April 11, 2024

To the Honorable Board of Port Commissioners:

Please accept this letter of my personal support for renaming the Oakland International Airport to the San Francisco Bay Area Oakland International Airport.

As Mayor of El Cerrito, I recognize the importance OAK Airport has on both our community and our region. We have residents who work at OAK Airport, and many residents utilize the Airport frequently. Renaming the Airport with a more recognizable regional name will help increase geographic awareness and will help both domestic and international travelers make more informed decisions.

Since OAK Airport is the closest airport for 58% of the Bay Area population (El Cerrito included), I believe this name change will ultimately help travelers make a choice which positively impacts the entire East Bay region.

Thank you,

Sincerely,

Tessa Rudnick
Mayor, City of El Cerrito
Port of Oakland Board,

I am 82, born in San Francisco and lifetime SF resident. My husband and I fly out of both SFO and OAK.

We are appalled at the proposed name change. The OAK commissioners seem to believe that there are tons of flyers who don't know that Oakland is just across the Bay from San Francisco. We have a hard time believing that. Our city’s name doesn’t belong on Oakland’s airport. 

As a sensible compromise, I propose the name **Oakland/Bay Area International Airport**. This lets flyers know that OAK is in the Bay Area without creating and unnecessary rift between S.F. and Oakland.

Danell S. Zeavin,
San Francisco
From: sherwood donahue
To: Port of Oakland Board Commissioners
Subject: [EXTERNAL] [Port of Oakland - People] "THE OAKLAND AIRPORT NAME CHANGE"
Date: Thursday, April 18, 2024 4:22:04 PM

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.)

From: sherwood donahue <sherwooddonahue@gmail.com>
Subject: THE OAKLAND AIRPORT NAME CHANGE

board@portoakland.com

Message Body:
When I first contacted the Mayor and the members of the Port Commissioners regarding the name change that starts with SAN FRANCISCO. Only one board member had the courtesy to respond. My suggestion regarding the name change was to lead with Oakland (OAKLAND SAN FRANCISCO BAY INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT). Now I have a question. Who pays for the litigation after we are being sued? I would appreciate a response. Sherwood Donahue

I am an Oakland High graduate and taught in the Oakland Unified School District for 39 years. I have been a resident for 68 years.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Port of Oakland (https://www.portoakland.com)
RE: Proposed Renaming of Metropolitan Oakland International Airport (OAK) to “San Francisco Bay Oakland International Airport” (File ID: 094-24)

Communities for a Better Environment (“CBE”) writes to express serious concerns about the proposed renaming of Metropolitan Oakland International Airport (OAK) to “San Francisco Bay Oakland International Airport” (File ID: 094-24). At its April 11, 2024, meeting, the Port proposed and approved the renaming (pending a second and final vote). This approval effectively curtails the public’s ability to conduct even the most basic environmental assessment. CBE is concerned that the Port is improperly segmenting its review of the environmental impacts. In relying on a legally inadequate project description, the Port has failed to analyze aspects of the project by piecemealing approval of the renaming.

Locally and globally, we are in an environmental crisis as a direct result of past decision-making solely concerned with economic growth at the expense of the local community and the environment. The science is clear: airports make surrounding communities sick and worsen climate change. Public agencies, like the Port, play an important role in identifying the environmental impacts of their own decision-making. CBE asks that the Port comply with its legal mandate to provide the public with an appropriate project description under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and undergo the necessary environmental review. The Port’s attention and emphasis on economic opportunities cannot come at the expense of the environment. The Port must identify economic growth opportunities that are fair and inclusive, and those opportunities must create decent work opportunities without leaving the East Oakland community worse off.

CBE would welcome the opportunity to meet with Port Commissioners and staff so the Port can be equipped with an understanding of the documented health impacts of airport operations and the priorities of the community members who live and breathe closest to the airport.

I) The Port is not in compliance with CEQA and must refrain from a final vote on the renaming ordinance until compliance is achieved.

A) The agenda report and attachments do not provide enough information to inform decision makers and the public about the potential environmental impacts of the project.

CBE is particularly concerned that the agenda report conclusively and wrongfully declares that the proposed renaming is “Not a Project under CEQA, as defined in Public Resources Code § 21065.” The proposed renaming, the agenda report, and the attachments provide evidence to the contrary. Specifically, the agenda action requests approval to modify the name of the Metropolitan Oakland International Airport (Airport of OAK) to San Francisco Bay Oakland International Airport and goes on to state that the proposed project “will not only support existing and new destinations from OAK but
will also provide additional jobs for Oakland and its surrounding region.” It further states that the renaming is intended to support “a broad range of other related projects including addressing challenges for airlines doing business at OAK who wish to offer new direct destinations desired and supported by OAK’s geographic market base.” Most notably, the agenda report states that the purpose of the name change is to increase inbound travelers choosing OAK to get to other travel destinations.

The CEQA requires government agencies to consider the environmental consequences of their actions before committing to a course of action on a project. Under CEQA, “a ‘Project’ means an activity which may cause either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment.” (Public Resources Code § 21065, emphasis added). California courts have held that a Project is “the whole of an action,” which has the potential for resulting in a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment. (Banning Ranch Conservancy v. City of Newport Beach (2012) 211 Cal.App.4th 1209, 1220). Before a lead agency may approve a project, CEQA requires the lead agency to complete a preliminary analysis called an “initial study.” The initial study is intended to determine whether an environmental impact report (EIR) or negative declaration (ND) must be prepared. (Guidelines §§ 15063, 15365; Pub. Res. Code §§ 21080.1, 21080.3). The initial study’s purpose is to determine if there may be a significant environmental impact. (Pub. Res. Code § 21080(c); Guidelines §§ 15063–15065).

