Introduction

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the Oakland International Airport (OAK or the Airport) Terminal Modernization and Development Project (Proposed Project) was published on May 7, 2021. A public involvement process was conducted by the Port of Oakland (Port) during the scoping period from May 7, 2021, through June 7, 2021. The scoping report will summarize that public involvement process and will be included as an appendix to the Draft EIR, anticipated to be released for public comment sometime in 2022.

The scoping report will consist of the following components:

- **Introduction:** A summary of the Proposed Project and the purpose of the scoping period.
- **Notice of Preparation and Advertisements for the Public Scoping Meetings:** Details for when and how notices and advertisements were issued to announce the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) scoping process.
- **Virtual Public Scoping Meetings:** Information on the four public scoping meetings that were held virtually on May 25, and 26, 2021.
- **Scoping Comments:** Details on how scoping comments were accepted and how many agencies, organizations, and members of the public provided comments.
- **List of Commenters:** Tables identifying commenters.
- **Responses to Scoping Comments:** A table documenting each scoping comment received and the Port’s response to each.

This document, the *Oakland International Airport Terminal Modernization and Development Project Summary Scoping Report*, is for informational purposes only. This document provides a summary of common comment themes and copies of the written comments the Port received during the scoping period. The full scoping report will be included with the Draft EIR.

Comment Period

The scoping period began with the release of the NOP on May 7, 2021. Comments were due to the Port by 3:00 pm Pacific Daylight Time (PDT) on June 7, 2021. The Port conducted a total of four virtual public scoping meetings on May 25, and 26, 2021. Notification of the CEQA scoping process included the following:

- Newspaper advertisements in English, Spanish, and Chinese language newspapers
- Press releases available on the Port’s website and sent to email media distribution lists
- Email notifications (eblasts) to contacts on the stakeholder list
• Announcement on the Port’s social media platforms
• On site airport advertisements on posters pre- and post-security

Scoping comments were accepted in the following formats during the scoping period:

• Electronic mail (email)
• Submittal of an online form at https://www.OaklandAirport.com/TerminalDevelopment/,
• U.S. Mail
• Verbally at the virtual scoping meetings,
• Via chat at the virtual scoping meetings.

A total of 6 agencies, 13 organizations, and 47 members of the public provided a total of 348 comments during the scoping period. Several letters were received after the scoping period closed. These letters were still accepted and will be included in the responses.

The number of comments broken down by method received is as follows:¹

- Email = 223
- Website Form = 66
- U.S. Mail = 24
- Verbally during the Scoping Meetings = 22
- Zoom Chat Feature during the Scoping Meetings = 22
- Phone Call = 3

Comment Overview

Responses to all comments made during the public scoping process will be included in the scoping report. Common themes identified during the scoping period and associated responses are included below in Table 1. All written comments submitted are included in this Summary Scoping Report as Attachment A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Theme</th>
<th>Response to Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The EIR should use the current baseline, which is existing conditions when the Notice of Preparation was issued.</td>
<td>Section 15125 of the CEQA Guidelines requires a Draft EIR to include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the Proposed Project to act as the baseline physical conditions by which a lead agency determines whether an impact is significant. As the Guidelines make clear, generally the baseline will be the environmental conditions existing at the time when...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The total number of comments broken down by method received does not match the total number of comments received because some commenters sent in comments using multiple methods.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Theme</th>
<th>Response to Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The EIR must include a robust analysis of the Project’s impacts, especially</td>
<td>The Draft EIR will discuss all of the potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, public health, and noise impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding a new terminal with 17 new passenger gates, together with numerous</td>
<td>The Draft EIR will address potential changes related to the forecast in aircraft operations that would occur as a result of the Proposed Project. The Draft EIR will identify mitigation measures to reduce significant environmental impacts that would occur as a result of the Proposed Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“efficiency” improvements, would remove existing operational constraints. The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project would enable OAK to accommodate far more passenger flight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operations than have ever been analyzed in prior OAK environmental documents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The DEIR must state how many more aircraft operations and passengers these and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other Proposed Project elements would accommodate at peak times and in total,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and analyze the impacts of the increase in airfield operations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Theme</td>
<td>Response to Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FedEx believes that its own proposed facilities optimization project should be evaluated during the preparation of the EIR.</td>
<td>On April 7, 2021, the Port rejected FedEx’s Development Permit Application for its “OAKR Hub Optimization Plan” submitted on March 8, 2021 and will not include it in the Draft EIR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT A

Written Comments
June 7, 2021

Colleen Liang  
Port of Oakland  
530 Water Street  
Oakland, CA 94658

SUBJECT: Response to the Notice of Preparation for the Oakland International Airport Terminal Development Project

Dear Colleen Liang,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Oakland International Airport Terminal Development Project. The proposed project would construct a new terminal, north of the existing terminal complex, and modernize terminals 1 and 2. The proposed project would also replace and create new parking for both employees and the public. The proposed project is located at various locations within the Oakland International Airport.

The Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) respectfully submits the following comments:

Basis for Congestion Management Program (CMP) Review

- It appears that the proposed project may generate at least 100 p.m. peak hour trips over existing conditions, and therefore the CMP Land Use Analysis Program requires the City to conduct a transportation impact analysis of the project. For information on the CMP, please visit: https://www.alamedactc.org/planning/congestion-management-program/.

Use of Countywide Travel Demand Model

- The Alameda Countywide Travel Demand Model should be used for CMP Land Use Analysis purposes. The CMP requires local jurisdictions to conduct travel model runs themselves or through a consultant. Before the model can be used for this project, a letter must be submitted to the Alameda CTC requesting use of the model and describing the project. A copy of a sample letter agreement is available upon request. The most current version of the Alameda CTC Countywide Travel Demand Model was updated in June 2018 to be consistent with the assumptions of Plan Bay Area 2040.

Impacts

- The DEIR should address all potential impacts of the project on the Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS) roadway network.
MTS roadway facilities in the project area include: I-880, Doolittle Dr, Hagenberger Rd, and Davis St.

For the purposes of CMP Land Use Analysis, the Highway Capacity Manual 2010 freeway and urban streets methodologies are the preferred methodologies to study vehicle delay impacts. Note that automobile delay cannot be deemed a significant environmental impact under current CEQA guidelines, however this analysis is required pursuant to the 2019 CMP. This impacts analysis may be included in an EIR appendix or in a separate document provided to Alameda CTC.

The Alameda CTC has not adopted any policy for determining a threshold of significance for Level of Service for the Land Use Analysis Program of the CMP. Professional judgment should be applied to determine the significance of project impacts (Please see Chapter 6 of the 2019 CMP for more information).

Please see the changes made to the CMP Land Use Analysis Program made in response to SB743 here: https://www.alamedactc.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Amendment_Land_Use_Analysis_Program_SB743.pdf

- The DEIR should address potential impacts, including both capacity and performance of the project on Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS) transit operators.
  o MTS transit operators potentially affected by the project include: BART and AC Transit
  o Transit impacts for consideration include the effects of project vehicle traffic on mixed flow transit operations, transit capacity, transit access/egress, need for future transit service, and consistency with adopted plans. See Appendix J of the 2019 CMP document for more details.

- The DEIR should address potential impacts of the project to people biking and walking in and near the project area, especially nearby roads included in the Countywide High-injury Network and major barriers identified in the Countywide Active Transportation Plan.
  o Impacts to consider on conditions for cyclists include effects of vehicle traffic on cyclist safety and performance, site development and roadway improvements, and consistency with adopted plans. See Appendix J of the 2019 CMP document for more details.

**Mitigation Measures**

- Alameda CTC’s policy regarding mitigation measures is that to be considered adequate they must be:
  o Adequate to sustain CMP roadway and transit service standards;
  o Fully funded; and
  o Consistent with project funding priorities established in the Capital Improvement Program of the CMP, the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP), and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) or the Federal Transportation Improvement Program, if the agency relies on state or federal funds programmed by Alameda CTC.

- The DEIR should discuss the adequacy of proposed mitigation measure according to the criteria above. In particular, the DEIR should detail when proposed roadway or transit route improvements are expected to be completed, how they will be funded, and the effect on service standards if only the funded portions of these mitigation measures are built prior to Project completion. The DEIR should also address the issue of transit funding as a mitigation measure in the context of the Alameda CTC mitigation measure criteria discussed above.
• Jurisdictions are encouraged to discuss multimodal tradeoffs associated with mitigation measures that involve changes in roadway geometry, intersection control, or other changes to the transportation network. This analysis should identify impacts to automobiles, transit, bicyclists, and pedestrians. The HCM 2010 MMLOS methodology is encouraged as a tool to evaluate these tradeoffs, but project sponsors may use other methodologies as appropriate for particular contexts or types of mitigations.

• The DEIR should consider the use of TDM measures, in conjunction with roadway and transit improvements, as a means of attaining acceptable levels of service. Whenever possible, mechanisms that encourage ridesharing, flextime, transit, bicycling, telecommuting and other means of reducing peak hour traffic trips should be considered. The Alameda CTC CMP Menu of TDM Measures and TDM Checklist may be useful during the review of the development proposal and analysis of TDM mitigation measures (See Appendices F and G of the 2019 CMP).

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this NOP. Please contact me or Chris G. Marks, Associate Transportation Planner at (510) 208-7453, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Cathleen Sullivan
Director of Planning

cc: Chris G. Marks, Associate Transportation Planner
Re: Oakland International Airport Terminal Modernization and Development Project + Notice of Preparation (NOP)

Dear Colleen Liang:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the Oakland International Airport Terminal Modernization and Development Project. We are committed to ensuring that impacts to the State’s multimodal transportation system and to our natural environment are identified and mitigated to support a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system. The following comments are based on our review of the May 2021 NOP.

Project Understanding

The project intends to address facility safety, efficiency, and modernization needs by developing the Terminal Area including the construction of a new terminal; modernization of existing Terminals 1 and 2, including consolidation of passenger processing functions (ticketing, baggage check-in, security) and construction of expanded Customs and Border Protection (CBP) facilities for international arrivals; and reconfiguration of existing cargo and support facilities. Development also includes improvements to the terminal area roadway, parking areas, and support facilities. The site is adjacent to State Route (SR)-61.
Travel Demand Analysis
With the enactment of Senate Bill (SB) 743, Caltrans is focused on maximizing efficient development patterns, innovative travel demand reduction strategies, and multimodal improvements. For more information on how Caltrans assesses Transportation Impact Studies, please review Caltrans' Transportation Impact Study Guide.
If the project meets the screening criteria established in the Port of Oakland or the Office of Planning and Research’s (OPR) adopted Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) policy to be presumed to have a less-than-significant VMT impact and exempt from detailed VMT analysis, please provide justification to support the exempt status in alignment with VMT policy. Projects that do not meet the screening criteria should include a detailed VMT analysis in the DEIR, which should include the following:

- VMT analysis pursuant to the Port of Oakland or OPR guidelines. Projects that result in automobile VMT per capita above the threshold of significance for existing (i.e. baseline) city-wide or regional values for similar land use types may indicate a significant impact. If necessary, mitigation for increasing VMT should be identified. Mitigation should support the use of transit and active transportation modes. Potential mitigation measures that include the requirements of other agencies such as Caltrans are fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other legally-binding instruments under the control of the City.

- A schematic illustration of walking, biking and auto conditions at the project site and study area roadways. Potential safety issues for all road users should be identified and fully mitigated.

- The project’s primary and secondary effects on pedestrians, bicycles, travelers with disabilities and transit performance should be evaluated, including countermeasures and trade-offs resulting from mitigating VMT increases. Access to pedestrians, bicycle, and transit facilities must be maintained.

- Clarification of the intensity of events/receptions to be held at the location and how the associated travel demand and VMT will be mitigated.

Mitigation Strategies
Location efficiency factors, including community design and regional accessibility, influence a project’s impact on the environment. Using Caltrans’ Smart Mobility 2010: A Call to Action for the New Decade, the proposed project site is identified as an Urban Center where community design is strong and regional accessibility is high.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
Given the place, type and size of the project, the DEIR should include a robust Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program to reduce VMT and greenhouse gas emissions from future development in this area. The measures listed below have been quantified by California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) and shown to have different efficiencies reducing regional VMT:

- Project design to encourage mode shift like walking, bicycling and transit access;
- Transit and trip planning resources such as a commute information kiosk;
- Real-time transit information systems;
- Transit access supporting infrastructure (including bus shelter improvements and sidewalk/ crosswalk safety facilities);
- New development vehicle parking reductions;
- VMT Banking and/or Exchange program;
- Incorporation of bicycle lanes in street design;
- Wayfinding and bicycle route mapping resources;
- Pedestrian network improvements;
- Traffic calming measures;
- Implementation of electric vehicle (EV) network, including designated parking spaces for EVs;
- Limiting parking supply;
- Market price public parking;
- Employee and public ridesharing programs, Commute Trip Reduction programs;
- Transit and trip planning resources such as a commute information kiosk;
- Real-time transit information system; and
- Transit access supporting infrastructure (including bus shelter improvements and sidewalk/ crosswalk safety facilities).

Using a combination of strategies appropriate to the project and the site can reduce VMT, along with related impacts on the environment and State facilities. TDM programs should be documented with annual monitoring reports by a TDM coordinator to demonstrate effectiveness. If the project does not achieve the VMT reduction goals, the reports should also include next steps to take in order to achieve those targets.

Please reach out to Caltrans for further information about TDM measures and a toolbox for implementing these measures in land use projects. Additionally, Federal Highway Administration’s Integrating Demand Management into the Transportation Planning Process: A Desk Reference (Chapter 8). The reference is
available online at:

Transportation Impact Fees
Please identify project-generated travel demand and estimate the costs of transit and active transportation improvements necessitated by the proposed project; viable funding sources such as development and/or transportation impact fees should also be identified. We encourage a sufficient allocation of fair share contributions toward multi-modal and regional transit improvements to fully mitigate cumulative impacts to regional transportation. We also strongly support measures to increase sustainable mode shares, thereby reducing VMT.

Lead Agency
As the Lead Agency, the Port of Oakland is responsible for all project mitigation, including any needed improvements to the State Transportation Network (STN). The project’s fair share contribution, financing, scheduling, implementation responsibilities and lead agency monitoring should be fully discussed for all proposed mitigation measures.

Equitable Access
If any Caltrans facilities are impacted by the project, those facilities must meet American Disabilities Act (ADA) Standards after project completion. As well, the project must maintain bicycle and pedestrian access during construction. These access considerations support Caltrans’ equity mission to provide a safe, sustainable, and equitable transportation network for all users.

Encroachment Permit
Please be advised that any permanent work or temporary traffic control that encroaches onto the State Right of Way (ROW) requires a Caltrans-issued encroachment permit. As part of the encroachment permit submittal process, you may be asked by the Office of Encroachment Permits to submit a completed encroachment permit application package, digital set of plans clearly delineating the State ROW, digital copy of signed, dated and stamped (include stamp expiration date) traffic control plans, this comment letter, your response to the comment letter, and where applicable, the following items: new or amended Maintenance Agreement (MA), approved Design Standard Decision Document (DSDD), approved encroachment exception request, and/or airspace lease agreement. Your application package may be emailed to D4Permits@dot.ca.gov.

To download the permit application and to obtain more information on all required documentation, visit https://dot.ca.gov/programs/traffic-operations/ep/applications.

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
Thank you again for including Caltrans in the environmental review process. Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Laurel Sears at laurel.sears@dot.ca.gov. Additionally, for future notifications and requests for review of new projects, please contact LDIGR-D4@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

MARK LEONG  
District Branch Chief  
Local Development - Intergovernmental Review  
c: State Clearinghouse
June 3, 2021

Colleen Liang  
Port of Oakland  
Environmental Programs and Planning Division  
530 Water Street, Oakland, California 94607

Via Email: cliang@portoakland.com

RE: Response to Notice of Preparation for the Oakland International Airport Terminal Development Project Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Liang,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation for the Oakland International Airport (OAK) Terminal Development Project Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). On behalf of the City of Alameda, I am writing regarding the scope of the EIR analysis.

The City of Alameda appreciates the value of the Oakland International Airport to the regional economy and its important role in providing mobility to our region. The Proposed Project addresses facility safety, efficiency, and modernization needs by developing the Terminal Area including the construction of a new terminal, modernization of existing Terminals 1 and 2, as well as improvements to the terminal area roadway, parking areas, and support facilities. We understand that the Proposed Project will result in an increase of 17 gates.

As the airport prepares its EIR, the City of Alameda asks that the scope of the EIR include consideration of how flight increases (both recent actual increases and forecasted potential future increases) will affect noise experienced in communities neighboring the airport. Specifically, we request that the EIR study any noise and safety impacts of the Proposed Project to the Alameda community. In addition, as the EIR scope will include the study of air quality and greenhouse gas emissions, we request that the EIR consider air quality impacts and emissions of projected flight increases on Alameda and neighboring cities.
The City acknowledges that the Proposed Project is intended to address safety, efficiency, and modernization needs primarily on the ground, and we ask for clarification in the Project Description as to the location of new facilities and gate capacity near the North Field. Our community is concerned that an increase in airport capacity, particularly when facilities are placed in closer proximity to the North Field, may correspond to not just an overall increase in flight activity and associated noise impacts and safety risk already experienced in Alameda, but also a likely increase in commercial flights off the North Field. If negative impacts on Alameda are identified in the EIR, then we look forward to seeing appropriate mitigation of those impacts.

The City of Alameda enjoys a collaborative relationship with the OAK Noise Office and Port of Oakland staff. We appreciate all the work that your staff has put in to address the airport noise and safety concerns of our community, and we look forward to a similarly collaborative process on the Oakland International Airport Terminal Development Project.

Please contact me at 510-747-6888 or atai@alamedaca.gov for questions.

Respectfully,

Allen Tai, AICP
City Planner

Cc: Eric Levitt, City Manager
    Andrew Thomas, Planning Director
May 25, 2021

Colleen Liang, Port Environmental Supervisor
Port of Oakland
Environmental Programs and Planning Division
530 Water Street
Oakland, CA 94607

Re: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report – Oakland
International Airport Terminal Development Project, Oakland

Dear Ms. Liang:

East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Oakland International Airport Terminal Development Project (Project) located in the City of Oakland (City). EBMUD has the following comments.

WATER SERVICE

EBMUD’s Central Pressure Zone, with a service elevation range between 0 and 100 feet, will serve the proposed development. Individual units in a newly built multi-occupancy commercial/industrial premises shall be individually metered. A water main extension, at the project sponsor’s expense, may be required to serve the property depending on EBMUD’s metering requirements and fire flow requirements set by the local fire department. Additional system capacity charges will be required due to the additional new water demand from the Project. The project sponsor should contact EBMUD’s New Business Office and request a water service estimate to determine the costs and conditions of providing additional water service to the proposed development. Engineering and installation of water mains and services require substantial lead time, which should be provided for in the project sponsor’s development schedule.

EBMUD’s Standard Site Assessment Report indicates the potential for contaminated soils or groundwater to be present within the project site boundaries. The project sponsor should be aware that EBMUD will not install piping or services in contaminated soil or groundwater (if groundwater is present at any time during the year at the depth piping is to be installed) that must be handled as a hazardous waste or that may be hazardous to the health and safety of construction and maintenance personnel wearing Level D personal protective equipment. Nor will EBMUD install piping or services in areas where groundwater contaminant concentrations exceed specified limits for discharge to the sanitary sewer system and sewage treatment plants. The project sponsor must submit copies to EBMUD of all known information regarding soil and groundwater quality within
or adjacent to the project boundary and a legally sufficient, complete and specific written remediation plan establishing the methodology, planning and design of all necessary systems for the removal, treatment, and disposal of contaminated soil and groundwater.

EBMUD will not design piping or services until soil and groundwater quality data and remediation plans have been received and reviewed and will not start underground work until remediation has been carried out and documentation of the effectiveness of the remediation has been received and reviewed. If no soil or groundwater quality data exists, or the information supplied by the project sponsor is insufficient, EBMUD may require the project sponsor to perform sampling and analysis to characterize the soil and groundwater that may be encountered during excavation, or EBMUD may perform such sampling and analysis at the project sponsor's expense. If evidence of contamination is discovered during EBMUD work on the project site, work may be suspended until such contamination is adequately characterized and remediated to EBMUD standards.

