

Responses to Comments on the Draft IS-MND

This section includes the comments received during public circulation of the Draft Initial Study-Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS-MND) prepared for the Alco Iron & Metal Company Facility Expansion Project (proposed project).

The Draft IS-MND was circulated for a 30-day public review period that began on October 24, 2025, and ended on November 24, 2025. The City of San Leandro (City) received five comment letters on the Draft IS-MND. The commenters and the page number on which each commenter's letter appear are listed below.

Letter No. and Commenter		Page No.
1	East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD)	H-2
2	Alameda County Community Development Agency	H-5
3	Port of Oakland	H-9
4	California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	H-22
5	Communities for a Better Environment	H-28

The comment letters and responses follow. The comment letters are numbered sequentially and each separate issue raised by the commenter, if more than one, has been assigned a number. The responses to each comment identify first the number of the comment letter and then the number assigned to each issue. (Response 1.1, for example, indicates that the response is for the first issue raised in Comment Letter 1.)

Where a comment resulted in a change to the Draft IS-MND text, the change is reflected in the Final IS-MND and the response indicates that changes were made. Changes in text in the Final IS-MND are signified by ~~strikeout font~~ where text was removed and by underlined font where text was added. These revisions do not constitute a "substantial revision" to the Recirculated Draft IS-MND, do not change the findings of the Recirculated Draft IS-MND, do not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts, and do not constitute significant new information warranting recirculation of the Draft IS-MND. None of the conditions pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15073.5 requiring second recirculation of an IS-MND have been met.

November 20, 2025

Cindy Lemaire, Project Planner
Community Development Department
City of San Leandro
835 East 14th Street
San Leandro, California 94577

Re: Notice of Availability and Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the
Alco Iron and Metal Company Facility Expansion Project (PLN21-0027), San
Leandro

Dear Ms. Lemaire,

East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Alco Iron and Metal Company Facility Expansion Project (Project) located in the City of San Leandro (City). EBMUD has the following comments.

WATER SERVICE

EBMUD's Central Pressure Zone, with a service elevation between 0 and 100 feet, will serve the proposed development. Individual parcels require separate water and private fire service meters. There is no EBMUD water main in Eden Road. A main extension, at the project sponsor's expense, may be required depending on fire flow requirements set by the local fire agency and EBMUD metering requirements. When the development plans are finalized, the project sponsor should contact EBMUD's New Business Office and request a water service estimate to determine costs and conditions for providing water service to the proposed development. Engineering and installation of water mains and services require substantial lead time, which should be provided for in the project sponsor's development schedule.

1

WATER CONSERVATION

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

2

Cindy Lemaire, Project Planner
November 20, 2025
Page 2

If you have any questions concerning this response, please contact Sandra Mulhauser, Senior Civil Engineer, Major Facilities Planning Section at (510) 287-7032.

Sincerely,



David J. Rehnstrom
Manager of Water Distribution Planning

DJR:RT:kn
wdpd25_178_Alco Iron and Metals Facility Expansion Project.doc

cc: Michael Bercovich
Alco Iron & Metal Company
2120 Davis Street
San Leandro, CA 94577

Letter 1

COMMENTER: David J. Rehnstrom, Manager of Water Distribution Planning, East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD)

DATE: November 20, 2025

Response 1.1

The commenter states that the proposed development would be served by EBMUD's Central Pressure Zone and that individual parcels require separate water and private fire service meters. The commenter notes that there is no EBMUD water main in Eden Road, so a main extension at the project sponsor's expense may be required based on fire flow and metering requirements. The commenter recommends that the sponsor contact EBMUD's New Business Office for a water service estimate once plans are finalized and account for substantial lead time for engineering and installation in the development schedule.

Water infrastructure is discussed in Section 19, *Utilities and Service Systems*, wherein EBMUD is acknowledged as the main service provider. The proposed project would be required to adhere to all relevant state and local regulations regarding water supply and service, such as those related to fire flow, metering, or sub-metering. Applicable regulations would be enforced by the City during project implementation and review of the associated building permits. The project applicant would be expected to contact EBMUD, as applicable, to determine costs and conditions once plans are finalized. No revisions to the IS-MND have been made in response to this comment.

Response 1.2

The commenter states that the project provides an opportunity to incorporate water conservation measures and requested that the City include a Condition of Approval requiring compliance with Assembly Bill 325, the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. The commenter also notes that Section 31 of EBMUD's Water Service Regulations prohibits furnishing new or expanded water service unless all applicable water-efficiency measures are installed at the project sponsor's expense.

As discussed in Section 10, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, of the IS-MND, the proposed project would involve minimal landscaping, installed primarily along Eden Road. The project would be required to comply with all applicable requirements, including Chapter 4.16, Landscape Requirements, of the San Leandro Municipal Code, which requires water-efficient landscaping. No revisions to the IS-MND have been made in response to this comment.



ALAMEDA COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Sandra Rivera
Agency Director

Albert Lopez
Planning Director

224 West Winton Ave
Room 111

Hayward, California
94544-1215

phone
510.670.5400
fax
510.785-8793

www.acgov.org/cda

November 21, 2025

Cindy Lemaire, Senior Planner
City of San Leandro
835 East 14th Street
San Leandro, California 94577

Letter 2

Re: Airport Land Use Commission Comments on Draft Initial Study – Mitigated Negative Declaration for PLN21-0027.

Thank you for providing the opportunity to review and comment upon the Draft Initial Study – Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Alco Iron & Metal Company Facility Expansion Project, PLN21-0027. Airport Land Use Commission Administrative staff have two primary comments: the need to limit possible flight obstructions and a factual error.

Fire Suppression and Dust Mitigation

The Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) has previously considered the Alco Iron & Metal Company Facility Expansion Project at its November 17, 2021, December 5, 2021, and January 19, 2022, meetings. At these meetings, commissioners were most concerned with possible fires at the facility and whether the Fire Protection Plan was adequate. The last reported fire at the Alco Iron & Metal Company Facility on Dolittle Drive was on December 4, 2024.

Smoke and heat from fires can obstruct flights. ALUC Administrative staff strongly encourage strict adherence to the Fire Protection Plan, particularly the installation of on-site firefighting equipment to efficiently access fires and the yearly inspection of firefighting equipment. Staff encourage regular fire safety training for staff and regular visitors to the site and, to the extent possible, encourage firefighting equipment to be located near parts of the facility with a higher likelihood of fire.

Potential visual hazards from the construction of new truck scales, the movement of scrap piles, and paving activities within the project are also of concern. It is imperative that Mitigation Measure AQ-1 be followed to minimize visual hazards from construction.

ALUC staff stress the importance of mitigating flight obstructions and other potential hazards that could impair pilots passing overhead.

1

2

3

Correction

In the Hazards and Hazardous Materials section, page 73, the report states that “[t]he project site is not within the noise or safety compatibility zones of Oakland International Airport or Hayward Executive Airport.”

This is incorrect; as stated elsewhere in the report, the Project Site is in Safety Compatibility Zone 2 of the Oakland International Airport ALUCP. Parcel 77A-649-6-5 is also partially within the 60-64 dB CNEL noise contour.¹ As listed in page 2-20 of the Oakland International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), aircraft accidents in the Inner Approach, Departure Zones, and Approach Surface (Zone 2) and the Runway Protection Zone (Zone 1) constitute 30-50% of all near-airport aircraft accidents. Given the risk, staff request that the correct facts be considered and appropriate mitigation measures be proposed.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to review this project. Please do not hesitate to contact me at olivia.ortiz@acgov.org if you have any questions about this letter or require additional information as this project moves forward.

Sincerely,

Olivia Ortiz
Planner III

cc: Members, Alameda County Airport Land Use Commission
Albert Lopez, Alameda County Planning Director, ALUC Administrative Officer

¹ This information is publicly available via this map:
<https://accda.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=fe68a494d7cd4d629a75812d0ed6af08>

Letter 2

COMMENTER: Olivia Ortiz, Planner III, Alameda County Community Development Agency

DATE: November 21, 2025

Response 2.1

The commenter states that the Airport Land Use Commission previously reviewed the Alco Iron & Metal Company Facility Expansion Project at multiple meetings and expressed concerns about potential fires at the facility and the adequacy of the Fire Protection Plan. The commenter notes that smoke and heat from fires could obstruct flights and emphasizes strict adherence to the Fire Protection Plan, including installing on-site firefighting equipment, conducting annual inspections, and providing regular fire safety training.