The staff report makes clear that the proposed name change constitutes a “project” under CEQA because the intended and expected outcome of this project is to increase flights, routes, consumers, workforce, and ground traffic. Increased traffic necessarily increases traffic impacts, just as increased flights increase jet engine pollution, thereby posing negative impacts to air quality, noise, and public services. According to the staff report, these outcomes are inevitable if the name change is approved. As such, CEQA requires more environmental assessment and review before this project can move forward. Not only are the environmental impacts of the name change reasonably foreseeable, the name change is being undertaken specifically for the purpose of achieving these changes. The Port cannot both claim that this is not a “project” under CEQA and at the same time undertake the name change to achieve these outcomes.

As with any proposed project, the Port must undertake an “initial study” to assess and inform the public about the potential environmental effects before it may approve this project. Based on the agenda staff report, OAK will establish more airline flights and routes than would otherwise occur without a name change. CEQA requires the assessment of air quality and climate change impacts. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21060.5 and Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15064.4 (b)(c)). Based on the agenda staff report, more people will also be using OAK as their travel destination to get to other bay area cities. In fact, the staff report assumes most new riders will not be visiting Oakland but rather using OAK as a gateway to other places. Those travelers will require a car or will use public transportation. CEQA requires that the increased traffic and strain on public transportation and other public resources be identified and mitigated. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15126.2 (a) and (e)). The public needs to know how much air traffic and ground traffic are expected to increase and the potential environmental impacts of those increases.

Given these problems with the proposed name change, it is impossible for members of the public to evaluate the impact of the project and it is not possible for the Port to make an informed decision on
whether to proceed with this project. CBE requests that the Port conduct an initial study, disclose any expected negative environmental impacts, and receive public comment before it approves this proposed project. The Port should refrain from making any decision until it provides members of the public and decision makers with accurate and transparent analysis as required by CEQA.

B) The Port is improperly segmenting its review of the environmental impacts of the OAK Expansion and failing to analyze aspects of the project by piecemealing approval of the project.

The Port’s decision to approve the proposed renaming at its April 11, 2024, meeting effectively curtails the public’s ability to engage with even the most basic environmental assessment. The lack of adequate information not only prevents decision makers and the public from understanding the potential environmental impacts, but it also demonstrates that the Port failed to appropriately analyze the totality of the Project’s impacts related to the increased air traffic, increased ground traffic, and increased number of jobs as required by CEQA.

“There is no dispute that CEQA forbids ‘piecemeal’ review of the significant environmental impacts of a project.” (*Berkeley Keep Jets Over the Bay Com. v. Board of Port Comrs.* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 1344, 1358). The California Supreme Court held that “an EIR must include an analysis of the environmental effects of future expansion or other action if: (1) it is a reasonably foreseeable consequence of the initial project; and (2) the future expansion or action will be significant in that it will likely change the scope or nature of the initial project or its environmental effects.” (*Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of University of California* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 390, 253). CEQA Guidelines section 15165 provides that where individual projects are, or a phased project is, to be undertaken and where the total undertaking comprises a project with significant environmental effect, the lead agency shall prepare a *single program EIR for the ultimate project* as described in Section 15168. (Emphasis added). CEQA Guidelines section 15168, subdivision (a) defines a program EIR as “an EIR which may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either: (1) Geographically, (2) As logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions, (3) In connection with issuance of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program, or (4) As individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects which can be mitigated in similar ways.”

In July 2023, the Port released a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the implementation of the Terminal Modernization and Development Project at Oakland International Airport (OAK Expansion). The DEIR does not include a proposed name change. The proposed renaming cannot be considered independently from the OAK Expansion because it is intimately tied to the Port’s ongoing efforts to increase services at Oakland Airport. The logical, foreseeable, and reasonable consequence of renaming is to increase services and ultimately to approve the proposed OAK Expansion. Thus, the proposed renaming of the airport is only the first step in the Port’s goal of expanding the airport’s activity, increasing routes, and gaining more international visibility. The proposed renaming is one step in the broader expansion project and the Port must provide the public with an appropriate project description under CEQA as well as undergo the environmental review process. The Port’s failure to recognize the relationship between the proposed name change and the proposed airport expansion is an attempt to piecemeal environmental review in violation of CEQA.
C) The Port made unfounded environmental impact findings without providing proper notice and disclosure required under CEQA.

At the April 11th hearing, the Port effectively made environmental CEQA findings when Commissioners expressed the opinion that automobile pollution from driving between SFO and East Bay locations is a more severe environmental threat than added OAK operations, and therefore environmental advocates are “one hundred percent fundamentally wrong” to raise concerns about increased OAK operations. Relying on these opinions and findings, the Port voted in favor of the renaming. Not only did Port commissioners loosely discuss environmental impacts, but they also made environmental findings about the significance of the project versus a no-project alternative as mandated by CEQA. Whether intentionally or unintentionally, the Port has made CEQA findings without the requisite notice and data to inform the findings and decisions.

Contrary to the Port commissioner’s unsubstantiated findings, adding flight routes to OAK may result in significant unavoidable environmental impacts. Adding flights to OAK not only increases toxic air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions from jet engines, but also from increased automobile and commercial truck emissions driving through Oakland to OAK and airport ground operations vehicles and equipment. Additionally, on-road vehicle pollution is significantly easier to reduce than jet engine pollution. Vehicle pollution can be mitigated through improved public transportation and converting on-road vehicles to zero emissions models, whereas there are no viable methods to significantly reduce jet engine pollution before 2050. Had the Port performed CEQA compliant assessments and reporting, the public and decision makers could understand the scale of potential harm and potential mitigation measures.

The Port must issue the appropriate notice and provide the public with the data it relied upon to make the abovementioned CEQA findings.

II) Expanding airport pollution hurts Oakland residents and workers and increases inequality. The Port should instead pursue environmentally, economically, and racially just economic development.

