October 28, 2004

To: Kristi McKenney, Aviation Planning Manager

From: Alameda Representatives to Airport Master Plan Stakeholders Committee

Subject: Comments on First Three Airport Master Plan Stakeholder Meetings

At the September 30th, Stakeholder Committee meeting, Port staff requested comments on the material presented to date and specifically requested comments and recommendations on the various alternatives presented for terminal facility expansion. On October 7, 2004 the Alameda representatives to the Airport Master Plan Stakeholder Committee met to discuss our recommendations with a larger group of concerned Alamedan citizens. As a result of our discussion, we have prepared the following comments and recommendations for your consideration:

1. Alameda Concerns: The Alameda representatives continue to be very concerned about the potential impacts of any airport expansion on the residents of Alameda. The primary impacts of the existing airport operations on the residents of Alameda are aircraft noise and safety, aircraft generated air pollution, and airport related automobile traffic. An increase in annual passengers served will result in an increase in these impacts to the residents of Alameda.

2. Mitigation: We recommend that the evaluation of expansion alternatives at future Stakeholder Meetings include discussion of the potential mitigations to eliminate or minimize increases in aircraft noise and safety, aircraft air pollution, and automobile traffic resulting from any airport expansion options.

3. Demand Management: We recommend that the evaluation of Airport expansion options include evaluation of options for demand management strategies to minimize the need to increase the size of the facilities. For example, by strategically spreading flight times throughout the day, existing gates which are being underutilized at certain times might be used to accommodate additional flights, thus reducing the demand for new gates and terminal expansion.

4. Terminal Placement: Because we believe that the concerns of the neighboring jurisdictions must be considered throughout the planning process and that these concerns represent very real constraints on airport expansion options, any comments and recommendations made by the Alameda representatives regarding alternative terminal or taxiway placements based solely upon the 18 million annual passenger (MAP) forecast or the 30 MAP forecast should not be taken by the Port as an implicit endorsement of a plan to expand the airport to accommodate those forecasts. Regarding terminal expansion locations presented to date, we recommend that:
   a. All terminal options in Area 1 should be removed from consideration. Alameda is not in support of any terminal expansions in this location.
   b. Area 2 appears, based upon the information provided, to be the best location for possible terminal expansions. The specific design suggestions will need to include noise, safety, traffic, and pollution mitigation mechanisms.
   c. In Area 3, Option 3a, should not be discarded prematurely. Based upon the information provided, it appears to us that the problems with terminal length can be overcome with “people movers” or “moving sidewalks” and the option provides several advantages including the reduction of additional terminal complexes to satisfy the SWA expansion.

5. Taxiways: At the future meetings, we hope to hear more about the potential advantages of a second taxiway linking North Field to South Field. We are currently of the opinion that a well positioned full size second taxiway will facilitate the movement of smaller jets between the South Field runway and their North Field destination/origin. It is expected that this will reduce the quantity of jets that use the North Field runways.

6. Stakeholder Committee Materials and Presentation: The Airport staff has done an excellent job of preparing and presenting information at the meetings to date. The Alameda representatives appreciate all the efforts that have been made by Kristi and Doug to make information available to us.
November 2, 2004

To: Kristi McKenney, Aviation Planning Manager
From: Oakland Representatives to Airport Master Plan Stakeholders Committee
Re: Potential Terminal Development Concepts

The City of Oakland is pleased to respond to a request for comments to the potential terminal and air cargo developments that have been reviewed over the past several months. We have discussed these options with City officials and other interested community members.

Terminal Development Concepts:

- We believe that Options 1A and 1B should be eliminated due to the gross intrusion of wetlands required and also the consequent expense to utilizing this site for development.
- The series of proposals under Option 2 deserve closer scrutiny and seem to provide the most practical and efficient use of space given the indicated needs and proposed growth. In addition, all of Option 2 appears preferable from an environmental consideration. Although all of Option 2 should be looked at in conjunction with possible Air Cargo expansion there are some concerns we have with specific proposals.
  1. We are concerned about Option 2A due to its increase on the curbside congestion for Terminal 1. This is a complaint voiced by many Oakland users of the Airport and should be acknowledged within the analysis.
  2. Option 2B is based on a remote unit terminal off site. We are informed of the land use constraints and demands in the private property within reasonable proximity to the airport and find the proposal to purchase the amount of land needed for this option unfeasible and impractical. We suggest its elimination.
- We find neither Option 3A or Option 3B viable both because of environmental considerations and because of the placement of facilities closer to residential areas.

Cargo Development Concepts:

- We support the proposal to eliminate Area 1 and Area 3 from consideration due to the obvious constraints of both considerations.

- Both Area 2 and Area 3 should be considered. The proposed Area 3 development should be analyzed in conjunction with the various proposals under Option 2 since they will utilize adjacent areas.

We appreciate the opportunity to represent Oakland’s interest in the proposed expansion of the Oakland Airport and specifically acknowledge the outstanding preparation and presentation done thus far by the Ms. McKenney and Mr. Mansel.
January 21, 2005

Ms. Kristi McKenney, Aviation Planning Manager
Mr. Doug Mansel, Aviation Planner
Port of Oakland
539 Water Street
Oakland, CA 94604

Subject: San Leandro’s Recommendations for Potential Terminal Development Concepts

Dear Ms. McKenney and Mr. Mansel:

The San Leandro members of the Airport Master Plan Stakeholder Committee respectfully submit the following recommendations for planning for potential terminal development at the Oakland International Airport. Our recommendations are predicated on the following positions:

1. San Leandro Stakeholder Committee members cannot support any concept that would facilitate diversion of traffic from South Field to North Field.

2. We cannot support any concept that would develop terminal facilities at the space currently occupied by the Oakland Maintenance Center Hangar.

3. San Leandro will not support expansion of any terminal facilities beyond what the current airfield can support. When OAK reaches current airfield capacity, expansion should stop.

Based on these positions, the consensus of our committee members is that Concept 2B as presented to the Master Plan Stakeholder Committee would be the best to consider for possible future study. This appears to be the most comprehensive solution presented to date. It addresses the need for more terminal space, more parking with potential garage expansion, better vehicle circulation, and upgrades to existing facilities.

However we would prefer to see 15 new gates versus 20. We ask that you plan for the low side of anticipated passenger numbers versus the high side. Eliminating the southern five gates proposed to be parallel to existing Terminal 1 would remove the conflicts with the international terminal.

At most, terminal development should not expand beyond what is proposed as shown. Expansion of the terminal further north cannot be supported.

There should never be any more expansion beyond the number of gates proposed on concept 2B. 2B should meet the passenger demand through 2012. Therefore, there should not be any expansion beyond that volume.

Our comments on the other presented concepts are as follows:

**Concepts 1A and 1B**

- Both concepts are too close to North Field. Taxiway enhancements could encourage diversion of South Field traffic to the North Field. Therefore, San Leandro would oppose both of these concepts.

- San Leandro cannot support a concept that would fill-in significant portions of wetlands.

- San Leandro will support Alameda’s opposition to any concept that would generate more vehicle traffic through Alameda.

**Concepts 2C through 2I**

- 2C, 2D and 2F do not show any connection between parking and the new terminal. How will passengers get from parking to the new terminal?
- 2C, 2E and 2F all show potential expansion of gates toward the North Field. Therefore, San Leandro cannot support these concepts. Proximity of the terminal to the North Field at this location will make it too easy to divert flights to the North Field.
- 2D proposes gates too close to the North Field. Therefore, San Leandro cannot support 2D. Proximity of the terminal to the North Field at this location will make it too easy to divert flights to the North Field.
- 2F concepts show the potential for expansion onto the OMC site, which San Leandro cannot support.
- 2H appears too confusing to travelers, with no connection to the existing terminals. This option of having ticketing, baggage handling and etc. at an off-airport location (close to Coliseum BART?) does not appear practical.
• 2G would create ground traffic conflicts for planes between terminals. It would also create significant distance between parking and existing terminals.

Concepts 3A and 3B

• Again, San Leandro cannot support any concept that will eliminate wetlands, including bay in-fill.

• Regarding 3A, adding new gates without other facility enhancements (i.e. parking, drop-off areas) will only add to congestion.

The following questions remain regarding the concepts that have been presented to the committee.

• Please show the existing and potential future surface parking on concept maps.

• Are you still assuming one main runway will support up to 75 gates?

• Would a new parallel taxiway parallel to Taxiway B ultimately be needed to avoid the same conflicts suggested by 2C – 2F?

Thank you for the opportunity to present our committee member recommendations. We look forward to receiving more detailed information about the Port’s vision of future terminal expansion as the Master Plan progresses.

Sincerely,

Kathy Ornelas
Community Relations Representative

---

OAKLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
Master Plan Open House / Public Meeting
Metro Park Golf Links
March 9, 2005

PORT OF OAKLAND
Please Print

Name (optional): Emilia Martins

Organization (optional): Davis West
Neighbors Group

Comments: I’m glad this international meeting was held. I appreciate the fact that there was not an official program per se allowing people to arrive after the start time. The Port of Oakland staff were knowledgeable and pleasant.

To speak to a Port of Oakland representative directly, please call Robert Bernardo at (510) 627-1401 or e-mail at: rbernard@portoakland.com
Oakland International Airport
Master Plan Open House / Public Meeting
Metropolitan Golf Links
March 9, 2005

PORT OF OAKLAND

COMMENT CARD
Please Print

Name (optional): Wafa A. Abuonsted

Organization (optional): DWNG

Comments: Program & intro's of who is who!

To speak to a Port of Oakland representative directly, please call
Robert Bernardo at (510) 627-1401 or e-mail at:
brbernard@portoakland.com

---

PORT OF OAKLAND

COMMENT CARD
Please Print

Name (optional): Jim Prola

Organization (optional): LABOR

AFSCME

Comments: Am not in favor of expansion, but if it's inevitable then I favor plan B

To speak to a Port of Oakland representative directly, please call
Robert Bernardo at (510) 627-1401 or e-mail at:
brbernard@portoakland.com
Comments: The Port Administration needs to concentrate on improving Oakland's image around the property you own. Landscape the areas around the landing fields so they are more attractive. Please do not put up any billboards at the airport, the estuary, or anywhere else. Don't create ghettos in Oakland.

To speak to a Port of Oakland representative directly, please call Robert Bernard at (510) 627-1401 or e-mail at: rbernard@portoakland.com

City of San Leandro
Civic Center, 835 E. 14th Street
San Leandro, California 94577

September 12, 2005

Ms. Kristi McKenney, Aviation Planning Manager
Mr. Doug Mansel, Aviation Planner
Port of Oakland
530 Water Street
Oakland, CA 94604

Subject: San Leandro's Review of Near-term and Long-term Land-use Maps

Dear Ms. McKenney and Mr. Mansel:

The San Leandro members of the Airport Master Plan Stakeholder Committee have reviewed the drafted Near-term and Long-term land-use maps for the Airport Master Plan. Overall, we have no objections to the two maps as planning tools. We will, of course, want to have ample opportunity to review any projects that are proposed.

As a general rule, San Leandro Stakeholder Committee members continue to maintain the position that we will not support any concept that would facilitate diversion of traffic from the South field to the North field. Additionally, because the wetlands in and around the airport properties are part of a migratory route, we have concerns regarding any developments that would fill wetlands.

Thank you for the opportunity to review these materials. We look forward to reviewing the drafted Master Plan.

Sincerely,

Kathy Ornelas
Community Relations Representative
COMMUNITY AGENDA FOR NEW MASTER PLAN

1. What specific plans will be included in the new master plan to AVOID NEW AIRPLANE NOISE problems resulting from the new airport extensions?

2. What specific noise mitigation plans will be included in the new master plan to ADDRESS NEW AIRPLANE NOISE problems resulting from the new airport extensions?

3. What specific plans will be included in the new master plan to encourage a REDUCTION IN THE USE OF NOISIER AIRCRAFT — especially AT NIGHT?

4. Why can’t some type of NOISE BARRIER be erected to, at least partially, reduce new noise impacts — especially at night — to residents living close to the SOUTH FIELD?

5. What specific mitigation plans will be included in the new master plan to ADDRESS NEW STREET TRAFFIC PROBLEMS resulting from the new airport extensions?

Compiled by San Leandro Community Representatives

PORT OF OAKLAND

December 29, 2005

City of San Leandro Representatives to the Master Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee:

Ms. Kathy Ornelas                     Ms. Debbie Pollart                     Ms. Carmen Fewless
City of San Leandro                   City of San Leandro                     2518 Galleon Place
835 E. 14th Street                    835 E. 14th Street                     San Leandro, CA 94577
San Leandro, CA 94577                 San Leandro, CA 94577                  San Leandro, CA 94577

Mr. James Reynolds                    Mr. Dennis Ronucci                      
1055 Addison Drive                     13111 Neptune Drive
San Leandro, CA 94578                  San Leandro, CA 94578                  

Subject: Response to San Leandro Comments
Master Plan, Oakland International Airport (OAK)

Dear San Leandro Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members:

Thank you for the comments in your letter dated September 12, 2005, and the five questions in your list entitled “Community Agenda for New Master Plan” (handed out at the June 30, 2005, Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting). The following paragraphs outline our response to your comments.

September 12, 2005, Letter

We agree that the City of San Leandro should have opportunity to review and comment on projects as they are proposed after the master plan. As you know, the master plan only suggests projects for further study, such as conceptual engineering, financial feasibility, and environmental review. The Port is committed to working with the San Leandro representatives to address potential effects of Airport growth on neighboring jurisdictions. As outlined in Section 8.3 of the master plan, we suggest establishing a committee so that the Port’s Planning and Development staff can continue to meet, annually or semi-annually, with community and Airport users to provide updates on various projects and Airport activity, and receive input. The City of San Leandro would also be able to provide input on projects as part of environmental reviews required in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

First, as a general rule, airlines prefer the longer runway length at South Field (compared to North Field). The Port also agrees that as a general rule, air traffic should not be diverted from South Field to North Field, except as required for safety, maintenance/construction, emergencies, or other reasons requiring
new terminal in Area 2. The master plan studies, but does NOT recommend, a new taxiway at North Field, south of Runway 9R-27L (see Figure 5.5).

The draft land-use map for 2010 to 2012 (see Figure 8.3) does not show any fill of wetlands. The draft land-use map for 2025 does show possible land uses that might require fill of wetlands. However, it is important to note that the master plan does not discuss any projects in the 2025 timeframe to accommodate unconstrained aviation demand because the master plan is not recommending a new South Field runway (which would likely be required to accommodate the unconstrained demand in 2025). Therefore, it is not reasonable to project that far into the future (see Section 3.1 of the master plan), and the 2025 land-use map shows potential land-uses if ever required.