WASTEWATER SERVICE

EBMUD's Main Wastewater Treatment Plant (MWWTP) and interceptor system are anticipated to have adequate dry weather capacity to accommodate the proposed wastewater flows from this project and to treat such flows provided that the wastewater generated by the project meets the requirements of the EBMUD Wastewater Control Ordinance. However, wet weather flows are a concern. The East Bay regional wastewater collection system experiences exceptionally high peak flows during storms due to excessive infiltration and inflow (I/I) that enters the system through cracks and misconnections in both public and private sewer lines. EBMUD has historically operated three Wet Weather Facilities (WWFs) to provide primary treatment and disinfection for peak wet weather flows that exceed the treatment capacity of the MWWTP. Due to reinterpretation of applicable law, EBMUD's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit now prohibits discharges from EBMUD's WWFs. Additionally, the seven wastewater collection system agencies that discharge to the EBMUD wastewater interceptor system (“Satellite Agencies”) hold NPDES permits that prohibit them from causing or contributing to WWF discharges. These NPDES permits have removed the regulatory coverage the East Bay wastewater agencies once relied upon to manage peak wet weather flows.

A federal consent decree, negotiated among EBMUD, the Satellite Agencies, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), requires EBMUD and the Satellite Agencies to eliminate WWF discharges by 2036. To meet this requirement, actions will need to be taken over time to reduce I/I in the system. The consent decree requires EBMUD to continue implementation of its Regional Private Sewer Lateral Ordinance (www.eastbayspsl.com), construct various improvements to its interceptor system, and identify key areas of inflow and rapid infiltration over a 22-year period. Over the same time period, the consent decree requires the Satellite Agencies to perform I/I reduction work including sewer main rehabilitation and elimination of inflow.
sources. EBMUD and the Satellite Agencies must jointly demonstrate at specified intervals that this work has resulted in a sufficient, pre-determined level of reduction in WWF discharges. If sufficient I/I reductions are not achieved, additional investment into the region’s wastewater infrastructure would be required, which may result in significant financial implications for East Bay residents.

To ensure that the proposed project contributes to these legally required I/I reductions, the lead agency should require the project applicant to comply with EBMUD’s Regional Private Sewer Lateral Ordinance. Additionally, it would be prudent for the lead agency to require the following mitigation measures for the proposed project: (1) replace or rehabilitate any existing sanitary sewer collection systems, including sewer lateral lines to ensure that such systems and lines are free from defects or, alternatively, disconnected from the sanitary sewer system, and (2) ensure any new wastewater collection systems, including sewer lateral lines, for the project are constructed to prevent I/I to the maximum extent feasible while meeting all requirements contained in the Regional Private Sewer Lateral Ordinance and applicable municipal codes or Satellite Agency ordinances.

**WATER RECYCLING**

EBMUD’s Policy 9.05 requires that customers use non-potable water, including recycled water, for non-domestic purposes when it is of adequate quality and quantity, available at reasonable cost, not detrimental to public health and not injurious to plant, fish and wildlife to offset demand on EBMUD’s limited potable water supply. Appropriate recycled water uses include landscape irrigation, commercial and industrial process uses, toilet and urinal flushing in non-residential buildings, cooling towers, and other applications.

The Oakland Airport is located within EBMUD’s San Leandro Recycled Water service area and present opportunities for recycled water uses ranging from landscape irrigation, toilet flushing and other non-potable commercial and industrial applications that can be served by the existing or expanded pipelines in the future. The current recycled water in the area is limited to secondary treated supply which is suitable for irrigation purposes per the state and health regulations but no other applications; however, the existing San Leandro Recycled Water project could potentially upgrade the treatment to a tertiary level which can expand and allow for indoor and commercial uses. If EBMUD determines that recycled water is available and appropriate for these applications, the project sponsor will be responsible for the extension of recycled water pipelines to and within the proposed development. Alternatively, the Port of Oakland could consider and evaluate the feasibility of an on-site satellite system to provide recycled water for irrigation and other potential uses to serve the Project. The satellite system can connect to and utilize either the partially treated secondary supply from the San Leandro Recycled Water project or other local wastewater sources in the vicinity of the airport for further treatment and use.

EBMUD requires that the Port of Oakland provide irrigation and indoor uses such as toilet flushing and cooling estimated demands and maintain continued coordination and consultation with the EBMUD as they plan and implement the Project to determine the
feasibility of the above options to provide recycled water for irrigation and other possible uses.

WATER CONSERVATION

The Project presents an opportunity to incorporate water conservation measures. EBMUD requests that the City include in its conditions of approval a requirement that the project sponsor comply with Assembly Bill 325, "Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance," (Division 2, Title 23, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 2.7, Sections 490 through 495). The project sponsor should be aware that Section 31 of EBMUD’s Water Service Regulations requires that water service shall not be furnished for new or expanded service unless all the applicable water-efficiency measures described in the regulation are installed at the project sponsor’s expense.

If you have any questions concerning this response, please contact Timothy R. McGowan, Senior Civil Engineer, Major Facilities Planning Section at (510) 287-1981.

Sincerely,

David J. Rehnstrom
Manager of Water Distribution Planning
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May 10, 2021

Colleen Liang
Port of Oakland
530 Water Street
Oakland, CA 94607

Re: 2021050164, Oakland International Airport Terminal Development Project, Alameda County

Dear Ms. Liang:

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) has received the Notice of Preparation (NOP), Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) or Early Consultation for the project referenced above. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code §21000 et seq.), specifically Public Resources Code §21084.1, states that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code § 21084.1; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §15064.5 (b) (CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 (b))). If there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before a lead agency, that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) shall be prepared. (Pub. Resources Code §21080 (a); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 5064 subd. (a)(1) (CEQA Guidelines §15064 (a)(1))). In order to determine whether a project will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, a lead agency will need to determine whether there are historical resources within the area of potential effect (APE).

CEQA was amended significantly in 2014. Assembly Bill 52 (Gatto, Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014) (AB 52) amended CEQA to create a separate category of cultural resources, “tribal cultural resources” (Pub. Resources Code §21074) and provides that a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code §21084.2). Public agencies shall, when feasible, avoid damaging effects to any tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code §21084.3 (a)). AB 52 applies to any project for which a notice of preparation, a notice of negative declaration, or a mitigated negative declaration is filed on or after July 1, 2015. If your project involves the adoption of or amendment to a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation or proposed designation of open space, on or after March 1, 2005, it may also be subject to Senate Bill 18 (Burton, Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004) (SB 18). Both SB 18 and AB 52 have tribal consultation requirements. If your project is also subject to the federal National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.) (NEPA), the tribal consultation requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (154 U.S.C. 300101, 36 C.F.R. §800 et seq.) may also apply.

The NAHC recommends consultation with California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of your proposed project as early as possible in order to avoid inadvertent discoveries of Native American human remains and best protect tribal cultural resources. Below is a brief summary of portions of AB 52 and SB 18 as well as the NAHC’s recommendations for conducting cultural resources assessments.

Consult your legal counsel about compliance with AB 52 and SB 18 as well as compliance with any other applicable laws.
AB 52

AB 52 has added to CEQA the additional requirements listed below, along with many other requirements:

1. **Fourteen Day Period to Provide Notice of Completion of an Application/Decision to Undertake a Project:** Within fourteen (14) days of determining that an application for a project is complete or of a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, a lead agency shall provide formal notification to a designated contact of, or tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice, to be accomplished by at least one written notice that includes:
   a. A brief description of the project.
   b. The lead agency contact information.
   c. Notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1 (d)).
   d. A "California Native American tribe" is defined as a Native American tribe located in California that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC for the purposes of Chapter 905 of Statutes of 2004 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code §21073).

2. **Begin Consultation Within 30 Days of Receiving a Tribe’s Request for Consultation and Before Releasing a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report:** A lead agency shall begin the consultation process within 30 days of receiving a request for consultation from a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1, subds. (d) and (e)) and prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration or Environmental Impact Report. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1(b)).
   a. For purposes of AB 52, "consultation shall have the same meaning as provided in Gov. Code §65352.4 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1 (b)).

3. **Mandatory Topics of Consultation If Requested by a Tribe:** The following topics of consultation, if a tribe requests to discuss them, are mandatory topics of consultation:
   a. Alternatives to the project.
   b. Recommended mitigation measures.
   c. Significant effects. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.2 (a)).

4. **Discretionary Topics of Consultation:** The following topics are discretionary topics of consultation:
   a. Type of environmental review necessary.
   b. Significance of the tribal cultural resources.
   c. Significance of the project’s impacts on tribal cultural resources.
   d. If necessary, project alternatives or appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation that the tribe may recommend to the lead agency. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.2 (a)).

5. **Confidentiality of Information Submitted by a Tribe During the Environmental Review Process:** With some exceptions, any information, including but not limited to, the location, description, and use of tribal cultural resources submitted by a California Native American tribe during the environmental review process shall not be included in the environmental document or otherwise disclosed by the lead agency or any other public agency to the public, consistent with Government Code §6254 (r) and §6254.10. Any information submitted by a California Native American tribe during the consultation or environmental review process shall be published in a confidential appendix to the environmental document unless the tribe that provided the information consents, in writing, to the disclosure of some or all of the information to the public. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (c)(1)).

6. **Discussion of Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources in the Environmental Document:** If a project may have a significant impact on a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency’s environmental document shall discuss both of the following:
   a. Whether the proposed project has a significant impact on an identified tribal cultural resource.
   b. Whether feasible alternatives or mitigation measures, including those measures that may be agreed to pursuant to Public Resources Code §21082.3, subdivision (a), avoid or substantially lessen the impact on the identified tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (b)).
7. **Conclusion of Consultation:** Consultation with a tribe shall be considered concluded when either of the following occurs:
   a. The parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect, if a significant effect exists, on a tribal cultural resource; or
   b. A party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.2 (b)).

8. **Recommending Mitigation Measures Agreed Upon in Consultation in the Environmental Document:** Any mitigation measures agreed upon in the consultation conducted pursuant to Public Resources Code §21080.3.2 shall be recommended for inclusion in the environmental document and in an adopted mitigation monitoring and reporting program, if determined to avoid or lessen the impact pursuant to Public Resources Code §21082.3, subdivision (b), paragraph 2, and shall be fully enforceable. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (a)).

9. **Required Consideration of Feasible Mitigation:** If mitigation measures recommended by the staff of the lead agency as a result of the consultation process are not included in the environmental document or if there are no agreed upon mitigation measures at the conclusion of consultation, or if consultation does not occur, and if substantial evidence demonstrates that a project will cause a significant effect to a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency shall consider feasible mitigation pursuant to Public Resources Code §21084.3 (b). (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (e)).

10. **Examples of Mitigation Measures That, if Feasible, May Be Considered to Avoid or Minimize Significant Adverse Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources:**
   a. Avoidance and preservation of the resources in place, including, but not limited to:
      i. Planning and construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context.
      ii. Planning greenspace, parks, or other open space, to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria.
   b. Treating the resource with culturally appropriate dignity, taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, the following:
      i. Protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource.
      ii. Protecting the traditional use of the resource.
      iii. Protecting the confidentiality of the resource.
   c. Permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or utilizing the resources or places.
   d. Protecting the resource. (Pub. Resource Code §21084.3 (b)).
   e. Please note that a federally recognized California Native American tribe or a non-federally recognized California Native American tribe that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC to protect a California prehistoric, archaeological, cultural, spiritual, or ceremonial place may acquire and hold conservation easements if the conservation easement is voluntarily conveyed. (Civ. Code §815.3 (c)).
   f. Please note that it is the policy of the state that Native American remains and associated grave artifacts shall be repatriated. (Pub. Resources Code §5097.991).

11. **Prerequisites for Certifying an Environmental Impact Report or Adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration or Negative Declaration with a Significant Impact on an Identified Tribal Cultural Resource:** An Environmental Impact Report may not be certified, nor may a mitigated negative declaration or a negative declaration be adopted unless one of the following occurs:
   a. The consultation process between the tribes and the lead agency has occurred as provided in Public Resources Code §21080.3.1 and §21080.3.2 and concluded pursuant to Public Resources Code §21080.3.2.
   b. The tribe that requested consultation failed to provide comments to the lead agency or otherwise failed to engage in the consultation process.
   c. The lead agency provided notice of the project to the tribe in compliance with Public Resources Code §21080.3.1 (d) and the tribe failed to request consultation within 30 days. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (d)).

The NAHC’s PowerPoint presentation titled, “Tribal Consultation Under AB 52: Requirements and Best Practices” may be found online at: [http://nahc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/AB52TribalConsultation_CalEPA.pdf](http://nahc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/AB52TribalConsultation_CalEPA.pdf)
SB 18 applies to local governments and requires local governments to contact, provide notice to, refer plans to, and consult with tribes prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation of open space. (Gov. Code §65352.3). Local governments should consult the Governor's Office of Planning and Research's "Tribal Consultation Guidelines," which can be found online at: https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/09_14_05_Updated_Guidelines.922.pdf.

Some of SB 18's provisions include:

1. **Tribal Consultation**: If a local government considers a proposal to adopt or amend a general plan or a specific plan, or to designate open space it is required to contact the appropriate tribes identified by the NAHC by requesting a "Tribal Consultation List." If a tribe, once contacted, requests consultation the local government must consult with the tribe on the plan proposal. A tribe has 90 days from the date of receipt of notification to request consultation unless a shorter timeframe has been agreed to by the tribe. (Gov. Code §65352.3 (a)(2)).

2. **No Statutory Time Limit on SB 18 Tribal Consultation.** There is no statutory time limit on SB 18 tribal consultation.

3. **Confidentiality**: Consistent with the guidelines developed and adopted by the Office of Planning and Research pursuant to Gov. Code §65040.2, the city or county shall protect the confidentiality of the information concerning the specific identity, location, character, and use of places, features and objects described in Public Resources Code §5097.9 and §5097.993 that are within the city's or county's jurisdiction. (Gov. Code §65352.3 (b)).

4. **Conclusion of SB 18 Tribal Consultation**: Consultation should be concluded at the point in which:
   a. The parties to the consultation come to a mutual agreement concerning the appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation; or
   b. Either the local government or the tribe, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached concerning the appropriate measures of preservation or mitigation. (Tribal Consultation Guidelines, Governor's Office of Planning and Research (2005) at p. 18).

Agencies should be aware that neither AB 52 nor SB 18 precludes agencies from initiating tribal consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with their jurisdictions before the timeframes provided in AB 52 and SB 18. For that reason, we urge you to continue to request Native American Tribal Contact Lists and "Sacred Lands File" searches from the NAHC. The request forms can be found online at: http://nahc.ca.gov/resources/forms/.

**NAHC Recommendations for Cultural Resources Assessments**

To adequately assess the existence and significance of tribal cultural resources and plan for avoidance, preservation in place, or limiting both, mitigation of project-related impacts to tribal cultural resources, the NAHC recommends the following actions:

1. **Contact the appropriate regional California Historical Research Information System (CHRIS) Center** (http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=1068) for an archaeological records search. The records search will determine:
   a. If part or all of the APE has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
   b. If any known cultural resources have already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE.
   c. If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
   d. If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.

2. **If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.**
   a. The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum and not be made available for public disclosure.
   b. The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional CHRIS center.
3. Contact the NAHC for:
   a. A Sacred Lands File search. Remember that tribes do not always record their sacred sites in the Sacred Lands File, nor are they required to do so. A Sacred Lands File search is not a substitute for consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project’s APE.
   b. A Native American Tribal Consultation List of appropriate tribes for consultation concerning the project site and to assist in planning for avoidance, preservation in place, or, failing both, mitigation measures.

4. Remember that the lack of surface evidence of archaeological resources (including tribal cultural resources) does not preclude their subsurface existence.
   a. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of inadvertently discovered archaeological resources per Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15064.5(f) (CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5(f)). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American with knowledge of cultural resources should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.
   b. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the disposition of recovered cultural items that are not burial associated in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.
   c. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the treatment and disposition of inadvertently discovered Native American human remains. Health and Safety Code §7050.5, Public Resources Code § 5097.98, and Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15064.5, subdivisions (d) and (e) (CEQA Guidelines §15064.5, subds. (d) and (e)) address the processes to be followed in the event of an inadvertent discovery of any Native American human remains and associated grave goods in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at my email address: Nancy.Gonzalez-Lopez@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Nancy Gonzalez-Lopez
Cultural Resources Analyst

cc: State Clearinghouse
June 9, 2021

Colleen Liang
Port of Oakland
530 Water Street
Oakland, CA 94607
Via email: cliang@portoakland.com

SUBJECT: Notice of Preparation of A Draft Environmental Impact Report for the
Oakland International Airport Terminal Development Project; BCDC Inquiry
File No. MC.MC.7415.26

Dear Ms. Liang:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Oakland International Airport Terminal Development
Project received by our office on May 7, 2021.

The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) is a responsible
agency for this project and will rely on the EIR when considering approvals related to the
project. While the description of the project in the NOP is not specific enough for BCDC staff to
comment on every potential issue that could be raised with respect to BCDC’s laws and policies,
staff has prepared the following comments outlining issues under BCDC’s jurisdiction that
should be addressed as part of the EIR. The Commission itself has not reviewed the NOP; the
following comments are based on BCDC staff review of the NOP, the McAteer-Petris Act (Title
7.2 of the California Government Code), and the San Francisco Bay Plan (Bay Plan).¹

Based on the NOP, we understand that the Proposed Project will include the following
components:

- **New Terminal.** Construction of a new terminal consisting of up to two levels located
  north of the existing terminal complex, with new connectors joining the new and
  existing terminals.

- **Terminal 1.** Demolition of the Terminal 1 check-in and baggage claim building and
  relocation of check-in and baggage processing functions to Terminal 2. Renovation of
  the Terminal 1 concourse and expansion of the Customs and Border Patrol facility.

¹ The most recent version of the Bay Plan (2020) can be found at
• **Terminal 2.** Expansion of check-in area, minor reconfiguration of the baggage screening area, development of a new outbound baggage makeup area, and expansion of the inbound baggage area.

• **Roadway and Parking.** Improvements to roadway and curb front configuration at new terminal, replacement parking facilities and new parking facilities for public and employee parking east of Airport Drive and at the western edge of the airport property.

• **Cargo and Support Facilities.** Demolition of freighter and belly cargo, public parking, and airline provisioning facilities. Relocation of freighter and belly cargo facilities in terminal area near Ron Cowan Parkway, involving demolition of existing Oakland Maintenance Center Hangar and relocation of employee parking. Relocation of airline provisioning and catering facilities and construction of a new consolidated receiving and distribution center northeast of existing main parking lot. Expansion and upgrading of existing fuel system and fuel farm.

**BCDC Jurisdiction**

A portion of the Proposed Project Area indicated in the NOP may be within BCDC permitting jurisdiction. Per the McAteer-Petris Act, BCDC is responsible for granting or denying permits for any proposed fill; extraction of materials; or substantial change in use of any water, land, or structure within the Commission’s jurisdiction (Government Code Section 66632).

Based on the NOP project description, relevant areas of BCDC jurisdiction for the project may include the shoreline band, consisting of all territory located between the shoreline of the Bay and 100 feet landward of and parallel with the shoreline (Government Code Section 66610(b)). The EIR’s project description and settings should clearly identify the shoreline band through mapping, and describe the project components taking place within BCDC jurisdiction. If any components of the Proposed Project would occur within the San Francisco Bay, defined as all areas subject to tidal action, including tidelands (land lying between mean high tide and mean low tide) and submerged lands (Government Code Section 66610(a)), the EIR should identify these components and note that they are within BCDC’s Bay jurisdiction.

Note that per California Code of Regulations Section 10710, any “areas once subject to Commission jurisdiction remain subject to that same jurisdiction,” including areas that may have been “filled or otherwise artificially altered.” Thus, the EIR should state whether any portion of the Proposed Project would be located on Bay fill that was placed since 1965.

