

*APPENDIX A.
NOTICE OF PREPARATION*

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



May 7, 2021

PORT OF OAKLAND

NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

NOTICE OF VOLUNTARY VIRTUAL PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS

May 25, 2021 from 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. PDT

May 25, 2021 from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. PDT

May 26, 2021 from 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. PDT

May 26, 2021, from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. PDT

Project Title: Oakland International Airport Terminal Development Project

Project Sponsor: Port of Oakland


Project Location: Oakland International Airport

Background: Oakland International Airport (OAK or Airport) is a primary commercial service airport owned and operated by the Port of Oakland (Port). OAK is on 2,600 acres and is located in the City of Oakland, about 6.5 miles southeast of downtown Oakland in Alameda County along San Francisco Bay (see **Figure 1**). Cities in the immediate vicinity of OAK include Alameda (to the northwest), Oakland (to the north), and San Leandro (to the southeast). Access to OAK is primarily by Interstate Highway 880, Hegenberger Road, and 98th Avenue to Airport Drive/Bessie Coleman Drive. Other major roadways serving OAK include Doolittle Drive/State Route 61, Harbor Bay Parkway, Ron Cowan Parkway, and Davis Street/State Route 61.

OAK includes South Field, which accommodates the commercial passenger and cargo activity, and North Field, which was the original airport and now accommodates corporate and general aviation activity and other supporting facilities (see **Figure 2**). OAK has four runways: one primary air carrier runway at South Field (Runway 12-30) and three runways at North Field (Runway 10R-28L, Runway 10L-28R, and Runway 15-33). The Airport is served by several passenger and cargo airlines. In calendar year 2019, OAK accommodated approximately 13.4 million annual passengers (total includes both arriving and departing passengers). The Airport currently has 29 aircraft gates in two terminals located in South Field: Terminal 1 and Terminal 2. In calendar year 2019, OAK accommodated approximately 0.64 million annual tons of air cargo (freight plus mail). In 2019, OAK had about 242,000 total aircraft operations (takeoffs and landings).

Project Description: The OAK Terminal Development Project (Proposed Project) is located primarily in the South Field. 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, including consolidation of passenger processing functions (ticketing, baggage check-in, security) and construction of expanded Customs and Border Protection (CBP) facilities for international

**Figure 1
Regional Location**



Source: RS&H 2021.

Note: This figure is for graphic purposes only and is not to scale.

Legend

 **Location of Oakland International Airport**




Figure 2
Existing Facilities at OAK




arrivals; and reconfiguration of existing cargo and support facilities. Development also includes improvements to the terminal area roadway, parking areas, and support facilities (see **Figure 3**). The development of the new terminal and modernization of Terminals 1 and 2 would result in an increase of 17 gates at OAK. Specific improvements include:

New Terminal. The new terminal would be constructed as a new, single-level terminal processor building with a two-level concourse¹, located north of the existing terminal complex. The new terminal would provide areas for check-in, passenger security screening checkpoint (SSCP), baggage claim, concessions, restrooms, amenities, airport and airline support, baggage handling and screening, and building infrastructure. New connectors would provide both secure and non-secure access between the new terminal and the existing terminal complex.

¹ A concourse is the area containing the aircraft gates.

Figure 3
Proposed Project Area



Terminals 1 and 2. The Terminal 1 check-in and baggage processing functions would be relocated and consolidated in Terminal 2 and the Terminal 1 check-in and baggage claim building itself would be demolished. Terminal 2 facilities would accommodate the multiple domestic and international airline functions currently being served in the Terminal 1 check-in and baggage claim building and would support the two existing Terminal 1 and Terminal 2 concourses. Modernization of Terminal 1 would include the renovation of the concourse and expansion of the CBP facility to process arriving international passengers. Modernization of Terminal 2 would include an expansion of the check-in area, minor

reconfiguration of the baggage screening area, development of a new outbound baggage makeup area², and expansion of the inbound baggage area.

Roadway and Parking Areas. Improvements would be made to the terminal area roadway and curb front configuration adjacent to the new terminal. Replacement and new parking facilities would be provided to accommodate public and employee parking, at close-in and remote areas as depicted on **Figure 3**.