**Question 1: Specific Plans to Avoid New Airplane Noise**

The Port of Oakland does not (and cannot) control the number or type of aircraft that the airlines (or other aircraft operators) fly in and out of OAK. In fact, under federal grant assurances, airports must make facilities available for public use on reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination to any person, firm, or corporation to conduct or engage in any aeronautical activity. The FAA has determined that some arrangements for accommodation must be made if reasonably possible, and that an airline may not be denied access to an airport solely based on the non-availability of facilities (FAA Order 5190.6A, Airport Compliance Handbook, Section 4-15). Further, the number of airline passengers will likely continue to grow even without new facilities, such as a new terminal building, and the airlines will likely continue to add flights, but existing facilities will operate at poorer and poorer levels of service (e.g., dirty restrooms, cramped hold rooms, long lines at the security checkpoint, etc.). For example, as discussed at the August 19 and September 30, 2004, Stakeholder Advisory Committee meetings, the 18 million annual passengers (MAP) forecast in 2010 might be able to be accommodated at the existing aircraft gates at the Airport, plus those that are currently under construction, albeit at a greatly reduced level of service than if new gates at a new terminal were available. The forecast increase in the number of passenger airline flights/operations (2010 compared to existing conditions in 2004) translates to single-event aircraft noise; however, until additional analyses are performed, it is unclear whether this new aircraft noise results from new projects or the normal growth that would occur even without those projects, as described above. Also, depending on the aircraft types, there may not be a corresponding increase in “airplane noise.”

For air cargo aircraft operations, the Port does have some control because air cargo is more dependent on the availability of facilities. As described in Section 3.3 of the master plan, we are recommending that the Port not aggressively pursue new air cargo development at OAK. This recommendation results in a low air cargo growth forecast (3.59% annual air cargo weight increase) focused on existing air cargo airlines at OAK as they grow in response to the economic growth in the San Francisco Bay Area. In terms of air cargo airline operations (and therefore, flights and single-event aircraft noise), these assumptions result in no new flights at South Field (2010 compared to existing conditions in 2003) and a 2% annual average growth in the small air cargo operations at North Field (e.g., Ameriflight). Therefore, we have listened to the input from the Stakeholder Advisory Committee about aircraft noise, and the master plan is recommending not to pursue an aggressive air cargo marketing campaign, resulting in fewer flights and less single-event aircraft noise.

The master plan compares aircraft noise anticipated in 2010 (based on the forecasts) to existing aircraft noise in 2004 (see Sections 6.3.8 through 6.3.10 in the master plan), both in terms of nighttime single event noise contours and community noise equivalent level (CNEIL) contours, a time-weighted average measurement of noise. Although there will be “new” aircraft operations resulting in more flights and noise resulting from those flights (see Figures 6.3-1 and 6.3-2), it is anticipated that there will be less overall CNEIL noise footprint in 2010 (compared to existing conditions in 2004) because it is anticipated
recognize that environmental review for the first project under the Master Plan must comprehensively evaluate the environmental impacts associated with accommodating 30 million passengers per year.

Demand Management: We reiterate the request in our October 28, 2004 letter that the Master Plan comprehensively evaluate demand management strategies to accommodate forecasted passenger levels. For example, by strategically spreading flight times throughout the day, existing gates, which are being underutilized at certain times, might be used to accommodate additional flights, thus reducing the demand for new gates and terminal expansion. As part of the Master Plan planning process, Port staff should evaluate demand management strategies that have been implemented at other airports.

Airfield Planning — Alternative Taxiways: The Master Plan is proposing alternative taxiways to improve access to Runway 29 and generally improve the connection between the North and South Fields. The Alameda representatives strongly support improving circulation access between the North and South Fields in an effort to encourage North Field based aircraft to use Runway 29 for departure (consistent with the 1976 Settlement Agreement). To that end we believe that Taxiway T3 may provide an attractive alternative, provided it is coupled with continuous two-way flow to Taxiway W. We also believe that the recommended improvements to Runway 29, coupled with this facilitated flow might be an incentive for increased use of Runway 29 by North Field aircraft. We therefore recommend detailed consideration of Taxiway T3, together with, not as an alternative to, a new taxiway parallel to and east of Taxiway B. We also request that the Port consider the feasibility of Taxiway T0 (zero), which would allow planes a path not blocked by departures on Runway 27. Finally, we request that the Port run simulations that describe the airfield circulation performance of the various taxiway layout alternatives. It is important to evaluate the numerical simulation results describing the performance of the different alternatives, but the only information currently available to us is the text on the layout plans. A detailed review of these airfield simulations will enable the Alameda representatives to more fully understand the Airfield layout.

facilities accommodating some of the increase in cargo demand. In particular, the Alameda representatives recommend that the Master Plan evaluate the potential for Mather Air Force Base to accommodate some portion of increased Bay Area cargo operations. Finally, as we stated above in regards to environmental review for passenger operations, environmental review for the first project under the Master Plan must comprehensively evaluate the environmental impacts associated with accommodating 1.5 MAT of cargo operations.

Parking and Passenger Facility Locations: The 2010 and 2025 Land Use Plans identify a large new parking area on Ron Cowan Parkway adjacent to the City of Alameda. The plans also show continued use of the area on Doolittle Drive for rental cars or other passenger facilities. The Alameda representatives are concerned with the number of cars that cut through Alameda to access the Airport. Locating long term parking and rental car facilities adjacent to Alameda on Doolittle Drive and Ron Cowan Parkway will increase the number of future passengers who will choose to cut through Alameda, park or drop off their car, and then proceed to the Airport. We recommend that the Master Plan evaluate the feasibility of locating all parking and rental car facilities serving passengers along the airport’s primary access routes of 98th Avenue and Hegenberger Road, and Airport Drive. Additionally, for parking and rental car facilities that might remain or be constructed on Doolittle Drive or Ron Cowan Parkway, we recommend that the Master Plan evaluate traffic control strategies and design features that would guide the vehicles to/from 98th Avenue rather than Alameda roadways.

Traffic Monitoring: Given the potential increase in vehicular traffic accessing the airport via Alameda roadways, we request that the Master Plan contain a program for on-going monitoring of airport-generated traffic using Alameda bridges. Monitoring results would then be used to calculate the Port’s pro rata share of necessary improvements to Alameda roadways.

Transit Mitigation: Passenger growth over the next 20 years will impact the I-880 freeway and the interchanges providing access to the airport. Moreover, regional growth over this same period will also contribute to worsening traffic congestion. The Master Plan should include considerations for costs and funding additional transit service in Oakland, Alameda, and San Leandro to mitigate the regional traffic impacts that will be caused by increasing passenger and cargo activity.

Airport BART Connector: Given the traffic impacts of airport expansion, we recommend that the Master Plan make a strong commitment to the Airport BART connector and that the final 2010 and 2025 Land Use Plans graphically depict the Airport BART Connector.

Noise Reduction: We recommend that the Master Plan prioritize improvements that will facilitate the use of Runway 29 by North Field pilots. To this end, Alameda representatives strongly encourage the Master Plan to consider airfield circulation when recommendations are set forth regarding passenger terminal areas. Specifically, while it is possible to meet terminal planning objectives with a variety of configurations that can fit in Area 2, an
important criterion for selection should be the impact on airfield circulation. As discussed
above, the provision of effective circulation from the North to the South Field is an important
incentive to reduce departures on Runway 27.

Air Quality Mitigation and Monitoring: We recommend that the Master Plan include a clear
commitment to continue the implementation of best management practices for fuel
management and continue to support the use of non-fossil fuel vehicles in use at the Airport
and environs. In addition we recommend that the Master Plan include air quality monitoring
stations capable of detecting toxic air contaminants within the residential communities
adjacent to the airport and make the monitoring results publicly available.

Prioritized Improvement Schedule: The 2010 and 2025 Land Use Plans include a large
number of recommended improvements. We recommend that the Master Plan include a
prioritization or schedule for improvements. The purpose of the prioritization or schedule
would be to clarify which improvements the Port believes to be the highest priority and
which improvements may be dependent on completion of other improvements. This
information will give all participants and interested parties a better understanding of the
timing and sequence of activities.

Stakeholder Committee Materials and Presentation. Doug Mansel and Kristi McKenney
have done an excellent job of preparing and presenting data and reports to the Stakeholder
members. We appreciate their willingness to entertain questions and provide thorough, well-
reasoned responses. The Alameda representatives now have a greater appreciation for and
understanding of the complexities associated with airport planning. More importantly, we
continue to believe that the Alameda representatives’ participation in the Master Plan process
has greatly improved the relationship between neighborhood representatives and the Port.

Citizens’ League for Airport Safety and Serenity
a corporation of homeowner associations formed to protect the safety, health & welfare of people living in
communities near the Oakland Airport

November 23, 2005

To: Kristi McKenney, Aviation Planning Manager
   Douglas Mansel, Aviation Planner

From: CLASS

Subject: Addendum to Alameda Representatives Comments on Near Term Land Use
         Map (2010-12) and Long Term Land Use Map (2025)

Along with other Alameda Representatives, members of CLASS prepared comments and
recommendations (dated 12 October 2005, from Alameda Representatives to Airport Master
Plan Stakeholders Committee) on the Near-Term and Long-Term Land Use Maps. That
letter contains a request for detailed airfield circulation simulations to help evaluate the merit
of the suggested taxiway alternatives.

In view of the data from the Port’s taxiway timing analysis that shows a non-significant
average improvement of taxi-time, and the CLASS investigation into the case-by-case
occurrences of jets departing North Field indicating a significant quantity of taxiway
blockage and queue delay events, we are requesting that the Master Plan include a case-by-

This analysis should include all available data such as taxiway conditions, South Field
runway conditions and runway congestion. And since the events are often the result of pilot-
ATC conversations, the audio recordings of those conversations should also be part of the
investigation data. Additionally, the investigation should include meetings with the pilots,
Air Traffic Controllers, and airfield operators regarding both their actions and their views of
these and other taxiway alternatives.

The goal of this investigation is to determine the merits of the suggested taxiway alternatives
in the reduction of North Field jet departures.

Thank you

Gary Hoffer
President, CLASS

PMB #151, 875-A Island Drive ● Alameda, CA 94502 ● (510) 433-7949
PORT OF OAKLAND

December 14, 2005

City of Alameda Representatives to the Master Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee:

Mr. Andrew Thomas
City of Alameda
2263 Santa Clara Avenue
Alameda, CA 94501

Ms. Marge McLean
City of Alameda
2263 Santa Clara Avenue
Alameda, CA 94501

Mr. David Needle
2981 Northwood
Alameda, CA 94501

Mr. Red Wetherill
28 Cove Road
Alameda, CA 94502

Mr. Walt Jacobs
28 Bailey Bay
Alameda, CA 94502

CLASS Representatives to the Master Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee:

Ms. Barbara Tuleja
22 Parcell Drive
Alameda, CA 94502

Ms. Eileen Bitten
115 Parcell Drive
Alameda, CA 94502

Ms. Laurel Impert
CLASS Staff Representative
396 Hayes Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

Mr. Gary Hoffer
President, CLASS
PMB #151, 875-A Island Drive
Alameda, CA 94502

Subject: Response to Alameda Comments on the Draft Land-Use Maps

Dear Alameda Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members:

Thank you for your letter dated October 26, 2005, and the Citizens’ League for Airport Safety and Serenity (CLASS) addendum dated November 23, 2005, providing us with your comments on the draft land-use maps. The following paragraphs outline our response to your comments using the same headings from your October 26, 2005, letter, as we discussed at our informal meeting on December 1, 2005.

Environmental Impacts

It is important to note that the 2025 land use map will likely not accommodate 30 million annual passengers (MAP) because a new South Field runway is not proposed (i.e., the existing South Field Runway 11-29 would likely not be able to accommodate the aircraft operations required to serve 30 MAP, given the forecast aircraft fleet mix). The 30 MAP forecast for 2022 is unconstrained (i.e., it is a forecast of how many people would naturally want to use the Airport assuming that there were no facility limitations). When 30 MAP is discussed in the master plan, we have tried to make it clear that 30 MAP will likely not be realized.

The Port is committed to work with Alameda representatives to address potential effects of Airport growth on neighboring jurisdictions. As outlined in Section 8.3 of the master plan, we suggest establishing a committee so that the Port’s Planning and Development staff can continue to meet, annually or semi-annually, as needed, with community and Airport users to provide updates on various projects and Airport activity, and receive input. We also recommend conducting an Airport ground traffic study in association with the cities of Alameda and San Leandro.

Future environmental documents will look at cumulative environmental effects in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). These environmental documents may or may not include all of the master plan projects, but only those that are reasonably anticipated to be in place in the selected “out year” in accordance with CEQA and NEPA requirements. It is unlikely that any documents will analyze the effects of 30 MAP because the master plan is not proposing a new runway, as described above. Further, the master plan does not recommend any projects to accommodate aviation demand in 2025. It is not reasonable to plan projects that far into the future (see Section 3.1.3 of the master plan). The 2025 land-use map shows potential land-uses if ever required.

As a point of clarification, the number of airline passengers that used OAK in calendar year 2004 was 14.1 million (14.1 MAP). For the last 12 months ending October 2005, OAK served over 14.4 MAP.

Demand Management

The Port does not control when the airlines fly airplanes in and out of OAK, as explained at the Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting on September 30, 2004. No U.S. airport has implemented demand management strategies to avoid constructing terminal facilities or minimize potential environmental effects. In fact, under Federal grant assurances, airports must make facilities available for public use on reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination to any person, firm, or corporation to conduct or engage in any aeronautical activity. The FAA has determined that some arrangements for accommodation must be made if reasonably possible, and that an airline may not be denied access to an airport solely based on the non-availability of facilities (FAA Order 5190.6A, Airport Compliance Handbook, Section 4-15).

The FAA has implemented a form of demand management called “slot controls” at a few U.S. airports with excessive air traffic control delay (e.g., 15 to 20 minutes of delay per aircraft on average throughout the entire day), such as LaGuardia Airport. Slots are essentially take-off or landing reservations, and the FAA issues only so many each hour of the day (similar to a popular, busy restaurant). The airlines can buy and sell slots and there are “use it or lose it” provisions. In general, the FAA is trying to phase-out slot controls and is researching other demand management strategies to address air traffic control delay, such as congestion or peak-hour pricing and slot auctions. However, these are only at airports with significantly more activity and congestion than OAK, and therefore, demand management strategies are not a tool that is available at OAK, at least through the near-term (2010 to 2012) planning horizon.

