

In association with

HNTB Corporation Alcantar & Associates, LLC Cephas, Inc. David Evans and Associates, Inc. DKS Associates NEXTOR Parametrix Synergy Consultants, Inc. Zimmer Gunsul Frasca Architects, LLP

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM NO. 4 – ALTERNATIVES

MASTER PLAN UPDATE PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Prepared for Port of Portland Portland, Oregon

November 2009





TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM NO. 4 - ALTERNATIVES

MASTER PLAN UPDATE PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Prepared for

Port of Portland Portland, Oregon

November 2009

CONTENTS

			Page
1.	INTR	ODUCTION AND SUMMARY	1-1
	1.1	PLANNING ACTIVITY LEVELS	1-1
	1.2	SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS	1-2
	1.3	 EMERGING DEVELOPMENT CONCEPTS 1.3.1 Development by Planning Activity Level 1 1.3.2 Development by Planning Activity Level 2 1.3.3 Development by Planning Activity Level 3 1.3.4 Development by Planning Activity Level 4 1.3.5 Development by Planning Activity Level 5 	1-2 1-2 1-4 1-6 1-6 1-9
	1.4	 BACKGROUND, PROCESS, AND KEY ASSUMPTIONS 1.4.1 Initial Work Plan 1.4.2 Evolution of Initial Work Plan 1.4.3 Approach for Moving Forward 1.4.4 Sustainability Criteria for Facilities Planning 	1-11 1-11 1-12 1-14 1-16
2.	VIAB	ILITY OF THE CENTRALIZED CONCEPT	2-1
	2.1	APPROACH	2-1
	2.2	TERMINAL ELEMENTS	2-1
	2.3	LANDSIDE ELEMENTS	2-6
	2.4	LAND AVAILABLE FOR DISPLACED FACILITIES	2-8
	2.5	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	2-8
3.	AIRF	IELD	3-1
	3.1	BACKGROUND	3-1
	3.2	CROSS-FIELD TAXIWAY LOCATION 3.2.1 Prior Planning 3.2.2 Alignment	3-1 3-2 3-2
	3.3	THIRD PARALLEL RUNWAY	3-4



CONTENTS (continued)

			Page
4.	PAS	SENGER TERMINAL	4-1
	4.1	BACKGROUND	4-1
	4.2	LONG-RANGE TERMINAL DEVELOPMENT CONCEPTS 4.2.1 Alternatives 4.2.2 Identification of Preferred Concept	4-2 4-2 4-7
	4.3	REMAIN OVERNIGHT AIRCRAFT PARKING4.3.1Remain Overnight Requirements4.3.2Remain Overnight Alternatives4.3.3Evaluation of Alternatives	4-9 4-9 4-9 4-12
	4.4	STRATEGY FOR MAINTAINING TERMINAL EFFECTIVENESS	4-13
5.	GRC	UND TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING	5-1
	5.1	PARKING	5-1
	5.2	 RENTAL CARS	5-4 5-4 5-9 5-14
	5.3	ENPLANING AND DEPLANING CURBSIDE ROADWAYS	5-15
	5.4	TERMINAL AREA ROADWAYS AND INTERSECTIONS 5.4.1 Terminal Area Roadways 5.4.2 Terminal Area Intersections	5-18 5-18 5-21
	5.5	ACCESS ROADWAY INTERSECTIONS	5-24



CONTENTS (continued)

		Page
6. AIR	CARGO	6-1
6.1	BACKGROUND	6-1
6.2	BELLY-CARGO FACILITIES	6-1
6.3	ALL-CARGO FACILITIES	6-4
7. GEI	NERAL AVIATION	7-1
7.1	BACKGROUND	7-1
7.2	ALTERNATIVES	7-1
8. RE(COMMENDED FUTURE STUDIES	8-1
8.1	PASSENGER TERMINAL MASTER PLAN	8-1
	8.1.1 Background	8-1
	8.1.2 Objective	8-1
	8.1.3 Scope	8-1
	8.1.4 Timing	8-3
8.2	TERMINAL EXPANSION EAST PROJECT DEFINITION	8-3
	8.2.1 Background	8-3
	822 Objective	8-4
	823 Scope	8-4
	8.2.4 Timing	8-5
0.2		
0.5		8-5
	9.2.1 Bockground	0-5
	8.2.2 Objectives	0-5
		0-0
		8-7
	8.3.4 I Iming	8-8
8.4	P4 PARKING GARAGE PROJECT DEFINITION	8-8
	8.4.1 Background	8-8
	8.4.2 Objectives	8-8
	8.4.3 Scope	8-9
	8.4.4 Timing	8-9



Page

CONTENTS (continued)

8.5	ALL-CA	RGO DEVELOPMENT STUDY	8-9
	8.5.1	Background	8-9
	8.5.2	Objectives	8-9
	8.5.3	Scope	8-10
	8.5.4	Timing	8-10
8.6	GATE N	ANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS STUDY	8-10
	8.6.1	Background	8-10
	8.6.2	Objectives	8-10
	8.6.3	Scope	8-10
	8.6.4	Timing	8-11
8.7	CONCC	OURSE A IMPROVEMENTS STUDY	8-11
	8.7.1	Background	8-11
	8.7.2	Objective	8-11
	8.7.3	Scope	8-11
	8.7.4	Timing	8-11
8.8	CONCC	OURSE E REGIONAL AIRLINE HOLDROOM	
	IMPRO	VEMENTS	8-11
	8.8.1	Background	8-11
	8.8.2	Objectives	8-12
	8.8.3	Scope	8-12
	8.8.4	Timing	8-12
8.9	AIRCRA	AFT RESCUE AND FIREFIGHTING FACILITIES	
	SITING	STUDY	8-12
	8.9.1	Background	8-12
	8.9.2	Objectives	8-12
	8.9.3	Scope	8-12
	8.9.4	Timing	8-12
8.10	82ND A	VENUE GRADE-SEPARATED INTERCHANGE	
	PROJE	CT DEFINITION	8-12
	8.10.1	Background	8-12
	8.10.2	Objectives	8-13
	8.10.3	Scope	8-13
	8.10.4	Timing	8-13



Page

CONTENTS (continued)

8.11	HIGH-S	SPEED RAIL STUDY	8-14
	8.11.1	Background	8-14
	8.11.2	Objectives	8-14
	8.11.3	Scope	8-14
	8.11.4	Timing	8-14
		-	
8.12	REMAI	N OVERNIGHT AIRCRAFT PARKING RAMP	
	DESIG	N STUDY	8-14
	8.12.1	Background	8-14
	8.12.2	Objectives	8-15
	8.12.3	Scope	8-15
	8.12.4	Timing	8-15
0 1 2			
0.13			0.45
	REDEV		0.45
	8.13.1	Background	8-15
	8.13.2	Objectives	8-16
	8.13.3	Scope	8-16
	8.13.4	Timing	8-16
8.14	ENPLA	NING ROADWAY STUDY	8-16
0111	8 14 1	Background	8-16
	8 14 2	Objectives	8-16
	8 14 3	Scope	8-17
	8 1/ /	Timing	0-17 8_17
	0.14.4	i ii iiii iy	0-17

Appendix

- A Facility Requirements
- B Life-Cycle Cost Analysis of Alternatives for Transporting Rental Car Customers To and From the Terminal
- C Aircraft Noise Assessment
- D Cost Estimates



TABLES

1-1	Aviation Demand Forecasts	1-1
2-1	Primary Terminal Requirements for 50th and 90th Percentile PAL 5 Demand	2-4
2-2	Primary Landside Requirements for 50th and 90th Percentile Planning Activity Level 5 Demand	2-7
5-1	Comparison of the P3 and P4 Alternative Parking Garage Sites	5-6
5-2	Comparison of Alternative Modes for Transporting Customers Between the P3 Garage and the Passenger Terminal	5-15
8-1	Timing of Recommended Future Studies	8-2

FIGURES

1-1	Planned Development at PAL 1 (15 Million Annual Passengers; Approximately 2012)	1-3
1-2	Planned Development at PAL 2 (18 Million Annual Passengers; Approximately 2017)	1-5
1-3	Planned Development at PAL 3 (21 Million Annual Passengers; Approximately 2022)	1-7
1-4	Planned Development at PAL 4 (24 Million Annual Passengers; Approximately 2027)	1-8
1-5	Planned Development at PAL 5 (27 Million Annual Passengers; Approximately 2035)	1-10
1-6	Centralized Airport Development Concept	1-12
1-7	Decentralized Airport Development Concept	1-13
2-1	Core Development Area	2-2



FIGURES (continued)

		Page
2-2	Comparison of Passenger Demand Future PDX vs. Large-Hub Airports in 2007	2-3
2-3	Concept for Developing Passenger Terminal Facilities to Accommodate 90th Percentile Demand	2-5
2-4	Concept for Developing Landside Facilities in Response to 90th Percentile Demand	2-9
2-5	Land Use Plan to Accommodate 90th Percentile Demand	2-10
3-1	Concept for the Planned Cross-Field Taxiways	3-3
3-2	Concept for 8,500-Foot-Long Third Parallel Runway	3-5
3-3	Aircraft Departures Accommodated on an 8,500-Foot-Long Third Parallel Runway, by Type	3-6
4-1	Concept 1 – Terminal Expansion East (TEE)	4-3
4-2	Concept 2 - Terminal Expansion Central (TEC)	4-5
4-3	Concept 3 – Replacement Terminal East	4-6
4-4	Concept 4 – Supplemental Terminal East	4-8
4-5	Planned Remain Overnight Parking Capacity for Each Planning Activity Level	4-10
4-6	Alternative Concepts for Locating RON Aircraft Parking	4-11
4-7	Recommended Concept for PAL 1 and PAL 2 RON Aircraft Parking	4-14
5-1	Planned Public Parking Capacity at the End of Each Planning Activity Level	5-2
5-2	Locations of the P3 and P4 Parking Garages and Other Potential Long-Term Development	5-3
5-3	Facilities Potentially Impacted by the P3 Garage	5-5



FIGURES (continued)

		Page
5-4	Planned Rental Car Ready/Return Parking Capacity at the End of Each Planning Activity Level	5-7
5-5	Planned Rental Car Service Facility Area at the End of Each Planning Activity Level	5-8
5-6	Alternative Concepts for Locating a Consolidated Rental Car Facility	5-10
5-7	Concept for an Automated People Mover System Between the Passenger Terminal and Consolidated Rental Car Facility	5-11
5-8	Concepts for Max Light Rail Between the Passenger Terminal and Consolidated Rental Car Facility	5-13
5-9	Planned Enplaning and Deplaning Curbside Capacity at the End of Each Planning Activity Level	5-16
5-10	Curbside Alternative 1 – Reconfigured Commercial Vehicle Area	5-17
5-11	Curbside Alternative 2 – Potential New Curbside on Level 3 of P1 Parking Garage	5-19
5-12	Roadway Links where Improvements are Needed	5-20
5-13	Terminal Area Intersections Assessed	5-22
5-14	Concept for Grade-Separated Intersection of NE 82nd Avenue and NE Airport Way	5-23
5-15	Other Airport Intersections Assessed	5-25
6-1	Cargo Areas	6-2
6-2	Planned Belly-Cargo Warehouse Capacity by Planning Activity Level	6-3
6-3	Planned All-Cargo Warehouse Capacity by Planning Activity Level	6-5
7-1	Alternative Concepts for Locating General Aviation	7-2
8-1	North Side Properties	8-6



1. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

This Technical Memorandum summarizes the alternative concepts considered for satisfying facilities requirements at Portland International Airport (the Airport or PDX) through 2035, as presented in *Technical Memorandum No. 3 – Facility Requirements,* December 2008. Alternative concepts were developed for the airfield (i.e., the runways and taxiways), the passenger terminal, ground transportation and parking, air cargo, and general aviation. The potential cost and aircraft noise impacts of the recommended long-term development concept are summarized in the appendices of this Technical Memorandum.

1.1 Planning Activity Levels

Recognizing the uncertainties associated with long-range aviation demand forecasting, five planning activity levels (PALs) were identified to represent future levels of activity at which key Airport improvements will be necessary. Because, for any number of reasons, activity levels could occur at different periods from those anticipated when the forecasts were prepared, the use of PALs allows for facilities planning that is realistically tied to milestone activity levels as they occur, rather than arbitrary years. PAL 1, PAL 2, PAL 3, PAL 4, and PAL 5 correspond to the 50th percentile aviation demand forecasts for 2012, 2017, 2022, 2027, and 2035, respectively. The aviation demand associated with each PAL is summarized in Table 1-1.

Table 1-1 AVIATION DEMAND FORECASTS						
			Aviation D	emand Fo	recasts (a)
	Actual 2007	PAL 1 2012	PAL 2 2017	PAL 3 2022	PAL 4 2027	PAL 5 2035
Enplaned passengers (thousands)	7,332	7,489	8,992	10,312	11,825	13,393
Total air cargo (thousands of short tons) (b)	280	322	414	496	594	732
Aircraft operations Passenger airline All-cargo airline General aviation Military Other <i>(c)</i> Total Airport aircraft operations	191,554 33,324 27,623 3,707 <u>8,310</u> 264,518	180,400 37,980 26,100 6,000 <u>8,000</u> 258,480	207,000 41,240 28,200 6,000 <u>9,100</u> 291,540	228,000 44,840 29,500 6,000 <u>10,100</u> 318,440	250,600 48,760 30,900 6,000 <u>11,100</u> 347,360	275,000 52,320 32,500 6,000 <u>12,000</u> 377,820

(a) Forecasts are shown for planning activity levels (PALs) and their corresponding years.

(b) A short ton equals 2,000 pounds.

(c) Includes nonscheduled and empty flights.

Sources: Actual 2007 demand from Port of Portland records. Forecast demand from Jacobs Consultancy, *Technical Memorandum No. 2 – Aviation Demand Forecasts*, September 2008.



1.2 Summary of Requirements

The most significant findings reported in *Technical Memorandum No. 3 – Facility Requirements* were that (1) a third parallel runway will not be required during the planning period and (2) terminal and ground access requirements can continue to be satisfied within the existing terminal envelope. Continued Airport development within the planning period will be required; however, it will not be necessary to implement a new Airport development concept (e.g., the centralized or decentralized development concept) as envisioned at the conclusion of the *2000 Airport Master Plan*.

The detailed requirements, which form the basis for the alternatives presented in this Technical Memorandum, are summarized in Table 1-2 from *Technical Memorandum No. 3 – Facility Requirements*, which is reproduced in Appendix A.

1.3 Emerging Development Concepts

This section provides an overview of how future development may occur at the Airport through a series of illustrations depicting the locations where recommended development concepts (hereafter referred to as "projects") will be implemented. The overview is organized by PAL and includes descriptions of the significant projects that will be needed to satisfy major functional requirements.

PAL 1 through PAL 5 correspond with the enplaned passengers, air cargo, and aircraft operations demand forecast to occur in 2012, 2017, 2022, 2027, and 2035, respectively. The functional requirements were developed based on activity, not time. Therefore, if activity does not occur as quickly as anticipated, the projects remain valid although the timing of their implementation may change.

It should be noted that sustainability planning principles, as developed during this Master Plan, were used extensively in developing the recommended concepts. These principles are discussed in detailed later in this Technical Memorandum.

1.3.1 Development by Planning Activity Level 1

PAL 1 demand is approximately 15 million total annual passengers, 322,000 short tons of cargo, and 258,000 aircraft operations. The locations of potential Airport development required to accommodate activity at PAL 1 are shown on Figure 1-1.

The most significant project is the remain overnight (RON) aircraft parking ramp, located immediately to the north of NE Airport Way and the hotel properties. This project will enable increased productivity of the aircraft gates located at the terminal.





Source: Jacobs Consultancy, November 2009

Supplemental at-grade rental car service facilities, which include fuel positions, car wash bays, and car storage, will be provided to the east of the existing rental car service facilities. One alternative being considered is that the existing and new rental car service facilities would be connected by a bridge that passes over the ramp leading to rental car facilities inside the P1 garage.

Projects to improve roadway and intersection performance will occur on the terminal exit roadway (a lane addition), the intersection of NE AirTrans Road and Cornfoot Road (a signalized intersection), and the intersection of NE Airport Way and I-205 (the addition of space to accommodate queues of eastbound traffic turning to the north).

Multiple sites have been identified for a second general aviation fixed-base operation, should that be required. For illustrative purposes, the site to the northeast of the intersection of NE Airport Way and NE 82nd Avenue is shown on Figure 1-1. For this project, the Port's costs would be limited to those associated with providing site access, utilities and aircraft ramp. Development costs would be borne by a developer or operator.

Undeveloped parcels located in the northern part of AirTrans Cargo Center would be improved as appropriate for development for all-cargo/maintenance use by a developer or operator.

Minor projects are expected within the passenger terminal related to security screening. As the Transportation Security Administration changes its equipment and procedures associated with passenger security screening, the space associated with the equipment and passenger processing will be rearranged accordingly. These projects are expected to continue throughout the planning period.

1.3.2 Development by Planning Activity Level 2

PAL 2 demand is approximately 18 million total annual passengers, 414,000 short tons of cargo, and 292,000 aircraft operations. The locations of potential Airport development required to accommodate activity at PAL 2 are shown on Figure 1-2.

Significant projects required to accommodate PAL 2 include the construction of a third public parking garage (approximately 2,060 spaces) and a grade-separated interchange at the intersection of NE Airport Way and NE 82nd Avenue. Although the location of the garage will be decided subsequent to the completion of the Master Plan Update, the current consensus is that it would be located immediately to the east of the central utility plant and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) airport traffic control tower (ATCT) as shown on Figure 1-2. This site is referred to as the P3 site; the alternate site is referred to as the P4 site.





The RON aircraft parking ramp and supplemental rental car service facilities added for PAL 1 activity would be expanded and minor projects related to passenger security screening, as described above, would be completed. The existing aircraft fuel storage facilities would be expanded.

All-cargo warehouse and ramp requirements would be met by either reusing or redeveloping the aircraft maintenance hangar located in the southwest corner of the AirTrans Cargo Center or by other redevelopment opportunities that may arise during the planning period.

1.3.3 Development by Planning Activity Level 3

PAL 3 demand is approximately 21 million total annual passengers, 496,000 short tons of cargo, and 318,000 aircraft operations. The locations of potential Airport development required to accommodate activity at PAL 3 are shown on Figure 1-3.

The public parking garage, RON aircraft parking ramp, and supplemental rental car service facilities constructed at PAL 1 and expanded at PAL 2 would be further expanded.

The existing commercial vehicle area, located between the lower level public roadways and the P1 garage, would be reconfigured to provide supplemental deplaning curbside and roadway capacity. Additional minor projects related to passenger security screening, as described previously, would be completed and the existing aircraft fuel storage facilities would be further expanded.

Roadway projects would include the addition of a westbound lane to NE Airport Way and the addition of queuing space for traffic on NE Alderwood Road traveling northbound and turning left on NE Cornfoot Road.

When all-cargo activity reaches the level forecast for PAL 3, AirTrans Cargo Center will be at capacity and additional all-cargo development will occur in the Southwest Quadrant, unless other suitable development opportunities have arisen.

1.3.4 Development by Planning Activity Level 4

PAL 4 demand is approximately 24 million total annual passengers, 594,000 short tons of cargo, and 347,000 aircraft operations. The locations of potential Airport development required to accommodate PAL 4 are shown on Figure 1-4.







Planned Development at PAL 4

The public parking garage, constructed for PAL 2 and expanded for PAL 3, would be expanded. In addition, a consolidated rental car facility would be constructed at one of five potential locations—the P1 and P2 garages, P3 site, P4 site, the rental car storage area to the north of NE Airport Way, or east of 82nd Avenue and north of NE Alderwood Road. A preferred location for the consolidated rental car facility was not identified. However, for illustrative purposes, the location shown on Figure 1-4 is east of 82nd Avenue and north of NE Alderwood Road. With the construction of the consolidated rental car facility, the rental car facilities located in the P1 and P2 parking garages would be converted to public parking spaces.

With the relocation of the rental cars from the P1 parking garage, the commercial vehicle area, which was reconfigured at PAL 3, would be reorganized. Taxicabs and other commercial vehicles would be relocated to the P1 parking garage space vacated by the rental cars and the space vacated by the taxicabs and commercial vehicles would accommodate rental car shuttle vehicles. The customer service center vacated by the rental car companies would be converted to a waiting area and service center for commercial vehicle customers.

Roadway projects would include lane additions to NE Airport Way, the P1 parking garage entrance and exit, the terminal exit roadway, return-to-terminal road, and the deplaning level departure roadway.

Additional RON aircraft parking will be provided to the west of Runway 3-21.

Additional minor projects related to passenger security screening, as described previously, would be completed and the existing aircraft fuel storage facilities would be expanded.

Additional all-cargo development will occur in the Southwest Quadrant, unless other suitable development opportunities have arisen.

1.3.5 Development by Planning Activity Level 5

PAL 5 demand is approximately 27 million total annual passengers, 732,000 short tons of cargo, and 378,000 aircraft operations. Potential Airport development required to accommodate activity at PAL 5 is shown on Figure 1-5.

Additional structured public parking would be provided by expanding parking garage P3.

The RON aircraft parking ramp constructed at PAL 4 will be expanded to provide additional capacity. Additional minor projects related to passenger security screening, as described previously, would be completed and the aircraft fuel storage facilities would be expanded.

At the intersection of NE 82nd Avenue and NE Alderwood Road, queuing space would be added for eastbound traffic turning right on NE 82nd Avenue.





Source: Jacobs Consultancy, November 2009

All-cargo development will continue in the Southwest Quadrant, unless other suitable development opportunities have arisen.

1.4 Background, Process, and Key Assumptions

The process for identifying and evaluating Airport development alternatives involved the planning team (the planning team consists of consultant, Port, and City staff), the Planning Advisory Group (PAG), the PAG combined Master Plan Alternatives and Sustainability subcommittee, and the PAG Land Use/Transportation subcommittee. The following sections summarize the evolution of the work plan, approach, and key assumptions that resulted in the recommended Airport facility improvements shown on Figures 1-1 through 1-5. Taken together, these facility improvements constitute the master plan for airport development.

1.4.1 Initial Work Plan

When the Master Plan Update process began in September 2007, it was with the understanding that decisions would be made related to two passenger terminal concepts and a third parallel runway. The two concepts, referred to as the Centralized Concept and the Decentralized Concept, were developed during the *2000 Airport Master Plan* and are illustrated on Figures 1-6 and 1-7.

The Centralized Concept includes a satellite concourse located to the west of the existing passenger terminal. The Decentralized Concept includes a second access roadway and a second passenger terminal and concourses located south of the existing terminal, where the military facilities are currently located. Both the Centralized and Decentralized concepts include an 11,925-foot-long, 200-foot-wide, third runway parallel to and located to the south of existing Runway 10R-28L.

The expectation was that the PAG would analyze the Centralized and Decentralized concepts and recommend the one that would meet the Region's air transportation needs without compromising the livability and quality of life for future generations.

Furthermore, the master plan process began with the understanding that the need for a third parallel runway was likely beyond the planning period (i.e., beyond 2035). However, it was also generally acknowledged that the 2035 demand would likely reach a level at which preparations for a third parallel runway would be appropriate, given the long lead time for runway implementation.

The Port agreed that it would not seek City Council approval to build a third parallel runway in the City Land Use Plan being developed by the City through Airport Futures. The City and Port agreed that a planning-level review of the potential impacts of a third parallel runway, including noise, height, and natural resources, needed to be completed and that the City Land Use Plan would detail a land use review process for a potential third parallel runway.





Figure 1-6 CENTRALIZED AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT

Source: Portland International Airport Master Plan, 2000.

1.4.2 Evolution of Initial Work Plan

Early in the master plan update process, the planning team, working closely with the full PAG and the Forecast Subcommittee, developed probabilistic forecasts of aviation demand, which were adopted by the PAG for use in the subsequent planning. The 2035 50th percentile forecasts for passengers and aircraft operations are 27 million annual passengers and 378,000 annual operations, respectively. While 27 million annual passengers is similar to the 2020 passenger demand forecast from the 2000 *Airport Master Plan*, 378,000 aircraft operations is substantially lower than the 2020 operations forecast from the 2000 *Airport Master Plan*.

The aviation industry has changed considerably since the 2000 Airport Master Plan was completed. These changes are reflected in the aviation demand forecasts (please refer to *Technical Memorandum No. 2 – Aviation Demand Forecasts*). Converting the 50th percentile forecasts for passenger, cargo, and aircraft demand into facilities needed to accommodate those demands resulted in requirements for this Master Plan Update that are significantly lower than the requirements estimated in the 2000 Airport Master Plan.





Figure 1-7 DECENTRALIZED AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT

Source: Portland International Airport Master Plan, 2000.

It was concluded that the 50th percentile forecast of 378,000 annual aircraft operations for 2035 can easily be accommodated with the Airport's existing airfield. This is in contrast to the 2000 Airport Master Plan, which had forecast 485,000 aircraft operations in 2020. Accordingly, a decision to build the third parallel runway is not required for this Master Plan Update.

Furthermore, it was concluded that with some strategic investments and operational and technological enhancements, the existing passenger terminal will likely serve the 50th percentile forecast 2035 passenger demand without the need to build outside the existing passenger terminal envelope. Therefore it is not necessary to choose between the Centralized and Decentralized concepts.

At the October 21, 2008 PAG meeting, all but one member present voted to continue the planning process using the Master Plan Update's then-current facility requirements and assumptions provided that there was a chance to revaluate them relative to PAG's sustainability criteria before reaching a final decision to recommend, modify, or reject them. The agreed-upon process provided for that opportunity.



1.4.3 Approach for Moving Forward

The approach for moving forward involved planning for a sustainable future; identifying investment decisions needed at PALs 1 through 5; and evaluating assumptions related to the Centralized Concept, the third parallel runway, and the military. This approach is described below.

Planning for a Sustainable Future. At a meeting of the combined Master Plan Alternatives and Sustainability subcommittee on November 18, 2008, it was concluded that from a sustainability perspective, it is prudent to consider levels of activity that are both greater and less than the 50th percentile demand forecasts when developing the Master Plan Update. The consideration of additional activity levels is particularly important for the City's long-term land use planning for land adjacent to the Airport.

Accordingly, although the majority of the planning work was based on the 50th percentile or "most likely" demand forecasts, key facilities were evaluated to determine their ability to accommodate demand ranging from the 90th percentile to the 10th percentile. The purpose of this analysis was to ensure that options remain open and the plan has sufficient flexibility to respond to an ever-changing region, economy, and aviation industry.

One concern was that any potential adoption of height and noise standards in the City's land use plan related to a possible third parallel runway could imply tacit approval of that runway. The process adopted addressed this issue directly. It was agreed that at the end of Airport Futures, the PAG would be asked:

Should the Planning Advisory Group's recommendation to the Port and City include policies and decisions that preserve the options for a third runway and both the Centralized and Decentralized concepts for future generations to decide? If yes, what are those recommendations? (Any such recommendation will not imply even tacit approval of a third parallel runway or terminal concept.)

Port and City staff believes the PAG should make recommendations that preserve the options for future generations to decide based on principles of sustainability. This is particularly important for the City's long term land use planning for land adjacent to the Airport. The Port and City staff also believes the remainder of the planning process should incorporate the Centralized Concept and no third runway assumptions.

In moving forward, the planning team was urged to determine if there are decisions that might be made differently to maintain flexibility for the future. An important part of sustainability is not making decisions that will leave future planners with no choices or only very expensive or impractical choices. All participants in the planning process were mindful that the aviation industry is dynamic. Further, the participants recognized that this will not be the last Master Plan Update undertaken by the Port, and the City's Land Use Plan will evolve over time.



Investment Decisions Needed at Planning Activity Levels 1 through 5. The existing airfield and passenger terminal envelope will continue to satisfy the aviation demand forecast through the planning period with operational and technological enhancements; however continued investment in Airport facilities to build terminal and access improvements outside the existing terminal envelope will be required. Examples of important investment decisions that will need to be made before the next master plan include those related to:

- A grade-separated interchange at the intersection of NE 82nd Ave and NE Airport Way
- The appropriate site for additional automobile parking
- The appropriate location for additional general aviation facilities

These types of investment decisions have long-term implications related to the phasing and cost of other Airport improvements and the ability to maintain future flexibility. Therefore, these decisions require forward thinking.

Assumptions Related to the Centralized Concept. The Master Plan Alternatives and Sustainability Subcommittee, the Land Use/Transportation Subcommittee, and the planning team recommended that plans for facility improvements in PALs 1 through 5 should be based on the assumption that the Airport will be developed consistent with the Centralized Concept. This recommendation was based on the following considerations.

- **Cost**—The cost differential between the two development concepts has widened since completion of the *2000 Airport Master Plan*, in which the Decentralized Concept was estimated to cost at least \$1 billion more than the Centralized Concept in 1997 dollars (of this amount, approximately \$400 million was the estimated cost to relocate the military).
- **Phasing**—Construction of the Decentralized Concept would be difficult, as it would require relocation of the military facilities to build access roadways, parking, and the terminal building. The complexity of phasing contributes to the high cost, the long lead time for development, and difficult financing.
- Environmental impact—The Centralized Concept would have a less impervious surface, fewer associated air emissions, and a generally reduced overall impact to natural resources than would the Decentralized Concept.
- **Operational efficiency**—The Centralized Concept can be operated more efficiently with the existing two parallel runway configuration than can the Decentralized Concept.



• **Viability**—The Centralized Concept is sufficiently flexible to accommodate the 90th percentile demand, should it occur. The challenges of accommodating this level of demand are understood and manageable, and potential solutions have been identified. Moreover, the ability to switch to the Decentralized Concept will exist for years.

While the Decentralized Concept is acknowledged to offer some long term capacity advantages over the Centralized Concept, its advantages are not great enough to overcome its significant cost differential, phasing difficulties, and greater environmental impacts.

Assumptions Related to the Third Parallel Runway. Planning began with the assumption that the third parallel runway would not be required to accommodate the forecast demand, and this assumption was tested throughout the planning process. The advantages and disadvantages of doing nothing, either on- or off-Airport, to either obligate or preclude the future consideration of a third parallel runway were considered.

There will not be a decision to permit or build the third parallel runway at the end of this Master Plan Update. However, this planning process will explore how a future decision on the third runway might be made within the context of the City's land use approval process, even though it may not be implemented for a very long time. Among other things, this exploration would include a discussion of noise, natural resource, and height impacts, on and off the Airport, and a discussion of strategies as to how these impacts might be avoided, minimized, or mitigated. There will also be a discussion of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process that would be undertaken by the FAA for a third parallel runway, and how the NEPA process would be coordinated with the City land use approval process.

Assumptions Related to the Military. The space occupied by the military is not needed for development to accommodate PALs 1 through 5. Currently, the cost to relocate the military is high. If the military's situation should change, for example if the military were to leave the Airport, receive approval to substantially update or expand its facilities, or begin operating the F22 aircraft, the Port should undertake a new master plan or reconsider the then-existing plan. Any new lease should include provisions that would allow the parties (i.e., the Port and the Oregon Air National Guard) to reopen negotiations to address any major changes. In the meantime, given the uncertainty and lack of demand for the military's space within the planning period, it is reasonable to assume the military will remain at its present location.

1.4.4 Sustainability Criteria for Facilities Planning

Consistent with the commitment to Airport Futures' Vision and Values, shown on Figure 1-2 in *Technical Memorandum No. 3 – Facility Requirements*, the planning team has carefully considered sustainability in identifying and evaluating the development alternatives for each functional area of the Airport. The application of new technologies,



changes in passenger behavior, and changes in the airline industry are among the many uncertain factors that will influence the capacity, design, use, and reuse of the Airport's facilities in the future. While the impact of these factors cannot be known with certainty, the Port embraces the notion, discussed at numerous PAG and PAG Subcommittee meetings, that some future changes have the potential to significantly increase the utilization of existing facilities and the efficiency of operations, thus extending the life of Airport facilities and ultimately postponing the development of new facilities.

The approach employed to ensure that the alternatives reflect the PAG's vision and values was to carefully evaluate the alternatives against criteria that were developed through collaborative discussions regarding sustainability. The sustainability criteria for facilities planning are as follows:

- Preserve future flexibility and options
 - Preserve options for enhanced premium light rail and other transportation modes to access the terminal
 - Preserve the flexibility to adapt to changes in requirements and emerging technologies (e.g., mode split changes, smaller cars, alternative fuels, new multi-party modes, changes in passenger processing)
- Minimize greenhouse gas emissions and impacts to natural resources, air quality, and water quality
- Maximize land use efficiencies
 - Cluster like and dependent uses
 - Promote compact development
 - Prioritize redevelopment over new development
- Maximize operational efficiencies
 - Maximize shared/common use opportunities
 - Substitute operational solutions (e.g., demand management) for new facilities, where possible
 - Minimize congestion
 - Enhance customer service (e.g., simplify passenger way finding and minimize mode changes and travel distances within the terminal environment)
 - Maximize the utilization of existing facilities



- Phase projects effectively
 - Minimize the impact of construction on the public
 - Expand facilities in reasonable increments
 - Ensure financially feasibility
- Comply with FAA airport design criteria (e.g., criteria related to height restrictions, tower line-of-sight, and aircraft movement)

The evaluation of alternatives against the sustainability criteria is described in subsequent sections of this Technical Memorandum.



2. VIABILITY OF THE CENTRALIZED CONCEPT

As described in Section 1.4.3 of this Technical Memorandum, the Centralized Concept is preferred to the Decentralized Concept based on considerations related to cost, phasing, environmental impact, operational efficiency, and viability. The concept would be considered viable if (1) it is sufficiently flexible to accommodate the 90th percentile demand forecast for 2035, should it occur, and (2) the challenges of accommodating this level of demand are understood and manageable, and potential solutions have been identified. This section summarizes the analyses that led to the conclusion the Centralized Concept is viable.

2.1 Approach

Although the master plan requirements were based on the 50th percentile demand, the PAG and planning team agreed the Centralized Concept would be considered viable only if it has the flexibility to accommodate aviation activity beyond the 50th percentile demand for PAL 5. For the purposes of testing the viability of the concept, the 90th percentile demand was determined to be appropriate.

From the analyses described in Section 2 of *Technical Memorandum No. 3 – Facility Requirements,* it was concluded that at the 90th percentile demand for PAL 5, a third parallel runway is needed. Furthermore, the Airport has sufficient land to accommodate a third parallel runway, which was included in the Centralized Concept developed in the *2000 Airport Master Plan.*

To assess the viability of the Centralized Concept, the analyses focused on the ability of the relatively narrow core development area and other major elements of the Airport to accommodate the 90th percentile demand. The core development area is bounded by the airfield and is shown on Figure 2-1. A three-part assessment was completed in which key terminal and landside elements were evaluated to determine if (1) the 90th percentile demand can be accommodated within the core development area and (2) displaced facilities can be accommodated elsewhere on the Airport. The results of this assessment are summarized in the following sections.

2.2 Terminal Elements

The terminal elements assessed were the passenger terminal, aircraft parking positions (i.e., gates), and RON aircraft parking. These elements were selected because they are the primary drivers of the overall land envelope required. The assessments were generalized to determine if these elements could be expanded and modified within the core development area to reasonably accommodate the 90th percentile demand for PAL 5.





2:32

Source: Jacobs Consultancy, November 2009

To provide some perspective regarding the magnitude of the 90th percentile demand for PAL 5, both the 50th and 90th percentile demand for PAL 5 were compared with passenger demand in 2007 at all large-hub airports in the United States. From this comparison, shown on Figure 2-2, it can be seen that at the 90th percentile level of demand, the number of originating passengers at PDX would be similar to the number of originating passengers at Chicago O'Hare International Airport in 2007. This observation underscores not only the magnitude of the 90th percentile passenger forecast, but also its probabilistic nature—there is only a 10% chance this level of activity would occur by PAL 5 (2035).

Figure 2-2



COMPARISON OF PASSENGER DEMAND FUTURE PDX VS. LARGE-HUB AIRPORTS IN 2007

Source: Jacobs Consultancy, November 2009.

An originating passenger begins his or her trip at PDX; a connecting passenger begins his or her trip elsewhere, and changes planes at PDX. The distinction between originating and connecting passengers is significant for facilities. For example, originating passengers require processing facilities within the terminal (e.g., ticketing,

AIRPORT FUTURES

security screening, and baggage claim facilities) whereas connecting passengers require facilities on the concourses (e.g., aircraft gates, concessions, and passenger holdrooms). The approximate requirements for passenger terminal, aircraft parking positions, and RON aircraft parking positions are shown in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1PRIMARY TERMINAL REQUIREMENTSFOR 50TH AND 90TH PERCENTILE PAL 5 DEMAND								
	Existing 50th Percentile 90th Percentile							
Passenger terminal	~1.2 million sq. ft.	No change	Double existing					
Aircraft parking positions	67	67	92 -107					
Aircraft remain overnight parking positions	8	31	42 - 49					
Source: Jacobs Consultancy, November 2009.								

From the facilities assessments, the following conclusions were reached regarding the ability of passenger processing, aircraft parking, and RON aircraft parking facilities to be expanded and modified within the core development area to reasonably accommodate the 90th percentile demand for PAL 5.

- 1. Passenger processing requirements can be met by constructing an additional facility such as Terminal Expansion East (TEE), which has been the subject of past studies by the Port and its staff.
- 2. Aircraft parking requirements can be met by constructing a satellite concourse and extending Concourse E. Aircraft parking requirements cannot be met without a satellite concourse—even if both Concourse A and Concourse E are extended and reduced aircraft wingtip clearances are assumed.
- 3. Satisfying RON aircraft parking requirements in the core development area would be expensive because of the need to displace existing facilities.

One potential concept for developing facilities within the core development area—if the 90th percentile demand were to occur—is shown on Figure 2-3.





Master Plan Update Portland International Airport

2.3 Landside Elements

Seven key landside elements were assessed:

- Access and circulation roadways
- Curbsides (enplaning, deplaning, commercial)
- Parking (public, employee)
- Rental car facilities
- MAX light rail
- Ground transportation providers hold lot
- Cell phone lot

These elements were selected because they are the primary drivers of the overall land envelope required for landside facilities. Similar to the terminal elements, the assessments were generalized, with the objective to determine if these landside elements can be expanded and modified within the core development area to reasonably accommodate the 90th percentile demand for PAL 5. The significant assumptions for the assessments included the following:

- TEE will be constructed
- Both Concourse A and Concourse E will be extended
- The intersection of NE Airport Way and NE 82nd Avenue will be gradeseparated
- Secondary functions will be relocated as required (e.g., general aviation and hotels)
- ATCT line-of-sight and Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77 height restrictions will govern the height of structures in the core development area

A four-part method was employed to assess the landside elements:

- 1. The primary landside requirements were estimated as shown in Table 2-2.
- 2. Facilities sizes, locations, and alignments were identified on concept sketches.
 - The number of individual parking facilities was minimized.



- Structured parking located to the west of the future cross-field taxiways was maximized.
- Four new parking structures were identified in the existing economy lot.
- 3. Appropriate corridors (e.g., for MAX light rail, pedestrians, bicycles, and automated people mover [APM] system) were preserved.
- 4. Parking and rental car requirements were allocated among the facilities.

PLANNING ACTIVITY LEVEL 5 DEMAND			
	Existing	50th Percentile	90th Percentile
Close-in parking (spaces)	7,380	10,500	17,300
Remote parking (acres)	67	146	240
Employee parking (spaces)	2,544	3,100	5,100
Rental cars (spaces)	1,481	2,700	4,300
Commercial vehicle hold lot (acres)	0.8	1.6	2.5

The following conclusions were reached regarding the ability of key landside facilities to be expanded and modified within the core development area to reasonably accommodate the 90th percentile demand for PAL 5.

- 1. The primary challenge is the narrow core development area.
- 2. Curbside requirements could be met by encouraging changes in behavior, for example, by:
 - Reducing the use of curbsides by private vehicles
 - Encouraging the use of alternate curbsides during peak periods
 - Requiring some commercial vehicles to pick up/drop off passengers at the same location
 - Relocating selected commercial vehicle services to an alternate location
 - Considering an APM to serve rental car and public parking facilities



One potential concept for developing landside facilities within the core development area—if the 90th percentile demand were to occur—is shown on Figure 2-4.

2.4 Land Available for Displaced Facilities

From the concepts illustrated on Figures 2-3 and 2-4, it is apparent that should the 90th percentile demand materialize, the potential exists for many facilities currently located in the core development area to be relocated. The Airport land available to accommodate these facilities, as well as to accommodate growth for other functions, is illustrated on Figure 2-5.

2.5 Summary and Conclusions

The key observations from the assessments of major terminal and landside facilities relative to the 90th percentile demand for PAL 5 (2035) were as follows:

- **Passenger terminal**—Adequate passenger terminal facilities could be provided.
- **Aircraft parking positions**—An adequate number of aircraft parking positions could be provided by realigning and extending Concourse A, extending Concourse E, and constructing a satellite concourse.
- **RON aircraft parking**—It is not likely that all the needs for RON aircraft parking could be met in ideal locations; however, this is not a fatal flaw.
- **Taxiways**—Taxiway T must be extended to the east.
- **Roadways**—On-airport roadways can meet the requirements with modifications. The most significant concern is with off-Airport roadways, which are beyond the scope of this Master Plan Update.
- **Curbsides**—Requirements could be met by implementing operational strategies.
- **Parking**—Parking demand could be served; however, the percentage of parking provided close in would not be as great as exists today.
- **Travel distances**—An APM system may be appropriate.
- Land use—Sufficient Airport land exists to accommodate facilities displaced from the core development area.




Master Plan Update Portland International Airport



Source: Jacobs Consultancy, November 2009

From the assessments, it was concluded that the Centralized Concept could accommodate the 90th percentile level of demand and the challenges would be manageable, is flexible and can provide reasonable levels of service, and can be effectively phased.