**Land Use and Planning**

The EIR should include information on the Bay Plan and the McAteer Petris Act, and assess the Proposed Project’s consistency with both as part of the impact analysis for land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The Bay Plan is BCDC’s primary policy instrument and establishes policies for
development and resource conservation within the Commission’s jurisdiction. Policy areas covered in the Bay Plan include water quality; airports; safety of fills; appearance, design, and scenic views; public access; and others.

Additionally, most of the Proposed Project would take place within BCDC’s Airport Priority Use Area as designated by the San Francisco Bay Plan (see Plan Map 5). The EIR should acknowledge this land use designation and accompanying Bay Plan policies.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The EIR should consider the following policy issues as part of its Hydrology and Water Quality analysis.

WATER QUALITY

The Bay Plan includes the following policies in its Water Quality section:

- **Policy 1.** Bay water pollution should be prevented to the greatest extent feasible...

- **Policy 2.** Water quality in all parts of the Bay should be maintained at a level that will support and promote the beneficial uses of the Bay as identified in the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board's Water Quality Control Plan, San Francisco Bay Basin and should be protected from all harmful or potentially harmful pollutants....

- **Policy 3.** New projects should be sited, designed, constructed and maintained to prevent or, if prevention is infeasible, to minimize the discharge of pollutants into the Bay by: (a) controlling pollutant sources at the project site; (b) using construction materials that contain non-polluting materials; and (c) applying appropriate, accepted and effective best management practices, especially where water dispersion is poor and near shellfish beds and other significant biotic resources.

- **Policy 6.** To protect the Bay and its tributaries from the water quality impacts of nonpoint source pollution, new development should be sited and designed consistent with standards in municipal stormwater permits and state and regional stormwater management guidelines, where applicable, and with the protection of Bay resources. To offset impacts from increased impervious areas and land disturbances, vegetated swales, permeable pavement materials, preservation of existing trees and vegetation, planting native vegetation and other appropriate measures should be evaluated and implemented where appropriate.
• Policy 7. Whenever practicable, native vegetation buffer areas should be provided as part of a project to control pollutants from entering the Bay, and vegetation should be substituted for rock riprap, concrete, or other hard surface shoreline and bank erosion control methods where appropriate and practicable.

The EIR should discuss the potential for demolition, construction, and operational components of the Proposed Project to have an adverse effect on water quality, particularly to the extent that beneficial uses of Bay waters could be impacted. The analysis should address how the Proposed Project would manage potential pollution sources such as dust, debris, chemicals, and waste, including pollutants from nonpoint sources, and how any potential impacts would be mitigated.

FLOOD HAZARDS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

The Bay Plan includes a Climate Change section, which recognizes the various ways climate change and related rises in sea level could affect the communities in BCDC’s jurisdiction, particularly through sea level rise and flooding. Policies in this section establish a basis for evaluating projects based on their resiliency to projected rises in sea level. BCDC highly recommends that the EIR investigate the probability and impact of sea level rise as a matter of hydrology and water quality and to consider how sea level rise may affect the significance of impacts in other topic areas, such as those related to geological hazards and hazards and hazardous materials. Sea level rise threatens water quality not only through the release of contaminants into shoreline developments by overland flooding, but also through groundwater contamination caused by saltwater incursions into fresh groundwater reservoirs.

The Climate Change policies include the following:

• Policy 2. When planning shoreline areas or designing larger shoreline projects, a risk assessment should be prepared by a qualified engineer and should be based on the estimated 100-year flood elevation that takes into account the best estimates of future sea level rise and current flood protection and planned flood protection that will be funded and constructed when needed to provide protection for the proposed project or shoreline area. A range of sea level rise projections for mid-century and end of century based on the best scientific data available should be used in the risk assessment...

• Policy 3. ...[W]ithin areas that a risk assessment determines are vulnerable to future shoreline flooding that threatens public safety, all projects—other than repairs of existing facilities, small projects that do not increase risks to public safety, interim projects and infill projects within existing urbanized areas—should be designed to be resilient to a mid-century sea level rise projection. If it is likely the project will remain in
place longer than mid-century, an adaptive management plan should be developed to address the long-term impacts that will arise based on a risk assessment using the best available science-based projection for sea level rise at the end of the century.

As part of its flood hazard analysis, the EIR should include mapping of potential sea level rise scenarios using the best available science for projected water levels. It should reference the mapping in discussing potential impacts related to flood hazards over the life of the Proposed Project, including the potential for the Proposed Project to affect flood flows. As of June 2021, the best available science-based projections for sea level rise can be found in the State of California’s 2018 Sea-Level Rise Guidance.\(^2\) Resources available to assist the preparers of the EIR in the above assessments include BCDC’s Adapting to Rising Tides (ART) maps and data products, including the Bay Shoreline Flood Explorer.\(^3\)

The EIR should also determine the locations of possible groundwater incursions, and analyze the impact of saline groundwater rise on the level and quality of fresh groundwater and the efficacy of possible prevention and mitigation methods (e.g., groundwater barriers). The analysis should also consider whether potential groundwater rise could affect underground utility systems, and whether potential impacts could result in contamination.

In addition, the Bay Plan’s Shoreline Protection section contains BCDC’s policies for the design and implementation of shoreline protection. The EIR should state whether shoreline protection would be necessary to avoid or mitigate flooding impacts and assess how such protection would be consistent with policies of this section.

**Geology and Soils**

Section 66632 of the McAteer-Petris Act defines fill as “earth or any other substance or material, including pilings or structures placed on pilings, and structures floating at some or all times and moored for extended periods, such as houseboats and floating docks.” The EIR should note whether any portion of the Proposed Project would be taking place on fill. If so, the EIR should map and describe any areas of the project site subject to tidal action at any point since September 17, 1965 that have been subsequently filled, and describe in detail the proposed development, activity, and uses on these filled areas and consistency with the Commission’s laws and policies. If any new fill is proposed as part of the project, the EIR should also indicate the location of such fill, the proposed method of fill (e.g., solid earth, pile-supported structure, cantilevered structure), the approximate volume and surface area of the Bay to be filled, and the proposed development, activity, and uses of the newly filled area.


If new fill is proposed as part of the project or if portions of the project will be sited on existing fill, the EIR should include a description and consistency assessment for the Bay Plan’s Safety of Fills policies, which include the following:

- **Policy 2.** Even if the Bay Plan indicates that a fill may be permissible, no fill or building should be constructed if hazards cannot be overcome adequately for the intended use in accordance with the criteria prescribed by the Engineering Criteria Review Board.

- **Policy 3.** To provide vitally needed information on the effects of earthquakes on all kinds of soils, installation of strong-motion seismographs should be required on all future major land fills....

- **Policy 4.** Adequate measures should be provided to prevent damage from sea level rise and storm activity that may occur on fill or near the shoreline over the expected life of a project....

### Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Bay Plan’s Safety of Fills policies state that even where “the Bay Plan indicates that a fill may be permissible, no fill or building should be constructed if hazards cannot be overcome adequately for the intended use in accordance with the criteria prescribed by the Engineering Criteria Review Board” (Policy 2).

The EIR should identify whether any portions of the project site are contaminated with hazardous substances, any potential effects associated with such contaminants, and the role other regulatory agencies, including the State and Regional water boards and the Department of Toxic Substances Control, will take in reviewing and approving the project. The analysis should discuss any potential for demolition, construction, or operation associated with the Proposed Project to disturb and/or mobilize contaminants into the Bay. As noted above, changes in sea and groundwater levels may have the potential to mobilize contaminants in and above ground.

### Transportation

The Bay Plan’s Transportation policies state, in part, that “transportation projects on the Bay Shoreline...should be designed to maintain and enhance visual and physical access to the Bay and along the Bay shoreline” and “should include pedestrian and bicycle paths that will either be a part of the Bay Trail or connect the Bay Trail with other regional and community trails” (Policy 4). The EIR should discuss whether the Proposed Project would involve circulation improvements within BCDC’s jurisdiction, or if it could otherwise affect circulation within BCDC’s jurisdiction.
The Bay Plan also addresses transportation issues in its Public Access policies. Under the McAteer-Petris Act, the project must provide “maximum feasible public access, consistent with a proposed project.” The Bay Plan’s Public Access Policies expound on this directive, stating, in part, that “maximum feasible access to and along the waterfront and on any permitted fills should be provided in and through every new development in the Bay or on the shoreline” (Policy 2), and “access to and along the waterfront should be provided by walkways, trails, or other appropriate means and connect to the nearest public thoroughfare where convenient parking or public transportation may be available” (Policy 10).

There are public access routes in the vicinity of the Propose Project Area, including a designated Class I bike lane along Ron Cowan Parkway and existing and proposed Bay Trail segments along the airport’s perimeter. The EIR should discuss the potential for construction vehicles and operational traffic associated with the Proposed Project to impact public access routes, including whether they would pose a safety hazard for users of the routes. This should include an assessment of how the proposed project’s siting and the projected influx of new employees and customers to the airport could impact traffic in the area, any changes to road design and traffic patterns, and any areas expected to experience congestion or high speeds.

**Aesthetics**

The EIR should cite the Bay Plan’s Appearance, Design, and Scenic Views policies in the regulatory settings of the Aesthetics analysis. Policies that may be relevant to the analysis include, but are not limited to the following:

- **Policy 2.** All bayfront development should be designed to enhance the pleasure of the user or viewer of the Bay. Maximum efforts should be made to provide, enhance, or preserve views of the Bay and shoreline, especially from public areas, from the Bay itself, and from the opposite shore....

- **Policy 4.** Structures and facilities that do not take advantage of or visually complement the Bay should be located and designed so as not to impact visually on the Bay and shoreline. In particular, parking areas should be located away from the shoreline....

- **Policy 8.** Shoreline developments should be built in clusters, leaving areas open around them to permit more frequent views of the Bay. Developments along the shores of tributary waterways should be Bay-related and should be designed to preserve and enhance views along the waterway, so as to provide maximum visual contact with the Bay.
Environmental Justice

The Bay Plan includes a section on Environmental Justice and Social Equity. While environmental justice is not necessarily identified as a distinct resource area in and of itself to be analyzed under Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, many of the DEIR’s topic areas touch on issues of environmental justice. Environmental Justice and Social Equity Policy 4 states: “If a project is proposed within an underrepresented and/or identified vulnerable and/or disadvantaged community, potential disproportionate impacts should be identified in collaboration with the potentially impacted communities. Local governments and the Commission should take measures through environmental review and permitting processes, within the scope of their respective authorities, to require mitigation for disproportionate adverse project impacts on the identified vulnerable or disadvantaged communities in which the project is proposed.”

In considering impacts related to resource topics such as air quality, noise, and transportation, which could affect quality of life for the surrounding community, the EIR should consider whether impacts may be borne disproportionately in vulnerable or disadvantaged communities. The EIR should base this determination on input gathered from meaningful engagement with potentially affected communities.

We appreciate your attention to the topics discussed above and for the opportunity to make the above comments on the scope of the EIR. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me at (415)-352-3650 or by email at katharine.pan@bcdc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

KATHARINE PAN
Principal Shoreline Development Analyst
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
375 Beale Street, Suite 510
San Francisco, California 94105
Tel: 415-352-3600
Fax: 888 348 5190
Email: info@bcdc.ca.gov
Website: www.bcdc.ca.gov

KP/ra

cc: State Clearinghouse
June 7, 2021

Colleen Liang  
Port of Oakland  
530 Water Street  
Oakland, CA 94607

Submitted via electronic mail to cliang@portoakland.com

Re: Comments on the scope and content of the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the OAK Terminal Modernization & Development Project

Dear responsible officials:

This brief letter is in regards the scope and content of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the OAK Terminal Modernization & Development Project (Project). This letter is offered on behalf of our organization Biofuelwatch¹. Biofuelwatch is an international organization that works to increase public understanding and civic engagement on the land use implications of climate policy. We have a particular focus on the environmental harms and social inequities of large-scale industrial bioenergy projects, and we work extensively on addressing the negative ecological and social outcomes specifically of the forest-based biomass industry. We have also looked closely at the harms associated with emissions trading systems. Our organization participates actively with the global Stay Grounded² network.

We believe it is in the public interest that the Draft EIR be as exhaustive as possible when considering the climate impact of the proposed expansion of the Oakland International Airport. It is an imperative that not only impacts from carbon emissions (CO2) be considered but also the impacts from non-CO2 factors.

An exhaustive review of the impacts of any increase in air traffic would necessarily need to include review of the following impacts from aviation pollution and address any measurable increase in any of these possible climate forcings associated with aviation:

- Warming from contrail plumes and contrail cirrus
- Warming from near ground emissions
- Impacts of NOx emissions and increased ozone
- Impacts from sulfate aerosols on reflectivity of low altitude clouds
- Warming from accumulation of water vapor
- Possible cloud changes from soot
- Direct radiative effects from sulfates, soot and other emissions

¹ http://www.biofuelwatch.org.uk/
² https://stay-grounded.org/
Proposed Conversions of SF Bay Area Refineries to Manufacturing Alternative Jet Fuels and Project Fuel Farm and Fuel Infrastructure Expansion

As the aviation industry pivots harder to the promotion of so-called 'low carbon' alternative jet fuels the Project must be analyzed in the context of the proposed conversion of local SF Bay refineries to these fuels. Any expansion of the fuel farm and fuel delivery infrastructure at the airport must be seen in the context of existing pipeline infrastructure connecting OAK with local refineries.

The following are examples of the types of questions regarding future fuel supply and delivery to meet the needs of the proposed Project:

- What are the possible impacts of these proposed refinery conversions on the Project, in the context of either, both or neither of the related projects coming to fruition?
- What are the cumulative affects of the Project and related fuel manufacturing sector dynamics?
- What does the increased demand for fuel as a foreseeable outcome of the Project mean for the production and delivery of fuels? What are the public safety, public health consideration from spill and pollution risks for fuel delivery and fuel distribution?
- What about the roles of incentives and subsidies for these alternative fuels? What are the economic implications of more expensive fuels? What if subsidies and incentives were to be removed? What uncertainties and risks are presented to the environment and communities depending on these economics? How are clients of OAK impacted by the cost uncertainties?
- What are the true climate impacts of the possible feedstocks for proposed alternative jet fuels?

Importance of Analyzing Numerous No-Build or No-Expansion Alternatives

It is an imperative that alternatives to airport expansion and alternatives to an increase in the number of flights be analyzed. What are the possible transportation alternatives that would result in reduced climate and environmental impacts?

Thank you for your attention to this brief comment letter on Project scoping.

Sincerely,

Gary Graham Hughes
California Policy Monitor – Biofuelwatch

garyhughes.bfw@gmail.com
+1-707-223-5434
May 25, 2021

*Via Electronic Mail Only*

Ms. Joan Zatopek  
Aviation Planning and Development Manager  
Port of Oakland  
530 Water Street  
Oakland, CA 94607  
jzatopek@portoakland.com

Re: Aviation Stakeholder Advisory Committee Participation in Planning Process for Oakland International Airport Terminal Development Project.

Dear Joan:

On behalf of the Citizens League for Airport Safety and Serenity (“CLASS’’), I am writing to express our concern about Port staff’s decision to limit the Aviation Stakeholder Advisory Committee’s (“Advisory Committee”) participation in the Oakland International Airport Terminal Development Project (“Project”). Specifically, CLASS is concerned that the Port has gone back on its word regarding the Advisory Committee having an advisory role through the planning process for the Project.

For several years, Port staff has reported to the Advisory Committee regarding the pre-planning process for the Project and pledged to share information with the group as it became available. Port staff assured the Advisory Committee that the group would play an advisory role and indicated that the Advisory Committee’s input was welcomed and valued. Now, after only one recent meeting where we discussed operation projections, staff indicates that the group will be limited to commenting on the Project through the California Environmental Quality Act public review process. Under the Settlement Agreement, and consistent with past practice, the Advisory Committee has provided feedback about airport plans and projects and played an advisory role, as the name of the group indicates. The Port’s reversal of the assurances made to the Advisory Committee violates the spirit of the Settlement Agreement and erodes the trust that has been built with the community since the Advisory Committee was formed in 2006.
Additional meetings about the Port’s plans related to the Project are important to help the Advisory Committee understand the project details and provide feedback to the Port early in the process. For example, it would be helpful for the group to have: revised aviation forecasts that are being used to prepare the EIR, drawings depicting specific elements of the Project, information and plans for the proposed Cargo and Support Facilities and the expansion and upgrade of the fuel system and fuel farm, and an understanding of why the airport decided to proceed with the Project without undertaking a Master Plan update.

CLASS appreciates the established working relationship with the Port. That relationship is built on mutual respect and trust that community representatives will have opportunities to learn about projects ahead of time and to provide meaningful feedback to the Port. We would like to continue to have a professional, friendly, and productive working relationship through this process and into the future. In this way, we are hopeful that the Port will hear the community’s concerns early in the planning process and design the Project in such a way that the community can be supportive of the plans. To that end, we request that Port staff reconsider your position and continue to engage with the Aviation Stakeholder Advisory Committee in a meaningful way and does not relegate participation to formal comments submitted through the CEQA process.

Very truly yours,

Matt Pourfarzaneh, President
CLASS

cc: Bryant Francis, Director of Aviation (bfrancis@portoakland.com)
Kristi McKenney, Chief Operating Officer
Matt Davis, Airside Operations Manager
Colleen Liang, Environmental Planner
Matt Pourfarzaneh, C.L.A.S.S. President
Osa Wolff, C.L.A.S.S. attorney
Hello Colleen,

Below please find my comments regarding Oakland Notice of Preparation (NOP).

**Comments on the Notice of Preparation (NOP): Impacts that should be analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR)**

- The EIR must evaluate impacts related to increased noise and other topics using the current baseline conditions.
- The EIR must include a robust analysis of the Project’s impacts, especially air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, public health, and noise impacts.
- The EIR must analyze all of the growth resulting from adding a terminal and 17 additional gates, including increased regional car traffic, increased flight operations, and increased noise.
- The EIR must identify the anticipated number and timing of existing and future flights.
- Mitigation measures must be developed for all potentially significant impacts resulting from increased flight operations.

Thank You,

Matt Pourfarzaneh, Ph.D.
CLASS, President

[EXTERNAL] Comment on Oakland Notice of Preparation (NOP)

matt classalameda.com <matt@classalameda.com>

Thu 6/3/2021 5:26 PM

To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>
Cc: borg@smwlaw.com <borg@smwlaw.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)
June 7, 2021

*Via Electronic Mail Only*

Ms. Colleen Liang  
Port of Oakland  
530 Water Street  
Oakland, CA 94607  
E-Mail: cliang@portoakland.com

**Re:** Notice of Preparation - OAK Terminal Development Project

Dear Ms. Liang:

On behalf of the Citizens League for Airport Safety and Serenity (“CLASS”), thank you for the opportunity to review the Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) for the Oakland International Airport’s (“OAK”) Terminal Development Project (“Terminal Project” or “Project”). We look forward to taking part in OAK’s continuing efforts to ensure that the impacts of OAK are minimized and mitigated. In order to fully address the community’s concerns, the draft environmental impact report (“DEIR”) must analyze the full scope of the Project’s environmental impacts, including the growth-induced impacts of adding new passenger terminals and gates.

As the Port of Oakland is aware, CLASS has a number of longstanding concerns related to OAK, including but not limited to noise and public safety impacts. CLASS is particularly concerned with the magnitude of this proposed Project. The NOP indicates that the Terminal Project would add a new terminal with a two-level concourse containing seventeen new gates for passenger loading. NOP at 3. The NOP also includes a variety of development projects on the north and south airfields, including unspecified replacement facilities for freighter and belly cargo. These new facilities would create substantial noise, air pollution, and greenhouse gas emissions impacting community of Harbor Bay Isle residents, and other Alameda residents, who already deal with the impacts from one of the busiest airports in the region.
This letter explains CLASS’ concerns about the Project and identifies specific impacts that OAK should carefully evaluate as part of an informative and comprehensive DEIR.