Airfield Planning – Alternate Taxiways

The Port is committed to its existing voluntary noise abatement procedures, which requires jets and large turboprops to take-off on Runway 29 (in west plan), as opposed to the runways at North Field. As such, the Port recognizes the need for an efficient taxiway system linking North Field (where corporate jets and large turboprops park) and South Field (where Runway 29 is located).
As a point of clarification, the master plan is not proposing alternative taxiways; however, the master plan does study alternative taxiways. The master plan studied five potential new taxiways linking North Field and South Field (T0 through T4), as shown on Figure 5.6. As described in your letter, Figure 5.6 does indeed outline planning considerations associated with each potential alternative. The master plan also contains Table 5.1 (presented at the March 31, 2005, Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting), which computes the distance and time increase or decrease associated with aircraft using each of the potential alternative taxiways. As summarized on the table, the best potential alternative taxiway (T3) only provides a 1% or 1 minute taxi time saving on an otherwise 9 minute taxi time from North Field to South Field. As such, the master plan concludes that none of the alternative North Field-South Field taxiway connectors provide any meaningful benefit.

However, based on the airfield simulation model (see Section 5.2), the Port did discover that there was indeed a significant amount of taxi delay on the South Field portion of Taxiway B (the existing North Field-South Field taxiway connector), generally between Taxiway T and Taxiway B2. This delay was being caused by corporate jets (or large turboprops) taxiing from North Field to South Field (southbound on Taxiway B) while other aircraft, such as FedEx airplanes going to the Metroplex apron, were taxiing northbound on Taxiway B. As part of the master plan, the Port is proposing (for further study and evaluation) a new taxiway parallel and east of existing Taxiway B, generally between Taxiways T and B2, to alleviate this head-to-head taxiway congestion, as well as provide efficient access to a potential new terminal in this area. This taxiway is shown conceptually on Figures 5.2 and 5.3 in the master plan. This taxiway will keep South Field as a convenient as possible for use by corporate jets and large turboprops, in accordance with the Port’s voluntary noise abatement procedures.

Taxiway T0 provides limited benefits in reducing delay crossing Runways 27L and 27R (for an aircraft taxiing from North Field to South Field). In order to provide any significant benefit, it would need to be constructed as a "perimeter taxiway." A perimeter taxiway takes aircraft far enough around the end of the runways that they do not have to stop and wait from clearance to cross from the traffic control tower. However, Taxiway T0 would need to be constructed well into the Metropolitan Golf Links golf course and possibly into the City of San Leandro in order to be considered a perimeter taxiway. Therefore, this taxiway alternative has not been recommended for further consideration in the master plan.

Your letter dated October 26, 2005, suggests using a computer simulation to further study the North Field-South Field taxiway connectors. Computer simulation may not be a useful tool in this instance because the programmer has to tell the simulation model how assign aircraft to the various taxiways. However, we do agree that the Port and CLASS and/or City of Alameda could jointly undertake a study to better understand why some flight crews choose not to comply with the Port’s voluntary noise abatement procedures, as suggested in the CLASS addendum dated November 23, 2005. This type of study will be recommended in the master plan. It should be noted, however, that almost 98% of corporate jets and turboprops comply with the voluntary noise abatement procedures and that the top three reasons for refusal are wear and tear on the aircraft (due to the long taxi distance), the cost of fuel (due to the long taxi distance), and taxi time (due to the long taxi distance).

Cargo Operations

There is a strong link between cargo weight, number of air cargo operations, and planning areas, unlike passenger airlines. More judgment and less calculation is involved. For example, the master plan is suggesting that the Port not pursue an aggressive air cargo growth program (due to community concerns over potential environmental effects of aggressive air cargo growth), which results in the lowest reasonable air cargo growth projections for OAK. As a result, air cargo growth is anticipated to occur only at existing air cargo tenants, as outlined in the master plan (Sections 3.3 and 4.3). As a result of this choice, any unmet demand would either not happen or occur at another airport (such as Mather Airport, as suggested in your letter).

As described above, future environmental documents will look at cumulative environmental effects in accordance with CEQA and NEPA. These environmental documents may or may not include all of the master plan projects, but only those that are reasonably anticipated to be in place in the selected “out year.” Further, the master plan does not recommend any projects (for further study) to accommodate aviation demand in 2025. It is not reasonable to plan projects that far into the future (see Section 3.1.3 of the master plan). The 2025 land-use map shows potential land-uses if ever required.

Parking and Passenger Facility Locations

The Port prefers that parking and rental cars be located as close as possible to the terminals. This arrangement is more convenient for airline passengers and employees and more cost effective for the Port (there would be less busing costs). However, as the terminal area becomes more congested, it might not be possible to keep all parking and rental car activity at South Field.

The master plan suggests that the Port, Alameda, and San Leandro jointly undertake a traffic monitoring study (Section 8.3).

Traffic Monitoring

The master plan suggests that the Port, Alameda, and San Leandro jointly undertake a traffic monitoring study (Section 8.3). As was the case in the Airport Development Program (ADP) environmental documents, the Port would expect to commit to paying its pro rata share of intersection improvements in the City of Alameda as a result of significant traffic impacts identified in future environmental documents. As you know, intersections within the City of Alameda are within the City’s jurisdiction, and therefore only the City can effect any intersection improvements.

Transit Mitigation

This suggestion is generally beyond the scope of the master plan and may not be possible because of FAA revenue diversion rules (see Section 7.2.3). Other Important Regulations and Requirements, for more discussion of revenue diversion). However, it is important to note that the Port is committed to public transportation and high-occupancy vehicle access to OAK. For example, the Port has already invested $2.5 million in planning and is planning to commit over $25 million to the construction of the on-Airport portions of the BART Connector, which is a BART project that would construct a people mover to link the Coliseum BART station and the terminals at OAK. Further, OAK has committed curbside access to public transportation and high-occupancy vehicles modes, such as AC Transit, other scheduled buses, and door-to-door vans. The Port is spending over $90 million to reconstruct the loop roadway and curbsides to keep OAK convenient for all ground access modes.

Airport BART Connector

We have shown the AirBART Connector on the 2025 land-use map (it will likely not be constructed in the 2010 to 2012 timeframe).

Noise Reduction

We agree with the recommendation to give high priority to airfield circulation when considering a terminal in Area 2. In fact, we are proposing to construct a new taxiway, parallel to Taxiway B to
improve airfield circulation and keep South Field as convenient as possible for North Field aircraft, as described above.

Air Quality Mitigation and Monitoring

The Port is committed to minimizing the potential effects of Airport operations and improving air quality. The master plan highlights specific programs that the Port does to accomplish this commitment (see Section 6.4.1). However, it is not appropriate for the Port to commit to installing air monitoring stations in the master plan at this time. The Port can continue research into the usefulness of air monitoring stations and potential costs. The Port is also committed to continue assisting the FAA in its research on aircraft emissions (see Section 6.4.1. Aircraft Emissions).

Prioritized Improvement Schedule

A list of potential near-term (2010 to 2012) projects for further study is included in the master plan (Section 8.3).

Thank you for taking the time to provide a detailed comment letter on the draft land-use maps discussed at the August 11, 2005, Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting. Your input has been valuable and had a true impact on the conclusions and recommendations in the master plan. We look forward to bringing the master plan process to a close and continuing to work with the City of Alameda, CLASS, and other communities as projects are further evaluated and potentially implemented.

Sincerely,

Kristi McKenney
Aviation Planning and Development Manager

cc: Douglas Mansel

City of San Leandro
Civic Center, 835 E. 14th Street
San Leandro, California 94577

Office of the City Manager 510-577-3351
FAX 510-577-3340

January 11, 2006

Ms. Kristi McKenney, Aviation Planning and Development Manager
Mr. Doug Mansel, Aviation Planner
Port of Oakland
530 Water Street
Oakland, CA 94604-2064

Subject: Comments to the Draft Master Plan for the Oakland International Airport

Dear Ms. McKenney and Mr. Mansel:

The following are comments to the Draft Master Plan submitted by the San Leandro City and community representatives to the Master Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee.

Permit me to preface these comments by thanking you and your staff, on behalf of the San Leandro committee members, for your assistance and guidance through this lengthy process. We have appreciated the amount of time, energy, expertise, and patience you have demonstrated throughout. We have all enjoyed and been enlightened by this opportunity.

Comments:

1. It would be appropriate to include a glossary with all of the acronyms. More than one of us has noticed it is difficult to recall technical references or titles made in early chapters.

2. Page E-1 – Don’t split tables between 2 pages, or if you must, include table headings on the second page.

3. Page E-2 shows the first reference to the term “unconstrained”. There needs to be an explanation of this term early on, since it is used in a number of references.

4. Page E-2 – Under Potential Airline Passenger Development, in the first paragraph, we ask that there be a rewording of paragraph so that it is clear that Port doesn’t actually need additional gates. You just want them so that passengers may get through gates in less time.
5. Page E-3 – The first paragraph under Potential Air Cargo Development should include the same statement that is made in other sections of MP that cargo forecasting was based on growth of existing cargo carriers and that the Port will not aggressively market new carriers.

6. Page E-3 – In the last sentence under Potential GA Development we request you change the statement to read “The Stakeholder Advisory Committee had comments, but did not recommend any changes on the potential general aviation development.”

7. Page E-3 – Under Potential Airfield Development, the section needs to state very clearly that no specific is being proposed for long-term forecast. Is it a valid assumption that, assuming the fleet remains similar to today, the airport cannot accommodate 30 million passengers?

8. Page E-4 – The second sentence of the second full paragraph should be changed to read “Most members preferred not to discuss…” rather than “Some members preferred not to discuss…”

9. Page E-4 – In the third paragraph in discussing RON, of the estimated 23-46 acres of RON required in 2010-2012 timeframe, how much acreage already exists? Also, how realistic a number is this “unconstrained” analysis?

10. Page E-4 – In the first paragraph under Airline-Related Support Facilities, are the parking areas referred to public and/or employee? That should be clarified.

11. Page E-4 – In the last sentence under Airport Ground Access, change “…should be considered for future airline…” to “…could be considered for future airline.” In addition, state why this location is the best choice for this use.

12. Page E-4 – Under Environmental Considerations, please give an explanation for the term “screening-level.” Also, indicate that this preliminary screening was done by Port staff and not technical specialists.

13. Page E-5 – In the first full paragraph please change “One environmental consideration…” to “The environmental consideration…” It should also be noted that it is not just the CNEL level of noise, but the duration over a 24-hour period that impacts residents. For example, the old, noisy fleet may be replaced with quieter planes, but now traffic is going 23-hours a day instead of 20. Is there really any improvement to quality of life for residents? We would argue that the answer is “no”.

14. Page E-5 – Shouldn’t the last sentence of the first full paragraph indicate “the forecast contours to the northwest of the airport…”?

15. Page E-5 – A reference should be made to the truck traffic study requested by the Stakeholder Committee members, since this issue was voiced as a concern during the MP process but never addressed.

16. Page 2-1 – At the end of the first paragraph, Davis Street (SR 61) should be added as another major roadway serving OAK.

17. Pages 3-9 and 3-10 – The references to jets should be clarified to be business jets or general aviation jets. While the stakeholders recognize the reference is for general aviation operations during the Southeast Plan, some may misunderstand and think that commercial jets have the ability to depart from North Field during those weather conditions.

18. Page 4-7 – In the discussion regarding the disadvantages to mixing lighter aircraft with larger aircraft, it would be helpful to add a sentence to the end of the first full paragraph that indicates that the same reasoning (delays in flights, bad to mix larger and smaller planes) supports the position that air carriers and other South Field traffic would not be encouraged to use the North Field, regardless of the proximity of terminal facility expansions. Or this comment could be added to the end of the first paragraph on page 4-5, addressing San Leandro concerns about transferring South Field traffic to North Field.

19. Page 6-10 – In the discussion regarding noise analysis methodology, there should be some explanation of the difference between A-weighted and C-weighted noise (shown in Fig. 6-2) and how there are no regulatory standards for measuring or mitigating impacts from C-weighted noise.

20. Page 6-12 – In the reference to “Noise Insulation Program”, San Leandro’s Airport Noise Insulation Program, which is underway, was not mentioned.

21. Pages 6-15 – 6-4.4 says “As described in Section 6.3, the Port has worked with surrounding communities to develop…” but we did not see a reference to the working groups in that section. Also, the working groups should be mentioned by name (North Field Study Group, South Field Study Group, Noise Forum). Many of the noise abatement measures have come about as a result of settlement agreements between the Port and the Cities of San Leandro and Alameda.

22. Page 6-20 or subsequent pages – There should be a comment that any proposed noise barrier could only reduce A-weighted noise; C-weighted noise would not be affected by any such barrier.

23. Page 6-21 – This section could be re-worked in light of the meeting held with residents of Neptune Drive on January 5, 2006. Reference could be made to the strong preference of the Neptune Drive residents that the noise barrier be built on airport property and not on Neptune Drive properties.
24. Page 6-22 – The last sentence of the first paragraph should explain why the noise barrier would be effective only for the first row of homes on the Bay. Also, a question regarding the noise barrier. The last sentence of the second full paragraph in the second column (For an on-Airport barrier ...) comments on a constant noise reduction until the aircraft climbs high enough to be seen above the barrier. Will there be a sudden noise increase once the aircraft climbs above the level of the barrier or would the noise grow gradually? That could have a dramatic effect.

25. Page 6-23 – Again, reference should be made to the meeting with Neptune Drive residents and property owners on January 5 and their strong preference for the barrier to be studied on airport property. Mention should also be made regarding the suggestion that was made at that meeting that the Port re-visit the concept of a cross-wind runway as a noise mitigation measure, accompanied by noise barrier walls at the east end of such a runway.

26. Page 7-2 – Compensatory Cost Centers – Can the concept of charging cargo companies for tonnage be considered, equivalent to the fees airlines pay for enplaned passengers?

27. Page 8-2 – In the second column, first bullet of "In addition to these projects...", strike "either on Airport or along Neptune Drive".

28. Page 8-3 – The sixth bullet refers to seismic strengthening to the perimeter of Runway 11-29. Would this need to be taken into consideration before a noise barrier could be designed on the southeast side of that levee?

In the Summary of Near-Term Master Plan Projects Recommended for Further Study, the final bullet on Page 8-2 recommends the establishment of a committee to continue meetings with the Port’s Planning and Development staff and community stakeholders to provide updates on projects and receive input from the community. We ask that the Port Board of Directors endorse this recommendation. We agree that the continued communication between the Port and the community is invaluable as the Port considers development projects at OAK.