Furthermore, the ability to modify development concepts will likely exist for many years. Such a change could be dictated by changes in circumstances (e.g., advances in technology or modified passenger behavior). Therefore, the Centralized Concept is a viable concept.



3. AIRFIELD

3.1 Background

The capacity of the existing airfield and airspace system was assessed in the facility requirements phase of the Master Plan Update to determine if and when additional airfield capacity improvements will be required to meet aviation demand forecast through PAL 5 (2035). The primary conclusions from that assessment were:

- Delay levels will remain low even with the forecast increase in aircraft operations. Consequently, there is no immediate need for significant capacity enhancements at the Airport, such as a new runway.
- As planned, the airfield has an adequate supporting taxiway system for aircraft circulation and the queuing of departures and arrivals. However, as traffic increases, the taxiway system should be modified to facilitate the movement of taxiing aircraft between the parallel runways and the passenger terminal.
- The airfield has reached 60% of its annual service volume of 425,000 operations. (In 2007, 264,518 operations, equal to 62% of annual service volume were processed.) As recommended by the FAA, appropriate planning related to capacity enhancements should be initiated.

During the past several years, several projects have been constructed or designed with the objective of improving the taxiway system. These projects and designs include the Taxiway T and Concourse D Pavement Rehabilitation project (completed in 2006), the Runway 10L-28R Extension Feasibility Study (completed in 2006), and the South Runway Rehabilitation Study (currently under way). Accordingly, no airfield projects are recommended during the planning period as part of the Master Plan Update.

However, two issues related to projects anticipated beyond the planning period—the cross-field taxiway location and the required length of the third parallel runway—were assessed because of their relevance to long-range planning. The results of the assessment of these issues are described in the following sections.

3.2 Cross-field Taxiway Location

At current traffic levels, air traffic controllers have the flexibility to minimize aircraft taxiing distances by assigning aircraft arrivals and departures to the runway closest to the requisite aircraft parking position at the passenger terminal. In the future with increased levels of operations, this flexibility is expected to be restricted and runways will most likely be assigned based on airspace considerations rather than aircraft parking position. Consequently, a cross-field taxiway system will be needed to facilitate the anticipated increase in aircraft taxiing between the parallel runways and the passenger terminal.



As stated, the level of aircraft operations that would warrant an improved cross-field taxiway system is not anticipated to occur within the planning period. However, the planned location and geometry of the cross-field taxiways will influence the potential size of certain facilities (e.g., the P3 garage) that will be constructed in the core development area, shown on Figure 2-1, during the planning period. Therefore, the location and geometry of the cross-field taxiways was considered at a concept level.

3.2.1 Prior Planning

Dual Airplane Design Group (ADG) VI cross-field taxiways were shown on the 2006 Airport Layout Plan (ALP). One cross-field taxiway was aligned with the threshold of Runway 28L and the other cross-field taxiway was located approximately 324 feet to the east of the Runway 28L threshold.

3.2.2 Alignment

To maximize the area available for development, the ability to shift the cross-field taxiways to the east was assessed, which resulted in the conceptual alignment shown on Figure 3-1. The location and geometry were developed based on the three factors described below.

- 1. Airplane Design Group. No ADG VI aircraft are forecast in the 2035 fleet mix at the Airport. Consequently, the cross-field taxiways were planned based on ADG V design standards.
- 2. Operational Capability. The new location and geometry of the cross-field taxiways shown on Figure 3-1 were discussed with Portland ATCT staff, who expressed the belief that shifting the taxiways to the east would increase operational flexibility by decreasing the dependence between aircraft arriving on Runway 28L and aircraft using the cross-field taxiways. The change in alignment of the cross-field taxiways would not cause a significant change in taxing distances from the alignment shown on the previous ALP. Other technical details (e.g., the functionality with navigational aids, obstacle clearance surfaces, and precision obstacle free zones) should be evaluated in follow-on studies.
- 3. Area for On-Airport Development. Shifting the taxiways to the east increases the area available for Airport development within the central core of the terminal area. The size of planned parking garage P3 is governed by the Portland ATCT line-of-sight to the cross-field taxiways. By shifting the cross-field taxiways to the east, the P3 parking garage size and height can be increased. The easternmost limit for the taxiways was considered to be the P4 parking garage site, shown on Figure 5-2, at the intersection of NE Airport Way and NE Air Cargo Road. The alignment shown resulted from shifting the taxiways to the east so that the taxiway object free area borders the site of the P4 parking





garage. The alignment of NE Airport Way was analyzed from the planned interchange at NE 82nd Avenue, and it was confirmed that the NE Airport Way grade would be feasible.

3.3 Third Parallel Runway

The concept for a third parallel runway was originally conceived in the 2000 Airport Master Plan, and it is identified as Runway 10R-28L on the current ALP. As shown on the ALP, the 2000 Airport Master Plan recommended that the runway be constructed 3,250 feet to the south of existing Runway 10R-28L (centerline-to-centerline separation) at a length of 11,925 feet and width of 200 feet.

Although the third parallel runway will not be needed during the planning period, the planning team evaluated its functionality if the length were reduced to 8,500 feet and the width were reduced to 150 feet. The reduced length and width were hypothesized based on the PAG's sustainability criteria—in particular, the desire to minimize the potential environmental impact of the runway while maximizing operational and land use efficiency.

The revised concept, shown on Figure 3-2, is for a third parallel runway that is 8,500 feet long, 150 feet wide, and located 3,250 feet to the south of existing Runway 10R-28L (centerline-to-centerline separation).

Based on discussions with Portland ATCT staff, the third parallel runway would be used primarily for aircraft arrivals. With three parallel runways in operation, the ATCT staff estimated that the north, center, and south parallel runways would be assigned 34%, 20%, and 46% of annual aircraft arrivals, respectively. Similarly, the ATCT staff estimated that the north, center, and south parallel runways would be assigned 37%, 53%, and 10% of annual aircraft departures. Accordingly, the new runway would be assigned nearly half of annual arrivals, and only 10% of annual departures.

Based on operating experience at the Airport, it is known that a runway 8,500 feet long is adequate for aircraft arrivals—existing Runway 10L-28R is 8,000 feet long and has functioned effectively for the last 20 years. Furthermore, there are no aircraft forecast to use the Airport that would require landing length greater than that required currently. Therefore, if a third parallel runway, 8,500 feet long, were constructed, its length would be adequate for arriving aircraft.

For purposes of evaluating the 8,500-foot-long third parallel runway for aircraft departures, the aircraft were divided into the following categories: military, general aviation, and air carrier (both passenger and all-cargo). Military aircraft were excluded from the analysis. Further, current operating experience at the Airport has proven that 8,500 feet is adequate for departures by general aviation aircraft. Accordingly, the detailed analysis of runway length required for aircraft departures was limited to air carrier (passenger and all-cargo) aircraft.





The analysis was performed using: the air carrier aircraft included in the PAL 5 (2035) fleet mix; data provided by the aircraft manufacturers; and the conservative assumption that all aircraft would depart at maximum allowable takeoff weight in high temperature conditions. High temperature conditions for the Airport are defined as 86 degrees Fahrenheit.

The results of the analysis, summarized on Figure 3-3, indicate that approximately 91.7% of the aircraft departures forecast for PAL 5 (2035) could be accommodated on an 8,500-foot-long runway. A small portion of the aircraft departures forecast for PAL 5 (2035), approximately 8.3% (consisting mainly of wide body cargo and passenger aircraft), could not be accommodated on an 8,500-foot-long runway.



Figure 3-3

AIRCRAFT DEPARTURES ACCOMMODATED ON AN 8,500-FOOT-LONG THIRD PARALLEL RUNWAY, BY TYPE

Source: Jacobs Consultancy, November 2009.



As stated, the third parallel runway's secondary use would be for aircraft departures. Departure runway length requirements vary depending on payloads, fuel loading, and temperature. The assumptions made in this analysis (high temperature day, maximum gross takeoff weight) are conservative, yet over 90% of the departures forecast for the Airport would be able to use the runway. Stated differently, fewer than 1% of all aircraft departures that Portland ATCT staff would ideally assign to the third parallel runway at planning activity level 5 (2035), would be unable to use the new runway for departure (10% of all departures that Portland ATCT staff would assign to the third parallel runway multiplied by 8.3% of the aircraft types not accommodated equals 0.83%). These departing aircraft could easily be accommodated on the existing runways.

The benefits of shortening the third parallel runway from 11,925 to 8,500 feet—reducing cost, minimizing environmental impacts, and maximizing land use efficiency—offset any loss of operational capability. In conclusion, 8,500 feet is an adequate length for a third parallel runway at the Airport. The runway's primary use would be for aircraft arrivals and virtually all aircraft could be accommodated.



4. PASSENGER TERMINAL

4.1 Background

The information presented in this section is based on conclusions described previously in Sections 1 and 2 of this Technical Memorandum and in *Technical Memorandum No. 3 – Facility Requirements.* The four primary elements of the long-range plan for passenger terminal facilities are:

- **Passenger terminal concourses**—Multiple facilities within the passenger terminal concourses may need to be modified to meet future requirements, including: the holdrooms on Concourse A; the regional airline holdroom on Concourse E; and the federal inspection services (FIS) facilities on level 1 of Concourse D. However, these projects are either deferrable or, in the case of the FIS facilities, market-driven. Moreover, the identification and assessment of alternatives for these facilities is not appropriate for the Master Plan Update and should occur in follow-on studies.
- **Main passenger terminal**—With upgrades and modifications that should reasonably be anticipated through PAL 5 (2035), the existing passenger terminal is capable of accommodating the demand associated with the 50th percentile forecasts for PAL 5. There is no need to develop alternative concepts to accommodate this level of activity; appropriate upgrades and modifications should be assessed in follow-on studies.
- **Terminal Expansion East**—Considerable planning was completed prior to this Master Plan Update to develop the TEE concept. TEE would provide passenger processing facilities to supplement the existing passenger terminal when it reaches capacity, which is not anticipated within the planning period for this Master Plan Update. However, projects will be constructed during the master planning period for which the design is closely related to the TEE, including the P3 garage. Therefore, prudent planning dictates that the TEE be evaluated and, if appropriate, confirmed to be the best long-range terminal development concept.
- **Remain overnight aircraft parking**—The highest priority project related to meeting terminal requirements is RON aircraft parking. RON aircraft are aircraft whose flight itinerary is completed upon arrival to the Airport, typically late in the evening. If a convenient location to park the aircraft (i.e., a nearby parking apron) is available, it can be towed from the terminal concourse and parked at the RON position, thus making the position at the terminal concourse available for a subsequent arriving flight. This process is reversed the following morning with the effect of increasing the productivity of the concourse holdrooms and aircraft parking positions.



Accordingly, this section describes (1) alternative long-range terminal development concepts, (2) alternatives for providing additional RON aircraft parking, and (3) the recommended strategy for maintaining terminal effectiveness.

4.2 Long-Range Terminal Development Concepts

4.2.1 Alternatives

Four alternative concepts for developing terminal facilities beyond PAL 5 were identified and assessed. Each is consistent with the Centralized Concept from the previous master plan, described in Section 1.4, and capable of accommodating the 90th percentile passenger demand at PAL 5. The primary considerations used to "size" the alternatives were the requirements for passenger processing facilities (i.e., ticketing lobby, passenger security screening), aircraft parking, and RON aircraft parking. These requirements are approximately double the area of the existing main terminal, 92 to 107 aircraft parking positions, and 42 to 49 RON aircraft parking positions, respectively. It was assumed that existing facilities would be modified, relocated, or demolished as required to implement the concepts. Concept 3 and Concept 4 were developed at a more fundamental level of detail than was developed for Concept 1 and Concept 2. Thus, the figures included for Concept 3 and Concept 4 are hand-drawn sketches.

The four long-range terminal development concepts are described below.

Concept 1 – Terminal Expansion East. The TEE concept, illustrated on Figure 4-1, features a new passenger terminal located to the east of the existing P1 and P2 parking garages and assumes:

- Existing Concourse A would be demolished, reconstructed on a new alignment, and extended so that it would connect to TEE. In the long-term, Concourse A will be demolished to enable the extension of Taxiway T to the east for better airfield circulation.
- Concourse E would be similarly extended to the east on its existing alignment.
- Additional ticketing lobby, baggage claim, and security screening functions would be provided in TEE similar to the existing passenger terminal.
- The P3 garage, located immediately to the east, would provide convenient, close-in, parking.
- Upper and lower level terminal roadways would be located between the TEE and P3 garage.





Passengers could walk from the TEE to gates located on Concourses A and E or be transported to Concourses C and D on a secure APM system. Airline ticketing and baggage claim facilities would be split between the TEE and the existing terminal facilities to provide balance for arriving and departing passengers.

Concept 2 – Terminal Expansion Central. The Terminal Expansion Central (TEC) concept, illustrated on Figure 4-2, features all passenger processing functions in one central location and assumes:

- The existing passenger terminal would be expanded to the east, across the space currently occupied by the upper and lower level roadways.
- The existing upper and lower level roadway system would be demolished, and a new upper and lower lever roadway system would be constructed.
- The existing P1 parking garage would be demolished.

Similar to the TEE concept, the TEC concept includes the realignment and extension of Concourse A to the east and the extension of Concourse E to the east, to provide the needed aircraft parking positions.

Concept 3 – Replacement Terminal East. Concept 3, illustrated on Figure 4-3, separates airside functions from landside functions, with all passenger processing functions occurring in a replacement passenger terminal located in the eastern portion of the core development area. Concept 3 assumes:

- All existing landside facilities between the passenger terminal and 82nd Avenue (e.g., existing upper and lower level roadways, P1 and P2 parking garages, and general aviation) would be demolished. Concourses A, B, and E would also be demolished.
- New passenger processing facilities and parking garages would be constructed in the vicinity of the intersection of NE 82nd Avenue and NE Airport Way.
- The existing passenger terminal would be converted to airside facilities and new aircraft parking and RON positions would be constructed to the east.

Passengers would be transported between the passenger terminal and airside concourses on a secure APM system.







Source: HNTB Corporation, November 2009

Concept 4 – Supplemental Terminal East. Concept 4, illustrated on Figure 4-4, features a supplemental passenger terminal with contiguous aircraft parking located approximately at the intersection of NE Airport Way and NE 82nd Avenue. Concept 4 assumes:

- A new upper and lower level roadway system and parking garage would be constructed adjacent to the supplemental passenger terminal.
- Most of the landside facilities located to the north and south of NE Airport Way would be relocated.
- Two parallel airside concourses would be constructed between the existing and supplemental passenger terminals.
- A tunnel would be constructed to accommodate NE Airport Way, which would be reconstructed beneath the supplemental passenger terminal and new airside concourses.
- Concourse A would be reconstructed and extended to the east and Concourse E would be extended to the east.

Passengers would be transported between the two passenger terminals on an APM system.

4.2.2 Identification of Preferred Concept

The four alternative long-range terminal development concepts were qualitatively assessed relative to potential cost and the PAG's sustainability criteria, which are described in Section 1.4.4.

Alternative Concept 3 and Concept 4 were rejected for the following reasons:

- Given the amount of demolition and construction involved, and the amount of impervious surface that would be created, the concepts do not minimize environmental impacts.
- Given the existing facilities that would be demolished and replaced, the concepts would not use land resources efficiently.
- The concepts would be difficult to implement in an incremental manner; phasing would be extremely difficult and likely involve considerable inconvenience to customers.
- The cost of Concepts 3 and 4 would be considerably greater than the cost of Concepts 1 and 2.





Source: HNTB Corporation, November 2009

Alternative Concept 2, Terminal Expansion Central, was rejected because of two significant flaws:

- The concept does not appear to be capable of meeting the enplaning and deplaning roadway requirements in the space available.
- The concept would be very difficult to phase and likely involve considerable inconvenience to customers.

As stated in the Section 4.1, considerable planning was completed prior to this Master Plan Update to develop the TEE concept. The assessment conducted for this master plan update supported the results from these previous planning efforts and resulted in the conclusion that TEE best meets the sustainability criteria set forth by the PAG. Therefore, Concept 1 – Terminal Expansion East was confirmed to be the preferred long-range terminal development concept.

4.3 Remain Overnight Aircraft Parking

4.3.1 Remain Overnight Requirements

For planning purposes, it was assumed that the demand for RON aircraft parking would be met incrementally at each PAL; in other words, additional RON aircraft parking would be constructed as it is needed. Although there may be reasons to phase the construction of new RON aircraft parking differently (e.g., economies of scale), construction as needed permits a simple graphic depiction, shown on Figure 4-5. Figure 4-5 shows the number of RON aircraft positions that will be added during each PAL, and the total number of positions that will exist at the end of each period. As shown, approximately 23 additional RON aircraft positions will be required through PAL 5, for a total of 31.

4.3.2 Remain Overnight Alternatives

Three alternative concepts were developed to provide RON parking to the north of Runway 10R-28L and as close to the passenger terminal concourses as possible. The alternative concepts are illustrated on Figure 4-6 and described below.

- RON Concept 1, phase 1, is to provide as much RON aircraft parking as is appropriate between the Sheraton and Hampton Inn and Taxiway A. Phase 2 would be to expand RON parking further by using the site currently occupied by the PDX Cargo Center for RON aircraft parking.
- RON Concept 2, phase 1, is the same as for RON Concept 1—to provide as much RON aircraft parking as is appropriate in the area bounded by the Sheraton and Hampton Inn to the south and Taxiway A to the north. Phase 2 would be to expand RON parking further by using the sites currently occupied by general aviation and the North Cargo Center for RON aircraft parking.



• RON Concept 3 is to construct a new apron area for RON aircraft parking to the west of Runway 3-21.

Figure 4-5

PLANNED REMAIN OVERNIGHT PARKING CAPACITY FOR EACH PLANNING ACTIVITY LEVEL



Source: Jacobs Consultancy, Technical Memorandum No. 3 – Facility Requirements.





4.3.3 Evaluation of Alternatives

Based on the evaluation of the three RON concepts, the following conclusions were reached:

- Concept 3 is the best concept for RON aircraft parking. Runway 3-21 is not heavily used; therefore, towing aircraft across Runway 3-21 would not result in significant delays to arrivals or departures. However, utilization of the area to the west of Runway 3-21 would require relocation of an existing navigation aid (the very-high frequency omni-directional range station, or VOR) and there is no current viable site for its relocation. Over time it is expected that the aging VOR will become obsolete and be replaced by another navigation aid. The removal of the VOR would permit construction of RON aircraft parking to the west of Runway 3-21. Accordingly, it was concluded that the best strategy for providing additional RON aircraft parking is to employ a hybrid of Concepts 1 and 2, with Concept 3 being implemented in the later PALs.
- Adding RON aircraft parking in the area bounded by the Sheraton and Hampton Inn to the south and Taxiway A to the north is the best alternative available in the short term—it is an efficient use of the land, will not affect adjacent functions, and is the lowest cost alternative.
- Expanding RON aircraft parking by using the site currently occupied by the PDX Cargo Center is not a viable option. As will be described in Section 6, the PDX Cargo Center is the preferred site for belly-cargo functions during the planning period. The belly-cargo facilities are in good condition and expensive to replace. Furthermore, there is no other suitable site. Also, expanding the RON aircraft parking at the PDX Cargo Center (the ramp currently provides eight RON aircraft parking positions) would exacerbate an existing problem caused by having a single taxiway, Taxiway T, between the PDX Cargo Center ramp and the passenger terminal. Frequently, it is time consuming to tow aircraft from the ramp westward to the terminal because these movements conflict with aircraft taxiing eastward to depart on Runway 28L. The only option for eliminating these conflicts is to provide a second taxiway by extending Taxiway A to the east, which requires the demolition and relocation of Concourse A.
- Expanding RON aircraft parking in the sites occupied by general aviation and the North Cargo Center is not appropriate unless all other options have been exhausted. As described below, adding RON aircraft parking in the area bounded by the Sheraton and Hampton Inn to the south and Taxiway A to the north will meet requirements through PAL 3.

Given these considerations, the recommended concept for providing RON aircraft parking is a hybrid of Concepts 1 and 2—continue using the PDX Cargo Center apron for aircraft RON parking and supplement that capacity by constructing additional RON



parking during each PAL. PAL 1 requirements can be met with phase 1 of an aircraft apron located to the north of the Sheraton and Hampton Inn. The layout of the apron would accommodate four ADG III (e.g., the Boeing 737-800) aircraft as shown on Figure 4-7.

PAL 2 (2017) requirements can be met by implementing phase 2 of the project completed during PAL 1. Phase 2 consists of expanding the phase 1 aircraft apron to the east, to accommodate an additional two ADG III aircraft. This expansion is also shown on Figure 4-7.

PAL 3 (2022) requirements can be met by expanding the phase 1 and 2 aircraft apron further to the east. This phase 3 expansion would be approximately the size of the phase 1 project; the aircraft parking layout would likely be changed and the resulting apron could accommodate a total of 10 ADG III aircraft. At this point, no further expansion is recommended as Taxiway A provides the only path between either the RON apron or Runway 28R and the terminal—a situation for RON aircraft analogous to the situation currently experienced by RON aircraft at the PDX Cargo Center.

PAL 4 (2027) and PAL 5 (2035) requirements should be met with Concept 3, described above, by constructing a RON aircraft parking apron to the west of Runway 3-21. Concept 3 would provide 13 additional RON aircraft parking positions on the Airport, satisfying the PAL 5 demand of 31 positions.

4.4 Strategy for Maintaining Terminal Effectiveness

Although no immediate or urgent requirements to modify passenger terminal facilities exist (modest improvements are not necessary until approximately PAL 2), concepts for maintaining their effectiveness will involve investing in opportunities related to six key elements:

- **Ticketing**—The layout of the existing passenger ticket counters is based on outdated procedures and technology (e.g., procedures that assumed most passengers check-in for flights at the ticket counters rather than at home or at common-use kiosks). Although the layout continues to be effective, there may be better alternatives.
- **Ticketing lobby**—The arrangement of the ticketing lobby to accommodate passenger queuing and circulation functions is based on the outdated procedures and technology that resulted in the existing ticket counter concept and layout.
- Airline ticket office space—Many of the functions that airline ticket offices, located behind the ticket counters, were originally designed to accommodate have been overtaken by new processes and technology; therefore, the space is underutilized and represents an opportunity for increasing terminal productivity.





J. \43791-PDX-MP\CADD\Exhibits\Atternatives\09_1021_Atternatives\Figures\Fi

- Concessions—The concessions program at the Airport is among the best in the United States and should continue to evolve based on the Port's strategy for satisfying changing passenger needs and enhancing revenue. Any future terminal changes should be carefully coordinated with the overall concessions strategy.
- **Passenger security screening**—As noted in *Technical Memorandum No. 3 Facility Requirements*, as passenger security screening equipment and procedures continue to evolve, it is likely that the layout of the space and equipment dedicated to passenger security screening will change. Moreover, a more effective layout may exist.
- **Mezzanine office space**—With the completion of the Port's new headquarters, atop the P2 parking garage, much of the Port's office space on the mezzanine of the passenger terminal will be vacant. This represents a potential revenue opportunity.

It is possible to significantly enhance the terminal's future effectiveness and improve level of service through a comprehensive remodeling program. Therefore, it is recommended that a passenger terminal master plan be completed to develop a comprehensive strategy and plan to reconfigure level 1 and the mezzanine. A comprehensive plan and strategy would avoid a piecemeal approach to improvements and ensure: (1) preserving future development options, (2) the most effective use of terminal resources, (3) the most efficient possible passenger processing and the best possible passenger experience, and (4) the maximum possible concessions revenues. This recommended follow-on study is further described in Section 8 of this Technical Memorandum.



5. GROUND TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING

This section (1) describes the alternatives that were considered for meeting the Airport's ground transportation and parking requirements through PAL 5 (2035), (2) summarizes the approach to evaluating the alternatives and the results, and (3) identifies key conclusions, recommended alternatives and development strategies. The five major ground transportation and parking elements:

- Parking
- Rental cars
- Enplaning and deplaning curbside roadways
- Terminal area roadways and intersections
- Access roadway intersections

5.1 Parking

For planning purposes it was assumed that during each PAL, the total requirement for close-in and remote public parking would be met incrementally during that period. Additional parking would be constructed as it is needed. Although there may be numerous reasons to phase the construction of new parking facilities differently (e.g., economies of scale), construction as needed permits a simple graphic depiction, shown on Figure 5-1. Figure 5-1 shows the number of parking spaces that will be added during each PAL and the total number of spaces that will exist at the end of each period. Approximately 12,400 additional public parking spaces will be required through PAL 5, resulting in a total of approximately 27,540 spaces.

An analysis was completed to identify and evaluate various future parking locations at the Airport. The primary assumptions used in the analysis were:

- A mix of parking products (i.e., short-term, long-term, and economy) will continue to be offered.
- The long-term and economy lots will remain in their existing locations.
- The size of the long-term lot will contract and expand through the PALs as the facilities in the core development area are developed and modified.
- Structured parking (i.e., garages) can be provided at both the P3 location (between the future terminal expansion east and cross-field taxiways) and the P4 location (at the southwest corner of the intersection of NE Airport Way and NE 82nd Avenue). The garages could accommodate both public parking and rental cars. This ensures that future development options are preserved, as recommended by the PAG. The locations of the TEE and the P3 and P4 garages are shown on Figure 5-2.



Figure 5-1



PLANNED PUBLIC PARKING CAPACITY AT THE END OF EACH PLANNING ACTIVITY LEVEL

Source: Jacobs Consultancy, Technical Memorandum No. 3 – Facility Requirements.

- The area available for construction of the P3 garage assumes the cross-field taxiways will be constructed to the east of the locations shown on the existing ALP. Please refer to discussion in Section 3.2 of this Technical Memorandum.
- Total public parking requirements can be met during each PAL by allocating parking demand among the facilities.
- To ensure that sufficient land will be available for public parking, the alternatives are based on consideration of the most demanding facility requirements (i.e., requirements resulting from the continuation of existing driving and parking trends). The Port continually reviews its policies related to parking operations and terminal access and future policies (e.g., policies related to LRT ridership and other transportation modes) could reduce parking demand. The objective of this analysis was to ensure that the most demanding requirements can be met; if the demand does not materialize, the facilities would not be built.





Source: Jacobs Consultancy, November 2009

The alternatives for providing structured parking at the P3 and P4 sites are shown on Figure 5-2, which illustrates the garages at full build out and shows the spatial relationship of these garages to TEE. The next increment of parking required, which will drive the construction of another garage, is associated with PAL 2 (approximately 2012). Therefore, the Port must decide in the relative near term where to locate the next garage.

Each alternative location has strengths and weaknesses. For example, a strength of the P3 location is its proximity to the passenger terminal, and a weakness is that its construction will trigger the relocation of several adjacent facilities, as illustrated in Figure 5-3. These strengths and weaknesses are summarized in Table 5-1 according to the applicable planning criteria. Unless future studies indicate that postponing the relocation of adjacent facilities outweighs the benefits related to preserving future flexibility, minimizing environmental impact, and maximizing land use and operational efficiency, the next parking garage should be constructed on the P3 site.

As described in *Technical Memorandum No. 3 – Facility Requirements*, additional employee parking will not be required until PALs 4 and 5.

5.2 Rental Cars

The analysis of the rental car element included (1) considering customer service, ready/return, and service facilities requirements as well as the convenience of customer access to rental cars relative to other means of transportation and (2) identifying and evaluating alternative modes for transporting customers to and from the terminal.

5.2.1 Customer Service, Ready / Return, and Service Facilities

The rental car customer service center and automobile ready and return facilities are currently located in the P1 parking garage. Based on considerable prior analysis, the Port has concluded that by providing additional automobile ready/return facilities in the P2 parking garage (planned to open in 2010) and expanding the existing at-grade rental car service facilities (i.e., fuel, wash, and storage), rental car facilities will be adequate until PAL 4 (2027). At that time, a consolidated rental car facility capable of accommodating 100% of the market would be provided. As currently planned, the facilities provided at the P1 and P2 garages will accommodate about 80% of the market; the remaining 20% of the market is composed of those rental car companies currently located off the Airport.

The rental car ready/return parking capacity and service facilities requirements, by PAL, are shown on Figures 5-4 and 5-5, respectively.





Source: Jacobs Consultancy, November 2009

Table 5-1 COMPARISON OF THE P3 AND P4 ALTERNATIVE PARKING GARAGE SITES		
Sustainability criteria	P3 Site	P4 Site
Preserve future flexibility and development options	 Large enough to meet parking and rental car needs through PAL 5 (2035) Allows incremental development Retains P4 as vacant site longer (good construction staging area) Synergy with extended Concourse E 	Not large enough to meet all parking needs on one site; therefore, selecting P4 as first location is an early commitment to build parking on both P3 and P4 sites
Minimize environmental impact	Energy consumption for transporting passengers to and from terminal: better	Energy consumption for transporting passengers to and from terminal: good
Maximize land use efficiency	Clusters dependent functions (TEE, roadways, and P3 garage) in compact location	Loss of airside property and convenient construction staging area
Maximize operational efficiency	 Time to terminal: 1 - 3 min (MAX light rail - bus) Wayfinding: better 	 Time to terminal: 5 - 6 min (MAX light rail- bus) Wayfinding: good As P3 expands to the east, it may become less efficient. Therefore, by developing P4 to supplement P3, overall operational efficiency may be maximized.
Maximize effective phasing	 Requires design coordination with TEE Potential early relocations: NE Airport Way, MAX light rail, PDX Cargo Center, and general aviation facilities 	Requires design coordination with the grade-separated interchange at NE 82nd Avenue and NE Airport Way
Source: Jacobs Consultancy, November 2009.		



Figure 5-4

PLANNED RENTAL CAR READY/RETURN PARKING CAPACITY AT THE END OF EACH PLANNING ACTIVITY LEVEL



Source: Jacobs Consultancy, Technical Memorandum No. 3 – Facility Requirements.



Figure 5-5

PLANNED RENTAL CAR SERVICE FACILITY AREA AT THE END OF EACH PLANNING ACTIVITY LEVEL



Source: Jacobs Consultancy, Technical Memorandum No. 3 – Facility Requirements.

An analysis was completed to identify and evaluate alternative concepts for locating a future consolidated rental car facility at the Airport. Five alternative concepts were considered:

- Concept 1—the P1 and P2 garages (status quo)
- Concept 2—the P3 garage
- Concept 3—the P4 garage
- Concept 4—a garage located in the existing rental car storage area, to the west of the intersection of NE Mount Hood Avenue and NE Airport Way
- Concept 5—a garage located to the east of 82nd Avenue and north of NE Alderwood Road, in Portland International Center (PIC)



The alternative concepts are shown on Figure 5-6. Each concept assumes an adjacent at-grade service center. Concepts 1, 2, and 3 assume a garage that provides a mix of rental car and public parking spaces. Concepts 4 and 5 assume a garage that accommodates rental cars only.

Given that the consolidated rental car facility is not needed until PAL 4 (2027), a decision regarding the preferred location for the facility is not needed for the purposes of the Master Plan Update. Furthermore, pending a decision regarding the location of the next public parking garage, which will not be made until a follow-on study is completed, such a decision would be premature. Nonetheless, the major factors bearing on the decision are addressed below, including operating expenses and customer convenience.

Rental car companies have a strong preference for combined ready/return areas where the spaces can be flexibly allocated to meet peak demand and minimize operating expenses. Split ready/return areas are inefficient and expensive to operate. All the alternatives considered have combined ready/return areas.

The convenience of customer access to rental cars relative to other means of transportation (e.g., cabs, limos, and MAX light rail) affects the number of customers who choose to use a rental car, which, in turn, affects Airport revenues. In the matter of convenience, perceived differences may be as important as the actual differences. Accordingly, rental car companies prefer to be located in the core terminal area if possible, where customers can conveniently walk to the rental car ready/return area. If customers must be transported to the rental car ready/return area, the focus of the rental car companies changes to (1) efficiency of operations, (2) way finding—can customers easily find their way to and from the Airport, and (3) transportation between the service center and terminal—is it affordable, convenient, and timely.

5.2.2 Identifying Alternative Transportation Modes

Considering the relevance of customer convenience and cost, three alternatives were identified for transporting customers between the consolidated rental car facility and the passenger terminal—an APM, MAX light rail, and busing.

Automated People Mover. Four alternatives for an APM system that would transport customers between the passenger terminal and consolidated rental car facility were considered. These alternatives are illustrated on Figure 5-7 and described below.

1. Alternative 1 (the P3 line)—This alternative assumes that in PAL 4 (2027), the APM system is constructed between the P3 garage and the existing passenger terminal with the ability to extend it to the P4 garage and add a stop at the TEE beyond PAL 5 (2035).





Source: Jacobs Consultancy, November 2009



Source: Jacobs Consultancy, November 2009

Master Plan Update Portland International Airport
- 2. Alternative 2 (the P4 line)—This alternative assumes that in PAL 4, the APM system is constructed between the P4 garage and the existing passenger terminal, with a stop at the P3 garage and with the ability to add a stop at the TEE beyond PAL 5 (2035).
- **3.** Alternative 3 (the Economy line)—This alternative assumes that in PAL 4, an APM system is constructed between a consolidated rental car facility located near the economy parking lot and the existing passenger terminal, with stops at the P4 and P3 garages. The system would be designed with the ability to add a stop at the TEE beyond PAL 5 (2035) and to be extended to the east to public parking garages located in the existing economy lot, should they be required.
- 4. Alternative 4 (the Portland International Center line)—This alternative assumes that in PAL 4, the APM system is constructed between a consolidated rental car facility located in PIC and the existing passenger terminal, with stops at the P3 and P4 garages. The system would be designed with the ability to add a stop at the TEE beyond PAL 5 (2035).

The APM concepts were developed based on the following assumptions:

- The consolidated rental car facility, APM system, and the P3 and P4 parking garages would be in place by PAL 4 (2027).
- The APM system would have stations at the consolidated rental car facility, the P3 garage, the P4 garage, and the passenger terminal.
- The APM system should allow for a station at the TEE.
- It should be possible to extend the "economy line" to the east to pick up customers at garages located in the existing economy parking lot, should such garages be required beyond the planning period.
- The APM track would be depressed so that it will pass beneath the cross-field taxiways that will be constructed between the parallel runways after PAL 5 (2035).

MAX Light Rail. Three alternatives for modifying the existing MAX light rail system to transport customers between the passenger terminal and consolidated rental car facility were considered. These alternatives are illustrated on Figure 5-8 and described below.

1. Alternative 1 (the P3 line)—This alternative assumes that in PAL 4 (2027), the MAX light rail system is modified so that it can transport customers between the P3 garage and the existing passenger terminal. The ability to add a stop at TEE beyond PAL 5 (2035) would be preserved.





- 2. Alternative 2 (the P4 line)—This alternative assumes that in PAL 4 (2027), the MAX light rail system is modified so that it can transport customers between the P4 garage and the existing passenger terminal. The ability to add a stop at the P3 garage or TEE beyond PAL 5 (2035) would be preserved.
- **3.** Alternative 3 (the Portland International Center line)—This alternative assumes that in PAL 4 (2027), the APM is constructed between a consolidated rental car facility located in PIC and the existing passenger terminal, with stops at the P4 and P3 garages. The ability to add a stop at TEE beyond PAL 5 (2035) would be preserved.

All the alternatives assume that that the light rail system providing transportation between the rental car system and the terminal would be free of charge to the customers and independent of the MAX light rail system serving off-Airport destinations.

Busing. This alternative assumes that the Port would provide a consolidated shuttle bus, funded by the rental car companies, for transportation between the consolidated rental car facility, regardless of its location, and the passenger terminal.

5.2.3 Evaluating Alternative Transportation Modes

The three alternative modes for transporting customers between the consolidated rental car facility and the passenger terminal were assessed and compared relative to five criteria. The criteria are explained below and the results of the comparison—for the alternative of placing the consolidated rental car facility in the P3 garage—are summarized in Table 5-2.

- Life-cycle cost—A 20-year life-cycle cost analysis was performed for each alternative mode and accounted for both capital and operating costs. The life-cycle cost analyses are explained in Appendix B.
- **Time to terminal**—The time required for a customer to be transported between the rental car facility and passenger terminal was estimated for each transportation mode.
- **Travel-time risk**—This criterion reflects the difference between a system that is independent of another transportation system (i.e., the APM and MAX light rail) and a system that is dependent on another transportation system (i.e., the busing system, which is dependent on the roadway system and its traffic condition).
- **Potential terminal impacts**—This criterion qualitatively reflects the physical terminal modifications that could be required to ensure the transportation mode and terminal are compatible. For example, the potential impact of the busing system is low, because the buses would pick up and drop off passengers at the existing commercial vehicle curbside. The potential impact of MAX light rail is medium, requiring the addition of double tracks at the terminal. By comparison,



the impact of an APM is relatively high, requiring a station platform and potentially an elevator and escalators.

• **Convenience at the terminal**—This criterion reflects differences in walking distance among the various airline customers. Busing is rated as equitable because the commercial vehicle curbside the buses would use is centrally located. By comparison, the MAX light rail system would discharge passengers at the south end of the terminal; thus passengers using Concourses A, B, and C would have less distance to walk than passengers using Concourses D and E and the system would be inequitable with respect to convenience at the terminal. The APM system also would be inequitable with respect to convenience at the terminal because the terminal platform would likely be located at either the south end or the north end of the terminal, not in the middle (a mid-terminal location would be too expensive and disruptive to construct).

From the results summarized in Table 5-2, it is clear that based on life-cycle costs, busing is the preferred transportation mode between the consolidated rental car facility and terminal.

Table 5-2 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE MODES FOR TRANSPORTING CUSTOMERS BETWEEN THE P3 GARAGE AND THE PASSENGER TERMINAL										
mode	(\$ millions)	(min)	risk	impacts	at terminal					
Automated people mover	\$111	1	Limited	High	Inequitable					
MAX light rail	\$62	1	Limited	Medium	Inequitable					
Bus	\$33	3	Roadway congestion	Low	Equitable					

5.3 Enplaning and Deplaning Curbside Roadways

As indicated in Table 1-2 of *Technical Memorandum No. 3 – Facility Requirements*, the enplaning curbside roadway, as currently configured, will be adequate until PAL 4 and PAL 5 and an additional lane will be required for each of those PALs. The deplaning curbside roadway will be adequate until PAL 3, when an additional lane will be required; this addition will satisfy the deplaning curbside roadway requirements through PAL 5 (2035).

AIRPORT FUTURES

The combined enplaning and deplaning curbside capacity and requirements, by PAL, are shown graphically on Figure 5-9. As indicated in Table 1-2, the enplaning and deplaning curbsides represent about 54% and 46% of the total curbside requirement, respectively.



PLANNED ENPLANING AND DEPLANING CURBSIDE CAPACITY AT THE END OF EACH PLANNING ACTIVITY LEVEL



Source: Jacobs Consultancy, Technical Memorandum No. 3 – Facility Requirements.

The enplaning curbside roadway and unloading area requirements may be satisfied by reallocating the outer roadway area reserved for non-curbside functions and encouraging drivers to use the outer roadway for passenger unloading.

Two alternatives were identified for satisfying the requirements for deplaning curbside roadways and loading areas. Alternative 1, illustrated on Figure 5-10, involves reconfiguring the commercial vehicle area (located on level 1 between the lower public roadways and P1 garage) to provide supplemental deplaning roadway and curbside loading capacity. Alternative 1 would be implemented in two phases. Phase 1, at PAL 3, would involve:

- Converting the 2nd traffic island and associated traffic lanes for private vehicle pickup (i.e., deplaning curbside and roadway)
- Removing the 3rd traffic island (the island closest to the P1 garage) and restriping the area for use by commercial vehicles





Phase 1 - Planning Activity Level 3 (2022)



NOT TO SCALE

Figure 5-10

Curbside Alternative 1 - Reconfigured Commercial Vehicle Area

Master Plan Update Portland International Airport



AIRPORT FUTURES

-

• Redirecting customers desiring to reach the commercial vehicle area to use the underground walkways located beneath the deplaning level roadways and constructing a physical barrier to prevent passengers from walking across the roadways to reach the commercial vehicle area

Phase 2, at PAL 4, would occur when a new consolidated rental car facility is constructed and the existing rental car service center, located in the P1 garage, would be vacated. Phase 2 would involve:

- Reusing the vacated rental car service center as a waiting area for commercial vehicle passengers
- Restriping the outside commercial vehicle area to accommodate the rental car shuttle buses
- Restriping the interior of the garage, adjacent to the new commercial vehicle passenger waiting area, to accommodate taxicabs, shared ride vans, and prearranged limousines

Alternative 2, illustrated on Figure 5-11, involves constructing new ramps to level 3 of the P1 parking garage, displacing public parking spaces, and creating a new curbside inside the garage. At the same time, as with Alternative 1, the 2nd traffic island and lanes would be converted for private vehicle pickups.

Alternative 1 is the preferred alternative based on the sustainability criteria—its relative costs are lower, the reuse of existing facilities is emphasized and changes to operational procedures are favored over construction.

5.4 Terminal Area Roadways and Intersections

Improvements to terminal area roadway lanes and intersections are discussed below.

5.4.1 Terminal Area Roadways

As indicated in Table 1-2 of *Technical Memorandum No. 3 – Facility Requirements*, roadway lane improvements will be required in PALs 1 through 5 as described below (the links referred to in the descriptions are identified on Figure 5-12).

- PAL 1 (2012)—An additional lane will be required for the enplaning level departure roadway (link F) and the terminal exit (link I).
- PAL 2 (2017)—An additional lane will be required for the terminal area exit roadway (link K).
- PAL 3 (2022)—An additional lane will be required for westbound NE Airport Way (link A) and the enplaning level approach roadway (link D).