**Project Description and Effect on Passenger Operations**

CLASS urges OAK to describe the Project and its environmental setting completely and accurately in the DEIR. “An accurate, stable and finite project description is the sine qua non of an informative and legally sufficient EIR.” San Joaquin Raptor/Wildlife Rescue Center v. County of Stanislaus (1994) 27 Cal.App.4th 713, 727. CLASS is concerned that the DEIR could fail to sufficiently analyze the Project’s potential impacts due to an incomplete project description. For instance, the Project’s “enabling components” include demolition of certain facilities, including the existing freighter and belly cargo facilities and the Oakland Maintenance Center Hangar. NOP at 5. The NOP states that facilities for freighter and belly cargo facilities would be relocated without providing sufficient detail regarding replacement facilities. *Id.* In addition to describing the removal of these and all other enabling components, the DEIR must clearly state where and when facilities slated for demolition would be rebuilt or relocated. If any of these facilities would be permanently removed, then the DEIR must state this and explain how any new and/or remaining facilities would accommodate capacity served by those planned for removal. Failure to analyze the impacts of the removal, relocation, and/or replacement of these facilities would run afoul of the California Environmental Quality Act’s (“CEQA”) prohibition on project segmentation.

Furthermore, by adding a new terminal with 17 new passenger gates, together with numerous “efficiency” improvements, the Project would remove existing operational constraints. The Project would enable OAK to accommodate far more passenger flight operations than have ever been analyzed in prior OAK environmental documents. The DEIR must state how many more aircraft operations and passengers these and other Project elements would accommodate at peak times and in total, and analyze the impacts of the increase in airfield operations.

In addition, the DEIR should include an analysis of how Project-related changes to flight operations, (e.g., increased taxi time to get across the airport and/or increased wait time for operations on Runway 30) might impact corporate jet compliance with the prohibition on north field use. The DEIR should include computer simulations to evaluate the Project’s impacts on corporate jets operations. In anticipation of significant impacts related to this topic, the DEIR should also include an alternative that includes relocation of fixed-base operators/corporate jet operations closer to Runway 30.
Unless the Project is fundamentally redesigned or incorporates substantial mitigation, it would lead to major increases in vehicle miles traveled, air pollution, and noise impacts on surrounding communities including Alameda. Under CEQA, the DEIR must address the Project’s substantial contribution to future growth in passenger traffic at OAK and the resulting impacts of such growth on surrounding communities.

Environmental/Land Use Setting

It is unclear, based on the NOP, how the DEIR will describe the environmental/land use setting for the Project. While the NOP notes the relationship between OAK and its neighbors, the focus of the description of the environmental setting appears to be within the airport’s boundaries and the specific plan area. See NOP at 1. Residents and businesses in Alameda, San Leandro, Oakland, and Berkeley, are adversely impacted by current operations, and the impacts would be greater with an expanded facility.

CEQA requires an EIR to provide a detailed description of the environmental setting of a proposed project. An adequate description of the setting must include “a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project, as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published . . . , from both a local and regional perspective.” CEQA Guidelines § 15125(a). The environmental setting forms the baseline against which the lead agency measures a proposed project’s environmental impacts. Id.

Expanded operations at Oakland Airport would affect a large area outside the airport’s boundaries. City of Alameda neighborhoods located immediately north of the airport would be particularly affected by the airport’s operations, given that primary flight paths go directly over, or are in close proximity to, these communities. Thus, the environmental setting in the DEIR must include a detailed and accurate description of the noise, traffic, and other physical environmental conditions existing at the time the NOP was published.

OAK Master Plan Consistency

Given the scale of the Project and its core terminal components, CLASS is concerned by the fact that OAK is advancing the Terminal Project as a standalone project instead of as an update to the 2006 Master Plan. The Master Plan is the modernization plan that is supposed to account for all growth at OAK, including construction of new taxiways, improving the level of passenger service, and building new aircraft parking gates. See generally Master Plan, Executive Summary. The Master Plan was adopted
fifteen years ago, in 2006 with analysis horizon of 2025. OAK cannot continue to rely on assumptions and mitigation from the Master Plan EIR while also advancing the Project as entirely separate from the Master Plan. Because the Master Plan is now due for an update, OAK should evaluate the project as part of a comprehensive update to the Master Plan and conduct the associated environmental review.

**Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas, Noise and Other Environmental Impacts**

The NOP states that Project construction and operations could result in significant impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use/planning, noise, public services, transportation, tribal cultural resources, and utilities/service systems. NOP at 5. Thus, the DEIR must fully analyze these impacts and provide mitigation and/or alternatives as required by CEQA. CLASS is especially interested in the analysis of impacts from single-event noise and impacts from the substantial increase in passenger operations the Project would enable. The analysis horizon should extend at least 25 years and must capture future growth enabled by the proposed project.

The DEIR should discuss the potentially significant cumulative environmental impacts of the Project. The CEQA Guidelines define cumulative impacts as “two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.” CEQA Guidelines § 15355(a). “[I]ndividual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects.” Id. “Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.” Id. § 15355(b). A legally adequate cumulative impacts analysis views a particular project over time and must consider the impact of the project combined with other projects causing related impacts, including past, present, and probable future projects. Id. § 15130(b)(1).

The DEIR for the Project must include other nearby development in its cumulative impacts analysis. The DEIR should consider the cumulative impacts, including traffic congestion, greenhouse gas, and air quality impacts, that could result from the combination of the Project and other cumulative projects. Additionally, the environmental review document should evaluate how expanded operations at OAK would impact the residents and businesses in newly-developed areas. CLASS urges a thorough analysis of potential cumulative impacts and inclusion of meaningful alternatives and mitigation measures in the DEIR.
**National Environmental Policy Act Review**

The NOP states that the Project requires approval by the Federal Aviation Administration, and will require review under the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”). CLASS requests more information regarding the timing and scope of such review. The NOP provides no useful information regarding how OAK’s CEQA process will relate to the federal NEPA process.

**Conclusion**

On behalf of CLASS, thank you for addressing the foregoing issues in the DEIR. We look forward to participating fully in the Project development process.

Very truly yours,

SHUTE, MIHALY & WEINBERGER LLP

Osa L. Wolff

Carmen J. Borg, AICP
Urban Planner

cc: Matt Pourfarzaneh, Ph.D., C.L.A.S.S. President
June 7, 2021

Port of Oakland
Environmental Programs and Planning Division
Colleen Liang
530 Water Street
Oakland, California 94607
Email: cliang@portoakland.com
Via Email

Re: Comments of Communities for a Better Environment on Oakland Airport Terminal Development Project’s Potential Environmental Effects

Dear Ms. Liang:

Communities for a Better Environment (CBE) appreciates the ability to submit this comment letter on the Oakland International Airport Terminal Development Project (“Project”). The continuing COVID-19 pandemic has created many challenges in trying to meaningfully engage in public outreach. Many projects that CBE are presently working on remain greatly impacted by the digital divide and we ask that governmental agencies have patience when working with community-based organizations. While 30 days were given for public comment, we hope that with the future release of the Draft EIR the Port of Oakland provides at minimum 60 days for public comment. The proposed project will have many lasting impacts on the community, including CBE’s membership in East Oakland, and public input will be essential to ensure community needs are properly considered in preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (“DEIR”).

I. Introduction

Communities for a Better Environment is a community–based environmental justice organization located in both Southern and Northern California. In Northern California, CBE is based out of Richmond and East Oakland. The mission of CBE is to build people’s power in California’s communities of color and low-income communities to achieve environmental health and justice by preventing and reducing pollution and building green, healthy and sustainable communities and environments.

The census tracts in the area impacted by this proposed project score within the 90th percentile under the California Environmental Screening tool (“CES”). CES is a mapping tool that aggregates data to identify which California communities are most impacted by environmental and socio-demographic burdens. CES uses environmental, health and socioeconomic information to produce scores for every census tract in the state. An area with a high CES score is one that experiences a much higher pollution burden than areas with low scores.

The Airport is already a significant direct and indirect source of environmental pollution that drives this existing inequity and this Project’s expansion of the Airport only stands to make the situation much worse. CBE offers these comments on the Project’s Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) with the intent that these impacts are properly considered and analyzed in the DEIR so that the Project’s true cost to the community may be known and ultimately rejected by the Port.
While it is appreciated that the NOP at the very least recognizes that there will likely be significant environmental impacts in several categories, the lack of detail on these potential impacts requires us to highlight certain aspects that must be considered further in the DEIR. This letter will follow the categories as laid out in the NOP where CBE urges greater study.

II. Air Quality Impacts

Of utmost concern to CBE and its membership in the East Oakland neighboring the Airport are the extensive impacts to air quality an expansion would require. Air impacts need to be analyzed at every step of each process for this project.

a. Increased Flights and Traffic from Passenger and Cargo Terminal Expansion

One of the most important aspects of an adequate DEIR is that impacts of the project are accurately compared to a “baseline” level of operations if there were no project. Thus, it is vital that the DEIR both accurately quantify this baseline number of flights to the Airport as well as the increased number of flights that this project would enable. Such a number is essential to accurately calculating in turn a number of other impacts, including direct and indirect impacts to air quality.

The increased commercial and freight flights that would be enable by the Project will lead to an unacceptable increase in deadly particulate matter and toxic air contaminants (“TACs”) emitted directly by aviation operations. In addition to the considerable emissions coming directly from airplanes, air pollution from all other aspects of increased operations should be considered, including but not limited to those from support vehicles, fugitive emissions from refueling, etc.

Further, indirect air quality impacts from the increased vehicle traffic to and from the Airport must be considered as well. The Project’s expansion of cargo facilities should thus consider the increased diesel emissions from additional trucks to and from the cargo facilities, while the expansion of passenger terminals should consider increased emissions from additional passenger vehicles, busses, rideshares, etc.

b. Fuel Tank Farm Expansion

The Project’s expansion of the Airport’s fuel tank farm will also lead to an increase in emissions of TACs like benzene and other harmful air pollution. Fugitive emissions from the tank farm should be properly analyzed and not underestimated as is typical for storage tanks of refined petroleum products.

c. Construction

While the NOP states that construction air impacts will be considered, those also need to be fully detailed. These analyses do typically cover the diesel emissions from construction equipment and from dust, which we hope is done here as well. However, since the project will involve significant amounts of demolition, the air impacts from the whole life cycle of that demolition should be fully assessed. For example, if aggregate, asphalt, and other materials from demolition will be recycled at local facilities, of which there are several in East Oakland, the air emissions of particulate matter, VOCs, and other air pollutants from that recycling should be analyzed as part of this project, along with the diesel emissions from the trucks moving the material.

d. Cumulative Air Impacts
All air impacts from this Project must also be considered in context of the already extreme cumulative air impacts in East Oakland. The CEQA process requires this type of analysis even of projects that may not have significant impacts on their own but stand to add to a significant increase to cumulative environmental impacts of an area. Since this project stands to have many significant impacts, especially to air, this type of analysis is vital and should not be glossed over. East Oakland is not only home to the Airport but also heavy industrial sites, two major freeways, one of which is a major truck corridor, other indirect sources of pollution like warehouses that attract diesel truck traffic, and many contaminated areas of land still emitting air pollution from the soil. The Project’s addition of even more air pollution to these many other cumulative impacts must be fully vetted.

III. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

On top of all the above air pollution impacts that must be considered, the DEIR must fully analyze the massive increase in greenhouse gases (“GHGs”) that would be required by the Project. The aviation industry’s reliance on combustible fuels that emit large amounts of carbon dioxide means that any increase in flights will lead to an increase in this GHG at a critical time when GHG emissions must be radically curtailed. Not only should the GHG emissions from an increased number of flights be considered, but also additional GHGs from trucks to and from the expanded Cargo Facility, passenger vehicles, support vehicles, etc. Furthermore, any fugitive emissions of other even more potent GHGs like methane from the expanded tank farm or increased aviation operations should be considered as well. All of these increases in GHGs should also be analyzed against local, state, and federal policies that mandate reduction of GHGs. Finally, despite the aviation industry’s recent embrace of “renewable” biofuels as an alternative to petroleum-derived kerosene, any analysis of GHG impacts should not assume widespread use of these fuels given extremely limited supply and questionable accounting of carbon costs from a variety of fuel stocks.

IV. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The hazards from the Project’s proposal to expand the Airport’s fuel tank farm needs to be properly analyzed as these tanks hold extremely hazardous materials that threaten the local community. The East Bay is all too familiar with the risks of fuel tanks holding petroleum products and fuels, with a fire that destroyed several tanks at NuStar in Rodeo being only the most recent example. While fires are dangerous, an explosion of these highly hazardous materials could be even more catastrophic. These worse-case scenario risks of fire and explosion of the tank farm must be properly considered. Furthermore, the risk of leaks of hazardous materials to the air and water should be considered, especially since the tank farm is located directly adjacent to Bay waters.

V. Noise

Noise pollution is a constant concern for any airport project and this Project is no different. Any increase in flight traffic will correspond with an increase in noise that is harmful to local residents. Analysis of these noise impacts should not be limited to areas like Bay Farm Island and should include other residential areas in East Oakland like Columbia Gardens.
VI. Transportation

As discussed above, the Project will likely lead to a significant increase in passenger vehicle traffic, including private vehicles, taxis, buses, and ride share services. Although there is a connecting rail service from the Airport to Bay Area Rapid Transit, its high cost has prohibited many Bay Area transit users from utilizing it as ride sharing services are generally faster and concerning even more cost-effective. Unless the Project proposes changes to increase ridership of this service, most prominently by reducing or eliminating the fare, any increase in passengers should be assumed to correspond with an increase in vehicle miles travelled (VMT) in order to fully analyze the potential impact of the Project.

VII. Conclusion

Communities for a Better Environment appreciates this preliminary opportunity to comment on the project and hopes that the DEIR thoroughly considers the above issues in its analysis. If you have any questions, please contact CBE Staff Attorney Tyler Earl at tyler@cbecal.org.

Sincerely,

Tyler Earl
Staff Attorney
Communities for a Better Environment
June 4, 2021

Ms. Colleen Liang  
Port Environmental Supervisor  
Port of Oakland, Environmental Programs and Planning  
530 Water Street  
Oakland, CA 94607

Subject: FedEx’s Scoping Comments on the Oakland International Airport Terminal Modernization and Development Project Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Liang:

On behalf of FedEx, we want to thank you for the opportunity to provide scoping comments for the Port of Oakland’s consideration during the preparation of Oakland International Airport’s (OAK) Terminal Modernization and Development Project Environmental (TMDP) Impact Report (EIR). FedEx supports the improvement of OAK’s passenger terminal facilities, which are outdated, inefficient, and no longer capable of meeting OAK’s air passenger demand. FedEx’s air cargo facilities at OAK are in a similar condition. FedEx cannot meet the current and future OAK air cargo demand or provide FedEx’s planned environmental improvements that would benefit OAK’s airport neighbors without optimizing our OAK facilities as soon as practical.

Although FedEx believes that the TMDP and our proposed OAK facilities optimization project are separate projects with independent utility, there are several aspects of FedEx’s facilities optimization project that should be evaluated during the preparation of the TMDP EIR, including the environmental benefits of FedEx’s facilities optimization as well as the interaction between FedEx’s proposed facilities and aircraft taxi operations to the proposed new terminal and North Field utilizing Taxiways Romeo and Bravo.

As the Port stated during its May 25, 2021 EIR Scoping Meeting, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that the Port “Reduce environmental impacts to the extent feasible” and “Identify ways to minimize or avoid the significant effects of a project.” Therefore, FedEx believes that it is critical that the TMDP EIR must consider the environmental benefits of FedEx’s facilities optimization plans and must not foreclose FedEx’s ability to optimize its facilities.

Ultimately, FedEx requests that the TMDP EIR include FedEx’s optimized facilities in the cumulative analysis, so that after completing their respective CEQA and NEPA reviews, both
projects can successfully serve the Oakland community, the greater San Francisco Bay Area and the region well into the future, while delivering the greatest amount of environmental benefits feasible.

The project objectives of FedEx’s proposed facilities optimization plan mirror or exceed environmental benefits of OAK’s TMDP:

- Modify FedEx’s cargo facilities to maximize safety, efficiency, flexibility, environmental benefits, and security for our operations and workers.
- Provide a sufficient number of aircraft parking positions to optimize our lift capacity and cargo sort facilities to efficiently accommodate the existing and future air cargo demand. Modernizing our fleet by optimizing our lift capacity allows FedEx to process more volume with fewer flights that are quieter and more fuel efficient.

Since the beginning of 2019, FedEx and the Port have been discussing FedEx’s proposed facilities optimization. Over the past two years, FedEx has successfully addressed the Port’s request to minimize the footprint of our optimized facilities to avoid wetland impacts. Figure 1 depicts the optimized plan, which achieved the Port’s request while meeting our needs.

Execution of this plan will: 1) accommodate more fuel efficient and quieter aircraft with greater cargo carrying capacity, which reduces noise and emissions intensity; 2) allow us to electrify all of the hardstands proposed in the optimized plan to reduce auxiliary power unit usage, which reduces air emissions; 3) install the infrastructure to allow us to electrify our GSE fleet, which further reduces air emissions; 4) install solar panels on our new buildings, adding to the existing 904 kW rooftop photovoltaic system at the facility and further reducing air emissions; and 5) incorporate the use of biofuels on our flights out of OAK, which further reduces greenhouse gas emissions.

Therefore, FedEx specifically requests that the TMDP EIR consider the following when conducting the CEQA cumulative analysis for the resource topics noted below:

- **Air Quality** – As described above, implementation of FedEx’s facilities optimization plan incorporates several measures that will reduce emissions. The benefits of these measures should be evaluated in the TMDP EIR air quality cumulative analysis.
- **Energy** - As described above, implementation of FedEx’s facilities optimization plan incorporates measures that will maximize energy efficiency. The benefits of these measures should be evaluated in the TMDP EIR energy cumulative analysis.
- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions** - As described above, implementation of FedEx’s facilities optimization plan incorporates several measures that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The benefits of these measures should be evaluated in the TMDP EIR greenhouse gas emissions cumulative analysis.
- **Noise** - As described above, implementation of FedEx’s facilities optimization plan incorporates several measures that result in a modernized aircraft fleet with greater volume capacity that have the potential to reduce aircraft noise exposure and the number of flights. The benefits of these measures should be evaluated in the TMDP EIR noise cumulative analysis.
FedEx is prepared to work with the Port to provide or develop the detailed data needed to ensure our proposed facilities optimization plan is considered and included in the cumulative analysis of the TMDP EIR. Please feel free to contact us directly and we will identify an approach to develop and/or to obtain whatever data you need.

It is important to underscore FedEx’s long-term presence at OAK and its contributions to both the OAK’s revenue stream and employment of Oakland/Bay Area residents. FedEx is the third largest contributor to OAK’s annual revenue contributing $21.2 million to the Port in FY 2020, which was 11.4 percent of the Port’s total aviation revenue. This percentage has greatly increased as OAK is recovering from declines in passenger traffic due to the pandemic.

In addition, FedEx’s hub operations resulted in 3,600 direct and indirect jobs in 2020 with a total payroll of $271 million and spending of $156 million, for a combined total annual economic activity of $428 million. After FedEx optimizes its OAK facilities, FedEx hub operations will employ (direct and indirect) over 4,800 people with a payroll of $400 million and spending of $189 million, for a combined total annual economic activity of $589 million. This impact is even greater when factoring in the greater region FedEx serves through its OAK hub.

Construction of FedEx’s optimized hub will generate 4,130 jobs with an average of 459 annual direct and indirect construction-related jobs during the nine years it will take to complete the project, which will generate an additional $131 million in economic activity. A detailed economic analysis of FedEx’s OAK hub has been prepared and the findings will be provided to the Port in the near future.

In addition to its financial contribution to the region, FedEx’s cargo operations were particularly critical to the people of Oakland, the San Francisco Bay area and the greater region during the COVID-19 pandemic when FedEx’s planes brought lifesaving COVID-19 vaccines, personal protective equipment, and ventilators to OAK on a daily basis. FedEx also transported COVID-19 test samples using its First Overnight service to ensure rapid diagnosis of infected community members allowing for immediate quarantining, which helped slow the spread of the disease.

