her; she will forward it to the appropriate person depending on the subject matter (e.g. roads vs. rental car).

A stakeholder asked about the parking garage and its status. Ms. McKenney answered that a garage was off the drawing board, and was not constructed. The garage associated with the previous terminal expansion was cancelled due to economics and availability of surface parking in the short-term. Looking at the parking issue again during the Master Plan process, it was determined that a parking garage, as well as a terminal, is needed to meet longer-term demand. The port is including a garage in the analyses.

Mr. Needle asked if the Port has received communication from new external people making complaints or having questions. Ms. McKenney answered that there are interested individuals who have not been nominated to the stakeholder committee, and that are outside the areas agreed to define in the stakeholder process. Mr. Doug Mansel concurred.

Update for Taxiway W Overlay project (HANDOUT)

Mr. Mansel reported that, per the previous briefing to the Stakeholders group, the Port needs to put a 10-inch asphalt/concrete overlay on the hold pad and adjacent taxiway (shown as the "project site" on the handout) at the end of Runway 29. The pavement is in poor condition, is old and cracking, is at the end of its useful life and needs to be replaced before the winter rains. To do the paving, the Port will have to close a portion of Taxiway W to aircraft traffic. The closure will start at 11pm on September 29th and end

at 6am on October 3rd. The contractor will work 24/7 to put down pavement and to extend runway centerline lights to the surface. During the closure, the Port will be asking aircraft to depart using Taxiway U, going straight out onto the runway; this shortens the effective length of runway to 7,000 feet, which is ok for approx 90% of the traffic; the approximately 10% that need the full 10,000 feet (cargo aircraft) will come out on Taxiway U, back-taxi on the runway, turn around, and have the full length. There will be no rolling takeoffs for that time.

A stakeholder asked about status of the gravel stopping areas at the ends of the runways (EMAS and RSA). Mr. Mansel reported that the Port is ready to issue an RFQ to hire consultants to conduct preliminary engineering and CEQA/NEPA environmental documents. EMAS has been installed at other airports (JFK) and worked to stop a large DC-10 aircraft that overshot the end of the runway. Mr. Mansel did further research on undershoots, meaning what would happen if an aircraft lands short in soft EAMS concrete. Information is available. According to the research, the aircraft would skip or hop and would not lose directional control. Based on extensive simulation testing the FAA believes that EMAS would not disrupt the aircraft enough to cause a crash. Mr. Needle stated that he does not believe that, and that he would like to consider it a safety issue. Mr. Mansel and Ms. McKenney will provide information for review. The Port has concerns about the material from maintenance perspective and is hoping that by the time the environmental review is complete and funding is in place, more research and development will be done on the material.

Ms. McKenney indicated that the next step for the EMAS project is to conduct the environmental review, and that it will occur in conjunction with the FAA. Stakeholders and the community-at-large could be involved. A stakeholder requested a list of who would be requested to review the environmental documents. Ms. McKenney asked Ms. Ananda to create a list that could serve for the EMAS and additional master planning projects. In addition to Scoping and traditional/required meetings, the regular Stakeholders' meetings would be used to keep people informed.

Mr. Valdez wanted to add discussion with regards to noise abatement and the Taxiway W overlay project. Mr. Valdez stated that the timeframe selected for the closure was not random. The Airport Staff met with the FAA and discussed how and when they would be impacted the least. 80 to 90% would use the taxiway U intersection departure to alleviate delay. If the activity falls under an unacceptable delay level, the tower would have to have arrivals only use the North field morning rush between 6 am and 10 am. The Staff would send out a community advisory approximately a week ahead. In response to a question about how many flight might occur, the answer was "10% of possibly 250 flights per day". However, this situation may not occur at all.

A stakeholder asked if the newspapers would be asked to publish notification. The answer is yes, however, the newspapers choose if they will publish them or not. Mr. Needle stated that CLASS should visit the newspapers and get them to put information in on a regular basis.

Third Terminal Planning Update

Internally, the Staff will stop calling it the Third Terminal, and will start calling it Terminal A, due to the sequencing and numbering of the existing terminals. As presented previously, the terminal is being planned in Area 2 of the master plan near the Ron Cowan Parkway, could be 20 gates, and on the order of 600,000 square feet. Staff has started preliminary work based on the alternatives presented before, and are developing one hybrid of the preferred schemes. In addition to fine tuning the scheme, three internal teams are working on the development of the project: one team is looking at the financing of the terminal, especially relative to the Port CIP; a second team is working on project delivery approaches; a third team is strategizing CEQA/NEPA environmental review and documentation. The work will be brought together with recommendations by next winter (end of year). Staff just went to the Aviation Committee to inform them of the process and to solicit their input and their concerns. Staff is planning to take the recommendations to the Aviation Committee to get approvals to move ahead with the project, to do the environmental documents, to secure the funding and to work on the contracting methods. Staff wants to schedule the stakeholders meeting so can brief the stakeholders right before going to the

Aviation Committee with the recommendations. Questions and issues from stakeholders would be welcome now.

Mr. Needle stated that, relative to parochial issues such as noise and traffic, he does not see that the construction and arranging of terminals would affect the community; alternatively, he asked the Port Staff to advise the stakeholders if they see an impact that they should consider.

A stakeholder asked if the international function would be moved to the new terminal. Ms. McKenney stated that current approach is to preserve what is in Terminal 1 and Terminal 2, and would not affect activity there. Things that do not matter from an environmental or master planning perspective could be figured out later. Due to cost of construction, Staff is trying to make decisions at the planning stage that do not destroy existing functional facilities. The plan continues Dual Bravo and pushback zone as discussed previously.

