

Airport Department Comments
Draft San Jose Envision 2040 General Plan and Draft EIR

1. The proposed noise policies presented in Chapter 3 of the Draft Envision Plan do not include requiring aviation easements for development in the Airport noise impact area. While the Draft Plan appropriately calls for aviation easements for safety/height purposes (Policy TR-14.4), it has been a long-standing City policy, reflected by existing General Plan Transportation Policy 49, to also require aviation easements to provide for acceptance of aircraft noise impacts, consistent with ALUC policy. We request that this existing policy be retained by including it under Goal EC-1.
2. The proposed land use designations presented in Chapter 5 of the Draft Envision Plan do not appear to include the existing Airport Approach Zone Overlay for the area bounded by I-880, the Guadalupe River, and Coleman Avenue. If so, we're not aware of any discussion with the Airport about dropping this land use designation which has been in place since 1986. We request retention of this overlay designation as it has served as an explicit disclosure that the underlying land uses (public park/open space, commercial, and industrial) are generally subject to stricter noise, height, and density considerations due to the close proximity to the Airport.
3. Suggested minor edits to Draft Envision Plan:
 - a. In Chapter 2, modify the wording of Policy IE-1.6 (1st sentence) so that the Airport is identified separately from "existing and planned transit systems".
 - b. Also in Chapter 2, modify the wording of Policy IE-4.3 to delete the reference to fixed transit at the Airport as something additional to a transit link between the Airport and LRT and Caltrain/future BART.
 - c. In Chapter 4, modify the wording of Action PR-5.1 (2nd sentence) to clarify that the Guadalupe River Park Master Plan and the Guadalupe Gardens Master Plan are separate, although complementary, land use documents.
 - d. In Chapter 6, modify the Airport data presented on p. 6-1, last full paragraph. The data do not match the City's officially-reported #s for any of the last few years (nor the data presented in the DEIR, which also should be corrected). If 2009 is the selected base year for this section, the corresponding #s are: 8.3 million annual passengers, 105,000 annual commercial operations by 18 commercial carriers (15 passenger and 3 cargo), and 40,000 annual general aviation operations. Attached for reference is the data table from the Airport's most recent Muni Code-required annual report to Council.
4. Suggested minor edits (staff text revisions) to Draft EIR:

The Airport data presented on p. 222 (last paragraph, 3rd/4th sentences), p. 315 (last paragraph, 4th/5th sentences), and p. 566 (2nd paragraph, last sentence) are not fully accurate. The Airport is also not familiar with the data source cited in the footnote on p. 315. Similar to Comment 3d above, the City's own published activity data should be utilized.

Excerpt from Annual Status Report on the Airport Master Plan (4/5/11), p. 3

Airport Activity Levels and Master Plan Forecasts

	2008	2009	2010	Projected 2027
Air Passengers	9,717,717	8,321,750	8,249,136	17,600,000
Cargo Tonnage	81,222	59,471	49,363	189,700
Based General Aviation Aircraft	151	149	136	209
Air Carrier Operations	118,366	102,774	90,542	183,700
<i>Major Airline</i>	93,270	80,232	73,586	151,300
<i>Commuter Airline</i>	25,096	22,542	16,956	32,400
All-Cargo Operations	2,884	2,364	1,984	6,800
General Aviation Operations	51,253	40,342	30,691	73,200
Military Operations	<u>73</u>	<u>358</u>	<u>273</u>	<u>100</u>
Total Operations	172,576	145,838	123,490	263,800