FedEx has been an industry leader in environmental stewardship and sustainability. For example, we have reduced our global aircraft emissions intensity by 27% since 2005 with our aircraft modernization and FedEx Fuel Sense programs saving more than 255 million gallons of jet fuel and avoiding more than 2 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) emissions in FY 2020 alone. In March 2021, we announced our goal to achieve carbon neutrality by 2040. We will achieve this goal by:

- Seeking LEED certification of all new FedEx buildings including our optimized facilities at OAK;
- Expanding our on-site energy generation capabilities and procuring renewable energy;
- Decreasing our aviation carbon emissions intensity by aircraft fleet modernization, implementing fuel conservation programs, and investing in sustainable aviation fuel (SAF) development;
- Sourcing 30 percent of our jet fuel from SAF by 2030; and
- Purchasing 100 percent of our global pickup and delivery vehicles as zero emissions electric vehicles by 2030.
As we described earlier, optimizing our facilities will allow FedEx to commit to the implementation of these plans at our OAK hub. We have attached FedEx’s 2021 ESG Report for the Port’s review/use in preparing the TMDP EIR.

Finally, as we head into a post-pandemic economy, we have seen a dramatic increase in e-commerce activity that is here to stay. Our current OAK hub facilities cannot accommodate the current demand, which means we are unable to employ all of the staff we need, implement our aircraft fleet modernization at OAK, or execute on all of our environmental initiatives at OAK – all of which negatively impacts the local economy and environment.

We appreciate the Port’s consideration of FedEx’s scoping comments on the OAK TMDP EIR and its ongoing consideration of FedEx’s facilities optimization process. We look forward to continuing our dialogue with the Port about our project and will be in touch soon. In the meantime, if you have any questions please contact David Fiore and our team will provide the appropriate answers to the questions you may have.

Sincerely,

David R. Fiore, JD, CM    Steven Zebovitz, P.E.
FedEx Airport Relations & Development    Chief Int’l Environmental Project Engineer
Figure 1

Completed Hub Optimization Plan
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Port of Oakland
Environmental Programs and Planning Division
Colleen Liang
530 Water Street
Oakland, CA 94607

Subject: Oakland International Airport Terminal Modernization and Development Project

The Oakland International Airport Terminal Modernization and Development Project includes the construction of a third terminal and renovation of existing terminals 1 and 2. The construction of a third terminal will allow increased air traffic arrivals and departures, including domestic and international passenger flights and freight operations. As is well known, much of air freight flight operations occur at night and early morning hours, as well as during the day. This necessarily will increase departure and arrival noise and air pollution in the Bay Area. Further, introduction of super-sonic passenger aircraft may occur. The environmental assessment must categorically declare whether such aircraft would be allowed to operate at Oakland International Airport, and if so, consider the noise impact of such aircraft on the local environment as well as the entire Bay Area.

The following are important considerations:

- Using current operations as the baseline rather than pre-Pandemic operations
- Evaluation all impacts of growth in aircraft operations and land side operations
- Evaluate the future environmental impacts with at least a 20-year horizon

Current noise impacts include departure flight paths over the East Bay Hills, including Oakland, Claremont, Berkeley, Kensington, Richmond, El Cerrito, San Pablo, and other East Bay and North Bay communities. The current WNDSR arrival path to OAK concentrates arriving aircraft along the East Bay Hills, including Richmond, Berkeley, and Montclair/Oakland. We can only assume that noise levels along these routes will increase both in terms of Day Night Level (DNL), Single Event Level (SEL), frequency of occurrence, and time-above. Aircraft noise impacts sleep disturbance, speech intelligibility, health and welfare, schools, hospitals, and parks. Mitigation measures that must be considered include:

- Shifting night time northwest departures from OAK (and SFO) west of Point Richmond will accomplish three things: 1) alleviate noise impact in Richmond, 2) provide greater climb distance to avoid Travis airspace, and 3) provide greater vertical separation between departures and WNDSR arrival path
• Dispersal of WNDSR arrivals to approximate pre NEXGEN conditions and thus reduce concentrated noise impacts Richmond, Berkeley, and the Montclair district of Oakland.

• Shifting the WNDSR flight path eastward by one to two nautical miles to avoid the higher elevations of Richmond, Berkeley, and Montclair.

• Shift REBAS waypoint westward of Richmond and require OAK and SFO northbound and eastbound departures to follow the San Francisco Bay to a point west of Richmond before turning onto eventual routes. This will greatly reduce aircraft noise impacts in the East Bay communities. OAK has not control over FAA flight paths, but can influence the design of flight paths to minimize noise impact.

The proposed layout of the modernization plan involves removal of economy parking lot and distributing parking in isolated areas beyond convenient walking distance. A thorough evaluation of parking requirements must be made, including possible construction of a parking garage. It is not clear from the proposed site layouts that parking has been adequately considered.

Thank you for providing this opportunity to comment on the environmental evaluation.

Very truly yours

KEEP JETS OVER THE BAY

Margery F. Eriksson
Chair
Re: [EXTERNAL] Request - RE: Notice of Preparation for the OAK Terminal Development Project

Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>
Wed 5/12/2021 7:51 AM
To: Dawn Argula <dargula@livermorechamber.org>

The Port thanks you for your interest in the proposed OAK Terminal Development Project.

The Port expects extensive interest in this process and as such we have scheduled four virtual scoping meetings on the Notice of Preparation (NOP). We encourage you to attend one of the four virtual scoping meetings which will be held on May 25 and 26, 2021. Further information regarding these meetings and accessing information can be found here at: https://www.oaklandairport.com/terminal-development-meeting-materials/. Each meeting will also be recorded, and will be available at the same link above. If you have any specific comments, or questions you can raise them during one of these four meetings. Alternatively, you can submit written comments via (i) the project website at: https://www.oaklandairport.com/terminal-development, (ii) via email to cliang@portoakland.com; or (iii) or to the attention of Colleen Liang at 530 Water St. Oakland, CA 94607.

Thank you,
Colleen

Colleen Liang | Port Environmental Supervisor
Port of Oakland | Env. Programs and Planning
530 Water Street | Oakland, CA 94607
T 510-627-1198 | Cell 650-303-2904
www.portofoakland.com

From: Dawn Argula <dargula@livermorechamber.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 11, 2021 11:47 AM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>
Cc: Dawn Argula <dargula@livermorechamber.org>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Request - RE: Notice of Preparation for the OAK Terminal Development Project

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)
Hi Colleen – I would welcome a brief presentation at the June 2 LVCC Business Alliance meeting (via zoom). Details:

LVCC Business Alliance Meeting
Wednesday June 2
8-9:30 am via zoom

Featured speakers – come on around 8:40ish am after reports. You will have 20 minutes± with Q&A.

Please advise.

Thanks.

Dawn P. Argula
CEO & President
Livermore Valley Chamber of Commerce
www.livermorechamber.org
925-447-1606
2157 First Street
Livermore, CA 94550

Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report and Public Scoping Meetings for the Oakland International Airport Terminal Development Project

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Port of Oakland (Port) is preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to evaluate
the potential environmental impacts associated with the Oakland International Airport Terminal Development Project. The Port is proposing to construct a new terminal and modernize Terminals 1 and 2 to address facility safety, efficiency, and modernization needs. The Proposed Project will require federal approval and thus will also require review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The Port issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and initiated a 30-day public comment period on May 7, 2021 to invite comments on the scope and content of the information to be included in the Draft EIR. All comments must be received by June 7, 2021 at 3:00 p.m. Pacific Daylight Time (PDT).

### Virtual Public Scoping Meetings

**Tuesday, May 25, 2021, 3:00 - 4:00 p.m. PDT**
**Tuesday, May 25, 2021, 6:00 - 7:00 p.m. PDT**
**Wednesday, May 26, 2021, 3:00 - 4:00 p.m. PDT**
**Wednesday, May 26, 2021, 6:00 - 7:00 p.m. PDT**

The Port is holding four virtual public scoping meetings to receive comments and to share information on the Proposed Project and the environmental review process. Each meeting will begin with a presentation followed by an opportunity to provide comments on the scope and content of the information to be included in the Draft EIR.

Information on accessing the virtual public scoping meetings is available at [www.oaklandairport.com/terminaldevelopment](http://www.oaklandairport.com/terminaldevelopment).

For individuals requiring additional accommodations, please contact Colleen Liang, Port Environmental Supervisor, at (510) 627-1198 or cliang@portoakland.com by 5:00 p.m. PDT on May 18, 2021.
Submitting Comments

Comments may be submitted by June 7, 2021 at 3:00 p.m. PDT as follows:

**Online:** Submit comments via an online form at:
[www.oaklandairport.com/terminaldevelopment](http://www.oaklandairport.com/terminaldevelopment)

**By email:** Email comments to cliang@portoakland.com

**By mail:** Mail comments to:
Port of Oakland
Environmental Programs and Planning Division
Colleen Liang
530 Water Street
Oakland, CA 94607

**Scoping meeting:** Provide comments orally or in writing during any of the four virtual public scoping meetings

For more information on the Proposed Project and to view the NOP, please visit [www.oaklandairport.com/terminaldevelopment](http://www.oaklandairport.com/terminaldevelopment).

Para información en español llame al (510) 627-1198
中文聯絡電話 (510) 627-1198
Total Control Panel

To: dargula@livermorechamber.org
From: a0hwhw+bvrbakyk5b71zra== 1118892918611_8b+rmhqueeye3powpej01a==@in.constantcontact.com

You received this message because the domain in.constantcontact.com is on the enterprise allow list. Please contact your administrator to block messages from the domain in.constantcontact.com
May 25, 2021

SCOPING COMMENTS FOR
OAKLAND AIRPORT TERMINAL DEVELOPMENT NOTICE OF PREPARATION

Save Our Skies East Bay (SOSEB) was organized by East Bay residents in January 2016 in response to the FAA’s implementation of the Next Generation Air Transportation System (NextGen) for Oakland and San Francisco International Airports. Our mission is to address the significant increase in noise and air pollution created by airplanes flying lower and more concentrated in 1,200-foot narrowed flight paths over densely populated residential neighborhoods in the East Bay. Over the years we have worked with and continue to enjoy a relationship with, Senators Feinstein and Padilla, Congressmember Barbara Lee, and numerous local elected officials. We have presented our concerns about airplane flight path noise to the Port of Oakland Board of Commissioners and are involved with the Oakland Airport/Community Noise Management Forum. Through our website, Facebook page, person-to-person outreach, community social media, email distribution list, and collaboration with local advocacy groups, we reach over 5,800 East Bay residents.

Save Our Skies East Bay is very concerned about the proposed expansion of the Oakland Airport (OAK) terminals because it will increase airplane traffic and hence the impact of airplane noise on residents of the East Bay. We understand that the FAA determines airplane flight paths, but the number of passengers and the planes that fly them are inextricably connected to the gate capacity of OAK. Therefore, as OAK plans to accommodate increased passenger numbers and increased planes it also needs to realize that this increase will greatly increase the noise impacting people who live under or near the FAA’s flight paths. All entities that are in any way connected to passengers, airplanes, and/or airplane flight paths are responsible for their role in creating the noise that results in so much suffering for East Bay residents. Therefore it is the responsibility of OAK airport to develop mitigations to the noise they share responsibility in creating.

Below are some important points SOSEB wants to see addressed as part of the environmental process of this project.

POOR COMMUNICATION ON THE PART OF THE BOARD REGARDING THIS PROJECT

- SOSEB did not receive notice of the release of the NOP about the proposed expansion of the Oakland airport. We have requested numerous times to be on the Port’s notification list of all CEQA-triggering projects. Because the Port failed to notify SOSEB of the NOP despite our formal requests for such notification, the
Port must extend the NOP comment period to a full 30 days from when we heard of its existence, May 17, 2021. In addition WE ARE AGAIN FORMALLY REQUESTING TO BE ON ALL SUCH NOTIFICATION LISTS!

- Public notification of this project has been weak. The first time we heard about the project was through a Mercury News article, dated May 17, 2021, a full ten days after the NOP release date. Notification needs to include all residents who will be impacted by the increased airplane traffic this proposed expansion will accommodate. This includes all residents currently impacted by the 2016 NextGen flight path that were imposed on our community. The Oakland Airport Noise Forum can identify the boundaries of this impacted community based on the high volume of complaints they’ve received. These residents need to be provided with the 30 day comment period as required by CEQA. Therefore, this comment period needs to be extended to accommodate notice of all residents currently impacted by OAK airport related airplane flight noise. This same community must receive timely notification of the publication of the DEIR and final EIR.

THE DEIR MUST INCLUDE AN ANALYSIS OF INCREASED FLIGHTS ON ALL OAK FLIGHT PATHS

- When flights were dispersed over the East Bay the noise was tolerable. But this noise increased exponentially for specific residents after the FAA changed the flight paths to the NextGen GPS-controlled routes. NextGen significantly narrowed the flight paths forcing specific homes and residents to experience a tremendous increase in the number of overhead plane flights 24 hours a day, along with a decrease in their flight altitudes (when taking into account the altitude of homes in the Oakland Hills). This significant increase in airplane noise can be corroborated by looking at the significant increase of noise complaints to the Oakland Airport after NextGen was implemented. Due to the existing significant noise impact caused by OAK flight paths we request a robust analysis of the project’s increase in flights. More passengers will mean more planes, bigger planes, heavier planes and more noise along the narrow flight paths.

The Port has stated that one of the reasons for expanding the terminals is to accommodate expected growth. This indicates that OAK operations are constrained by terminal cap, and the project will induce growth (under CEQA’s definition of growth inducement, which includes removal of constraints to growth). That growth will greatly impact residents living far away from the actual construction site! Per CEQA’s clearly stated definition of growth inducement, the EIR must consider the project to be growth inducing and not just growth accommodating in terms of flights in and out of the airport.

- The EIR should identify the passenger level that the new facilities are designed to handle and compare that level to existing passenger levels, as well as design capacity levels of the existing terminal.

- The EIR must identify the anticipated number and timing of existing and future flights. Will there be more nighttime flights? More daytime flights? Both? How many more? The frequency of flights and spacing between flights during short windows of time (ie: 1 hour) in every 24 period needs to be specified by day of the week. Absent all this information, it is not possible to adequately assess the project’s noise and air quality (GHG and TAC) impacts.
THE DEIR MUST INCLUDE AN ANALYSIS OF ALL OAKLAND AIRPORT FLIGHT PATH NOISE IMPACTS

- The noise impacts of the proposed project are both airport-specific (SFO and OAK) as well as cumulative. Noise impacts of the WNDSR flight path are exacerbated by the fact that this path lies below SFO departure flight paths (from the TRUKN corridor). Cumulative noise from both SFO and OAK flight paths exacerbates the noise impact for residents unfortunate enough to live under and near these overlapping flight paths. Therefore any analysis must include not just increased flights associated with the OAK terminal expansion project but also overlapping (cumulative) noise from increased flights from SFO.
- Residents have had some relief over the past year due to reduced flights associated with the pandemic. Per CEQA case law, this current operational scenario must be considered the baseline for the EIR’s noise analyses.
- The Port has the obligation under CEQA to identify all impacts associated with the project. It then must develop mitigation measures for all potentially significant impacts, even if their implementation would require approval of other agencies, including the FAA. The Port cannot reject mitigation as infeasible solely because the measures are outside of their jurisdiction. Therefore OAK must consider mitigations for increased noise along the WNDSR flight path and others that will be impacted by increased flights associated with the proposed project.
- Given the existing documented large-scale problems with noise along the WNDSR flight path, any substantial increase in flights must be considered to be a significant impact. The OAK Airport, Port of Oakland Board of Commissioners, and the Oakland Airport Noise Forum must work directly with the FAA to seriously and transparently attempt to implement the mitigations sent to the FAA by The Oakland Airport Noise Forum in their proposals entitled Supplemental Proposals to Revising the Northern California Metroplex For Alameda County/Contra Costa County and the follow-up responses.

THE DEIR MUST USE SINGLE EVENT NOISE METRICS AND MONITORING

- The EIR must include monitoring in the Berkeley and Oakland Hills measuring single-event noise levels of jets on the WNDSR flight path associated with the airport to establish an existing baseline.
- The single-event metric must be used in the impact assessment as well, as ordered by the Court of Appeals in the Berkeley Keep Jets Over the Bay v. Port of Oakland 2002 decision.

Please inform us of the new NOP response date, and all public correspondence associated with this project.

Sincerely

Reva Fabrikant
Save Our Skies East Bay
Dear Ms. Liang,

Despite local, state, national, and international climate targets to reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions, the Oakland Airport is planning an expansion to add 17 new gates to accommodate what they anticipate is a widening demand for air travel in the Bay Area.

Aviation is the most climate-harming mode of transport due to high altitude effects. The total climate impact of flight is on average 3 times the effect of the emitted CO2 alone. Aviation accounted for 9% of California statewide and 11% of SF Bay Area greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in 2019, and are on track to increase.

Public money should not be spent on fossil fuel intensive transport infrastructure. In its report Net zero by 2050 released last month, the International Energy Agency recommends the following:

- Regional flights are shifted to high-speed rail where feasible.
- Business and long-haul leisure air travel does not exceed 2019 levels
- California High Speed rail is under construction and will service 4 of the 10 top Oakland airport departure destinations.

Public money should not be spent on infrastructure that is not resilient to sea level rise. The Oakland airport runways are actually below sea level during high tide events and the airport infrastructure includes multiple pumping stations to keep the runways dry at such times. The DEIR needs to study the dike system surrounding the airport and the cost of maintaining this infrastructure.

Public money should not be invested in fossil fuel intensive travel modes that accelerate climate change and wildfires. We ask that the EIR correlate aviation’s impact on climate change and the increase in severity and frequency of wildfires in California.

Public money should not be invested in air polluting activities that harm front line communities. A study in the LAX airport neighborhood shows that pregnant women exposed to high levels of pollution
from the exhaust of jet planes are 14% more likely to deliver prematurely than women exposed to lower levels. We ask that the EIR study the health consequences for the population that will be exposed to increased airport activity at the Oakland Airport. The EIR must also make a thorough assessment of the noise and vibration impacts of increased flights. Communities in the take-off, climb-out, and landing glide path are already impacted by elevated sound and vibration for several miles north, south and east of the OAK. According to the Howard Terminal DEIR sound levels for residents near airports can reach 80 decibels, which is the equivalent of loud TV audio. This sound level has impacts on sleep, conversation, and mental health.

We ask that the EIR scope include an estimate of total greenhouse gas emissions from jet and aviation fuels as well as airport construction and operation activities on the ground. The DEIR needs to include not only the emissions in the immediate environment of the airport but also all Greenhouse Gas Emissions discharged by additional vehicle miles of in-state and international air travel occurring beyond California State boundaries, which are a foreseeable consequence of the project. Furthermore, it is critical to understand that aviation’s climate impact isn’t limited to CO₂. Due to different emissions other than just the CO₂ taking place at altitude, there is a total climate impact of flights that is on average 3 times the effect of the emitted CO₂ alone, so we ask that the EIR include this reality in their estimate too. When considering total greenhouse gas emissions use the CARB well-to-wheels GREET model for the fuel and lubrication oils. Also include the emissions from the manufacture and end-of-life disposal of the additional airplanes required to serve this additional demand. And finally we ask that the EIR report on the impacts of sea level rise, wildfires and air pollution that would be affected by the proposed airport expansion.

Respectfully,

Igor Tregub, Chair
Sierra Club Northern Alameda County Group
June 7th, 2021

Re: Comments on the scope and content of the Draft EIR For Oakland Airport Terminal Development

Dear Colleen Liang,

Despite local, state, national, and international climate targets to reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions, the Oakland Airport is planning an expansion to add 17 new gates to accommodate what they anticipate is a widening demand for air travel in the Bay Area.