 PAL 4 (2027)—An additional lane will be required for eastbound NE Airport Way (link B), the P1 and P2 parking entrance (link C), the enplaning level departure roadway (link F), the deplaning level departure roadway (link G), the P1 and P2 parking exit (link H), the terminal exit (link I), the return-to-terminal road (link J), and the terminal area exit (link K).

If demand cannot be reduced, the practical alternatives for each of the needed roadway improvements include adding a lane to the roadway or accepting a lower level of service. It should be noted that having a lower level of service could be counter to the sustainability criteria, particularly as increased air emissions associated with roadway congestion would have negative environmental impacts. With the exception of the enplaning level departure and approach roadways (links D and F), it is assumed a lane would be added to each of these roadway segments. The enplaning level departure and approach roadways segments to Concourses E and A; the feasibility of widening these roads to permit an additional departure lane and approach lane should be determined in a follow-on study.

5.4.2 Terminal Area Intersections

Terminal area intersection improvements will be required in PALs 1, 2, and 5, as indicated in Table 1-2 and described below (the intersection numbers referred to in the descriptions are identified on Figure 5-13).

- PAL 1 (2012)—Additional capacity will be required on eastbound NE Airport Way for traffic attempting to turn left to northbound I-205 (intersection no. 5). This intersection is not on Airport property.
- PAL 2 (2022)—A grade-separated interchange will be required at the intersection of NE 82nd Avenue and NE Airport Way (intersection no. 1). Depending on its design, this project will have varying levels of impact on facilities in the four quadrants surrounding the intersection with potential impacts on the P4 garage site, NE Airport Way, MAX Light Rail, the Sheraton Hotel, the Hampton Inn, and the Northeast Cargo Complex. These potential impacts are illustrated on Figure 5-14, which depicts one potential planning concept for the intersection. The alternative planning and design concepts for this intersection are beyond the scope of the master plan and are important objectives of follow-on studies.
- PAL 5 (2035)—Additional capacity will be required at the intersection of NE 82nd Avenue and NE Alderwood Road (intersection no. 7). The alternatives for increasing capacity will be identified during design. The most likely solution would be to provide additional queuing space (i.e., a "turn pocket") for eastbound traffic on Alderwood Road turning right onto 82nd Avenue.





Terminal Area Intersections Assessed

Master Plan Update Portland International Airport

FUTURES

· · · · ·

NOT TO SCALE

AIRPOR



1"=200

Source: Harper, Hough, Peterson, Righellis Inc., November 2009

5.5 Access Roadway Intersections

Access-roadway intersection improvements will be required in PALs 1 and 3 as indicated in Table 1-2 of *Technical Memorandum No. 3 – Facility Requirements* and described below (the intersection numbers referred to in the descriptions are identified on Figure 5-15).

- PAL 1 (2012)—The intersection of NE AirTrans Way and NE Cornfoot Road will need to be signalized (intersection no. 9).
- PAL 3 (2022)—Additional capacity will be required at the intersection of NE Alderwood Road and NE Cornfoot Road (intersection no. 8). The alternatives for increasing capacity will be identified during design. The most likely solution would be to provide additional queuing space (i.e., a "turn pocket") for northbound traffic on Alderwood Road desiring to turn left onto NE Cornfoot Road.

It should be noted that these improvements are not recommended as mitigations in the Airport Futures Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA). This difference is primarily because a different methodology was employed. The mitigations identified in the TIA were based on a significance threshold between a no-build and build scenario. The improvements identified in the Master Plan Update analysis demonstrate what is needed to meet the jurisdictional performance standard.





NOT TO SCALE

Master Plan Update Portland International Airport

6. AIR CARGO

This section describes the alternatives considered and the recommended strategy for developing the Airport's air cargo facilities through PAL 5 (2035).

6.1 Background

There are two general types of air cargo facilities at the Airport. The first type is primarily related to air freight distributors and passenger airlines that carry cargo within the belly of the airplane. Collectively, the air cargo facilities related to air freight distributors and passenger airlines are referred to in this Technical Memorandum as belly-cargo facilities.

The second type of air cargo facilities is primarily related to air freight distributors, integrated carriers (such as FedEx and United Parcel Service that provide complete door-to-door cargo services), and all-cargo carriers (all-cargo carriers provide airport-to-airport service using all-cargo aircraft). Collectively, the air cargo facilities related to air freight distributors, integrated carriers, and all-cargo carriers are referred to in this Technical Memorandum as all-cargo facilities.

The Airport's belly-cargo facilities are located to the north of Runway 10R-28L in the PDX Cargo Center, the Northeast Cargo Complex, and the North Cargo Center as shown on Figure 6-1. All-cargo facilities are located to the south of Runway 10R-28L, in the AirTrans Cargo Center and the Southwest Ramp, also shown on Figure 6-1.

The relationship between capacity and demand, and therefore the requirement for additional facilities, is very different for belly-cargo facilities than for all-cargo facilities. These relationships and the recommended alternatives and strategy for meeting the requirements for belly-cargo and all-cargo facilities are described in the following sections.

6.2 Belly-Cargo Facilities

The requirements for belly-cargo facilities (i.e., warehouse space), by PAL, are shown on Figure 6-2.

The PDX Cargo Center, the North Cargo Center and the Northeast Cargo Complex currently provide a capacity of approximately 236,000 square feet of processing and warehousing space. As shown on Figure 6-2, this capacity far exceeds the requirement for belly-cargo facilities, even at PAL 5 (2035), when the total requirement is estimated at 93,000 square feet.







PLANNED BELLY-CARGO WAREHOUSE CAPACITY BY PLANNING ACTIVITY LEVEL



Source: Jacobs Consultancy, Technical Memorandum No. 3 - Facility Requirements.

However, during the planning period and beyond, it is expected that some of these belly-cargo facilities will be demolished to make way for other development. For example:

- Depending on the design, the relocation of NE Airport Way to permit construction of a P3 garage could result in the demolition of the PDX Cargo Center (west building; refer to Figure 5-3)—this construction could occur at PAL 2 (2017).
- Construction of a grade-separated interchange at the intersection NE 82nd Avenue and NE Airport Way may result in the demolition of facilities in the Northeast Cargo Complex (refer to Figure 5-14)—this construction could occur at PAL 2 (2017).



Construction of the cross-field taxiways will result in the demolition of the PDX Cargo Center (east building) and the North Cargo Center as shown on Figure 3-1—this construction may not occur until activity beyond that envisioned for PAL 5 (2035). Accordingly, the recommended strategy for belly-cargo facilities is as follows:

- Initiate cargo-specific follow-on studies to confirm that:
 - The realignment of NE Airport Way to construct the P3 parking garage can avoid the demolition of the west building in the PDX Cargo Center—this would ensure that the PDX Cargo Center (east and west buildings) would remain viable until the cross-field taxiways are constructed.
 - The grade-separated interchange at NE 82nd Avenue will require the demolition of all or part of the Northeast Cargo Complex.
 - The best use of the properties to the north of NE Airport Way includes retention of the North Cargo Center (also confirm the duration of its retention).
- Pending the results of the follow-on studies, do not invest further in the PDX Cargo Center (west building), Northeast Cargo Complex, or the North Cargo Center.
- Encourage the consolidation of the belly-cargo facilities within the PDX Cargo Center over time. The PDX Cargo Center (east and west buildings) appears adequate for accommodating all belly-cargo requirements until construction of the cross-field taxiways results in the demolition of the east building.
- If the U.S. Postal Service should vacate its facility, reserve the space to allow the partial replacement of the PDX Cargo Center east building when the cross-field taxiways are constructed.

6.3 All-Cargo Facilities

Three principal components constitute the all-cargo facilities at the Airport—warehouse and office, aircraft ramp, and landside facilities (i.e., shipping and receiving docks as well as employee and customer parking). For the purposes of assessing alternatives and developing a recommended development strategy, it has been assumed that (1) these components will be developed concurrently, as appropriate for the available sites, and (2) the timing of the need for these three components is indicated by the timing of the requirements for warehouse facilities.

The requirements for all-cargo warehouse facilities, by PAL, are shown on Figure 6-3 (the estimated requirements for all-cargo ramp are shown in Appendix A). As indicated, additional all-cargo facilities will be required in every PAL, beginning with PAL 1 (2012).





PLANNED ALL-CARGO WAREHOUSE CAPACITY BY PLANNING ACTIVITY LEVEL



Source: Jacobs Consultancy, Technical Memorandum No. 3 - Facility Requirements.

The recommended strategy for developing all-cargo facilities is as follows:

- The AirTrans Cargo Center is well designed with excellent landside access for trucking cargo to and from the Airport and excellent airside access for aircraft. Therefore, the AirTrans Cargo Center should continue to be utilized as the Airport's primary all-cargo processing area.
- The land available in the AirTrans Cargo Center to the north of the Horizon Maintenance Center and west of the ground run-up enclosure should be developed as necessary to satisfy the all-cargo requirements through PAL 1 (2012). A follow-on study is needed to define the remaining development area, the development potential, and the site layout.
- Following the full build-out of the remaining undeveloped area of the AirTrans Cargo Center, a decision will be needed regarding the best use of the area occupied by the Boeing aircraft maintenance hangar. This facility is currently leased to Boeing and is used for painting commercial aircraft. It is assumed that the all-cargo facilities requirements for PAL 2 (2017) will be met either by converting the aircraft maintenance hangar for use as a cargo warehouse or demolishing it and constructing a new warehouse. Whether the aircraft



maintenance hangar should be converted or replaced should be the subject of a follow-on study. The aircraft ramp associated with the aircraft maintenance hangar is in excellent condition and should be reused.

- When the AirTrans Cargo Center is fully developed, which is expected at PAL 2 (2017), there are two alternatives for locating subsequent development—the Southwest Quadrant or some portion of the existing military area, should it become available. The military area is preferred because it has the same strengths as the AirTrans Cargo Center, the potential environmental impact associated with reuse and redevelopment of an existing developed site is assumed to be lower than that of an undeveloped site, land resources would be used efficiently, and operational efficiency would be maximized.
- However, the military area is under long-term lease; therefore, for planning purposes it was assumed that all-cargo development at PALs 3 through 5 will occur in the Southwest Quadrant.



7. GENERAL AVIATION

This section describes the alternatives considered and the recommended strategy for developing the Airport's general aviation facilities through PAL 5 (2035).

7.1 Background

The requirements and alternatives for general aviation development at the Airport were developed based on two considerations:

- Policy and management philosophy—The Port's policy is to comply with assurances given the FAA that exclusive rights for the use of Airport property will not be offered to a single fixed-base operator. Accordingly, the management philosophy is that in addition to the approximately 30 acres currently occupied by general aviation facilities, 10 to 20 acres of land should be reserved to accommodate an additional fixed-base operator (i.e., a general aviation service provider), should the demand materialize. More discussion regarding the requirements for general aviation is in Section 6 of *Technical Memorandum No. 3 Facility Requirements*.
- Land use priorities—The land currently used for general aviation facilities will ultimately be needed to accommodate higher priority facilities, e.g., the extension of Concourse E. Although the extension of Concourse E will not be needed by PAL 5 (2035), P3 parking garage construction could occur by PAL 2 (2017). Depending on its design, the construction of the P3 garage could trigger the relocation of NE Airport Way and require the demolition of many existing general aviation facilities, as shown previously on Figure 5-3.

Thus, alternative locations were considered both for the relocation of existing and the provision of additional general aviation facilities.

7.2 Alternatives

Three alternative concepts for accommodating general aviation facilities were identified. The locations of the concepts are shown on Figure 7-1.

- Concept 1 is to maintain the existing 30-acre general aviation area and expand it to include a 13-acre area immediately to its east for a potential second fixed base operator. Concept 1 provides a total of 43 acres.
- Concept 2 is to maintain the existing 30-acre general aviation area and provide, in addition, 20 acres immediately to the south of the end of Runway 28R for a potential second fixed-base operator. Concept 2 provides a total of 50 acres.





Source: Jacobs Consultancy, November 2009

 Concept 3 is to prepare a 50-acre site, located in the northwest quadrant of the Airport adjacent to the fuel farm and Marine Drive. This site would accommodate the relocated existing general aviation facilities and if demand warranted, a second fixed-base operator. Concept 3 provides a total of 50 acres.

The preferred concept depends on market-driven conditions such as the following:

- Proposals received from businesses desiring to develop a second fixed-base operation—If no such proposal is received or if none is judged to be acceptable, no additional land would be needed for general aviation facilities.
- The timeframe in which demand for a second fixed-base operator materializes and the improvements that have occurred or are planned to occur on the sites identified within the Master Plan Update—If at the time of the proposal from a second fixed base operator, there is a higher and better use for the land or if the site would not be usable for a period long enough to justify the required investment, the alternative concept would be selected. For example, the additional 13-acre area in Concept 1 is available only until the cross-field taxiways are constructed through the site.
- The timing and design of the P3 parking garage—As explained Section 5.1 and illustrated on Figure 5-3, the construction of the P3 garage may require the relocation of several existing general aviation facilities.

Therefore, in the short term, it is recommended that the existing general aviation facilities be maintained in their current location. Further investment in the existing general aviation area should be curtailed pending completion of a follow-on study to determine the timing and impact on facilities adjacent to the P3 site.



8. **RECOMMENDED FUTURE STUDIES**

This Technical Memorandum describes alternatives, strategies, and recommended concepts for development through PAL 5 (2035). Equally important, it identifies future studies that will be required to develop the technical details required to finalize key development decisions. This section summarizes the background, objective, scope, and timing for each of fourteen recommended future studies. The recommended timing of the studies is identified in Table 8-1.

8.1 Passenger Terminal Master Plan

8.1.1 Background

It was concluded from the Master Plan Update that although no urgent requirements to modify passenger terminal facilities exist, it is possible to significantly enhance the passenger terminal's future effectiveness through a comprehensive study.

8.1.2 Objective

The objective of a passenger terminal master plan would be to study the terminal in its entirety and develop a comprehensive strategy and plan to reconfigure level 1 and the mezzanine, thus avoiding a piecemeal approach to improvements and ensuring (1) the most effective possible passenger processing, (2) the best possible passenger experience, and (3) the maximum possible concessions revenues.

This objective meets the sustainability criteria to preserve future development options and maximize operational efficiency while minimizing the environmental impacts associated with building new facilities. Also, it would result in an effective phasing plan.

8.1.3 Scope

The scope of the passenger terminal master plan would include the following elements.

Ticketing. The layout of existing passenger ticketing and check-in facilities is based on obsolete procedures and technology. Although the layout continues to be effective, there may be more effective alternatives. The passenger terminal master plan should identify alternative facility layouts to leverage evolving technology and passenger processing strategies.

Ticketing Lobby. The arrangement of the ticketing lobby to accommodate passenger queuing and circulation functions is based on the obsolete procedures and technology that resulted in the existing ticket counter concept and layout. The passenger terminal master plan should explore all elements comprehensively to identify the best configuration and use of all space (e.g., space currently occupied by x-ray equipment).



Table 8-1	

TIMING OF RECOMMENDED FUTURE STUDIES BASED ON 50TH PERCENTILE FORECASTS

		Complete Initiate within			
		within	Two	Four	
		two years	years	years	Other
1.	Passenger Terminal Master Plan		Х		
2.	Terminal Expansion East (TEE) Project Definition		Х		
3.	North Side Properties Redevelopment Study		Х		
4.	P4 Parking Garage Project Definition		Х		
5.	All-Cargo Development Study				X (a)
6.	Gate Management and Operations Study				X (b)
7.	Concourse A Improvements Study				Х (с)
8.	Concourse E Regional Airline Holdroom Improvements				X (d)
9.	Aircraft Rescue and Firefighting Facilities Siting Study				X (e)
10.	82nd Avenue Grade-Separated Interchange Project Definition	X (f)			
11.	High-Speed Rail Study				X (g)
12.	Remain Overnight Aircraft Parking Ramp Design Study		Х		
13.	Commercial Vehicle Roadway Redevelopment Study				X (h)
14.	Enplaning Roadway Study		Х		

Note: Timing indicated is relative to completion of Master Plan Update and assumes increases in passengers, cargo and aircraft operations in accordance with the 50th percentile forecasts. The need for all future studies will be monitored and their timing adjusted consistent with demand.

- (a) Consistent with activity and before further development within AirTrans Cargo Center.
- (b) When improvements would be beneficial and study is justified.
- (c) When justified by activity and input from Horizon Air.
- (d) When justified by holdroom utilization and input from United Airlines and SkyWest Airlines.
- (e) When FAA requirements cannot be met with existing facilities.
- (f) Should be completed before or in conjunction with study #3 and study #4.
- (g) Consistent with region's high-speed rail plans.
- (h) Consistent with activity and need to accommodate PAL 3 requirements.



Airline Ticket Office Space. The functions that airline ticket offices, located behind the ticket counters, were originally designed to accommodate have been overtaken by new processes and technology; therefore, the space is underutilized. The passenger terminal master plan should explore how, through remodeling, this and other underutilized space can be redistributed for more productive use.

Concessions. The concessions program at the Airport is among the best in the United States and will continue to evolve based on the Port's strategy for satisfying changing passenger needs and enhancing revenue. The passenger terminal master plan and concessions strategy and plan should be developed jointly. Mutually dependent issues, such as pre-security and post-security concessions and the concept of "force-feeding" passengers through concessions spaces, should be explored.

Passenger Security Screening. As noted in Section 10 of *Technical Memorandum No. 3 – Facility Requirements*, as passenger security screening equipment and procedures continue to evolve, it is likely that the layout of the space and equipment dedicated to passenger security screening will change. The passenger terminal master plan should consider alternatives other than the status quo. For example, the passenger terminal master plan might consider the advantages and disadvantages of a single central passenger screening checkpoint that converges all passengers into a central concessions mall.

Mezzanine Office Space. With the completion of the Port's new headquarters, atop the P2 parking garage, much of the Port's office space on the mezzanine of the passenger terminal will be vacant. The passenger terminal master plan should consider the potential use(s) for this space and the modifications required for its effective use. The location of the space may be ideal for revenue-generating airline clubs and/or post-security concessions.

8.1.4 Timing

The passenger terminal master plan should be initiated within two years of the Master Plan Update.

8.2 Terminal Expansion East (TEE) Project Definition

8.2.1 Background

TEE will provide supplemental passenger processing facilities when the existing passenger terminal reaches its potential. Although this is not expected within the time frame considered in the Master Plan Update, TEE is within the Airport's core development area and affects or is affected by other facilities that must be modified or constructed in the relatively near term. The ultimate success of TEE depends on the extent to which the operation of these dependent facilities is effectively integrated through thoughtful planning and design.



8.2.2 Objective

The objective of a TEE project definition study would be to complete a sufficient amount of preliminary design for TEE and its related facilities to understand and document the (1) concept of operation for TEE and major related facilities (e.g., how origin, destination, and transfer passengers and baggage will be processed and how ground transportation functions will work), (2) program and vertical and horizontal dimensional requirements for TEE and major related facilities, and (3) likely construction sequence for facilities related to TEE and the timing of and impact to existing facilities.

8.2.3 Scope

The scope of TEE Project Definition would include the following elements.

Terminal Expansion East. Although the TEE passenger processor will perhaps be one of the last physical elements of the core development area and not be built until passenger demand reaches approximately 28 million annual passengers, considerable knowledge about the facility and its potential dimensions must be known to effectively plan, design, and construct the related facilities. This review of the terminal should include an assessment of the potential location and circulation associated with a new light rail station.

P3 Parking Garage. The P3 site has been identified as one of two likely sites (the other is the P4 site) for construction of the next parking garage, likely to be needed when passenger demand reaches approximately 18 million annual passengers. It is essential that the P3 parking garage be designed to function effectively with TEE—even though 15 or more years could separate the construction of TEE and the P3 parking garage.

NE Airport Way. The eastbound and westbound lanes of NE Airport Way must be separated to permit the construction of the P3 parking garage and, ultimately, TEE. Thus, the planning and design of TEE, the P3 parking garage, NE Airport Way, and the roadway system linking NE Airport Way with TEE and the P3 Garage are inextricably linked.

Adjacent Facilities. For the purposes of TEE project definition, adjacent facilities include the following:

- The planned cross-field taxiways to the east—these future taxiways define the land envelope for TEE and its supporting facilities
- The P2 parking garage, FAA ATCT, and central utility plant to the west— these facilities would not be relocated but define the land envelope for TEE and its supporting facilities



- General aviation facilities, Cargo Center West, and the future Concourse E extension to the north
- The MAX light rail line, the U.S. Post Office, the PDX Cargo Center, and the future Concourse A extension to the south

During TEE project definition, the extent and timing of relocations of adjacent facilities must be determined.

Consolidated Rental Car Facility. Inasmuch as the P3 parking garage remains an option for the location of the consolidated rental car facility (i.e., the P3 garage could be shared by public parking and rental car functions), the requirements of the consolidated rental car facility must be considered during TEE project definition.

8.2.4 Timing

TEE project definition should be initiated within two years of the Master Plan Update. TEE project definition must be completed before commencing additional planning or design related to the P3 parking garage.

8.3 North Side Properties Redevelopment Study

8.3.1 Background

The north side properties are those properties located to the north of NE Airport Way, between Concourse E and Mt. Hood Avenue, as identified on Figure 8-1. Some of the properties are fully utilized (e.g., those used by general aviation), some are underutilized (e.g., the North Cargo Center), and at least one is vacant (the Delta Cargo facilities). All are subject to future relocation or redevelopment as required for higher and better use (e.g., the extension to the east of Concourse E).

8.3.2 Objectives

The objectives of the redevelopment study are to define (1) how the land envelope for the north side properties will be impacted by adjacent short- and long-term development, such as TEE and the P3 parking garage, the cross-field connector taxiways, and the grade-separated interchange at NE Airport Way and 82nd Avenue; (2) appropriate land uses, both interim and permanent, for the north side properties; (3) investments or facilities modifications that could permit maximum utilization of these valuable north side properties, and (4) the plan for additional RON aircraft parking positions to be constructed by the time PAL 1 activity (2012) is achieved.





November 2009

8.3.3 Scope

The scope of the north side properties redevelopment study should include the following elements.

Cross-Field Taxiways. When constructed, these taxiways will require the demolition of several facilities, potentially including the North Cargo Center, the United Airlines maintenance facility, and the flight kitchen immediately to the east of the United Airlines maintenance facility.

Potential Extension of Taxiway T. The extension of Taxiway T to the east may become necessary to serve the additional RON aircraft parking or other redevelopment.

General Aviation. The existing general aviation facilities can remain in their existing location until they are displaced by higher priority facilities (e.g., extended Concourse E) or until their relocation is economically justified. The redevelopment study should consider both existing and supplemental general aviation facilities.

North Cargo Center. This belly-cargo facility is underutilized. The redevelopment study should consider modifications to make it more attractive for interim use as a belly-cargo facility or other potential uses.

United Airlines Maintenance. As terminal area development continues to the east, the highest and best use for this maintenance facility must be determined.

Hotels. The redevelopment study should consider the impact of the gradeseparated interchange at NE Airport Way and 82nd Avenue on the hotels, whether either or both hotels can remain viable businesses after the interchange is completed, and if, not, the best use of the parcels.

Delta Cargo. This belly-cargo facility is vacant. The redevelopment study should consider modifications to make it more attractive for interim use as a belly-cargo facility or other potential uses. Also, the redevelopment study should consider demolition, the facility and redeveloping the site in a way that is better suited to the future configuration of the interchange proposed at the intersection of NE Airport Way and NE 82nd Avenue.

Flight Kitchens. The north side properties include two flight kitchens, one of which is vacant. The redevelopment study should consider all options including relocation of the remaining food-service business, reuse of the existing facilities, and redevelopment.

Delta Ground Service Equipment. As terminal area development continues to the east, the highest and best use for property must be determined.



Rental Car Facilities. As terminal area development continues to the east, the highest and best use for property must be confirmed. If rental car facilities are appropriate, the amount of land allocated to rental car facilities should be confirmed.

Remain Overnight Aircraft Parking. Land to the north of the Sheraton and Hampton Inn has been identified as a potential location for the development of an apron to accommodate RON aircraft parking. The plans for this parking should be completed within the context of the north side properties redevelopment study.

8.3.4 Timing

The north side properties redevelopment study should be initiated within two years of the Master Plan Update—it should be completed before commencing additional planning or design related to RON aircraft parking. The 82nd Avenue grade-separated interchange project definition study, described in Section 8.10, should be completed before or in conjunction with the north side properties redevelopment study.

8.4 P4 Parking Garage Project Definition

8.4.1 Background

The P4 parking garage site is located immediately to the northwest of the intersection of NE Airport Way and 82nd Avenue. Both the P3 site and the P4 site have been identified as potential locations for the next increment of on-Airport structured parking. In addition, it is believed that either could accommodate the consolidated rental car facility.

8.4.2 Objectives

The objectives of P4 parking project definition are to:

- 1. Define the utility of the P4 site as a construction staging and lay down area and recommend whether this utility is sufficiently great to justify delaying development of the site until after the P3 site is developed.
- 2. Prepare a drawing illustrating the area available for development considering completion of the grade-separated interchange at NE Airport Way and NE 82nd Avenue.
- 3. Determine the size and layout of the garage if it were to accommodate public parking only or both public parking and a consolidated rental car facility.
- 4. Evaluate the differences if rental car hold and staging facilities are at grade and outside the garage vs. inside the garage.
- 5. Identify the number of public parking spaces available for the two optional configurations defined in objective 3, above.



6. Develop a P4 access/egress plan that provides clear public access while not compromising the operations of NE Airport Way, 82nd Avenue, and the light rail system.

8.4.3 Scope

The scope of P4 parking project definition would include the P4 site and the gradeseparated interchange at the intersection of NE Airport Way and NE 82nd Avenue.

8.4.4 Timing

P4 parking project definition should be initiated within two years of the Master Plan Update and before commencement of additional planning or design related to the next parking garage.

8.5 All-Cargo Development Study

8.5.1 Background

At PAL 2 (2017) when all-cargo activity reaches 384,000 short tons per year, an additional 129,000 square feet of warehouse space will be required. The AirTrans Cargo Center is the preferred location for the development of future all-cargo facilities; however, its capacity is limited.

8.5.2 Objectives

The objectives of the all-cargo development study are to:

- 1. Determine if the existing aircraft maintenance hangar should be converted for use as a cargo warehouse, demolished and replaced with a new cargo warehouse, or retained as is.
- 2. Identify the site or sites remaining within the AirTrans Cargo Center for allcargo development.
- 3. Identify sites within AirTrans Cargo Center that could be redeveloped to permit more efficient use of the area.
- 4. Prepare plans illustrating the incremental all-cargo development potential of the sites remaining in the AirTrans Cargo Center and the actions required to complete the development. Account for the potential impact of criteria such as Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77.
- 5. Identify the potential for all-cargo development or redevelopment of some portion of the property currently leased by the military, should that property become available. Account for the potential impact of criteria such as Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77.



6. Prepare plans illustrating the potential for phased all-cargo development in the Southwest Quadrant.

8.5.3 Scope

The all-cargo development study would include the aircraft maintenance hangar and vacant or underutilized facilities within the AirTrans Cargo Center, a portion of the military leasehold immediately to the east of the AirTrans Cargo Center, and the Southwest Quadrant.

8.5.4 Timing

The all-cargo development study should be completed in a timeframe consistent with the growth of cargo activity at the Airport and need for additional cargo facilities—it must be completed before commencing additional planning or design related to development within the AirTrans Cargo Center.

8.6 Gate Management and Operations Study

8.6.1 Background

The Port's long-term strategy is to increase gate use from approximately four daily turns (a turn is the arrival and departure of a single aircraft) per gate to approximately six daily turns. This strategy, which assumes the implementation of common-use gate practices, when combined with the somewhat limited area available for ground service equipment staging and storage, may increase the difficulty of managing and operating the aircraft gates.

8.6.2 Objectives

The objectives of the gate management and operations study are to (1) document the amount of ground service equipment associated with airline passenger aircraft currently at the Airport by owner/operator, where that equipment is stored and staged, how it is managed, and current management issues; (2) assess how and why these management issues may be exacerbated in the future by increased gate utilization through increased common use; and (3) identify alternatives to facilitate the management and operation of the gates with respect to staging and storing ground service equipment.

This study would emphasize the Port's commitment to sustainability by maximizing operational efficiency.

8.6.3 Scope

The scope of the gate management and operations study would include the current and potential future aircraft and ground service equipment parking areas, an existing and potential future inventory of ground service equipment, the potential use of electric



ground service vehicles and associated infrastructure, and technological solutions (e.g., radio-frequency identification tags and monitoring systems) to assist in the management of ground service vehicles.

8.6.4 Timing

The gate management and operations study should be undertaken in the future when operations increase to the point that Port staff believes improvements would be beneficial and the study is justified.

8.7 Concourse A Improvements Study

8.7.1 Background

Holdroom space on Concourse A is currently deficient and will become further deficient in the future as larger capacity aircraft (e.g., the Q-400) enter service. This deficiency is partially mitigated by adjacent concession spaces that provide passengers with additional seating area. Although Concourse A will ultimately be demolished and reconstructed to permit the extension of Taxiway T, interim improvements may be justified.

8.7.2 Objective

The objectives of the Concourse A improvements study are to identify (1) alternatives for increasing passenger comfort and convenience in Concourse A, and (2) the timing of the improvements to ensure minimal inconvenience to customers and the tenant.

8.7.3 Scope

The scope of the Concourse A improvements study would include holdrooms, concessions, circulation, and restrooms.

8.7.4 Timing

The timing of the Concourse A improvements study should be based on (1) current and future utilization of Concourse A gates, and (2) input from Horizon Air.

8.8 Concourse E Regional Airline Holdroom Improvements

8.8.1 Background

The lower level holdroom on Concourse E that serves commuter aircraft at Gates E6 through E13 is currently deficient and will remain so in the future. To the extent that the number of commuter aircraft served from this holdroom increases, or the size of the aircraft increases, the level of service will deteriorate.



8.8.2 Objectives

The objectives of the Concourse E regional airline holdroom improvements study are to identify (1) alternatives for increasing passenger comfort and convenience in the holdroom to a level equivalent to that provided at other holdrooms, and (2) the timing of the improvements to ensure minimal inconvenience to customers and SkyWest Airlines.

8.8.3 Scope

The scope of the Concourse E regional airline holdroom improvements study would include holdroom seating, concessions, vertical and horizontal circulation, and restrooms.

8.8.4 Timing

The timing of the Concourse E regional airline holdroom improvements study should be based on (1) current and future utilization of the holdroom, and (2) input from United Airlines and SkyWest Airlines.

8.9 Aircraft Rescue and Firefighting Facilities Siting Study

8.9.1 Background

The FAA's requirements for aircraft rescue and firefighting (ARFF) facilities may change in the future. Should it not be possible to meet the new requirements with the Airport's existing ARFF facilities, a new siting study would be needed.

8.9.2 Objectives

The objective of the ARFF facilities siting study would be to identify and evaluate alternatives for meeting the new requirements and recommend the preferred alternative.

8.9.3 Scope

The scope of the ARFF facilities siting study would include the new FAA requirements and all services required of the Airport's firefighting personnel and equipment.

8.9.4 Timing

The timing of the ARFF facilities siting study would coincide with the publication of new requirements by the FAA that cannot be met with existing ARFF facilities.

8.10 82nd Avenue Grade-Separated Interchange Project Definition

8.10.1 Background

It is anticipated that the intersection of NE 82nd Avenue with NE Airport Way will become capacity-constrained by PAL 2 (2017). According to prior Port access studies,



the solution is a grade-separated interchange to provide for unimpeded travel eastbound and westbound on NE Airport Way while northbound and southbound traffic on NE 82nd Avenue would use the signalized interchange ramps.

8.10.2 Objectives

The objectives of the grade-separated interchange project definition would be to identify the (1) the preferred design concept for the interchange, (2) extent of Airport property required to accommodate the concept, and (3) the impacts on existing facilities and land parcels as well as the timing of those impacts.

8.10.3 Scope

The scope of the grade-separated interchange project definition study would include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following elements:

- NE Airport Way
- NE 82nd Avenue
- MAX Light Rail
- Facilities to the northeast of the intersection
 - Delta Cargo
 - Flight kitchen
 - Frontage road
- Facilities to the northwest of the intersection
 - Sheraton
 - Hampton Inn
 - Frontage road
- Facilities to the southeast of the intersection
 - Embassy Suites
 - Rentrak Corporation
- Vacant parcel to the southwest of the intersection

8.10.4 Timing

The grade-separated interchange project definition study should be completed in a timeframe consistent with the growth of automobile traffic at the Airport and prior to or in conjunction with the north side properties redevelopment study and the P4 parking garage project definition study.


8.11 High-Speed Rail Study

8.11.1 Background

The effective integration of the Airport with the region's future high-speed rail service requires additional study.

8.11.2 Objectives

The objectives of the high-speed rail study would be to (1) confirm the region's expectations and plans for high-speed rail service and facilities, (2) define the range of policy and facilities issues that must be resolved to integrate air transportation at the Airport with high-speed rail transportation, (3) identify a range of potential Airport-related policy and facilities alternatives, and (4) prepare a preliminary long-range plan for integrating air and high-speed rail transportation.

8.11.3 Scope

The high-speed rail study would be completed in cooperation with appropriate regional transportation organizations and be consistent with the Master Plan Update. Potential facilities alternatives would be limited to those facilities located on-Airport to expedite the transfer of passengers between aircraft and railcars.

8.11.4 Timing

Assuming transportation between the Airport and the high-speed rail system will be provided by bus or light rail (an assumption that should be verified), the timing of the high-speed rail study will be determined by the region's high-speed rail plans. In other words, the high-speed rail study should be completed when the region's plans are decided.

8.12 Remain Overnight Aircraft Parking Ramp Design Study

8.12.1 Background

To meet the Port's objective to achieve higher gate utilization, thereby avoiding the expansion of passenger concourses to add aircraft gates, 23 additional remain overnight RON positions will be required by PAL 5 (2035). The requirements also include four additional RON positions by PAL 1 (2012) and two additional RON positions by PAL 2 (2017).



8.12.2 Objectives

The objectives of the RON aircraft parking ramp design study are to:

- 1. Confirm the preferred location for a supplemental RON aircraft parking.
- 2. Complete the design for the aircraft ramp(s) required through PAL 2 (i.e., ramp(s) to accommodate up to six RON aircraft.
- 3. Recommend how the project should be phased.
- 4. Determine the maximum number of RON aircraft parking positions that should be constructed in the immediate terminal area, before proceeding with development to the west of Runway 3-21.
- 5. Prepare a concept plan showing how RON aircraft parking positions can be developed to the west of Runway 3-21 to meet the Airport's needs through PAL 5 (2035).

8.12.3 Scope

The RON aircraft parking ramp design study should be limited to the area to the north of NE Airport Way and east of Runway 3-21, consistent with the recommendation presented in Section 4 of this Technical Memorandum. The study should be coordinated with the north side properties redevelopment study.

8.12.4 Timing

The study should be completed within two years of the Master Plan Update to accommodate PAL 1 (2012) requirements.

8.13 Commercial Vehicle Roadway Redevelopment Study

8.13.1 Background

By PAL 3 (2022), the deplaning curbside loading area will be deficient. By PAL 4 (2027), the deplaning curbside loading area deficiency will increase and another deplaning roadway lane will be needed. The preferred alternative for correcting both the loading area and roadway lane deficiencies involves reconfiguring the existing commercial vehicle service area in a two-phase process. In phase 1, which will occur at PAL 3, the existing commercial vehicle area will be reconfigured for use by automobiles associated with deplaning passenger activity. This reconfiguration will allow both the PAL 3 and PAL 4 needs to be met. Phase 2, which will occur at PAL 4, involves relocating some of the commercial vehicles into the P1 garage (into the space to be vacated when the rental car service center moves to the consolidated rental car facility)



and restriping the commercial vehicle area to accommodate rental car buses to and from the consolidated rental car center.

8.13.2 Objectives

The objectives of the study would be to develop detailed plans showing (1) how the space to be vacated by the rental cars will be used by commercial vehicles, and (2) how the space vacated by the commercial vehicles will be used for supplemental deplaning curbside and roadway lanes.

8.13.3 Scope

The study would include the entire lower level curbside and roadway system, the commercial vehicle area, the entrance and exit serving the rental car service center in the P1 garage, and the rental car service center.

8.13.4 Timing

The study should be completed in a timeframe consistent with the growth of rental car activity at the Airport and the need to accommodate PAL 3 (2022) requirements.

8.14 Enplaning Roadway Study

8.14.1 Background

Deficiencies have been identified in the enplaning level departure and approach roadways by PAL 1 (2012) and PAL 3 (2022), respectively. Because these roadways are elevated and adjacent to Concourses A and E, the feasibility of widening them to permit an additional departure and approach lanes requires further study.

8.14.2 Objectives

The objectives of the study would be to:

- 1. Determine the feasibility of widening the enplaning level departure and approach roadways to permit the addition of one departure lane and one approach lane.
- 2. Identify other alternatives for resolving the deficiency, including operating at a lower level of service.
- 3. Evaluate the alternatives using modeling to quantify the operational merits of each alternative.
- 4. Recommend the preferred alternative, considering factors such as construction difficulty and phasing, potential customer inconvenience, level of service, and estimated cost.