Finally, regarding environmental concerns, we feel that stronger commitments should have been made in the Draft Master Plan by the Port regarding mitigating noise impacts to surrounding communities. Assumptions are being made regarding a significant increase to the number of commercial airline flights anticipated by 2010. While noise contour forecasts may indicate CNEL levels remaining similar to today or shrinking, it is logical to conclude that single event noise incidents will increase. While Federal and State regulatory standards rely on DNL and CNEL measurements, all parties, including the Port, have acknowledged that single events are disruptive and intrusive, particularly during nighttime hours. Therefore, the Port should take a more proactive stance in addressing noise impacts from the airport’s operations as it considers the need to expand airport facilities.

Thank you, again, for the opportunity to participate in this process and for consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Kathy Ornelas
Community Relations Representative

C: City Council Airport Committee
San Leandro Stakeholder Committee Members
February 7, 2006

City of San Leandro Representatives to the Master Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee:

Ms. Kathy Ornelas  Ms. Debbie Pollart  Ms. Carmen Fewless
City of San Leandro  City of San Leandro  2516 Galleon Place
835 E. 14th Street  835 E. 14th Street  San Leandro, CA 94577
San Leandro, CA 94577

Mr. James Reynolds  Mr. Dennis Rosucci
1055 Adison Drive  13111 Neptune Drive
San Leandro, CA 94578  San Leandro, CA 94577

Subject: Response to San Leandro Comments
Master Plan, Oakland International Airport (OAK)

Dear San Leandro Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members:

Thank you for the comments in your letter dated January 11, 2006. The following paragraphs outline our response to your comments using the same numbering used in your letter to us.

1. We will include a glossary of acronyms in the final master plan (Appendix D).

2. The final master plan will not contain tables split between pages or columns.

3. The final master plan will include an explanation of the term “unconstrained” in the Executive Summary.

4. We have added a brief discussion of the concept of level of service to the first paragraph under “Potential Airline Passenger Development” in the Executive Summary. We, however, disagree with the characterization that the gates are not needed and that they only allow passengers to “get through gates in less time.” These additional gates are indeed required to accommodate the forecast increase in the number of airline passengers at a reasonable level of service. Although it might be possible to accommodate the anticipated number of airline passengers through fewer gates, the level of service would be very poor, resulting in crowded corridors, long lines at security checkpoints, and facilities that cannot be maintained because they are in use all or most of the time, similar to the existing conditions at Terminals 1 and 2. In fact, these gates are required not only to accommodate the anticipated increase in the number of airline passengers, but also allow these facilities to function and be maintained while providing a reasonable (not opulent) level of service for airline passengers and Airport tenants.

5. Under “Potential Air Cargo Development,” the Executive Summary states that the “master plan recommends accommodating the lowest forecast of air cargo activity, rather than an aggressive forecast that would require a significant amount of new development.” It goes on to say that “only a modest amount of additional on-Airport area would be needed to accommodate future air cargo growth, and this area would likely be needed adjacent to existing air cargo facilities.” Further, under “Background and Overview,” the Executive Summary states that “air cargo growth is focused on existing air cargo tenants; a low-growth air cargo forecast is recommended as the Port intends to de-emphasize marketing new air cargo airlines and service.”

6. We have included this comment in the Executive Summary as suggested.

7. Under “Potential Airfield Development,” the Executive Summary states that “it is recommended that the Port not pursue a new South Field runway at this time due to environmental and financial constraints.” Further, under “Background and Overview,” the Executive Summary states that “projects are not proposed to accommodate long-term (2025) forecasts, which are speculative and not reasonably foreseeable at this time. Further, the long-term, unconstrained airline passenger forecasts are not likely to be realized due to limitations on South Field (air carrier) runway capacity (i.e., a new runway is not proposed in this master plan.”

In general, it is a reasonable assumption that, assuming the aircraft fleet using the Airport remains similar to today, the Airport cannot likely accommodate 30 million annual passengers (MAP). We have added a discussion to the Executive Summary (under “Summary of Aviation Activity Forecasts”) that describes the difficulty associated with estimating constrained demand for 2025 (i.e., given the capacity limitation of Runway 11-29 at South Field). Constrained airline passenger forecasts are dependent on many future variables including fleet mix, aircraft seating configurations, load factors, assumed taxiway and other airfield improvements, amount of delay that the airlines and airline passengers are willing to tolerate, air travel market considerations, air traffic control rules and procedures, required aircraft-to-aircraft separations due to wake vortices, all of which are likely to change between now and 2025.

8. We have included your suggested change in the Executive Summary (under “Potential Airfield Development”).

9. In the Executive Summary under “Potential Airfield Development,” we have included an estimate of the area (in acres) of remote (on-Airport, off-gate) remain overnight (RON) aircraft parking available in February 2005, as well as the amount that is planned to be available after the Terminal 2 renovation/extension is complete. The estimated range in the future remote RON aircraft parking represents our “best guess” on the area that might be required for this activity. We anticipate that the Airport will continue to have a high demand for RON aircraft parking, whether at aircraft gates or remote aprons (off-gate). The detailed calculations and explanation, which were reviewed with the Stakeholder Advisory Committee, are contained in Chapter 5, Section 5.6 of the final master plan.

10. The parking areas referred to here are for ground service equipment (GSE), not the public or employees. All GSE must have a safe place to park so that it does not interfere with the safe movement of aircraft and vehicles operating on the airfield and aprons. We have clarified this section...
by adding “GSE” in front of “parking areas” under “Airline-Related Support Facilities” in the Executive Summary.

11. In the Executive Summary under “Airport Ground Access,” we have changed “should” to “could,” as you suggest. We have also added that this area could be considered because “of this location’s good roadway access to/from the terminal complex and the availability of a large, upland area.”

12. In the Executive Summary under “Environmental Considerations,” we have clarified that “Port staff considered environmental issues at a screening-level (identifying key environmental benefits and constraints).” We have included similar clarifications in Chapter 6, Section 6.5 of the final master plan.

13. In the Executive Summary under “Environmental Considerations,” we have changed “One environmental consideration . . .” to “The environmental consideration . . .” as you suggest. We also added the single event noise discussion stating that the increase in flights “translates to more single aircraft overflight noise events.” The tradeoff between the number of flights (which is anticipated to increase) and the noise that each of these flights generates (which is anticipated to decrease due to the slow phase-out of the cargo Boeing 727 and, in general, new aircraft and engine technologies) is why the master plan and future environmental documents look at not only time-weighted, cumulative noise contours, but also single aircraft overflight noise contours.

14. We have added the word “forecast” as you suggest (in the Executive Summary, under “Environmental Considerations”).

15. We have added a brief discussion of (1) the Airport ground traffic study, (2) the Neptune Drive noise barrier study, and (3) the North Field general aviation jet “deviations” study to the Executive Summary under “Environmental Considerations.”

16. We have added Davis Street (State Route 61) to the list of major roadways serving the Airport. We have also added Davis Street (State Route 61) to the list of access roadways on Figure 2.2.

17. We have added “general aviation” in front of “jets” in Section 3.4.2 summarizing noise abatement procedures, as you suggest.

18. In Section 4.2.5, under the discussion of San Leandro representatives comments, we have added that “from a runway capacity perspective, it would not be desirable to mix lighter general aviation aircraft that operate at North Field with larger aircraft flown by the passenger airlines.”

19. We have expanded the discussion of A-weighted versus C-weighted scales and described some of the issues associated with using C-weighted scales in Section 6.3.1 under “Characteristics of Sound, Sound Level and Frequency” of the final master plan (in the paragraph that references Figure 6.3).

20. This section on “Noise Insulation Program” has been deleted from Section 6.4 (Other Environmental Programs and Policies) because it is already addressed in Section 6.3.7 and Figure 6.12, including the City of San Leandro Sound Insulation Program. Similarly, Section 6.4.4 (Noise Abatement) in the draft master plan has been deleted.

21. As described in our response to Comment #20 (above), we have deleted Section 6.4.4 from the draft master plan because noise abatement is already addressed in Section 6.3.7 and Figure 6.12.

22. This contention is not true. A noise barrier would affect higher frequency sounds. Both the A and C scale measure high frequency sound so both would be affected. The A scale may be affected more, but the significance of the difference cannot be known without knowing the frequency of the sound.

23. The input received at the January 5, 2006, Neptune Drive neighborhood meeting is contained at the end of Section 6.6.5 in the final master plan. We state that “all homeowners along the west side of Neptune Drive that expressed an opinion indicated that they did not want a noise barrier constructed in their rear yards despite the potential noise reduction benefit . . . . instead, they requested that the Port continue to study the costs and benefits of constructing an Airport noise barriers.”

24. We have added a brief discussion on why a potential noise barrier is only effective for the first row of homes along Neptune Drive (along San Francisco Bay) to the end of Section 6.6.2 (The Noise Barrier Effect) in the final master plan: “This limited benefit if because the homes along the west side of Neptune Drive already serve as a noise barrier and block much of the high-frequency taxi and Runway 29 take-off roll noise from the rest of the neighborhood.”

In Section 6.6.5 of the final master plan, we have added the following discussion: “When the aircraft rises above the noise barrier, the noise increase will be sudden. However, since the noise barrier reduction at this point is about 5 dBA, the increase would not be considered dramatic.”

25. See response to Comment #23 (above). We have included that the neighbors expressed an interest in further studying on-Airport noise barriers (which can include those associated with other runways).

26. We have added discussion in “Airline Cost Per Enplaned Passenger” under Section 7.2.3 in the final master plan to indicate that the passenger airlines do not pay the Port on a “per passenger” basis. The passenger airlines pay for the amount of terminal space and gates that they use, and they pay landing fees based on weight. One can take the amount they pay and divide by the number of airline passengers to calculate an average airline cost per enplaned passenger. Airline cost per enplaned passenger is a calculated number that is useful for various analyses, comparisons, etc., but it is not bow the passenger airlines pay the Port. It should also be noted that the cargo airlines pay the Port for the facilities that they use (through lease agreements) and for landing fees based on weight, similar to the passenger airlines.

The Port does collect Passenger Facility Charges (PFCs) on a “per enplaned passenger” basis, as described in Section 7.2.4 in the final master plan. PFCs are collected by the airlines when passengers purchase tickets, and forwarded to the Port, less any handling charge. PFCs are used to fund capital projects. A similar charge could be considered for the users of air cargo airlines, but would require federal legislation to implement. These charges would also likely only be able to fund capital projects.

27. In Section 8.3.1 of the final master plan (Section 8.3 of the draft master plan), we have modified this recommendation to read as follows: “Continue to study a potential Runway 29 aircraft noise barrier,”
on Airport, which would provide some aircraft noise reduction for the homes on the west side of Neptune Drive in the City of San Leandro under certain, limited conditions, or other methods to reduce the effects of aircraft noise in the community (including the City of Alameda), and continue to work with the City of San Leandro on their residential sound insulation program, which is currently underway."

28. We do not know for certain if the dike would need to be seismicly strengthened prior to construction of a noise barrier, but it is quite possible.

As described in our response to Comment #27, we are recommending that the Port and City of San Leandro (and other affected communities as well) continue to work together to identify and implement methods to reduce the effects of aircraft noise in the community, including residential sound insulation programs.

Thank you for taking the time to provide detailed input on the draft master plan discussed at the December 8, 2005, Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting. Your input has been valuable and had a true impact on the conclusions and recommendations in the master plan. We look forward to bringing the master plan process to a close and continuing to work with the City of San Leandro and other communities as projects are further evaluated and potentially implemented.

Sincerely,

Kristi McKenney
Manager, Aviation Planning and Development

cc: Douglas Mansel
San Leandro Unified School District (USD) Representatives to the Master Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee:

Mr. Leon Glaster
San Leandro USD
14735 Juniper Street
San Leandro, CA 94579

Mr. Mike Murphy
San Leandro USD
14735 Juniper Street
San Leandro, CA 94579

Ms. Heidi Finberg
262 Davis Street
San Leandro, CA 94577

Mr. Francois Gallo
979 Woodland Avenue
San Leandro, CA 94577

City of Alameda • California

Date: January 12, 2006
To: Kristi McKenney, Aviation Planning Manager
Douglas Mansel, Aviation Planner

From: City of Alameda Representatives to Airport Master Plan Stakeholders Committee:
David Needle, Walt Jacobs, Red Wetherill, Marge McLean, and Andrew Thomas

CLASS Representatives to Airport Master Plan Stakeholders Committee:
Barbara Tuleja, Eileen Bitten, Gary Hoffer, and Laurel Impett

Subject: November 29, 2005 Draft Oakland International Airport Master Plan

At the December 2005 Stakeholder Committee meeting, Port staff requested comments on the November 29, 2005 Draft Oakland International Airport Master Plan. The Alameda representatives to the Airport Master Plan Stakeholder Committee prepared the following comments and recommendations to assist you in the preparation of the next draft Airport Master Plan.

The Alameda Representatives commend the Port staff, in particular Doug Mansel and Kristi McKenney, who have done an excellent job of preparing and presenting data and reports to the Stakeholder members. We appreciate their willingness to entertain questions and provide thorough, well-reasoned responses. The Alameda Representatives now have a greater appreciation for and understanding of the complexities associated with airport planning. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the draft Master Plan.

Master Plan Executive Summary – Requested Revisions. The Alameda Representatives continue to be very concerned about the potential environmental and safety impacts of airport expansion on Alameda. Alameda residents are already burdened with noise from aircraft overflights, aircraft generated air pollution, airport related vehicular traffic and the threat of aircraft accidents on residential communities. Substantial increases in passengers and corresponding increases in aircraft operations from the existing 14 million annual passengers to 18 or 22 million passengers will result in significant impacts to Alameda residents.
To adequately evaluate the environmental impacts of the proposed improvements at OAK, we request that the Executive Summary be revised to include a clear statement of the total number of passengers that might be realistically expected to be served by the improvements proposed in the Master Plan.

Currently the second bullet of the Overview Section of the Executive Summary, page E-1 states that the Master Plan is designed to accommodate the 2010/2012 forecast passenger activity of 18 MAP. Near the very end of the document, on page 7-8, the draft plan states that the maximum number of airline passengers that will ever use OAK on an annual basis is just over 22 MAP “due to capacity limitations of the OAK’s main air carrier runway (Runway 11/29).”

We request that the Master Plan Executive Summary Overview section be revised to include a clear statement about the maximum number of airline passengers (MAP) and million annual tons (MAT) of cargo that can be reasonably anticipated by 2025 given the improvements proposed in the Master Plan.

On page E-2 of the Executive Summary (under Potential Airline Passenger Development), please add a statement such as the following: “Alameda Representatives stated that any recommendations made by the Alameda Representatives regarding the location of terminal projects should not be taken as an implicit endorsement of a plan to expand the airport.” Please see the Alameda Representatives October 28, 2004 letter.