In response to this comment, additional information has been added to Section 9, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, and Section 15, *Public Services*, of the Final IS-MND. As stated in the Final IS-MND, the Fire Protection Plan, which is also included as Appendix G in the Final IS-MND, includes installation of on-site fire protection equipment, such as fire suppression water tanks and a truck-mounted foam system, as well as procedures for promptly contacting Alameda County Fire and the airport during an emergency. Additionally, annual inspections would be conducted by a qualified third-party fire protection consultant, and employees would receive regular training on the Fire Protection Plan. These measures are intended to address concerns regarding fire safety and ensure strict adherence to protocols that minimize potential risks to airport operations. Overall, the IS-MND found that the proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire department facilities or require the need for new or physically altered fire department facilities. Impacts related to fire protection services would be less than significant.

Response 2.2

The commenter raises concerns about potential visual hazards from construction of new truck scales, scrap pile movement, and paving and stressed the need to implement Mitigation Measure AQ-1.

Potential impacts associated with fugitive dust emissions during construction are analyzed in Section 3, *Air Quality*, of the IS-MND. Construction activities, including installation of new truck scales, paving, and movement of scrap piles could create fugitive dust emissions that could cause a visual hazard. As acknowledged in the IS-MND, construction-related fugitive dust emissions would vary from day-to-day and could affect local visibility on a temporary and intermittent basis during construction. To address this, the IS-MND includes Mitigation Measure AQ-1, which incorporates Bay Area Air District (BAAD) best management practices for construction-related fugitive dust emissions. These practices require measures such as regular watering of exposed surfaces, covering haul trucks, limiting vehicle speeds on unpaved roads, and promptly cleaning paved areas. By minimizing dust generation, Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would reduce the potential for fugitive dust to impair visibility for aircraft during ascent and descent near Oakland San Francisco Bay Airport. Implementation of these practices ensures compliance with air quality standards and addresses visual safety concerns by preventing dust plumes that could interfere with pilots' line of sight. In response to this comment, additional information has been added to the Final IS-MND to acknowledge potential concerns about visibility for aircraft and that Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would

reduce such potential impacts. These text revisions do not affect the findings or conclusions of the IS-MND.

Response 2.3

The commenter highlights the importance of mitigating flight obstructions and other hazards that could impair pilots overhead.

In response to this comment, Section 9, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, of the Final IS-MND has been revised to clarify that the project would not involve construction of new buildings, and the height of existing structures would remain unchanged. The proposed changes include installation of new truck scales, but these would be generally flush to the ground. Additionally, operational changes associated with the project could potentially reduce the height of scrap piles compared to current conditions, as there would be more room for the existing quantities of materials, further minimizing potential visual or physical obstructions. During both construction and operation, there would be no structures or activities that would penetrate Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Part 77 airspace surfaces or otherwise create hazards for aircraft. Therefore, the project would not result in flight obstructions or impair visibility for pilots overhead.

Response 2.4

The commenter states that the *Hazards and Hazardous Materials* section of the Draft IS-MND incorrectly identifies the project site as not within the noise or safety compatibility zones of Oakland Airport or Hayward Executive Airport. The commenter clarifies that the site is in Safety Compatibility Zone 2 of the *Oakland International Airport Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan* (ALUCP) and partially within the 60–64 dB CNEL noise contour. The commenter notes that Zone 2 and Zone 1 account for 30–50 percent of near-airport aircraft accidents and requested that these facts be corrected and appropriate mitigation measures proposed.

In response to this comment, Section 9, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, of the Final IS-MND has been updated. The Final IS-MND acknowledges that the project site is located fully within Safety Compatibility Zone 2 of the *Oakland International Airport* ALUCP. The updated analysis clarifies that the proposed project is an industrial use and does not fall within the list of prohibited land uses for Zone 2. The project involves reconfiguration and expansion of the Alco Iron & Metal Company facility, but no changes to the height of existing structures or installation of substantial new lighting are proposed. The project would relocate existing scrap piles from the open area in the center of the site to the proposed expansion area. Because the expansion area provides more space, the scrap piles would be spread out, potentially allowing for reduced pile heights. Therefore, the project would not conflict with height restrictions and other regulations under the ALUCP, and impacts would be less than significant.

In addition, Section 13, *Noise*, of the Final IS-MND has been updated in response to this comment. The revised text acknowledges that the project site is partially within the 60 dB CNEL noise contour. The updated analysis clarifies that the industrial use of the project site is a compatible land use according to the ALUCP. Therefore, implementation of the project would not expose persons residing or working in the project vicinity to noise levels from airport activity that would be in excess of normally acceptable standards for the proposed project, and impacts would be less than significant.



PORT OF OAKLAND

November 24, 2025

Ms. Cindy Lemaire, AICP, CNU-A
Senior Planner
City of San Leandro
835 East 14th Street
San Leandro, California 94577

Transmitted via email: CLemaire@sanleandro.org

Subject: Draft Initial Study – Mitigated Negative Declaration for Alco Iron & Metal
Company Facility Expansion Project PLN21-0027 (1091 Doolittle Drive)

Dear Ms. Lemaire:

The Port of Oakland (Port) appreciates this opportunity to comment on the Draft Initial Study – Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the Alco Iron & Metal Company Facility Expansion Project PLN21-0027 at 1091 Doolittle Drive (proposed project). The Port understands that the proposed project involves an increase in the size (additional two acres) and a reconfiguration of the project applicant's recycling facility including the following physical changes:

- Paving and configuring the proposed expansion area to drain to stormwater treatment facilities.
- Adding a site access point from Eden Road to the expansion area.
- Installing an additional outgoing and incoming scales east of the location of the existing scale.
- Repairing/replacing damaged and missing pavement in the location of the existing scrap metal piles on the portion of the project site with Alco's existing operations
- Striping for vehicle parking in the southern portion of the site.
- Replacing the existing frontage wall.
- Installing landscaping and stormwater treatment facilities, primarily along Eden Road.
- Constructing 45 new parking spaces at the Doolittle Drive entrances

The Port generates vital economic activity, community benefits and environmental innovation, as the Port decarbonizes its operations for a cleaner and greener future. Along with its partners, the Port supports 98,345 jobs in the region and \$174 billion in annual economic activity. The Port oversees the Oakland San Francisco Bay Airport (OAK or Airport), the Oakland Seaport and nearly 20 miles of waterfront including Jack London Square and is a publicly owned utility. The Port provides the following comments on the IS/MND for the City of San Leandro (City) to consider.

530 Water Street ■ P.O. Box 2064 ■ Oakland, California 94604-2064

www.portofoakland.com

Oakland San Francisco Bay Airport Name Change

Oakland San Francisco Bay Airport name change was approved by the Port of Board Commissioners at a July 2025 Board meeting. All references to *Oakland International Airport* should be revised to *Oakland San Francisco Bay Airport*. This name change should be reflected throughout the IS/MND.

1

Land Use and Planning

The Alameda County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) is a commission authorized under the provisions of the California Public Utilities Code, Sections 21670 et seq., and established to promote compatibility between airports and the land uses surrounding them.

The Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) is the primary document used by the ALUC to promote compatibility between OAK and its environs. The intent of the ALUCP is to encourage compatibility between airports and the various land uses that surround them. The proposed project is within the Airport Influence Area (AIA) and Section 11, Land Use and Planning, of the IS/MND should evaluate the compatibility of the proposed project with the four primary criteria for land use within the AIA: Airspace Protection Zones, Overflight Zones, Noise, and Safety. The following provides information on additional analysis required to determine consistency with the ALUCP and compliance with the document.

2

1) Airspace Protection Zones

According to the OAK ALUCP, the proposed project must comply with safety zone guidelines and height restrictions to prevent any interference with airport operations. This includes ensuring that structures do not penetrate navigable airspace as defined by Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 77.