Appendix A FACILITY REQUIREMENTS

Table A-1 (page 1 of 4) FACILITIES REQUIREMENTS SUMMARY Master Plan Update Portland International Airport

Functional learner PALS PALS <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Estimate</th> <th>d total requir</th> <th>ements</th> <th></th> <th>Estima</th> <th>ated surplus (o</th> <th>deficiency) com</th> <th>pared with exis</th> <th>sting</th> <th>Pe</th> <th>riod-over-perio</th> <th>d (i.e., incremer</th> <th>ntal) requireme</th> <th>ent</th>				Estimate	d total requir	ements		Estima	ated surplus (o	deficiency) com	pared with exis	sting	Pe	riod-over-perio	d (i.e., incremer	ntal) requireme	ent
Linking Desired Desired <t< th=""><th>Functional Element</th><th></th><th>PAL 1</th><th>PAL 2</th><th>PAL 3</th><th>PAL 4</th><th>PAL 5</th><th>PAL 1</th><th>PAL 2</th><th>PAL 3</th><th>PAL 4</th><th>PAL 5</th><th>PAL 1</th><th>PAL 2</th><th>PAL 3</th><th>PAL 4</th><th>PAL 5</th></t<>	Functional Element		PAL 1	PAL 2	PAL 3	PAL 4	PAL 5	PAL 1	PAL 2	PAL 3	PAL 4	PAL 5	PAL 1	PAL 2	PAL 3	PAL 4	PAL 5
basis for Reconsense withow 1<		Existing	2012	2017	2022	2027	2035	2012	2017	2022	2027	2035	2012	2017	2022	2027	2035
Tabi answer information from the integration for the integratio	BASIS FOR REQUIREMENTS (DEMAND FORECASTS)																
Cauge in let of grange and streamed in barrier of motions of other barrier of manages and streamed in barrier of manages and streamed in barrier of manages. Search registreamed in barrier of manages. Description of manages. <td>Total annual passengers (millions)</td> <td>14.7</td> <td>15.0</td> <td>18.0</td> <td>20.6</td> <td>23.7</td> <td>26.8</td> <td>n/a</td>	Total annual passengers (millions)	14.7	15.0	18.0	20.6	23.7	26.8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Charper bar benchmony 280 280 374 280 174	Cargo in belly of psngr acft (thousands of short tons)		36	40	46	52	62										
Addem converse Addem c	Cargo in all-cargo acft (thousands of short tons)	280	288	374	450	542	670	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
ARFELD 2 pumble pins 2 pumble pins </td <td>Aircraft operations (thousands)</td> <td>265</td> <td>5 258</td> <td>292</td> <td>318</td> <td>347</td> <td>378</td> <td>n/a</td>	Aircraft operations (thousands)	265	5 258	292	318	347	378	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Amber J Amber J Paralle of para																	
Instruction Image of transport Image of transport <thimage of="" th="" transport<=""> Image of transp</thimage>	AIRFIELD					0 norollala											
Number values reasons of part-400	Number of summers		2 parallels	2 parallels	2 parallels	2 parallels	2 parallels										
Critical sizeraft D = 2/2 + 4/0 P =	Number of runways		pius	pius	plus	pius	plus	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Critical larger Internet IMRC D-M IMRC			B-747-400	B-747-400	B-747-400	B-747-400	B-747-400										
Rumay logal Game Log Bary	Critical aircraft		(ARC D-V)	(ARC D-V)	(ARC D-V)	(ARC D-V)	(ARC D-V)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Burney 10:28R 9.827	Runway length (feet)		,,		,	0	() () ()										
Burney 167-28L 11,000 <th< td=""><td>Runway 10L-28R</td><td></td><td>9,827</td><td>9,827</td><td>9,827</td><td>9,827</td><td>9,827</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></th<>	Runway 10L-28R		9,827	9,827	9,827	9,827	9,827	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Returner appring 6.000 6.000 6.000 6.000 · <	Runway 10R-28L		11,000	11,000	11,000	11,000	11,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Instrument approach capability CAT III	Runway 3-21		6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PASSENDER TEMINAL COMPLEX Image: constraint of parting Im	Instrument approach capability		CAT III	CAT III	CAT III	CAT III	CAT III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Altrend gates and parking Image of the parking Imag	PASSENGER TERMINAL COMPLEX																
Domestic gates 3 1 2 2 3 2 1 <th1< th=""> 1 <th1< th=""> <t< td=""><td>Aircraft gates and parking</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<></th1<></th1<>	Aircraft gates and parking																
Widebody AG IV (a.g., B-757-300) 22 1 1 - 1 - 1 - - - - Narewoody - ADG IV (a.g., B-757-300) 21 3 22 21 14 12 19 16 . - </td <td>Domestic gates</td> <td></td>	Domestic gates																
Marwbody - ADG II (e.g. B-737-800) 22 1 5 10 3 4 21 14 12 19 18 -<	Widebody	3	1	2	2	3	2	2	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Narwedy- AOC III (e.g., B-737-800) 15 34 29 27 33 32 (19) (14) (12) (18) (17) -	Narrowbody - ADG IV (e.g., B-757-300)	22	1	8	10	3	4	21	14	12	19	18	-	-	-	-	-
Regional jet / turbopop 21 19 19 19 21 21 2 2 - - - -	Narrowbody - ADG III (e.g., B-737-800)	15	34	29	27	33	32	(19)	(14)	(12)	(18)	(17)	-	-	-	-	-
Total domestic gates 61 55 58 68 60 59 6 3 3 1 2 -<	Regional jet / turboprop	21	19	19	19	21	21	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FIS gates Narrowbody - ADG II (e.g., B-737-800) S Narrowbody - ADG II (e.g., B-737-800) S Narrowbody - ADG II (e.g., B-737-800) S Narrowbody - ADG II (e.g., B-737-800) Narrowbody - ADG III (e.g., B-737-800) Narrowbody - ADG III (e.g., B-	Total domestic gates	61	55	58	58	60	59	6	3	3	1	2	-	-	-	-	-
Widebody S 3 4 4 5 6 2 1 1 - (1) -	FIS gates																
Narrowbody - ADC IV (e.g., B-757-300) -	Widebody	5	3	4	4	5	6	2	1	1	-	(1)	-	-	-	-	-
Narrowbody - ADG III (e.g., B-737-800) 1 2 3 2 3 2 1 (1) (2) (1) (2) (1) (2) (1) (2) (1) (2) (1) (2) (1) (2) (1) (2) (1) (2) (1) (2) (1) (2) (1) (2) (1) (2) (1) (2) (1) (2) (1) <th< td=""><td>Narrowbody - ADG IV (e.g., B-757-300)</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></th<>	Narrowbody - ADG IV (e.g., B-757-300)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Regional jef. utoporop	Narrowbody - ADG III (e.g., B-737-800)	1	2	3	2	3	2	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	-	-	-	-	-
Total FIS gates 6 5 7 6 8 8 1 (1) (2) (2) (2) - <td>Regional jet / turboprop</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td>	Regional jet / turboprop	-	-								-		-	-	-	-	-
Total domestic + FIS gates 8 4 6 6 8 8 4 2 2 - </td <td>Total FIS gates</td> <td>6</td> <td>5</td> <td>7</td> <td>6</td> <td>8</td> <td>8</td> <td>1</td> <td>(1)</td> <td></td> <td>(2)</td> <td>(2)</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td>	Total FIS gates	6	5	7	6	8	8	1	(1)		(2)	(2)	-	-	-	-	-
Widebody B 4 6 6 8 8 4 2 2 -<	Total domestic + FIS gates																
Narrowbody ADG IV (e.g., B-757-300) 22 1 8 10 3 4 21 14 12 19 18 -<	Widebody	8	4	6	6	8	8	4	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Narrowbody - ADG III (e.g., B-737-800) 16 36 32 29 36 34 (20) (15) (22) (16) - <td>Narrowbody - ADG IV (e.g., B-757-300)</td> <td>22</td> <td>1</td> <td>8</td> <td>10</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>21</td> <td>14</td> <td>12</td> <td>19</td> <td>18</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td>	Narrowbody - ADG IV (e.g., B-757-300)	22	1	8	10	3	4	21	14	12	19	18	-	-	-	-	-
Regional jet / turboprop 21 19 19 21 31 31 33	Narrowbody - ADG III (e.g., B-737-800)	16	36	32	29	36	34	(20)	(16)	(13)	(20)	(18)	-	-	-	-	-
Iotal domestic + FIS gates 67 60 66 66 66 67 7 2 3 (1) -	Regional jet / turboprop	21	19	19	19	21	21		2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Remote / RON parking 3 - - - - - - 3	I otal domestic + FIS gates	67	60	65	64	68	67	7	2	3	(1)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wideboody AB	Remote / RON parking						0	2	0		0						
Natrowoody - ADG III (e.g., B-737-300) 5 4 1 2 - 5 4 1 2 - 5 4 3 5 2 1 1 - 1 1 2 5 2 4 1 5 2 1	Widebody	3	-	-	-	-	3	3	3	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
National outline (a.g., b) is rotation (a.g., b)	Narrowbody - ADG IV (e.g., B-757-300)	5	4	12	15	-	3	(7)	4 (12)	3 (15)	0 (25)	(24)	-	-	-	-	-
Treglonarie/ notophy	Regional jet / turbonron	-	1	1	1	25	24	(1)	(12)	(13)	(23)	(24)	-	-	-	-	-
Holdrooms (area in square feet) 6 12 14 18 23 31 (4) (6) (10) (17) (23) 4 2 4 7 6 Holdrooms (area in square feet) 6,004 9,953 9,953 11,076 10,417 10,766 (3,949) (3,949) (5,072) (4,413) (4,762) 3,949 - <td>Total Remote / RON parking</td> <td></td> <td>12</td> <td>1</td> <td>10</td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>(<u>)</u></td> <td>(I) (6)</td> <td>(1)</td> <td>(47)</td> <td>(1)</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>- </td> <td>- 7</td> <td>-</td>	Total Remote / RON parking		12	1	10		1	(<u>)</u>	(I) (6)	(1)	(47)	(1)	-	-	-	- 7	-
Holdborn gate insquare recty 6,004 9,953 9,953 11,076 10,417 10,766 (3,949) (3,949) (4,413) (4,762) 3,949 - 1,123 - - Concourse A 4,701 4,182 4,308 4,308 2,914 2,633 519 393 393 1,787 2,068 -	Holdrooms (area in square feet)	0	12	14	18	25	31	(4)	(0)	(10)	(17)	(23)	4	2	4	1	0
Concourse B 4,701 4,182 4,308 4,308 2,914 2,633 519 393 1,787 2,668 - <		6 004	9 953	9 953	11 076	10 417	10 766	(3 940)	(3 040)	(5.072)	(4 413)	(4 762)	3 040	-	1 123	-	_
Concourse C 40,267 24,407 29,316 28,464 30,748 31,629 15,860 10,951 11,803 9,519 8,638 - <	Concourse B	4 701	2,333 4 182	4 308	4 308	2 91/	2 633	510	(3,3-3) 303	303	1 787	2 068		_	-	-	_
Concourse D 26,117 27,341 31,930 34,321 37,129 36,838 (1,224) (5,813) (8,204) (11,012) (10,721) 1,224 4,589 2,391 2,808 - Concourse E 11,212 10,611 9,914 9,759 8,868 8,984 601 1,298 1,453 2,344 2,228 -	Concourse C	40 267	24 407	29,316	28 464	30 748	31 629	15 860	10 951	11 803	9,519	8 638	-	_	_	-	_
Concourse E 11,212 10,611 9,914 9,759 8,868 8,984 601 1,298 1,453 2,344 2,228 - - - - - - - - - - 1775 774	Concourse D	26,117	27,341	31,930	34.321	37,129	36,838	(1.224)	(5.813)	(8,204)	(11.012)	(10.721)	1.224	4.589	2 391	2,808	-
Total holdroom area 88.301 76.494 85.421 87.928 90.076 90.850 11.807 2.880 373 (1.775) (2.549) 1.775 774	Concourse E	11.212	10.611	9.914	9.759	8.868	8.984	601	1.298	1.453	2.344	2.228	-	-	-	-	-
	Total holdroom area	88.301	76.494	85.421	87.928	90.076	90.850	11.807	2.880	373	(1.775)	(2.549)	-	-	-	1.775	774

Table A-1 (page 2 of 4) FACILITIES REQUIREMENTS SUMMARY Master Plan Update Portland International Airport

			Estimated	total requir	ements		Estim	ated surplus (d	leficiency) comp	ared with exis	tina	Per	iod-over-perio	d (i.e., incremen	tal) requireme	nt
Functional Element		PAL 1	PAL 2	PAL 3	PAL 4	PAL 5	PAL 1	PAL 2	PAL 3	PAL 4	PAL 5	PAL 1	PAL 2	PAL 3	PAL 4	PAL 5
	Existing	2012	2017	2022	2027	2035	2012	2017	2022	2027	2035	2012	2017	2022	2027	2035
BASIS FOR REQUIREMENTS (DEMAND FORECASTS)																
Total annual passengers (millions)	14.7	15.0	18.0	20.6	23.7	26.8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Cargo in belly of psngr acft (thousands of short tons)		36	40	46	52	62										
Cargo in all-cargo acft (thousands of short tons)	280	288	374	450	542	670	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Aircraft operations (thousands)	265	258	292	318	347	378	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Airline Check-in																
Number of processors																
Agent counters	87	50	57	64	64	68	37	30	23	23	19	-	-	-	-	-
Kiosks w/bag check	56	36	42	49	47	52	20	14	7	9	4	-	-	-	-	-
Kiosks w/out bag check	23	24	23	25	28	32	(1)	-	(2)	(5)	(9)	1	-	1	3	4
Curbside	24	24	24	24	24	24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	190	134	146	162	163	176	56	44	28	27	14	-	-	-	-	-
Lobby queue area (square feet)	1											-	-	-	-	-
@ IATA level of service B	13,565	11,296	12,944	14,528	14,832	16,704	2,269	621	(963)	(1,267)	(3,139)	-	-	963	304	1,872
@ IATA level of service C	13,565	9,884	11,326	12,712	12,978	14,616	3,681	2,239	853	587	(1,051)					
Passenger Security Screening																
Number of screening lanes																
South	8	8	9	9	10	13	-	(1)	(1)	(2)	(5)	-	1	-	1	3
North	8	6	6	7	8	8	2	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	16	14	15	16	18	21	2	1	-	(2)	(5)	-	-	-	2	3
Queue area (square feet)																
Document check																
@ IATA level of service B																
South	1,660	1,170	3,458	3,692	3,536	4,602	490	(1,798)	(2,032)	(1,876)	(2,942)	-	1,798	234	-	910
North	1,504	1,118	2,301	2,301	2,470	2,704	386	(797)	(797)	(966)	(1,200)	-	797	-	169	234
Total	3,164	2,288	5,759	5,993	6,006	7,306	876	(2,595)	(2,829)	(2,842)	(4,142)	-	2,595	234	13	1,300
@ IATA level of service C	1															
South	1,660	990	2,926	3,124	2,992	3,894	670	(1,266)	(1,464)	(1,332)	(2,234)	-	1,266	198	-	770
North	1,504	946	1,947	1,947	2,090	2,288	558	(443)	(443)	(586)	(784)	-	443	-	143	198
Total	3,164	1,936	4,873	5,071	5,082	6,182	1,228	(1,709)	(1,907)	(1,918)	(3,018)	-	1,709	198	11	1,100
Primary queue																
@ IATA level of service B	1															
South	2,003	2,860	3,367	4,082	4,082	4,953	(857)	(1,364)	(2,079)	(2,079)	(2,950)	857	507	715	-	871
North	2,044	2,223	2,288	2,483	2,951	3,250	(179)	(244)	(439)	(907)	(1,206)	179	65	195	468	299
Total	4,047	5,083	5,655	6,565	7,033	8,203	(1,036)	(1,608)	(2,518)	(2,986)	(4,156)	1,036	572	910	468	1,170
@ IATA level of service C		,		,		,										
South	2,003	2,420	2,849	3,454	3,454	4,191	(417)	(846)	(1,451)	(1,451)	(2,188)	417	429	605	-	737
North	2,044	1,881	1,936	2,101	2,497	2,750	163	108	(57)	(453)	(706)	-	-	57	396	253
Total	4,047	4,301	4,785	5,555	5,951	6,941	(254)	(738)	(1,508)	(1,904)	(2,894)	254	484	770	396	990
Baggage Security Screening																
Number of primary EDS machines																
South	4	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
North	4	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	-	-	-	-	-
Total	8	5	5	5	5	6	3	3	3	3	2	-	-	-	-	-
Outbound Baggage Makeup																
Number of cart staging positions																
South	78	65	72	79	86	95	13	6	(1)	(8)	(17)	-	-	1	7	9
North	85	56	69	71	89	90	29	16	14	(4)	(5)	-	-	-	4	1
Total	163	121	141	150	175	185	42	22	13	(12)	(22)	-	-	-	12	10
Inbound Baggage Handling										()	()					
Total offload frontage (linear feet)	439	328	379	425	462	490	111	60	14	(23)	(51)	-	-	-	23	29
Baggage Claim Domestic											. ,					
Total presentation frontage (linear feet)	1,653	1,094	1,262	1,417	1,539	1,635	559	391	236	114	18	-	-	-	-	-
Total area for claiming baggage (square feet)	32,812	16,529	19,067	21,411	23,250	24,702	16,283	13,745	11,401	9,562	8,110	-	-	-	-	-

Table A-1 (page 3 of 4) FACILITIES REQUIREMENTS SUMMARY Master Plan Update Portland International Airport

			Estimated	total requir	ements		Estima	ted surplus (deficiency) comp	pared with exist	ing	Pe	riod-over-period	l (i.e., increme	ntal) requireme	nt
Functional Element		PAL 1	PAL 2	PAL 3	PAL 4	PAL 5	PAL 1	PAL 2	PAL 3	PAL 4	PAL 5	PAL 1	PAL 2	PAL 3	PAL 4	PAL 5
	Existing	2012	2017	2022	2027	2035	2012	2017	2022	2027	2035	2012	2017	2022	2027	2035
BASIS FOR REQUIREMENTS (DEMAND FORECASTS)																
Total annual passengers (millions)	14.7	15.0	18.0	20.6	23.7	26.8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Cargo in belly of psngr acft (thousands of short tons)		36	40	46	52	62										
Cargo in all-cargo acft (thousands of short tons)	280	288	374	450	542	670	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Aircraft operations (thousands)	265	258	292	318	347	378	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
FIS Facilities																
Primary processing	6	F	7	7	7	7	4	(4)			(4)		1			
Drimony queuing area (aquera fact)	5 027	0 4 212	6 029	6 0 2 9	6 0 2 9	6 029	704	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	-	1 001	-	-	-
Baggage Claim	5,037	4,313	0,030	0,030	0,038	0,030	124	(1,001)	(1,001)	(1,001)	(1,001)	-	1,001	-	-	-
Per device																
Presentation frontage (linear feet)	145	210	210	210	210	210	(65)	(65)	(65)	(65)	(65)	65	-	-	-	-
Retrieval & peripheral area (square feet)	2 525	2 972	2 972	2 972	2 972	2 972	(447)	(447)	(447)	(447)	(447)	447	-	-	-	-
Total	2,020	2,072	2,012	2,012	2,012	2,012	(,	(,	(,	(,	(,					
Number of devices	2	2	3	3	3	3	-	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	-	1	-	-	-
Presentation frontage (linear feet)	290	420	630	630	630	630	(130)	(340)	(340)	(340)	(340)	130	210	-	-	-
Retrieval & peripheral area (square feet)	5,800	5,945	8,917	8,917	8,917	8,917	(145)	(3,117)	(3,117)	(3,117)	(3,117)	145	2,972	-	-	-
Secondary processing																
Queuing area (square feet)	460	565	791	791	791	791	(105)	(331)	(331)	(331)	(331)	105	226	-	-	-
Referral waiting area (square feet)	1,015	275	400	400	400	400	740	615	615	615	615	-	-	-	-	-
Exam podiums w/ belts (units)	4	-	-	-	-	-	4	4	4	4	4	-	-	-	-	-
X-ray workstations (units)	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Baggage security screening																
Number of primary EDS machines	1	3	4	4	4	4	(2)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	2	1	-	-	-
Passenger security screening			-		_		_									
Number of screening lanes	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	-
GROUND TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING																
Public parking (spaces)																
Close-in parking	7,380	5,120	6,540	7,760	9,000	10,540	2,260	840	(380)	(1,620)	(3,160)	-	-	-	-	-
Remote parking	7,788	8,260	10,540	12,510	14,510	17,000	(472)	(2,752)	(4,722)	(6,722)	(9,212)	-	-	-	-	-
Subtotal	15,168	13,380	17,080	20,270	23,510	27,540	1,788	(1,912)	(5,102)	(8,342)	(12,372)	-	1,912	3,190	3,240	4,030
Holiday / overflow	-	650	840	990	1,150	1,350	(650)	(840)	(990)	(1,150)	(1,350)	-	-	-	-	-
Requirements currently accommodated off-Airport	1,300	1,400	1,800	2,100	2,500	2,900	(100)	(500)	(800)	(1,200)	(1,600)	-	-	-	-	-
Total, including holiday/overflow and off-Airport	16,468	15,430	19,720	23,360	27,160	31,790	1,038	(3,252)	(6,892)	(10,692)	(15,322)	-	-	-	-	-
Employee parking (spaces)	2,544	1,900	2,200	2,500	2,800	3,100	644	344	44	(256)	(556)	-	-	-	256	300
Enclosing authoide	020	700	940	060	1 0 9 0	1 200	200	90	(24)	(454)	(274)			24	120	120
	929	120	640 520	960	1,060	720	209	(20)	(31)	(151)	(271)	-	- 20	31	120	120
Subtotal	1 / 29	1 160	1 360	1 560	1 730	1 930	269	(20)	(100)	(130)	(230)		20	131	170	200
Curbside roadway (lanes)	1,425	1,100	1,000	1,500	1,700	1,350	203	00	(101)	(301)	(301)			101	170	200
Enplaning curbside	4	4	4	4	5	6	-	-	-	(1)	(2)	-	-	-	1	1
Deplaning curbside	4	4	4	5	5	5	-	-	(1)	(i)	(1)	-	-	1	-	-
Commercial vehicle facilities																
Loading area (linear feet)	1,245	770	840	890	970	1,070	475	405	355	275	175	-	-	-	-	-
Hold / staging facility (acres)	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.2	1.4	1.6	(0.0)	(0.2)	(0.3)	(0.5)	(0.7)	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Rental car facilities																
Ready / return parking (spaces)	1,481	910	1,090	1,250	2,390	2,700	571	391	231	(909)	(1,219)	-	-	-	909	310
Service facilities (acres)	2.4	6.9	7.9	10.5	8.5	9.6	(4.5)	(5.5)	(8.1)	(6.1)	(7.2)	4.5	1.0	2.6	0.0	1.1
Roadways																
NE Airport Way, westbound (link ID AFig 4-4)	3	3	3	4	4	4	-	-	(1)	(1)	(1)	-	-	1	-	-
NE Airport Way, eastbound (link ID BFig 4-4)	3	3	3	3	4	4	-	-	-	(1)	(1)	-	-	-	1	-
Parking entrance (link ID CFig 4-4)	1	1	1	1	2	2	-	-		(1)	(1)	-	-	-	1	-
Enplaning level approach (link ID DFig 4-4)	2	2	2	3	3	3	-		(1)	(1)	(1)	-	-	1	-	-
Deplaning level approach (link ID EFig 4-4)	3	3	3	3	3	3		-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Enplaning level departure (link ID FFig 4-4)	1	2	2	2	3	3	(1)	(1)	(1)	(2)	(2)	1	-	-	1	-
Deplaning level departure (link ID GFig 4-4)	2	2	2	2	3	3	-	-	-	(1)	(1)	-	-	-	1	-
Terminal avit (link ID HFIG 4-4)	1	1	1	1	2	2	-	-	-	(1)	(1)	-	-	-	1	-
Poturn to terminal road (link ID I - Fig 4-4)	2	3	3	3	4	4	(1)	(1)	(1)	(2)	(2)	1	-	-	1	-
Terminal area avit (link ID K Eig 4.4)	1	1	1	1	2	2	-	-	- (4)	(1)	(1)	-	-	-	1	-
reminararea exit (iink ID KFig 4-4)	2	2	3	3	4	4	-	(1)	(1)	(2)	(2)	-		-		-

Table A-1 (page 4 of 4) FACILITIES REQUIREMENTS SUMMARY Master Plan Update Portland International Airport

			Estimated	total requir	ements		Estin	nated surplus (deficiency) comp	pared with exis	sting	Pe	riod-over-perio	od (i.e., increment	tal) requireme	ent
Functional Element	E-sie die e	PAL 1	PAL 2	PAL 3	PAL 4	PAL 5	PAL 1	PAL 2	PAL 3	PAL 4	PAL 5	PAL 1	PAL 2	PAL 3	PAL 4	PAL 5
	Existing	2012	2017	2022	2027	2035	2012	2017	2022	2027	2035	2012	2017	2022	2027	2035
BASIS FOR REQUIREMENTS (DEMAND FORECASTS)	447	15.0	10.0	20.0	00.7	20.0	-	-	n/n				-	2/2	2/2	2/2
Lotal annual passengers (millions)	14.7	15.0	18.0	20.6	23.7	20.8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Cargo in all-cargo acft (thousands of short tons)	280	288	374	450	542	670	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Aircraft operations (thousands)	265	258	292	318	347	378	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Key interceptions																
Rey Intersections			grade					grade					arade			
NE 82nd Ave/NE Airport Way		-	separated	-	-	-	-	separated		-	-		separated			
			interchange					interchange				-	interchange		-	-
Mt. Hood interchange area (3 intersections)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NE Airport Way/I-205 interchange																
I-205 Southbound		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1 205 Northbound		e bound to					e bound to					e'hound to				
I-205 Nottribound		solution	-	-	-	-	solution	-	-	-	-	n'hound solution	-	_	-	_
		oolution				e'bound rt	ooranon				e'bound rt					e'bound rt turn
NE 82nd Avenue/NE Alderwood Road		-	-	-	-	turn pocket	-	-	-	-	turn pocket	-	-	-	-	pocket
NE Alderwood Bood/NE Corpfort Bood				n'bound lt					n'bound It					n'bound It turn		
NE Alderwood Road/NE Comioor Road		-	-	turn pocket	-	-	-	-	turn pocket	-	-	-	-	pocket	-	-
NE Airtrans Way/NE Cornfoot Road		signalized intersection	-	-	-	-	signalized intersection	-	-	-	-	signalized intersection	-	-	-	-
NE Columbia Boulevard/NE 82nd Avenue (2 intersecti NE Killingsworth St./I-205 interchange area (2 intersection)	ons) tions)											-				
AIR CARGO																
Belly Cargo																
Warehouse space (square feet)	236,000	54,000	60,000	69,000	78,000	93,000	182,000	176,000	167,000	158,000	143,000	-	-	-	-	-
Ramp (square yards)	67,000	4,000	4,000	5,000	6,000	7,000	63,000	63,000	62,000	61,000	60,000	-	-	-	-	-
Landside area (square feet)	-	54,000	60,000	69,000	78,000	93,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
l otal area (acres)	-	3	4	4	5	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Warehouse space (square feet)	392 000	432 000	561 000	675 000	813 000	1 005 000	(40,000)	(169,000)	(283.000)	(421 000)	(613,000)	40.000	129 000	114 000	138 000	192 000
Ramp (square vards)	189.000	240.000	312.000	375.000	452.000	558.000	(51,000)	(123,000)	(186.000)	(263.000)	(369.000)	51.000	72.000	63.000	77.000	106.000
Landside area (square feet)	-	432,000	561,000	675,000	813,000	1,005,000	(432,000)	(561,000)	(675,000)	(813,000)	(1,005,000)	432,000	129,000	114,000	138,000	192,000
Total area (acres)		69	90	108	131	161	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
GENERAL AVIATION																
Total area (acres)	30	40 - 50	40 - 50	40 - 50	40 - 50	40 - 50	10 - 20	10 - 20	10 - 20	10 - 20	10 - 20	10 - 20	10 - 20	-	-	-
MILITARY																
Total area (acres)	246	246	246	246	246	246	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
AIRLINE SUPPORT																
Fuel storage																
Quantity (millions of gallons)	3,360	3,109	3,534	3,884	4,262	4,660	251	(174)	(524)	(902)	(1,300)	-	174	350	378	398
Land area (acres)	4	3.7	4.2	4.6	5.1	5.5	0	(0)	(1)	(1)	(2)	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.4
In-flight catering facilities (acres)	6.5	339 6.5	539 6.5	539 6.5	6.5	539 6.5	-	-		-	-					
AIRPORT SUPPORT							<u> </u>									
Aircraft rescue and fire fighting (acres)	5.8	9	9	9	9	9	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	3	-	-	-	-
Airport maintenance (acres)	12.2	14.4	14.4	14.4	14.4	14.4	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	2	-	-	-	-
					I		L									

ADG = Airplane design group

EDS = Explosives detection system FIS = Federal Inspection Services IATA = International Air Transport Association

ARC = Airplane reference code CAT = Category

FIS = Federal Inspection Sei

n/a = Not applicable

RON = Remain overnight

a. Passenger terminal complex requirements were determined based primarily on simulation modeling using flight schedules for 2008, 2017, 2022, 2027 and 2035. A flight schedule was not developed for 2012 because the activity is forecast so be very similar to activity in 2008. Accordingly, requirements for the passenger terminal complex in 2012 were assumed to equal the requirements for 2008.

Sources: Jacobs Consultancy, DKS Associates, and HNTB Corporation; October 2008.

Appendix B

LIFE-CYCLE COST ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES FOR TRANSPORTING RENTAL CAR CUSTOMERS TO AND FROM THE TERMINAL

Appendix B

LIFE-CYCLE COST ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES FOR TRANSPORTING CUSTOMERS BETWEEN A CONSOLIDATED RENTAL CAR CENTER AND THE TERMINAL

Three alternatives modes were identified for transporting customers between a consolidated rental car facility and the passenger terminal—an automated people mover (APM) system, MAX light rail, and busing. These alternatives are described in Section 5.2.2 of this Technical Memorandum.

This appendix summarizes the results of the life-cycle cost analysis that was performed for each alternative mode and accounted for both capital and operating costs estimated to occur in each year over a 20-year period. The net present values of the life-cycle costs were estimated assuming a discount rate of 7%.

1. AUTOMATED PEOPLE MOVER SYSTEM

Capital and operating cost estimates for the APM system alternatives were provided by Lea + Elliott, Inc. and are shown in Table B-1. The life-cycle costs and their net present values for the APM system alternatives are shown in Table B-2.

2. MAX LIGHT RAIL

In June 2009, the planning team spoke with John Griffiths of TriMet (operator of Portland's MAX light rail system) to (1) explore the concept of modifying and expanding the MAX system at the Airport so that it might be used to transport customers between the passenger terminal and parking garages or a consolidated rental car facility, (2) learn if Griffiths believes the concept is sound, and if so, (3) obtain information on potential costs. Griffiths believes the concept is sound; the discussion and input provided are summarized in Table B-3. The capital and operations and maintenance costs estimated for the MAX light rail alternatives are summarized in Table B-4. The life-cycle costs and their net present values for the MAX light rail alternatives are shown in Table B-5.

3. BUS

The input required to estimate the life-cycle costs and their net present values for the busing alternatives are summarized in six tables as follows:

- Table B-6 bus operations and maintenance costs
- Table B-7 round-trip travel times



PDX623

- Table B-8 number of buses and operating hours required for service to public parking and rental car facilities
- Table B-9 total number of buses required, including spares
- Table B-10 annual operations and maintenance costs
- Table B-11 net present value of life-cycle costs



PDX623

	Table B-1			
ESTIMATED CAPITAL AND			NANCE COST	S
	STSTEW ALT	ERNATIVES		
PDX Master Plan U	pdate, ROM APM	A Costs (Prelimin	ary)	
Item	Economy	P4	PIC	P3 ³
Max. Passenger Demand (2035)	2,676 pphpd	2,547 pphpd	2,676 pphpd	2,288 pphpd
Max. System Capacity	2,872 pphpd	2,857 pphpd	2,700 pphpd	4,186 pphpd
Guideway Length	8,600 ft.	5,800 ft.	9,900 ft. 🌰	2,400 ft.
No. of Stations	4	3	4	2
No. of Substations	2	1	2	1
No. of MSF	1	1	1	1
Roundtrip Time	9.5 min	6.5 min	10.0 min	3.0 min
Headway	3 .0 min	3.0 min	3.5 min	1.5 min
Trip Time (Wait Plus Travel)	6.5 min	4.5 min	6.5 min	2 min
No. of Trains	3	2	3	2
No. of Cars per Train	3	3	3	2
Spare Vehicles	2	1	2	0
Total Fleet Size	11 vehicles	7 vehicles	11 vehicles	4 vehicles
System Capital Cost (DBOM Contractor) ¹	\$99 million	\$70 million	\$106 million	\$40 million
Facilities Capital Cost (DBB Contractor) ²	\$112 million	\$90 million	\$123million	\$39 million
Total Capital Cost Incl. Contingency	\$212 million	\$160 million	\$229 million	\$79 million
Annual O&M Cost	\$6.5 million	\$4.5 million	\$6.5 million	\$3.0 million

³ includes 35% for design and PM plus 20% contingency ² includes 20% for design and PM plus 20% contingency ³dual lane shuttle

Assumptions:

- 1. Pinched loop operations (except P3) with maximum 50 mph train speed.
- 2. 50 passenger capacity per car (baggage conditions).
- 3. 30 second dwell time.
- 4. 24 hour operation.
- 5. Estimate in 3rd quarter 2009 dollars.
- 6. Self propelled vehicles for pinched loop and capacity issues (e.g. Bombardier, Mitsubishi, IHI).
- 7. Station and maintenance facility have minimal architectural finishes.
- 8. Estimate does not include owner soft costs.
- 9. Side platform stations.
- 10. P3 dual lane shuttle could be cable-propelled if not expanded in the future.

Source: Lea + Elliott, June 2009.



		Т	able B-2		
	LIFE-CYC	LE COSTS AND FOR APM SYS	THEIR NET PR	ESENT VALUES TIVES	
		Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
•	Year	P3 Line	P4 Line	Economy Line	PIC Line
Canital Co	sts (\$millions)				
System		\$40	\$70	\$99	\$106
Facilities		39	90	112	123
Total		\$79	<u>\$160</u>	<u>\$211</u>	\$229
		ψi ö	φ100	Ψ211	Ψ220
Annual O&I (\$millions)	VI Cost	\$3.0	\$4.5	\$6.5	\$6.5
l ife-cvcle (Cost Analysis				
	Year				
0	2026	\$79	\$160	\$211	\$229
1	2027	\$3	\$5	\$7	\$7
2	2028	\$3	\$5	\$7	\$7
3	2029	\$3	\$5	\$7	\$7
4	2030	\$3	\$5	\$7	\$7
5	2031	\$3	\$5	\$7	\$7
6	2032	\$3	\$5	\$7	\$7
7	2033	\$3	\$5	\$7	\$7
8	2034	\$3	\$5	\$7	\$7
9	2035	\$3	\$5	\$7	\$7
10	2036	\$3	\$5	\$7	\$7
11	2037	\$3	\$5	\$7	\$7
12	2038	\$3	\$5	\$7	\$7
13	2039	\$3	\$5	\$7	\$7
14	2040	\$3	\$5	\$7	\$7
15	2041	\$3	\$5	\$7	\$7
16	2042	\$3	\$5	\$7	\$7
17	2043	\$3	\$5	\$7	\$7
18	2044	\$3	\$5	\$7	\$7
19	2045	\$3	\$5	\$7	\$7
20	2046	\$3	\$5	\$7	\$7
	NPV <i>(a)</i>	\$111	\$208	\$280	\$298

(a) NPV is computed assuming a discount rate of 7%.

Note: Amounts shown are real values (i.e., in 2009 dollars). Capital cost is shown in year 0, recurring O&M is shown in Years 1-20.

Source: Jacobs Consultancy, June 2009.



Table B-3

SUMMARY OFLIGHT RAIL INPUT RECEIVED FROM TRIMET ASSUMPTIONS AND GENERAL DISCUSSION

- 1. Single-station pick up (i.e., if MAX were to pick up customers at a consolidated rental car facility, the customers would be picked up from a single location).
- 2. Two tracks would likely be adequate for cars on 5-minute headways; less than 5 minute headways would likely require three tracks.
- 3. Two tracks would not be adequate at the terminal—four tracks would likely be required, two for local service and two for on-Airport service.

Issue: Should we assume the on-Airport system could share one of the existing tracks (i.e., construct one additional track) or should we assume no sharing (i.e., construct two additional tracks)?

Response: Assume the addition of only one track. But if the alignment changes, demolish the existing track and construct two new tracks at \$50 million per mile.

- 4. Service to the P3 garage location would likely require a spur from the main line with a stub end, a pair of switches, a crossing, and a simple platform. (All these costs except the platform cost are included in the per mile track cost documented below.)
- 5. Service to the Portland International Center location would require the same equipment as for the P3 garage location (the spur would be longer).
- 6. Service to the P4 garage location would require parallel tracks (i.e., a siding).
- 7. About two minutes is required to turn a train (customers board during the turn).
- 8. Assume an average speed of 20 miles per hour assuming double tracks (this includes slow downs, etc.).
- 9. The cars providing on-Airport transportation would be different from the cars providing transportation off-Airport. No fares would be collected for on-Airport use.
- 10. Three to four vehicles could be required. If four vehicles were required, a spare would also be required.
- 11. Vehicle maintenance could be provided off-Airport at an existing TriMet maintenance facility. Assume the cost of support facilities for the vehicles at the yard and shop is \$1.5 million per vehicle.
- 12. TriMet would operate the on-Airport system.



Table B-3 (continued)SUMMARY OFLIGHT RAIL INPUT RECEIVED FROM TRIMETASSUMPTIONS AND GENERAL DISCUSSION

- 13. The minimum radius curve for the track is 82 feet. The track on minimum radius curves wears faster than track on larger radius curves and has to be replaced every 10 years.
- 14. The system for providing on-Airport transportation would be independent of the existing system.

POTENTIAL COSTS

Capital

- 1. Assume \$50 million per mile to lay two tracks on open ground. This includes earthwork, roadway, overhead lines, new substations, signals and controls. This does not include right-of-way acquisition, stations (i.e., platforms), fare collection system, or station furniture. This unit cost is scalable.
- 2. Vehicles cost \$4.5 million each and are equipped with 68 seats. TriMet assumes a maximum capacity of 133 persons with some standing and no luggage. Useful vehicle life is 35 years.

A less expensive option would be to use streetcars instead of LRVs, which cost \$3.5 million per vehicle. Passenger capacity would be 92 per streetcar.

3. Griffith believes a platform would cost \$200,000. Port staff believes this cost is too low, based on what the Port spent on the existing platform.

O&M

- 1. Light rail vehicle (LRV) O&M cost is \$250 per vehicle hour. This is all inclusive (i.e., includes maintenance, the cost of supervision, controllers, etc.). Griffiths stated we may want to assume a 10% higher O&M to account for overhead.
- The use of streetcars would require a maintenance facility on site which could cost \$1.5 million per vehicle, not including land and utility connections. Streetcar O&M is \$135 per vehicle-hour.

Source: TriMet, June 2009.



	Tabl	e B-4					
ESTIMATED CAPITAL A FOR MA	ND OPERA	TIONS A AIL ALTE	ND MAI	NT /ES	ENANCE CO S	OSTS	
						Alternative	
					1	2	3
Cost elements	Unit Cos	t <i>(a)</i>	Units (b)	P3 Line	P4 Line	PIC Line
CAPITAL ASSUMING LIGHT RAIL VEHICLE CARS							
Light rail vehicle (LRV) cars	• · · · · · · · · · ·		_		•		
P3 service only	\$4,500,000	per car	2		\$9,000,000	\$9,000,000	\$9,000,000
P4 and P3 service (incremental cars)	\$4,500,000	per car	4			\$18,000,000	\$18,000,000
	φ4,300,000	per car	5				φ+0,000,000
Spare LRV cars	¢ 4 500 000		0		* 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
P3 service only P4 and P3 service (incremental care)	\$4,500,000 \$4,500,000	per car	0		\$0	\$U \$4 500 000	\$U \$4 500 000
PIC. P4 and P3 service (incremental cars)	\$4,500,000	per car	2			\$4,500,000	\$9,000,000
Vehicle and spares subtotal	÷ ,,				\$9,000,000	\$31,500,000	\$81,000,000
Additional track							
Segment 1: two additional tracks at terminal (ft)	\$50,000,000	per mile	500	ft	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000
Segment 2: two additional tracks for service to P3	\$50,000,000	, per mile	1,500	ft	\$14,000,000	\$14,000,000	\$14,000,000
Segment 3: two additional tracks for service to P4	\$50,000,000	per mile	2,000	ft		\$19,000,000	\$19,000,000
Segment 4: one additional track for service to P4	\$25,000,000	per mile	1,300	ft		\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000
Segment 5: one additional tracks for service to PIC	\$25,000,000 \$50,000,000	per mile	2,200	ft			\$10,000,000 \$18,000,000
Segment 6. two additional tracks for service to PIC	\$50,000,000	permie	1,900	п			\$18,000,000
Additional platforms							
Terminal platform	\$1,500,000	each	1		\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
P3 platform	\$1,000,000	each	1		\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
PIC platform	\$1,000,000	each	1			\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
Additional track and platforms subtotal	φ1,000,000	ouon	·		\$21,500,000	\$47,500,000	\$76,500,000
Total conital cost (rough order of magnitude)					¢20 500 000	¢70,000,000	¢167 600 000
					φ30,500,000	φ <i>ι</i> 9,000,000	φ157,500,000



Table B-4 (page 2 of 2) ESTIMATED CAPITAL AND OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE COSTS FOR MAX LIGHT RAIL ALTERNATIVES

					Alternative	
				1	2	3
Cost elements	Unit Co	st <i>(a)</i>	Units (b)	P3 Line	P4 Line	PIC Line
CAPITAL ASSUMING OPTIONAL STREETCARS						
Streetcars						
P3 service only	\$3,500,000	per car	2	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000
P4 and P3 service (incremental cars)	\$3,500,000	per car	4		\$14,000,000	\$14,000,000
PIC, P4 and P3 service (incremental cars)	\$3,500,000	per car	9			\$31,500,000
Spare streetcars						
P3 service only	\$3,500,000	per car	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
P4 and P3 service (incremental cars)	\$3,500,000	per car	1		\$3,500,000	\$3,500,000
PIC, P4 and P3 service (incremental cars)	\$3,500,000	per car	2			\$7,000,000
Streetcar subtotal				\$7,000,000	\$24,500,000	\$63,000,000
Maintenance facility for streetcars						
P3 service only	\$1.500.000	per car	2	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000
P4 and P3 service	\$1,500,000	per car	4	\$0,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000
PIC. P4 and P3 service	\$1,500,000	per car	. 9	_	\$0,000,000	\$13,500,000
	\$1,000,000	por our	0	¢04 500 000	¢ 47 500 000	\$70,500,000
Additional track and platforms (from page 1)				\$21,500,000	\$47,500,000	\$76,500,000
Total capital cost (rough order of magnitude)				\$31,500,000	\$81,000,000	\$162,000,000
ANNUAL O&M ASSUMING LRV CARS (c)						
Alternative 1P3 Line	\$275	per hour		\$3.000.000		
Alternative 2P4 Line	\$275	, per hour			\$10,000,000	
Alternative 3PIC Line	\$275	, per hour				\$30,000,000
ANNUAL O&M ASSUMING OPTIONAL						
STREETCARS						
Alternative 1P3 Line	\$135	per hour		\$2,000,000		
Alternative 2P4 Line	\$135	per hour			\$5,000,000	
Alternative 3PIC Line	\$135	per hour				\$12,000,000
 (a) Unit costs provided by TriMet. (b) Units estimated by Jacobs Consultancy. (c) O&M cost estimated assuming regular and spare LRV cars includes a 10% increase for overhead. 	vehicles operat	e 16 and 4 f	hours per day,	respectively, 36	5 days per yea	r; O&M for
	MGL, JUINE 2009	•				



				Table B-5			
		LIFE-CY	CLE COSTS	AND THEIR NI IGHT RAIL AL	ET PRESENT \ TERNATIVES	ALUES	
		Alternative	1 - P3 Line	Alternative	2 - P4 Line	Alternative	3 - PIC Line
	Year	LRV cars	Streetcars	LRV cars	Streetcars	LRV cars	Streetcars
0	2026	\$30,500,000	\$31,500,000	\$79,000,000	\$81,000,000	\$157,500,000	\$162,000,000
1	2027	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$12,000,000
2	2028	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$12,000,000
3	2029	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$12,000,000
4	2030	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$12,000,000
5	2031	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$12,000,000
6	2032	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$12,000,000
7	2033	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$12,000,000
8	2034	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$12,000,000
9	2035	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$12,000,000
10	2036	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$12,000,000
11	2037	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$12,000,000
12	2038	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$12,000,000
13	2039	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$12,000,000
14	2040	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$12,000,000
15	2041	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$12,000,000
16	2042	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$12,000,000
17	2043	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$12,000,000
18	2044	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$12,000,000
19	2045	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$12,000,000
20	2046	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$12,000,000
	NPV <i>(a)</i>	\$62,000,000	\$53,000,000	\$185,000,000	\$134,000,000	\$475,000,000	\$289,000,000

(a) NPV is computed assuming a discount rate of 7%.

Note: Amounts shown are real values (i.e., in 2009 dollars). Capital cost is shown in year 0, recurring O&M is shown in Years 1-20.

Source: Jacobs Consultancy, June 2009.

Table B-6 SUMMARY OF BUS INPUT RECEIVED FROM PORT

Operating Costs

The cost to operate one bus 24-hours is approximately \$160,000 annually. Operating costs primarily includes the wages/salaries for contracted staff. A new parking facility will require one to two buses operating 24-hours, two or more buses operating 12-hours/day and an additional bus or two for peak periods. If the garage includes a consolidated rental car facility, the peak bus needs could total eight to 10 buses during the morning, noon and afternoon peak periods.