CBE believes that a healthy economy and healthy environment must coexist and that the process of securing economic prosperity should not cost workers and the community their health and wellbeing (Just Transition). As an organization committed to securing a Just Transition for East Oakland and all of California, CBE was deeply concerned to hear the Commission pitting job creation against

---

1 Although the airline industry gestures at “Sustainable” Aviation Fuel (SAF), hydrogen, and electrification to make environmental claims, none of these fuel sources are scalable before 2050 (well past the climate tipping point) and most alternative fuels are not actually environmentally friendly. (See Center for Biological Diversity, The Biofuels Myth- Why “Sustainable Aviation Fuels” Won’t Power Climate-Safe Air Travel (August, 2022) https://biologicaldiversity.org/programs/climate_law_institute/pdfs/2022_The_Biofuels_Myth_Center_for_Biological_Diversity.pdf; Stay Grounded, https://stay-grounded.org/greenwashing/). The amount of SAF produced in 2022 only met 0.2% of global jet fuel demand and Southwest only uses enough SAF to makeup 0.1% of its jet fuel use. (Southwest, https://www.southwest.com/citizenship/planet/ sustainable-aviation-fuels/).
environmental concerns at the April 11th hearing. In our more than 40 years of existence, CBE has worked with many boards, agencies, and decision-makers to support their growth and understanding of Just Transition. We would welcome the opportunity to present to the Port, prior to any decision on the name change, so the Port can be equipped with an understanding of the development priorities of the community members who live and breathe closest to the airport. CBE does not oppose development in Oakland. We advocate for economic development that benefits East Oakland residents, including their health and wellbeing. CBE’s longstanding campaigns fight for robust development plans at the Oakland Coliseum, and other important locations where we organize.

A) East Oakland Suffers Health Harms from Severe Air Pollution.

East Oakland is a predominantly low-income, Latinx and Black community that has some of the worst air quality and environmental health outcomes in the state; increasing OAK operations will worsen this inequity. The census tract closest to OAK is in the 100th percentile of asthma rates, the 98th percentile of low birth weights, and the 97th percentile of the overall CalEnviroScreen score (indicating communities most disproportionately affected by environmental and socio-demographic burdens). As the Alameda County Department of Public Health wrote to the Port on October 16, 2023 (Appendix A), East Oakland residents have the highest rates of asthma hospitalization in Alameda County, including an asthma hospitalization rate in children more than three times the county rate. ACDH further states: Cancer, heart disease, stroke, and chronic lower respiratory disease are among the top 10 causes of death in East Oakland and together account for 43.4% of all deaths. These diseases are associated with—but not solely attributable to—air pollution, and East Oakland residents are dying from them at higher rates than residents countywide. Life expectancy in some census tracts of East Oakland is 12 years less than life expectancy in tracts with the highest life expectancy in the county.

Simply put, air pollution is killing East Oakland residents. Children, the elderly, disabled people, and workers in harmful industries are hurt the most.

B) OAK already significantly contributes to toxic air pollution in East Oakland and global climate change; the Port must decrease, not increase, pollution.

OAK operations significantly contribute to environmental health injustice in East Oakland through jet engine pollution, diesel ground vehicles and equipment, associated road traffic, and worsening climate change. Based solely on flights and ground operations (not including associated passenger and commercial vehicle traffic) OAK operations emit more than 880 tons of nitrous oxide (NOx) per year, the equivalent of yearly NOx emissions from approximately 332,000 cars. NOx exposure causes and aggravates lung disease. OAK operations directly emit 11 tons per year of

---

4 Id.
5 ACDH Comment Letter.
6 Based on 2019 data (Port of Oakland, Draft Environmental Impact Report Oakland International Airport Terminal Modernization and Development Project, Table 3.3-6).
7 Based on estimates and modeling from https://airporttracker.org/.
8 US EPA, Basic Information about NO2, https://www.epa.gov/no2-pollution/basic-information-about-no2.
particulate matter (PM)\textsuperscript{9} and NOx also leads to additional formation of PM. PM exposure is linked to increased incidences of heart and lung disease, including increased premature deaths.\textsuperscript{10} Ultrafine particles (UFP) emitted from aircrafts are highly dangerous to human health due to their miniscule size and are associated with early mortality, cancer, heart disease, and lung disease.\textsuperscript{11} UFP is not regulated or regularly monitored, but studies show it is highly concentrated at airports and major roadways, with elevated UFP extending 10 miles from airports in the direction of flight paths.\textsuperscript{12} OAK also directly emits approximately 125,000 pounds of toxic air contaminants (pollutants that are unsafe in any quantity above zero) per year, which contribute to cancer, chronic health condition, and acute symptom risks.\textsuperscript{13} Flights from OAK produce 2.3 million tons of carbon dioxide (CO2) per year, the yearly greenhouse gas emissions equivalent of 1,200,000 cars. The data is clear: current OAK pollution makes East Oakland, the Bay, and the planet sick and any increase in pollution would increase health inequity.

East Oakland is an AB617 community because of its terrible air quality, selected by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop a Community Emissions Reduction Plan (CERP) to reduce pollution. The Port is party to that process and multiple government agencies have called on the Port to participate in good faith and alter the expansion plan based on community concerns.\textsuperscript{14} All Port decisions on OAK operations must consider the dire health impacts East Oakland residents face from compounding air pollution.

C) Organized labor has testified to the Port that airport jobs are not good jobs and workers oppose an expansion of low-wage jobs that make workers sick.