FAA determination on whether the proposed project would be a hazard to air navigation may be required to assess permanent impacts from the structure as well as for temporary impacts during construction. In consultation with OAK, the City should review the heights of permanent and temporary structures and equipment associated with the proposed project. If it is determined that a FAA Form 7460-1, Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration, is necessary, the applicant must submit the appropriate forms to the FAA for review. The Port is available to review Form 7460-1 before the applicant/contractor submits to the FAA for its determination. The applicant/contractor will be required to meet all resulting conditions and requirements in the FAA's determination stating whether the proposed project would be a hazard to air navigation.

Additionally, lighting and glare from project features including lights, glass facades, and reflective materials can interfere with pilot vision or runway approach lighting. The IS/MND should disclose these potential effects as part of its compatibility analysis with the ALUCP as well as in Section 1, Aesthetics, Subpart c and identify measures to minimize or mitigate them if applicable.

3

Since the project involves the handling and storage of metals and potential fire hazards within the AIA of OAK, any fire event or significant smoke plume could temporarily affect aircraft visibility and safety. The IS/MND should acknowledge

4

this as part of its compatibility analysis with the ALUCP as well as in Section 15, Public Services, and specify that incident notifications to OAK Airport Operations are required in the event of a fire, hazardous release, or smoke event.	4, cont.
FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5200-33C, Hazardous Wildlife Attractants on or Near Airports, provides guidance on land use practices that may attract hazardous wildlife and outlines appropriate wildlife hazard management procedures. The AC recommends that the FAA be notified as early as possible during the planning phase of any land use change occurring within five statute miles of an airport, to allow the FAA to determine whether further evaluation is necessary. Given the project's proximity to OAK, the Port recommends that the City notify the FAA of the proposed development and incorporate appropriate measures to prevent wildlife attractants, including conditions to reduce the potential for bird strikes or other wildlife hazards.	5
2) <u>Overflight Zones</u> Pursuant to ALUCP §3.3.3.8 Avigation Easement Dedication, the IS/MND should be revised to require the dedication of an avigation easement as a condition of project approval. The avigation easement must be dedicated to the Port of Oakland and shall: 1. Identify the potential airspace hazards associated with the project and its location within protected airspace; 2. Grant the airport owner the right to clear or maintain airspace free of obstructions; 3. Grant the right to mark potential obstructions and notify aviators of such hazards; and 4. Provide the right for aircraft to pass within the affected airspace. The Port recommends that airport-related real estate disclosures run with the land to ensure long-term transparency regarding the site's location within the OAK's AIA. These disclosures should be provided not only to current occupants but also to all prospective future property owners and tenants, ensuring they are fully informed of aircraft overflight, noise exposure, and airport-related operational conditions.	6
3) <u>Noise</u> The project site is located within the AIA of OAK and is therefore subject to the noise compatibility policies outlined in the ALUCP. The Port recommends that the project identify the applicable noise contour to evaluate the extent of noise exposure relative to acceptable levels for the proposed land uses and disclose potential aircraft overflight noise exposure to determine whether mitigation measures are necessary to ensure compatibility. We further recommend that the IS/MND reference the ALUCP, as well as in Section 13, Noise, the compatibility criteria and address any relevant sound-level thresholds to ensure that the project remains consistent with airport compatibility standards.	7
4) <u>Safety</u> • Land use safety compatibility criteria are intended to minimize risks to people and property on the ground, as well as to aircraft occupants, in the event of an accident or emergency landing occurring outside the	8

airport boundary. The seven safety zones identified in the ALUCP are based on those established in the California Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Handbook (Handbook). Each zone includes specific land use compatibility standards, with allowable uses determined by the level of acceptable risk. Land uses that pose unacceptable risks at a given distance from the airport must be prohibited, while those with tolerable but significant risks may require restrictions to reduce risk to an acceptable level.

8

- The proposed project is located within Airport Safety Zone 2 (Inner Approach/Departure Zone) and Airport Safety Zone 4 (Outer Approach/Departure Zone). The Port requests that the IS/MND be updated to correctly identify these safety zones and recommends that the City evaluate the land use risk considerations for both zones in accordance with the ALUCP and incorporate any necessary revisions into the IS/MND in the Land Use and Planning section, as well as Section 9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.
- The ALUCP expressly prohibits the storage of fuel and other hazardous materials within Airport Safety Zone 2. Because the project site is within Safety Zone 2, any use or storage of hazardous, flammable, corrosive, or otherwise hazardous substances would be inconsistent with the ALUCP's safety compatibility criteria. The IS/MND should be revised to clearly disclose this inconsistency and require the applicant to remove all hazardous materials storage and handling activities from areas located within Safety Zone 2.

9

10

Public Services

Page 14 of the IS/MND notes that the proposed project's Fire Protection Plan includes "procedures for contacting the airport and other relevant entities during a fire event." The Port requests clarification in the document, specifying that in the event of a fire, the Alameda County Fire Department should be contacted as the primary responder, and that the "airport" i.e., OAK Airport Operations, should be contacted for notification purposes only.

The IS/MND should clarify the applicant's commitment to ongoing fire prevention training for employees. While the document notes that employees will receive training, the description implies a one-time effort. To ensure adequate fire protection over the life of the project, the City should require the applicant to implement and maintain a continuous fire prevention training program as part of project operations.

11

Additionally, the Port requests that the City confirm the date of the Fire Protection Plan and include the current version in the IS/MND. If the plan is not dated November 8, 2021, please identify and summarize any changes that have been made after the 2021 version.

Transportation

1) Access

- Landside access and circulation around the airport and related surface transportation corridors are an important compatibility consideration. Proposed development, including construction and operation, should not hamper safe and efficient access to Airport property, security zones, or movement of Airport vehicles, including blocking emergency/evacuation corridors or airport access roads.
- Page 14 of the IS/MND states “Alco would utilize Eden Road for in-process truck queuing.” The Port notes that any truck queuing on Eden Road cannot block access to Airport property.
- We encourage the lead agency to coordinate with OAK to review the development’s access and parking plan to verify no adverse impacts on airport access.

12

2) Traffic Study

- The Traffic Study evaluates two site driveways on Eden Road but does not acknowledge the existing driveway to the Port parcel currently used for laydown area. The Port recommends the Traffic Study acknowledge the existing Port driveway on Eden Road.
- Please confirm the date of the Traffic Study. Pages are labeled either February 2025 or March 2023.
- Page 21 of the Traffic Study states that the separate Eden Road Project is not funded, is this correct?
- Page 26, Table 7 of the Traffic Study: where is the 100-foot storage for the eastbound lane on Eden Road and Doolittle Drive measured from?
- Page 28 and throughout the Traffic Study and IS/MND: Eden Road is identified as alternative access to and from the project site. As noted in earlier comments, Eden Road should acknowledge existing Port property on the north side of Eden Road and traffic activity from proposed project construction or its operations should not block Airport access.

13

Closing

The Port appreciates the opportunity to comment on the IS/MND. Development on sites located near airport property and within flight paths must remain consistent with applicable federal and state standards, including Federal Aviation Regulations, ALUC planning guidelines, and all other relevant regulations and amendments. Port staff recommend that the ALUC and Alameda County Community Development Agency, Planning Department, as an administrative department are involved in the planning process for the proposed project. In addition to coordination with applicable planning agencies, Port staff look forward to ongoing coordination with the City of San Leandro throughout the environmental process.

For any follow-up questions or responses, please contact Sharon Grewal, C.M., PMP, AICP, Aviation Project Manager, at sgrewal@portoakland.com, or Elizabeth Nagle, Associate Environmental Planner/Scientist, at enagle@portoakland.com.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Colleen Liang', with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Colleen Liang
Director of Environmental Programs and Planning

CC:

Olivia Ortiz, Planner III, Alameda County Community Development Agency
Kristi McKenney, Executive Director, Port of Oakland
Craig Simon, Aviation Director, Port of Oakland
Joan Zatopek, Aviation Planning and Development Manager, Port of Oakland

Letter 3

COMMENTER: Colleen Liang, Director of Environmental Programs and Planning, Port of Oakland

DATE: November 24, 2025

Response 3.1

The commenter states that the Port of Oakland Board of Commissioners approved the name change of Oakland International Airport to Oakland San Francisco Bay Airport at its July 2025 meeting and requests that all references to Oakland International Airport in the IS-MND be updated to reflect the new name.