Aviation is the most climate-harming mode of transport due to high altitude effects. The total climate impact of flight is on average 3 times\(^1\) the effect of the emitted CO\(_2\) alone. Aviation accounted for 9\% of California statewide and 11\% of SF Bay Area greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in 2019, and are on track to increase.\(^2\)

Public money should not be spent on fossil fuel intensive transport infrastructure. In its report Net zero by 2050\(^3\) released last month, the International Energy Agency recommends the following:

- Regional flights are shifted to high-speed rail where feasible.
- Business and long-haul leisure air travel does not exceed 2019 levels

California High Speed rail is under construction\(^4\) and will service 4 of the 10 top Oakland airport departure destinations.\(^5\)

Public money should not be spent on infrastructure that is not resilient to sea level rise. The Oakland airport runways are actually below sea level during high tide events and the airport infrastructure includes multiple pumping stations to keep the runways dry at such times. The DEIR needs to study the dike system surrounding the airport and the cost of maintaining this infrastructure.

---

\(^1\) “The contribution of global aviation to anthropogenic climate forcing for 2000 to 2018” https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1352231020305689?via%3Dihub


\(^4\) Map of California HSR https://buildhsr.com/

\(^5\) Top 10 destination listed here: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oakland_International_Airport
Public money should not be invested in fossil fuel intensive travel modes that accelerate climate change and wildfires. We ask that the EIR correlate aviation’s impact on climate change and the increase in severity and frequency of wildfires in California.

Public money should not be invested in air polluting activities that harm front line communities. A study in the LAX airport neighborhood shows that pregnant women exposed to high levels of pollution from the exhaust of jet planes are 14% more likely to deliver prematurely than women exposed to lower levels. We ask that the EIR study the health consequences for the population that will be exposed to increased airport activity at the Oakland Airport. The EIR must also make a thorough assessment of the noise and vibration impacts of increased flights. Communities in the take-off, climb-out, and landing glide path are already impacted by elevated sound and vibration for several miles north, south and east of the OAK. According to the Howard Terminal DEIR sound levels for residents near airports can reach 80 decibels, which is the equivalent of loud TV audio. This sound level has impacts on sleep, conversation, and mental health.

We ask that the EIR scope include an estimate of total greenhouse gas emissions from jet and aviation fuels as well as airport construction and operation activities on the ground. The DEIR needs to include not only the emissions in the immediate environment of the airport but also all Greenhouse Gas Emissions discharged by additional vehicle miles of in-state and international air travel occurring beyond California State boundaries, which are a foreseeable consequence of the project. Furthermore, it is critical to understand that aviation’s climate impact isn’t limited to CO2. Due to different emissions other than just the CO2 taking place at altitude, there is a total climate impact of flights that is on average 3 times the effect of the emitted CO2 alone, so we ask that the EIR include this reality in their estimate too. When considering total greenhouse gas emissions use the CARB well-to-wheels GREET model for the fuel and lubrication oils. Also include the emissions from the manufacture and end-of-life disposal of the additional airplanes required to serve this additional demand. And finally we ask that the EIR report on the impacts of sea level rise, wildfires and air pollution that would be affected by the proposed airport expansion.

Thank you,

Ariella Granett, Berkeley, CA

Steering committee member of www.stopOAKexpansion.org

---

Letter to Port of Oakland Environmental Programs & Planning Division

June 7th, 2021

Re: Comments on the scope and content of the Draft EIR For Oakland Airport Terminal Development

Despite the climate emergency, the Oakland Airport is planning an expansion to add 17 new gates to accommodate what they anticipate is a widening demand for air travel in the Bay Area. Aviation is the most climate-harming way to travel due to high altitude effects. The total climate impact of flight is on average 3 times the effect of the emitted CO2 alone. Aviation accounted for 9% of California statewide and 11% of SF Bay Area greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in 2019, and are on track to increase.

We urge the Airport to ensure that the Draft EIR includes careful estimations of:

- the Airport’s contribution to climate impacts, not only CO2 emissions from airport construction and operations but also emissions of all flights, not only CO2 but also other greenhouse gases.
- all costs to individuals and governments of health consequences of all kinds, both physical and mental, from increased air pollution and sound pollution for communities in the vicinity of the airport.
- all costs to governments and individuals of wildfires increased by the additional emissions contributing to the climate crisis.
- opportunity costs comparing emissions of high speed rail, passenger rail, and bus travel to expected airline destinations.
- increasing costs of building and maintaining pumps and dikes to keep runways, already below sea level, dry and safe with progressively rising sea level.

California has a climate goal of carbon neutrality by 2045. Public money should not be invested in fossil fuel intensive transport infrastructure nor should it be spent on infrastructure vulnerable to sea level rise. Public money should not be invested in air polluting activities that harm front line communities. We say no to airport expansion!

Signed by the following 10 organizations and 83 Individuals (see next pages) with additional individual comments at end of letter.

---

1 “The contribution of global aviation to anthropogenic climate forcing for 2000 to 2018”
2 See Page 2 & 6 “Reducing aircraft CO2 emissions: The role of U.S. federal, state, and local policies”
Briefing by The International Council On Clean Transportation, February 2021,
3 https://buildhsr.com/
1. Sierra Club SF Bay https://www.sierraclub.org/san-francisco-bay
2. 350 East Bay https://350bayarea.org/350-east-bay
4. No Coal in Oakland https://nocoalinoakland.info/
5. Railroad Workers United https://www.railroadworkersunited.org/
6. 1,000 Grandmothers For Future Generations http://www.1000grandmothers.com/
7. System Change not Climate Change
8. Flight Free USA https://flightfree.org/
10. Green Sky Thinking https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCE8tv_Kk-bLBqLjwc0BkCfw

Signed by the following Individuals:

1. Lora Jo Foo, NCIO Committee member, Oakland
2. Martin MacKerel, San Francisco, CA
3. Betsy Thagard, Berkeley, CA
4. Mary Prophet, Berkeley, CA
5. Sarah Granett, Los Angeles, CA
6. Ann Harvey, Oakland, CA
7. Susan Wright, Oakland, CA
8. Susanna Marshland, Kensington, CA
9. Steve Ongerth, Richmond, CA
10. Ron Kaminkow, General Secretary, Railroad Workers United
11. John Holme, Oakland, CA
12. Mary Ann Furda, Berkeley, CA
13. Paul Peczon, Oakland, CA
14. Diana Bohn, Berkeley, CA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City, State, CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Richard Freeman</td>
<td>Kensington, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Dr. Jessica Fielden, MD</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Christopher Lish</td>
<td>San Rafael, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Leana Zang-Rosetti</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Stella Hattendorf</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Janice Cecil</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Susan Aberg</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Gary Hughes, California Policy Monitor</td>
<td>BiofuelWatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ian McCluskey</td>
<td>Arlington, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Joy Johnson</td>
<td>Huntsville, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Laureen France</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Kathy Dervin</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Nicole Ulakovic</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Finlay Asher, Aerospace Engineer</td>
<td>Green Sky Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ann Blake, Environmental &amp; Public Health Consulting</td>
<td>Alameda, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Stanley Shaw</td>
<td>Emeryville, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Jennifer Neff</td>
<td>Fremont, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Gim Crew</td>
<td>Moraga, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Maxine Daniel</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Michael Bostick, Advocate for quiet skies</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Django Sheridan</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Jim Stewart, PhD Physicist</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Mary Lorain</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Barton Lounsbury, Attorney</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Willis Carraway</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Ariella Granett</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Lin Griffith</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Bhima Sheridan</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Richard Rollins</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>David Gassman</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Igor Tregub, Chair, Northern Alameda Co.</td>
<td>Group, Sierra Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Patricia Seffens</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Dave Margulius</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Michael Eisenscher</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Cate Leger</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Susan Schacher</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Linda Ray</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Steve Woodward</td>
<td>Fairfax, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Michael Eichenholtz</td>
<td>Richmond, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Professor Paul W Rea</td>
<td>Hayward, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>David Burtis, Calistoga</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Rochelle Towers</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>David Fairley</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Helena Birecki</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Stella Hattendorf</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Lara Clayman</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Ann Sheridan, Martinez</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>H. Orr</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Jennifer Holden</td>
<td>Granada Hills, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Laura Gibbons</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Brian Skinner</td>
<td>San Mateo, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Anirvan Chatterjee</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Jan Warren</td>
<td>Walnut Creek, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Jeffrey Mann</td>
<td>Lafayette, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Richard Otter</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Claire Fruechting</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Tony Sirna</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Ted Obbard</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Kevin Mulvey</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Sara Gaucher</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stop OAK Expansion Coalition

75. Sandra Liu, Berkeley, CA
76. Michael Kaufman, NCIO Committee member, Oakland
77. Zette Thierry, Berkeley, CA
78. Isabelle Stierli, Orinda, CA
79. Kristine Carraway, San Diego, CA
80. Charlene Woodcock, Berkeley, CA
81. Jenny Holmberg, Sherman Oaks, CA
82. Rochelle Towers, 1,000 Grandmother’s Committee Member, Berkeley, CA
83. Janet Saevitz, Oakland, CA

Additional Comments:

“The CEQA analysis must use the CARB well-to-wheels GREET model for the fuel and lubrication oils (although in this case it is well-to-jet engine analysis).” Jim Stewart, PhD Physicist, Long Beach CA

“This expansion is unwarranted and does nothing to help curb the climate crisis the world is in.” Maxine Daniel, Oakland CA

“Less atmospheric carbon, less air travel, less airports!” Joy Johnson, Huntsville, AL

“I’m an aircraft engine designer with first-hand experience working on future aircraft concepts with Airbus and Boeing. I’m aware that new technologies and new fuels often used as cover for airport/airline expansion will not be ready soon enough at scale to reduce aviation emissions, particularly if air traffic continues to grow. The only way we can effectively reduce aviation emissions in the necessary timescales is to limit air traffic and pause expansion.” Finlay Asher, Aerospace Engineer, Green Sky Thinking

“I am opposed to seeing tax dollars either spent or tax revenues waived for private company expenditure on low efficiency hydrocarbon emitting operations for profit. I would prefer subsidies go towards significantly more efficient infrastructure like high speed rail or restructuring currently poorly executed public transportation systems with the resulting poor utilization.” Paul Peczon, Oakland CA

“To avert a climate meltdown, we need to curtail, not expand, air travel, along with other significant GHG emitting activities.” Michael Eisenschier, Publisher, SolidarityINFOService, Oakland

“Future generations need our involvement NOW.” Ann Sheridan, Martinez, CA

“Do a REAL EIR, including all the issues mentioned above. This is a dangerous request at this time.” Janice Cecil, Berkeley, CA

“Going to OAK now is fairly workable. I use SF airport ONLY if I have no other choice. We need to keep Oakland’s airport at a manageable level.” Mary Prophet, Berkeley, CA
“American culture embraces growth: bigger is better here. That assumption needs to be re-examined in many parts of our lives that have contributed to the climate crisis now upon us. Ahead of us, thinking people have canceled plans for airport expansion in France, Sweden and the UK. We, too, should think more deeply about expanding this airport.” *Lin Griffith, Oakland, CA*

“Until the carbon costs of flying are radically reduced, all responsible people should eliminate or radically reduce their air travel. By the same token, all municipalities that include an airport should be require that airport to cut its carbon footprint in every way possible and especially work to replace short term flights with bus or train trips.” *Charlene Woodcock, Berkeley, CA*
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

SUSAN ABERG <website@oaklandairport.com>
Thu 6/3/2021 1:32 PM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

________________________________

First Name: SUSAN
Last Name: ABERG
Email Address: [removed]
Phone: [removed]
Comment:
June 3, 2021

RE:

OAKLAND AIRPORT TERMINAL DEVELOPMENT NOTICE OF PREPARATION
I disagree with your plans to expand the Oakland Airport. There will be a significant increase in noise and air pollution created by airplanes flying lower and more concentrated in 1,200-foot narrowed flight paths over densely populated residential neighborhoods in the East Bay.

• Public notification of this project has been weak. The first time we heard about the project was through a Mercury News article, dated May 17, 2021, a full ten days after the NOP release date. Notification needs to include all residents who will be impacted by the increased airplane traffic this proposed expansion will accommodate. This includes all residents currently impacted by the 2016
NextGen flight path that were imposed on our community. The Oakland Airport Noise Forum can identify the boundaries of this impacted community based on the high volume of complaints they’ve received. These residents need to be provided with the 30 day comment period as required by CEQA. Therefore, this comment period needs to be extended to accommodate notice of all residents currently impacted by OAK airport related airplane flight noise. This same community must receive timely notification of the publication of the DEIR and final EIR.

THE DEIR MUST INCLUDE AN ANALYSIS OF INCREASED FLIGHTS ON ALL OAK FLIGHT PATHS

• When flights were dispersed over the East Bay the noise was tolerable. But this noise increased exponentially for specific residents after the FAA changed the flight paths to the NextGen GPS-controlled routes. NextGen significantly narrowed the flight paths forcing specific homes and residents to experience a tremendous increase in the number of overhead plane flights 24 hours a day, along with a decrease in their flight altitudes (when taking into account the altitude of homes in the Oakland Hills). This significant increase in airplane noise can be corroborated by looking at the significant increase of noise complaints to the Oakland Airport after NextGen was implemented. Due to the existing significant noise impact caused by OAK flight paths we request a robust analysis of the project’s increase in flights.

More passengers will mean more planes, bigger planes, heavier planes and more noise along the narrow flight paths. The Port has stated that one of the reasons for expanding the terminals is to
accommodate expected growth. This indicates that OAK operations are constrained by terminal cap, and the project will induce growth (under CEQA’s definition of growth inducement, which includes removal of constraints to growth). That growth will greatly impact residents living far away from the actual construction site!
Per CEQA’s clearly stated definition of growth inducement, the EIR must consider the project to be growth inducing and not just growth accommodating in terms of flights in and out of the airport.
• The EIR should identify the passenger level that the new facilities are designed to handle and compare that level to existing passenger levels, as well as design capacity levels of the existing terminal.
• The EIR must identify the anticipated number and timing of existing and future flights. Will there be more nighttime flights? More daytime flights? Both? How many more? The frequency of flights and spacing between flights during short windows of time (ie: 1 hour) in every 24 period needs to be specified by day of the week. Absent all this information, it is not possible to adequately assess the project’s noise and air quality (GHG and TAC) impacts.

THE DEIR MUST INCLUDE AN ANALYSIS OF ALL OAKLAND AIRPORT FLIGHT PATH NOISE IMPACTS
• The noise impacts of the proposed project are both airport-specific (SFO and OAK) as well as cumulative. Noise impacts of the WNDSR flight path are exacerbated by the fact that this path lies below SFO departure flight paths (from the TRUKN corridor). Cumulative noise from both SFO and OAK flight paths exacerbates
the noise impact for residents unfortunate enough to live under and near these overlapping flight paths. Therefore any analysis must include not just increased flights associated with the OAK terminal expansion project but also overlapping (cumulative) noise from increased flights from SFO.

- Residents have had some relief over the past year due to reduced flights associated with the pandemic. Per CEQA case law, this current operational scenario must be considered the baseline for the EIR’s noise analyses.
- The Port has the obligation under CEQA to identify all impacts associated with the project. It then must develop mitigation measures for all potentially significant impacts, even if their implementation would require approval of other agencies, including the FAA. The Port cannot reject mitigation as infeasible solely because the measures are outside of their jurisdiction. Therefore OAK must consider mitigations for increased noise along the WNDSR flight path and others that will be impacted by increased flights associated with the proposed project.
- Given the existing documented large-scale problems with noise along the WNDSR flight path, any substantial increase in flights must be considered to be a significant impact. The OAK Airport, Port of Oakland Board of Commissioners, and the Oakland Airport Noise Forum must work directly with the FAA to seriously and transparently attempt to implement the mitigations sent to the FAA by The Oakland Airport Noise Forum in their proposals entitled Supplemental Proposals to Revising the Northern California Metroplex For Alameda County/Contra Costa County and the follow-up responses.
THE DEIR MUST USE SINGLE EVENT NOISE METRICS AND MONITORING
• The EIR must include monitoring in the Berkeley and Oakland Hills measuring single-event noise levels of jets on the WNDSR flight path associated with the airport to establish an existing baseline.
• The single-event metric must be used in the impact assessment as well, as ordered by the Court of Appeals in the Berkeley Keep Jets Over the Bay v. Port of Oakland 2002 decision.

Sincerely, Susan Aberg, Berkeley resident

I have read and agree
Sign me up
--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport (https://www.oaklandairport.com)
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

John Batcheller <website@oaklandairport.com>
Sat 6/5/2021 5:15 PM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

First Name: John
Last Name: Batcheller
Email Address: [REDACTED]
Phone: [REDACTED]
Comment:
I fully support modernizing OAK terminals and facilities, and demolishing OAK’s aging Terminal 1 to be replaced with modern technology and energy savings. On the rare occasion I fly, I find other airport terminals to be much more aesthetically pleasing and comfortable than OAK. These other airports offer concessions which rival, or are better than, local shopping districts in terms of convenience, design, and efficiency, and it is my hope that OAK’s plan is similar.

I do not have any objections to possible increases in air or ground traffic, since they are part of the cost of living in a metropolitan region. On the contrary, I hope the proposed plans will improve traffic flow around the airport.

Regarding cargo and terminal facilities, I believe the people working on the upgrades will do their best to improve efficiency and safety of the facilities.

I have read and agree
Sign me up
--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport
(https://www.oaklandairport.com)
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

Michael Bostick <website@oaklandairport.com>
Sun 6/6/2021 9:03 PM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

________________________________
First Name: Michael
Last Name: Bostick
Email Address: [Redacted]
Phone: [Redacted]
Comment:
I am against the project as it currently stands and is being proposed. I am deeply concerned about the severe noise and pollution impacts of many more jets arriving and departing OAK. We live under the WNDSR flight path in the Oakland hills and have suffered deeply after the FAA implemented NextGen, concentrating 3 flight paths (two SFO departures and WNDSR OAK arrival) over our house and neighborhood. Unless OAK can successfully convince the FAA to move WNDSR eastward and higher (much less noise and the jets can glide in and not have to take that silly turn towards Dublin to get into landing position), I will do everything in my power to oppose this plan. This is an unfair and unjust burden on an undeserving segment of the population and the impact is not equitably shared among all those who use and benefit from the airport. Jet noise is real and seriously harming, both physically and psychologically. Additionally, this project expansion should be climate neutral! More jets means more Avgas being burned in our backyard. This is not ecologically sustainable and the Bay Area must be the place where mitigation is paramount. Please be prepared for ongoing litigation if this plan is approved in its current form. Thank you!

I have read and agree
Sign me up

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport (https://www.oaklandairport.com)
I am a resident of the Oakland Hills and am writing in opposition to any expansion of Oakland airports routes or flight capacity until there is a permanent remedy for the jet noise above our homes. Flights to and from Oakland airport wake me up as early as 7 am in the morning and continue past 11 pm at night, interrupting my sleep and well being and creating additional unwanted air and noise pollution. The draft plan notes potential significant impact on greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, water and air quality. I am a resident, consumer of Oakland airport services pre-pandemic, and stakeholder in this decision and I am opposed to any terminal or flight expansion at the airport. Thank you.

Tina Broder
DEAR [NAME],

May 19, 2021

[Handwritten notes and corrections]

Sincerely,

[Signature]
On 5/18/2021 I went to OAK. Ca. Airport via BART connector to the BART Connector. I met 8 A.M. #1 and #2 at the BART station via A/C transit. I am therefore TRANSIENT DEPENDANT! W/Delta Air Lines as to service Oak/to Columbus, Ga. As I was in the U.S. Army at Ft. Benning, Ga. 1968/69. 

Mr. Charles J. Cameron

OAKLAND CA 945

20 MAY 2021 PM 7 L

Part of Oakland Environment Programs & Planning Div.

Ms. Colleen Liang

530 Water St.
Oakland, Ca. 94607
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

Bruce Cribley <website@oaklandairport.com>
Thu 5/27/2021 9:36 AM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

First Name: Bruce
Last Name: Cribley
Email Address: [Redacted]
Phone: [Redacted]
Comment:
Hello,

I’m writing to voice my concern about the negative environmental impact that the Oakland airport expansion could have on us. We’ve lived in our current home for 40 years, two blocks from Skyline, near the top of the Oakland Hills in the Montclair District.

Over the last five years or so, the increase in jet engine noise has risen dramatically. The Covid shutdowns over this last year highlighted this increase by the contrast. Almost overnight, the daily noise levels went way down. It was reminiscent of the years before the flight patterns were changed around 2015 - the birds seemed to suddenly find their voices again, and it was quiet again down in the redwood canyons.