CBE urges the Port to listen to airport workers and SEIU-USWW who have repeatedly stated that many airport workers are paid poverty wages while being exposed to toxic air pollution at work and at home in frontline communities. Airport workers, particularly ground operations employees, are exposed to significant air pollution from jet fuel combustion, leading to increased acute respiratory distress, lung disease, cardiovascular disease, and cancer.\textsuperscript{15} While on April 11\textsuperscript{th} Commissioners voiced support for expanding OAK operations in the name of job creation, workers themselves are telling you these are not “good jobs.” As SEIU-USWW wrote in their October 16, 2023 comment letter to the Port: [Airport workers] are exposed to hazardous emissions at their workplace, only to go home for more of the same. Further still, commercial airlines turn their profits toward actively undermining the standards of the workers most affected by their activity. Trade groups like Airlines for America sue over and lobby against living wage standards, sick

\textsuperscript{9} DEIR, Table 3.3-6.
\textsuperscript{12} Id.
\textsuperscript{13} BAAQMD 2021 East Oakland Emissions Inventory.
\textsuperscript{14} Including Alameda County Public Health Department, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, and EPA Region 9 (comment letters available at https://www.oaklandairport.com/terminal-development-meeting-materials/comments-from-public-agencies/).
leave, and healthcare for the subcontracted, low-wage workers essential to the industry. Commercial airlines contribute to serious health problems for workers, their families, and their communities and then the airlines spend their resources attacking the very tools these groups have to cope with those health outcomes. Every major domestic airline is a member of Airlines for America, including Southwest, who possess about 80% market share in Oakland’s airport and whose business plans are key to the rationale for this Project [propose expansion]… OAK has no obligation to permanently enshrine significant harms to its most vulnerable workers and neighboring communities for the sake of accommodating the business plans of a multi-billion dollar corporation still reliant almost entirely on polluting fossil fuels. (Emphasis added.)
The entirety of SEIU-USWW’s October 16, 2023 comment letter should be seriously considered by Commissioners (Appendix B). On February 22, 2024, an SEIU-USWW representative and several airport workers voiced their opposition to the OAK expansion and shared personal experiences of health impacts and poverty wages with Commissioners. The Port must be accountable to the public they serve who are bravely testifying to their experience as frontline workers in a toxic industry.

III) Conclusion

The Port must not move ahead with the proposed renaming project without considering and reporting on the potentially significant environmental impacts as required by CEQA. At this moment in time, East Oakland is reckoning with an enormous pollution burden and the planet is reaching a tipping point of catastrophic climate crisis that impacts the most marginalized first. The Port can lead Oakland into a future of zero-emissions transportation and commerce, with dignified and healthy jobs, rather than doubling down on fossil fuel industries that hurt Oakland residents and the planet.

Sincerely,

Esther Goolsby
Northern California Program Co-Director
Communities for a Better Environment
esther@cbecal.org
APPENDIX A:
Alameda County Department of Public Health
Comment Letter to the Port of Oakland
October 16, 2023
October 16, 2023

Colleen Liang
Port of Oakland Environmental Programs and Planning Division
530 Water St., Oakland CA 94607

RE: Comments on the Port’s Oakland International Airport Terminal Modernization and Development Project Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Colleen Liang:

On behalf of the Alameda County Public Health Department (ACPHD), we are submitting the following comments based on our review of the Oakland Airport Expansion Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR). The vision of ACPHD is that everyone in Alameda County no matter who they are, where they live, how much money they make, or the color of their skin, leads a healthy, fulfilling and productive life. ACPHD has a longstanding commitment to partnering with community stakeholders, regulatory agencies, the City and the Port to achieve health equity in Oakland.

ACPHD appreciates the opportunity to comment specifically on the Draft EIR with regard to its analysis of the project’s air quality impacts and the likely connection to health consequences. Many studies have examined the significant effects of airports on the health of people who live, work, and play nearby because of exposure to air and noise pollution associated with aircraft, ground-side operations, and traffic. Given these likely population health concerns and the scale and complexity of the airport expansion project, we recommend that the EIR include a comprehensive analysis of the public health impacts of the Proposed Project, such as through a Health Impact Assessment.

Health Impact Assessment (HIA) is a recognized and well-defined process to evaluate the potential health implications of a policy or decision. HIAs typically look at who is most likely to be affected, explore whether the positive or negative impacts affect certain groups of people more than others, and consider health holistically, including broader social, economic, and environmental influences. HIAs can provide evidence-based recommendations to enhance predicted positive health impacts and minimize or mitigate negative ones. A comprehensive and systematic evaluation of the Proposed Project’s impacts on human health and the distribution of those effects within the population is especially critical as part of CEQA requirements for EIRs to adequately inform the public about health and safety impacts, including to “reasonably describe the nature and magnitude of the adverse effect” and show a “reasonable effort to put into a meaningful context” any conclusions about significant impacts.

ACPHD is particularly concerned with pursuing further study of these specific areas of the Draft EIR:
3.3 AIR QUALITY

Air pollution disproportionately impacts low-income communities of color. East Oakland is a predominantly low-income, Hispanic/Latino and African American/Black community located in the airport’s vicinity. This community already experiences high levels of pollution from highways and industrial facilities, creating a disproportionate burden of illness associated with pollution. East Oakland residents have the highest rates of asthma hospitalization in the county. From 2018-2020, there were 936.6 asthma hospitalizations and Emergency Department visits per 100,000 for adults in East Oakland, and 1256.1 per 100,000 for children. This is more than three times higher than the overall Alameda County rate. Cancer, heart disease, stroke, and chronic lower respiratory disease are among the top 10 causes of death in East Oakland and together account for 43.4% of all deaths. These diseases are associated with—but not solely attributable to—air pollution, and East Oakland residents are dying from them at higher rates than residents countywide. Life expectancy in some census tracts of East Oakland is 12 years less than life expectancy in tracts with the highest life expectancy in the county.