Cargo and Support Facilities. In order to accommodate the new terminal footprint, existing facilities need to be demolished and relocated, including freighter and belly cargo, public parking, and airline provisioning. Replacement facilities for freighter and belly cargo would be relocated within the Terminal Area near Ron Cowan Parkway, which would require demolition of the existing Oakland Maintenance Center (OMC) Hangar and relocation of employee parking. The OMC would not be replaced. Public and employee parking would be relocated to the parking areas shown on **Figure 3**. Replacement facilities for airline provisioning and catering buildings and a new consolidated receiving and distribution center would be constructed northeast of the existing main parking lot. The existing fuel system, and potentially the fuel farm, would require expansion and upgrades to support the new terminal.

Environmental Review: The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that the Port of Oakland (Port), as the Lead Agency with the principal responsibility for approving the project, conduct an environmental review of the project.

The Port has determined that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be the required CEQA document for the Proposed Project, per Sections 15162 and 15163 of the CEQA Guidelines. It is anticipated that the EIR will discuss potentially significant environmental 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**. It is anticipated that the Proposed Project will not result in the need for review per CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 for **Agriculture / Forest Resources, Mineral Resources, Population / Housing, Recreation, and Wildfire**.

Scoping: The Port is issuing this Notice of Preparation (NOP) to invite comments on the scope and content of the Draft EIR. The scoping period begins on May 7, 2021. An Initial Study has been prepared and is attached.

The Port is sending this NOP to all interested parties and Responsible Agencies who will rely on the EIR for their approval. When the Draft EIR is published, it will be sent to persons who respond to this NOP or otherwise indicate interest in the Proposed Project. Responses to this NOP and any related questions or comments regarding the scope or content of the Draft EIR should be submitted in writing (email or hard copy) to:

² A baggage makeup area is where baggage is sorted by flight numbers and destinations and are placed on carts or conveyor systems to transport the baggage to the aircraft.

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

Comments on the scope and content of the Draft EIR must be received at the above mailing or email address on or before June 7, 2021 at 3:00 p.m. PDT. Please reference the project title as shown above in all correspondence.

Meeting Information: 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. The virtual scoping meetings will be held at the dates and times identified below. Additional information on accessing the virtual scoping meetings is available at www.oaklandairport.com/terminaldevelopment.

Virtual Public Scoping Meeting #1: Tuesday, May 25, 2021, 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. PDT
Virtual Public Scoping Meeting #2: Tuesday, May 25, 2021, 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. PDT
Virtual Public Scoping Meeting #3: Wednesday, May 26, 2021, 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. PDT
Virtual Public Scoping Meeting #4: Wednesday, May 26, 2021, 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. PDT

Additional Accommodations: To request auxiliary aids or services such as interpreters or closed captioning, please contact Colleen Liang at 510.627.1198 or cliang@portoakland.com no later than 5:00 p.m. PDT on May 18, 2021. For requests not received by May 18, 2021, the Port will attempt to provide auxiliary aids or services if possible.

Información sobre reuniones: Debido a la orientación federal y estatal actual sobre el distanciamiento social en respuesta a la pandemia de COVID-19, el Puerto llevará a cabo cuatro reuniones públicas virtuales separadas para este proyecto. Cada reunión proporcionará la misma información y la misma oportunidad de hacer comentarios sobre el alcance y contenido del Borrador de EIR. Las reuniones virtuales de determinación de alcance se llevarán a cabo en las fechas y horas que se identifican a continuación. Puede encontrar información adicional sobre el acceso a las reuniones virtuales de determinación de alcance en www.oaklandairport.com/terminaldevelopment.

Reunión pública virtual sobre determinación de alcance #1: Martes, 25 de mayo de 2021, de 3:00 p.m. a 4:00 p.m. PDT
Reunión pública virtual sobre determinación de alcance #2: Martes, 25 de mayo de 2021, de 6:00 p.m. a 7:00 p.m. PDT
Reunión pública virtual sobre determinación de alcance #3: Miércoles, 26 de mayo de 2021, de 3:00 p.m. a 4:00 p.m. PDT
Reunión pública virtual sobre determinación de alcance #4: Miércoles, 26 de mayo de 2021, de 6:00 p.m. a 7:00 p.m. PDT

Adaptaciones adicionales Para solicitar ayudas o servicios auxiliares como intérpretes o subtítulos, comuníquese con Colleen Liang al 510.627.1198 o cliang@portoakland.com a más tardar a las 5:00 p.m. PDT el 18 de mayo de 2021. Para las solicitudes que no se reciban antes del 18 de mayo de 2021, el Puerto intentará proporcionar ayudas o servicios auxiliares si es posible.