I understand there are alternative flight routes on the table that utilize lower altitude and much less densely populated areas than the East Bay Hills. I’m concerned that without implementing some alternative routes, any airport expansion will exacerbate an already bad problem.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues.

Bruce Cribley

I have read and agree
Sign me up

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport
(https://www.oaklandairport.com)
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

Michael Dieffenbach <website@oaklandairport.com>
Mon 6/7/2021 11:52 AM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

First Name: Michael
Last Name: Dieffenbach
Email Address: [REDACTED]
Phone: [REDACTED]
Comment:
My family and I are very disappointed by the revised Flight Plan for Oakland Airport. The amount of noise from these overhead flights is truly unbearable. We hope and pray you might find some way to space out these flights- or even reduce the overall number- so that we can live with a modicum of peace and quiet. This is an overwhelmingly important issue to us and our neighbors. Please reconsider and reconfigure the flight plan for Oakland International Airport. Thank you.

I have read and agree
Sign me up

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport (https://www.oaklandairport.com)
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

Jennifer Evangelist <website@oaklandairport.com>
Mon 5/24/2021 2:35 PM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

________________________________
First Name: Jennifer
Last Name: Evangelist
Email Address:
Phone:
Comment:
I am interested in receiving future updates

I have read and agree
Sign me up

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport (https://www.oaklandairport.com)
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

Vernon Freeman <website@oaklandairport.com>
Wed 5/12/2021 6:23 PM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

______________________________

First Name: Vernon
Last Name: Freeman
Email Address: [REDACTED]
Phone: [REDACTED]
Comment:

I really hope that the people involved with this project put something together that brings this 20yr past redevelopment. Elevated arrivals, separate International terminal, multi level parking. Second main runway in the bay, stop letting southwest dominate the airport. Bring in other airlines. Start competing with SJC and SFO for airplane seats. Build a hotel in airport parking lot. More cultural art history throughout the airport, not just abstract paintings. A real food court........

I have read and agree
Sign me up
--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport (https://www.oaklandairport.com)
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

David Gassman <website@oaklandairport.com>
Thu 6/3/2021 12:19 PM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

_________________________________________________________________

First Name: David
Last Name: Gassman
Email Address: [REDACTED]
Phone: [REDACTED]
Comment:
I am concerned that the Port is simply planning an expanded 20th century airport for use in the 21st century. That may not be the wisest approach. Covid may become tamed & air travel may soon return to prior levels, but that may not be for the best. I address the following factors in this NOP: Air Quality, Energy, GHG emissions, Hydrology (Sea Level Rise), Noise, Transportation & Utilities.

As we know the world is facing a climate crisis due to GHG emissions brought on primarily by the use of fossil fuels for energy. We also know that air travel is a prodigious user of such fossil fuels & that their combustion has an effect upon air quality both locally & beyond. This entire situation has to be thoroughly re-evaluated.

While reportedly many types of electrified airplanes are being tested, it seems quite unlikely that we will have an electrified large-body airplane (comparable to today’s jumbo jets) available for use in the foreseeable future. It is clear to me that the facilities for handling & managing aircraft have to be designed to comport with the type of aircraft that are actually being used. Efficient handling of dramatically different types of aircraft will likely require a
dramatically different type of infrastructure, both conceptually & physically. The impact upon our local electrical utilities (PG@E, East Bay Community Energy) needs to be taken into consideration.

Expanding the facilities designed to handle large-body, fossil-fueled airplanes is comparable to investing in oil & gas pipelines, i.e. it is wasteful & makes it that much more problematical to convert to the type of system that is required. Oakland airport has to prepare itself for substantial sea level rise in the near future & investment should be directed toward making those required modifications as opposed to planning for expanded air travel. It may be that exactly the opposite will (& arguably SHOULD) be the case & that what we should see is a smaller, more secure, more flexible & more resilient Oakland airport than an expanded version of the one that we have at present.

Happily I am informed that electrified airplanes are a far less noisy form of transportation than the planes we presently use.

I have read and agree
Sign me up
--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport (https://www.oaklandairport.com)
FW: RE: RE: [EXTERNAL] Airport Expansion

swharrison < >
Fri 6/11/2021 2:25 PM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

I'm not sure how to start this email. But we are extremely concerned about the Oakland Terminal Modernization & Development Project. Some years ago we had a terrible experience with the Oakland Airport and we had over 500 planes flying over our house in a month. It was a nightmare. Scared 😨 us to death. We are seniors and we do not want to experience anything like that again.

What is going to be the flight pattern, when would these changes go into effect and when are the POA meetings going to start up again?

Thank you for your assistance.

William and Sandra Harrison

Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device

-------- Original message --------
From: swharrison < >
Date: 6/1/21 8:59 AM (GMT-08:00)
To: Jesse Richardson <jrichardson@portoakland.com>
Subject: RE: RE: [EXTERNAL] Airport Expansion

OK thank you.

Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device
Construction has not started on the Terminal Modernization & Development Project. Sorry, I do not know when the project will be completed. I would recommend that you contact the project team through their website. Someone will get back to you with answers to all your questions. Here is the contact us page on their website:
https://www.oaklandairport.com/contact-us/

Best regards,

Jesse Richardson, Jr.

Airport Noise Abatement and Environmental Affairs Supervisor

Oakland International Airport

Port of Oakland

One Airport Drive, Box 45

Oakland, CA 94621

Desk: (510) 563-3349

Noise Hotline: (510) 563-6463

FlyQuietOak.com | WhisperTrack.com

www.oaklandairport.com | www.portofoakland.com
Please consider the environment before printing this email.

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION

The information contained in this email message may be privileged, confidential, and protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution, or copying is strictly prohibited. If you think that you have received this email message in error, please email the sender.

From: swharrison <>
Sent: Tuesday, June 1, 2021 8:24 AM
To: Jesse Richardson <jrichardson@portoakland.com>
Subject: RE: RE: [EXTERNAL] Airport Expansion

So the changes regarding the Airport Expansion haven't gone into effect yet? When will the Airport Expansion be completed?

Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device
Ms. Harrison:

Air traffic has picked up a bit, but still not back to 2019 levels.

Best regards,

Jesse Richardson, Jr.

Airport Noise Abatement and Environmental Affairs Supervisor
Oakland International Airport
Port of Oakland
One Airport Drive, Box 45
Oakland, CA 94621
Desk: (510) 563-3349
Noise Hotline: (510) 563-6463

FlyQuietOak.com | WhisperTrack.com
I mistakenly sent this to me instead of you. When does the increase in airplane traffic start? Or has it already started?

Sandra Harrison
Question. When does this increase in air traffic start or has it already started?

Sandra
Can we attend the meeting on the 25th or 26th? The Form meeting Wednesday in July is that a zoom meeting? What is the ID# and password? Thank you for the information.

Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device

-------- Original message --------

From: Jesse Richardson <jrichardson@portoakland.com>

Date: 5/24/21 8:45 AM (GMT-08:00)

To: swharrison <xxxxxxxxxx>

Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Airport Expansion

Good morning Mr. and Mrs. Harrison

Thank you. I hope you are well too. The Noise Forum still meets Quartely. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic the meetings are virtual. The Port has not determine when our next Noise Forum in person meeting will be. But, the
next virtual Noise Forum is scheduled at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, July 21, 2021.

Regarding the Airport Expansion, the Terminal Development Meetings are Tuesday, May 25, 2021 and Wednesday, May 26, 2021. Again, due to current federal and state guidance on social distancing in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Port is holding four separate virtual public scoping meetings for this project. Each meeting will provide the same information and the same opportunity for providing comments on the scope and content of the Draft EIR. Details on these meetings can be found at this location: https://www.oaklandairport.com/terminal-development-meeting-materials/

Please let me know if you have any questions. I hope this is helpful.

Best regards,

Jesse Richardson, Jr.
Airport Noise Abatement and Environmental Affairs Supervisor
Oakland International Airport
Port of Oakland
One Airport Drive, Box 45
Oakland, CA 94621
Desk: (510) 563-3349
Noise Hotline: (510) 563-6463

FlyQuietOak.com | WhisperTrack.com
Hi hope all is well with you. My husband just gave me some terrible news/information. When is the Port of Oakland going to start their meetings
again? Some of us who live around or somewhat near the airport need to hear more about these recent changes.

Waiting to hear from you.

Always,

Sandra and Bill Harrison

Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

Carol Healey <website@oaklandairport.com>
Tue 5/25/2021 3:58 PM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortT71394.)

First Name: Carol
Last Name: Healey
Email Address: [redacted]
Phone: [redacted]
Comment:
I attended the hearing from 3 to 4 today (screen name Carrie). Mr. Full said the project "would not affect the runways," but he then answered a caller asking about the runways, "what I said is the project does not change the runways at OAK." I see the area for "replacement cargo facilities" is at the edge of the Parkway and very close to North Field runway 28L. As a North Field hangar tenant, I would be very concerned if this project, extending all the way to the Parkway, will require shutting down 28L in order to construct the "replacement cargo facilities." I would also like to know if you have already submitted the proposal, or at least the NOP, to the FAA for determination whether construction cranes and equipment will be too close to the North Field runways to permit them to remain open safely.

I have read and agree
Sign me up
--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport (https://www.oaklandairport.com)
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

Christine Ingoldsby <website@oaklandairport.com>
Fri 6/4/2021 12:53 PM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

First Name: Christine
Last Name: Ingoldsby
Email Address: [REDACTED]
Phone: [REDACTED]
Comment:
Re: Oakland International Airport Terminal Development Project

When the FAA changed flight paths to GPS controlled routes in 2015, and initiated the WNDSR Flight Path, it changed everything for us. Who is “us”? We are the thousands of residents living in the higher elevations in eight (!) cities of the East Bay Hills: i.e. El Cerritos, San Pablo, Richmond, Berkeley, San Leandro, Hayward, San Lorenzo and OAKLAND.

My family and I live in the Oakland Hills and have suffered greatly from the almost constant, and very loud flights over our home. And now, after countless meetings with the FAA and the Port of Oakland- all after we have provided verified documentation of flight altitude and accompanying noise- not only is NOTHING being done to correct the situation, you now want to increase the number of flights and the accompanying noise. This is not acceptable!

We have lived here for 20 years and know that it does not have to be like this. It wasn’t this way for many years for thousands of tax-paying residents of the East Bay Hills. Is it really impossible to spread the incoming and outgoing flights around the area, and particularly over the ocean? I realize that you have rejected alternative options in the name of efficiency and cost reduction, but this solution is ruining any chance for a peaceful life in the Oakland Hills and beyond. Please take this into consideration in your upcoming meetings and reports, and fix the problem for so many people. Thank you.

I have read and agree
Sign me up

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport (https://www.oaklandairport.com)
[EXTERNAL] Jet Fuel residue

Michelle Ingram <>
Thu 6/3/2021 4:57 PM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>
Cc: miang <>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

I live at Alameda.

I would like to draw attention to the environmental safety of the jet fuel accumulation that takes place with the current flight patterns out of both the main runway and the north fields.

I am attaching a picture of the inside (original color) and exposed side of my outdoor umbrella.

As you can clearly see there is a dramatic difference between the original color of the umbrella and the distorted color caused by jet fuel.

This presents an environmental safety issue that must be addressed as your department assess impact of an airport expansion.

My umbrella can be replaced but I breath in the same substance that is left behind by the airport traffic.

With the expansion this jet fuel residue will become a bigger problem and needs to be addressed in your study.

Thank you.
Sent from my iPhone
[EXTERNAL] NOP Comments

Carrolyn Kubota <carrolyn.kubota@portoakland.com>
Mon 6/7/2021 1:34 PM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

Dear Colleen,

Here are my comments regarding the NOP.

- Hire an acoustic engineer to measure departure noise levels at the west end of Alameda island from Ballena Bay to the former Navy yard. Sound definitely travels over water.
- The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must evaluate impacts related to increased noise and other topics using the current baseline conditions.
- The EIR must include a robust analysis of the Project’s impacts, especially air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, public health, and noise impacts.
- The EIR must analyze all of the growth resulting from adding a terminal and 17 additional gates, including increased regional car traffic, increased flight operations, and increased noise.
- The EIR must identify the anticipated number and timing of existing and future flights.
- Mitigation measures must be developed for all potentially significant impacts resulting from increased flight
operations.

Thank you for your time,
Carrolyn

Best. Carrolyn Kubota
Hello,

I am a regular patron of OAK and enjoy the convenience of having an airport in the East Bay. However, I do not support further expansion of the airport.

1. This expansion will negatively impact the mental and physical health of those in our neighboring communities (Alameda, Oakland, Berkeley, San Leandro, Hayward, Castro Valley - anywhere on a depart or return flight path). That is hundreds of thousands of people, if not a million.
2. The expansion will negatively impact the environment through increased flights + air pollution, destroyed wetlands, and increased runoff into the Bay.
3. Sea levels are rising and the airport is on the Bay. Why would we spend time, effort, and precious resources building something that will be underwater in a few decades?

If we need more gates to serve the East Bay or Bay Area at large - build an airport in Tracy.

Laura
Your verbiage does not tell the real story. I am against adding so many new runways to the Oakland Airport. I live in Richmond and the number of planes flying over my house daily has become shocking. Most homes here have no A/C, thus our windows are open during the warm season to toxic noise and filth. How would you like to wake up to a plane landing on your roof?

I have read and agree

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport (https://www.oaklandairport.com)
Hello Ms or Mr C Liang

Please excuse me if I’m addressing you incorrectly. I was unable to distinguish your name in the mailing.

I understand you are seeking public input pertaining to the necessary growth of Oakland Airport.

I strongly support that idea and thank you for moving ahead with it.

I’m 78 years old now but remember OA as a just a few huts. How wonderful that it has grown to serve the Bat Area so well.

BUT, may I raise a serious concern please about the current air corridors for take off and landing.

Obviously we cannot just expect all jet noise to go away - for only when we personally need it.

But 4 years ago when your new computer analysis program took hold, air routes over the East Bay Hills and Berkeley and North Oakland were severely changed.

A serious error was made but it require a very minor adjustment in the approach and takeoff routes.

For 30 years jets flew up the center of the Bay and turned up the Sacramento River. The noise was close to zero.

They also flew over the back (east) of the hills above Berkeley and Oakland. Four years ago the landing/takeoff path was moved 2.5 miles close to the top of the hills (a route along Tilden Park &/or Grizzly Peak Blvd.

So now, all the jet noise (and it’s very bad) cascades down the hills towards the west. Please go back to the original paths up the center of the Bay, or further over the East side of the hills.

This decision on your part will increase comfort and rest for over 40,000 people.

In the expansion of the airport, it is not unreasonable to ask you to correct and improve the current air paths for take off and landing.

Under the policies of our new President and his appointees, we presume we will be seriously listened to.

Over the past 4 years, we have been ignored, laughed at and repeatedly lied to.

We know that we won’t receive those kinds of responses from you and your colleagues.

We know that you have a very hard and complicated job - and one where every person expects you to do what they want.

We sincerely look forward to your good faith efforts to help us, as these fine plans for the
Oakland Airport move forward.
Thank you for dedicated professional effort.
We look forward to your public analysis and presentation of your decision making process.
Good wishes

Dr Antony J Lepire

Berkeley, Ca 94708

&&&& **#

Sent from my iPad
[EXTERNAL] Comments on the NOP for the OAK Terminal Development Project

Bart Lounsbury <[REDACTED]>
Sat 6/5/2021 11:13 PM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

Dear Colleen Liang:

I write to express my concerns with the Notice of Preparation ("NOP") for the Draft EIR related to the Oakland International Airport ("OAK" or "Airport") Terminal Development Project ("Project"). From the perspectives of both environmental impacts and actual need, the Project is ill-considered and should not move forward.

Most notably, OAK has demonstrated no justification for the Project. Recent passenger volume statistics at OAK do not support an expansion of the Airport. In 2018, passenger volume was 13.59 million. In 2019, before the COVID-19 pandemic even began to affect travel, passenger volume had dropped to 13.38 million, 1.5% below 2018 figures, indicating waning interest in flights from OAK. In 2020, OAK handled a mere 4.62 million passengers, a drop largely attributable to the pandemic. In light of these most recent statistics, the Airport has no logical basis on which to assume that passenger volume will naturally increase in the near future or ever. The pandemic's long-term consequences on air travel patterns remain unknown, and it is possible that passenger volume at OAK will never return to its 2018 record for various reasons, including the following.
First, many businesses, particularly those in the Bay Area that generate a significant number of the business travelers who utilize OAK, have adapted to the permanent reality of a workforce that interacts remotely to a rising degree. Experts expect that business travel will never return to its previous volume (see, e.g., https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2021-03-26/will-business-travel-return-to-normal-after-covid). Bill Gates has stated that he estimates 50% of business travel will disappear in the post-pandemic world (https://www.cnbc.com/video/2020/11/17/bill-gates-business-travel-coronavirus.html).

Second, the population of the Bay Area is dropping, with obvious implications for air travel in the future. From 2020 to 2021, the figures were as follows: Alameda County -- 0.4% loss; Marin County -- 1% loss; Napa County -- 1% loss; San Francisco City and County -- 1.7% loss; San Mateo County -- 0.8% loss; Santa Clara County -- 0.6% loss; Santa Cruz County -- 3.4% loss; Solano County -- 0.2% loss. (https://www.sacbee.com/news/politics-government/capitol-alert/article251245999.html) The only Bay Area county that gained population is Contra Costa County with a 0.3% increase. (Id.) In total, the Bay Area's population dropped by almost 46,000 residents (0.6%) from 2020 to 2021. (https://socketsite.com/archives/2021/05/the-bay-area-population-decline.html) Given factors such as the extreme costs of housing in the Bay Area, the new acceptance of remote work by many companies and organizations, and the deleterious impacts of increased wildfire activity around the region, the Bay Area's population may continue to decline into the indefinite future.

The Airport's proposal to construct a new terminal at this time is irresponsible when considered against the backdrop of diminished interest in air travel and decreasing population in the Bay Area. The Project appears to be a result of momentum generated during a time when the Airport's passenger volume was increasing. That time is now years past, and the Airport should reframe its plans and cease to pursue a proposal that reflects outdated assumptions and takes no account of the likely realities of a post-pandemic world.
Beyond the lack of any justification for the project, the Project should never be approved due also to the unacceptable environmental impacts of expanding passenger volume to the extent contemplated. As the NOP indicates, the Project is expected to result in potentially significant impacts in virtually every resource category and would undoubtedly require a long statement of overriding considerations to receive final approval as there may be no feasible means to mitigate the increased greenhouse gas emissions (millions of tons), which would exacerbate the already dire predictions for climate change-induced problems, such as sea level rise that will lead to more frequent flooding at the Airport (see "Oakland Preliminary Sea Level Rise Road Map," available at [https://cao-94612.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/oak068799.pdf](https://cao-94612.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/oak068799.pdf)) and more disastrous wildfires that have catastrophically affected California in recent years; the criteria air pollutant emissions; the noise impacts on communities already detrimentally and severely impacted by the FAA's hopelessly poorly implemented NextGen program; and numerous other adverse impacts.

Instead of focusing on an ill-conceived project that reflects currently inapplicable assumptions about air travel in the future, OAK should refocus its efforts on adapting to the realities of our changing world and attempting to reduce its impacts on humans and the environment. The Airport should not try to generate new air traffic where no such increase is supported by present trends and where that increase would worsen the quality of life and of the environment for residents of the Bay Area and beyond.

As an environmental attorney for the last 15 years, as a user of the Airport, and having worked for a decade for two large public agencies on both CEQA and NEPA analyses, I am disappointed to see that OAK persists in reviewing one of the most irresponsible projects that I have seen proposed by a public entity. I hope that the Airport will halt the Project now before wasting funds and the time of OAK staff and members of the public, as well as almost certainly generating protracted litigation over what would be an indefensible environmental impact report for unneeded development.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,
Barton Lounsbury
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

Julie Machado <website@oaklandairport.com>
Wed 5/26/2021 9:05 AM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortT71394.)