The Draft EIR finds that cancer risk and chronic non-cancer human health hazards from emissions of the Proposed Project construction and operation would be less than significant at residential locations. However, numerous studies of airport emissions from around the world indicate that air quality near major airports can be significantly affected by emissions from air mobile sources. One 2014 study measured particle number (PN) concentrations downwind from Los Angeles International Airport and found that LAX emissions adversely impacted air quality much further than reported in previous airport studies, increasing PN concentrations four-fold as far as 10 miles downwind. Another 2018-2019 study of SEA-TAC found that communities underneath and downwind within 10 miles of jets landing at the airport are exposed to a type of ultrafine particle pollution that is distinctly associated with aircraft. A health risk assessment conducted in 1993 for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency reported that aircraft engines are responsible for approximately 10.5 percent of the cancer cases within a defined geographic location (approximately 16 square miles) surrounding Chicago’s Midway Airport.

The Draft EIR does find that chronic non-cancer human health hazards would be considered significant at on-Airport worker locations during incremental operations of the Proposed Project. The Draft EIR concludes that this impact would be potentially significant and unavoidable, due to the cause resulting from aircraft operations which the Port does not regulate. However, the EIR should include a more adequate discussion specifying the nature and magnitude of these significant impacts, such as: how many workers are at risk for which chronic health impacts, and at what concentrations of pollutants are symptoms triggered.

3.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The Draft EIR finds the increase to GHG emissions potentially significant and unavoidable, but concludes that the cause will result from market-based demand and related aircraft operations, which the Port does not regulate. Climate change contributes to a range of health impacts globally, including more illness and death from extreme heat, poor air quality, and vector-borne disease; more injury and illness arising from flooding of homes and businesses; impacts on mental health; and indirect impacts arising from weather-related loss of core services such as electricity, transportation, and communication. While market-based demand may drive airport expansion needs, it must be acknowledged that expansion will directly lead to increases in GHG emissions and that these are only unavoidable within the context of pursuing expansion.

In a warming climate, air pollutants are also expected to increase, including from the frequency of wildfires, according to the World Health Organization. Heat stress can also increase sensitivity to air pollution. East Oakland, like Oakland overall, has older housing stock with over 35% of housing built in 1939 or earlier; 64% of East Oakland’s housing stock was built before 1960, compared to 39% for the county as a whole. A majority of East Oakland’s residents are also renters (60%), further increasing the likelihood of barriers to accessing protective resources such as weatherization, air purification and cooling.
3.11 NOISE AND VIBRATION

The Draft EIR finds that a substantial increase in aircraft noise and exposure of people residing or working within an Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) area to excessive noise levels would be less than significant during the Proposed Project operation. The FAA currently adopts a noise threshold of 65 dB DNL (day-night average sound level) as compatible with residential areas. However, problems with this threshold have been identified since 1995, when the National Resources Defense Council found that the 65 dB DNL is based on an averaging of noise that does not account for the loud “single event” noise of aircraft takeoff.

Aviation noise can cause community annoyance, disrupt sleep, adversely affect academic performance of children, and could increase the risk for cardiovascular disease of people living in the vicinity of airports. Aircraft noise exposure at school or at home is associated with children having poorer reading and memory skills, along with increasing evidence suggesting that children exposed to chronic aircraft noise at school have poorer performance on standardized achievement tests.5

RECOMMENDATIONS

Environmental Justice principles hold that: “No group of people, including ethnic, or a socioeconomic group, should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, municipal, and commercial operations or the execution of federal, state, local, and tribal programs and policies.” A long history of environmental racism has led to intentional overburdening of pollution in communities of African Americans, Latinx, Indigenous People, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, migrant farmworkers, and low-income workers. As a result, they face increased risks of health problems like cancer and respiratory issues.

To ensure that the EIR process addresses these critical health disparities, and is clear and meaningful to all stakeholders and communities, we recommend the following:

- Establishing a more comprehensive and detailed evaluation of specific health impacts to provide the public and decision makers’ an opportunity for meaningful consideration of the nature and magnitude of increasing airport emissions. This can be accomplished effectively through commissioning a Health Impact Assessment. While the Port does not regulate aviation, the Proposed Project facilitates increased aviation activity that has likely significant population level health consequences.
- Committing to a collaborative public process and consider setting aside funds for ongoing meaningful community engagement, particularly around the impacts of air quality.
- Developing a Community Benefits Agreement with key stakeholders such as community-based, faith-based, grassroots, and civic and labor organizations representing residents and workers most affected by the Proposed Project. Any CBA should be driven by the priorities identified by community stakeholders, along with best practices to protect worker health and safety, improve job quality, and provide mitigations such as funding for HEPA filters in surrounding schools and residential homes and noise abatement strategies such as soundproofing of schools and significantly affected homes.
- Aligning efforts in public engagement and planning for the Proposed Project wherever possible with the AB 617 East Oakland Steering Committee which is developing the East Oakland Community Emissions Reduction Plan, a process begun in 2022 as part of the Community Air Protection Program mandated by Assembly Bill 617.

A “business as usual” approach to this proposed development would lead to burdens on communities that have historically borne the brunt of health, environmental and economic inequity.
ACPHD is dedicated to improving the health of all Alameda County residents and to preventing avoidable health risks. We look forward to engaging further with the Port of Oakland to safeguard communities affected by major airport development. Please reach out to us with any questions or concerns about these comments.