Capital Costs

In 2009, the Port purchased six 35' ElDorado buses for \$321,614 per bus and now has a fleet of 18, 35' low-floor, CNG buses and eight Blue Bird 30' CNG buses. The Blue Bird buses are being removed from service by 2010 and anticipate increasing the number of 35' ElDorado buses to 22-24 buses. A new garage (P3 or P4) will require additional buses to maintain the 6-8 minute headway and accommodate both public and rental car customer activities.

Fuel

For FY08, fuel costs were \$292,450; in FY07 fuel was \$334,962 to operate 26 CNG buses and four diesel buses. The vast majority of the fuel used was CNG, my guess is more than 95% was CNG as the diesel buses only operate the international flights between the FIS and concourse.

Maintenance Costs

Maintenance costs, including labor, material and outside services was \$468,878 in FY08, or approximately \$15,630 per bus for a 30 bus fleet.

Depreciation

Finance assumes a 10 year life for depreciation. The Port's shuttle bus program recommends replacing buses at eight years due to accumulation of miles, and to keep up with the evolving technology (improvements/changes in CNG engines, multiplex wiring) and features (LED lights and destination signs, and body design).

Source: Port of Portland staff, June 2009.



	Table	e B-7			
ESTIMATION OF ROUND-	TRIP TRAVE	L TIMES FO	OR BUSING	ALTERNA	TIVES
	Distance	Speed	Time Requ	uired (sec)	
Alternative and Route segment	(ft)	(mph)	Travel	Dwell	
P3					
P3 plaza	570	10	39	180	
Inbound road	2,206	20	75		
CGT plaza	630	10	43	180	
outbound road	2,395	20	82		
Total travel and dwell time			599		
P4					
P4 plaza	800	10	55	180	
left to 82nd	0	20	0	30	
82nd	850	20	29		
left to AP Way	0	20	0	30	
inbound roadway	5,870	30	133		
CGT plaza	630	10	43	180	
outbound road	6,220	30	141		
right to 82nd	0	20	0	10	
82nd	560	20	19		
Right to plaza		20	0	10	
plaza and U-turn	800	10	55	10	<u-tur< td=""></u-tur<>
Total travel and dwell time			925		



Table B-7 (page 2 of 2) ESTIMATION OF ROUND-TRIP TRAVEL TIMES FOR BUSING ALTERNATIVES

	Distance	Speed	Time Req	uired (sec)	
Alternative and Route segment	(ft)	(mph)	Travel	Dwell	
Economy					
RAC plaza	800	10	55	180	
Onramp to AP Way	240	15	11		
inbound roadway	8,714	30	198		
CGT plaza	630	10	43	180	
Outbound road	9,514	30	216		
LT to Mt. Hood	0	20	0	30	
Mt Hood	810	20	28		
Left to frontage		20	0	15	
Frontage	884	20	30		
Plaza and U-turn	800	10	55	10	<u-turn< td=""></u-turn<>
Total travel and dwell time			1,050		
RIC					
	000	10	50	100	
RAC plaza	826	10	90	180	
Rd to 82nd	950	20	32	40	
Rt to 82nd		25	0	10	
82nd	2,400	25	65	0	
Light at AP Way		25	0	15	
82nd	20	20	1		
LT to AP way		20	0	30	
Inbound roadway	5,870	30	133		
CGT plaza	630	10	43	180	
Outbound road	6220	30	141		
Rt to 82nd	0	20	0	10	
82nd	2,400	20	82		
Left to road		20	0	30	
Rd from 82nd	950	20	32		
Plaza and U-turn	826	10	56	10	<u-turn< td=""></u-turn<>
Travel time			1,108		

Source: Jacobs Consultancy, June 2009.



						Table	e B-8					
		ES	TIMATION C FOR SERV	F NUM	BER OF PUBLIC	BUSES	AND OPERATING HOUP	RS REQU	IRED S			
		Pul	olic Bus					Rental	Car Bus			
Duration (b	Shift Time	Trip time		Buses F	Required Doursdood	Bus Hours	Shift	Trip time	leedurer (min)	Buses F	Required	Bus Hours
Duration (n	<u>nis)</u> <u>nine</u>	<u>(mn)</u>	Headway (min)	Computed	Rounded	Per Shill	Duration (ms) <u>nime</u>	<u>(min)</u> <u>r</u>	ieauway (min)	Computed	Rounded	Per Snin
P3												
4	Midnight-4 a.m.	10.0	15	0.7	1	4	4 Midnight-4 a.m.	10.0	15	0.7	1	4
5	4 - 9 a.m.		2	5.0	5	25	5 4 - 9 a.m.		1.3	7.7	8	40
7	9 a.m - 4 p.m.		7	1.4	2	14	7 9 a.m - 4 p.m.		5	2.0	2	14
4	4 p.m 8 p.m.		7	1.4	2	8	4 4 p.m 8 p.m.		5	2.0	2	8
4	8 p.m mianight		2	5.0	5	20	4 8 p.m mianight		1.3	1.1	8	32
	2-MIN headway is	demand ba	sed		Annual	25,915	1.3-min is demand	based			Annual	35,770
P4												
	Midnight-4 a.m.	15.4	15	1.03	1	4	4 Midnight-4 a.m.	15.4	15	1.0	1	4
5	4 - 9 a.m.		5	3.08	3	15	5 4 - 9 a.m.		1.3	11.9	12	60
7	9 a.m - 4 p.m.		7	2.20	3	21	7 9 a.m - 4 p.m.		5	3.1	3	21
4	4 p.m 8 p.m.		7	2.20	3	12	4 4 p.m 8 p.m.		5	3.1	3	12
4	8 p.m midnight		5	3.08	3	12	4 8 p.m midnight		1.3	11.9	12	48
	5-MIN headway is	demand ba	sed		Annual	23,360	1.3-min is demand	based			Annual	52,925
Economy	/							17.5 H	eadway	Buses	Rounded	Bus-hrs
	4 Midnight-4 a.m.						4 Midnight-4 a.m.		15	1.2	2	8
	54-9a.m.						5 4 - 9 a.m.		1.3	13.5	14	70
	79a.m - 4p.m.		Not /	\	_		7 9 a.m - 4 p.m.		5	3.5	4	28
	4 4 p.m 8 p.m. 4 8 p.m midnight		NOT A	Applicable	9		4 4 p.m 8 p.m. 4 8 p.m midnight		5	3.5	4	16
	4 8 p.m midnight						4 o p.m manight		1.0	15.5	14	50
							1.3-min is demand	based			Annual	64,970
PIC								18.5 H	eadway	Buses	Rounded	Bus-hrs
	4 Midnight-4 a.m.						4 Midnight-4 a.m.		15	1.2	2	8
	54-9a.m.						5 4 - 9 a.m.		1.3	14.2	15	75
	1 9 a.m - 4 p.m. 4 4 n m - 8 n m		Net /	\nnliaahl			7 9 a.m - 4 p.m. 4 4 p.m 8 p.m.		5	3./ 27	4	28
	4 8 p.m midnight		NOL F	spplicable	,		4 8 p.m midnight		1.3	14.2	4 15	60
							1.3-min is demand	based			Annual	68,255
			_									
ource: Ja	acobs Consultancy	y, June 20	009.									



Table B-9
ESTIMATION OF TOTAL BUSES REQUIRED

						Allocation of tota for NPV asses	al buses sment
Alternative	Public Parking	RAC	Subtotal	Spares (a)	Total	Public Parking	RAC
P3	5	8	13	3	16	6.2	9.8
P4	3	12	15	3	18	3.6	14.4
Economy	n/a	14	14	3	17	n/a	17
PIC	n/a	15	15	3	18	n/a	18

(a) Assumes one spare bus for each five operating busses.

Source: Jacobs Consultancy, June 2009.



Table B-10

ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE COSTS FOR BUSING ALTERNATIVES

									Alternative					
			Р	3			P	4			Econom	ıy	 PIC	
Parameter	Units	I	Rental Car		Public Parking		Rental Car		Public Parking		Rental Car	Public Parking	 Rental Car	Public Parking
Assumed route distance	miles		1.1		1.1		3.0		3.0		4.2		4.0	
Assumed bus circuit time	minutes		10.0		10.0		15.4		15.4		17.5		18.5	
Annual bus hours to meet headways	bus-hours		35,770		25,915		52,925		23,360		64,970	able	68,255	able
Estimated annual busing cost												plic		plic
Including fleet value		\$	1,571,618	\$	1,138,622	\$	2,325,354	\$	1,026,363	\$	2,854,572	t ap	\$ 2,998,905	t ap
Rounded value		\$	1,600,000	\$	1,100,000	\$	2,300,000	\$	1,000,000	\$	2,900,000	DOL	\$ 3,000,000	DOL
Excluding fleet value		\$	861,470	\$	624,126	\$	1,274,624	\$	1,026,363	\$	1,564,710		\$ 1,643,825	
Rounded value		\$	900,000	\$	600,000	\$	1,300,000	\$	1,000,000	\$	1,600,000		\$ 1,600,000	
Assumptions														
Assumptions.	ublic porking	and	rantal car not	rong										
1. Separate bus routes for pr		anu) 	- 4 4 1-	- T o mas (m o l)							
2. Stops per foute	2 (1	atin	e parking / K		acinty and T	attr	ie reminal)							
3. Average dwell time per sto	op 3 mii	nute	S	<i></i>		,								
4. Headways, public parking	15 m	ninut	es	(Mi	dnight to 4 a.	m.)								
	Dem	and	-based	(4 ;	a.m. to 9 a.m	., 8	p.m. to midnig	ht)						
	7 mii	nute	S	(9 ;	a.m. to 8 p.m	.)								
5. Headways, rental cars	15 m	ninut	es	(Mi	dnight to 4 a.	m.)								
	Dem	and	-based	(4 a	a.m. to 9 a.m	., 8	p.m. to midnig	ht)						
	5 mii	nute	S	(9 a	a.m. to 8 p.m	.)								
6. Cost per bus-hour				Co	st data from I	Port	of Portland, ba	ase	d on bus valu	ie a	nd cost of fuel	,		
Including fleet value	\$43.	94		ma	intenance, m	ana	gement, and s	staff.	. Value is in	200	9 dollars.			
Excluding fleet value	\$24.	08												

Source: Jacobs Consultancy and Port of Portland, June 2009.



						т	able B-11						
			LIFE-C	YCLE COS	TS AND TH	IEIR NET P	RESENT V	ALUE FOR	BUSING A	LTERNATI	/ES		
		Alterr	native 1 - P3 R	oute	Alterr	native 2 - P4 R	oute	Alter	native 4 - PIC F	Route	Alternat	ive 3 - Econom	y Route
<u> </u>	<u>'ear</u>	Rental car	Public parking	<u>Total</u>	Rental car	Public parking	<u>Total</u>	Rental car	Public parking	Total	Rental car	Public parking	<u>Total</u>
0	2026	\$3,430,000	\$2,170,000 \$600,000	\$5,600,000 \$1,500,000	\$5,040,000 \$1,300,000	\$1,260,000 \$1,000,000	\$6,300,000 \$2,300,000	\$6,300,000 \$1,600,000		\$6,300,000 \$1,600,000	\$5,950,000 \$1,600,000		\$5,950,000 \$1,600,000
2	2027	\$900,000	\$600,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,300,000	\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000		\$1,600,000
3	2029	\$900,000	\$600,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,300,000	\$1,600,000		\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000		\$1,600,000
4	2030	\$900.000	\$600.000	\$1.500.000	\$1.300.000	\$1.000.000	\$2.300.000	\$1.600.000		\$1,600,000	\$1.600.000		\$1.600.000
5	2031	\$900,000	\$600,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,300,000	\$1,600,000		\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000		\$1,600,000
6	2032	\$900,000	\$600,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,300,000	\$1,600,000		\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000		\$1,600,000
7	2033	\$900,000	\$600,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,300,000	\$1,600,000		\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000		\$1,600,000
8	2034	\$900,000	\$600,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,300,000	\$1,600,000	Φ	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	Φ	\$1,600,000
9	2035	\$3,430,000	\$2,170,000	\$5,600,000	\$5,040,000	\$1,260,000	\$6,300,000	\$6,300,000	lde	\$6,300,000	\$5,950,000	lde	\$5,950,000
		\$900,000	\$600,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,300,000	\$1,600,000	<u>iö</u>	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	<u>iö</u>	\$1,600,000
10	2036	\$900,000	\$600,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,300,000	\$1,600,000	dd	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	dd	\$1,600,000
11	2037	\$900,000	\$600,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,300,000	\$1,600,000	ta	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	ta	\$1,600,000
12	2038	\$900,000	\$600,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,300,000	\$1,600,000	DC	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	ρĹ	\$1,600,000
13	2039	\$900,000	\$600,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,300,000	\$1,600,000	_	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	_	\$1,600,000
14	2040	\$900,000	\$600,000	\$1,500,000 \$1,500,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,300,000 \$2,300,000	\$1,600,000		\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000		\$1,600,000
16	2041	\$900,000	\$600,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,300,000	\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000
17	2042	\$3,430,000	\$2,170,000	\$5,600,000	\$5,040,000	\$1,260,000	\$6,300,000	\$6,300,000		\$6,300,000	\$5,950,000		\$5,950,000
	2010	\$900.000	\$600.000	\$1.500.000	\$1.300.000	\$1.000.000	\$2.300.000	\$1.600.000		\$1,600,000	\$1.600.000		\$1.600.000
18	2044	\$900,000	\$600,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,300,000	\$1,600,000		\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000		\$1,600,000
19	2045	\$900,000	\$600,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,300,000	\$1,600,000		\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000		\$1,600,000
20	2046	\$900,000	\$600,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,300,000	\$1,600,000		\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000		\$1,600,000
	NPV (a)	\$20,000,000	\$13,000,000	\$33,000,000	\$29,000,000	\$14,000,000	\$43,000,000	\$36,000,000		\$36,000,000	\$35,000,000		\$35,000,000

(a) NPV is computed assuming a discount rate of 7%.

Note: Amounts shown are real values (i.e., in 2009 dollars). Capital cost is shown in year 0, recurring O&M is shown in Years 1-20. Busses cost \$350,000. Source: Jacobs Consultancy, June 2009.



Appendix C

AIRCRAFT NOISE ASSESSMENT

Appendix C

AIRCRAFT NOISE ASSESSMENT

C.1 BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

This appendix documents the noise exposure analysis completed to inform the longterm land use planning process for Portland International Airport (the Airport). The purposes of the analysis were to (1) assess the potential noise exposure in areas surrounding the Airport through Planning Activity Level (PAL) 5 (corresponding to approximately 2035), and (2) compare the noise exposure in the potentially affected areas with that in areas in which the City of Portland has restricted the development of noncompatible uses (i.e., residential development).

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has determined that residential land uses are not compatible with noise exposure above a threshold defined as day-night average sound level (DNL) 65 (expressed in A-weighted decibels, or dBA). DNL is a noise metric developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and used in most FAAsponsored noise analyses. To help enforce its restrictions on noncompatible development around the Airport, the City has developed a boundary—referred to as the X-Overlay—that identifies where restrictions apply. The X-Overlay is based on the DNL 65 noise contour from a noise analysis completed for the Airport in 1990.

C.2 APPROACH

The noise analysis consisted of three primary elements: (1) use of the FAA's Integrated Noise Model (INM) to determine noise exposure, (2) definition of scenarios representing various levels of aviation demand, facilities, and procedures expected to be in use at the Airport at PAL 5, and (3) development of INM inputs based on those defined scenarios. In addition to the DNL contours, contours for two supplemental metrics, time-above (TA) and number of-events-above (NA), were produced for this analysis.

C.2.1 Integrated Noise Model

The noise analysis was completed using INM Version 7.0a. The model, developed by the FAA in the 1970s and updated and refined numerous times, contains sets of algorithms describing sound propagation and attenuation over distance traveled. The INM includes an extensive database of noise-thrust-distance relationships for most civil and many military aircraft operating in the United States. These relationships provide the best correlation between predictable aircraft operating characteristics and noise generation.

Noise exposure is typically shown as areas in which aircraft noise equals or exceeds defined levels; the boundaries of these defined levels are referred to as contours. The



PDX623

INM is used to produce DNL noise contours centered around the Airport's runways. DNL is designed to represent the cumulative noise level in an area for a 24-hour period during any given year. The INM computes DNLs by summing the noise produced by all aircraft events during a 24-hour period, adding an extra 10 decibel weighting penalty to reflect the significance of nighttime noise—from aircraft operations between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

C.2.2 Noise Analysis Scenarios

In the calculation of DNL in the INM, a considerable number of variables are taken into account. Variables having the greatest effect on noise exposure are numbers of annual aircraft operations, the aircraft fleet mix serving the Airport, airfield geometry, time of operation, and expected flight paths. To estimate noise exposure for different combinations of activity (annual operations/time of operation), facilities (airfield geometry), and procedures (flight paths) at Portland International Airport, four scenarios were defined.

The highest level of annual aircraft operations identified in *Technical Memorandum 2: Aviation Demand Forecasts* is forecast to occur at PAL 5. Therefore, the four future scenarios were all developed for PAL 5 at two levels of forecast demand: the 50th and 90th percentiles. The forecasts also include future flight schedules used to determine time of operation.

Scenario 1 represents future Airport conditions at PAL 5, assuming the 50th percentile forecast level of activity. Scenario 2 represents future Airport conditions at PAL 5, at the 90th percentile forecast level of activity. Scenario 3 represents the same activity assumptions as Scenario 2, but incorporates modified jet aircraft departure flight paths, reflecting dual-stream operations.

Currently, the flight paths of jets departing from the Airport merge over the Columbia River, focusing noise exposure over the water. Changing to a dual-stream mode of operation, where jets would not converge into a single stream over the river, is a capacity-enhancing measure expected to be implemented if demand at the 90th percentile occurs at PAL 5.

Scenario 4 represents another capacity-enhancing measure likely to be implemented as a result of demand reaching the 90th percentile at PAL 5—the addition of a third parallel runway south of existing Runway 10R–28L. Additional information pertaining to each scenario is presented in Table C-1.



Table C-1 NOISE EXPOSURE ANALYSIS SCENARIOS Portland International Airport										
	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4						
Annual aircraft operations Annual average day operations <i>(a)</i> Departure restrictions Runway configuration	377,820 1,035 Yes Existing	567,140 1,553 Yes Existing	567,140 1,553 No Existing	567,140 1,553 No Addition of third parallel runway						
(a) Numbers may vary slightly from	the forecasts	because of ro	ounding.							
Source: Jacobs Consultancy, <i>Techr</i> September 2008.	nical Memorai	ndum 2: Aviati	ion Demand F	orecasts,						

C.2.3 Integrated Noise Model Inputs

The variables for this noise analysis were derived from the INM databases for the future 2017 Noise Exposure Map (NEM) developed as part of the ongoing Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 150 Noise Exposure Map Update for the Airport. As identified earlier, the number of annual aircraft operations, aircraft fleet mix, time of operation, airfield geometry, and expected flight paths (flight tracks) have the greatest effect on the size and shape of the areas affected by aircraft noise. INM inputs for these variables are presented in Tables C-2 through C-7. Tables C-2 and C-4 present the fleet mix, time of operation, stage length, and number of annual average day (AAD) aircraft operations for each scenario. The AAD is calculated by dividing the total number of annual operations by the number of days in the year. Scenarios 2, 3, and 4 are based on the same forecast level of demand and future flight schedules and, therefore, have identical inputs with regard to those variables.

Tables C-3, C-5, C-6, and C-7 depict aggregate runway use percentages for each scenario, by aircraft category. At the Airport, runways are assigned by FAA Airport traffic control tower (ATCT) staff primarily based on minimizing taxiing distance from aircraft gates and parking positions. In consulting with ATCT staff, it was determined that, as the number of annual operations increases, runway assignments would tend toward equal use of the two parallel runways, rather than heavier use of one over the over because of taxiing distances. Assumed runway use percentages for the airfield configuration with three parallel runways were also developed using ATCT staff guidance.



Aircraft flight tracks for Scenarios 1 and 2 were derived from the 2017 NEM. The flight tracks in the 2017 NEM are generalized, created using radar data archived by Airport staff. In Scenario 3, jet aircraft departure restrictions are eliminated, and in Scenario 4, a third parallel runway is added; therefore, new flight tracks were developed for those scenarios. These flight tracks were developed using guidance provided by ATCT staff, as depicted on Figures C-1 and C-2, respectively. Generalized INM flight tracks derived from the 2017 NEM are located within the INM databases developed for this analysis, and are available upon request from Airport Noise Office staff.

C.2.4 Supplemental Metrics

In addition to DNL contours, TA and NA contours were also produced. The TA metric identifies the cumulative amount of time above a selected threshold of noise exposure, thereby describing the duration of noise exposure. For this analysis, 65 dBA—the threshold for "significant" noise as defined by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA)—was used as the threshold.

The NA metric identifies the cumulative number of events above a selected threshold of noise exposure—in this case, 65 dBA. For this analysis, the NA metric represents the number of aircraft overflights during an annual average day whose maximum sound level exceeds 65 dBA over predetermined points on the ground. This metric describes the frequency of the noise exposure.

TA contours are produced by the INM. The NA contours presented in this appendix were created by software other than the INM using tabular output for each scenario calculated by the INM. As all metrics for this analysis were calculated in the INM, the inputs remain constant for each metric (DNL, TA, and NA).



Table C-2

AVERAGE DAILY AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS BY TYPE, TIME OF DAY, AND STAGE LENGTH – SCENARIO 1 Noise Exposure Analysis Portland International Airport

											Depa	artures									
									Sta	ge 3			Sta	ge 5	Sta	age 6	Sta	age 7			
					Stag	e 1	Stage	2	(1,001	- 1,500	Stag	e 4	(2,501	- 3,500	(3,501	- 4,500	(4,501	1 - 5,500	_		
0			Arriv		(0 - 50	0 nm)	(501 - 1,0	00 nm)	n	<u>m)</u>	(1,501 - 2,	500 nm)	n	<u>m)</u>	n	im)	<u> </u>	nm)		tal operatio	ns T ()
Group		Aircraft type	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	lotal
Heavy jet	747400	Boeing 747-400		1.00														1.42		2.42	2.42
Heavy jet	757300	Boeing 757-200	0.89		0.89														1.78		1.78
Heavy jet	757PW	Boeing 757-200/PW2037	4.48	0.68					2.05	0.68	1.75	0.68							8.28	2.05	10.33
Heavy jet	757RR	Boeing 757-200/RB211-535E4	2.20	0.23					0.68	0.23	1.29	0.23							4.18	0.68	4.86
Heavy jet	767300	Boeing 767-300		0.71							0.71								0.71	0.71	1.42
Heavy jet	767CF6	Boeing 767-200	2.48	2.68		1.66				3.31	0.20								2.68	7.65	10.33
Heavy jet	777200	Boeing 777-200ER/GE90-90B	2.31	0.09	0.18		0.18		0.18		0.09		0.09		1.69				4.71	0.09	4.80
Heavy jet	A300-622R	Airbus 300F4-600	0.85	1.28		2.13													0.85	3.41	4.26
Heavy jet	A330-301	Airbus 330-200	3.38												3.38				6.76		6.76
Heavy jet	A330-343	Airbus 330-343/RR TRENT 772B	1.69												0.84		0.84		3.38		3.38
Heavy jet	A340-211	Airbus 340-300	1.21		0.36												0.84		2.41		2.41
Heavy jet	DC1030	McDonnell Douglas DC-10	4.97	0.71	1.42		1.42		1.42		0.71		0.71						10.65	0.71	11.36
Heavy jet	MD11GE	MD-11/CF6-80C2D1F	0.35	0.35		0.24				0.47									0.35	1.06	1.42
Helicopter	A109	AgustaWestland AW109	0.90		0.90														1.80		1.80
Helicopter	S70	Sikorsky S-70 Blackhawk (UH-60A)	0.11		0.11														0.21		0.21
Jet	7373B2	Boeing 737-300	0.91		0.46					0.46									1.37	0.46	1.82
Jet	737400	Boeing 737-400/CFM56-3C-1	0.91		0.46					0.46									1.37	0.46	1.82
Jet	737700	Boeing 737-700	79.32	15.49	41.00	6.38	33.71	2.73	4.56		4.56	1.82							163.15	26.43	189.57
Jet	737800	Boeing 737-800/CFM56-7B26	55.67	11.59	5.47	0.53	20.05	3.87	7.29	0.91	19.13	9.98							107.61	26.88	134.49
Jet	A319-131	Airbus 318	6.38	3.64	0.91		3.64	1.82			1.82	1.82							12.76	7.29	20.05
Jet	A320-211	Airbus 320	19.66	4.43	1.97		5.90	1.48	1.48	0.49	9.80	2.95							38.81	9.35	48.16
Jet	A320-232	Airbus 320-232/V2527-A5	14.99	3.77	1.68		5.03	1.26	1.26	0.42	6.60	2.52							29.55	7.96	37.51
Jet	CIT3	Cessna Citation III	2.04	0.05	1.96	0.13													4.00	0.18	4.18
Jet	CL600	Dassault Falcon 2000	1.28	0.03	1.24	0.07													2.52	0.09	2.61
Jet	CL601	Bombardier Challenger 300	2.01	0.02	1.98	0.05													4.00	0.07	4.07
Jet	CNA55B	Cessna Citation CJ3	14.53	0.33	14.05	0.80													28.58	1.13	29.71
Jet	CNA750	Cessna Citation X	1.19	0.03	1.14	0.07													2.33	0.11	2.44
Jet	FAL20	Dassault Falcon 20 (twin-jet)	1.08		1.08														2.16		2.16
Jet	GIIB	IAI Gulfstream 200	1.34		1.34														2.67		2.67
Jet	GIV	Dassault Falcon 900	1.86	0.03	1.81	0.07													3.67	0.11	3.78
Jet	GV	Canadair Regional Jet 200	60.57	1.98	58.72	3.79													119.28	5.77	125.05
Jet	IA1125	IAI Gulfstream 100	2.56	0.05	2.48	0.13													5.03	0.18	5.21
Jet	LEAR25	Learjet 25 (twin-jet)	1.19	0.03	1.14	0.07													2.33	0.11	2.44
Jet	LEAR35	Dassault Falcon 10 (twin-jet)	5.83	0.11	5.66	0.28													11.48	0.40	11.88



Table C-2 (page 2 of 2) AVERAGE DAILY AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS BY TYPE, TIME OF DAY, AND STAGE LENGTH – SCENARIO 1 Noise Exposure Analysis Portland International Airport

											Dep	artures									
					01	- 4	01	- 0	Sta	ge 3	01	- 4	Sta	ige 5	Sta	age 6	St	age 7			
			Δrriv	ale	5tag (0 - 50(e 1 0 nm)	501 - 1 C	e Z)00 nm)	(1,001	- 1,500 m)	Stag	e 4 500 nm)	(2,501	- 3,500 m)	(3,501 r	1 - 4,500 nm)	(4,50	1 - 5,500 nm)	Tot	al oneratio	ane
Group	INM type	Aircraft type	Day	Night	 Dav	Night	 	Night	Day	Night	 Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Total
Military ist	0140																				0.00
Military jet	0140	Lockneed JetStar	0.11		0.11														0.23		0.23
Military jet	C17	Globemaster III	0.34		0.34														0.68		0.68
Military jet	EA6B	Northrop Grumman EA-6B Prowler	0.36		0.36														0.72		0.72
Military jet	F15E20	F-15 Eagle	1.44		1.44														2.88		2.88
Military jet	F16PW9	F-16 Fighting Falcon	1.08		1.08														2.16		2.16
Military jet	F-18	McDonnell Douglas Hornet	1.44		1.44														2.88		2.88
Military prop	C-130E	Lockheed Hercules	0.45		0.45														0.91		0.91
Military prop	T34	T-34 Mentor (Single Prop Military Trainer)	0.36		0.36														0.72		0.72
Prop	BEC58P	Baron 58P	3.09	1.84	3.50	1.44													6.59	3.28	9.87
Prop	GASEPV	Grumman Tr2 (piston-single)	19.32	7.39	22.15	4.58													41.46	11.97	53.43
Small	CNA172	Cessna 120 (tail-wheel)	0.93	0.06	0.93	0.06													1.87	0.13	1.99
Small	CNA206	Cessna P210 (turbine) (single-turboprop)	1.29	0.14	1.29	0.14													2.58	0.29	2.86
Small	PA31	PA-31-350	12.68	4.06	12.67	4.06													25.35	8.12	33.47
Turboprop	1900D	Beech 1900D	0.99	0.43	0.24		0.99												2.22	0.43	2.65
Turboprop	CNA441	Rockwell Turbo Commander 680	5.77	0.39	6.06	0.10													11.83	0.49	12.32
Turboprop	DHC6	Piper Aerostar (twin-piston)	16.01	3.60	15.60	4.02													31.62	7.62	39.23
Turboprop	DHC8	Aerotécnica AC-14	1.42		1.42														2.84		2.84
Turboprop	DHC830	De Havilland Canada Dash 8-300	69.97	4.93	70.97	3.94													140.94	8.87	149.81
Turboprop	EMB120	Embraer 120 Brasilia	7.88	0.99	8.87														16.76	0.99	17.74
		Total	444.09	73.15	297.68	34.75	70.93	11.16	18.91	7.43	46.66	20.00	0.80		5.91		1.69	1.42	886.67	147.92	1,034.59

nm = nautical miles

Note: Columns and rows may not add to totals shown because of rounding.

Source: Jacobs Consultancy, INM input files, October 2009 based on the Airport's aviation demand forecasts approved by the FAA in 2008.



Table C-3

RUNWAY USE BY AIRCRAFT GROUP – SCENARIO 1

		Portland I	nternation	al Airpor	t		
			Runway	end			
Aircraft group	03	10L	10R	21	28L	28R	Total
Heavy jet	%	26.5	25.9		23.4	24.2	100.0%
Jet	%	26.8	25.0		24.9	23.4	100.0%
Military jet	%		51.1		44.8	4.1	100.0%
Military prop	%	51.2				48.8	100.0%
Prop	5.7%	18.9	27.5	1.9	4.6	41.2	100.0%
Small	5.8%	11.6	34.8	3.3	13.9	30.7	100.0%
Turboprop	0.5%	25.1	25.9	1.2	25.2	22.2	100.0%
Total use	0.7%	25.2	26.0	0.5	23.3	24.4	100.0%
Helicopter	16.9%	18.3	13.6	2.8	21.3	27.2	100.0%
		-					

Noise Exposure Analysis Portland International Airport

Note: Rows may not add to totals shown because of rounding.

Source: Jacobs Consultancy, INM input files, October 2009, based on the analysis of data from the Port's Airport Noise and Operations Management System and discussion with Airport Control Tower staff.



Table C-4

AVERAGE DAILY AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS BY TYPE, TIME OF DAY, AND STAGE LENGTH – SCENARIO 2, 3, AND 4 Noise Exposure Analysis Portland International Airport

											Dep	artures									
			Arri	vals	Stag (0 - 50	je 1 0 nm)	Stage (501 - 1 0	e 2 00 nm)	Sta (1,001	ge 3 - 1,500 m)	Stag (1 501 - 2	e 4 500 nm)	Sta (2,501	ge 5 - 3,500 m)	Sta (3,501	age 6 1 - 4,500	Sta (4,501	age 7 I - 5,500 vm)	Tota	al operatio	ns
Group	INM type	Aircraft type	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Total
Heavy iet	747400	Boeing 747-400		1.00														0.93		1.93	1.93
Heavy jet	757300	Boeing 757-200	1.07		1.07														2.14		2.14
Heavy jet	757PW	Boeing 757-200/PW2037	6.74	1.08					3.24	1.08	2.42	1.08							12.40	3.24	15.64
Heavy jet	757RR	Boeing 757-200/RB211-535E4	3.14	0.36					1.08	0.36	1.70	0.36							5.92	1.08	7.00
Heavy jet	767300	Boeing 767-300		1.12							1.12								1.12	1.12	2.25
Heavy jet	767CF6	Boeing 767-200	3.13	3.44		2.08				4.17	0.32								3.44	9.69	13.14
Heavy jet	777200	Boeing 777-200ER/GE90-90B	3.38	0.11	0.22		0.22		0.22		0.11		0.11		2.60				6.88	0.11	6.99
Heavy jet	A300-622R	Airbus 300F4-600	1.07	1.61		2.68													1.07	4.29	5.36
Heavy jet	A330-301	Airbus 330-200	5.21												5.20				10.41		10.41
Heavy jet	A330-343	Airbus 330-343/RR TRENT 772B	2.60												1.30		1.30		5.20		5.20
Heavy jet	A340-211	Airbus 340-300	1.66		0.36												1.30		3.32		3.32
Heavy jet	DC1030	McDonnell Douglas DC-10	6.25	0.89	1.79		1.79		1.79		0.89		0.89						13.40	0.89	14.29
Heavy jet	MD11GE	MD-11/CF6-80C2D1F	0.45	0.45		0.30				0.60									0.45	1.34	1.79
Helicopter	A109	AgustaWestland AW109	1.08		1.08														2.16		2.16
Helicopter	S70	Sikorsky S-70 Blackhawk (UH-60A)	0.11		0.11														0.21		0.21
Jet	7373B2	Boeing 737-300	1.44		0.72					0.72									2.16	0.72	2.88
Jet	737400	Boeing 737-400/CFM56-3C-1	1.44		0.72					0.72									2.16	0.72	2.88
Jet	737700	Boeing 737-700	125.28	24.49	64.79	10.09	53.27	4.32	7.20		7.20	2.88							257.74	41.78	299.52
Jet	737800	Boeing 737-800/CFM56-7B26	87.94	18.22	8.64	0.84	31.67	6.12	11.52	1.44	30.24	15.67							170.00	42.30	212.30
Jet	A319-131	Airbus 318	10.08	5.76	1.44		5.76	2.88			2.88	2.88							20.16	11.53	31.68
Jet	A320-211	Airbus 320	31.05	7.00	3.11		9.33	2.33	2.33	0.78	15.49	4.67							61.31	14.78	76.09
Jet	A320-232	Airbus 320-232/V2527-A5	23.67	5.96	2.65		7.95	1.99	1.99	0.66	10.42	3.98							46.68	12.59	59.27
Jet	CIT3	Cessna Citation III	2.78	0.07	2.68	0.18													5.47	0.25	5.72
Jet	CL600	Dassault Falcon 2000	1.53	0.03	1.49	0.08													3.02	0.11	3.13
Jet	CL601	Bombardier Challenger 300	2.64	0.03	2.60	0.08													5.24	0.11	5.35
Jet	CNA55B	Cessna Citation CJ3	18.90	0.44	18.27	1.07													37.16	1.51	38.67
Jet	CNA750	Cessna Citation X	1.65	0.04	1.59	0.11													3.24	0.15	3.39
Jet	FAL20	Dassault Falcon 20 (twin-jet)	1.08		1.08														2.16		2.16
Jet	GIIB	IAI Gulfstream 200	1.60		1.60														3.21		3.21
Jet	GIV	Dassault Falcon 900	2.45	0.04	2.39	0.11													4.84	0.15	5.00
Jet	GV	Canadair Regional Jet 200	97.57	3.20	94.65	6.10													192.23	9.30	201.53
Jet	IA1125	IAI Gulfstream 100	3.06	0.06	2.97	0.16													6.04	0.22	6.25
Jet	LEAR25	Learjet 25 (twin-jet)	1.65	0.04	1.59	0.11													3.24	0.15	3.39
Jet	LEAR35	Dassault Falcon 10 (twin-jet)	7.18	0.15	6.97	0.36													14.15	0.51	14.66



Table C-4 (page 2 of 2) AVERAGE DAILY AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS BY TYPE, TIME OF DAY, AND STAGE LENGTH – SCENARIO 2, 3, AND 4 Noise Exposure Analysis Portland International Airport

											Depa	artures									
					0		01	0	Stag	je 3	01		Sta	ge 5	Sta	age 6	St	age 7			
			Δrriv	als	5tag (0 - 50)	e 1) nm)	501 - 1 0	e Z 100 nm)	(1,001 · nn	· 1,500	Stage (1 501 - 2	94 500 nm)	(2,501 n	- 3,500 m)	(3,501 r	1 - 4,500 m)	(4,50	1 - 5,500 nm)	Tota	al operatio	ns
Group	INM type	Aircraft type	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Total
Militory int	C140		0.11		0.11		<u> </u>		· · ·	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			<u> </u>		Ŭ			0.22		0.22
Military jet	C140		0.11		0.11														0.23		0.23
Military jet			0.34		0.34														0.66		0.00
Military jet	EAGB	Nonnrop Grumman EA-6B Prowier	0.36		0.36														0.72		0.72
Military jet	F15E20	F-15 Eagle	1.44		1.44														2.88		2.88
Military jet	F16PW9	F-16 Fighting Falcon	1.08		1.08														2.16		2.16
Military jet	F-18	McDonnell Douglas Hornet	1.44		1.44														2.88		2.88
Military prop	C-130E	Lockheed Hercules	0.45		0.45														0.91		0.91
Military prop	T34	T-34 Mentor (Single Prop Military Trainer)	0.36		0.36														0.72		0.72
Prop	BEC58P	Baron 58P	4.02	2.34	4.55	1.81													8.58	4.15	12.72
Prop	GASEPV	Grumman Tr2 (piston-single)	25.13	9.39	28.79	5.76													53.91	15.15	69.06
Small	CNA172	Cessna 120 (tail-wheel)	1.05	0.08	1.05	0.08													2.09	0.15	2.25
Small	CNA206	Cessna P210 (turbine) (single-turboprop)	1.55	0.17	1.55	0.17													3.09	0.34	3.43
Small	PA31	PA-31-350	15.97	5.11	15.95	5.12													31.91	10.22	42.13
Turboprop	1900D	Beech 1900D	1.25	0.54	0.30		1.25												2.80	0.54	3.33
Turboprop	CNA441	Rockwell Turbo Commander 680	7.21	0.56	7.66	0.12													14.87	0.68	15.55
Turboprop	DHC6	Piper Aerostar (twin-piston)	20.03	4.55	19.55	5.05													39.58	9.60	49.18
Turboprop	DHC8	Aerotécnica AC-14	1.79		1.79														3.57		3.57
Turboprop	DHC830	De Havilland Canada Dash 8-300	113 31	7 99	115.00	6 39													228.30	14 37	242 68
Turboprop	EMB120	Embraer 120 Brasilia	12.77	1.60	14.37														27.14	1.60	28.74
		Total	668.56	107.93	440.70	48.81	111.24	17.65	29.36	10.53	72.79	31.52	1.00		9.11		2.60	0.93	1,335.37	217.37	1,552.74

nm = nautical miles

Note: Columns and rows may not add to totals shown because of rounding.

Source: Jacobs Consultancy, INM input files, October 2009 based on the Airport's aviation demand forecasts approved by the FAA in 2008.



Table C-5

RUNWAY USE BY AIRCRAFT GROUP – SCENARIO 2

			Runway	end			
Aircraft group	03	10L	10R	21	28L	28R	Total
Heavy jet	%	26.8	25.6		24.7	23.0	100.0%
Jet	%	27.4	24.4		24.6	23.6	100.0%
Military jet	%		51.1		44.8	4.1	100.0%
Military prop	%	51.2				48.8	100.0%
Prop	5.8%	18.8	27.6	1.9	4.7	41.2	100.0%
Small	5.8%	11.6	34.8	3.3	13.8	30.7	100.0%
Turboprop	0.5%	25.2	25.8	1.2	24.2	23.1	100.0%
Total	0.6%	25.8	25.4	0.5	23.2	24.5	100.0%
Helicopter	16.9%	18.3	13.6	2.8	21.3	27.2	100.0%

analysis of data from the Port's Airport Noise and Operations Management System and discussion with Airport Control Tower staff.


Table C-6

RUNWAY USE BY AIRCRAFT GROUP – SCENARIO 3 Noise Exposure Analysis

		Portland	Internation	nal Airpoi	rt							
		Runway end										
Aircraft group	03	10L	10R	21	28L	28R	Total					
Heavy jet	%	26.5	25.9		24.3	23.3	100.0%					
Jet	%	26.0	25.8		24.3	24.0	100.0%					
Military jet	%		51.1		44.8	4.1	100.0%					
Military prop	%	51.2				48.8	100.0%					
Prop	5.8%	18.8	27.6	1.9	4.7	41.2	100.0%					
Small	5.8%	11.6	34.8	3.3	13.8	30.7	100.0%					
Turboprop	0.5%	24.7	26.3	1.2	23.7	23.6	100.0%					
Total	0.6%	24.8	26.4	0.5	22.9	24.9	100.0%					
Helicopter	16.9%	18.3	13.6	2.8	21.3	27.2	100.0%					

Note: Rows may not add to totals shown because of rounding.

Source: Jacobs Consultancy, INM input files, October 2009, based on the analysis of data from the Port's Airport Noise and Operations Management System and discussion with Airport Control Tower staff.



Table C-7

RUNWAY USE BY AIRCRAFT GROUP – SCENARIO 4 Noise Exposure Analysis

Portland International Airport

			-				
			Runwa	y end			
Aircraft group	10L	10R	11	28L	28R	29	Total
Heavy jet	19.1%	19.5	11.6	19.3	19.6	10.9	100.0%
Jet	18.2%	19.8	12.9	18.8	18.1	12.1	100.0%
Military jet	%	47.1	5.0	35.3	7.6	5.0	100.0%
Military prop	51.2%				43.8	5.0	100.0%
Prop	16.7%	30.1	3.9	5.2	40.2	3.9	100.0%
Small	13.0%	32.9	4.0	14.5	31.6	4.0	100.0%
Turboprop	19.7%	19.5	11.2	21.0	18.8	9.8	100.0%
Total	18.3%	20.8	11.7	18.6	19.9	10.8	100.0%
Helicopter	18.3%	13.6	16.9	21.3	27.2	2.8	100.0%
		-					

Note: Rows may not add to totals shown because of rounding.