First Name: Julie
Last Name: Machado
Email Address: [REDACTED]
Phone: [REDACTED]
Comment:
I am concerned about the proposed expansion of the Oakland airport. When I moved to my home in 1994, we hardly ever heard a plan near us. Now we commonly hear plans, and they interrupt our conversations and daily lives. Sometimes they are repeated, every few minutes, all day long. It interferes with the quiet enjoyment of our property, our home.

I urge the airport to work with the FAA to implement mitigations regarding both noise and pollution for all Oakland airport flight paths. The most sensible mitigation, it seems to me, is to fly over unpopulated areas as much as possible, including over the water instead of land.

I do not support endlessly increasing air flights. Enough is enough.

I have read and agree

---

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport (https://www.oaklandairport.com)
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

Howard Matis <website@oaklandairport.com>
Sun 6/6/2021 11:54 AM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

________________________________________________________________

First Name: Howard
Last Name: Matis
Email Address: [Redacted]
Phone: [Redacted]
Comment:

I approve of the plan to add a new terminal with 17 net additional gates. Too often, I have to drive from Oakland to San Francisco. Oakland is much closer to my house. By offering more flights from Oakland, I would save gas and be able to fight climate change by driving less. Please expand the Oakland Airport. I will save people from the East Bay driving all the way to San Francisco.

I have read and agree

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport (https://www.oaklandairport.com)
The following comments as a resident of Bay Farm Island, are for items that must be included in the EIR:

- The EIR must include a robust analysis of the Project’s impacts, especially air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, public health, and noise and safety impacts.

- The EIR must analyze all of the growth resulting from adding a terminal and 17 additional gates, including increased regional car traffic, increased flight operations, and increased noise.

- Mitigation measures must be developed for all potentially significant impacts resulting from increased flight operations.

Roger McClure
Alameda, CA 94502
[EXTERNAL] Environmental Studies for OAK Terminal Development in response to NOP

Thu 6/3/2021 8:00 PM

To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>
Cc: 'Mike McClintock' <>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

Dear Ms. Liang,

I watched one of the recorded OAK Public Scoping Meetings on May 26, 2021 – had I been on that Zoom call as I would have been very eager to ask for information about studies regarding the environmental impact on the Bay from the OAK Fuel Farm as it exists now, and after its upgrade and expansion as mentioned in the OAK Scoping Meeting.

I saw on the graphic or photograph that the OAK Fuel Farm is located on the edge of the Bay. I live in Point Richmond, a neighborhood of Richmond, California, near a legacy toxics site also positioned directly on the Bay. This site is called Terminal 1, and it is adjacent to Ferry Point in Miller Knox Regional Shoreline (EBRPD). From the many decades of use of the Terminal 1 site as a fuel depot, the ground and groundwater are contaminated: valid groundwater data exists documenting the extent of the pollution. Petroleum discharges to the Bay have been occurring for decades from this site. A solution currently proposed to stop these toxic discharges is an appropriately designed slurry wall.

I would like to know if state-of-the-art ground and groundwater testing for toxics is being done now at the OAK Fuel Farm, and if petroleum discharges to the Bay exceeding allowable levels are occurring?; and, how will this be stopped and the Bay protected if the OAK Fuel Farm is expanded and upgraded? Groundwater and stormwater monitoring on a consistent and regular basis should be mandated, if it is not already so.

The design of an expanded OAK Fuel Farm should ensure that contaminated stormwater is captured and prevented from entering the Bay.
Of great concern, of course, since the OAK Fuel Farm is located right on the Bay, would catastrophic-level contamination of the Bay in the case of a severe earthquake; and increased vulnerability of the OAK Fuel Farm to structural failure with anticipated sea level rise. The Port of San Francisco is planning for at least a 4-6 foot rise, I believe, by 2050. Is this being seriously considered in the design for the expansion and upgrade?

Thanks for the opportunity to express my concerns.

Yvonne McHugh, Ph.D.
Richmond CA 94801
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

George Moore <website@oaklandairport.com>
Sun 6/6/2021 2:21 PM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

First Name: George
Last Name: Moore
Email Address: [redacted]
Phone: [redacted]
Comment: It doesn’t seem reasonable to demolish the OMC hangar. This will leave Oakland without a commercial repair facility and preclude it from future consideration as a hub or mini-hub.

I have read and agree
Sign me up
--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport (https://www.oaklandairport.com)
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

Luis Ortega <website@oaklandairport.com>
Tue 5/11/2021 12:35 PM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

__________________________

First Name: Luis
Last Name: Ortega
Email Address: [REDACTED]
Phone: [REDACTED]
Comment:
I love Oakland international airport for its simplicity and easy access in and out. However, it is time for a major update on the existing terminals. A more modern terminal with high ceilings and more overall space is needed.

I have read and agree
Sign me up
--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport (https://www.oaklandairport.com)
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

Audrey Pirruccello <website@oaklandairport.com>
Tue 6/1/2021 10:58 AM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortiT71394.)

________________________

First Name: Audrey
Last Name: Pirruccello
Email Address: [REDACTED]
Phone: [REDACTED]
Comment:
I'm interested in knowing how noise levels and traffic will be impacted, and what will be done to mitigate those impacts on neighboring communities. Thanks.

I have read and agree
Sign me up
--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport
(https://www.oaklandairport.com)
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

H. Rostock <website@oaklandairport.com>
Sat 6/5/2021 7:22 PM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

________________________________

First Name: H.
Last Name: Rostock
Email Address:
Phone:
Comment:
I am opposed to adding more flights and the expansion of the oakland airport for these reasons.

Communities have experienced significantly high levels of noise disturbances after the FAA changed the flight paths to GPS-controlled routes in 2015.

Residents in the East Bay Hills suffer greatly from WNDSR, the OAK arrival path that follows the spine of the East Bay Hills.

I request a robust analysis of the project’s increase in all flights.

The EIR must identify the anticipated number and timing of existing and future flights.

Mitigation measures must be developed for all potentially significant impacts, including noise & air pollution, from all OAK dispersed flights and NextGen related flight paths.
The Port of Oakland Board must work with the FAA to implement mitigations, including shifting flight paths (like WNDSR) away from populated areas.

The EIR must include rigorous monitoring of current noise levels associated with the airport to establish an existing baseline.

I’m an Oakland resident impacted by already numerous low flying planes over my house.

I have read and agree

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport (https://www.oaklandairport.com)
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

mark santamaria <website@oaklandairport.com>
Thu 5/27/2021 6:48 AM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

First Name: mark
Last Name: santamaria
Email Address: [REDACTED]
Phone: [REDACTED]
Comment:

JUST ONE COMMENT, IF NEXTGEN IS SO GREAT WHY WONT YOU HAVE THE FLIGHT PATHS OVER THE BAY??? WE ARE FED UP WITH THE EXCUSE ABOUT ENOUGH ROOM YET THESE FLIGHTS PATHS WORK OVER HOMES AT LOW ALTITUDES???? IN A VERY NARROW CORRIDOR??????????I HAVE ASKED IN THE PAST TAKE A DRIVE OVER ANY OF THE BRIDGES IN THE BAY AREA AND LOOK OUT OVER THE VAST SPACE THERE IS!!! NO PLANES ??? SFO USES A VERY, VERY SLIM PROTION OF THE BAY SHORE LINE ON ARRIVALS FROM THE SOUTH!!!! OAKLAND'S DEPARTING PLANES SHOULD FLY INTO SAN PABLO BAY FIRST BEFORE TURNING OVER LAND PERIOD!!! AND IT WOULD BE A VERY EASY FLIGHT PATH WITH MORE THAN ENOUGH ROOM !!! ARRIVING FLIGHTS SHOULD COME IN OVER THE BAY AND TURN OVER THE BAY AND LAND IN OAKLAND!!!! AGAIN IF NEXTGEN IS SO GREAT, THIS SHOULD NOT EVEN BE A CONVERSATION!!!!!! LASTLY WHY ARE YOU AND THE FAA CHOOSING PLANE FLIGHT PATHS OVER THE TAX PAYERS HEALTH??????????????????????????????????????????????????????????????????????????????????????? WHO OWNS YOU???????? ARE YOU THAT CORRUPT?????? PROFITS OVER PEOPLE???????????????????? ONE DAY IN THE FUTURE PEOPLE WILL LOOK BACK ON THIS AND SAY HOW SICK NEXTGEN WAS TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND HOW DID THE GOVERNMENT GET AWAY WITH IT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

I have read and agree
Sign me up
--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport
(https://www.oaklandairport.com)
The proposed expansion of Oakland Airport, to include construction of an additional passenger terminal as well as cargo facilities, will have a significant impact on neighboring Bay Farm Island. Conduct of an EIR to identify all impacts and potential mitigation measures using established and well documented scientific methods (and data) will be essential to assuring the airport's neighbors safety issues are appropriately addressed. Following are suggestion for conduct of the EIR:

(1) Identification of sound impacts throughout Bay Farm Island should be based not only on peak decibels and decibels over an established threshold (eg. normal conversation level) but also **duration and frequency** at these levels. Sound sensors already exist on Bay Farm Island. Historical data from these sensors can be analyzed and compared to the expected increases in decibels and above threshold levels as well as duration and frequency.

(2) Mitigation measures against increased noise levels should include moving departing (northward) flight paths more bayward of the Bay Farm Shoreline as
currently exists. This is the current "Hush" flight path used at night-time, and was safely used for many years prior to institution of the NextGen flight Software. Other sound mitigation measures should be considered, including sound insulated windows for those home suffering from the increased aircraft noise.

(3) Jet flights departing from the North Field should continue to be restricted to emergency use, only, as the Port/FAA has currently agreed to with CLASS. Jet flights from the North Field poses a deadly threat to residences in this flight path.

(4) Bay Farm was developed prior to the introduction of cargo flights conducted using heavy and noisy cargo jets. Expansion of the cargo facilities will only serve to exasperate the noise and vibration levels from these cargo jets. Mitigation measures should include the aforementioned moving of the northward departing flight path bayward, and potentially restricting flights of cargo jets to those meeting a maximum sound level and/or restricting night flights of these large, loud planes. Also, vibration mitigation measures for impacted residences in the vicinity of the flight path should be considered.

(5) I look forward to reviewing reviewing studies of what increases in air pollution we can expect due to the proposed expansion, particularly impacts to younger residents and those who have compromised respiratory systems on Bay Farm.

(6) Regarding increased traffic due to the expansion, what measures will be undertaken to ensure that airport through traffic does not traverse through Bay Farm residential streets? We have already seen greatly increased traffic from the Harbor Bay Business Park speeding through our residential streets.

(7) We enjoy a great deal of wildlife on Bay Farm Island. What will be the impacts of airport expansion and operations on this important resource?

Thank you for your consideration of the above.

Ed Sing
Bay Farm Resident
The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

We are writing today to express our concerns about the proposed expansion of Oakland Airport.

Communities such as ours in the Oakland Hills above Highway 13 already experienced high levels of noise disturbance after the FAA changed the flight paths to GPS-controlled routes in 2015. This new plan must be based on a robust EIR of the proposed increase. It should include the following 4 things:

First, a rigorous monitoring of current noise levels associated with the airport to establish a clear existing baseline. Second, the identification of the passenger levels that the new facilities are designed to handle. Third, the comparison of that level to the passenger levels that existed before the pandemic drastically reduced the number of flights. Fourth, the identification of the anticipated number and timing of future flights.

Then mitigation measures must be developed for all potentially significant impacts (including noise & air pollution) from ALL OAK airport flight paths.

Finally, the Airport must work with the FAA to implement mitigations, including shifting the flight paths away from populated areas. The pre-pandemic noise levels were already unacceptable to residents in our community. Any increase in flights using current paths would make things far worse.

We hope you will attend to and go forward with our concerns in mind. Thank you.

Chiho and Richard Solomon
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

Jim Stewart <website@oaklandairport.com>
Sat 6/5/2021 12:12 PM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

First Name: Jim
Last Name: Stewart
Email Address: 
Phone: 
Comment:
The CEQA analysis must use the CARB well-to-wheels GREET model for the fuel and lubrication oils (although in this case it is well-to-jet engine).

It should also include the emissions from the manufacture and end-of-life disposal of the additional airplanes required to serve these additional gates.

I have read and agree

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport (https://www.oaklandairport.com)
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

Alan Stewart <website@oaklandairport.com>
Mon 6/7/2021 12:29 AM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

______________________________

First Name: Alan
Last Name: Stewart
Email Address: [REDACTED]
Phone: [REDACTED]
Comment:

Communities have experienced significantly high levels of noise disturbances after the FAA changed the flight paths to GPS-controlled routes in 2015. Residents in the East Bay Hills suffer greatly from WNDSR, the OAK arrival path that follows the spine of the East Bay Hills. I distinctly remember the uptick in 2015. We initially were living in a quiet area in Montclair and once the change occurred we heard a plane go overhead sometimes every 5 minutes. It would be a rare, but cherished time when I could go for a walk for an hour and only hear 1-2 planes. I don't want it to get worse than it already is!

I have read and agree

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport (https://www.oaklandairport.com)
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

Judy Taylor <website@oaklandairport.com>
Mon 6/7/2021 2:12 AM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

________________________________
First Name: Judy
Last Name: Taylor
Email Address: [redacted]
Phone: [redacted]
Comment:
I have lived in Alameda for 40 years, always at the West end and 12 years near the former Navy Base off of Ballena Blvd.
As a former flight attendant out of Oakland, I have noticed the airplane noise has increased at least over the last decade. For at least 5 years the airplanes seemed to have moved closer to our houses and are therefore noisier. When the base was active, the planes made their ascent farther out in the Bay and I have visually noticed they have moved closer to the island during takeoff and ascent. I have to wear earplugs to sleep, however, the large Fed Ex or UPS planes can wake me up with a jolt between 2, 2:30 and 3 AM, they are so loud. Sometimes I think I am feeling an earthquake. If the airport is expanding to have more flights, I worry about more noise than now over by Ballena Bay. When I watch the planes, they seem to make their climb right near our homes. The Bay is huge, why can’t the planes move out a little more away from Alameda’s shoreline - which I believe they used to do when the planes didn’t seem so loud. A new terminal would be nice, but more noise as the planes ascend will not be appreciated. Alameda prides itself on being a peaceful island, not a noisy island. See if you can do something about the current noise and the impending airplane noise. Thank you.
I have read and agree

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport
(https://www.oaklandairport.com)
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

Flora Tso <website@oaklandairport.com>
Wed 5/26/2021 9:40 PM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

First Name: Flora
Last Name: Tso
Email Address: [Redacted]
Phone: [Redacted]
Comment:
We live on Bay Farm in Alameda. If there is a planned expansion, please make sure that airplanes take off going out to the bay or over Oakland direction with no additional Takeoff/landings along Bay Farm coast to minimize any additional pollution/noise.

Many thanks,
Flora

I have read and agree
Sign me up
--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport
(https://www.oaklandairport.com)
[EXTERNAL] New Airport in Oakland

Judy Ubsdell <[redacted]>
Sat 5/29/2021 5:01 PM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

Please consider the following when scoping out if an expanded airport is a good idea:

1. There has been a high level of noise disturbance after the FAA changed the flight paths in 2015. The carbon footprint may be less, but the noise pollution is awful.
2. A thorough analysis of what the flight increase means and how it will affect the communities in the vicinity of the airport, including, traffic.
3. What is the timing and anticipated number of flights now and in the future?
4. What mitigation measures will be made to address any potentially significant impacts.
5. The airport must work with the FAA to implement mitigation, including shifting the flight paths away from populated areas.
6. There must be rigorous monitoring of current noise levels associated with the airport. Currently air brakes are used a lot.

Respectfully submitted,
Judy Ubsdell
Oakland Resident.
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

Judith Ubsdell <website@oaklandairport.com>
Sun 6/6/2021 6:09 PM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

________________________________
First Name: Judith
Last Name: Ubsdell
Email Address: __________________________
Phone: ________________________________
Comment: Please consider the following when scoping out if an expanded airport is a good idea:
There has been a high level of noise disturbance after the FAA changed the flight paths in 2015. The carbon footprint may be less, but the noise pollution is awful.
A thorough analysis of what the flight increase means and how it will affect the communities in the vicinity of the airport, including, street traffic.
What is the timing and anticipated number of flights now and in the future?
What mitigation measures will be made to address any potentially significant impacts, e.g. noise and air pollution.
The airport must work with the FAA to implement mitigation, including shifting the flight paths away from populated areas.
There must be rigorous monitoring of current noise levels associated with the airport. Currently air brakes are used a lot.
Respectfully submitted,
Judy Ubsdell
Oakland Resident.

I have read and agree
Sign me up

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Oakland International Airport (https://www.oaklandairport.com)
[EXTERNAL] Terminal: Get in Touch

Thomas Varghese <website@oaklandairport.com>
Thu 6/3/2021 11:04 PM
To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

First Name: Thomas
Last Name: Varghese
Email Address: [REDACTED]
Phone: [REDACTED]
Comment:
I believe it is imperative that Oakland Airport remain a viable part of the Bay Area’s aviation infrastructure. An out-dated airport with significantly hamper the region’s economic well-being and social capacity.

I urge airport leaders and planners to address three issues: (1) our transportation needs for the next 30 years, (2) airport architectural designs that are both functional and attractive, and (3) the growing threat of climate change. With respect Issue 1, I would strongly support a special airport user fee or a local property tax to fund airport development needs for the next 30 years. With respect to Issue 2, I urge airport leaders to engage renowned architectural firms like Santiago Calatrava or Zaha Hadid to develop striking designs that complement the mid-century modern design of Terminal 1 and the post- modern design of Terminal 2. And with respect to Issue 3, I feel it’s vital that future airport plans include dikes or berms, to account for rising sea levels that would threaten the airport runways and terminals.

In closing, I urge everyone to be aggressive in our planning perspective! Oakland needs not remain in the shadow of other cities in the Bay Area and the US. Our airport should reflect our optimism and confidence in the future!
I have read and agree
Sign me up
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To: Colleen Liang <cliang@portoakland.com>

The sender of this message is external to the Port of Oakland. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. (Disclaimer posted by PortIT71394.)

First Name: Solomon
Last Name: Weingarten
Email Address: [REDACTED]
Phone: [REDACTED]
Comment:

My wife and I moved into a peaceful, quiet home and community in 2008. NextGen changed that! The OAK WNDSR flight path inundates our home with noise 24 hours a day and my wife suffers from it terribly. Imagine having a migraine and trying to deal with that while a thundering plane flies less than 4,000 ft over your home. She has to do that.

Expanding OAK airport will just make it worse. More passengers means more planes! This expansion will only bring more suffering to people who are already suffering too much. Before OAK can expand, the Port of Oakland must get a commitment from the FAA to move WNDSR to a flight path suggested in the Noise Forum’s proposals to the FAA.

I have the followings specific comments on the NOP.

• Communities have experienced significantly high levels of noise disturbances after the FAA changed the flight paths to GPS-controlled routes in 2015. Residents in the East Bay Hills suffer greatly from WNDSR, the OAK arrival path that follows the spine of the East Bay Hills.
• I request a robust analysis of the project’s increase in all flights.
• The EIR should identify the passenger level that the new facilities are designed to handle and compare that level to the passenger levels that existed during Covid.
• The EIR must identify the anticipated number and timing of existing and future flights.
• Mitigation measures must be developed for all potentially significant impacts, including noise & air pollution, from all OAK dispersed flights and NextGen related flight paths.
• The Port of Oakland Board must work with the FAA to implement mitigations, including shifting flight paths (like WNDSR) away from populated areas.
• The EIR must include rigorous monitoring of current noise levels associated with the airport to establish an existing baseline.

I have read and agree
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First Name: Nance
Last Name: Wilson
Email Address: [REDACTED]
Phone: [REDACTED]
Comment:
I am not certain about the correct terminology, so please try to understand what I mean. The width of the flight path has, in the recent past, been substantially reduced such that the air traffic over our area has been drastically increased. The new terminal- plus the updates to terminals 1 and 2- are cause for concern about a further increase to the noise pollution if the planes are all instructed to fly in narrowed flight lane

I have read and agree
Sign me up
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