會議資訊: 聯邦政府和州政府對新冠疫情時期社交距離出臺了指導辦法，針對相關內容，Port將舉辦四次獨立的線上公共範圍界定會議。每次會議提供的資訊是相同的，參與者均有機會就EIR（環境影響報告書草案）的範圍和內容發表意見。線上範圍界定會議將在以下日期和時間舉行。有關訪問虛擬範圍界定會議的更多資訊，請訪問www.oaklandairport.com/terminaldevelopment。

線上公共範圍界定會議#1: 2021年5月25日星期二，太平洋時間下午3:00至4:00

線上公共範圍界定會議#2: 2021年5月25日星期二，太平洋時間下午6:00至7:00

線上公共範圍界定會議#3: 2021年5月26日星期二，太平洋時間下午3:00至4:00

線上公共範圍界定會議#4: 2021年5月26日星期二，太平洋時間下午6:00至7:00

住宿: 如需口譯員或閉路字幕等說明或服務，請於2021年5月18日晚5:00前致電510.627.1198或發郵件至cliang@portoakland.com聯繫Colleen Liang。如果2021年5月18日前未能收到相關請求，Port不能保證可以提供相關服務，但會盡己所能提供設備或服務。

Note regarding Federal Requirements: Federal approval will be required for this project and this project is subject to review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) will be the lead agency for NEPA documentation.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture / Forestry Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

X I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



Signature

May 6, 2021

Date

Colleen Liang

Port Environmental Supervisor

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VI. ENERGY. Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XIII. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Fire protection?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

XVI. RECREATION.

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XVII. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:

a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

XX. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The following specifically identifies the environmental resources to be analyzed in the Draft EIR and those environmental resources that do not require any additional analysis in the Draft EIR.

I. AESTHETICS

a) through d) – The Draft EIR will analyze the change in visual resources and visual character that would occur as a result of the Proposed Project.

II. AGRICULTURE / FORESTRY RESOURCES

a) through e) – The Airport does not contain any prime farmland, unique farmland, farmland of statewide importance, or any forest land. In addition, no Williamson Act land exists at the Airport. The Proposed Project would have no impact on any agricultural / forestry resources and no further analysis of this issue will be included in the Draft EIR.

III. AIR QUALITY

a) through c) – The Draft EIR will analyze the air pollutant emissions that would occur during construction of the Proposed Action as well as the change in air pollutant emissions that would occur as a result of the implementation of the Proposed Project.

d) – The Proposed Project would not result in any change in the types of aircraft operations that would occur at OAK. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in any odors or emissions that would affect a substantial number of people and no further analysis of this issue will be included in the Draft EIR.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

a) through f) – The Draft EIR will identify any impacts to special status species, the habitats of special status species, sensitive natural communities, and migratory fish or wildlife. In addition, the Draft EIR will discuss any conflicts with policies and ordinances protecting biological resources or with any conservation plans.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

a) and b) – The Draft EIR will discuss any effects of the Proposed Project on historic or archaeological resources.

c) – Because the Airport was constructed on fill material, there is little to no possibility of human remains at the Airport. In addition, in the unlikely event that unknown subsurface archaeological resources are encountered during construction, the Port would implement required actions outlined in the Port's Emergency Response Plan for Discoveries of Unknown Historic or Archaeological Resources. Therefore,

the Proposed Project would not have the potential to disturb any human remains and no further analysis of this issue will be included in the Draft EIR.

VI. ENERGY

a) and b) – The Draft EIR will discuss energy consumption that would occur during construction of the Proposed Project as well as the change in energy use that would occur as a result of the implementation of the Proposed Project. The Draft EIR also will discuss any conflicts with state or local plans regarding renewable energy or energy efficiency.