Source: Jacobs Consultancy, INM input files, October 2009, based on the analysis of data from the Port's Airport Noise and Operations Management System and discussion with Airport Control Tower staff.



PDX623



Sources: Jacobs Consultancy - Generalized Future INM Flight Tracks, June 2009; Port of Portland - Basemap, June 2009.

Master Plan Update Portland International Airport

December 2009



Sources: Jacobs Consultancy - Generalized Future INM Flight Tracks, June 2009; Port of Portland - Basemap, June 2009.

Scale: 1" = 3 mile

Master Plan Update Portland International Airport

December 2009

C.3 RESULTS

An overview of the output produced by the INM for each scenario modeled is provided in this section.

C.3.1 Day-Night Average Sound Level Contours

DNL 55, 60, and 65 noise exposure contours are presented for each scenario respectively on Figures C-3 through C-6. DNL contours vary in size and shape because of differences in the INM inputs. For example, a higher number of annual operations would produce larger contours. The fleet mix operating at the Airport also influences the size of the noise exposure contours—one large jet aircraft is louder than one small piston aircraft.

The shape of the DNL contour is influenced by the location of the noise. Two scenarios with similar fleet mixes and numbers of annual aircraft operations would result in similarly sized noise exposure contours. However, if those aircraft were assigned different runways and flight tracks, the shape of the contours would be different.

The contours produced for Scenario 2 are noticeably larger than the contours produced for Scenario 1. The aircraft fleet mix for both scenarios is constant, but Scenario 2 is based on about 200,000 more annual aircraft operations. The general shape of the contours remains the same inasmuch as the airfield geometry, flight tracks, and runway use percentages remain constant in both scenarios.*

While Scenarios 2, 3, and 4 are based on identical fleet mixes, numbers of annual aircraft operations, and day/night split, they are based on different flight tracks, runway use percentages, and—in the case of Scenario 4—a different runway configuration. As depicted on Figure C-1, the flight tracks for departing jet aircraft were modified under Scenario 3. The modification involves removal of existing departure restrictions that require departing jet aircraft to converge into a "single stream" over the river. The modified flight tracks represent a "dual-stream" departure scenario, changing the shape of the contours west and east of the Airport.

Scenario 4 differs from all other scenarios in that the airfield configuration includes a third parallel runway south of the existing parallel runways, and the removal of the crosswind runway. This scenario also results in a change in contour shape similar to that shown for Scenario 3 (resulting from modified departure procedures) as well as a change in contour shape south of the Airport caused by operations assigned to the additional runway and flight tracks.

^{*}Small variances in the runway use percentages for Scenarios 1 and 2 are the result of annualization, the difference in forecast schedules, and a slight change in the distribution of operations on the two parallel runways.



PDX623





Figure C-3

Noise Exposure Contours - Scenario 1





Figure C-4

Noise Exposure Contours - Scenario 2





Figure C-5

Noise Exposure Contours - Scenario 3





Figure C-6

Noise Exposure Contours - Scenario 4

C.3.2 Supplemental Metrics

In addition to DNL noise exposure contours, contours for two supplemental metrics were produced. TA contours, presenting the duration of noise above 65 dBA, and NA contours, presenting the frequency of events producing noise above 65 dBA, are depicted for each scenario on Figures C-9 through C-15.

The variation in the size and shape of the TA and NA contours generally corresponds with the variation in the size and shape of the DNL contours. Changes in flight tracks and airfield geometry resulted in changes in the TA and NA contours similar to those observed in the DNL contours.

C.4 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The key findings from the noise exposure analysis for the Airport are:

- Increasing numbers of annual aircraft operations would result in larger DNL noise exposure contours.
- Removing jet aircraft departure restrictions would change the location of noise exposure, and thus the shape of the DNL contours.
- Adding a third parallel runway would change the location of noise exposure, and thus the shape of the DNL contours.
- Scenario 3 and Scenario 4 would result in DNL noise exposure contours that encompass the largest land area.
- The X-Overlay encompasses the majority of the DNL 65 contours for Scenarios 3 and 4.

Figures C-7 and C-8, respectively, present comparisons of Scenarios 3 and 4 with the X-Overlay. The DNL 65 contour for Scenario 3 encompasses about 6,300 acres. Approximately 1,000 acres within the DNL 65 contour for Scenario 3 are not encompassed by the X-Overlay. The majority of this area, approximately 900 acres, consists of the Columbia River. The remaining area is located southeast of Airport property.

The DNL 65 contour for Scenario 4 encompasses about 7,000 acres. Approximately 1,200 acres within the DNL 65 contour for Scenario 4 are not encompassed by the X-Overlay. About half of this area, approximately 600 acres, consists of the Columbia River. The remaining 600 acres are located south of Airport property.





Sources: Jacobs Consultancy - Noise Exposure Contours, June 2009; City of Portland - X-Overlay, June 2009; Port of Portland - Basemap, June 2009.

AIRPORT FUTURES

Comparison of Noise Exposure Contours: Scenario 3 and X-Overlay Master Plan Update

Portland International Airport



Sources: Jacobs Consultancy - Noise Exposure Contours, June 2009; City of Portland - X-Overlay, June 2009; Port of Portland - Basemap, June 2009.



Sources: Jacobs Consultancy - Number of Events above 65 dBA per day, August 2009; Port of Portland - Basemap, June 2009.





Time above 65 dBA Noise Exposure Contours - Scenario 1 Master Plan Update Portland International Airport



Sources: Jacobs Consultancy - Number of Events above 65 dBA per day, August 2009; Port of Portland - Basemap, June 2009.



AIRPORT FUTURES

Time above 65 dBA Noise Exposure Contours - Scenario 2



Sources: Jacobs Consultancy - Number of Events above 65 dBA per day, August 2009; Port of Portland - Basemap, June 2009.



AIRPORT FUTURES

Time above 65 dBA Noise Exposure Contours - Scenario 3 Master Plan Update Portland International Airport



Sources: Jacobs Consultancy - Number of Events above 65 dBA per day, August 2009; Port of Portland - Basemap, June 2009.

Number of Events above 65 dBA - Scenario 4



Sources: Jacobs Consultancy - Time above 65 dBA Noise Exposure Contours, August 2009; Port of Portland - Basemap, June 2009.

Master Plan Update

Portland International Airport

Appendix D COST ESTIMATES

CEPHAS

Construction Cost Consultants 119 Pine Street, Suite 301 Seattle, WA 98101 Telephone 206-624-8539 Fax 206-624-8955

MASTER PLAN

PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

October 21, 2009

PORTLAND, OREGON

CONCEPT ESTIMATE

Prepared for: JACOBS CONSULTANCY 555 Airport Boulevard, Suite 300 Burlingham, California, 94010 Tel:- 650-579-7722

Date: October 21, 2009

ESTIMATE REPORT F		
Description	Pages	
Basis of Estimate	1	
Basis For Project Cost Estimate	2-4	
Main Summary	5-6	
Summary PL-1	7-8	
Summary PL-2	9-10	
Summary PL-3	11-12	
Summary PL-4	13-14	
Summary PL-5	15-16	
Back-Up Cost Estimate For PL-1	17-26	
Back-Up Cost Estimate For PL-2	27-39	
Back-Up Cost Estimate For PL-3	40-51	
Back-Up Cost Estimate For PL-4	52-70	
Back-Up Cost Estimate For PL-5	71-77	
Project Development Support Cost	78	
Escalation Calculation Sheet	79	

INTRODUCTION BASIS OF ESTIMATE

GENERAL

This report summarizes estimated construction costs and project costs corresponding to the emerging development concepts described in Section 1 of this Technical Memorandum. Concepts costs are defined as construction costs plus allowances for contingency, project development and support, and project development contingency.

Emerging development concepts are those projects believed by the planning team to reasonably represent how future development may occur at the Airport. These concepts are described throughout this Technical Memorandum and their locations are illustrated in Section 1, Figures 1-1 through 1-5.

The basis for the cost estimates is summarized in Table C-1 and described in more detail later in this appendix. The format of the Table C-1 is the same as the format in which the requirements are summarized (refer to Table 1-2 in this Technical Memorandum); cell entries are provided only where incremental requirements were indicated in Table 1-2.

The project cost estimates are summarized in three levels of detail. The Main Summary of Project Cost (pages 5 and 6) is a high-level summary showing total project cost by functional element for each planning activity level and in total for all planning activity levels. Project costs are presented in both current (i.e., October 2009 dollars) and "year of expenditure" dollars (i.e., 2012, 2017, 2022, 2027, and 2035, corresponding to planning activity levels 1 through 5, respectively).

The Summary (pages 7 through 16) disaggregates the total project cost for each functional element into construction cost (this also includes the estimating contingency), project development and support, and project development contingency by planning activity level. Costs are presented in both current and year of expenditure dollars.

The Back-up Detail Estimate (pages 17 through 77) provides the details of the estimates for each functional element (note these estimates includes estimate design contingency). The Back-up Detail Estimate is organized by planning activity level.

COMPONENTS OF THE ESTIMATE

Construction:

The estimate construction cost includes all construction cost, together with temporary work, contractors site administration and general contractor's direct project cost, including overheads and profit.

A 15% estimating and design contingency has additionally been added to the overall construction cost numbers, that have been transferred to the individual summary sheets.

Project Development & Support:

These costs covers addition cost other than construction cost. Included under this section is Project Administration, Design Fees, Construction & Project Management, Permit Fes and Close Out Costs. The percentage used in the estimate is 50% of construction cost and is based on Port Input numbers.

Project Development Contingency

This is an overall project contingency and includes the construction contingency.

A 20% overall construction and development contingency has been added separately to the combined construction and project development costs on each individual summary sheet to give the overall project cost for each future work item.

ESCLATION

All cost used in the back-up estimate sheets are in current October 2009 cost. Escalation has been added for the appropriate year on the main summary sheets.

INTRODUCTION BASIS FOR PROJECT COST ESTIMATES Table C-1

	Planning Activity Level (PAL)										
Functional Element	PAL 1 (2012)	PAL 2 (2017)	PAL 3 (2022)	PAL 4 (2027)	PAL 5 (2035)						
	2012	2017	2022	2027	2035						
PASSENGER TERMINAL COMPLEX Aircraft Gates and Parking											
Remote / RON parking	Phase 1 of RON pad is north of hotels (pad is ~580' x 400' to accommodate 4 aircraft)	Phase 2 is immediately east of phase 1 (pad is ~285' x 400' to accommodate 2 aircraft)	Phase 3 is immediately east of phase 2 (north of Delta Air Cargo; pad ~580' x 400' to accommodate 4 aircraft)	Phase 4 RON parking is west of crosswind runway pad ~465' wide x 525' deep; +8 aircraft in two facing rows separated by a taxilane; assume a new taxiway connecting pad to apron; assume VOR is relocated	Phase 5 is to lengthen PAL 4 pad by ~400 feet to accommodate a total of about 12 aircraft (+4)						
Passenger Security Screening	Assumes (1) costs driven by need to change layout of areas accommodating screening lanes and/or queuing areas, (2) existing space will be reused and cost allowances are for electrical and floor repairs, and (3) basis for estimates is total floor area involved in north and south security screening areas	Assumes (1) costs driven by need to change layout of areas accommodating screening lanes and/or queuing areas, (2) existing space will be reused and cost allowances are for electrical and floor repairs, and (3) basis for estimates is total floor area involved in north and south security screening areas	Assumes (1) costs driven by need to change layout of areas accommodating screening lanes and/or queuing areas, (2) existing space will be reused and cost allowances are for electrical and floor repairs, and (3) basis for estimates is total floor area involved in north and south security screening areas	Assumes (1) costs driven by need to change layout of areas accommodating screening lanes and/or queuing areas, (2) existing space will be reused and cost allowances are for electrical and floor repairs, and (3) basis for estimates is total floor area involved in north and south security screening areas	Assumes (1) costs driven by need to change layout of areas accommodating screening lanes and/or queuing areas, (2) existing space will be reused and cost allowances are for electrical and floor repairs, and (3) basis for estimates is total floor area involved in north and south security screening areas						
GROUND TRANSPORTATION AND PA Public Parking (spaces)	RKING	Phase 1 of garage is at P3 site	Phase 2 of garage is at P3 site	Phase 3 of garage is at P3 site	Phase 4 of garage is at P3 site						
Employee Parking (spaces)				Expand existing at- grade lot	Expand existing at- grade lot						
Curbside Loading & Unloading	++										
(linear feet) Enplaning curbside			Requirements will be met by means other than construction	Requirements will be met by means other than construction	Requirements will be met by means other than construction						
Deplaning curbside		Do nothing	Reconfigure commercial vehicle area to increase deplaning curbside & provide additional roadway lane	Relocate rental car service center to CONRAC; move taxicabs into garage; restripe commercial vehicle areas inside & outside P1 garage	Do nothing						
Curbside Roadway (lanes) Enplaning curbside				Meet requirement by reducing outer roadway areas reserved for non- curbside functions and use of outer roadway	Meet requirement by reducing outer roadway areas reserved for non- curbside functions and use of outer roadway						

INTRODUCTION BASIS FOR PROJECT COST ESTIMATES Table C-1

		Pla	nning Activity Level (I	PAL)	
Functional Element	PAL 1 (2012)	PAL 2 (2017)	PAL 3 (2022)	PAL 4 (2027)	PAL 5 (2035)
	2012	2017	2022	2027	2035
Deplaning curbside			Reconfigure commercial vehicle area to increase deplaning curbside & provide additional roadway lane		
Rental Car Facilities					
Ready / return parking (spaces) Service facilities (area in square feet)	New at-grade service facilities added to east of existing road. Bridge added to connect east and west service areas.	Service facilities expanded on east side of existing road	Service facilities expanded on east side of existing roadway	Parking garage constructed to house new consolidated facility At-grade service facilities constructed adjacent facilities in new garage	
Roadways					
NE Airport Way, westbound (link ID AFig 4-4)			New lane		
NE Airport Way, eastbound (link ID				New lane	
BFig 4-4) Parking entrance (link ID CFig 4-				New lane	
Enplaning level approach (link ID D			Follow-up study		
Fig 4-4)			required		
Deplaning level approach (link ID E Fig 4-4)					
Enplaning level departure (link ID F Fig 4-4)	Follow-up study required			Follow-up study required	
Deplaning level departure (link ID G- -Fig 4-4)				New lane	
Parking exit (link ID HFig 4-4)				New lane	
Terminal exit (link ID IFig 4-4)	New lane			New lane	
Terminal area exit (link ID KFig 4-		Newlane		New lane	
4)		INEW Idile		inew latte	
Key Intersections					
NE 82nd Ave/NE Airport Way		Basis is ODOT			
		estimate; assumed			
		some buildings			
		estimate detail)			
NE Airport Way/I-205 interchange		,			
I-205 Northbound	Not on Port property; no cost				
NE 82nd Avenue/NE Alderwood Road					Basis is existing Port estimate
NE Alderwood Road/NE Cornfoot			Basis is existing Port		
Koad	Basis is evicting		estimate		
Road	Port estimate				
AIR CARGO					
All Cargo	Cost estimate is for	Assumes demolition	Phase 1 of SW	Phase 2 of	Phase 3 of
	site preparation,	or maintenance	Quadrant	Quadrant includes	development in SW
	5,000 square feet	aircraft ramp as is	includes site prep.	expansion of aircraft	expansion of aircraft
	aircraft ramp.		utilities, aircraft ramp,	ramp	ramp
			and upgrades to NE		
			EIROD ROAD		

INTRODUCTION BASIS FOR PROJECT COST ESTIMATES Table C-1

	Planning Activity Level (PAL)											
Functional Element	PAL 1 (2012)	PAL 2 (2017)	PAL 3 (2022)	PAL 4 (2027)	PAL 5 (2035)							
	2012	2017	2022	2027	2035							
GENERAL AVIATION	Includes site preparation, access, utilities and 5,000 square feet aircraft ramp. Site prep includes costs equivalent to those to demolish the North Cargo Center, Unites Airlines Maintenance, and a flight kitchen. Assumed 2nd FBO begins operation in PAL 1											

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT			P	ROJECTED		R PAL 1 TO	D PAL 5 YEA	AR 2012-203	5			Date:	October	21, 2009
PORTLAND, OREGON	-	1		N	AIN SUMM	ARY OF PR	OJECT COS	БТ					By:	DN
	Linit	Tetal	Total Design		n Current Se	pt 2009 Cos	t DAL 4	DALE	Total Vaca of	Year c	of Expenditur	e 2012 -203	5Cost	DALE
FUNCTION ELEMENT	Unit	Quantity PAL 1-5	Cost in 2009 Dollars	2012	2017	2022	2027	2035	Expenditure Project Cost Dollars	2012	2017	PAL 3 2022	2027	2035
PASSENGER TERMINAL COMPEX Aircraft Gates & Parking Remote /RON Parking														
Narrow Body Aircraft Taxiway Connection RON Parking Area	Aircraft SY	23 5,556	40,548,000 2,268,000	9,108,000	4,500,000	9,132,000	9,564,000 2,268,000	8,244,000	66,432,000 4,092,000	10,044,000	5,856,000	13,968,000	17,244,000 4,092,000	19,320,000
Passenger Security Screening														
Document Check Primary Check	SF SF	4,142 4,156	312,000 480,000	108,000	168,000 72,000	24,000 108,000	24,000 60,000	96,000 132,000	504,000 780,000	132,000	216,000 96,000	36,000 168,000	36,000 96,000	216,000 288,000
GROUND TRANSPORTATION & PARKING Public Parking Garage	Space	11 532	639 348 000		106 008 000	176 856 000	179 628 000	176 856 000	1 146 888 000		137 760 000	270 744 000	323 916 000	414 468 000
Employee Parking	opuoo	11,002	000,010,000		100,000,000				1,110,000,000		101,100,000	210,11,000	020,010,000	
At Grade Parking Lot	Space	556	4,296,000				2,004,000	2,292,000	8,964,000				3,600,000	5,364,000
Curbside Passenger Loading & Unloading Enplaning Curbside Deplaning Curbside	LF LF	271 230	2,400,000			1,944,000	456,000	0	3,792,000			2,976,000	816,000	C
Curbside Roadway														
Enplaning Curbside Deplaning Curbside	Lane Lane	2 1	0 216,000			216,000	0		0 324,000			324,000	0	
Rental Car Facility Ready Return Parking	Spaces	2,700	186,912,000				186,912,000		337,068,000				337,068,000	
Rental Car Service Facility														
Car Wash	Position	24	15,252,000	1,980,000	648,000	1,284,000	11,340,000		25,452,000	2,184,000	852,000	1,968,000	20,448,000	
Fuel Positions	Position	83	12,396,000	132,000	648,000	648,000	10,968,000		21,756,000	144,000	852,000	996,000	19,764,000	
Stacking Spaces	Spaces	720	4,092,000	528,000	180,000	360,000	3,024,000		6,840,000	576,000	240,000	564,000	5,460,000	
Connecting Bridge	LF	136	1,620,000	1,404,000	60,000	108,000	216,000		1,944,000	1,548,000	72,000	168,000	396,000	
Roadways	19	1	708 000			708 000			1 080 000			1 080 000		
NE Airport Way Eastbound [link ID R-Fig 4-4]	LS	1	708,000			100,000	708.000		1,260,000			1,000,000	1.260.000	
Parking Entrance Link [link ID C -Fig 4-4]	LS	1	432,000				432,000		780,000				780,000	
Enplaning Level Approach [link ID D-Fig 4-4]	LS	1												
Deplaning Level Approach [link ID E-Fig 4-4]	LS	0												
Enplaning Level Departure [link ID F-Fig 4-4]	LS	2	Follow - up stud	y required										
Deplaning Level Departure [link ID G-Fig 4-4]	LS	1	756,000				756,000		1,368,000				1,368,000	
Parking Exit [link ID H-Fig 4-4]	LS	1	324,000	1 350 000			324,000		576,000	1 500 000			576,000	
Return to Terminal Road [link ID] LEig 4 4]		2	2,760,000	1,356,000			528,000		4,044,000	1,500,000			2,544,000	
Terminal Area Exit [link ID K-Fig 4-4]	LS	2	1,704,000		852,000		852,000		2,640,000		1,104,000		1,536,000	
Key Intersections NE 82nd Avenue/NE Airport Way														
Moving TriMet Light Rail Line [Double Track]	LS	1	15,360,000		15,360,000				19,968,000		19,968,000			
Intersection Road Work and Overpass	LS	1	101,232,000		101,232,000				131,568,000		131,568,000			
Demolition of Embassy Suite	LS	1	2,544,000		2,544,000				3,300,000		3,300,000			
Demolition and Alternation to Sheraton Hotel Mt Hood Interchange Area [3 sections]	LS LS	1 0	2,844,000		2,844,000				3,696,000		3,696,000			

MASTER PLAN																	
PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT			P	ROJECTE	COSTS FO	R PAL 1 TO	D PAL 5 YEA	AR 2012-203	5			Date:	October	21, 2009			
PORTLAND, OREGON	-			r	AAIN SUMM	ARY OF PR	OJECT COS	51					By:	DN			
					n Current Se	pt 2009 Cos	t			Year	of Expenditur	e 2012 -203	bCost				
FUNCTION ELEMENT	Unit	Total Quantity PAL 1-5	Total Project Cost in 2009 Dollars	PAL 1 2012	PAL 2 2017	PAL 3 2022	PAL 4 2027	PAL 5 2035	Total Year of Expenditure Project Cost Dollars	PAL 1 2012	PAL 2 2017	PAL 3 2022	PAL 4 2027	PAL 5 2035			
NE Airport Way/I-205 interchange																	
1-205 Southbound	LS	0															
1-205 Northbound	LS	0															
NE 82nd Avenue/NE Alderwood Road	LS	1	900,000					900,000	2,112,000					2,112,000			
NE Alderwood Road/NE Cornfoot Road	LS	1	900,000			900,000			1,392,000			1,392,000					
NE Airtrans Way/NE Cornfoot Road	LS	1	360,000	360,000					396,000	396,000							
NE Columbia Boulevard/NE 82nd Avenue	LS	0															
NE Killingsworth Street/I-205 interchange area	LS	0															
AIR CARGO																	
All Cargo																	
Warehouse Space [Site Preparation only]	SF	613,000	13,380,000	240,000	11,772,000	540,000	360,000	468,000	18,132,000	252,000	15,300,000	828,000	648,000	1,104,000			
Ramp	SY	369,000	96,036,000	17,100,000	96,000	20,232,000	24,696,000	33,912,000	173,964,000	18,864,000	108,000	30,984,000	44,532,000	79,476,000			
Landside Area [Site Preparation only]	SF	613,000	1,908,000	204,000	420,000	360,000	396,000	528,000	3,264,000	216,000	540,000	564,000	720,000	1,224,000			
Upgrade of Elrod Road [To New Cargo Area]	LS	1	2,508,000			2,508,000			3,840,000			3,840,000					
GENERAL AVIATION																	
General																	
Site Preparation	Acre	13	2,076,000	2,076,000					2,292,000	2,292,000							
			1,159,452,000	34,740,000	247,404,000	215,928,000	437,952,000	223,428,000	2,003,712,000	38,316,000	321,528,000	330,600,000	789,696,000	523,572,000			
		Check	1,159,452,000			Check 1,159,452,000 Check											

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON	LAN DINTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PROJECTED COSTS FOR PLANNING ACTIVITY LEVEL 1 YEAR 2012 Date: 0 O, OREGON SUMMARY By: [October 21, 2009 DN
				Current Sept	2009 Cost				Year of Expe	enditure 201	2 Cost		Comments
FUNCTION ELEMENT	Unit	Quantity	Unit Project Cost	Construction Cost	Project Development & Support	Project Development Contingency	Total Project Cost	Unit Project Cost	Construction Cost	Project Development & Support	Project Development Contingency	Total Project Cost	3.33% per annum used [yearly escalation average over 20 years for Portland]. A 20% project development contingency
PASSENGER TERMINAL COMPEX Aircraft Gates & Parking Remote /RON Parking Narrow Body Aircraft Taxiway Connection RON Parking Area	Aircraft SY	4	2,277,000	5,060,000	2,530,000	1,518,000	9,108,000	2,511,000	5,580,000	2,790,000	1,674,000	10,044,000	580' x 400' ramp area
Passenger Security Screening Queue Area Document Check Primary Check	SF	1,036	104	60,000	30,000	18,000	108,000	127	70,000	40,000	22,000	132,000	
GROUND TRANSPORTATION & PARKING Public Parking Garage	Space												
Employee Parking At Grade Parking Lot	Space												
Curbside Passenger Loading & Unloading Enplaning Curbside Deplaning Curbside	LF LF												
Curbside Roadway Enplaning Curbside Deplaning Curbside	Lane Lane												
Rental Car Facility Ready Return Parking	Spaces												
Rental Car Service Facility Car Wash Fuel Positions Stacking Spaces Circulation Connecting Bridge	Position Position Space SF LF	3 1 90 4,800 135	660,000 132,000 5,867 30 10,400	1,100,000 70,000 290,000 80,000 780,000	550,000 40,000 150,000 40,000 390,000	330,000 22,000 88,000 24,000 234,000	1,980,000 132,000 528,000 144,000 1,404,000	728,000 144,000 6,400 35 11,467	1,210,000 80,000 320,000 90,000 860,000	610,000 40,000 160,000 50,000 430,000	364,000 24,000 96,000 28,000 258,000	2,184,000 144,000 576,000 168,000 1,548,000	
Roadways NE Airport Way Westbound [link ID A-Fig 4-4] NE Airport Way Eastbound [link ID B-Fig 4-4] Parking Entrance Link [link ID C -Fig 4-4] Enplaning Level Approach [link ID C -Fig 4-4]	LS LS LS LS												
Enplaning Level Departure [link ID E-Frig 4-4] Deplaning Level Departure [link ID G-Fig 4-4] Parking Exit [link ID H-Fig 4-4] Terminal Exit [link ID I-Fig 4-4] Return to Terminal Road [link ID J-Fig 4-4] Terminal Area Exit [link ID K-Fig 4-4]	LS LS LS LF LS LS	1	1,356,000	750,000	380,000	226,000	1,356,000	1,500,000	830,000	420,000	250,000	1,500,000	Meets requirement other than Construction Two lanes add plus sidewalk
Key Intersections NE 82nd Avenue/NE Airport Way Moving TriMet Light Rail Line [Double Track] Intersection Road Work and Overpass Demolition of Embassy Suite Demolition and Alternation to Sheraton Hotel Mt Hood Interchange Area [3 sections] NE Airport Way/I-205 interchange 1-205 Southbound 1-205 Northbound NE 82nd Avenue/NE Alderwood Road	LS LS LS LS LS LS LS LS												

MASTER PLAN													
PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT			PROJECTED	COSTS FOR P	LANNING AC	TIVITY LEVE	_ 1 YEAR 20	12				Date:	October 21, 2009
PORTLAND, OREGON					SUMMARY							By	: DN
				Current Sept	2009 Cost				Year of Exp	enditure 201	12 Cost		Comments
FUNCTION ELEMENT	Unit	Quantity	Unit Project	Construction	Project	Project	Total Project	Unit Project	Construction	Project	Project	Total Project	3.33% per annum used [yearly escalation
			Cost	Cost	Development	Development	Cost	Cost	Cost	Development	t Development	Cost	average over 20 years for Portland]. A
					& Support	Contingency				& Support	Contingency		20% project development contingency
NE Alderwood Road/NE Cornfoot Road	LS												
NE Airtrans Way/NE Cornfoot Road	LS	1	360,000	200,000	100,000	60,000	360,000	396,000	220,000	110,000	66,000	396,000	\$300,000 construction cost from Port
NE Columbia Boulevard/NE 82nd Avenue	LS												2 intersections
NE Killingsworth Street/I-205 interchange area	LS												2 intersections
AIR CARGO													
All Cargo													
Warehouse Space [Site Preparation only]	SF	40,000	6	130,000	70,000	40,000	240,000	6	140,000	70,000	42,000	252,000	
Ramp	SY	51,000	335	9,500,000	4,750,000	2,850,000	17,100,000	370	10,480,000	5,240,000	3,144,000	18,864,000	
Landside Area [Site Preparation only]	SF	40,000	5	110,000	60,000	34,000	204,000	5	120,000	60,000	36,000	216,000	
GENERAL AVIATION													
General													No destato especito e se de se se dise
Site Preparation	Acre	13	159,692	1,150,000	580,000	346,000	2,076,000	176,308	1,270,000	640,000	382,000	2,292,000	No decision regarding made regarding
													The cost is intended to provide a worst
													case cost
													The cost is related to Concept 1 in TM No
													4 Alternates. Demolishing North Cargo
													Center, United Maintenance Center & flight
													kitchen
	TOTALS I	FOR PAL 1	_	19,280,000	9,670,000	5,790,000	34,740,000		21,270,000	10,660,000	6,386,000	38,316,000	1
		Check					34,740,000					38,316,000	

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON			PROJECTED (COSTS FOR P	LANNING AC SUMMARY	TIVITY LEVE	2 YEAR 20	17				Date: By:	October 21, 2009 DN
				Current Sept	2009 Cost				Year of Exp	enditure 201	7 Cost		Comments
FUNCTION ELEMENT	Unit	Quantity	Unit Project Cost	Construction Cost	Project Development & Support	Project Development Contingency	Total Project Cost	Unit Project Cost	Construction Cost	Project Development & Support	Project Development Contingency	Total Project Cost	3.33% per annum used [yearly escalation average over 20 years for Portland]. A 20% project development contingency used
PASSENGER TERMINAL COMPEX Aircraft Gates & Parking <u>Remote /RON Parking</u> Narrow Body Aircraft Taxiway Connection RON Parking Area	Aircraft SY	2	2,250,000	2,500,000	1,250,000	750,000	4,500,000	2,928,000	3,250,000	1,630,000	976,000	5,856,000	285' x 400' ramp area
Passenger Security Screening Queue Area Document Check Primary Check	SF SF	2,595 572	65 126	90,000 40,000	50,000 20,000	28,000 12,000	168,000 72,000	83 168	120,000 50,000	60,000 30,000	36,000 16,000	216,000 96,000	
GROUND TRANSPORTATION & PARKING Public Parking Garage	Space	1,912	55,444	58,890,000	29,450,000	17,668,000	106,008,000	72,050	76,530,000	38,270,000	22,960,000	137,760,000	
Employee Parking At Grade Parking Lot	Space												
Curbside Passenger Loading & Unloading Enplaning Curbside Deplaning Curbside	LF LF	20		No Cost									
Curbside Roadway Enplaning Curbside Deplaning Curbside	Lane Lane												
Rental Car Facility Ready Return Parking	Spaces												
Rental Car Service Facility Car Wash Fuel Positions Stacking Spaces Circulation Connecting Bridge	Position Position Space SF LF	1 6 30 2,280	648,000 108,000 6,000 26	360,000 360,000 100,000 30,000	180,000 180,000 50,000 20,000	108,000 108,000 30,000 10,000	648,000 648,000 180,000 60,000	852,000 142,000 8,000 32	470,000 470,000 130,000 40,000	240,000 240,000 70,000 20,000	142,000 142,000 40,000 12,000	852,000 852,000 240,000 72,000	
Roadways NE Airport Way Westbound [link ID A-Fig 4-4] NE Airport Way Eastbound [link ID B-Fig 4-4] Parking Entrance Link [link ID C -Fig 4-4] Enplaning Level Approach [link ID D-Fig 4-4] Deplaning Level Departure [link ID F-Fig 4-4] Deplaning Level Departure [link ID F-Fig 4-4] Parking Exit [link ID H-Fig 4-4] Terminal Exit [link ID H-Fig 4-4] Return to Terminal Road [link ID J-Fig 4-4] Terminal Area Exit [link ID K-Fig 4-4]	LS LS LS LS LS LS LS LS LS LS LS	1	852,000	470,000	240,000	142,000	852,000	1,104,000	610,000	310,000	184,000	1,104,000	One lane added
Key Intersections NE 82nd Avenue/NE Airport Way Moving TriMet Light Rail Line [Double Track] Intersection Road Work and Overpass Demolition of Embassy Suite Demolition and Alternation to Sheraton Hotel Mt Hood Interchange Area [3 sections] NE Airport Way/I-205 interchange 1-205 Southbound 1-205 Northbound	LS LS LS LS LS LS LS	1 1 1 1	15,360,000 101,232,000 2,544,000 2,844,000	8,530,000 56,240,000 1,410,000 1,580,000	4,270,000 28,120,000 710,000 790,000	2,560,000 16,872,000 424,000 474,000	15,360,000 101,232,000 2,544,000 2,844,000	19,968,000 131,568,000 3,300,000 3,696,000	11,090,000 73,090,000 1,830,000 2,050,000	5,550,000 36,550,000 920,000 1,030,000	3,328,000 21,928,000 550,000 616,000	19,968,000 131,568,000 3,300,000 3,696,000	Based on HHPR. Drawing Cost broken down

MASTER PLAN													
PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT			PROJECTED	COSTS FOR P	LANNING AC	TIVITY LEVE	2 YEAR 20	17				Date:	October 21, 2009
PORTLAND, OREGON					SUMMARY							By:	DN
				Current Sept	2009 Cost				Year of Exp	enditure 201	7 Cost		Comments
FUNCTION ELEMENT	Unit	Quantity	Unit Project Cost	Construction Cost	Project Development & Support	Project Development Contingency	Total Project Cost	Unit Project Cost	Construction Cost	Project Development & Support	Project Development Contingency	Total Project Cost	3.33% per annum used [yearly escalation average over 20 years for Portland]. A 20% project developmen contingency used
NE 82nd Avenue/NE Alderwood Road NE Alderwood Road/NE Comfoot Road NE Airtrans Way/NE Comfoot Road NE Columbia Boulevard/NE 82nd Avenue NE Killingsworth Street/I-205 interchange area	LS LS LS LS LS												
AIR CARGO All Cargo Warehouse Space [Site Preparation only] Ramp Landside Area [Site Preparation only] GENERAL AVIATION	SF SY SF	129,000 72,000 129,000	91 1 3	6,540,000 50,000 230,000	3,270,000 30,000 120,000	1,962,000 16,000 70,000	11,772,000 96,000 420,000	119 2 4	8,500,000 60,000 300,000	4,250,000 30,000 150,000	2,550,000 18,000 90,000	15,300,000 108,000 540,000	Using existing ramp to hangar
General Site Preparation	Acre TOTALS F	FOR PAL 2		137,420,000	68,750,000	41,234,000	247,404,000		178,590,000	89,350,000	53,588,000	321,528,000	
General Site Preparation	Acre	FOR PAL 2 Check	-	137,420,000	68,750,000	41,234,000	247,404,000 247,404,000		178,590,000	89,350,000	53,588,000	321,528,000 321,528,000	

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PROJECTED COSTS FOR PLANNING ACTIVITY LEVEL 3 YEAR 2022 Date: October 21, 2009 Date: October 21, 2009													
ORTLAND, OREGON SUMMARY								By: DN					
	Current Sept 2009 Cost					Year of Exp			enditure 202	2 Cost	T (D) (Comments	
FUNCTION ELEMENT	Unit	Quantity	Cost	Construction	Development & Support	Development Contingency	Cost	Cost	Construction	Project Development & Support	Project Development Contingency	Cost	3.33% per annum used [yeariy escalation average over 20 years for Portland]. A 20% project development contingency used
PASSENGER TERMINAL COMPEX Aircraft Gates & Parking <u>Remote /RON Parking</u> Narrow Body Aircraft Taxiway Connection RON Parking Area	Aircraft SY	4	2,283,000	5,070,000	2,540,000	1,522,000	9,132,000	3,492,000	7,760,000	3,880,000	2,328,000	13,968,000	580' x 400' ramp area
Passenger Security Screening Queue Area Document Check Primary Check	SF SF	234 910	103 119	10,000 60,000	10,000 30,000	4,000 18,000	24,000 108,000	154 185	20,000 90,000	10,000 50,000	6,000 28,000	36,000 168,000	
GROUND TRANSPORTATION & PARKING Public Parking													
Garage	Space	3,190	55,441	98,250,000	49,130,000	29,476,000	176,856,000	84,873	150,410,000	75,210,000	45,124,000	270,744,000	\$28,000 per space allowed
Employee Parking At Grade Parking Lot	Space												
Curbside Passenger Loading & Unloading Enplaning Curbside Deplaning Curbside	LF LF	31 80	24,300	no cost 1,080,000	540,000	324,000	1,944,000	37,200	1,650,000	830,000	496,000	2,976,000	Meets requirement other than Construction Commercial vehicle reconfiguration
Curbside Roadway Enplaning Curbside Deplaning Curbside	Lane Lane	1	216,000	120,000	60,000	36,000	216,000	324,000	180,000	90,000	54,000	324,000	Road island added
Rental Car Facility Ready Return Parking	Spaces												
Rental Car Service Facility Car Wash Fuel Positions Stacking Spaces Circulation Connecting Bridge	Position Position Space SF LF	2 6 60 3,840	642,000 108,000 6,000 28	710,000 360,000 200,000 60,000	360,000 180,000 100,000 30,000	214,000 108,000 60,000 18,000	1,284,000 648,000 360,000 108,000	984,000 166,000 9,400 44	1,090,000 550,000 310,000 90,000	550,000 280,000 160,000 50,000	328,000 166,000 94,000 28,000	1,968,000 996,000 564,000 168,000	
Roadways NE Airport Way Westbound [link ID A-Fig 4-4] NE Airport Way Eastbound [link ID B-Fig 4-4] Parking Entrance Link [link ID C -Fig 4-4] Enplaning Level Approach [link ID D-Fig 4-4] Deplaning Level Departure [link ID F-Fig 4-4] Deplaning Level Departure [link ID G-Fig 4-4] Parking Exit [link ID H-Fig 4-4] Terminal Exit [link ID I-Fig 4-4] Return to Terminal Road [link ID J-Fig 4-4] Terminal Area Exit [link ID K-Fig 4-4]	LS LS LS LS LS LS LS LS LS LS LS	1	708,000	390,000 no cost	200,000	118,000	708,000	1,080,000	600,000	300,000	180,000	1,080,000	One lane added Weets requirement other than Construction
Key Intersections NE 82nd Avenue/NE Airport Way Moving TriMet Light Rail Line [Double Track] Intersection Road Work and Overpass Demolition of Embassy Suite Demolition and Alternation to Sheraton Hotel Mt Hood Interchange Area [3 sections] NE Airport Way/I-205 interchange 1-205 Southbound NE 82nd Avenue/NE Alderwood Road	LS LS LS LS LS LS LS LS												

MASTER PLAN															
PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PROJECTED COSTS FOR PLANNING ACTIVITY LEVEL 3 YEAR 2022									Date: October 21, 2009						
PORTLAND, OREGON			SUMMARY						By: DN						
			Current Sept 2009 Cost						Year of Exp	Comments					
FUNCTION ELEMENT	Unit	Quantity	Unit Project Cost	Construction Cost	Project Development & Support	Project Development Contingency	Total Project Cost	Unit Project Cost	Construction Cost	Project Development & Support	Project Development Contingency	Total Project Cost	3.33% per annum used [yearly escalatio average over 20 years for Portland]. A 20% project development contingency used		
NE Alderwood Road/NE Cornfoot Road NE Airtrans Way/NE Cornfoot Road NE Columbia Boulevard/NE 82nd Avenue NE Killingsworth Street/I-205 interchange area	LS LS LS LS	1	900,000	500,000	250,000	150,000	900,000	1,392,000	770,000	390,000	232,000	1,392,000	5750,000 construction cost from Port		
AIR CARGO AII Cargo Warehouse Space [Site Preparation only] Ramp Landside Area [Site Preparation only] Upgrade of Elrod Road [To New Cargo Area] GENERAL AVIATION General Site Preparation	SF SY SF LS Acre	114,000 63,000 114,000 1	5 321 3 2,508,000	300,000 11,240,000 200,000 1,390,000	150,000 5,620,000 100,000 700,000	90,000 3,372,000 60,000 418,000	540,000 20,232,000 360,000 2,508,000	7 492 5 3,840,000	460,000 17,210,000 310,000 2,130,000	230,000 8,610,000 160,000 1,070,000	138,000 5,164,000 94,000 640,000	828,000 30,984,000 564,000 3,840,000	New Facility		
	FOR PAL 3		119,940,000	60,000,000	35,988,000	215,928,000		183,630,000	91,870,000	55,100,000	330,600,000	μ			
	Check					215,928,000					330,600,000				