On page E-3 of the Executive Summary, under General Aviation, please include some information on and discussion of the current and projected increase in helicopter activity at OAK and the related noise implications. Also please include a description of the types of training schools that are anticipated and the types of aircraft that are anticipated to be used in these schools.

On page E-3, in the airfield development section queue delay, please add a statement showing the current queue delays and perhaps the national average.

On page E-5, in the aircraft noise paragraph, please include a reference to the study of noise mitigation and specifically the study of the additional northfield-southfield taxiways.

Chapter 1: Introduction and Background – Requested Revisions

In section 1.1.3 Stakeholder Advisory Committee, please include a discussion of the work done by the stakeholders, such as independent simulations, spreadsheet analysis, and use of outside consultants for peer review.

Section 1.2, History of Master Planning at OAK, should include mention of the settlement agreement with the City of Alameda and the requirement in that agreement for Stakeholder participation in the Master Plan process.

Chapter 6: Environmental Considerations – Requested Revisions

Noise: While the Plan states that aircraft noise was studied “in some detail,” (page E-5) and indeed the Plan authors model single aircraft overflight noise, the Plan never correlates the actual impact (even at a screening level) that increased overflights would have on nearby residents. The Plan contains a generic description of the effect of noise on humans; mentioning communication interference, sleep interference, physiological responses and annoyance. What is missing, however, is an analysis of the impact on nearby residents of the single noise events associated with total operations in the Plan’s forecast year (i.e., 2010-2012). It is critically important for the public to understand, for example, how many additional nighttime flights to expect in 2010-2012 and the impact of these flights on their lives. To this end, the Plan should be able to describe, at a screening level, the frequency of increased awakenings that Alameda residents would likely experience in 2012 compared to current conditions.

The Alameda Representatives support the proposed additional studies recommended in the Master Plan to determine whether any additional taxiways or other improvements might further reduce the number of pilots who choose to not comply with the voluntary noise abatement procedure.

Transportation and Traffic: Each of the previous letters from the Alameda Stakeholders expressed our concerns about noise and traffic impacts of OAK expansion on Alameda. We appreciate the extensive work done in the Master Plan to describe and measure the potential noise impacts of OAK expansion. However, we are disappointed that the Environmental Considerations Chapter does not include a similar discussion or quantification of the potential traffic implications of expanding passenger services from 14 MAP to 18 to 22 MAP. The Master Plan should include a discussion of how the expanding Airport will accommodate the additional automobile and transit needs of 18 to 22 MAP, while minimizing the impacts of the additional traffic on neighboring jurisdictions and the region. Specifically, as described below, we recommend that the Master Plan address the feasibility of increased transit access to OAK.

The Alameda Representatives are concerned that with increasing congestion on I-880, increasing amounts of airport related traffic will choose to cut through Alameda to access the OAK. The 2010 and 2025 Land Use Plans identify a large new parking area on Ron Cowan Parkway adjacent to the City of Alameda. Locating long term parking and rental car facilities adjacent to Alameda on Doolittle Drive and Ron Cowan Parkway will increase the number of future passengers who will choose to cut through Alameda, park or drop off their car, and then proceed to the Airport.

We continue to recommend that the Master Plan prioritize locations along the Airport’s primary access routes of 98th Avenue, Hegenberger Road, and Airport Drive for automobile parking and rental car facilities. Additionally, for parking and rental car
facilities that might remain or be constructed on Doolittle Drive or Ron Cowan Parkway, we recommend that the Master Plan include recommendations for traffic control strategies and design features that would guide the vehicles to/from 98th Avenue rather than Alameda roadways.

We support the recommendation on page 8-2 that the Port conduct a ground traffic study to determine how much airport-related traffic is using local Alameda streets. However, we request that the following revisions be made to this section:

1. The recommended traffic study should be conducted by the Port prior to the first environmental document prepared for any improvements recommended in the Master Plan so that the information from the study is available for the environmental review.

2. The recommended traffic study should include tasks to complete traffic studies and intersection improvements identified in the original settlement agreement that have not yet been completed.

3. The recommended traffic study should include a commitment to ongoing or periodic monitoring, which can be used to calculate the Port’s pro rata share of necessary improvements to Alameda roadways.

Transit Improvements: Passenger growth over the next 20 years will impact the I-880 freeway and the interchanges providing access to the Airport. Moreover, regional growth over this same period will also contribute to worsening traffic congestion. We continue to request that the Master Plan include recommendations for transit improvements to accommodate increases in MAP and mitigate the regional traffic impacts that will be caused by increasing passenger and cargo activity. As a planning and feasibility study, the Master Plan should address the feasibility of providing automobile access and transit access to OAK. The Master Plan should include a discussion of the existing AirBART bus line, current capacity of that line, and the additional capacity and transit facilities that would need to be provided to accommodate 18 or 22 MAP. We appreciate that the Maps were modified to include the proposed BART connector, but we would request that the Master Plan include a discussion of the proposed BART connector, the progress that has been made to implement the connector and the remaining obstacles to project completion.

Health Risk: The Draft Plan should include a section on health risk from aircraft emissions. Aircraft are sources of toxic air contaminants that may have acute and chronic health impacts on nearby residents. The FAA/University of Missouri-Rolla/NASA/CARB study on aircraft emissions should be published within the next year. We recommend that the Master Plan add the following bullet in section 8.3 (Summary of Near-Term Master Plan Projects Recommend for Further Study). “Upon completion of the FAA/University of Missouri-Rolla/NASA/CARB study on aircraft emissions, undertake a health risk assessment to determine the health risk to nearby residents resulting from 2010-2012 aircraft operations.”
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Subject: Response to Alameda Comments
Master Plan, Oakland International Airport (OAK)

Dear Alameda Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members:

Thank you for your letter dated January 12, 2006, providing us with your comments on the draft master plan. The following paragraphs outline our response to your comments using the same headings and paragraph structure in your letter to us.

Master Plan Executive Summary – Requested Revisions

We have added a discussion to the Executive Summary (under “Summary of Aviation Activity Forecasts”) that describes the difficulty associated with estimating constrained demand for 2025 (i.e., given the capacity limitation of Runway 11-29 at South Field). Constrained airline passenger forecasts are dependent on many future variables including fleet mix, aircraft seating configurations, load factors, assumed taxiway and other airfield improvements, amount of delay that the airlines and airline passengers are willing to tolerate, air travel market considerations, air traffic control rules and procedures, and required aircraft-to-aircraft separations due to wake vortices, all of which are likely to change between now and 2025. Therefore, we cannot predict with accuracy or reliability what the constrained airline passenger forecasts might be in 2025, at least not to a level that could be included in the final master plan. However, if the aircraft fleet remains similar to today (which we believe is likely, but not certain) and assuming all of the other variables described above remain similar to today and assuming that the airlines and airline passengers are willing to tolerate an increase in delay (e.g., 4 to 5 minutes average delay per aircraft throughout the day), then Runway 11-29 might be able to accommodate between 20 and 22 million annual passengers (MAP). However, it is important to note that even upon reaching between 20 and 22 MAP, it is unlikely that the number of airline passengers using the Airport will simply stop growing. Growth will likely continue, but at a slower (trickle) rate. Further, as any of the variables described above change, the “maximum” number of passengers (as described above) would also change.

The unconstrained and constrained forecast for air cargo weight in 2025 is 1.5 million annual tons (MAT). That is, we anticipate that the existing air cargo airlines could probably grow to accommodate 1.5 MAT at their existing facilities, plus those that have not yet been constructed but previously reviewed and approved in the Airport Development Program (ADP) environmental documents. The constrained and unconstrained air cargo weight forecasts are the same. We have shown a modest explosion of the FedEx metropolis (to the north; towards Ren Cowan Parkway) on the 2025 land-use map, which would allow FedEx to operate more efficiently and might be required to accommodate ramp area for larger (and quieter) aircraft.

In the Executive Summary under “Potential Airline Passenger Development” and other areas in the final master plan, as appropriate, we have added the following statement: “Input and recommendations provided by members of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee on potential future terminal development should not necessarily be considered implicit endorsement of future terminal expansion.”

In the Executive Summary under “Potential General Aviation Development” and in Chapter 4, Section 4.4.1 and in a footnote to Table E.1 (Summary of Unconstrained Aviation Activity Forecasts), we have expanded the discussion of existing and future helicopter operations anticipated at the Airport. In the Executive Summary under “Potential General Aviation Development,” we have added the following: “The area anticipated to be needed to base additional piston airplanes and helicopters is for hangars to park private airplanes, not aircraft associated with flight schools. Today, there is one flight school at North Field that trains students to fly helicopters. There are also two smaller flying clubs/businesses that offer flight instruction in small, piston airplanes.” To Table E.1, we have added a footnote explaining that in 2004, a new helicopter flight training school opened at North Field. The school is ramping up training classes and flight operations through 2006. During this period, the number of helicopter operations is anticipated to grow from between 2,000 to 4,000 to just over 34,000 annual operations. After this ramp-up period, it is anticipated that helicopter operations would grow 16% annually (no additional helicopter flight training schools are anticipated at North Field). Most of the helicopter training flights are conducted over Airport property.

In the Executive Summary under “Potential Airfield Development” and in Chapter 5, Sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.3, we have added the following statement (or similar): “In August 2005, the average queue delay per
aircraft was less than 10 minutes during the morning departures peak, with only occasional queue delays averaging less than a few minutes each for the remainder of the day.” There is no published “national average” for queue delay. Typically, national average delays that are quoted are for total delay, including delay associated with air traffic control, mechanical delays, weather, queue delay, etc.

In the Executive Summary under “Potential Airfield Development,” we have added a discussion about potential North Field - South Field taxiway connections. We conclude that “based on measured taxi distances and estimated taxi times, as well as the airfield simulation . . ., it was demonstrated that a taxiway parallel to Taxiway B on South Field (e.g., between Taxiways T and B2) would resolve most of the Taxiway B congestion and head-to-head taxi issues.”

Chapter 1: Introduction and Background – Requested Revisions

We have included the following statement in Section 1.1.3: “Some members of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee performed independent technical work to verify master plan analyses and draw their own conclusions, including preparation of simulations, spreadsheet analyses, and use of outside consultants for peer review.” We have also added a similar statement in the Executive Summary under a new subheading “Stakeholder Advisory Committee Process.”

We have included the following statement in Section 1.2: “The Port committed to prepare this master plan with community participation as a result of various agreements settling litigation over the ADP environmental review documents.”

Chapter 6: Environmental Considerations – Requested Revisions

Noise:

The potential effects of aircraft noise on humans (e.g., communication interference, sleep interference, etc.) are discussed generally in Sections 6.3.3 and 6.3.4 of the final master plan, as you note. However, the level of analysis requested is too detailed compared to the level of detail contained in the final master plan. The master plan focuses on land-use designations and areas for potential development, not specific projects. As projects undergo more detailed planning, preliminary engineering, financial feasibility, and environmental review, only then will enough information be known to proceed with these important analyses on the effects of aircraft noise on residents in the City of Alameda. In fact, these types of analyses would be conducted on projects that come out of the master plan (when they are ripe for consideration) as part of the environmental review process that is required pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Even though the requested analyses are generally beyond the scope of the master plan, one can get a more detailed sense of the effects of aircraft noise on City of Alameda residents from a review of the environment documents prepared for the prior Airport Development Program (ADP), including the most recent (second) Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) on the ADP (certified by the Board of Port Commissioners in November 2003). These documents analyze the effects of aircraft noise in considerable detail. Generally, we anticipate the effects resulting from projects implemented out of the master plan to be less than those analyzed in the prior environmental documents. For example, the prior environmental documents analyzed the noise effects of aircraft operations associated with 22.4 MAP and 2.1 MAT. As described above, it is unclear whether the existing air carrier runway at South Field could accommodate more than about 22 MAP, and the 2025 forecast for air cargo weight is only 1.5 MAT. That is, the aircraft noise effects associated with projects that might come out of the master plan might be less than those described in the prior environmental documents, although more detailed work would be required to determine the effects. Therefore, the prior environmental documents are a good resource for estimating potential environmental effects on City of Alameda residents.

Transportation and Traffic:

The master plan recommends conducting a baseline traffic study to determine the number and types of vehicles (cars, trucks) accessing the Airport through the cities of Alameda, San Leandro, and Oakland. However, the level of analysis requested is generally too detailed compared to the level of detail contained in the final master plan. The master plan focuses on land-use designations and areas for potential development, and in general, not specific projects. As projects undergo more detailed planning, preliminary engineering, financial feasibility, and environmental review, only then will enough information be known to proceed with more detailed traffic studies (the baseline traffic study described above is an important first step). In fact, these types of analyses would be conducted on projects that come out of the master plan (when they are ripe for consideration) as part environmental review that is required pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Even though the requested analyses are generally beyond the scope of the master plan, one can get a more detailed sense of the effects of Airport traffic on Alameda residents from a review of the environment documents prepared for the prior ADP, including the most recent SEIR. These documents analyze the effects of
However, as the terminal area becomes more and more congested, the Port may need to explore remote (but on-Airport) parking locations for long-term/economy passenger and/or employee parking.

Regarding the proposed baseline traffic study, the three suggested additions in your letter are too detailed to include in the final master plan. On your first suggestion, we believe the baseline traffic study will provide important information that can be used in subsequent environmental review documents. However, the suggested baseline traffic study could be done before an environmental review process gets underway, as one of the first tasks (e.g., a technical study) in an environmental review process, or it could overlap with an environmental review process. On the second suggestion, all of the traffic studies associated with the ADP have been completed. The Port committed to paying its pro rata share of intersection improvements in the City of Alameda as a result of significant traffic impacts identified in the ADP environmental documents. As you know, however, intersections within the City of Alameda are within the City’s jurisdiction, and therefore, only the City can effect intersection improvements. It is worth noting that the Port would expect to commit to pay its pro rata share of intersection improvements as a result of significant traffic impacts identified in future environmental documents (and the suggested baseline traffic study might form the basis for such analyses conducted in future environmental documents). On the third suggestion, the Port is committing to conducting a baseline traffic study in the final master plan document. Future commitments (e.g., ongoing or periodic monitoring) would need to be negotiated between the Port and City of Alameda based on the results of the baseline traffic study and mitigations required in future environmental documents, if any.

**Transit Improvements:**

The Port is committed to public transportation and high-occupancy vehicle access to the Airport. For example, the Port has already invested $2.5 million in planning and is planning to commit over $25 million to the construction of on-Airport portions of the BART Connector. Further, the Airport has convenient curbside access for public transportation (AirBART and AC Transit) and high-occupancy vehicle modes (e.g., door-to-door vans). The Port is spending over $90 million to reconstruct the loop roadway and curbsides to keep the Airport convenient for all modes. These improvements should be able to accommodate the anticipated near-term traffic accessing the Airport (18 to 20 MAP in the 2010 to 2012 timeframe). Of course, any new terminal (e.g., in Area 2) would require its own curbside roadways that would be implemented with such a project (see Section 4.6.3 in the final master plan).