In response to this comment, the airport name has been changed in the Final IS-MND. The airport name change that was approved by the Port of Oakland Board of Commissioners in July 2025 is currently under litigation. Nonetheless, the Oakland airport name has been changed to “Oakland San Francisco Bay Airport” throughout the Final IS-MND and in this Responses to Comments document. The name of the ALUCP for the airport remains as the *Oakland International Airport* ALUCP, and therefore, this document name is used in the Final IS-MND. These text revisions do not affect the findings or conclusions of the IS-MND.

Response 3.2

The commenter states that the Alameda County Airport Land Use Commission promotes compatibility between airports and surrounding land uses through the ALUCP. The commenter notes that the proposed project is within the Airport Influence Area (AIA) and requested that Section 11, *Land Use and Planning*, of the IS-MND evaluate the project’s consistency with ALUCP criteria: Airspace Protection Zones, Overflight Zones, Noise, and Safety. Specifically, the commenter emphasizes compliance with safety zone guidelines and FAA height restrictions under Federal Aviation Regulation Part 77 and recommends reviewing permanent and temporary structure heights. If necessary, the commenter advises submitting FAA Form 7460-1 for determination of hazards to air navigation and meeting all resulting FAA conditions.

In response to this comment, Section 11, *Land Use and Planning*, of the Final IS-MND has been updated to evaluate the project’s consistency with the ALUCP. Table 7 in Section 11 of the Final IS-MND demonstrates that the project is consistent with the Safety Zone 2 (Inner Approach/Departure Zone) policies contained in the ALUCP that aim to avoid or mitigate safety hazards and land use conflicts. No residences, schools, day care centers, libraries, hospitals, nursing homes, or places of worship uses are proposed. The project would not involve high-intensity land uses that attract a large number of people. There are six existing structures on the project site. The proposed project would not involve construction of additional buildings (other than truck scales which are not a habitable building and would be low to the ground) and the occupancy of the site would remain the same. The proposed project would not cause an increase in the number or volume of hazardous materials used in project operation. Additionally, the project would not exceed Part 77, as no new buildings are proposed. All existing structures are, and all would remain, well under the 150-foot height limit. FAA Form 7460-1 is not required. The text revisions in the Final IS-MND do not affect the findings or conclusions of the IS-MND.

Response 3.3

The commenter states that lighting and glare from project features, such as lights, glass facades, and reflective materials, can interfere with pilot vision or runway approach lighting. The commenter requested that the IS-MND disclose these potential effects in its ALUCP compatibility analysis and in Section 1, *Aesthetics*, Subpart c and identify measures to minimize or mitigate them if applicable.

Impacts associated with light and glare are discussed in Subpart d in Section 1, *Aesthetics*. In response to this comment, Section 1 of the Final IS-MND has been updated to include an ALUCP compatibility analysis addressing potential lighting and glare impacts. The analysis reviews project features, such as exterior lighting, glass facades, and reflective materials, in relation to ALUCP policies for visual hazards. The analysis concludes that the proposed project complies with ALUCP requirements regarding light and glare, because the project does not introduce substantial reflective surfaces or lighting compared to existing conditions that would interfere with pilot vision or runway approach lighting. As a result, no additional mitigation measures are required beyond compliance with existing ALUCP policies. The text revisions in the Final IS-MND do not affect the findings or conclusions of the IS-MND.

Response 3.4

The commenter states that because the project involves handling and storing metals and poses potential fire hazards within the AIA of the Oakland San Francisco Bay Airport, any fire or significant smoke plume could temporarily affect aircraft visibility and safety. The commenter requests that the IS-MND acknowledge this in its ALUCP compatibility analysis and in Section 15, *Public Services* and specify that incident notifications to Oakland San Francisco Bay Airport Operations are required in the event of a fire, hazardous release, or smoke event.

In response to this comment, Section 15, *Public Services*, of the Final IS-MND has been updated to address potential fire hazards and smoke impacts within the AIA and reiterate the project's commitment to implementing the Fire Protection Plan. The Fire Protection Plan is also included in Appendix G of the Final IS-MND. The revised text specifies that, in accordance with the project's Fire Protection Plan and ALUCP compatibility requirements, incident notifications to airport would be made in the event of a fire, hazardous material release, or smoke event. These updates ensure that emergency communication protocols are clearly identified and that coordination with airport operations will occur to maintain safety. Although the project would expand the project site, the expansion area would primarily be used to improve internal circulation and would not result in an increased demand for fire protection services. The number of employees and amount of material processed are not anticipated to change with the proposed project. Overall, the proposed project would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire department facilities or require the need for new or physically altered fire department facilities. The text revisions in the Final IS-MND do not affect the findings or conclusions of the IS-MND.

Response 3.5

The commenter states that FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200-33C provides guidance on minimizing hazardous wildlife attractants near airports and recommends notifying the FAA early in the planning phase for projects within 5 miles of an airport. The commenter requests that, given the project's proximity to the airport, the City notify the FAA of the proposed development and incorporate measures to prevent wildlife attractants, including conditions to reduce the potential for bird strikes or other wildlife hazards.

In response to this comment, Section 4, *Biological Resources*, Subpart d of the Final IS-MND has been updated to address hazardous wildlife. The project site is in a heavily disturbed industrialized area of San Leandro and has been previously developed with industrial warehouses, storage, and limited perimeter landscaping, including trees. The project site is not located in a migratory wildlife corridor and most of the site is fenced, which currently limits wildlife movement. While the project proposes some landscaping along Eden Road, it would not be sufficient to attract enough wildlife that would create a hazardous environment for airport operations. The text revisions in the Final IS-MND do not affect the findings or conclusions of the IS-MND.

Response 3.6

The commenter states that, pursuant to ALUCP Section 3.3.3.8, the IS-MND should require dedication of an avigation easement to the Port of Oakland as a condition of project approval. The easement should identify potential airspace hazards, grant rights to maintain airspace free of obstructions, allow marking of hazards, and permit aircraft overflight. The commenter also recommends that airport-related real estate disclosures run with the land to ensure long-term transparency for current and future property owners and tenants regarding overflight, noise exposure, and airport operational conditions.

In response to this comment, Table 7 has been added to the Final IS-MND which shows consistency with Section 3.3.3.8 and Table 2-3 of the ALUCP. Pursuant to ALUCP Section 3.3.3.8, Avigation Easement Dedication, the project applicant is required to dedicate an avigation easement to the Port of Oakland. Avigation easements transfer certain property rights from the owner of a property to the owner of the airport. According to the ALUCP, avigation easements should be dedicated to the airport owner as a condition for any discretionary local approval of any development within airport Safety Zones that include obstructions or other flight hazards. The City will include a Condition of Approval for the project to grant an avigation easement to the Port of Oakland to address the risks associated with the facility's storage of scrap metal piles. The Condition of Approval will require that:

Pursuant to ALUCP §3.3.3.8 Avigation Easement Dedication, the applicant shall dedicate an avigation easement to the Port of Oakland and shall:

1. Identify the potential airspace hazards associated with the project and its location within protected airspace;
2. Grant the airport owner the right to clear or maintain airspace free of obstructions;
3. Grant the right to mark potential obstructions and notify aviators of such hazards; and
4. Provide the right for aircraft to pass within the affected airspace.

No significant impacts associated with airport hazards or consistency with the ALUCP have been identified, and therefore, mitigation is not required. The text revisions in the Final IS-MND do not affect the findings or conclusions of the IS-MND.

Response 3.7

The commenter states that the project site is within the AIA of the Oakland San Francisco Bay Airport and subject to noise compatibility policies in the ALUCP. The commenter recommends identifying the applicable noise contour to assess noise exposure for proposed land uses, disclosing potential aircraft overflight noise, and determining if mitigation is needed. The commenter further

requests that the IS-MND reference the ALUCP and address compatibility criteria and sound-level thresholds in Section 13, *Noise* to ensure consistency with airport standards.