Sincerely,

Kimi Watkins-Tartt
Public Health Department Director, Alameda County

Nicholas Moss, MD
Health Officer, Alameda County

---

i Cal. Supreme Court *Sierra Club v. County of Fresno*, Case No. S219783 (Dec. 24, 2018),

ii Analysis by Alameda County Healthcare Services Agency, Community Assessment Planning and Evaluation unit of American Community Survey 2018-2020 data

iii Ibid


viii Analysis by Alameda County Healthcare Services Agency, Community Assessment Planning and Evaluation unit of American Community Survey 2018-2020 data


APPENDIX B:
SEIU-USWW
Comment Letter to the Port of Oakland
October 16, 2023
October 16, 2023

Submitted electronically & via email - cliang@portoakland.com & TermDev@portoakland.com

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

RE: Draft EIR Comments; OAK Terminal Modernization & Development Project

Dear Ms. Liang,

On behalf of Service Employees International Union, United Service Workers West ("USWW" or "SEIU USWW"), we submit the following comments regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR") for Oakland International Airport's Terminal Modernization and Development Project (the "Project", SCH No. 2021050164).

SEIU USWW represents nearly 45,000 janitors, security officers, entertainment & stadium workers across California, including thousands of workers at LAX, SFO and other airports throughout the state, including OAK. Our membership primarily consists of workers within low-wage industries, including aviation. Many of our members reside in communities near major airports and within their flight paths. For decades, our members, their families and these communities - largely Black and Brown - have endured exposure from an array of toxic pollutants produced by airport operations, adding on to the decades of environmental racism these cities and neighborhoods have faced from other sources. At work our members breathe in these toxins at a level far above what others endure. Additionally, our union’s largest office in Northern California is on Bay Farm Island right next to OAK, where staff and our members are reminded every few minutes of the consistent flight activity at this airport.

USWW recognizes the detrimental health impacts on our membership and communities produced by commercial aviation’s dependency on fossil fuel consumption. For years, we’ve fought to raise industry standards at the bargaining table, but more recently have been expanding our commitment to confronting the environmental racism and inequity that our members and their communities face as a result of this industry’s ever-expanding operations and superficial efforts on issues of sustainability.

The Draft Environmental Impact Report associated with this Project is deeply flawed in a number of ways we will explore in this comment letter. The Terminal Modernization and Development Project, as proposed, stands to have significant harmful impacts on our members, their communities, East Bay cities and the region. We hope to see the Port take these issues seriously and make considerable effort to ensure that it approaches development responsibly and equitably - or not at all.
1) **The Significant and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts Laid Out in the DEIR Disproportionately Harm Airport Workers & Communities Around the Airport**

The Draft EIR for this Project acknowledges three significant and unavoidable adverse impacts stemming from increased aviation activity and the airport’s operations:

- Emissions of nitrogen oxides (NO\(_X\)) and reactive organic gasses (ROG).
- 8-hour chronic non-cancer human health hazard effects for on-airport workers.
- Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

All of these impacts stand to disproportionately harm airport workers and communities near the airport who are most exposed to emissions from OAK operations.

These groups are the most direct and significant stakeholders in a project of this type - particularly the on-airport workers who live in the same frontline communities around Oakland International Airport. They are first in line for the harmful consequences of major developments like this one while receiving few of the Project’s benefits. They are exposed to hazardous emissions at their workplace, only to go home for more of the same. Further still, commercial airlines turn their profits toward actively undermining the standards of the workers most affected by their activity. Trade groups like Airlines for America sue over and lobby against living wage standards\(^1\), sick leave\(^2\), and healthcare\(^3\) for the subcontracted, low-wage workers essential to the industry. Commercial airlines contribute to serious health problems for workers, their families and their communities and then the airlines spend their resources attacking the very tools these groups have to cope with those health outcomes. Every major domestic airline is a member of Airlines for America, including Southwest, who possess about 80% market share\(^4\) in Oakland’s airport and whose business plans are key to the rationale for this Project.

This Project as it is currently proposed and the DEIR as currently written both fall woefully short of offering adequate redress to OAK’s most vulnerable stakeholders, while doing an excellent job of advancing the stated business interests of the airport’s most dominant carrier. The Port of Oakland and the City need to do much better than declaring these significant and adverse health impacts unavoidable while offering mitigation measures that are marginal at best.

2) **DEIR Regards Projected Growth in Activity at OAK as Inevitable Regardless of Expansion, Ignores Growth-Inducing Impact of a Project that Inherently Expands OAK’s Operational Capacity**

One of the more confounding elements of this Project’s DEIR is the position that the projected “increase in passengers would occur whether or not a replacement passenger terminal is developed.”\(^5\) The Project objectives go so far as to acknowledge that the Project is intended to allow the airport to “accommodate the market-based demand,” but the airport paradoxically argues in the DEIR that the increased demand would be met regardless of the expansion project.

---

\(^1\) Re: Motion #15-0817-S1 on Living Wage at LAX, Airlines for America, City of LA Council File No. 15-0217-51, 09/19/17; Chicago Sun Times, “$13.45-an-hour wage cleared for takeoff at O’Hare, Midway Airports,” 09/06/17; RE: Supplemental Comments Regarding Proposed Minimum Wage Mandate, Airlines for America, Port Authority of NY & NJ, 07/27/2018; Rosenberg, Mica. “U.S. Airlines Sue Port of Seattle over Airport Workers Wage Hikes.” Reuters. 11/11/14

\(^2\) Courthouse News Service, “Airlines Call Out Massachusetts Sick-Leave Law,” 04/05/18

\(^3\) Reuters, “San Francisco must face legal challenge to airline health insurance mandate,” 8/29/23; Legal Newsline, “Airlines say new San Francisco law goes too far,” 04/08/21

\(^4\) Bureau of Transportation Statistics, TranStats for Oakland International Airport (OAK), Data for June 2023

\(^5\) Port of Oakland, “Oakland International Airport Terminal Modernization and Development Project,” DEIR, 5.3.2 (pg. 447)
To be clear, Oakland International Airport’s aviation activity forecasts predict a 31% increase in annual passengers by 2028 and an 84% increase by 2038. This would go alongside a 21% jump in air cargo tonnage by 2028 and a 38% increase by 2038.