MASTER PLAN PROJECTED COSTS FOR PLANNING ACTIVITY LEVEL 4 YEAR 2027 Date: October 21, 2009												October 21, 2009	
PORTLAND, OREGON	SUMMARY										DN		
		0		Current Sept	2009 Cost		T . I	Year of Expenditure			7 Cost	T (D) (Comments
FUNCTION ELEMENT	Unit	Quantity	Cost	Construction Cost	Project Development & Support	Development Contingency	Cost	Cost	Construction	Project Development & Support	Development Contingency	Cost	3.33% per annum used [yearly escalation average over 20 years for Portland]. A 20% project development contingency used
PASSENGER TERMINAL COMPEX Aircraft Gates & Parking Remote /RON Parking													
Narrow Body Aircraft Taxiway Connection RON Parking Area	Aircraft SY	7 5,556	1,366,286 408	5,310,000 1,260,000	2,660,000 630,000	1,594,000 378,000	9,564,000 2,268,000	2,463,429 737	9,580,000 2,270,000	4,790,000 1,140,000	2,874,000 682,000	17,244,000 4,092,000	580' x 400' ramp area 500' x 100' paving allowed
Passenger Security Screening Queue Area Document Check	SF	169	142	10,000	10,000	4,000	24,000	213	20,000	10,000	6,000	36,000	
Primary Check	SF	468	128	30,000	20,000	10,000	60,000	205	50,000	30,000	16,000	96,000	
GROUND TRANSPORTATION & PARKING Public Parking Garage	Space	3,240	55,441	99,790,000	49,900,000	29,938,000	179,628,000	99,974	179,950,000	89,980,000	53,986,000	323,916,000	\$28,000 per space allowed
Employee Parking At Grade Parking Lot	Space	256	7,828	1,110,000	560,000	334,000	2,004,000	14,063	2,000,000	1,000,000	600,000	3,600,000	325 sf space allowed per car
Curbside Passenger Loading & Unloading		120		no cost									
Deplaning Curbside	LF	50	9,120	250,000	130,000	76,000	456,000	16,320	450,000	230,000	136,000	816,000	Commercial vehicle reconfiguration
Curbside Roadway Enplaning Curbside Deplaning Curbside	Lane Lane	1											Meet requirements by adjusting operation
Rental Car Facility Ready Return Parking	Spaces	2,700	69,227	103,840,000	51,920,000	31,152,000	186,912,000	124,840	187,260,000	93,630,000	56,178,000	337,068,000	New Facility Multi-story parking structure
Rental Car Service Facility Car Wash	Position	18	630,000	6,300,000	3,150,000	1,890,000	11,340,000	1,136,000	11,360,000	5,680,000	3,408,000	20,448,000	New Facility
Fuel Positions	Position	70	156,686	6,090,000	3,050,000	1,828,000	10,968,000	282,343	10,980,000	5,490,000	3,294,000	19,764,000	
Circulation	SF	36 480	5,600	570,000	290,000	172 000	3,024,000	51	3,030,000	520,000	310,000	5,460,000	
Connecting Bridge [Removal]	LS	1	216,000	120,000	60,000	36,000	216,000	396,000	220,000	110,000	66,000	396,000	
Roadways NE Airport Way Westbound [link ID A-Fig 4-4]	LS												
NE Airport Way Eastbound [link ID B-Fig 4-4]	LS	1	708,000	390,000	200,000	118,000	708,000	1,260,000	700,000	350,000	210,000	1,260,000	one lane added
Parking Entrance Link [link ID C -Fig 4-4] Enplaning Level Approach [link ID D-Fig 4-4] Deplaning Level Approach [link ID E-Fig 4-4]	LS LS LS	1	432,000	240,000	120,000	72,000	432,000	780,000	430,000	220,000	130,000	780,000	one lane added
Enplaning Level Departure [link ID F-Fig 4-4]	LS	1	1 [,]										Follow - up study required
Deplaning Level Departure [link ID G-Fig 4-4]	LS	1	756,000	420,000	210,000	126,000	756,000	1,368,000	760,000	380,000	228,000	1,368,000	one lane added
Parking Exit [link ID H-Fig 4-4]	LS	1	324,000	180,000	90,000	54,000	324,000	576,000	320,000	160,000	96,000	576,000	one lane added
Terminal Exit [link ID I-Fig 4-4]	LF	1	1,404,000	780,000	390,000	234,000	1,404,000	2,544,000	1,410,000	710,000	424,000	2,544,000	one lane added
Return to Terminal Road [link ID J-Fig 4-4] Terminal Area Exit [link ID K-Fig 4-4]	LS LS	1	528,000 852,000	290,000 470,000	150,000 240,000	88,000 142,000	528,000 852,000	936,000 1,536,000	520,000 850,000	260,000 430,000	156,000 256,000	936,000 1,536,000	one lane added one lane added
	ļ	<u> </u>	ļ'										
Key Intersections			1										
NE 82nd Avenue/NE Airport Way	1.0		1										
Moving TriMet Light Rail Line [Double Track]	LS		1										
Demolition of Embassy Suite	15		1 '										
Demolition and Alternation to Sheraton Hotel	LS		1 '										
Mt Hood Interchange Area [3 sections]	LS		1 '										
NE Airport Way/I-205 interchange 1-205 Southbound	LS												
MASTER PLAN													
--	--------	-----------	--------------	--------------	-------------	-------------	---------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	-------------	---------------	---
PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT			PROJECTED	COSTS FOR P	LANNING AC	TIVITY LEVE	4 YEAR 20	27				Date:	October 21, 2009
PORTLAND, OREGON					SUMMARY						By:	DN	
				Current Sept	2009 Cost				Year of Exp	enditure 202	7 Cost		Comments
FUNCTION ELEMENT	Unit	Quantity	Unit Project	Construction	Project	Project	Total Project	Unit Project	Construction	Project	Project	Total Project	3.33% per annum used [yearly escalation
			Cost	Cost	Development	Development	Cost	Cost	Cost	Development	Development	Cost	average over 20 years for Portland]. A
					& Support	Contingency				& Support	Contingency		20% project development contingency
								-					UARU
1-205 Northbound	LS												
NE 82nd Avenue/NE Alderwood Road	LS												
NE Alderwood Road/NE Cornfoot Road	LS												
NE Airtrans Way/NE Cornfoot Road	LS												
NE Columbia Boulevard/NE 82nd Avenue	LS												
NE Killingsworth Street/I-205 interchange area	LS												
AIR CARGO													
All Cargo													
Warehouse Space [Site Preparation only]	SF	138,000	3	200,000	100,000	60,000	360,000	5	360,000	180,000	108,000	648,000	
Ramp	SY	77,000	321	13,720,000	6,860,000	4,116,000	24,696,000	578	24,740,000	12,370,000	7,422,000	44,532,000	
Landside Area [Site Preparation only]	SF	138,000	3	220,000	110,000	66,000	396,000	5	400,000	200,000	120,000	720,000	
GENERAL AVIATION													
General		1											
Site Preparation	Acre	1											
	TOTALS	FOR PAL 4		243,270,000	121,690,000	72,992,000	437,952,000		438,690,000	219,390,000	131,616,000	789,696,000	1
		Check					437,952,000	1				789,696,000	1

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON			PROJECTED (COSTS FOR P	LANNING AC SUMMARY	TIVITY LEVEL	5 YEAR 203	35				Date: By:	October 21, 2009 DN
				Current Sept	2009 Cost				Year of Expe	enditure 203	5 Cost		Comments
FUNCTION ELEMENT	Unit	Quantity	Unit Project Cost	Construction Cost	Project Development & Support	Project Development Contingency	Total Project Cost	Unit Project Cost	Construction Cost	Project Development & Support	Project Development Contingency	Total Project Cost	3.33% per annum used [yearly escalation average over 20 years for Portland]. A 20% project development contingency used
PASSENGER TERMINAL COMPEX Aircraft Gates & Parking <u>Remote /RON Parking</u> Narrow Body Aircraft Taxiway Connection RON Parking Area	Aircraft SY	6	1,374,000	4,580,000	2,290,000	1,374,000	8,244,000	3,220,000	10,730,000	5,370,000	3,220,000	19,320,000	580' x 400' ramp area
Passenger Security Screening Queue Area Document Check Primary Check	SF SF	1,144 1,170	84 113	50,000 70,000	30,000 40,000	16,000 22,000	96,000 132,000	189 246	120,000 160,000	60,000 80,000	36,000 48,000	216,000 288,000	
GROUND TRANSPORTATION & PARKING Public Parking		0.400	55.444		40,400,000		170 050 000	100.007					
Garage	Space	3,190	55,441	98,250,000	49,130,000	29,476,000	176,856,000	129,927	230,260,000	115,130,000	69,078,000	414,468,000	\$28,000 per space allowed
At Grade Parking Lot	Space	300	7,640	1,270,000	640,000	382,000	2,292,000	17,880	2,980,000	1,490,000	894,000	5,364,000	325 sf space allowed per car
Curbside Passenger Loading & Unloading Enplaning Curbside Deplaning Curbside	LF LF	120 80		no cost no cost									Meets requirement other than Construction Requirement meet in PAL-4
Curbside Roadway Enplaning Curbside Deplaning Curbside	Lane Lane	1		no cost									Road island added in Pal-4
Rental Car Facility Ready Return Parking	Spaces												
Rental Car Service Facility Car Wash Fuel Positions Stacking Spaces Circulation Connecting Bridge	Position Position Space SF LF												
Roadways NE Airport Way Westbound [link ID A-Fig 4-4] NE Airport Way Eastbound [link ID B-Fig 4-4] Parking Entrance Link [link ID C -Fig 4-4] Enplaning Level Approach [link ID E-Fig 4-4] Deplaning Level Departure [link ID F-Fig 4-4] Deplaning Level Departure [link ID F-Fig 4-4] Parking Exit [link ID H-Fig 4-4] Terminal Exit [link ID I-Fig 4-4] Return to Terminal Road [link ID J-Fig 4-4] Terminal Area Exit [link ID K-Fig 4-4]	LS LS LS LS LS LS LS LS LS LS												
Key Intersections NE 82nd Avenue/NE Airport Way Moving TriMet Light Rail Line [Double Track] Intersection Road Work and Overpass Demolition of Embassy Suite Demolition and Alternation to Sheraton Hotel Mt Hood Interchange Area [3 sections] NE Airport Way/I-205 interchange 1-205 Southbound 1-205 Northbound NE 82nd Avenue/NE Alderwood Road	LS LS LS LS LS LS LS LS LS	1	900,000	500.000	250.000	150.000	900.000	2.112.000	1.170.000	590,000	352,000	2.112.000	

MASTER PLAN													
PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT			PROJECTED (COSTS FOR P	LANNING AC	TIVITY LEVE	5 YEAR 20	35				Date:	October 21, 2009
PORTLAND, OREGON					SUMMARY						By:	: DN	
				Current Sept 2009 Cost Year of Expenditure 20				enditure 203	5 Cost Comments				
FUNCTION ELEMENT	Unit	Quantity	Unit Project	Construction	Project	Project	Total Project	Unit Project	Construction	Project	Project	Total Project	3.33% per annum used [yearly escalation
			Cost	Cost	Development	Development	Cost	Cost	Cost	Development	Development	Cost	average over 20 years for Portland]. A
					& Support	Contingency				& Support	Contingency		20% project development contingency used
NE Alderwood Road/NE Cornfoot Road	LS												
NE Airtrans Way/NE Cornfoot Road	LS												
NE Columbia Boulevard/NE 82nd Avenue	LS												
NE Killingsworth Street/I-205 interchange area	LS												
AIR CARGO													
All Cargo													
Warehouse Space [Site Preparation only]	SF	192,000	2	260,000	130,000	78,000	468,000	6	610,000	310,000	184,000	1,104,000	
Ramp	SY	106,000	320	18,840,000	9,420,000	5,652,000	33,912,000	750	44,150,000	22,080,000	13,246,000	79,476,000	
Landside Area [Site Preparation only]	SF	192,000	3	290,000	150,000	88,000	528,000	6	680,000	340,000	204,000	1,224,000	
General													
Site Preparation	Acre												
]	TOTALS F	OR PAL 5		124,110,000	62,080,000	37,238,000	223,428,000		290,860,000	145,450,000	87,262,000	523,572,000	1
		Check					223,428,000					523,572,000	

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT Date: PORTLAND, OREGON Prepared By: CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN PAL-1 2012 BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMATE

October 21, 2009

DN

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals	
PASSENGER TERMINAL COMPEX					
Aircraft Gates & Parking [No 4]					
Remote /RON Parking					
Temporary Work					
Temporary construction and work	1	LS	50,000.00	50,000	
Escorts	1	LS	100,000	100,000	
Traffic control	1	LS	20,000.00	20,000	
Demolition & Site Preparation					
Removal of concrete or asphalt paving [1/3 area allowed]	8,507	SY	10.50	89,324	
Miscellaneous demolition work including drainage and	25,778	SY	1.25	32,223	
electrical work					
Miscellaneous general demolition work	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000	
New					
Mass excavation	25,969	CY	8.00	207,752	
Extra for rock excavation	260	CY	45.00	11,686	
Remove excavated material and stockpile on site	25,969	CY	4.00	103,876	
Rough grading and compaction	27,067	SY	0.50	13,534	
Erosion & sedimentary control	27,067	SY	0.65	17,594	
Imported select compact Sub-base	9,022	CY	18.00	162,396	
Geotech fabric	25,778	SY	1.50	38,667	
Crushed aggregate base	6,045	CY	34.00	205,530	
Concrete paving 16 1/2" thick	25,778	SY	80.00	2,062,240	
Asphalt paving	239	TON	115.00	27,485	
Sealer coat concrete	25,778	SY	0.25	6,445	
Primer and tack coat	1,895	SY	1.50	2,842	
Extra for joining new paving to existing	1,160	LF	15.00	17,400	
Pavement marking	25,778	SY	0.50	12,889	
Allowance for general repair	25,778	SY	0.50	12,889	
Utilities					
Drainage to apron area	25,778	SY	15.00	386,670	
Electrical including lighting and power	25,778	SY	3.00	77,334	
Guidance and general signage	4	EA	3500.00	14,000	
Landscaping					
Hydro-seeding and landscaping	1	LS	10000.00	10,000	
	Sub-Total		-	3,692,774	-
General Contractors General Conditions		12.50%		461,597	
	Sub-Total		-	4,154,370	•
Conoral Contractors Eco		6 00%		240.262	
General Contractors Fee		0.00%	_	249,202	_
	Sub-Total		_	4,403,633	
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		660,545	
Total for	r Remote RON	I Parking	-	5,064,177	-

Passenger Security Screening Queue Area Primary Check Temporary Work

				0 / 1 0/ 0000
PORILAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT			Date:	October 21, 2009
PORTLAND, OREGON		Р	repared By:	DN
CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN				
PAL-1 2012 BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMA	TE			
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals
Temporary screening and protection to construction area Demolition	1,036	SF	1.00	1,036
Interior demolition work New	1,036	SF	1.50	1,554
Interior construction	1,036	SF	2.00	2,072
Floor wall and ceiling finishes [mainly using existing]	1,036	SF	1.00	1,036
New queue barrier	1,036	SF	3.00	3,108
Specialties and signage	1,036	SF	2.00	2.072
	1 036	SF	5.00	5 180
HVAC [alteration and additional hvac at examination area]	.,	•	0.00	0,100
Electrical [power supply to examination machines]	1.036	SF	6.00	6,216
Electrical lighting changes	1.036	SF	1.50	1,554
Casework and furniture	1,000	SE	5.00	5 180
Miscellaneous work	1,000	LS	1 000 00	1 000
		20	1,000.00	1,000
	Sub-Total		-	30,008
Extra for shift and out of normal hours working		30.00%		9,002
	Sub-Total		-	39,010
General Contractors General Conditions		30.00%		9,002
	Sub-Total		-	48,013
General Contractors Fee		10.00%		4,801
	Sub-Total		-	52,814
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		7,922
Total for Queu	ie Area Primar	y Check	-	60,736
			-	
Rental Car Facility				
Service Facility				
Rental Car Wash [3 No]				
Temporary Work				
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc	600	SY	1 50	000
Site Prenaration & Demolition	000	01	1.50	300
Demolition and proparation	6 750	٩E	2.50	16 075
Erosion & and preparation	6,750	SF SE	2.30	10,075
Erosion & Sedimentary control	6,750	эг	0.20	1,350
Foundations & Slad	F 400	05	0.00	40.000
	5,400	51	3.00	16,200
Concrete slab on grade	5,400	SF	6.50	35,100
Superstructure		<u> </u>	-	
Pre-engineered building	5,400	SF	30.00	162,000
Interior Construction				
Partition interior doors	5,400	SF	1.50	8,100
Specialties bollards	12	EA	450.00	5,400
Signs and pavement marking	3	EA	600.00	1,800
Interior Finishes				

Date:

Prepared By:

October 21, 2009

<u>PAL-1 2012</u>

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals	
Wall floor and ceiling finishes	5,400	SF	2.00	10,800	
Plumbing					
Sump pit	3	EA	1,250.00	3,750	
Drainage	3	EA	5,000.00	15,000	
HVAC					
Ventilation and radiant heating	5,400	SF	1.50	8,100	
Electrical					
Electrical supply and distribution	3	EA	8,500.00	25,500	
Lighting and power	5,400	SF	3.00	16,200	
Low voltage and communication, fire alarm	5,400	SF	1.65	8,910	
Equipment	2		110 000	220.000	
venicie wasning equipment	3	EA	110,000	330,000	
Height barrier Weter reelemetien system	ى 1	EA	2,500.00	7,500	
Stool guard rails	3		4 000 00	12,000	
Allow for testing	3		4,000.00	3 750	
Site Improvement	5	LA	1,230.00	5,750	
Asphalt paying associated with new washing facility	150	SY	35.00	5 250	
Site Mechanical Utilities	100	01	00.00	0,200	
Connecting drain pipe to existing	1	1.5	10 000 00	10 000	
New water supply	1	LS	10.000.00	10,000	
Site Electrical Utilities			,	. 0,000	
Electrical supply to facility	1	LS	20,000.00	20,000	
			_		
	Sub-Total			794,485	
General Contractors General Conditions		13.00%		103,283	
	Sub-Total			897,768	
		0 500/		50.055	
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		58,355	
	Sub-Total		_	956,123	
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		143,418	
Т	otal for Car Wa	sh [3 No]	_	1.099.541	
			_	, <u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>	
Fuel Positions [1]					
Fuel position add to existing					
I emporary work	COO	05	1.00	000	
Allowance for temporary work and tencing etc	600	55	1.00	600	
Allowance for neverant and other demolition work	750	SE	2 50	1 075	
Allowance for miscellaneous demolition work	100 / 1	ىر 19	2.0U 500.00	1,875	
Frosion & sedimentary control	750	SF	1 00	500	
Site Work	750	0	1.00	150	
3" asphalt on 4" crushed rock base including excavation	67	SY	46 88	3 141	
Allow for joining paying to existing	1	LS	300.00	300	
Reinforced concrete island	150	SF	10.00	1.500	
Pavement marking and signage	67	SY	2.50	168	
Bollards	4	EA	465.00	1.860	

Date: Oo Prepared By:

October 21, 2009

<u>PAL-1 2012</u>

BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMATE

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals	
	709	9E	30.00	22.040	
Miscellaneous nainting	1 1	19	200.00	23,940	
Litilities		LO	200.00	200	
Storm drainage including connecting to existing	1	1.5	1 000 00	1 000	
Electrical supply to dispenser	1	LS	1,000.00	1,000	
Low voltage control to dispenser	1	LS	1,000,00	1,200	
Connecting to existing control	1	IS	500.00	500	
	798	SF	2.50	1 995	
Fuel		•		1,000	
Fuel dispenser to match existing	1	EA	3.350.00	3.350	
Supply piping and vent including excavation	1	LS	2,500.00	2.500	
New dispenser sump to match existing	1	EA	800.00	800	
Extra for connection to existing tank	1	LS	1.000.00	1.000	
Miscellaneous work associate with fuel supply and control	1	LS	500.00	500	
			_		
	Sub-Total			48,678	
General Contractors General Conditions		14.00%		6,815	
	Sub-Total		-	55,493	
General Contractors Fee		6 50%		3 607	
		0.0070	_	0,001	
	Sub-Total			59,100	
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		8,865	
Total	for New Fuel	Position	-	67,965	
Rental Car Stack Spaces [For 90 cars]					
Temporary Work					
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc	2,000	SY	3.00	6,000	
Allowance for payement and other demolition work	1 320	SY	10.00	13 200	
Allowance for miscellaneous demolition work	1	LS	5.000.00	5 000	
Erosion & sedimentary control	2.000	SY	2.25	4,500	
Site Work	_,	•		.,	
3" asphalt on 4" crushed rock base including excavation	2,000	SY	37.50	75.000	
Pavement marking and signage	2,000	SY	2.50	5,000	
Concrete curb and gutter	660	LF	24.00	15,840	
Storm drainage	2,000	SY	8.50	17,000	
Oil/water separator	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000	
Lighting poles	4	EA	3,500.00	14.000	
Allowance for landscaping	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000	
Miscellaneous parking equipment including barriers	1	LS	6,000.00	6,000	
Electrical supply	1	LS	7,000.00	7,000	
Fire hydrant and water main	1	LS	6,500.00	6,500	
Fencing	1	LS	6,000.00	6,000	
Miscellaneous site work	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000	

Sub-Total

211,040

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN PAL-1 2012		Pi	Date: repared By:	October 21, 2009 DN
BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMA	TE			
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Totals
General Contractors General Conditions		13.50%		28,490
	Sub-Total		-	239,530
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		15,569
	Sub-Total		-	255,100
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		38,265
Total for	Rental Stack	Parking	-	293,365
Rental Car Circulation Area				
Temporary Work Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc Demolition	533	SY	5.00	2,665
Allowance for pavement and other demolition work Allowance for miscellaneous demolition work Site Work	533 1	SY LS	10.00 2,500.00	5,330 2,500
Erosion & sedimentary control 3" asphalt on 4" crushed rock base including excavation Pavement marking and signage Concrete curb and gutter Storm drainage Lighting poles Allowance for landscaping Miscellaneous parking equipment including barriers Electrical supply Fire hydrant and water main Fencing Miscellaneous site work General Contractors General Conditions General Contractors Fee	533 533 107 533 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 5ub-Total Sub-Total Sub-Total	SY SY LF SY EA LS LS LS LS 13.50% 6.50%	2.25 37.50 3.00 24.00 8.50 3,500.00 1,500.00 1,200.00 1,500.00 1,000.00	1,199 19,988 1,599 2,558 4,531 3,500 2,000 1,500 1,200 4,000 1,500 1,200 4,000 1,500 1,000 55,070 7,434 62,504 4,063 66,567
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		9,985
Total for Rental Ca	ar Parking Cir	culation	-	76,552
Connecting Bridge Temporary Work Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc Traffic co-ordination and control Protection to parking ramp Demolition & Site Preparation	405 1 1	SY LS LS	5.00 10,000 20,000	2,025 10,000 20,000

Date: Prepared By:

October 21, 2009

DN

<u>PAL-1 2012</u>

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals
Allowance for pavement and other demolition work	297	SY	10.00	2,970
Miscellaneous demolition	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000
Clear and prepare site	0.25	ACRE	3,500.00	875
Site Work	405	CV/	2.50	4 440
Erosion & sedimentary control	405	SY	3.50	1,418
Excavalion Removal of executed material	15		10.00	150
Compact fill for ramps	10	CY	22.00	14 950
Compact millior ramps Rough grade	270	ev	22.00	14,650
Concrete retaining wall foundation	270		250.00	22 500
Concrete retaining wall	90 810	SE	230.00 65.00	22,500 52,650
Concrete bridge including support	1 215	SE	265.00	32,000
Bridge spandrel wall	90	IF	140.00	12 600
4" asphalt on 6" crushed rock hase	270	SY	40.00	10,800
Extra for joining new road to existing	54	IF	20.00	1 080
Pavement marking and signage	405	SY	2 50	1,000
Crash barrier to bridge columns road	+00	15	5 000 00	5,000
Crash barrier	80	I F	65.00	5 200
Steel quardrails	270	I F	85.00	22 950
Storm drainage	405	SY	6 50	2 633
Lighting poles	400	FΔ	3 200 00	12,000
Electrical supply	1	IS	10 000	10,000
Allowance for landscaping	1	IS	5 000	5 000
Litility diversion and relocation	1	IS	10,000	10,000
Miscellaneous site work	1	IS	10,000	10,000
		20	10,000	10,000
	Sub-Total			569,118
General Contractors General Conditions		12.50%		71,140
	Sub-Total		-	640,257
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		41.617
			_	, -
	Sub-Total			681,874
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		102,281
	Total for Connectin	g Bridge	-	784,155
Roadway				
Terminal Exit [Link ID I-Fig 4-4] [One Lane Added]				
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc	2 412	SY	5.00	12 060
Traffic co-ordination and control	2,712	15	35,000,00	35 000
Demolition & Site Preparation	I	20	22,000.00	00,000
Allowance for payement and other demolition work	2.412	SY	10.00	24 120
Remove existing fencing etc	1.500	LF	6.00	9 000
Miscellaneous demolition	.,500	LS	12.000.00	12,000
Site Work			,	12,000
Erosion & sedimentary control	2.412	SY	3.00	7.236
4" asphalt on 6" crushed rock base including excava	ation 2,412	SY	45.00	108,540

Date: Prepared By:

October 21, 2009

|--|

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals		
Allowance for extra fill	102	CY	22.00	8 811		
Extra for joining new road to existing	1	LS	20.000.00	20,000		
Pavement marking and signage	2.412	SY	2.50	6.030		
Concrete curb and gutter	1,500	LF	30.00	45.000		
Storm drainage	2,412	SY	6.50	15,678		
Lighting poles	15	EA	3,850.00	57,750		
Allowance for landscaping	1	LS	30,000.00	30,000		
Electrical supply	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000		
Fire hydrant and water main	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000		
Fencing	1,500	LF	35.00	52,500		
Concrete sidewalk including excavation	9,000	SF	6.00	54,000		
Miscellaneous site work	1	LS	25,000.00	25,000		
	Sub-Total		_	542,758		
General Contractors General Conditions		13.00%		70,559		
	Sub-Total		-	613,317		
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		39,866		
	Sub-Total		-	653,182		
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		97,977		
Total for Terminal Exit [Link ID I-Fig 4-4]						
Key Intersections						
NE Airtrans way/NE Corntoot Road						
Project cost for allowance from Port \$300,000						
Adjusted for construction cost				200,000		
			_			
Total for NE Airtrans v	vay/NE Cornto	oot Road	_	200,000		
Warehouse Space						
New warehouse area 40.000 SF						
Site preparation and utilities to warehouse only						
Temporary Work						
Temporary construction and work	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000		
Traffic control	1	LS	5,000.00	5,000		
Demolition & Site Preparation						
Miscellaneous general demolition work	1	LS	5,000.00	5,000		
Miscellaneous demolition work including drainage and site utilities	4,444	SY	0.25	1,111		
Clear and prepare site for building pad	4,444	SY	0.50	2,222		
Erosion & sedimentary control	4,444	SY	1.00	4,444		
Grade for new building pad	4,444	SY	1.80	7,999		
New						

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT Date: October 21, 2009 PORTLAND, OREGON Prepared By: DN CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN PAL-1 2012 **BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMATE** Unit Cost Item Description Quantity Unit Totals Incl All warehouse construction work to be performed at Tenant's cost Site Utilities Domestic water LS 10,000.00 10,000 1 10,000.00 10,000 Fire water main 1 LS Fire hydrants 1 ΕA 4,000.00 4,000 Sanitary 1 LS 10,000.00 10,000 Storm water 1 LS 10,000.00 10,000 5,000 LS 5,000.00 Gas 1 Electrical supply 1 LS 10,000.00 10,000 Sub-Total 94,776 General Contractors General Conditions 12.50% 11,847 Sub-Total 106,623 **General Contractors Fee** 6.00% 6,397 Sub-Total 113,021 **Design & Estimating Contingency** 15.00% 16,953 **Total for Warehouse Space Area** 129,974 **Cargo Warehouse Ramp Area** New ramp area 51,000 SY **Temporary Work** Temporary construction and work LS 50,000.00 50,000 1 Escorts LS 100,000 100.000 1 Traffic control LS 30,000.00 30,000 1 **Demolition & Site Preparation** Removal of concrete or asphalt paving [assuming 1/4 of 12,750 SY 10.50 133,875 areal Miscellaneous demolition work including drainage and 51,000 SY 25,500 0.50 electrical work Clear and prepare site preparation 38,250 SY 0.20 7,650 Miscellaneous general demolition work 1 LS 20,000.00 20,000 New Mass excavation 51,378 CY 8.00 411,024 Extra for rock excavation CY 45.00 23,120 514 205,512 Remove excavated material and stockpile on site 51,378 CY 4.00 Rough grading and compaction 34,808 53,550 SY 0.65 Erosion & sedimentary control 51,000 SY 0.60 30,600 Imported select compact Sub-base 17,850 CY 18.00 321,300 Geotech fabric 51,000 SY 1.50 76,500 Crushed aggregate base 406,640 11,960 CY 34.00 Concrete paving 16 1/2" thick 51,000 SY 80.00 4,080,000 Sealer coat concrete 51,000 SY 0.25 12,750 Extra for joining new paving to existing 700 LF 15.00 10,500 Pavement marking 51,000 SY 0.20 10,200 Allowance for general repair 51,000 SY 0.20 10,200

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN <u>PAL-1 2012</u>		Pr	Date: epared By:	October 21, 2009 DN
BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIM	ATE	Unit	Unit Cost	Totals
	Quantity	Onit	Incl.	Totals
Utilities Drainage to ramp area Electrical including lighting and power Guidance and general signage Landscaping Hydro-seeding and landscaping	51,000 51,000 1 1 Sub-Total	SY SY LS LS	15.00 2.50 20,000.00 12000.00	765,000 127,500 20,000 12,000 6.924.679
		10 500/		
General Contractors General Conditions		12.50%		865,585
	Sub-Total		-	7,790,263
General Contractors Fee		6.00%		467,416
	Sub-Total		-	8,257,679
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		1,238,652
Total for	Warehouse Ra	mp Area	-	9,496,331
Cargo Landside Area New landside area 40,000 SF Temporary Work Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc Traffic co-ordination and control Demolition & Site Preparation Allowance for pavement and other demolition work [1/3 area allowed] Remove existing fencing etc Miscellaneous demolition Clear and prepare site for building pad Erosion & sedimentary control	4,444 1 1,481 200 1 4,444 4,444	SY LS SY LF LS SY SY	2.00 5,000.00 10.00 6.00 5,000.00 0.50 1.00	8,888 5,000 14,813 1,200 5,000 2,222 4,444
Grade for new building pad New All cargo landside construction work to be performed at Tenant's cost Site Utilities Fire water main Sanitary Storm water Electrical supply	4,444 1 1 1 1	SY LS LS LS	1.80 10,000.00 5,000.00 10,000.00 5,000.00	7,999 10,000 5,000 10,000 5,000
	Sub-Total			79,567
General Contractors General Conditions		13.00%		10,344
	Sub-Total		-	89,910
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		5,844
	Sub-Total		-	95,754

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN <u>PAL-1 2012</u> BACK UP DETAIL ESTIMA	TE	P	Date: repared By:	October 21, 200 DN	09
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Totals	
Design & Estimating Contingency	· Cargo Lands	15.00% side Area		14,363 110,117	<u> </u>
GENERAL AVIATION General Area [13 Acres] Temporary Work	C C		-		•
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc Traffic co-ordination and control Demolition	62,920 1	SY LS	1.00 30,000.00	62,920 30,000	
Demolish existing maintenance and flight kitchen Allowance for hazardous waste removal Break up and remove building concrete slab and foundation	819,000 1 45,500	CF LS SF	0.26 75,000.00 2.20	212,940 75,000 100,100	
Allowance for asphalt pavement and other demolition work [1/2 area allowed]	28,932	SY	8.00	231,456	
Allowance for removing or plugging unused services Site Preparation Clear site [1/2 area allowed] Site preparation	28,932 6.5 62.920	SY ACRES SY	0.80 2,500.00 1.25	23,146 16,250 78.650	
	Sub-Total		-	830,462	-
General Contractors General Conditions		13.00%		107,960	
	Sub-Total		-	938,422	•
General Contractors Fee	Sub-Total	6.50%	-	60,997 	-
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		149,913	
Total for	^r Cargo Lands	side Area	-	1,149,332	-

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN			Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 20 DN	09
PAL-2 2017 BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIM	IATE				
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl. Subcont.	Totals	
PASSENGER TERMINAL COMPEX					
Aircraft Gates & Parking					
Remote /RON Parking [2 No]					
Temporary Work					
Temporary construction and work	1	LS	25,000.00	25,000	
ESCORS Traffic control	1	LS	50,000	50,000	
Domolition & Site Proparation	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000	
Removal of concrete or apphalt paying [1/3 area allowed]	4 180	٩٧	10.50	13 800	
Miscellaneous demolition work including drainage and	12 667	57 57	1 25	45,090	
electrical work	12,007	51	1.25	15,054	
Miscellaneous general demolition work	1	LS	6.000.00	6.000	
New	·	20	0,000.00	0,000	
Mass excavation	12,761	CY	8.00	102,088	
Extra for rock excavation	128	CY	45.00	5,742	
Remove excavated material and stockpile on site	12,761	CY	4.00	51,044	
Rough grading and compaction	13,300	SY	0.50	6,650	
Erosion & sedimentary control	13,300	SY	0.65	8,645	
Imported select compact Sub-base	4,433	CY	18.00	79,794	
Geotech fabric	12,667	SY	1.50	19,001	
Crushed aggregate base	2,970	CY	34.00	100,980	
Concrete paving 16 1/2" thick	12,667	SY	80.00	1,013,360	
Asphalt paving	118	TON	115.00	13,570	
Sealer coat concrete	12,667	SY	0.25	3,167	
Primer and tack coat	931	SY	1.50	1,397	
Extra for joining new paving to existing	685	LF	15.00	10,275	
Pavement marking	12,667	SY	0.50	6,334	
Allowance for general repair	12,667	SY	0.50	6,334	
	40.007	01/	45.00	400.005	
Drainage to apron area	12,667	SY	15.00	190,005	
Electrical including lighting and power	12,007	51	3.00	38,001	
Guidance and general signage	2	EA	3500.00	7,000	
Hydro-seeding and landscaping	1	LS	10000.00	10,000	
	Sub-Total		-	1,824,109	
General Contractors General Conditions		12.50%	, 0	228,014	
	Sub-Total		-	2.052.123	
				,,	
General Contractors Fee		6.00%	0	123,127	
	Sub-Total		-	2,175,250	
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%	, 0	326,287	
Total for	Remote RON	l Parking	9	2,501,537	
Passenger Security Screening					

Screening Lanes

Unclear how screen walls will be added

No cost estimated

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN <u>PAL-2 2017</u> BACK UP DETAIL ESTIM	ATE		Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 200 DN	09
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Totals	
Queue Area Document Check Temporary Work Temporary screening and protection to construction area Demolition	2,595	SF	1.00	2,595	
Interior demolition work New Interior construction Floor wall and ceiling finishes [mainly using existing] New queue barrier Specialties and signage HVAC [minor alteration] Electrical lighting changes Casework and furniture Miscellaneous work	2,595 2,595 2,595 2,595 2,595 2,595 2,595 2,595 2,595 2,595	SF SF SF SF SF SF LS	1.50 2.00 1.00 3.00 2.00 1.50 1.00 4.00 2,500.00	3,893 5,190 2,595 7,785 5,190 3,893 2,595 10,380 2,500	
Extra for shift and out of normal hours working General Contractors General Conditions	Sub-Total Sub-Total Sub-Total	30.00% 25.00%	- 6 -	46,615 13,985 60,600 11,654 72,253	
General Contractors Fee	Sub-Total	10.00%	6 _	7,225	
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%	6	11,922	
Total for Queue	Area Documei	nt Chec	k _	91,400	
Queue Area Primary Check Temporary Work Temporary screening and protection to construction area Demolition	572	SF	1.00	572	
New Interior construction Floor wall and ceiling finishes [mainly using existing] New queue barrier Specialties and signage	572 572 572 572 572 572	SF SF SF SF SF	2.00 1.00 3.00 2.00 5.00	1,144 572 1,716 1,144 2,860	
HVAC [alteration and additional hvac at examination area] Electrical [power supply to examination machines] Electrical lighting changes Casework and furniture Miscellaneous work	572 572 572 1	SF SF SF LS	5.00 1.50 5.00 2,500.00	2,860 858 2,860 2,500	

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN <u>PAL-2 2017</u>			Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 2009 DN
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Totals
	Sub-Total		_	17,944
Extra for shift and out of normal hours working		30.00%		5,383
	Sub-Total		-	23,327
General Contractors General Conditions		30.00%		5,383
	Sub-Total		-	28,710
General Contractors Fee		10.00%	,	2,871
	Sub-Total		-	31,581
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		4,737
Total for Que	ie Area Prima	ry Check		36,319
Close in Parking New Close-in Parking Structure Garage located P3 site. Cost of \$28,000 per space obtained from Port Multi-story parking structure including all construction cost [average cost for parking structure \$22,500 per space]	1,912	Space	28,000.00	53,536,000
	Sub-Total		-	53,536,000
General Contractors General Conditions		incl in ab	ove	
	Sub-Total		-	53,536,000
General Contractors Fee		incl in ab	ove	
	Sub-Total		-	53,536,000
Design & Estimating Contingency		10.00%		5,353,600
Total for New Clos	e in Parking	Structure	, – –	58,889,600
Curbside Loading & Unloading Deplaning curbside No cost involved Rental Car Facility Service Facility Rental Car Wash [1 No] Temporary Work				
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc	200	SY	1.50	300

PORTLAND, OREGON			Prepared By:	DN
CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN				
BACK-UP DETAIL ES	STIMATE			
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl. Subcont.	Totals
Site Preparation & Demolition				
Demolition and preparation	2.250	SF	2.50	5.
Erosion & sedimentary control	2,250	SF	0.20	-,
Foundations & Slab	,	-		
Foundations	1.800	SF	3.00	5.
Concrete slab on grade	1.800	SF	6.50	11.
Superstructure	,	-		,
Pre-engineered building	1,800	SF	30.00	54.
Interior Construction				- ,
Partition interior doors	1,800	SF	1.50	2.
Specialties bollards	4	EA	450.00	1,
Signs and pavement marking	1	EA	600.00	
Interior Finishes				
Wall floor and ceiling finishes	1,800	SF	2.00	3,
Plumbing				
Sump pit	1	EA	1,250.00	1,
Drainage	1	EA	5,000.00	5,
HVAC				
Ventilation and radiant heating	1,800	SF	1.50	2,
Electrical				
Electrical supply and distribution	1	EA	8,500.00	8,
Lighting and power	1,800	SF	3.00	5,
Low voltage and communication, fire alarm	1,800	SF	1.65	2,
Equipment				
Vehicle washing equipment	1	EA	110,000	110,
Height barrier	1	EA	2,500.00	2,
Water reclamation system	1	LS	20,000.00	20,
Steel guard rails	1	EA	4,000.00	4,
Allow for testing	1	EA	1,250.00	1,
Site improvement	50	<u> </u>	25.00	4
Site Mechanical Utilities	50	51	35.00	1,
Connecting drain pine to existing	1	19	2 000 00	2
New water supply	1		2,000.00	2, 2
Site Electrical Litilities	I	20	2,000.00	۷,
Electrical supply to facility	1	LS	6,666.00	6,
	Sub-Total		-	262,
General Contractors General Conditions		13.00%	6	34,
	Sub-Total		-	206
	Sub-i Ulai			230,
General Contractors Fee		6.50%	6	19,
	Sub-Total		-	315,
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%	6	47,

Fuel Positions [6]

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN			Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 2009 DN	;
PAL-2 2017 BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIM	ATE				
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl. Subcont.	Totals	
Fuel position add to existing					
Temporary Work					
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc	3,600	SF	1.00	3,600	
Site Preparation & Demolition					
Allowance for pavement and other demolition work	4,500	SF	2.50	11,250	
Allowance for miscellaneous demolition work	1	LS	5,000.00	5,000	
Erosion & sedimentary control	4,500	SF	1.00	4,500	
3" asphalt on 4" crushed rock base including excavation	120	sv	11 25	17 325	
Allow for joining paying to existing	420	15	1 000 00	1 000	
Reinforced concrete island	720	SF	10.00	7,200	
Pavement marking and signage	400	SY	2.50	1.000	
Bollards	24	EA	465.00	11,160	
Canopy	4,788	SF	30.00	143,640	
Miscellaneous painting	1	LS	800.00	800	
Utilities					
Storm drainage including connecting to existing	1	LS	2,000.00	2,000	
Electrical supply to dispenser	1	LS	3,000.00	3,000	
Low voltage control to dispenser	1	LS	2,000.00	2,000	
Connecting to existing control	1	LS	500.00	500	
Eighting to canopy	4,700	55	2.50	11,970	
Fuel dispenser to match existing	6	FΔ	3 350 00	20 100	
Supply piping and vent including excavation	1		7 500 00	20,100	
New dispenser sump to match existing	6	EA	800.00	4 800	
Extra for connection to existing tank	1	LS	2,000.00	2.000	
Miscellaneous work associate with fuel supply and control	1	LS	1,000.00	1,000	
			- -		
	Sub-Total			261,345	
General Contractors General Conditions		13.00%	6	33,975	
	Sub-Total		-	295,320	
General Contractors Fee		6.50%	6	19,196	
	Sub-Total		-	314,516	
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%	6	47,177	
Total	for New Fuel	Positio	n _	361,693	
Rental Car Stack Spaces [For 30 cars]			-		
Temporary Work					
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc	667	SY	5.00	3.335	
Demolition & Site Preparation	007		0.00	0,000	
Allowance for pavement and other demolition work	447	SY	10.00	4,469	
Allowance for miscellaneous demolition work	1	LS	2,500.00	2,500	
Erosion & sedimentary control	667	SY	2.25	1,501	

667

667

SY

SY

37.50

2.50

25,013

1,668

3" asphalt on 4" crushed rock base including excavation Pavement marking and signage