Please see Response 2.4. In response to this comment, Section 13, *Noise* has been updated to acknowledge that the project site is partially within the 60 dB CNEL noise contour. The updated analysis clarifies that the industrial use of the project site is a compatible land use according to the ALUCP. The text revisions in the Final IS-MND do not affect the findings or conclusions of the IS-MND.

Response 3.8

The commenter states that land use safety compatibility criteria are designed to minimize risks to people and property on the ground and to aircraft occupants in the event of an accident or emergency landing outside the airport boundary. The commenter notes that the ALUCP identifies seven safety zones based on the *California Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Handbook*, each with specific land use standards. Uses posing unacceptable risks must be prohibited, while those with tolerable but significant risks may require restrictions to reduce risk to an acceptable level.

Please see responses 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4. Section 9, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials* of the Final IS-MND has been updated to acknowledge that the project site is located within Safety Zone 2 (Inner Approach/Departure Zone) of the *Oakland International Airport* ALUCP. The updated analysis clarifies that the proposed project is compatible with the land use criteria in Table 2-3 of the ALUCP for Zone 2. The text revisions in the Final IS-MND do not affect the findings or conclusions of the IS-MND.

Response 3.9

The commenter states that the proposed project is located within Airport Safety Zone 2 (Inner Approach/Departure Zone) and Zone 4 (Outer Approach/Departure Zone). The commenter requests that the IS-MND be updated to correctly identify these zones and recommends evaluating land use risk considerations for both zones in accordance with the ALUCP, incorporating any necessary revisions into Section 11, *Land Use and Planning*, and Section 9, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*.

Please see responses 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4. In response to this comment, Section 9, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials* of the Final IS-MND has been updated to acknowledge that the project site is located within Safety Compatibility Zone 2 of the *Oakland International Airport* ALUCP. In addition, the added Table 7 in Section 11, *Land Use and Planning* of the Final IS-MND analyzes project consistency with the ALUCP. Table 7 compares project consistency with Table 2-3, Basic Compatibility Criteria and Supporting Information, of the ALUCP, which sets forth criteria for development in each Safety Zone, including Safety Zone 2. As shown in Table 7 of the Final IS-MND, the project would be consistent with the criteria in Table 2-3 of the ALUCP.

Furthermore, while the business and sales offices for the Alco Iron & Metal Company are within Zone 4, the project site where facility changes would occur (the expansion area and the ferrous metal operations area) as shown in Figure 2 in the IS-MND is not within Zone 4, the Outer Approach/Departure Zone. Figure 7, which displays the project site and the Oakland San Francisco Bay Airport safety zones has been added to the Final IS-MND. As shown in the figure, the project site is entirely within Zone 2. The updated analysis in the Final IS-MND also clarifies that the proposed project is compatible with the land use standards for Zone 2. The text revisions in the Final IS-MND do not affect the findings or conclusions of the IS-MND.

Response 3.10

The commenter states that the ALUCP prohibits the storage of fuel and other hazardous materials within Airport Safety Zone 2 (Inner Approach/Departure Zone). Because the project site is within Zone 2, use or storage of hazardous, flammable, corrosive, or otherwise hazardous substances would be inconsistent with ALUCP safety compatibility criteria. The commenter requests that the IS-MND disclose this inconsistency and require removal of all hazardous materials storage and handling activities from areas located within Safety Zone 2.

Section 11, *Land Use and Planning*, has been updated in the Final IS-MND to include Table 7, which evaluates the project's compatibility with the Zone 2 requirement that prohibits use or storage of hazardous, flammable, corrosive, or otherwise hazardous substances. As discussed in Table 7, the project site is an existing Nonconforming Use due to the storage of hazardous materials on-site, which is prohibited in Safety Zone 2 (Inner Approach/Departure Zone). According to Policy 2.7.5.7, Special Conditions, of the *Oakland International Airport* ALUCP, where development not in conformance with the ALUCP already exists, additional infill development of similar land uses may be allowed to occur even if such land uses are prohibited elsewhere in the AIA. Policy 2.7.5.7 states that Nonconforming Uses may be expanded if the development qualifies as "infill." Policy 2.7.5.7 also includes criteria for qualifying as "infill." For non-residential development, the site must be less than 10 acres and the number of people per acre shall be no greater than the average intensity of existing uses within 300 feet of the project site. The project would meet these conditions as it is less than 10 acres and would not further increase the density or intensity of the existing use. As a result, the project would meet the criteria for an allowed expansion of a Nonconforming Use. Therefore, because the project involves expansion of an existing Nonconforming Use, which is allowed under the ALUCP, the project is not inconsistent with the Zone 2 requirement that prohibits storage of hazardous materials.

Furthermore, as stated in the *Hazardous Materials Handling and Disposal and Fire Safety* section of the IS-MND Project Description, the proposed project would not introduce substantial amounts of additional hazardous materials on-site, nor would it involve the storage of hazardous materials in the proposed expansion area. As stated in the *Proposed Operational Changes at the Project Site* section of the IS-MND Project Description, the proposed project is not intended to increase the amount of materials received or processed at the facility but to improve handling of materials. Overall, the proposed project would not increase the amount of material processed on-site. Additionally, as discussed in Section 9, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, the project has a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) in place. The HMBP depicts the inventory of hazardous materials used in the operation. The HMBP includes requirements for storage/containment, notification, and contingency measures in the event of a spill, fire, or other incident. The proposed project would not cause an increase in the location, number or volume of hazardous materials used in project operation. The text revisions in the Final IS-MND do not affect the findings or conclusions of the IS-MND.

Response 3.11

The commenter states that the IS-MND should clarify that in the event of a fire, the Alameda County Fire Department is the primary responder and Oakland San Francisco Bay Airport Operations should be contacted for notification purposes only. The commenter requests confirmation that the applicant will maintain ongoing fire prevention training for employees rather than a one-time effort and recommends requiring a continuous training program as part of project operations.

Additionally, the commenter asks the City to confirm the date of the Fire Protection Plan, include the current version in the IS-MND, and identify any changes made since the November 8, 2021, version.

Please see Response 3.4. Section 15, *Public Services* of the Final IS-MND was updated to reiterate the procedures of the Fire Protection Plan, which include notifying the airport in the event of a fire and providing regular fire prevention training for employees. The current Fire Protection Plan is dated December 4, 2021. The text revisions in the Final IS-MND do not affect the findings or conclusions of the IS-MND.

Response 3.12

The commenter states that landside access and circulation around the airport are critical for compatibility and that proposed development should not impede safe and efficient access to airport property, security zones, or emergency/evacuation corridors. The commenter notes that truck queuing on Eden Road, as mentioned in the IS-MND, must not block airport access and encouraged coordination with Oakland San Francisco Bay Airport to review the development's access and parking plan to ensure no adverse impacts on airport access.

In response to this comment, Section 17, *Transportation*, of the Final IS-MND has been updated to clarify that the project would not impact access to the Oakland San Francisco Bay Airport property during an emergency or block evacuation corridors or airport access roads. Impacts would be less than significant. As discussed in Section 17, *Transportation*, the project is designed to improve access and site circulation, reducing the potential for truck queuing outside the project site. Furthermore, as discussed in the IS-MND, Eden Road is planned to be paved and improved prior to implementation of the proposed project. The text revisions in the Final IS-MND do not affect the findings or conclusions of the IS-MND.

Response 3.13

The commenter states that the Traffic Study should acknowledge the existing Port driveway on Eden Road currently used for laydown area. The commenter requested confirmation of the Traffic Study date, noting inconsistencies between February 2025 and March 2023. The commenter asked whether the statement on page 21 that the Eden Road Project is not funded is correct and requested clarification on where the 100-foot storage for the eastbound lane at Eden Road and Doolittle Drive (Table 7, page 26) is measured from. The commenter also notes that Eden Road is identified as alternative access throughout the Traffic Study and IS-MND and reiterated that traffic from project construction or operations should not block airport access or the existing Port property on the north side of Eden Road.