We have included a brief discussion of AirBART bus capacity in the final master plan (see Section 6.4.1). Essentially, as ridership grows, the Port can add additional buses to the system to increase capacity, as is done today during peak periods. A discussion of the status of the BART Connector project is contained in Section 4.6.4 of the final master plan.

**Health Risk:**

The requested analyses are generally beyond the scope of the master plan. However, one can get a more detailed sense of the effects of toxic air contaminants on Alameda residents from a review of the environment documents prepared for the ADP, including the second SEIR. These documents analyze the effects of toxic air contaminants in considerable detail. Generally, we anticipate that the effects resulting from projects implemented out of the master plan to be less than those analyzed in these prior environmental documents. That is, the health risks associated with projects that might come out of the master plan might be less than those described in the prior environmental documents, although some detailed work would be required to determine the effects. Also, we hope that health risk assessments in future environmental documents might be able to rely on more accurate aircraft engine emissions data that was collected by the Federal Aviation Administration, University of Missouri-Rolla, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the California Air Resources Board, and is now being analyzed.

**Air Quality Mitigation and Monitoring:**

The Port is committed to on-going air quality improvement, as outlined in Section 6.4.1 of the final master plan.

**General Document Format:**

We will include a clearer reference system for drawings, graphics, and tables in the final master plan.

Thank you for taking the time to provide detailed input on the draft master plan discussed at the December 8, 2005, Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting. Your input has been valuable and had a true impact on the conclusions and recommendations in the master plan. We look forward to bringing the master plan process to a close and continuing to work with the City of Alameda and other communities as projects are further evaluated and potentially implemented.

Sincerely,

Kristi McKenney
Manager, Aviation Planning and Development

cc: Douglas Mansel
RE: Comments on Oakland International Airport 20-year Master Plan Stakeholder Process

Dear Mr. Grossman:

As the Oakland City Councilmember representing both the Oakland International Airport and many residents impacted by its operations, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the ongoing Master Plan Stakeholder Process that has been coordinated by the Port of Oakland.

I would first like to offer my appreciation for the sincere commitment and effort that the Port has demonstrated in soliciting input and developing recommendations on the future land use configurations and terminal development options in the airport area. I have been apprised of the ongoing discussions from City of Oakland and Port of Oakland staff, as well as from the City of Oakland community representatives to the committee. I would like to recognize the Port for its engagement with the community stakeholders from the surrounding areas. The outstanding work of Ms. Kristi McKenney and Mr. Doug Mansel, in particular, should be commended.

It is my hope that this process will lead to a terminal development concept and land use configuration that can be supported by all parties involved. The airport is important both to my district and to the City of Oakland as a whole, and serves as a catalyst for economic development throughout the region. Ensuring that the airport is equipped to handle the projected growth in passengers and cargo activity in its terminal development concepts, land use configurations, ground transportation access, and through support services and facilities in the Airport area is important to me and my constituents.

Further, I would like to concur with the staff recommendations contained within the draft Master Plan that limits additional on-airport parking sites sponsored by the Port of Oakland to one of the nine areas identified in Figure 4.19 in the immediate airport area. I am concerned with advice given by some stakeholders to locate airport parking along Hegenberger Road and 98th Avenue off of the airport, given both the current revitalization of these corridors and the opportunity for separate economic development opportunities that might exist in these areas.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to respond to your ongoing deliberations.

Sincerely,

Larry E. Reid
President Pro Tempore of the City Council
Councilmember, District 7
PROCEEDINGS

Em the record at 7:31 p.m.

MR. GROSSMAN: Good evening, everybody.

There's plenty of seats in the front for
all you standees back there. Don't rush at once.

Okay. Don't rush at all.

For those of you who don't know, I'm Steve
Grossman, the Director of Aviation here at Oakland
International and the Port of Oakland.

That's another thing. For those of you who
don't know, the Port of Oakland owns and runs the
airport. We'll talk more about that later, if you like.

It's a pleasure to be here tonight to
present to you 18 months' worth of very hard work by
a tremendous number of people -- and certainly not
just my staff, but the members of the stakeholders, et

What we're all about is really to present
the information to you -- some of which you got in
the other room -- and get any feedback you might have.

Unlike a normal, quote, public hearing, we actually will
try and answer your questions tonight. So, yes, I know
it's unique and it's a novel approach, but we're going
to give it a shot.

What we would hope to do during those
questions and answers is really try to answer the
questions of general interest to everybody. If you
have something that's real specific to you, we'd prefer
to talk to you afterward. The staff will be here till
midnight, 1:00, 2:00 in the morning. I'll be home
sleeping, but they'll be here.

Again, I want to thank you for coming
tonight -- which must mean we have a room full
of Democrats because you've all missed the State of
the Union address. And afterwards I'll give you the
Readers Digest version.

I want to do one or two things, though.
First of all -- part of this process was a lot of
involvement with the people affected by the airport,
both those who live around us and those who use the
airport. And I want to thank everybody who was on
the stakeholders committee for all the time they put
in, the honesty that they expressed during the meetings
and the input that they gave to this process.

Could I ask everybody on that committee to
raise your hands and stand up?

Great. Thank you very much.
And as a corollary to that, I want to thank

Krisi McKenney and her staff -- and particularly,
as he has become fondly known among the stakeholders,
Professor Mansel -- for all their work in bringing us
to whom we are today.

And I think you'll see that a lot of thought
has gone into it. It represents the vision for the
next 20 years of the airport. It doesn't provide all
the answers, but it does give the vision and the land
use that we expect to see here over time. And if
history is any indicator, the first five or six years
are pretty good. We get beyond five or six years in
this business, and it's anybody's guess. But, again,
you've got to take your best shot.

So, what we'll do is -- I'm supposing the
response, but the real meat is going to come from our
three speakers.

So, with that, as our very special guest
tonight I'd like to bring up, Mr. Anthony Batarse. I
call him "Tony." He is the first vice-president of the
Board of Port Commissioners but, much more importantly,
the chair of my Aviation Committee.

So, Tony,

COMMISSIONER BATAOPE: Good evening, everyone.

Welcome to this presentation.

First of all, I would like to acknowledge
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some elected officials that we have been tonight.

First, the wonderful Shelia Young, Mayor of
San Leandro. And Honorable Larry Reid, Councilmember of
Oakland, Honorable Surlene Grant, Councilmember of San
Leandro. Mr. Frank Matterase, Alameda County.

MAYOR YOUNG: Alameda city.

COMMISSIONER BATARSE: Representing the
County, Supervisor Kate Miller’s office, Robyn Hodges.
Representing Senator Don Perata’s office, Deneine
Herrera. The Honorable Gordon Wozniak, Commissioner
for Berkeley.

I guess Steve said everything I was prepared
to say.

Well, I want to thank you for coming. I’m
going to be brief and let Steve --

MR. GROSSMAN: Oops.

COMMISSIONER BATARSE: -- Grossman continue.

MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, I can do that.

Okay, the first faux pas of the evening.

Never steal the Commissioner’s speech. Resume on the
web tomorrow.

What I’ll do now is introduce Kristi
McKenney, who is the manager of our Planning and
Development Department, which is where all the work
was centered. And she’ll kind of provide you an
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the master plan, Mr. Doug Mansel.

The master plan really allows us to share
with the community potential future development at the
airport. It allows us to look at what kind of demand
might be out there for our services and what kind of
projects we might need to consider to meet that demand
or what the consequences might be if we don’t meet that
demand.

The master plan, for those of you who don’t
know, really was originated by the community through
the settlement agreement process we went through a
number of years ago. This process was specifically
requested by the community. And I think we’re grateful
they did that, because it’s been a truly fruitful
effort, I know, at least on the part of the Port.

And I hope the stakeholders would say the same.

So, give you a little bit of context of what
this master plan means in terms of other activities
and developments going on at the airport. Some of
you may be familiar with the current development going
on at the airport known as the ADP, the Airport
Development Program, and specific projects, such as
the terminal expansion program, T2, our roadway project.

If you’ve been to the airport recently, you’re very
familiar with these projects. They’re well underway.
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It’s very exciting to see it going on.

A number of projects over the years have
been built under that program. The airport roadway
project was another collaborative effort with the
City of Alameda. Also, Gateway projects. That was
spearheaded, in fact, by Larry Reid and Shelia Young
and those folks from Alameda and San Leandro and
Oakland that worked together on that process.

Those projects are underway. They’re not
part of the master plan. That’s the last effort.

This is really what’s to come. So, this is sort of
the future and looking forward.

None of these projects have specifically
been cleared -- or will be -- through the master plan
adoption process. They’re really the future. There
will be a lot more to look at in detail and study and
go over and share with the community as specific
projects come out of the master plan and go forward.

I’m going to give you a brief overview on
some of the key outcomes. And Doug will talk in more
detail about those.

Really, the land use maps are the key
projects to come out of this process, looking in broad
terms at what kind of land uses and where those might go
to meet some of the demand we forecast for the future.
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Our primary focus, as Steve Grossman,

indicated is on the near term. While it may have
been appropriate some decades back to plan and pay for
projects 20 years hence that might be needed, that's not
appropriate for this industry anymore. So, we can look
20 years out together, we can think about it, we can
forecast for it, but specific projects are really more
appropriate for the near term where we know we'll need
those facilities and we know we can afford them and they
make sense to proceed with.

The long-term forecast you'll hear more about
tonight. You'll find really that can be accommodated
without any runway, which is not recommended in this
master plan at this time. We'll discuss more about
that in the presentation.

And I think one of the most important things
you'll find is that the stakeholders, throughout the
process, had a great impact on the process, but this
is -- a good example of a significant area was in our
cargo growth forecast.

Unlike passenger demand, cargo demand can be
considerably varied. We looked at a number of high-,
medium- and low-growth scenarios. We're recommending
the lower-growth scenario largely through a lot of input
with our community groups. So, again, you'll hear more
detail about those tonight.

I just want to again lastly thank you, the
stakeholders. Thank all of you for coming out tonight.
And this is -- on one hand, this is the end
of an 18-month process. On the other hand, it's really
the beginning of life with these projects. These
projects won't start from here forward. And there will
be an ongoing community involvement process where there
will be many more opportunities to discuss the specifics
and the details of each one of these projects as they
go forward and make them the best they can be to serve
Oakland and the region.

Thank you very much.

With that, I'd like to introduce Doug Mansel.

MR. MANSEL: Okay. I'm going to walk you
through about nine slides. And we'll just go ahead
and start.

This first slide talks about what is a master
plan at Oakland. And Kristi and Steve and Commissioner
Batarse talked about this a little bit. But a master
plan for Oakland -- first of all, we're following the
FAA guidance on preparing a master plan. They give us
some guidance on how to do that. We're following that
guidance.

The master plan will identify near-term
projects and provide long-term on-airport general land
use guidance. Again, as we get further and further into
the future, it gets more and more speculative and more
and more general, and really, in the end, focuses on land
use.

The master plan is providing a vehicle
for community participation in the airport planning
process, as Kristi and the other speakers mentioned.
And, importantly, we agreed to do this -- the community
requested we do that, and we're doing it under various
settlement agreements that we have with the surrounding
communities.

It's also important to note what the master
plan will not do.

It's not focusing on detailed plans for
individual projects. That will come later on as
projects are ripe for consideration.

I might talk about some terminal buildings and things
like that in future slides, but when our Board
eventually approves this master plan, it's not
approving any sort of specific projects in that
master plan. Therefore, it won't undergo detailed
environmental review under CEQA and NEPA, the
California Environmental Quality Act.

It's important to note we did do sort of
comprehensive environmental screening level review in
the master plan, with particular focus on aircraft
noise. We did do some environmental screening --
again, with a particular emphasis on aircraft noise --
but we didn't do the detailed work that's required under
CEQA and NEPA. That will be later on as projects come
out of the master plan and move forward.

We'll cut right to the chase here: The key
outcomes and recommendations of the master plan.
Kristi hit on this a little bit.

The primary products are the land use maps.
We'll present those here. Many of you
probably saw them outside.

The near-term land use map and the long-term
land use map. The primary focus of potential near-term
projects and accommodating near-term airline passenger
demand. Projects are not recommended to accommodate

long-term demand. It's too speculative at this point and likely isn't achievable without a new air carrier runway. You'll see that we have not shown a new air carrier runway in the long-term. In the 2025 planning, we're not showing an air carrier runway. It's not recommended in the master plan at this time. What we are recommending -- I guess I should say we have identified the need for that runway. It's clear, based on demand, that a runway would be needed. We're not recommending, at this point, the Port pursue that, but we are recommending that sort of be a regional discussion. There's a couple reasons why we don't think the Port can undertake this on its own. First of all, the environmental considerations and issues associated with building a runway likely in San Francisco Bay or through wetlands. And, second of all, the cost associated with building that runway is probably billions of dollars. It's unlikely the Port would be able to afford something like that. So, because of those two reasons, we're recommending that the Bay Area, as a whole, look at runway capacity and tackle this issue. It really is a regional decision. Should a runway go at Oakland?
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the little hand here. I don't know if you can see that on the screen.

The Port had 14.1 million annual passengers that flew in and out of Oakland. By 2004, we expect that to go to 18 million annual passengers. By 2021, up to 30 million.

Again, what's important to note about the 30 million is that's an unconstrained number. It's likely we'll not achieve 30 million because of the air carrier runway capacity at the airport.

You put all these passengers onto airplanes, and this is how it translates in terms of operations, which are takeoffs and landing. In 2004 we had 430 daily air passenger airline operations. We expect that to go to 542 by 2010.

We didn't get into the level of detail of forecasting daily airline operations for 2025. Again, you know, we probably won't get there. It's just too detailed a level of work for this sort of higher-level master planning we're doing here, land use planning.

In terms of cargo, in 2004 we had point 7 million annual tons. That's 700 thousand million tons of cargo coming in and out of the airport. We project that going to point 9 by 2010 and up to 1.5 by 2025.

And this is our low-growth air cargo forecast we talked about a few minutes ago.