The EIR claims that existing terminals at OAK “were designed to accommodate an estimated 8 to 10 million annual passengers,” then noting that “more than 13 million annual passengers” traveled through OAK in 2019. Very simply, it defies common sense that a Project set to add a third terminal to a two-terminal airport, and up to 16 new gates to a 29 gate airport would somehow not increase the operational capacity at that airport or affect the number of passengers going through an airport already well above intended capacity.

3) Reliance on Only “Unconstrained” Growth Forecasts is a Fatal Flaw in the EIR, Leaving the Public with No Way to Evaluate Airport’s Claims that Project Would Not Increase Flights & No Sense of the Project’s True Impact

The DEIR for this Project relies exclusively on “unconstrained” forecasts of activity and operations at OAK, and the forecast report cited specifically does not “take facility constraints or other outside limiting factors into consideration.” That report explains that “the forecast assumes facilities can accommodate the projected demand.” This is a rather astonishing admission, as it means this Project assumes as a baseline the very conditions that wouldn’t be fulfilled without it, then uses those conditions to justify its own creation.

Without any kind of forecasts that attempt to estimate passenger activity, cargo activity, or flight operations in a scenario where the proposed Project does not exist, it becomes impossible to actually evaluate one of the most important claims being made in this DEIR: that the OAK Terminal Modernization and Development Project would have no growth-inducing effect on the airport.

This is a fatal flaw in the EIR, leaving the public with no idea what levels of flight activity would take place at OAK 5 or 15 years from now if the existing terminal facilities - already well over capacity - had the effect of limiting activity at the airport. A true “no Project” scenario is never really considered in this EIR, and without a legitimate baseline in flight activity to compare against, the actual impact of the Terminal Modernization and Development Project is not known, and the impact laid out in this DEIR is significantly understated.

a) “Market-based” Demand Being Used to Justify Expansion is Coming from Southwest Airlines’ Deliberate Choice to Concentrate Growth at OAK

Throughout the DEIR, the Port asserts that accommodating the “market-based” demand is a core objective of the Project. This makes it seem as if this is a force external to the airport, and that OAK has no choice but to push forward a massive expansion so that it can properly serve the significantly growing passenger demand that will happen with or without the Project.

---

6 Port of Oakland, “Oakland International Airport Terminal Modernization and Development Project,” DEIR, 2.4 (pg. 59)
7 Port of Oakland, “Oakland International Airport Terminal Modernization and Development Project,” DEIR, 2.5.2 (pg. 61)
8 OAK Comprehensive Aviation Activity Forecast Report, 7/28/20, Updated 7/2022 (pg. 11)
9 OAK Comprehensive Aviation Activity Forecast Report, 7/28/20, Updated 7/2022 (pg. 11)
10 Port of Oakland, “Oakland International Airport Terminal Modernization and Development Project,” DEIR, 2.5 (pg. 60)
This framing - central to the rationale behind the Project - is highly misleading, however. In the Comprehensive Aviation Activity Forecast Report that underpins so much of the DEIR, the Port acknowledges that “Southwest’s continued growth is vital to the airport’s overall growth,”11 and that OAK’s flight activity projections were based in part on “Southwest Airlines commitment to the airport and specific plans for growth at OAK.”12

This Project is not, in actuality, an attempt by the Port to ensure that OAK can comfortably accommodate inevitable demand. This Project is an attempt to accommodate a single airline’s deliberate choice to further concentrate its growth in the region at OAK. This is a business decision being made by a corporation whose objective is to maximize profit. While this is an expected motivation for Southwest Airlines, it’s not nearly a compelling enough reason to justify a development of this scale and the considerable negative impacts it will have on airport workers and communities around OAK - especially when the Port is doing so little to adequately mitigate those impacts.

4) Mitigation Outlined in the DEIR is Inadequate, Planned Project Fails to Consider Feasible Measures that Were Part of Recent & Comparable Airport Expansion

The mitigation currently proposed in this project is entirely inadequate, and the airport far too easily dismisses the significant health and air quality effects of the development as unavoidable, indirectly referencing federal preemption in the aviation industry by noting that “the Port does not have the authority to regulate”13 emissions from aircraft operations. The only mitigation laid out for the “significant and unavoidable” air quality and adverse health impacts associated with this Project is the use of electrical infrastructure for the terminal and cargo areas that would be built or relocated as part of this development.

This is a profound and disappointing lack of concern for the health of workers and OAK’s neighboring communities. In early 2022, Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA) agreed to a number of mitigation measures associated with the Los Angeles International Airport’s (LAX) own expansion project that OAK could explore without running afoul of industry deregulation:

- LAW A accelerated the timeline for its transition to electric or zero-emission ground support equipment (GSE) and committed funding to an incentive program that would encourage the earlier retirement of polluting diesel GSE.
- LAW A also accelerated by several years the implementation date for an electric-only purchase policy on its light-duty vehicle fleet, while also committing to plans to electrify or convert medium and heavy-duty fleet vehicles as commercially available.
- LAW A committed to the generation of 15% of its power from on-site renewable sources by 2035.
- LAW A updated the alternative fuel vehicle requirement program for vehicles that regularly serviced the airport.
- LAW A committed to participation in an independent study on the health impacts of aviation emissions on airport workers and on communities near LAX.

A significant portion of emissions associated with an airport’s operations are owed to ground vehicle trips to and from the airport, and LAW A also committed to a number of measures promoting further mass transportation at LAX, including:

---

11 OAK Comprehensive Aviation Activity Forecast Report, 7/28/20, Updated 7/2022 (pg. 58)
12 OAK Comprehensive Aviation Activity Forecast Report, 7/28/20, Updated 7/2022 (pg. 77)
13 Port of Oakland, “Oakland International Airport Terminal Modernization and Development Project,” DEIR, Table ES-2
The development and funding of a micro-transit shuttle for LAX workers living in South Los Angeles and nearby Lennox.