Kimley Horn prepared the Traffic Study for the proposed project in February 2025. This report is included as Appendix F to the IS-MND. As stated under *Site Access and Circulation* in the Project Description in the IS-MND, improvements to Eden Road are planned. The City has transferred the Eden Road property to a private firm, the parent company of the Alco Iron & Metal Company, which will improve and maintain Eden Road as a private street. Improvements to Eden Road would occur independently from the proposed project and are not part of this project; however, the improvements must be completed before the proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP), if approved, is implemented. With completion of these improvements, an access gate would be added to the eastern portion of Eden Road to provide secondary access to the project site, prevent traffic buildup, and eliminate truck queuing on Doolittle Drive. However, if Doolittle Drive becomes congested, the Alco Iron & Metal Company would utilize Eden Road for in-process truck queuing.

Alco Iron & Metal Company Facility Expansion Project

Because Eden Road is planned for secondary access, the project would not block airport access or access to the existing Port property on the north side of Eden Road. It is anticipated that the improvements to Eden Road would improve access to the parcels along Eden Road. No changes to the IS-MND have been made in response to this comment.

California Department of Transportation

DISTRICT 4
OFFICE OF REGIONAL AND COMMUNITY PLANNING
P.O. BOX 23660, MS-10D | OAKLAND, CA 94623-0660
www.dot.ca.gov



November 24, 2025

SCH #: 2025101070
GTS #: 04-ALA-2025-01001
GTS ID: 38391
Co/Rt/Pm: ALA/61/R15.093

Cindy Lemaire, Project Planner
City of San Leandro
835 East 14th Street
San Leandro, CA 94577

Re: Alco Iron and Metals Facility Expansion Project – Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND)

Dear Cindy Lemaire:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the Alco Iron and Metal Facility Expansion Project. The Local Development Review (LDR) Program reviews land use projects and plans to ensure consistency with our mission and state planning priorities. The following comments are based on our review of the October 2025 MND.

Please note this correspondence does not indicate an official position or approval by Caltrans on this project and is for informational purposes only.

Project Understanding

The proposed project would involve reconfiguring operations on the ferrous metal portion of the Alco Iron and Metals facility and expanding those operations to a two-acre expansion area adjacent to the west of the existing facility near State Route (SR) 61.

Travel Demand Analysis

The project vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis and significance determination are undertaken in a manner consistent with City's adopted VMT guidelines. Per the MND, this project is found to have a less than significant VMT impact.

Hydrology

The project is in a base flood plain. FEMA map 06001C0254H, effective December 21, 2018, shows the site is in a 0.2% annual flood hazard area. Please provide a floodplain

analysis report and document and mitigate any floodplain impacts. Any additional floodplain impacts on existing adjacent properties should be explained.

3, cont.

Please ensure that any increase in storm water runoff to State Drainage Systems or Facilities be treated, contained on project site, and metered to preconstruction levels. If the project involves drainage work that flows into the State Drainage System, please provide a drainage design memorandum, which shows how the proposed drainage system flows on the plans. The drainage design memorandum should include pre and post project flow to the existing drainage system. Drainage plan and profile sheets should include lengths, size, and types of new and existing pipes, inlets, outlets, and systems showing any utility conflicts. Plans should also include drainage details and profiles for connection to the existing drainage system. Assumptions and calculations used in designing the drainage system should be shown.

4

Construction-Related Impacts

Project work that requires movement of oversized or excessive load vehicles on State roadways requires a transportation permit that is issued by Caltrans. To apply, please visit Caltrans Transportation Permits ([link](#)). Prior to construction, coordination may be required with Caltrans to develop a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) to reduce construction traffic impacts to the State Transportation Network (STN).

5

Encroachment Permit

Please be advised that any temporary or permanent work including traffic control that encroaches in, under, or over any portion of the State highway Rights-of-Way (ROW) requires a Caltrans-issued encroachment permit.

The Office of Encroachment Permits requires 100% complete design plans and supporting documents to review and circulate the permit application package. The review and approval of encroachment projects is managed through the Encroachment Permits Office Process (EPOP) or the Project Delivery Quality Management Assessment Process (QMAP), depending on project scope, complexity, and completeness of the application. Please use the following resources to determine the appropriate review process:

6

- TR-0416 Applicant's Checklist ([link](#))
- Caltrans Encroachment Projects Processes – Information Video ([link](#))
- Flowchart, Figure 1.2 in Section 108, Overview of the Encroachment Review Process, of Chapter 100 – The Permit Function, Caltrans Encroachment Permit Manual ([link](#))

The permit approval typically takes less than 60 days, but may take longer depending on the project scope, size, complexity, completeness, compliance with applicable

laws, standards, policies, and quality of the permit package submitted. Projects requiring exceptions to design standards, exceptions to encroachment policies, or external agency approvals may need more time to process.

6, cont.

To obtain more information and download the permit application, please visit Caltrans Encroachment Permits ([link](#)).

Thank you again for including Caltrans in the environmental review process. Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Llisel Ayon, Associate Transportation Planner, via LDR-D4@dot.ca.gov. For future early coordination opportunities or project referrals, please visit Caltrans LDR website ([link](#)) or contact LDR-D4@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



YUNSHENG LUO
Branch Chief, Local Development Review
Office of Regional and Community Planning

c: State Clearinghouse

Letter 4

COMMENTER: Yunsheng Luo, Branch Chief, Local Development Review, Office of Regional and Community Planning, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

DATE: November 24, 2025

Response 4.1

The commenter thanks the City for including Caltrans in the environmental review process and states the Local Development Review Program reviews land use projects and plans to ensure consistency with Caltrans' mission and state planning priorities. The commenter provides a summary of their understanding of the project.

The commenter's understanding of the project is accurate. This comment does not relate directly to the adequacy of the information or analysis within the Draft IS-MND. No revisions to the Draft IS-MND have been made in response to this comment.

Response 4.2

The commenter states that the project's vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis and significance determination were conducted in accordance with the City's adopted VMT guidelines and that the MND concludes the project would have a less-than-significant VMT impact.

As discussed under Impact b. in Section 4.17, *Transportation* of the IS-MND, the transportation VMT analysis is based on the City's adopted Policy for Analyzing VMT Impact under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No revisions to the IS-MND have been made in response to this comment.

Response 4.3

The commenter states that the project site is located in a base floodplain, as shown on Federal Emergency Management Agency map 06001C0254H (effective December 21, 2018), within a 0.2 percent annual flood hazard area. The commenter requested a floodplain analysis report, documentation, and mitigation of any floodplain impacts, as well as an explanation of any additional impacts on adjacent properties.

As discussed under Impact d. in Section 4.10, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, the project site's expansion area is located in Zone AE, which is defined as a high-risk area for flooding. The project site is also located in a tsunami hazard area. Approval of the CUP would expand operations into the proposed 2-acre expansion area but would not substantially increase the amount of hazardous waste on-site, since existing scrap piles on the existing operations portion of the site would be relocated to the proposed expansion area. The project is subject to multiple state and local regulations for the regulation of hazardous materials and runoff. With compliance with existing regulations, the project would not increase the risk of release of pollutants in the event of a flood or have additional impacts on adjacent properties. No revisions to the IS-MND have been made in response to this comment.

Response 4.4

The commenter states that any increase in stormwater runoff to State Drainage Systems or Facilities should be treated, contained on-site, and metered to preconstruction levels. If the project involves

drainage work flowing into the State Drainage System, the commenter requests a drainage design memorandum showing proposed drainage flows, including pre- and post-project flow, plan and profile sheets with lengths, sizes, types of pipes, inlets, outlets, and systems, as well as utility conflicts. The memorandum should also include drainage details, profiles for connections to the existing system, and all assumptions and calculations used in designing the drainage system.