A stakeholder had a concern about the idea of tiering off of other environmental documents, given that this is a substantial project. Ms. McKenney explained that the Port does have approval of other projects and gates that have not been built. The Port's intent would be to make the most of the prior efforts in order to not waste prior moneys spent. Is there anything of value that could be used in the prior review processes that could be applied to a refinement of the project? Do you use it in part and add to it later? Ms. McKenney stated that Staff hoped to have a better idea of their approach by the next stakeholders' meeting and that Staff is asking for concerns to be voiced. Ms. McKenney also stated that, from a footprint perspective, the layout of the current plan may be different, but the extent of the overall footprint is not; it is all paved construction, just as was previously studied. The difference is that the forecasts are huge and could drive impacts from an operational perspective.

Mr. Needle stated a concern for the use of previous documents for this project. The issue is that people who reviewed the previous environmental analyses did not concur with all of the statements or results; he would prefer not to have to go back and figure out all of the pieces that they considered astray at that time. He would prefer sufficient preliminary notice of the approach selected by the Port, so CLASS can determine the action to be taken.

Ms. McKenney presented two other functions that were being considered during the current terminal planning efforts.

When United vacated the Maintenance facility, UPS requested to relocate to that site. They were asked to wait until the master planning process was completed before a decision could be made. As the Master Plan was approved in the spring, UPS is asking again and is very interested. The Port is getting close enough in the terminal planning process to draw a line demarcating an available site and open that dialogue with UPS. Because it is a relocation of an existing operation, and may be smaller, it would probably not require substantial environmental review, and may be able to be reviewed through a categorically ex.

OAK also needs a GSE Maintenance facility that that is in the appropriate place and can support the management of the function. The Port would like to add that project to the terminal and cargo site planning.

Mr. Needle stated a concern that, with moving to North Field, UPS might increase their departures from North Field. While he does not know what to do about that, he would like that to be a discussion. Ms. McKenney stated that there is not enough incentive to use North Field for large heavy aircraft departures, so their aircraft splits and runway usage would remain the same. Additionally, because the forecast indicates that the cargo operations are not during the peak times, congestion would not push cargo departures to North Field.

Mr. Needle stated a concern that, if the GSE support center moves GSE further away from North Field, there needs to be a way to get GSE to and from areas without being on aircraft taxiways. Ms. McKenney agreed; Ms. McKenney stated that, additionally, this would solve a problem of GSE equipment being moved around on off-airport roads.

Out of the Master Plan work, the Port agreed to do two follow-on studies: the Airport Ground Traffic Study Update and the Corporate Jet Noise Abatement Procedure Compliance Study. Staff has prepared draft scopes of work for consultants, and is sharing those scopes and asking for input before they are finalized.

Airport Ground Traffic Study Update

Hugh Johnson handed out the draft scope of work and reviewed it. Mr. Johnson stated that he met with the traffic staff for San Leandro and Alameda, and separately with the traffic staff for Oakland. The Port wants to issue the RFP so work can begin before December, the heaviest cargo traffic month in the year. Data collection is focused on traffic going through the city.

Going through the draft work scope, Mr. Johnson stated that the purpose of the study is to understand current traffic patterns in the vicinity of the airport. The study will require the collection of current information on passenger, employee, and airport cargo related ground traffic, including traffic volumes, existing traffic patterns to and from the airport, and the classification of vehicles. Per Mr. Johnson and as discussed, the big challenge will be identifying the routes to and from the airports. Data itself can be collected through standard means and methods. Oakland has committed to Hegenberger and 98th Avenue as the main routes to and from the Airport, and these routes have been studied. The Airport knows quite a bit less about traffic through Alameda and San Leandro.

One stakeholder requested that if data were collected and not needed for this study, to separate the data but not discard it. Mr. Johnson stated that data relative to volume will be included, but that the analysis on specific streets will be focused on airport traffic. One stakeholder was concerned about a regional approach to the issue. Ms. McKenney stated that she considers it an excellent issue for RAPSI and MTC to research when decisions are considered at that level. Another stakeholder asked if the scope could include a task focused on potential mitigation of observed problems. Ms. McKenney stated that the Staff could think about ways of getting suggestions from the consultants, but that the scope would not be requesting mitigation measures. The purpose of the study is to document existing conditions.

Port Staff will continue to work with the city staff on the project; Port Environmental Staff will be involved in the process so that the resulting baseline data can be used in later, separate studies.

Corporate Jet Noise Abatement Procedure Compliance Study Update

As part of the master planning efforts, the Port found about 98% of the jets comply with the voluntary noise abatement measures that are in place. The study focuses on finding out why that 2% choose not to comply. The study focuses on compliance of jet activity with the existing procedures, not potential changes to the procedures. Christian Valdez presented the draft work plan and thanked Dave for his efforts in developing the work plan. The formal name is the North Field Preferential Runway Use Program. The work plan has three areas: (1) Study the data monitored since 2003, looking for trends (noise type, time of day, etc.) so can see how might influence the compliance rate; (2) Look at the Stage 1 and Stage 2 engines; (3) Look at medical jet activity. Planning and Development will provide oversight

and funding; Noise office will provide PM and support Vince will write up the report and do quantitative work.

Wrap-up Items

Ms. McKenney would like to set next meeting in time to discuss draft recommendations for how to proceed with cargo and terminal work before Staff goes to the Aviation Committee. As requested, the Port can send information out the week before the stakeholders' meeting.

Meeting set for December 14th at 1:00 p.m.