VII. GEOLOGY / SOILS

a) through d) – The Draft EIR will discuss issues related to development of the Proposed Project being affected by seismic ground shaking and liquefaction and issues associated with soil erosion and expansive soils.

e) – The Airport uses existing infrastructure to convey wastewater from Port property for treatment and disposal by East Bay Municipal Utility District. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems exist at the Airport. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not use soils that would be incapable of supporting septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal system and no further analysis of this issue will be included in the Draft EIR.

f) – Because the Airport was constructed on fill material, there is little to no possibility of paleontological resources or unique geologic features at the Airport. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have the potential to disturb any paleontological resources or unique geologic features and no further analysis of this issue will be included in the Draft EIR.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

a) and b) – The Draft EIR will discuss changes in greenhouse gas emissions that would occur as a result of the construction and operation of the Proposed Project.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

a) through f) – The Draft EIR will evaluate the effects of the Proposed Action on the use, disposal, or transport of hazardous materials or wastes. In addition, the Draft EIR will determine whether there are any recorded sites at the Airport that are listed or under consideration for listing on the National Priorities List (NPL) established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and whether the Proposed Project would impair implementation of interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evaluation plan.

g) – The Airport is not located in an area where wildland fires occur. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not expose people or structure to wildland fires and no further analysis of this issue will be included in the Draft EIR.

X. HYDROLOGY / WATER QUALITY

a) through e) – The Draft EIR will discuss the impacts of the Proposed Project to water quality, groundwater, drainage patterns, and floodplains. In addition, the Draft EIR will identify any conflicts with any existing water quality control plans or groundwater management plans.

XI. LAND USE / PLANNING

a) – The Proposed Project would be constructed at the Airport and there is no potential for physically dividing any established community. Therefore, no further analysis of this issue will be included in the Draft EIR.

b) – The Draft EIR will identify any conflict of the Proposed Project with any existing land use plan, policy, or regulation.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

a) and b) – No known mineral resources exist at the Airport. Therefore, the implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or a mineral resource recovery site and no further analysis of this issue will be included in the Draft EIR.

XIII. NOISE

a) through c) – The Draft EIR will discuss any construction-related noise that could occur as a result of the construction of the Proposed Project. In addition, any change in noise associated with aircraft operations will be included in the Draft EIR.

XIV. POPULATION / HOUSING

a) and b) – The Proposed Project would be implemented at the Airport and no new housing is part of the Proposed project. Therefore, no substantial population growth would occur as a result. In addition, because no residential uses exist at the Airport, no displacement of people or housing would occur. Construction of the Proposed Project would result in a temporary increase in jobs and upon completion of the Proposed Project there would be a minor permanent increase in jobs associated with operation of the new terminal. This increase is minor compared to the labor market in the Bay Area and it is anticipated that all new jobs would be filled by existing residents of the Bay Area. Therefore, no further analysis of this issue will be included in the Draft EIR.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) – The Draft EIR will discuss any changes in fire protection, police protection, or other public facilities that would occur as a result of the Proposed Project. Because the Proposed Project would occur at the Airport and no change in population would occur as a result of the Proposed Project, no impacts to schools or parks would occur and no further analysis of this issue will be included in the Draft EIR.

XVI. RECREATION

a) and b) – The Proposed Project would occur at the Airport and would not result in any increase in the use of parks or recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of existing parks or recreational facilities. Therefore, no further analysis of this issue will be included in the Draft EIR.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

a) through d) – The Draft EIR will identify any changes in surface traffic, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities that would occur as result of the Proposed Project. In addition, the Draft EIR will discuss any changes to surface traffic infrastructure that could affect traffic safety or emergency access.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

a) i) and ii) – The Draft EIR will discuss any effects of the Proposed Project on historic or archaeological resources and will coordinate with tribal interests.

XIX. UTILITIES / SERVICE SYSTEMS

a) through e) – The Draft EIR will discuss any changes in the demand for wastewater, water, and solid waste services at the Airport that would occur as a result of the implementation of the Proposed Project.

XX. WILDFIRE

a) through d) – The Airport is not located in an area that has been designated as very high fire hazard severity zones. Therefore, no further analysis of this issue will be included in the Draft EIR.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) through c) – The Draft EIR will discuss all impacts that would occur as a result of the implementation of the Proposed Project. In addition, the Draft EIR will include an analysis of cumulative impacts to which the Proposed Project could contribute.