As described in Section 19, *Utilities and Service Systems* of the IS-MND, stormwater from the project site drains west to Washington Avenue, where it is collected by storm drains into the City's stormwater system. Stormwater runoff is collected and disposed of by an integrated system of storm drains, inlets, curbside gutters, catch basins, drainage ditches, and man-made channels. Ultimately, stormwater that enters the City's system drains to the San Francisco Bay. As stated in Section 10, *Hydrology and Water Quality* of the IS-MND, the project would be required to comply with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit requirements, C.3 Stormwater Guidelines, and would be subject to a site-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan to control stormwater runoff. The proposed expansion area would be paved and designed for stormwater control and treatment. The project applicant would also be required to comply with grading and excavation regulations established by the City and obtain appropriate permits prior to project approval. As discussed in Section 4, *Biological Resources* of the IS-MND, a drainage plan is required to be prepared by a civil engineer and submitted to the City for approval prior to issuance of a grading permit. Where appropriate, the control measures must include measures including, but not limited to, short-term erosion control planting, waterproof slope covers, stormwater retention basins, and devices to trap, store, and filter sediment during project construction and operation. No revisions to the IS-MND have been made in response to this comment.

Response 4.5

The commenter states that any project work requiring movement of oversized or excessive load vehicles on state roadways will need a transportation permit issued by Caltrans and provided a link for applying. The commenter also notes that prior to construction, coordination with Caltrans may be necessary to develop a Transportation Management Plan to minimize construction traffic impacts on the State Transportation Network.

As stated in the IS-MND Project Description, the proposed project is not intended to increase the amount of materials received or processed at the facility, but to improve handling of materials. Overall, the proposed project would not increase equipment use, employee count, or amount of material processed on-site. Furthermore, the project does not involve construction of new structures. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project would require movement of oversized or excessive load vehicles on state roadways. Nonetheless, the project would comply with all applicable requirements for oversized or excessive load vehicles, including obtaining a transportation permit from Caltrans prior to any work involving such vehicles on state roadways. Additionally, the project sponsor will coordinate with Caltrans before construction to develop a Transportation Management Plan, if required, to minimize potential traffic impacts on the State Transportation Network. No revisions to the IS-MND have been made in response to this comment.

Response 4.6

The commenter states that any temporary or permanent work, including traffic control, that encroaches in, under, or over state highway rights-of-way requires a Caltrans-issued encroachment permit. The commenter explained that the permit process requires 100 percent complete design plans and supporting documents and is managed through either the Encroachment Permits Office

Process or the Project Delivery Quality Management Assessment Process, depending on project scope and complexity. The commenter provided resources for determining the appropriate review process and notes that permit approval typically takes less than 60 days but may take longer for projects requiring design exceptions, policy exceptions, or external agency approvals.

The proposed project would not involve improvements in Caltrans right-of-way along Doolittle Drive fronting the project site. Nonetheless, should improvements along Doolittle Drive be needed, the project would comply with all Caltrans requirements for temporary or permanent work, including traffic control, that encroaches in, under, or over state highway rights-of-way. The City will include the following Condition of Approval for the project:

The applicant is responsible for obtaining the approval of all participating regulatory and non-City agencies. The applicant shall obtain an Encroachment Permit from the State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for all work within the state right-of-way.

No revisions to the IS-MND have been made in response to this comment.

November 24, 2025

Cindy Lemaire, AICP, CNU-A, Senior Planner
 City of San Leandro
 835 East 14th Street
 San Leandro, California 94577

Submitted via email to clemaire@sanleandro.org

RE: Alco Iron & Metal Company Facility Expansion Project, Draft Initial Study-Mitigated Negative Declaration (PLN21-0027)

Dear Mx. Lemaire,

We submit this letter on behalf of Communities for a Better Environment, East Oakland (“CBE”) regarding the Alco Iron & Metal Company (“Alco”) Facility Expansion Project (“Project”). CBE is an organization building people power in California’s communities of color and low-income communities to achieve environmental health and justice by preventing and reducing pollution and building green, health, and sustainable communities and environment. CBE members in East Oakland live, work, play, and pray near heavy industrial pollution sources, including Alco. We urge Alco and the City of San Leandro to revise and recirculate the draft initial study and mitigated negative declaration (“MND”) to implement more stringent mitigation and monitoring practices given the heavy cumulative pollution in the area and Alco’s history of deadly non-compliance with health-protective regulations.

Alco is located on the border of East Oakland and San Leandro, in a predominantly Black and Latine working-class community experiencing severe pollution. Decades of racist zoning and development policies have created a deadly cycle of harm in East Oakland. For example, the 880 highway and local streets are congested with cars and diesel trucks emitting exhaust, crematories release heavy metals near residences, the Oakland Airport burns massive volumes of jet fuel, and facilities like Alco process and store toxic materials on already contaminated soil. This cumulative pollution contributes to Deep East Oaklanders experiencing some of the worst health outcomes in the state. Residents of Deep East Oakland experience asthma hospital visits at a rate higher than 99% of California, live with more toxic cleanup sites than 94% of California, and the most impacted residents have an average life expectancy that is 15 years less than life expectancy in the wealthiest parts of Alameda County.¹

¹ CalEnviroScreen 4.0, Cal OEHHA (last accessed Nov. 24, 2025), https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/11d2f52282a54ceebcac7428e6184203/page/CalEnviroScreen-4_0/ (results for Deep East Oakland Census tracts below International Blvd. nearest Alco and other major industrial pollution: 6001409000, 6001408800, 6001409100, 6001409500, 6001408900, 6001409400, 6001409200,

The MND must be revised to include a description of the environmental setting that includes the Project's location in an overburdened community. Due to the disproportionately heavy pollution burden and health inequities, East Oakland was prioritized by the Bay Area Air District ("BAAD") to conduct a Community Emissions Reduction Plan ("CERP") under Assembly Bill 617. CBE has served as a co-lead of the CERP process with BAAD over the past several years. Alco is located on the border of the East Oakland CERP boundary. Alco is in a census tract with 7,000 residents that share similarly severe environmental health burdens² and meets the Bay Area Air District ("BAAD") of an overburdened community.³ The MND acknowledges this designation and provides CalEnviroScreen scores in the tables of Attachment A but does not discuss this in the body of the MND.⁴ This is not sufficient under the California Environmental Quality Act.⁵ Alco is nearby a popular golf course and basketball courts, is located on a highly trafficked local road, and neighbors residential areas. The overburdened community is therefore highly likely to be exposed to any Project impacts. By omitting this discussion in the body, the MND fails as an informational document because it does not adequately disclose the true environmental impacts to those most likely to be affected by the Project.

3

Further, given Alco's deadly history of violating regulations, we urge the City of San Leandro to require more stringent mitigation, public notice and disclosure requirements, and independent monitoring prior to certification of the MND and approval of any further permits. Project construction will disturb acres of contaminated soil containing diesel-range organics (DRO), arsenic, nickel, and cobalt above safety thresholds.⁶ To mitigate the potentially significant impact of disturbing contaminated soil, the MND states, "The City of San Leandro shall ensure that a written [Site Management Plan], [Health and Safety Plan], and remedial measures for impacted soils has been prepared and approved prior to issuance of a grading permit."⁷ Assuming regulatory compliance is not enough assurance of mitigation for a company that has seen three employees have killed on-site in the last eight years, that has been fined for more than 60 safety violations going back to the 1990's, exposed employees and their families to toxic lead, and received an Air District notice of violation for open burning.⁸ CBE urges the

4

6001409300); Tejada-Vera et al., *Life Expectancy Estimates by U.S. Census Tract, 2010-2015*, National Center for Health Statistics (2020).

² CalEnviroScreen 4.0, census tract 6001432400.

³ Bay Area Air District, Best Practices for Centering Environmental Justice, Health, and Equity, CEQA Guidelines (2022), at 2-9, https://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa-guidelines-2022/ceqa-guidelines-chapter-2-environmental-justicefinal-pdf.pdf?rev=724445e52f394fe1ab3d3b1636b6d023&sc_lang=en.

⁴ MND at 200-204.

⁵ 14 Cal Code Regs §15063(d)(MND must provide a description of the Project Setting); *Santa Clarita Organization for Planning the Environment v. County of Los Angeles* (2003) 106 Cal.App.4th 715, 722 [an agency's analysis must be contained in the body of the document, not "scattered here and there in...appendices"].