1. or should it go at San Francisco?
2. There's certainly projected demand for it, but how that gets accommodated in the Bay Area is something the region as a whole needs to discuss.
3. So, that's sort of our recommendation. So, because of that, we're not likely to achieve our long-term forecasts you'll see on the next slide.
4. We're also -- as Kristi mentioned, we're recommending a low-growth air cargo forecast. We're going to recommend we de-emphasize our marketing of air cargo -- new air cargo airlines. This is again based on input from the Stakeholder Advisory Committee.
5. With that said, it's important to note we do anticipate the existing air cargo airlines at Oakland -- FedEx, UPS and others -- we do think they will continue to grow as the Bay Area grows. It's just not going to be a super-high growth that might be expected if we went out and marketed, for example, a new cargo hub or something like that. We do expect growth in cargo focused on our existing air cargo airlines and around existing facilities, but not a huge growth that one could achieve if you went out and marketed that.
7. In 2004 the Port served -- I'll start using
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When you put this cargo on the airplanes, in 2004 we had 156 daily air cargo airline operations. We're projecting that to go to 164.

It's interesting to note that growth from 156 to 164 -- we're actually expecting that to be mostly the smaller feeder air cargo planes that come in and out of the airport.

In terms of the large air cargo airplanes that FedEx, UPS and the heavy cargo airlines fly, we're actually projecting that to stay the same as it is today or what it was in 2004. The way they do that, they -- the way they accommodate more weight from point 7 to point 9 is they change their airplanes out. They fly larger airplanes to accommodate the increasing weight.

That's good news, because FedEx, in particular, flies some of the noisiest airplanes. They depart in the middle of the night -- the Boeing 727's, if you're familiar with that. So, the good news is, when the cargo grows to point 9, they'll need bigger airplanes to fly that cargo. And the good news is the bigger airplanes are substantially quieter than the current fleet.

We'll talk about that in a minute when we
look at the noise figures.  
Daily general aviation operations will go 
from 352 to 434. We actually broke this down by type 
of general aviation activity in terms of helicopters, 
pistons, turboprops, and corporate jets. Those numbers 
were outside on the board for anyone interested in 
seeing how each of those subcategories of general 
aviation are growing on, in some cases, shrinking. 
We also forecast a number of based general 
aviation aircraft, those aircraft that call their 
home Oakland and have their airplane in a hangar or 
on a ramp. These forecasts were programmed -- in some 
cases, we have wait lists for airplanes waiting to 
get a hangar -- and, also, based on industry trend in 
terms of corporate jets that are entering and exiting 
the fleet. So, we do forecast a bit of an increase in 
the number of aircraft that want to call Oakland home. 
We spent a lot of time with the Stakeholder 
Advisory Committee talking about the relationship 
or a lack of a relationship between the number of 
operations and the number of based aircraft. In 
many master plans, there’s actually a relationship: 
The more based aircraft you have, the more operations 
you have. For Oakland, it’s not quite as strong 
just looked at the earlier slide and there’s more 
operations, more takeoffs and landings. 
That is true. There will be more takeoffs 
and landings. However, as we talked about, we think 
some of those takeoffs and landings -- particularly 
the cargo airlines -- will be -- instead of using 
noisy aircraft, they will use quieter aircraft. 
Even though there will be more operations, there will 
be quieter aircraft. So, we’re predicting the noise 
footprint will shrink a little bit, especially up here 
in the northwest adjacent to Alameda. 
Again, the reason for that is largely that 
Federal Express is starting to retire their Boeing 727’s. We 
can’t affect when that happens, but we think it’ll 
probably happen, at least in part, by 2010, given 
the cost of jet fuel and other considerations and the 
increase in cargo volume. 
Okay. We have three more slides -- they’re 
the land use maps -- and then the next steps. So, 
we’re getting near the end here. 
This first map shows Oakland Airport and 
the land uses that exist today. I’ll point out -- 
highlight a few things to sort of familiarize you 
with that for those of you that aren’t terribly 
familiar with the airport.
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The two largest land uses on the airport are 
air fields, which includes the runways and taxiways. 
We have, basically, two air fields -- North Field, 
with three runways at North Field and supporting 
taxiways or structures. Then, at South Field, we 
have one main air carrier runway -- 11/29 -- and the 
supporting taxiway system. 
The second largest land use on the airport 
is actually undesignated. We have a significant amount 
of our land that is not designated for any aviation use 
currently. A lot of that is jurisdictional wetlands. 
It’s sort of challenging development. That is our 
second largest land use, undesignated. 
Just to do orientation, this taxiway running 
from North Field to South Field is the main taxiway 
connector between those two air fields. It’s called 
Taxiway Bravo, if I use that term. 
I’ll point out the existing Terminal 1, 
Terminal 2 complex in this area. 
And then Kristi mentioned Terminal 2 
renovation and extension work currently under 
construction. That’s in this area right here. 
Just to the west of Taxiway Bravo is the 
Federal Express metropole. This is their West Coast 
hub.
In 2010 to 2012, we are projecting the need for a 17-to-21 gate terminal. Based on the work we’ve done with the stakeholders, we’re showing that terminal in this area northwest of Terminal 1.

In order to put a terminal there, we have to relocate the cargo building somewhere else. The somewhere else we’re suggesting is the former site of the United Airlines maintenance hangar. So, that building would have to be torn down, and the cargo building would have to be — a new cargo building would have to be constructed to house UPS and the belly cargo.

A couple other changes in the 2010 to the 2012 time frame.

We’re showing some expansion of general aviation at North Field. This type of expansion is based on our forecast for the number of based aircraft that would like to park here.

It’s sort of unlikely the Port would choose to go out and develop this on its own, so we’d probably rely on, like, a third-party developer to construct this area. So, it would be heavily market driven. We think there’s a demand out there for it, but a developer would have to tell us that, yes, it makes sense to do this development. Some of it’s quite challenging, due to the aging infrastructure.

The North Field goes back to 1920. A lot of the infrastructure up there is aged.

A couple other things.

We are showing a surface parking lot at the corner of Ron Cowan Parkway. We’d like to try to keep the passenger parking in the terminal area. That’s the most convenient for the airline passengers, and it is less expensive for us to operate because we don’t have to operate buses all over the place. But as this area becomes more congested with replacement facilities and a new terminal, it may — we may need to expand our surface parking.

In this case, it would probably be long-term airline passenger parking or potential parking for employees. We have a lot of employees that work at the airport that need to park.

The last thing I’ll point out on the 2010 to 2012 land use map is air field improvements. We are showing -- a kind of dashed in here -- a taxiway parallel to Taxiway Bravo. That serves two purposes. The first purpose is, if we do build a terminal in this area, it supports that terminal. It helps the flow of traffic to and from the -- the air traffic of the airplanes to and from the terminal.

The second thing it does is it minimizes the number of head-to-head taxi operations on Taxiway Bravo.

I’ll give you an example of that.

After a FedEx airplane, for example, lands and pulls off the runway, it needs to taxi northbound on Bravo to get to the ramp, to the FedEx hub. Meanwhile, an aircraft that parks up at the general aviation -- a corporate jet that parks at North Field may need to taxi southbound to get to runway 29 and depart. They do that for noise abatement.

So, there’s the head-to-head taxi issue.

In some cases, it creates delay.

This taxiway helps alleviate that problem.

The second taxiway improvement is right here. It’s a new high-speed exit off of runway 29.

After an aircraft lands on runway 29, we found, through simulation studies, that most of them actually cannot pull off on the first taxiway exit right here. They go a little too fast to do that. But by the time they get to the second one right here, they’re going too slow. Then we take them further away from the terminal, and they have to taxi back.
Another study that was recommended by the community was — as I mentioned, from noise abatement, corporate jets are requested to taxi to South Field. About 98 percent of them do that. It's a voluntary procedure.

We think that's pretty good, a pretty good compliance, but we really want to drive into the two percent that don't and understand a little more why those two percent are refusing to comply with our long-term noise abatement procedure.

So, those are two examples.

As Kristi mentioned, we do want to — as these projects come out of the master plan and we start exploring what a 17-to-21 gate terminal might look like in that area, we do want to continue working with the stakeholders and get their input on these projects as we move forward.

So, with that, that's the summary of the master plan. And I'll turn it back over to Steve, and then we'll have questions and answers.

ME: MS. McKENNEY: I've been asked to make one announcement.

Before we hand it back — just in case any of you are trying to leave early — at this time tonight, the airport is paying for your parking. So, all you need to do is tell the guard at the booth that
MR. MANSEL: If you do come up to speak, we'd like to get your name and -- at least your name, so we know how to spell it. So, if you wouldn't mind filling out a speaker card, if you come up, so we have your name, that would be great.

MR. GROSSMAN: That would be wonderful.

So, who's got a question?

Please.

MR. CLIFFORD: I'm Ethan Clifford.

What is the capacity of air ops for that single runway?

MR. GROSSMAN: I think that -- yeah.

MR. GROSSMAN: Not to my knowledge. I don't think they know the answer.

MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I think they know the answer.

MR. MESTRE: The two percent wouldn't be commuter in the sense of, like, commuter passenger aircraft, because none of the commercial passengers -- even the smaller commuter are taking off at North Field. But they would be general aviation business jets. They could be carrying packages or doing other things like that, or whatever business they might be on.

And that's exactly the purpose of that follow-on study. Let's really understand who those two percent are and why they're doing that.

MR. GROSSMAN: I'm assuming those are then.

They are probably more annoying than the jets.

I'm wondering, why is it voluntary rather than mandatory?

MR. GROSSMAN: I'll let Doug chime in as well.

Again, if you want to be purely mathematical and you want to multiply about 50 ops an hour times 24 hours a day, you can come up with a pretty big number. But that's not necessarily a business realistic number because you're not going to have that level of activity at 1:00 or 2:00 or 3:00 in the morning when you -- you do have cargo operations, but they're not that frequent. So that's sort of our peak hour period.

And then there's big dips during the day.

If you came out at 2 o'clock, there's fewer demand for flights, et cetera.

It's very hard to say with great certainty what the capacity might be in terms of passengers -- which is a very common request, but the people want to know. That's because it's so dependent on such detailed factors.

For example, if Southwest changed from 737 700s to 800s and carried 20 more passengers, all of a sudden, how many people we could carry on the same runway on the same weather and same conditions changes.

So, we've discussed it in terms of broad terms.

MR. GROSSMAN: That doesn't mean...
There’s a lot of Congressional interest in stronger security requirements on the cargo side. But there is a program today administrated by the airlines.

And, Harold, as long as you don’t make that speech at the airport, it’s okay, talking about putting bombs on airplanes.

The second question on the wall. Most people, I’m sure, are not familiar with that. So why don’t you give a general description of what that’s all about?

MS. MCKENNEY: Sure.

The wall Mr. Perez is referring to is in the master plan, so you can read about it in more detail there.

One of the requests we had -- specifically, from the City of San Leandro -- was to look at the possibility of a sound wall, if you will, inhibiting some of the noise, especially along the bayshore there at Neptune Drive where there’s homes right up against the water.

With our noise consultant, Vince Mestre, we did take a look at the possibility of a sound wall both on the airport and along Neptune Drive. It was actually a very interesting study. We did have a meeting in San Leandro about it not too long ago. We did find there would be some noise attenuation.

There’s a lot of Congressional interest in stronger security requirements on the cargo side. But there is a program today administrated by the airlines.

And, Harold, as long as you don’t make that speech at the airport, it’s okay, talking about putting bombs on airplanes.

The second question on the wall. Most people, I’m sure, are not familiar with that. So why don’t you give a general description of what that’s all about?

MS. MCKENNEY: Sure.

The wall Mr. Perez is referring to is in the master plan, so you can read about it in more detail there.

One of the requests we had -- specifically, from the City of San Leandro -- was to look at the possibility of a sound wall, if you will, inhibiting some of the noise, especially along the bayshore there at Neptune Drive where there’s homes right up against the water.

With our noise consultant, Vince Mestre, we did take a look at the possibility of a sound wall both on the airport and along Neptune Drive. It was actually a very interesting study. We did have a meeting in San Leandro about it not too long ago. We did find there would be some noise attenuation.
the right thing to pursue is.

MR. MANSEL: I think, to add to that, it's important to note that one of the things that did come out of the study was the sound wall and noise barrier really only helped the homes that are on the west side of Neptune Drive. So, there's probably 15 homes, or something like that, on the west side of Neptune Drive right on the bay. After you get beyond those homes, the homes that are on that side of Neptune Drive actually blocked the noise from the homes further east.

So, there wouldn't be a huge benefit. There would be actually no benefit to any homes further -- anywhere else in San Leandro. The only homes that benefit are those right on the water.

MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.

Next question?

SPEAKER: My name is William (last name unintelligible). I'm an Alameda resident.

I have two questions.

Can somebody comment on one of the these?

They're saying that the helicopter traffic is supposed to decrease from around nine to seven? I think I saw that correctly. I only glanced at it, but I thought it was interesting.

MR. MANSEL: While he does that, I'll answer your first question.

MR. MANSEL: Welcome.

MR. MANSEL: That helicopter flight school left Oakland Airport. When they left Oakland Airport -- again, I think a couple years ago now -- the number of operations dropped down to the number you see. I think it was nine or some small number of daily helicopter operations.

Those are pretty much transient-type operations, the Coast Guard coming in for fuel or medevac or something like that.

Just last year -- I think it was last year -- we got a new helicopter flight school back at Oakland Airport. They are now starting to ramp up their operations. They started last year. They're continuing to ramp up their operations through this year. So, that's why you see sort of -- going from a very-low number of helicopter operations ramping up to a fairly-significant number. That's actually happening through this year. It actually started last year.

After this year, we're actually projecting only a very-small increase in the number of helicopter operations at the airport. We're not anticipating another new helicopter flight school. The flight school we do have today -- most of the helicopter operations stay primarily over the airport. We receive very few, if any, noise complaints from those guys at all.

MR. GROSSMAN: Second question.

SPEAKER: Thank you.

My second question was about the noise footprint, one of the slides you've shown.

Did I understand correctly that that footprint pretty much takes into account the average takeoff and landing of a single aircraft? In other words, if the number of takeoffs and landings double at Oakland International, that footprint potentially would stay the same if aircraft, in general, don't get noisier?

MR. MANSEL: I think I would like to see if Vince -- Vince Mestre is the noise consultant that helped us prepare those charts. I want to see if he could explain that.

SPEAKER: Maybe you can go back to it on the slide show.

MR. MANSEL: While he does that, I'll answer the question.

MR. MANSEL: The history of helicopters at the airports. We used to have probably -- now, three, four years ago we used to have a flight school at the airport that did helicopter flight training. We used to have close to 80 or 90 helicopter flight operations a day. That helicopter flight school left Oakland Airport. When they left Oakland Airport -- again, I think a couple years ago now -- the number of operations dropped down to the number you see. I think it was nine or some small number of daily helicopter operations.

