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This presentation has been prepared in advance of a meeting of the Ad Hoc Airport Regional Policy Committee.

Minor changes to the information contained herein may be made prior to the meeting.

This document contains concepts and analyses for consideration and discussion which will be used as context during the meeting. No decision regarding the implementation of these concepts has been made.
Agenda

1. Recap of evaluation matrix summary
2. Preliminary development phasing
3. Proposed financial analysis scope
4. Conclusions and next steps
Today’s Meeting Objectives

- Review preliminary development phasing
- Discuss proposed financial analysis scope
Recap of alternatives evaluation matrix

- Recap of alternatives evaluation process
- Sensitivity testing – removal of qualitative criteria
- Recap of traffic analysis
**GOALS & OBJECTIVES**

1. Improve access and parking
2. Develop intermodal facility regional connectivity
3. Develop efficient terminal facilities and user satisfaction
4. Develop best airfield configuration for horizon PAL
5. Incorporate environmental stewardship best practices
6. Develop a financially feasible plan
7. Provide social and economic benefits
8. Integrate airport facilities into fabric of community through urban design

**SCREENING MATRIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUANTITATIVE SCORE</th>
<th>QUALITATIVE SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Economic / Financial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Environmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Social Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALTERNATIVES**

- Family A
- ITC
- Family B
Evaluation Criteria

- **Quantitative criteria**
  - Goal to maximize quantitative criteria within all categories
  - Sought out quantifiable differences between alternatives
    - e.g. capital costs, walking distance

- **Qualitative criteria**
  - Aesthetics
  - Community controversy
  - Enhance MCRD mission
  - Environmental mitigation
  - Hazardous materials
  - Threatened & endangered species
  - Historic properties
Committee requested removal of qualitative/subjective criteria for sensitivity testing:

- Potential for community controversy
  - Very subjective
  - Self fulfilling

- Aesthetics (viewshed)
  - Very subjective
  - Future design consideration

- Revenue evaluation
  - Should be based on actual analysis, to be prepared later
### Sensitivity Testing of Screening Results

#### SUMMARY MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic/financial factors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational factors</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental factors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social responsibility</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SCORE</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### REVISED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic/financial factors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational factors</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental factors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social responsibility</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVISED SCORE</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
Lowest score represents the best alternative(s)
Traffic Analysis Assumptions - Recap

- Traffic Analysis Assumptions
  - Airport generated traffic will increase relative to passenger, cargo and general aviation activity
  - Airport traffic was redistributed based on the location of terminal processing, parking, rental car, cargo and general aviation facilities
  - Non-airport traffic growth was based on SANDAG regional transportation forecast model
  - SANDAG airport transit forecasts were used in analyzing future traffic conditions
    - Alternatives A2 and B1: PAL 2 Transit Ridership = 19% (includes shared-ride vans)
    - Alternatives A3 and A8: PAL 2 Transit Ridership = 11% (includes shared-ride vans)
2030 Traffic – Key Roads

Grape (Pacific/Kettner)

- **Base**
- **A2**
- **A3**
- **A8**

Non-Airport Traffic

Airport Traffic

- **Capacity**
- Mitigated Capacity

Hawthorn (Pacific/Kettner)

- **Base**
- **A2**
- **A3**
- **A8**

Non-Airport Traffic

Airport Traffic

- **Capacity**
- Mitigated Capacity

Base = Existing airport with T2West Expansion
2030 Traffic – Key Roads

Pacific (Palm/Laurel)

- Base
- A2
- A3
- A8

India (Sassafras/Washington)

- Base
- A2
- A3
- A8

Non-Airport Traffic
Airport Traffic
Capacity
Mitigated Capacity

Base = Existing airport with T2West Expansion
2030 Traffic - Key Roads

Laurel (Pacific/Kettner)

- Average daily traffic (ADT)
- Base
- A2
- A3
- A8

Rosecrans (Quimby/Barnett)

- Average daily traffic (ADT)
- Base
- A2
- A3
- A8

- Non-Airport Traffic
- Airport Traffic
- Capacity
- Mitigated Capacity

Base = Existing airport with T2West Expansion
Traffic Analysis Findings

- Alternative A2 results in the best average LOS*
- Alternative A3 results in the worst average LOS primarily due to 30% of terminal processing remaining on North Harbor Drive
- Alternative A2 results in an acceptable LOS on North Harbor Drive
- Pacific Highway remains at an acceptable LOS in all alternatives
- India Street remains at an unacceptable LOS F in all alternatives due to the high volume of non-airport traffic

*Acceptable Level of Service (LOS) defined as C or better
A2 ranks best among the A series
A8 ranks poorest among the A series
Each alternative has specific individual merits
Planning team has taken the following actions
- Prepared a preliminary development phasing plan combining some attributes of all three remaining A series alternatives
- At ultimate buildout, either A2 or A3 can be implemented
- Internal circulation road from A8 was used
A8 is recommended for additional analysis by the planning team to fully understand the positive and negative aspects of that alternative
Preliminary development phasing

- Phasing plan goals
- Facility phasing matrix
- Opening day Intermodal Transit Center (ITC)
- Overall development phasing:
  - Opening day ITC
  - Planning Activity Level 1
  - Planning Activity Level 2
Phasing Plan Goals

- Do not preclude the option of developing airline gates in the north (i.e. Alternative B1)
- Create a “Path to the Future” for a fully-capable intermodal center with passenger check-in
- Develop a realistic plan for ITC facility growth that will match improvements in the San Diego transit network through 2030
- Assemble an “opening day” level of facilities that will allow the ITC to be developed on a fast track
- Include facilities in the opening day plan that can have a significant positive impact on traffic congestion (i.e. CONRAC)
- Provide flexibility to conclude with either A2 or A3 in the ultimate development, depending on conditions at that time
# Facility Phasing Matrix

## ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITC OPENING DAY</th>
<th>PAL1</th>
<th>PAL2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enplaned passengers</td>
<td>2015 (approximate)</td>
<td>2020 (approximate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated transit ridership</td>
<td>10 million</td>
<td>11 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Key Facilities</td>
<td>4% - 6%</td>
<td>7% - 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY</td>
<td>2015 (approximate)</td>
<td>2020 (approximate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport entrance</td>
<td>South / North</td>
<td>South / North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airline ticketing</td>
<td>South (North for those not checking baggage)</td>
<td>South / North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baggage check / claim</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>South / North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT DEFINITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITC</td>
<td>2 trolley tracks, 2 coaster tracks, elevated walkway, shuttle or APM</td>
<td>1 additional trolley line, freight bypass, APM, Phase 1 – processing, grade separations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Access</td>
<td>Via existing circulation roads</td>
<td>New ramps to north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-speed rail</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONRAC/north side parking</td>
<td>9,000 – 10,000 spaces, including storage</td>
<td>14,000-15,000 spaces, including storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South side parking</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baggage conveyance system</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation roadway “loop”</td>
<td>Existing access with minor improvements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concourses</td>
<td>Terminal 2, 10 gate expansion</td>
<td>Terminal 1 replacement gates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition (non-MCRD)</td>
<td>Initial ITC phase property</td>
<td>Expanded ITC property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ITC
- Trolley and Coaster tracks
- Passenger walkway
- CONRAC
- Alternative B1 terminal footprint
- ITC/CONRAC access routes
- On-airport roadway – link to terminals

Development Phasing

- Existing facilities
- New facilities
- On-airport roadway

Development Phasing

JACOBS CONSULTANCY

DESTINATION LINDBERGH - THE ULTIMATE BUILD-OUT