⁶ MND at 68.

⁷ MND at 72-73.

⁸ Lisa Fernandez, *3 workers killed at San Leandro company; Cal-OSHA has no power to shut down*, KTVU (Apr. 30, 2025) <https://www.ktvu.com/news/alco-3-workers-killed-san-leandro-company-cal-osh-has-no-power-shut-down>; Bay Area Air District, Notice of Violation No. A56699A (issued Aug. 26, 2021).

East Oakland
 100 Hegenberger Rd., Suite 270
 Oakland, CA 94621

Richmond
 340 Marina Way
 Richmond, CA 94801

Southeast Los Angeles
 6325 Pacific Blvd., Suite 300
 Huntington Park, CA 90255

Wilmington
 113 E Anaheim St
 Wilmington, CA 90744

adoption of mitigation measures that provide transparent, stringent, and specific procedures for the protection of on and off-site workers, members of the public using Doolittle Drive and nearby recreational facilities, and nearby residents. The MND should be revised to allow public review of a complete remediation and mitigation plan. At a minimum, the MND could incorporate a requirement that a draft of the remediation and mitigation plan be released to the public and provide the public with an opportunity to comment before the plan is finalized and adopted. Such a plan must account for impacts to residents and should include rigorous compliance monitoring conducted by the City of San Leandro or another reputable independent body. Per BAAD's environmental justice guidelines,⁹ the Project sponsor should conduct outreach and engagement with neighboring communities regarding the Project's potential impacts and mitigation measures.

4, cont.

CBE urges the City of San Leandro to prioritize environmental justice communities' right to a healthy, livable environment. We thank you for your review and consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

Sarah Chen Small
Associate Attorney, East Oakland
Communities for a Better Environment

⁹ BAAD 2022 CEQA Guidelines, at 2-7.

Letter 5

COMMENTER: Sarah Chen Small, Associate Attorney, East Oakland, Communities for a Better Environment

DATE: November 24, 2025

Response 5.1

The commenter introduces the organization and urges the City to revise and recirculate the Draft IS-MND to implement more stringent mitigation and monitoring practices.

For responses to specific issues raised please see responses 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4.

Response 5.2

The commenter states that the Alco Iron & Metal Company is located on the border of East Oakland and San Leandro in a predominantly Black and Latino working-class community that experiences severe cumulative pollution due to decades of discriminatory zoning and development policies. The commenter notes that sources of pollution include congested highways and diesel truck traffic, crematories releasing heavy metals, jet fuel emissions from the Oakland San Francisco Bay Airport, and facilities like the Alco Iron & Metal Company handling toxic materials on contaminated soil. The commenter suggests that this cumulative burden contributes to poor health outcomes compared to the rest of California, including very high asthma hospitalization rates, more toxic cleanup sites, and a decreased life expectancy.

The comment raises concerns regarding cumulative environmental burdens and health disparities in East Oakland and surrounding communities but does not provide specific information or analysis related to the analysis in the Draft IS-MND. As discussed in Section 3, *Air Quality*, of the IS-MND, the project was assessed for its potential to result in cumulative impacts regarding air pollution. The project was found to have a less-than-significant impact related to construction emissions. With respect to operational emissions, the project was found to reduce air pollutant and toxic air contaminant (TAC) emissions from engine combustion due to reduced idling time. Therefore, compared to existing conditions, the project would improve air quality. Additionally, the proposed expansion area would be covered by metal plates and would not involve exposed dirt that could create dust emissions from trucks driving on the site or from wind. Furthermore, pursuant to a Condition of Approval for the project required by the City, the paving of and improvements to Eden Road would be constructed prior to implementation of the requested CUP, which would substantially reduce track-out and dust emissions from trucks driving on Eden Road.

As discussed in Section 9, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, the IS-MND evaluates potential impacts of the proposed project in accordance with CEQA based partially on a Phase 2 soil investigation for the project site. The Phase 2 investigation tested for various contaminants, including petroleum hydrocarbons, volatile organic compounds, polychlorinated biphenyls, and metals. With preparation of a Soil Management Plan as required under Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, the project would not result in impacts related to potential contamination encountered during construction.

Overall, the IS-MND discloses environmental impacts associated with the project as required under CEQA. The analyses related to air quality, noise, and hazards and hazardous materials account for potential impacts to the nearest sensitive land uses or receptors, which are located approximately

0.4 mile from the project site, as well as potential cumulative impacts. These impacts were found to be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation. No revisions to the IS-MND have been made in response to this comment.

Response 5.3

The commenter states an opinion that the IS-MND must be revised to include a description of the environmental setting that acknowledges the project's location in an overburdened community. The commenter notes that East Oakland, due to its heavy pollution burden and health inequities, was prioritized by BAAD for a Community Emissions Reduction Plan (CERP) under Assembly Bill 617. The commenter states that the Alco Iron & Metal Company is located on the border of the East Oakland CERP boundary in a census tract of 7,000 residents with severe environmental health burdens and meets BAAD's definition of an overburdened community. The commenter suggests that it is necessary to discuss this context in the IS-MND to adequately disclose environmental impacts to those most likely to be affected, given the proximity to residential areas, recreational facilities, and highly trafficked roads.

In response to this comment, additional information has been added to the *Air Quality Setting* in Section 3, *Air Quality* of the Final IS-MND to explain that the project site is within a Disadvantaged Community according to the California Environmental Protection Agency and the San Leandro General Plan Environmental Justice Element. The *Air Quality Setting* has also been updated to include the CalEnviroScreen score and states that the project site is near the boundary of the East Oakland CERP. The text revisions in the Final IS-MND do not affect the findings or conclusions of the IS-MND.

The IS-MND evaluates potential impacts related to air quality, hazardous materials, and cumulative impacts, and incorporates mitigation measures to reduce potential adverse effects to the extent feasible under CEQA. As discussed in Section 3, *Air Quality*, project construction would generate negligible TAC emissions due to its short duration (about 30 days) and low intensity, and health risk assessment is not required for activities under two months per Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment guidance. The nearest sensitive receptors are 0.4 mile away. During operation, the project would reduce TAC emissions by improving truck circulation and decreasing idling, without introducing new TAC sources or vehicle trips. As a result, carbon monoxide hotspots would also decrease. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and the impact would be less than significant. As discussed in Section 21, *Mandatory Findings of Significance*, the impacts associated with the project are anticipated to be localized at the project site and would not be expected to combine with other projects to cause cumulatively considerable environmental impacts. Given the limited impacts anticipated with project implementation, the project would not cause considerable contributions to significant cumulative impacts.

Response 5.4

The commenter states that, given the Alco Iron & Metal Company's history of regulatory noncompliance, the City should consider requiring additional mitigation measures, public notice and disclosure requirements, and independent monitoring prior to certifying the IS-MND or approving permits. The commenter notes that project construction would disturb contaminated soil containing diesel-range organics, arsenic, nickel, and cobalt above safety thresholds and expressed concern that reliance on regulatory compliance alone may not provide sufficient assurance. The commenter recommends revising the IS-MND to include transparent and specific procedures for protecting

workers, nearby residents, and the public, and suggested allowing public review and comment on a draft remediation and mitigation plan before finalization. The commenter also recommends compliance monitoring by the City or an independent entity and outreach to neighboring communities in alignment with environmental justice guidelines.

The IS-MND evaluates potential hazards associated with soil disturbance during construction and includes mitigation measures consistent with applicable regulatory standards. Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 requires preparation and implementation of a Site Management Plan by a qualified environmental professional prior to ground-disturbing activities. The Site Management Plan would include procedures for worker protection, soil handling, dust control, and disposal of contaminated materials in compliance with state and federal regulations. Furthermore, as implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1, which implements BAAD's best management practices, would reduce the potential for project construction activities to result in fugitive dust impacts, implementation of this measure would reduce project impacts related to air quality to a less-than-significant level.

A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program has been prepared for the project as required by CEQA. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program includes a description of monitoring and enforcement procedures for the City to ensure the applicant complies with required mitigation measures. No revisions to the IS-MND have been made in response to this comment.

This page intentionally left blank.