



San Francisco International Airport

P.O. Box 8097
San Francisco, CA 94128
Tel 650.821.5000
Fax 650.821.5005
www.flysfo.com

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE Jan. 4, 2001

**Contact: Kandace Bender
Airfield Development Bureau
(650) 821-2112**

**SFO TO FURTHER EVALUATE ‘NON-BUILD’ OPTION
IN RUNWAY RECONFIGURATION PROGRAM**

*Underwater tunnel, joint airport authority, slot controls among
options to undergo critical, independent analysis*

**AIRPORT
COMMISSION
CITY AND COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO**

**WILLIE L. BROWN, JR.
MAYOR**

**HENRY E. BERMAN
PRESIDENT**

**LARRY MAZZOLA
VICE PRESIDENT**

MICHAEL S. STRUNSKY

LINDA S. CRAYTON

CARYL ITO

SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT – A multinational consulting firm specializing in transportation issues has been retained by San Francisco International Airport to conduct an independent review of possible alternatives to building new runways at SFO.

SFO currently has one of the worst flight delay records of any major U.S. airport, primarily because of its outdated runway configuration, and the airport is studying the possibility of constructing new runways. However, SFO officials are also studying “non-build” options that could institute demand management practices, such as slot controls, expanding existing regional airports, peak-pricing strategies and high-speed ferries and rail, among others, to reduce flight delays.

The non-build option, known as “Alternative Two” has been examined extensively by airport staff and outside consultants and is being considered at the same level of detail as the “build” alternatives in the ongoing Environmental Impact Report. Airport officials have requested further critical and independent review of this option to ensure that all feasible alternatives are being studied.

“Any decision made regarding SFO’s runways will affect all of us in the Bay Area for decades to come, and we want to ensure that no stone is left unturned in examining every possible alternative to building in the Bay,” said Karen Skelton, one of the project’s managers.

To assist with the critical review, SFO has retained the services of the Charles River Associates consulting firm.

Charles River Associates’ analyses will pursue in greater detail the impact that various demand management alternatives, such as slot controls and peak pricing strategies, would have on the level of air traffic as well as on expected delay levels.

**JOHN L. MARTIN
AIRPORT DIRECTOR**

In addition, Charles River Associates will analyze the impact of additional alternatives such as high-speed ferries and rail, a joint operation between Oakland and San Francisco, an underground connection between the two airports, differential landing fees and shifting of traffic to other airports, among others.

Charles River Associates has consulted on hundreds of projects worldwide in the areas of airspace management, airport operations, airline competition, marketing and distribution and passenger demand forecasting. The firm previously worked with SFO officials in analyzing airline scheduling patterns, the competitive and financial consequences of shifting demand during bad weather and the dependence of various communities on air service at SFO. Charles River will use existing, FAA-approved projected forecasts at the three Bay Area airports through the year 2015.

SFO has four objectives in its runway reconfiguration program: to reduce flight delays, to reduce human exposure to aircraft noise, to accommodate the new large aircraft and to achieve a net environmental gain for the Bay should new runways be built.

SFO's runways, constructed in the 1940s, are 750 feet apart; the current industry standard is 4,300 feet apart. During bad weather, which occurs one out of every two days, one of the parallel runways must be shut down for safety reasons, thereby cutting arrival capacity by 50 percent. In addition to Alternative Two, SFO is studying a "do-nothing" option and four new "build" options.

Airport officials have made no decisions on a preferred alternative, although that decision is expected sometime in the late Spring of 2001. The draft EIR/EIS, being conducted by the City Office of Environmental Review and the Federal Aviation Administration, respectively, is expected to be completed in late 2001. More than 30 regulatory agencies must approve a new runway reconfiguration.

###



San Francisco International Airport

P.O. Box 8097
San Francisco, CA 94128
Tel 650.821.5000
Fax 650.821.5005
www.flysfo.com

December 26, 2000

Administrator Jane Garvey
Federal Aviation Administration
National Headquarters
800 Independence Ave. S.W.
Washington, D.C., 20591

AIRPORT
COMMISSION
CITY AND COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO

WILLIE L. BROWN, JR.
MAYOR

HENRY E. BERMAN
PRESIDENT

LARRY MAZZOLA
VICE PRESIDENT

MICHAEL S. STRUNSKY

LINDA S. CRAYTON

CARYL ITO

JOHN L. MARTIN
AIRPORT DIRECTOR

Dear Administrator Garvey:

Thank you for taking time to meet us during our recent visit to Washington. This letter is to follow up on our discussion about the San Francisco International Airport's runway reconfiguration program.

As you know, our four key project objectives are to reduce existing and future flight delays at SFO, to reduce human exposure to noise, to accommodate the new larger aircraft and to produce a net environmental gain for the Bay. To that end, we are studying several runway reconfiguration alternatives as well as a "no-build" option.

Per our discussion, you know that we are dedicated to further exploration of the "no-build" option, known as Alternative Two, in which we could institute technologies and/or demand management practices rather than construct new runways to achieve our goals.

Although Alternative Two has been examined extensively by our staff and by our consultants, we feel this option requires further critical, independent and objective review. To assist in this review, SFO has secured the services of Charles River Associates, a multinational consulting firm with vast transportation experience.

Charles River's analyses will pursue in greater detail the impact that various demand management alternatives, such as slot controls and peak pricing strategies, would have on the level of air traffic as well as on expected delay levels. In addition, Charles River will analyze the impact of additional alternatives such as high-speed ferries, a joint operation between Oakland

Letter to Administrator Jane Garvey
December 26, 2000
Page 2

and San Francisco and an underground connection between the two airports. Charles River will use existing, FAA-approved projected forecasts at the three Bay Area airports through the year 2015.

As you know, the FAA is currently on record as stating that Alternative Two does not appear a feasible solution to SFO's flight delay problem. However, to reiterate the request we made to you earlier, we ask the FAA to withdraw its objections to Alternative Two and support our efforts to analyze all potentially feasible alternatives.

It was good to see you again, and I look forward to working with you in the future.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Karen Skelton", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Karen Skelton
Airfield Development Bureau
San Francisco International Airport

cc:
Woodie Woodward
Kate Lang
Ed Melisky
Lynne Picard
Ralph Thompson
Nancy Lobue
Camille Mittleholtz