- The establishment of a Carpool Parking Incentive Program for workers at LAX.
- Subsidized Metro passes for LAX workers (though OAK does offer discounted BART fares for badged employees already).

These are just recent examples from a single airport. The Port of Oakland can do significantly more to offset the adverse impacts associated with its proposed expansion than is currently being considered in the DEIR, and its failure to do so leaves it in violation of CEQA (§ 15126.4.(a)(1)).

5) **DEIR Fails to Consider Recent State Measures Related to Aviation Emissions, Ignores Significant Steps Being Taken to Curb Aviation Emissions**

The DEIR for this Project fails to consider a number of recent state measures related to aviation emissions, ignoring some of the most significant policy developments in that space in recent years. The airport’s “Modernization” Project turns out to be anything but modern, and the development as proposed would permanently add growth-inducing infrastructure to OAK based on state policies that were outdated even before the DEIR was released.

a) **Cites Outdated California Air Resources Board (CARB) Scoping Plan Despite Availability of Current Plan Months Before Release of DEIR, Avoiding Consideration of Latest Statewide Targets for Aviation Sector**

In Chapter 3 of the DEIR, it is noted that the California Air Resources Board’s 2022 Scoping Plan “does not include any language, targets, or measures related to aircraft emissions.”\(^\text{14}\) This claim relies on an outdated Scoping Plan, as the Final 2022 plan, approved eight months before the release of this Project’s DEIR, does in fact include language, targets and measures related to aircraft emissions.\(^\text{15}\)

The 2022 Scoping Plan’s targets for the aviation sector included:

> “20% of aviation fuel demand is met by electricity (batteries) or hydrogen (fuel cells) in 2045.

> Sustainable aviation fuel meets most or the rest of the aviation fuel demand that has not already transitioned to hydrogen or batteries.”\(^\text{16}\)

These updates were added in order to reduce demand for petroleum aviation fuel and to reduce GHGs, to help reduce emissions from sources covered by the statewide GHG inventory, and based on direction from Gov. Newsom to CARB Chair Liane Randolph. Even the Draft 2022 Scoping Plan update\(^\text{17}\), released \textit{over 14 months before} publication of the DEIR, included language, targets and measures aimed at reducing emissions from aircraft. It was entirely possible to include this language in the DEIR, and the Port’s failure to recognize or account for such an important update in policy directly concerning aviation emissions - the most significant and harmful impacts of the Project - is an egregious move.

\(^\text{14}\) Port of Oakland, “Oakland International Airport Terminal Modernization and Development Project,” DEIR, 3.7-3
\(^\text{15}\) California Air Resources Board, 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality, December 2022
\(^\text{16}\) California Air Resources Board, 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality, Table 2-1, December 2022
\(^\text{17}\) California Air Resources Board, Draft 2022 Scoping Plan Update, Table 2-2, May 2022
b) Similarly Avoids Accounting for Significant Proposed Changes to Treatment of Conventional Fossil Jet Fuel under California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS)

In a similar vein, this DEIR relies on a version of California’s Low Carbon Fuel Standard that is already 4 years old, managing to avoid acknowledging that CARB’s current proposal in the ongoing rulemaking for the LCFS contains some of the most significant changes to state policy on aviation emissions in modern history. Namely, the agency is seeking the addition of conventional fossil jet fuels as a deficit-generator in the market-based program, ending a longstanding exemption to the program’s standards the industry has enjoyed for too long. This proposed change, if approved, could significantly alter the growth plans at OAK that Southwest currently has and which serve as a foundational rationale for this entire Project.

While the Port may not be required to consider proposed changes to state policy in the baseline being used for this DEIR, they should ask whether or not they would like to see this Project to be the last major airport expansion pushed through in California before the state finally caught up to commercial aviation and took steps to finally address the sector’s outsized climate impact. This would be an ignoble distinction for OAK and the City of Oakland.

6) Conclusion

SEIU USWW urges the Port and City of Oakland to stay all action on this Project until the issues discussed in this comment letter are better addressed. As it stands, this DEIR has multiple serious flaws that prevent the public from gaining an accurate understanding of the true impact of this Project. The proposed mitigation is nowhere near adequate, even by the low and limited standards of recent airport expansions elsewhere in California. OAK has no obligation to permanently enshrine significant harms to its most vulnerable workers and neighboring communities for the sake of accommodating the business plans of a multi-billion dollar corporation still reliant almost entirely on polluting fossil fuels.

We appreciate the time spent in consideration of these comments, and ask that this letter be placed in the administrative record for the Project.

Sincerely,

David Huerta
President - SEIU United Service Workers West & SEIU California

---

18 California Air Resources Board, Standardized Regulatory Impact Assessment (SRIA), 9/8/23
Respectfully,

Daria Edgerly
Secretary of the Board
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From: Marsha Converse <mconverse1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, May 3, 2024 9:57 AM
To: Port of Oakland Board Commissioners <board@portoakland.com>; Daria Edgerly <dedgerly@portoakland.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fw: [EXTERNAL] OAK rename

To Whom It May Concern:

I am not necessarily against the rebranding of the OAK airport name but why does Oakland come in second to SF. Oakland is to SF what Brooklyn is to NY. I've lived here now for over 30 years, please don't put 'OAK' after 'SF' in name placement. We are a vibrant, culturally diverse community that often gets a bad reputation but that's ok because those of us who stay know Oakland has always had more to offer than SF. Instead of burying the OAK name, at least put it first.

A better naming convention would be: 'Oakland International Airport, SF Bay' vs 'San Francisco Bay Oakland International Airport'.
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