What happens in this case is the number of operations increases, but the number of the loudest aircraft -- in particular, the hushkitted 727 aircraft that operate at night -- those numbers decrease in the fleet. There's sort of an offsetting effect. The noise effect is the contours get a little bit smaller because the effect of the retirement of the noisier aircraft has a greater effect than the increase in the number of operations.

SPEAKER: In other words, it is sort of like a compound effect of noise? It's not as simple as just taxing the noise effect of the single takeoff?

MR. MANSEL: No.

There are three factors that are included in these contours -- the number of operations, how loud the operation is and the time of day that the operation occurs. So, an operation that occurs between 7:00 and 10:00 in the evening is the same as three aircraft during the day. It's a penalty of
An aircraft that operates between 10 p.m. at night and 7 a.m. in the morning goes into this computation as though it were 10 airplanes during the day. So, there's a factor of 10 penalty for any aircraft that operates at night.

Those are the three main factors that go into these footprints.

SPEAKER: Thank you. That explains it.

Maybe while -- I'm sorry. One more.

So, you mentioned these are really for limited noise studies. If none of those plans were to go forward, there would be additional noise impact studies.

So, can you maybe give an idea of how more sophisticated or how much more information the study will be done beyond what you presented here today?

MR. MESTRE: The description of existing noise contours, those aren't preliminary. Those are very well established.

The airport operates a permanent noise monitoring system that has monitors that operate 24/7 around the airport. Those contours are updated every three months.

The airport publishes a new set of contours every quarter. Then there's an annual report that has a new annual contour.

So, these are not something that the airport looks at irregularly. Every three months, a new contour is generated. This is tracked. The trend -- the number of people inside the contours are reported on a quarterly basis. So, it's something that's not exactly real-time, but three months after the effect, the noise footprints are known.

MR. GROSSMAN: No, will we do future noise in any more detail.

MR. MESTRE: Certainly, if there was some piece of information that caused us to change any major assumption that was used in the study, either in terms of fleet mix or number of operations or the runways they use or the flight tracks, then the airport would essentially generate a new future contour that would be used for all the airport planning, community planning and work with the community. So, there is an ongoing program to keep track of what is happening and what might happen in the future.

MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Yes, sir. Thank you.

MR. WOZNIAK: Gordon Wozniak, City Council of Berkeley.

Could you put up the graph that shows the master plan forecast, the numbers? I have a summary sheet, but I think you had most of the information.

I wanted to ask a question about it.

The question relates to this. You were saying, on the transportation tonnage, even the tonnage was going to go up projected from 2004 to 2025. It roughly doubles from point 7 million tons, or whatever, to 1.5. The number of flights were staying about the same. You said they'll be using larger planes because you're going to constrain the number of flights. But in a more detailed figure which -- in the summary, when you show the passengers -- daily passengers -- the number of passengers per flight seems to be a little over 100. So, as you scale up your projected numbers, basically, the numbers grow linearly.

Since you're saying now you're constrained by one runway, why wouldn't the airlines put in bigger planes so you might actually get substantially higher than 207? The passenger facilities can't handle it?

Seems to me you could have a lot more passengers than you projected.

The numbers you had here -- in 2004, there are 44 thousand passengers per day, 430 flights. 2012 is 42 thousand and 600. That's, roughly, 100 passengers per plane. But there are a lot bigger planes out there.
1 Yeah, they right.
2 Again, as I think Doug mentioned, if
3 Southwest decided to buy 737 800s -- which is a
4 slightly bigger aircraft than the 700 -- we could
5 carry or they could carry more passengers.
6 They haven't made that decision. Nothing
7 suggests they're going to make that decision. But
8 they might.
9 So, this is our best guess right now.
10 10 years from now we'd have to re-evaluate all this.
11 You're right. We may handle more
12 airplanes or not more airplanes but more
13 passengers because the system has changed.
14 Again, we're basing our projections on
15 what we know today.
16 MS. FORSYTHE: Hi. My name is Hannah Forsythe. I'm an Alameda resident.
17 As part of your noise survey, the next one
18 you're going to be doing, are you going to be testing
19 noise levels in various parts of the county, the area?
20 I ask specifically because I've lived here only about a
21 year and a half.
22 I'd never heard an airplane until November 30.
23 I don't know what happened on November 30, but since
24 then I hear planes all the time. I can't hear Dave
25 Letterman on the television. Something happened.
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1 I'm wondering why last year, when I was
2 living here at the same time, I never heard an airplane.
3 Something is different. Something is different.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, if I had to pick on
5 somebody from the FAA here, I would, but I don't see
6 them.
7 That's a great question. We'll continue
8 working to try and get you answers on that.
9 MS. FORSYTHE: Could the FAA -- I tried
10 calling them. I talked to about four people.
11 I want to do something. So, that's why I'm
12 here.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
14 MS. FORSYTHE: I don't know where to go.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: That's a good point.
16 UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN SPEAKER: This is not a
17 question for you; it's actually an add-on to what my
18 neighbor just said.
19 I live in the same area. I went out to the
20 beach and watched flight patterns. The planes that
21 are going over our neighborhood are headed to SFO.
22 That's what I've discovered.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: That could be part of it.
24 Why it didn't happen last year is a whole other aspect
25 of it to consider.
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1 That is something fairly common. As you all
2 know, when the weather changes, airplanes coming into
3 SFO fly right over the Berkeley, Oakland, San Leandro
4 hills, to an extent. It's a very different operation.
5 But, again, we can check on last year and see
6 what's different, if anything. We'll keep working on
7 that.
8 Thank you.
9 MR. WACOWSKI: Hello. I'm Jim Wacowski.
10 If California were to build high-speed rail
11 between Northern and Southern California, would that
12 have any material impact on your projections, the use
13 of the airport?
14 MR. GROSSMAN: I'll try that one.
15 MS. McKENNEY: Okay.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: They like to delegate up to
17 me, so...
18 In the next 30 years, probably not, because
19 I don't know if it can be built in the next 30 years.
20 Long term, very well may be. If there were
21 high-speed rail, it would certainly draw traffic from
22 all three Bay Area airports in the Los Angeles market
23 without a doubt.
24 So, you know, again, that's a very long-term
25 investment to be made.
The regional decision that every government in the Bay Area needs to weigh in on.

But there is no plan I'm aware of to build, certainly, an air carrier airport in the Livermore area, nor am I aware of any plans to build a general aviation airport in the Livermore area. They have a very good airport for general aviation as it is.

Any other rumors out there?

MR. OKAY. Yeah.

MR. HOLL: Jim Roll, San Leandro.

Yeah. Speaking of rumors, has there been any talk about Travis? That airport is already built. It seems to me that could alleviate a lot of the problems, particularly in our neighborhood where we have a tremendous noise problem.

MR. GROSSMAN: Travis, Stockton, those have been talked about. They come into this regional planning scenario. Travis, of course, is a very active military base and has avoided being put on the closure list. So, it makes it a little problematic, but not to say it can't be done.

Stockton has a large airport facility with almost nobody there. So, that's another candidate if the region decides to go for a fourth airport or even a high-speed rail.

MR. GROSSMAN: All in favor? All opposed?

MR. GROSSMAN: Any comment on that?

MR. KROLL: Jim Kroll, San Leandro.

Ah. Okay. Yeah.

Any other rumors out there?

MR. GROSSMAN: You're fine.

MR. JACOBS: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. GROSSMAN: You're fine.

So, that's all that is. Nobody has plans to do it. Nobody is pushing to do it.

And you can imagine the difficulty of building a new airport in somebody's backyard. And so that's why, as Doug mentioned, this is a regional decision.

And neither Oakland nor my friends at Millbrae International can do it on their own. And so -- I mean, they proved it by spending eight million dollars and getting nowhere. So, I don't have eight million, but... So, I think that's going to be a

SPEAKER: Any comment on that?

SPEAKER: -- about an airport being built on the other side of the mountains, on Livermore -- over there.

MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. There's been a rumor that's come and gone through the years --

MR. GROSSMAN: I love rumors.

MR. GROSSMAN: -- about an airport being built on the other side of the mountains, on Livermore -- over there.

SPEAKER: -- about an airport being built on the other side of the mountains, on Livermore -- over there.

MR. GROSSMAN: Any comments?
I would like to mention to everybody. One of them is that there is pressure at every airport in the country to not expand, on the part of citizens, until they do two things -- quiet the airplanes and engage in some kind of dialogue and solution to pollution.

So, it's coming from a reverse direction. Now the airlines say, all of a sudden, waking up to the fact that there is a lot of pressure from citizens, that they're not going to get anywhere until they deal with those things, which has brought pressure on from an entirely different direction than we've seen up to now at the Noise Forum.

The other thing is that new aircraft are still being developed. There has been no real discussion about that tonight, but what was that new aircraft that Boeing is building, 30 percent quieter than the quietest airplane out there?

MR. GROSSMAN: 787. Was that mentioned?

MR. JACOB: 787. We could also be the beneficiary of that at some point, too.

MR. GROSSMAN: The technology is changing. The 787, of course, is essentially, I understand, designed as an intercontinental airplane -- of which we don't have a whole lot at Oakland. But that technology, as it gets applied to smaller airplanes, can certainly benefit us, as it gets applied to large cargo airplanes, can certainly benefit us.

Good point, Walt. Thank you.

Yes. Come on up.

MR. BLAND: Hi. My name is Mercedes Bland, and I'm in Alameda.

With all the growth that you projected regarding to where you'll be in 2025 with Oakland Airport, is there anything, like, planned in conjunction with the three cities that are here tonight and how all their plans have growth that will be combined and affected on 880 once everybody gets to grow? Everybody else can grow everywhere else, but I don't see how 880 between Emeryville and the end of San Leandro has room to expand to accommodate a whole lot more, much less double.

MR. GROSSMAN: Good question. Boy, we could start a whole lot of rumours about that.

Once we get into our detailed environmental work, one of the things we have to do is coordinate with the cities around us and their plans for development and then analyze, essentially, kind of what they all look like together. It is a concern. I mean, one of the reasons the Port has been so vocal in its support of the air-BART connector project is for that project and for BART to take a greater share of our passengers. We're hopeful, working with BART, that that will become a reality as well.

We handle about a million passengers on the buses we run to the Coliseum. With a light-rail connection, we think we could potentially double that. But that's one way to, hopefully, take traffic off the roads.

But, yes, we do have to look at that as we get into the detailed environmental assessments before the projects are approved. So, you'll see some of that as we move forward with whatever the Board decides we'll move forward with.

Good points.

Yes?

MR. WAGNER: My name is Richard Wagner. I live in Alameda.

I didn't know there was a Noise Forum. If I had known there was, I probably would have shown up a long time ago.

My comment is about the cargo planes in the middle of the night.

It seems to me -- I've never taken -- I've never recorded the exact times I hear noise, but my best recollection is around 3 o'clock is when these are the first takeoffs, and then there's a period of about a half an hour or so, and then it seems like there are more planes that take off.

I have two comments. One is, why can't they just take off at about the same time -- 1:00, 2:00, 3:00? I mean, there's no other traffic.

There's no -- it's not a traffic problem. Why can't they all take off within 15 minutes?

The other thing -- it seems like they're doing a lot of taxiing out there. I mean, you hear the low hum of a jet aircraft.

I mean, when I fly, you get on the plane. Everybody is on. They fire it up. You back out and taxi a little bit and take off.

There's no other traffic out there, and yet I hear planes just running or a plane running as if they are waiting for the weather. Why can't they -- there can't be more than about five planes from FedEx and UPS that take off at that time of night. Why can't they all take off in five or 10 minutes?

MR. BLAND: 787. Was that mentioned?

MR. WAGNER: Good question.

Well, FedEx and UPS could provide you with a detailed answer to the question.
My assumption is it's related -- obviously, it's related to their business and how fast they can load, unload and get planes out of there.

Again, cargo planes operate a bit the same as passenger planes. They push back from their gates at the cargo buildings and taxi out to the runway.

I guess what I would suggest is if -- one, I'm sure Walt would be willing to talk to you about the Noise Forum. You're certainly invited to attend.

Two, I don't know if you're fully aware of our Noise Abatement Office that we have, because we could tell you exactly what time that's happening, where those airplanes are flying and what the noise levels are. And so if you would afterwards -- actually, Wayne has his hand raised back there.

Get a card from Wayne. If you can make the time, come in and talk to Wayne and the staff. You'll be amazed at the information they can provide you. We can also do some work with you on some of the business reasons why things happen.

MR. PEREZ: You were talking about newer, smaller aircraft.

MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.

MR. PEREZ: I'd like to ask another question.

MR. GROSSMAN: You can.

MR. PEREZ: You were talking about newer, smaller aircraft.

MR. GROSSMAN: In the master plan as such, is there anything in the master plan to encourage the use of quieter aircraft at night?

MR. KROLL: Hi. Jim Kroll again. We have one more question here.

MR. PEREZ: Okay. Any other questions?

MR. KROLL: How come?

MR. GROSSMAN: Mainly, because we don't control it. We worked with the Noise Forum to try and cajole FedEx into phasing out their noisy aircraft.

Actually, the most effective thing in phasing out those aircraft is the high cost of jet fuel. That's going to drive those aircraft out of the market faster than anything.

Once those aircraft are gone, essentially, we will have just about all new technology aircraft from the airlines, be they passenger or cargo. And so what you'll see -- over time, as technology improves, every new aircraft that the airlines buy is quieter than aircraft they were buying 10 years ago. And so that's going to change.

But, essentially, airports -- any airport around the country does not control that decision. And be it -- at least, in my opinion, we're not going to have any economic incentives or economic disincentives, we couldn't provide enough of those to make a difference in airline decision making, not when you're talking about every airplane costing in excess of 100 million dollars. So, I don't think it will be very effective to even try that.
insulation program, we were as liberal as we could be, under the Federal guidelines, to draw that line. So, in some cases, people are getting insulation who would not normally receive it, but, because we didn’t want to break up blocks, again, the line was drawn where it is.

We routinely look at the issue of the insulation program. It may well be that, as part of our environmental studies, we’ll look at are there any other homes that need to be insulated. But I don’t want to mislead you. Generally speaking, as the airport environment gets a bit quieter, there is less justification for us, in working with the Federal government, to approve additional homes to be insulated. That’s just kind of the facts.

So, while we’ll look at it, I don’t hold out a lot of hope we’re going to expand the insulation program beyond the boundaries today.

Ready to go home?

Sounds like it.

Great.

Thank you all for coming out tonight. We will be here if you have any questions.

Ms. McKENNEY: We want to let folks know. If you picked up a handout, all this information is on the Oakland Airport web site, www.oaklandsairport.com, and more.

Off the record at 8:50 p.m.
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