Site Work

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN <u>PAL-2 2017</u> BACK UD DETAIL ESTIM	ATE		Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 2009 DN
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Totals
Concrete curb and gutter Storm drainage Connect to Oil/water separator Lighting poles Allowance for landscaping Miscellaneous parking equipment including barriers Electrical supply Fire hydrant and water main Fencing Miscellaneous site work General Contractors General Conditions	220 667 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 3 Sub-Total	LF SY LS EA LS LS LS LS 15.00%	24.00 8.50 1,000.00 3,500.00 3,500.00 1,000.00 2,500.00 3,000.00 3,000.00	5,283 5,670 1,000 7,000 3,500 1,000 2,500 3,000 2,000 3,000 72,437 10,866 83,302
General Contractors Fee	Sub-Total	6.50%	-	5,415 88,717
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%	, 0	13,308
Total for Rental Car Circulation Area	r Rental Stack	a Parking	9 _	102,025
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc Demolition Allowance for pavement and other demolition work Allowance for miscellaneous demolition work Site Work Erosion & sedimentary control 3" asphalt on 4" crushed rock base including excavation Pavement marking and signage Concrete curb and gutter Storm drainage Lighting poles Allowance for landscaping Miscellaneous parking equipment including barriers Electrical supply Fire hydrant and water main Fencing Miscellaneous site work	253 253 253 253 253 253 51 253 None 1 1 None 1 1 Sub-Total	SY LS SY SY LF SY LS LS LS LS	5.00 10.00 2,500.00 2.25 37.50 3.00 24.00 8.50 1,000.00 500.00 500.00 500.00	1,265 2,530 2,500 569 9,488 759 1,214 2,151 1,000 500 500 500 500 500
General Contractors General Conditions	Sub-Total	15.00%	, 0 –	3,521 26,997
General Contractors Fee		6.50%	, 0	1,755

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN PAL -2 2017			Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 2009 DN
BACK-UP DETAIL ES	STIMATE			
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Totals
			Inci. Subcont.	
	Sub-Total		-	28 752
	Oub rotar			20,702
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%	0	4,313
Total for Ren	tal Car Parking Ci	rculation	n _	33,065
Roadway				
Terminal Area Exit [Link ID K-Fig 4-4] [One lane added]				
Temporary Work	1 074	ev.	F 00	C 070
Allowance for temporary work and tencing etc	1,374	SY	25 000 00	6,870 25.000
Demolition & Site Preparation	I	L3	23,000.00	25,000
Allowance for pavement and other demolition work	1,374	SY	10.00	13,740
Remove existing fencing etc	989	LF	6.00	5,937
Miscellaneous demolition	1	LS	7,500.00	7,500
Site Work				
Erosion & sedimentary control	1,374	SY	3.00	4,122
4" asphalt on 6" crushed rock base including excavatio	n 1,374	SY	45.00	61,830
Allowance for extra fill	229	CY	22.00	5,038
Extra for joining new road to existing	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000
Pavement marking and signage	1,374	SY	2.50	3,435
Storm droipage	989		30.00	29,684
Storm dramage	1,374		2 850 00	8,931
Allowance for landscaping	10		20,000,00	36,500
Flectrical supply	1	15	5 000 00	5 000
Fire hydrant and water main	1	LO	10,000,00	10,000
Fencing	989	LF	35.00	34,632
Concrete sidewalk including excavation	5.937	SF	6.00	35.621
Miscellaneous site work	1	LS	12,000.00	12,000
	Sub-Total		-	337,840
General Contractors General Conditions		13.00%	, D	43,919
	Sub-Total		-	381,759
General Contractors Fee		6.50%	, 0	24,814
	Sub-Total		-	406,573
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%	, D	60,986
Total for Termi	nal Exit [Link ID ł	K-Fig 4-4] _	467,559
Key Intersections				
NE 82nd Ave/NE Airport Way				
Moving TriMet Light Rail Line [Double Track]				
Remove existing track	6,300	TF	25.00	157,500
Remove existing OCS	6,300	TF	15.00	94,500
Remove existing fencing	6,400	LF	6.00	38,400

Date: Prepared By: October 21, 2009

DN

DAI 2	2047
PAL-Z	2017

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl. Subcont.	Totals
Cite electrics and proposition	2		2 500 00	40,500
Site clearing and preparation	3	ACRES	3,500.00	10,500
Demolition work associated with new rall route	1		25,000.00	25,000
Excavation and preparation for new double track	3,150		160.00	504,000
Double ballasted track	3,150		660.00	2,079,000
Crossover connection to existing	2	EA	160,000.00	320,000
General drainage and utility relocation	3,150		100.00	315,000
Environment mitigation	1	LS	60,000.00	60,000
Structural walls etc	3,150		100.00	315,000
l raffic control	1	LS	50,000.00	50,000
Signage	1	LS	20,000.00	20,000
Crossings	2	EA	60,000.00	120,000
Signals	1	LS	100,000.00	100,000
Power supply	1	LS	100,000.00	100,000
OCS for double rail	3,150	TF	320.00	1,008,000
Ductbank	3,150	TF	70.00	220,500
Electrical shield at bridge	1	EA	20,000.00	20,000
New fencing	6,400	LF	38.00	243,200
Extra for connection to existing	2	EA	50,000.00	100,000
Communication	3,150	TF	55.00	173,250
Allow for preparing existing track route of other use	14,000	SY	3.00	42,000
Landscape	1	LS	50,000.00	50,000
	Sub-Total			6,165,850
General Contractors General Conditions		13.00%		801,561
	Sub-Total			6,967,411
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		452,882
	Sub-Total			7,420,292
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		1,113,044
Total for NE 82nd Ave/NE Airport Wa	y for Moving L	.ight Rail		8,533,336
Intersection Road Work and Overnass	-	-		<u> </u>
Temporary Work				
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc	29.309	SY	5.00	146.545
Allowance for temporary road and diversion during construction including dismantling	1,733	SY	32.00	55,456
Traffic co-ordination and control	1	LS	200,000	200,000
Allowance for pavement and other demolition work	1 647	SY	10.00	16 /70
Remove existing fencing etc	3 400	I F	6.00	20 400
Demolish existing Delta cargo buildings	2 012 500	CF	0.00 0.18	362 250
Break-out and remove concrete slab and foundations to	100 625	SF	2 00	201 250
hangar	100,020	0	2.00	201,200
Miscellaneous demolition	1	LS	30,000.00	30,000
Demolition of Sheridan & Embassy Suite hotels taken separately				
Clear and prepare site	7	ACRE	3,500.00	24,500

Prepared By:

October 21, 2009

Date:

DN

Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl. Subcont.	Totals
Site Work				
Erosion & sedimentary control	36.636	SY	3.50	128.226
Excavation	1.125	CY	7.00	7.875
Removal of excavated material	1,125	ĊY	15.00	16.875
Compact fill for ramps	47.897	CY	22.00	1.053.730
Rough grade	36,636	SY	1.50	54,954
Concrete retaining wall foundation	16,160	LF	314.81	5,087,407
Concrete retaining wall	335,160	SF	65.00	21,785,400
Concrete bridge including support	16,549	SF	320.00	5,295,680
Bridge spandrel wall	514	LF	160.00	82,240
4" asphalt on 6" crushed rock base	28,136	SY	40.00	1,125,440
Extra for joining new road to existing	1,700	LF	20.00	34,000
Pavement marking and signage	29,645	SY	2.50	74,113
Concrete curb and gutter	2,100	LF	30.00	63,000
Concrete sidewalk including excavation	12,600	SF	5.50	69,300
Crash barrier to bridge columns road	1	LS	30,000.00	30,000
Crash barrier to bridge columns rail	1	LS	20,000.00	20,000
Crash barrier at off and on ramps	1,800	LF	65.00	117,000
Extra for pedestrian down ramp on north side	1,000	SF	30.00	30,000
Steel guardrails	16,387	LF	85.00	1,392,895
Pedestrian crossing with lights	2	EA	20,000.00	40,000
Storm drainage	31,148	SY	6.50	202,462
Lighting poles	41	EA	5,500.00	225,500
Electrical supply	1	LS	120,000	120,000
Traffic signals	4	EA	285,000	1,140,000
Allowance for landscaping	1	LS	250,000	250,000
Fire hydrant and water main	1	LS	60,000.00	60,000
Fencing	4,000	LF	38.00	152,000
Utility diversion and relocation	1	LS	1,000,000	1,000,000
Miscellaneous site work	1	LS	100,000	100,000
	Sub-Total			40,814,968
General Contractors General Conditions		12.50%		5,101,871
	Sub-Total		_	45,916,838
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		2,984,594
	Sub-Total		_	48,901,433
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		7,335,215
Total for NE 82nd Ave/NE Airport Way for	r Intersection & C	Overpass		56,236,648
Demolition of Embassy Suite		-	_	
Temporary Work				
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc.	10 226	SY	4 00	40 904
Traffic co-ordination and control	10,220	LS	10 000	10,000
Demolition & Site Preparation	I	20	10,000	10,000
Allowance for pavement and other demolition work	500	SY	10.00	5 000
Remove existing fencing etc	300	LF	6.00	1.800
				.,

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN PAL-2 2017 DAOK UP DETAIL SOTIN			Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 200 DN	09
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Totals	
Demolish existing Hotel Break-out and remove concrete slab and foundations to	2,709,200 69,200	CF SF	0.27 2.25	731,484 155,700	
Demolish entry canopy Allowance for removing or plugging unused services Miscellaneous demolition work	5,000 10,226 1	SF SY LS	3.00 2.50 10,000.00	15,000 25,565 10,000	
Clear site [1/2 area allowed] Site preparation	3 10,226	ACRES SY	3,500.00 1.50	10,500 15,339	
	Sub-Total		-	1,021,292	
General Contractors General Conditions		13.00%)	132,768	
	Sub-Total		-	1,154,060	
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		75,014	
	Sub-Total		-	1,229,074	
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		184,361	
Total for NE 82nd Ave/NE Airport Way for Demol	ition of Emba	ssy Suite	-	1,413,435	
Demolition and Alternation to Sheridan Hotel					
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc Traffic co-ordination and control Demolition & Site Preparation	2,135 1	SY LS	10.00 10,000.00	21,350 10,000	
Allowance for pavement and other demolition work Remove existing fencing etc Demolish existing Hotel	1,000 600 497,700	SY LF CF	10.00 6.00 0.28	10,000 3,600 139,356	
Break-out and remove concrete slab and foundations to hangar Allowance for removing or plugging unused services	14,450 2,135	SF	2.25	32,513 4,270	
Site preparation Site preparation Site preparation	1 2 2 135	ACRES	3,500.00 1 50	5,000 7,000 3,203	
Building Allow for closing existing building were section has been removed	4,390	SF	70.00	307,300	
Extra for alteration work required due to removal of part of hotel	1	LS	600,000	600,000	
	Sub-Total		-	1,143,591	
General Contractors General Conditions		13.00%		148,667	
	Sub-Total		-	1,292,258	
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		83,997	

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN			Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 2009 DN
<u>PAL-2 2017</u> BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIN	MATE			
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Totals
	Sub-Total		-	1,376,255
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%	6	206,438
Total for NE 82nd Ave/NE Airport Way for Demolition & Alte	eration of The	Sherida	n _	1,582,693
AIR CARGO				
All Cargo Assuming all new slab. Significant saving could be made if existing Warehouse Space New warehouse area 129,000 SF Site preparation and utilities to warehouse only	is re-used for ra	amp and	landside	
Temporary Work Temporary construction and work Traffic control	1	LS LS	10,000.00 20,000.00	10,000 20,000
Demolition & Site Preparation Demolish existing two bay large aircraft hangar Break-out and remove concrete slab and foundations to	27,720,000 252,000	CF SF	0.13 4.00	3,603,600 1,008,000
Miscellaneous general demolition work Miscellaneous demolition work including drainage and site utilities	1 1	LS LS	25,000.00 10,000.00	25,000 10,000
Clear and prepare site for building pad Erosion & sedimentary control Grade for new building pad	14,333 14,333 14,333	SY SY SY	0.50 1.00 1.80	7,167 14,333 25,799
All warehouse construction work to be performed at Tenant's cost Site Utilities				
Assuming existing utilities to hangar can be used for new wa Domestic water Fire water main Fire hydrants Sanitary Storm water Gas Electrical supply	arehouse 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	LS EA LS LS LS LS	5,000.00 5,000.00 4,500.00 8,000.00 10,000.00 2,000.00 10,000.00	5,000 5,000 4,500 8,000 10,000 2,000 10,000
	Sub-Total		-	4,768,399
General Contractors General Conditions		12.50%	6	596,050
	Sub-Total		-	5,364,449
General Contractors Fee		6.00%	6	321,867
	Sub-Total		-	5,686,316
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%	6	852,947
Total for	Warehouse Sp	ace Area	a _	6,539,263

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN <u>PAL-2 2017</u> BACK-UP DETAIL ESTI	MATE		Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 20 DN	09
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl. Subcont.	Totals	
Cargo Warehouse Ramp Area New cargo ramp area 72,000 SY Using existing ramp to Aircraft Hangar Allowing for only minor alteration and repair work Demolition				9	
New	I	LO	8.00	0	
Minor pavement repair and alteration work	72,000 Sub-Total	SY	0.50	36,000	•
Constal Contractors Constal Conditions	Sub-10tal	12 500	/	4 500	
General Contractors General Conditions	Sub Total	12.507	•	4,500	
Conoral Contractora Eco	Sub-Tolai	6 00%	/	40,500	
	Sub-Total	0.007	•	42 030	
	Sub-Total		,	42,900	
		15.00%	6 _	6,440	
I otal for	Warehouse Ra	mp Area	a _	49,370	
Cargo Landside Area New landside area 129,000 SF Temporary Work					
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc Traffic co-ordination and control	14,333 1	SY LS	2.00 10,000.00	28,666 10,000	
Allowance for pavement and other demolition work [1/4 area allowed]	3,583	SY	10.00	35,833	
Remove existing fencing etc Miscellaneous demolition Clear and prepare site for building pad Erosion & sedimentary control Grade for new building pad New All cargo landside construction work to be performed at Tenant's cost Site Utilities	500 1 14,333 14,333 14,333	LF LS SY SY SY	6.00 10,000.00 0.50 1.00 1.80	3,000 10,000 7,167 14,333 25,799	
Fire water main Sanitary Storm water Electrical supply	1 1 1 Sub-Total	LS LS LS LS	10,000.00 5,000.00 10,000.00 5,000.00	10,000 5,000 10,000 5,000 164,797	
General Contractors General Conditions		13.00%	6	21,424	
	Sub-Total		-	186,221	

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN			Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 20 DN	09
<u>PAL-2 2017</u> BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIM	ATE				
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl. Subcont.	Totals	
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		12,104	
	Sub-Total		-	198,325	
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		29,749	
Total for	Cargo Land	side Area	-	228,074	

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN		ŀ	Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 20 DN	09
PAL-3 2022 BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMA	ATE				
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals	
PASSENGER TERMINAL COMPEX					
Aircraft Gates & Parking					
Remote /RON Parking [No 4]					
Temporary work	1	10	50 000 00	50.000	
Fecores	1		50,000.00	50,000	
Traffic control	1		20,000,000	20,000	
Demolition & Site Preparation	I	L0	20,000.00	20,000	
Removal of concrete or asphalt paving [1/3 area allowed]	8 507	SV	10 50	80 32/	
Miscellaneous demolition work including drainage and electrical work	25,778	SY	1.25	32,223	
Miscellaneous general demolition work	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000	
New					
Mass excavation	25,969	CY	8.00	207,752	
Extra for rock excavation	260	CY	45.00	11,686	
Remove excavated material and stockpile on site	25,969	CY	4.00	103,876	
Rough grading and compaction	27,067	SY	0.50	13,534	
Erosion & sedimentary control	27,067	SY	0.65	17,594	
Imported select compact Sub-base	9,022	CY	18.00	162,396	
Geotech fabric	25,778	SY	1.50	38,667	
Crushed aggregate base	6,045	CY	34.00	205,530	
Concrete paving 16 1/2" thick	25,778	SY	80.00	2,062,240	
Asphalt paving	239	ION	115.00	27,485	
Sealer coat concrete	25,778	SY	0.25	6,445	
Primer and tack coat	1,895	SY	1.50	2,842	
Extra for joining new paving to existing	1,160		15.00	17,400	
Allowence for general repair	25,778	SI	0.50	12,889	
	23,770	31	0.50	12,009	
Drainage to apron area	25 778	SY	15.00	386 670	
Electrical including lighting and power	25 778	SY	3.00	77 334	
Guidance and general signage	4	EA	3500.00	14.000	
Landscaping	-			.,	
Hydro-seeding and landscaping	1	LS	12500.00	12,500	
	Sub-Total		-	3,695,274	
General Contractors General Conditions		12.50%	6	461,909	
	Sub-Total		-	4,157,183	
General Contractors Fee		6.00%	6	249,431	
	Sub-Total		-	4,406,614	
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%	6	660,992	
Total for	Remote RON	l Parking	g _	5,067,606	

Passenger Security Screening Queue Area Document Check Temporary Work

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN <u>PAL-3 2022</u> BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIM	IATE	F	Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 2009 DN
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals
Temporary screening and protection to construction area	234	SF	1.00	234
Demolition Interior demolition work	234	SF	1.50	351
Interior construction	234	SE	2 00	468
Floor wall and ceiling finishes [mainly using existing]	234	SE	2.00	400 234
New queue barrier	234	SE	3.00	204 702
Specialties and signage	234	SF	2.00	468
HVAC [minor alteration]	234	SF	2.00	468
Electrical lighting changes	234	SF	1.50	351
Casework and furniture	234	SF	4.00	936
Miscellaneous work	1	LS	1,000.00	1,000
	Sub-Total		-	5,212
Extra for shift and out of normal hours working		30.00%	•	1,564
	Sub-Total		-	6,776
General Contractors General Conditions		30.00%	,	1,564
	Sub-Total		-	8,339
General Contractors Fee		10.00%	,	834
	Sub-Total		-	9,173
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%	•	1,376
Total for Queu	e Area Docume	nt Check	-	10,549
Queue Area Primary Check				
Temporary work Temporary screening and protection to construction area	910	SF	1.00	910
Interior demolition work	910	SF	1.50	1,365
Interior construction	910	SF	2 00	1 820
Floor wall and ceiling finishes [mainly using existing]	910	SF	1.00	910
New queue barrier	910	SF	3.00	2,730
Specialties and signage	910	SF	2.00	1,820
	910	SF	5.00	4,550
HVAC [alteration and additional hvac at examination area	a]			
Electrical [power supply to examination machines]	910	SF	5.00	4,550
Electrical lighting changes	910	SF	1.50	1,365
Casework and furniture Miscellaneous work	910 1	SF LS	5.00 3,000.00	4,550 3,000
	Sub Total		-	07 570
	Sud-10tai			27,570
Extra for shift and out of normal hours working		30.00%)	8,271

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN		Ρ	Date: repared By:	October 21, 2009 DN
PAL-3 2022 BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIM	ATE			
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Totals
·			Inci.	
	Sub-Total		-	35,841
General Contractors General Conditions		30.00%		8,271
	Sub-Total		-	44,112
General Contractors Fee		10.00%		4,411
	Sub-Total		-	48,523
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		7,278
Total for Que	ue Area Prima	ry Check	-	55,802
GROUND TRANSPORTATION & PARKING		-	-	
Close in Parking New Close-in Parking Structure Garage located P3 site. Cost of \$28,000 per space obtained from Port Multi-story parking structure including all construction cost [average cost for parking structure \$22,500 per space]	3,190	Space	28,000.00	89,320,000
	Sub-Total		-	89,320,000
General Contractors General Conditions	i	incl in abo	ove	
	Sub-Total		-	89,320,000
General Contractors Fee	i	incl in abo	ove	
	Sub-Total		-	89,320,000
Design & Estimating Contingency		10.00%		8,932,000
Total for New Close	se in Parking S	Structure	-	98,252,000
Curbside Loading & Unloading Deplaning curbside [alteration to accommodate buses, vans etc]				
Allowance for temporary work and fencing signage etc Traffic control Protection to pedestrians	3,547 1 1	SY LS LS	5.00 20,000.00 10,000.00	17,735 20,000 10,000
Remove and hand to owner existing sidewalk screens,	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000
Break out and remove existing concrete sidewalk Allowance for saw cutting Remove existing concrete road curb and gutter Allowance for demolition work associated with drainage and electrical power and lighting	10,112 1 1,124 3,547	SF LS LF SY	2.00 1,000.00 5.00 1.50	20,224 1,000 5,620 5,321

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN		P	Date: repared By:	October 21, 2009 DN
PAL-3 2022				
BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMA	TE			
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals
Allowance for moving signage and direction markers Allowance for miscellaneous demolition work Erosion & sedimentary control Site Work	1 1 10,112	LS LS SY	1,000.00 3,000.00 1.25	1,000 3,000 12,640
3" asphalt on 4" crushed rock base including excavation Extra for connecting to existing Concrete curb and gutter Concrete repair to existing sidewalk Extra for forming traffic island New stripping and traffic direction pavement marking Extra for pedestrian walkways crossing New signage Bollards Pedestrian barrier Allowance for canopies and pedestrian waiting facilities Storm drainage Lighting Allowance for landscaping Miscellaneous parking equipment	3,547 140 610 560 2 3,547 3,248 3,547 20 400 1 3,547 31,920 1 1	SY LF LF EA SF SY EA LS SF LS SF LS	$\begin{array}{c} 41.25\\ 10.00\\ 30.00\\ 30.00\\ 1,500.00\\ 2.50\\ 7.00\\ 10.00\\ 450.00\\ 180.00\\ 50,000.00\\ 5.50\\ 1.60\\ 20,000.00\\ 2,500.00\\ 2500.00\\ 3500.$	$146,314 \\ 1,400 \\ 18,300 \\ 16,800 \\ 3,000 \\ 8,868 \\ 22,736 \\ 35,470 \\ 9,000 \\ 72,000 \\ 50,000 \\ 19,509 \\ 51,072 \\ 20,000 \\ 2,500 \\ 25,00$
Extra for shift and out of normal hours working	Sub-Total	30.00%	-	608,507 182,552
General Contractors General Conditions	Sub-Total	15.00%	-	91,276
General Contractors Fee	Sub-Tolar	6.50%		57,352
	Sub-Total		-	939,687
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		140,953
Total fo	or Deplaning C	Curbside	-	1,080,640
Curbside Roadway lanes Deplaning roadway curbside Temporary Work				
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc Traffic control Demolition & Site Preparation	167 1	SY LS	10.00 5,000.00	1,670 5,000
Remove existing road surface Allowance for saw cutting Remove existing concrete road curb and gutter Allowance for demolition work associated with drainage and electrical power and lighting	167 1 250 167	SY LS LF SY	10.50 300.00 5.00 5.00	1,754 300 1,250 835
Miscellaneous demolition work	1	LS	1,000.00	1,000

Site Work

Date: Prepared By: October 21, 2009

DN

PAL-3 2022 BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMATE						
	Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals	
	Repair to existing road at new curb line	250	LF	20.00	5.000	
	Concrete curb and gutter	250	LF	30.00	7.500	
	Extra for joining new curb to existing	2	EA	100.00	200	
	Concrete repair to existing sidewalk	250	LF	35.00	8.750	
	Forming landscape island between road and sidewalk	3,600	SF	4.00	14,400	
	New stripping and traffic direction pavement marking	1	LS	1,000.00	1,000	
	New signage	1	LS	2,500.00	2,500	
	Bollards	4	EA	450.00	1,800	
	New catchbasin in new position including connecting to existing pipe runs	2	EA	2,000.00	4,000	
	Lighting	1	LS	2,500.00	2,500	
	Miscellaneous site work	1	LS	5,000.00	5,000	
		Sub-Total		_	64,459	
	Extra for shift and out of normal hours working		30.00%)	19,338	
		Sub-Total			83,796	
	General Contractors General Conditions		25.00%	,	16,115	
		Sub-Total		_	99,911	
	General Contractors Fee		8.00%	,	7,993	
		Sub-Total			107,904	
	Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%)	16,186	
	Total for Depla	ning Roadway (ing Roadway Curbside			
Rental Car	Facility					
Servic	e Facility					
Rental	Car Wash [2 No]					
	Temporary Work					
	Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc	400	SY	1.50	600	
	Site Preparation & Demolition					
	Demolition and preparation	4,500	SF	2.50	11,250	
	Erosion & sedimentary control	4,500	SF	0.20	900	
	Foundations & Slab					
	Foundations	3,600	SF	3.00	10,800	
	Concrete slab on grade	3,600	SF	6.50	23,400	
	Superstructure					
	Pre-engineered building	3,600	SF	30.00	108,000	
	Interior Construction		~-			
	Partition interior doors	3,600	SF	1.50	5,400	
	Specialties bollards	8	EA	450.00	3,600	
	Signs and pavement marking	2	EA	600.00	1,200	
	Interior Finishes		~-			
	Wall floor and ceiling finishes	3,600	SF	2.00	7,200	
	Plumbing Sump pit	2	EA	1,250.00	2,500	

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT Date: October 21, 2009 PORTLAND, OREGON Prepared By: DN CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN PAL-3 2022 **BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMATE** Unit Cost Unit Item Description Quantity Totals Incl 2 Drainage ΕA 5,000.00 10,000 HVAC Ventilation and radiant heating 3,600 SF 1.50 5,400 Electrical Electrical supply and distribution 7.500.00 2 EΑ 15,000 Lighting and power 3,600 SF 3.00 10.800 SF Low voltage and communication, fire alarm 3,600 1.65 5,940 Equipment 2 ΕA Vehicle washing equipment 110,000 220,000 Height barrier 2 EΑ 2,500.00 5,000 Water reclamation system 1 LS 35,000 35,000.00 Steel guard rails 2 ΕA 8,000 4,000.00 Allow for testing 2 EΑ 1,250.00 2,500 Site Improvement Asphalt paving associated with new washing facility 100 SY 35.00 3,500 Site Mechanical Utilities Connecting drain pipe to existing 2,000.00 1 LS 2,000 New water supply 1 2,500.00 LS 2,500 Site Electrical Utilities Electrical supply to facility 1 LS 12,000.00 12,000 Sub-Total 512,490 **General Contractors General Conditions** 13.00% 66,624 579,114 Sub-Total **General Contractors Fee** 6.50% 37,642 Sub-Total 616,756 **Design & Estimating Contingency** 92,513 15.00% Total for Car Wash [2 No] 709,270 **Fuel Positions [6]** Fuel position add to existing **Temporary Work** Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc 3,600 SF 1.00 3,600 Site Preparation & Demolition Allowance for pavement and other demolition work 4.500 SF 2.50 11,250 Allowance for miscellaneous demolition work LS 5,000.00 5.000 1 Erosion & sedimentary control 4,500 SF 4,500 1.00 Site Work 3" asphalt on 4" crushed rock base including excavation 420 SY 41.25 17,325 Allow for joining paving to existing LS 1,000.00 1 1,000 Reinforced concrete island 720 SF 10.00 7,200 Pavement marking and signage 400 SY 2.50 1,000 Bollards ΕA 465.00 24 11,160 Canopy 4.788 SF 30.00 143,640 Miscellaneous painting LS 800.00 1 800 Utilities

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN		F	Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 2009 DN			
PAL-3 2022 BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMATE							
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals			
Storm drainage including connecting to existing	1	LS	2,000.00	2,000			
Electrical supply to dispenser	1	LS	3,000.00	3,000			
Low voltage control to dispenser	1	LS	2,000.00	2,000			
Connecting to existing control	1	LS	500.00	500			
Lighting to canopy	4,788	SF	2.50	11,970			
Fuel							
Fuel dispenser to match existing	6	EA	3,350.00	20,100			
Supply piping and vent including excavation	1	LS	7,500.00	7,500			
New dispenser sump to match existing	6	EA	800.00	4,800			
Extra for connection to existing tank	1	LS	2,000.00	2,000			
Miscellaneous work associate with fuel supply and control	1	LS	1,000.00	1,000			
	Sub-Total		-	261,345			
General Contractors General Conditions		13.00%)	33,975			
	Sub-Total		-	295,320			
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		19,196			
	Sub-Total		-	314,516			
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		47,177			
Total	al for New Fuel Position			361,693			
Rental Car Stack Spaces [For 60 cars]							
Temporary Work Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc	1,333	SY	3.00	3,999			
Allowance for payement and other demolition work	803	SV	10.00	9 021			
Allowance for miscellaneous demolition work	1		5 000 00	5,931			
Erosion & sedimentary control	1,333	SY	2.25	2,999			
Site Work							
3" asphalt on 4" crushed rock base including excavation	1,333	SY	37.50	49,988			
Pavement marking and signage	1,333	SY	2.50	3,333			
Concrete curb and gutter	440	LF	24.00	10,557			
Storm drainage	1,333	SY	8.50	11,331			
Connect to Oil/water separator	1	LS	1,000.00	1,000			
Lighting poles	4	EA	3,500.00	14,000			
Allowance for landscaping	1	LS	7,000.00	7,000			
Restricel europh	1		2,500.00	2,500			
Electrical supply Fire hydrant and water main	1	10	5,000.00	5,000			
Fire nyurani anu waler mam	1		5,000.00	0,000			
Miscellaneous site work	1	LS	5,000.00	5,000			
	Sub-Total		-	141,637			
General Contractors General Conditions		15.00%		21,246			
	Sub-Total		-	162,883			

	MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON		Р	Date: repared By:	October 21, 2009 DN
	CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN				
	<u>PAL-3 2022</u> BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIM	ATE			
	Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Totals
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			Inci.	
	General Contractors Fee		6.50%		10,587
		Sub-Total		-	173,470
	Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		26,021
	Total fo	r Rental Stack	Parking	-	199,491
Rental C	Car Circulation Area Temporary Work				
	Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc Demolition	427	SY	5.00	2,135
	Allowance for pavement and other demolition work	427	SY	10.00	4,270
	Site Work	1	LS	2,500.00	2,500
	Erosion & sedimentary control	427	SY	2.25	961
	3" asphalt on 4" crushed rock base including excavation	427	SY	37.50	16,013
	Pavement marking and signage	427	SY	3.00	1,281
	Concrete curb and gutter	85	LF	24.00	2,050
	Storm drainage	427	SY	8.50	3,630
	Lighting poles	1	EA	3,500.00	3,500
	Allowance for landscaping	1	LS	1,000.00	1,000
	Miscellaneous parking equipment including barriers	1	LS	500.00	500
	Electrical supply	1	LS	500.00	500
	Fire hydrant and water main	None			
	Fencing	1	LS	1,000.00	1,000
	Miscellaneous site work	1	LS	500.00	500
		Sub-Total		-	39,838
	General Contractors General Conditions		15.00%		5,976
		Sub-Total		-	45,814
	General Contractors Fee		6.50%		2,978
		Sub-Total		-	48,792
	Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		7,319
	Total for Rental (Car Parking Ci	culation	-	56,111
I		C		-	<u> </u>
Roadway NE Airpo	ort Way Westbound [Link ID A-Fig 4-4] [One lane added]				
	Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc.	1 1 1 1	SV	5 00	5 555
	Traffic co-ordination and control Demolition & Site Preparation	1,111	LS	5.00 25,000.00	5,555 25,000
	Allowance for pavement and other demolition work	1.111	SY	10.00	11.110
	Remove existing fencing etc	800	LF	6.00	4,800
	Miscellaneous demolition	1	LS	6,000.00	6,000

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN <u>PAL-3 2022</u> BACK UP DETAIL ESTIM	ATE	I	Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 2009 DN		
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Totals		
	Galantity	•	Incl.			
Site Work Erosion & sedimentary control 4" asphalt on 6" crushed rock base including excavation Allowance for extra fill Extra for joining new road to existing Pavement marking and signage Concrete curb and gutter Storm drainage Lighting poles Allowance for landscaping Electrical supply Fire hydrant and water main Fencing	1,111 1,111 185 1 1,111 800 1,111 8 1 1 1 800	SY CY LS SY LF SY EA LS LS LS	3.00 45.00 22.00 10,000.00 2.50 30.00 6.50 3,850.00 20,000.00 5,000.00 6,000.00 35.00	3,333 49,995 4,070 10,000 2,778 24,000 7,222 30,800 20,000 5,000 6,000 28,000		
Concrete sidewalk including excavation	4,800	SF	6.00	28,800		
Wiscellaheous site work	ı Sub-Total	13		282.462		
				202,402		
General Contractors General Conditions		13.00%	6	36,720		
	Sub-Total		-	319,182		
General Contractors Fee		6.50%	6	20,747		
	Sub-Total		-	339,929		
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%	6	50,989		
Total for NE Airport Way Westbound [Link ID A-Fig 4-4]						
Key Intersections NE Alderwood Road/NE Cornfoot Road Signalizing existing intersection Project cost for allowance from Port \$750,000 Adjusted for construction cost 500,000						
Total for NE Alderwood R	oad/NE Cornf	ort Roa	d _	500,000		
AIR CARGO All Cargo [New Facility] Warehouse Space New warehouse area 114,000 SF Site preparation and utilities to Warehouse only						
Temporary Work Temporary construction and work Traffic control	1 1	LS LS	10,000.00 5,000.00	10,000 5,000		
Miscellaneous general demolition work	1	LS	12,500.00	12,500		
Miscellaneous demolition work including drainage and site utilities	1	LS	5,000.00	5,000		
Clear and prepare site for building pad Erosion & sedimentary control	12,667 12,667	SY SY	0.50 1.00	6,334 12,667		

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON		P	Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 2009 DN	
CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN					
<u>PAL-3 2022</u> BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIN	IATE				
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Totals	
	40.007	0)/	1.00	00.001	
Grade for new building pad	12,667	SY	1.80	22,801	
All warehouse construction work to be performed at Tenant's cost Site Utilities					
Assuming new utilities needed [existing not available]	4		15 000 00	15 000	
Domestic water Fire water main	1		20,000,00	15,000	
Fire hydrants	2	EA	4.000.00	8.000	
Sanitary	1	LS	25,000.00	25,000	
Storm water	1	LS	30,000.00	30,000	
Gas	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000	
Electrical supply	1	LS	40,000.00	40,000	
	Sub-Total		-	222,301	
General Contractors General Conditions		12.50%	,	27,788	
	Sub-Total		-	250,089	
General Contractors Fee		6.00%	1	15,005	
	Sub-Total		-	265,094	
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%	1	39,764	
Total for	Warehouse Space Area			304,858	
Cargo Warehouse Ramp Area					
New ramp area 63,000 SY					
Temporary Work	1	19	50 000 00	50,000	
Escorts [assuming not required as new area]	I	20	30,000.00	30,000	
Traffic control	1	LS	20,000.00	20,000	
Demolition & Site Preparation [assuming non paved area]					
Miscellaneous demolition work including drainage and	63,000	SY	0.30	18,900	
Clear and prepare site preparation	66 150	SY	0.25	16 538	
Miscellaneous general demolition work	1	LS	20,000.00	20,000	
New			,		
Mass excavation	63,467	CY	8.00	507,736	
Extra for rock excavation	635	CY	45.00	28,560	
Remove excavated material and stockpile on site	63,467	CY	4.00	253,868	
Fresion & sodimentary control	63 000	ST SV	0.70	40,303	
Imported colors compact Sub base	22,000	CV	19.00	306,000	
Imported Select compact Sub-base	22,000	ev	10.00	290,900 01 EUU	
Crushed angregate base	1 <u>/</u> 77/	CY	1.00 3/1 00	502 316	
Concrete naving 16 1/2" thick	63 000	SV.	24.00 80.00	5 040 000	
Sealer cost concrete	63,000	SY	00.00 0.25	15 750	
Pavement marking	63 000	SY	0.23	12 600	
Utilities	23,000		5.20	,000	
MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN <u>PAL-3 2022</u> BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIM	ATE	Pi	Date: repared By:	October 21, 2009 DN	
--	---	--	---	---	--
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals	
Drainage to ramp area Electrical including lighting and power Guidance and general signage Landscaping Hydro-seeding and landscaping	63,000 63,000 1 1	SY SY LS LS	15.00 2.50 20,000.00 15,000.00	945,000 157,500 20,000 15,000	
	Sub-Total		-	8,199,273	
General Contractors General Conditions		12.50%		1,024,909	
	Sub-Total		-	9,224,182	
General Contractors Fee		6.00%		553,451	
	Sub-Total		-	9,777,633	
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		1,466,645	
Total for	Warehouse Ra	mp Area	-	11,244,278	
Cargo Landside Area New landside area 114,000 SF Temporary Work Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc Traffic co-ordination and control Demolition & Site Preparation [assuming non paved area] Remove existing fencing etc Miscellaneous demolition Clear and prepare site for building pad Erosion & sedimentary control Grade for new building pad New All cargo landside construction work to be performed at Tenant's cost Site Utilities Fire water main Sanitary Storm water Electrical supply	12,667 1 400 1 12,667 12,667 12,667 12,667 12,667 12,667	SY LS LF LS SY SY SY LS LS LS	2.00 10,000.00 6.00 10,000.00 0.50 1.00 1.80 20,000.00 5,000.00 20,000.00 10,000.00	25,334 10,000 2,400 10,000 6,334 12,667 22,801 20,000 5,000 20,000 10,000	
General Contractors General Conditions	Sub-Total	13.00%	-	18,790 163,325	
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		10,616	
	Sub-Total		-	173,941	
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		26,091	

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN BAL 3 2022		Pi	Date: repared By:	October 21, 20 DN)09			
BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMA	TE							
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals				
Total for Cargo Landside Area 200,032								
Upgrade of NE Elrod Road [For new Cargo Area] [New Surfacing Temporary Work	to Existing &	One lane	added]					
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc	5,833	SY	5.00	29 165				
Traffic co-ordination and control	0,000	LS	25.000.00	25,100				
Demolition & Site Preparation		_0	_0,000.00	20,000				
Allowance for site clearing and preparation	1.5	ACRES	3,500.00	5.250				
Allowance for removal of existing road curb	4,200	LF	4.00	16,800				
Allowance for demolition work	5,833	SY	1.00	5,833				
Remove existing fencing etc	5,000	LF	3.00	15,000				
Allowance for demolition work at road intersection	1	LS	2,000.00	2,000				
Erosion & sedimentary control	5.833	SY	3.00	17.499				
4" asphalt on 6" crushed rock base including excavation	5,833	SY	45.00	262.485				
Allowance for extra fill	972	CY	22.00	21,384				
Extra for joining new road to existing	4,200	LF	2.50	10,500				
Prepare existing road surface for new topping coat	11,667	SY	2.50	29,168				
1 1/2" asphalt topping to existing road surface	11,667	SY	7.50	87,503				
New work at road intersection	1	LS	5,000.00	5,000				
Pavement marking and signage	17,500	SY	1.00	17,500				
Concrete curb and gutter	4,200	LF	30.00	126,000				
Storm drainage	5,833	SY	6.50	37,915				
Lighting poles	21	EA	3,850.00	80,850				
Allowance for landscaping	1	LS	25,000.00	25,000				
Electrical supply	1	LS	20,000.00	20,000				
Fire hydrant and water main	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000				
Fencing	4,200	LF	35.00	147,000				
Miscellaneous site work	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000				
	Sub-Total		-	1,006,851	-			
General Contractors General Conditions		13.00%		130,891				
	Sub-Total		-	1,137,741	-			
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		73,953				
	Sub-Total		-	1,211,694	-			
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		181,754				
Total for Upg	rading NE El	rod Road	-	1,393,448	-			

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN PAL-4 2027		ŀ	Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 2009 DN)
BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMA	TE				
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals	
PASSENGER TERMINAL COMPEX Aircraft Gates & Parking Remote /RON Parking [7 No] Temporary Work Temporary construction and work Escorts Traffic control Demolition & Site Preparation	1 1 1	LS LS LS	75,000.00 120,000 30,000.00	75,000 120,000 30,000	
Removal of concrete or asphalt paving [Taxiway] Miscellaneous demolition work including drainage and	4,069 27,125	SY SY	10.50 1.25	42,725 33,906	
electrical work Miscellaneous general demolition work New	1	LS	15,000.00	15,000	
Mass excavation Extra for rock excavation Remove excavated material and stockpile on site Rough grading and compaction Erosion & sedimentary control Imported select compact Sub-base Geotech fabric Crushed aggregate base Concrete paving 16 1/2" thick Asphalt paving Sealer coat concrete Primer and tack coat Pavement marking Allowance for general repair to existing Utilities Drainage to apron area Electrical including lighting and power Guidance and general signage Landscaping Hydro-seeding and landscaping	27,326 273 27,326 28,481 28,481 9,494 27,125 6,361 27,125 252 27,125 27,125 27,125 27,125 27,125 27,125 27,125 7 1 Sub-Total	CY CY SY CY SY CY SY SY SY SY SY SY LS LS	8.00 45.00 4.00 0.50 0.65 18.00 1.50 34.00 80.00 115.00 0.25 1.50 0.20 15.00 3.00 3500.00	218,608 12,297 109,304 14,241 18,513 170,892 40,688 216,274 2,170,000 28,980 6,781 2,991 13,563 5,425 406,875 81,375 24,500 15,000 3,872,935	
General Contractors General Conditions	Sub-Total	12.50%	-	484,117 4,357,052	
General Contractors Fee		6.00%	, _	261,423	
Design & Estimating Contingency	Sub-Total	15.00%)	4,618,475 692.771	
Total for F	Remote RON	Parking	_ ب _	5,311,247	
Taxiway Connection From RON to Taxiway M Allowing taxiway of 500 long by 100' Temporary Work Temporary construction and work	1	LS	50,000.00	50,000	

MASTER PLAN						
PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL	AIRPORT			Date:	October 21, 20	009
PORTLAND, OREGON			F	Prepared By:	DN	
CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MA	STER PLAN					
	PAL-4 2027					
BA	CK-UP DETAIL ESTIMA	TE				
Item Description		Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals	
Facerto		1	10	50.000	E0.000	
ESCOILS Traffic control		1		20,000	50,000	
Demolition & Site Preparation		1	L3	20,000.00	20,000	
Removal of concrete or asphalt pa	ving [Taxiwav]	556	SY	10 50	5 834	
Clear and prepare for new Taxiwa	V	5 000	SY	0.70	3 500	
Miscellaneous demolition work inc	, luding drainage and	5,556	SY	1.25	6,945	
electrical work	5 5	-,	•		-,	
Miscellaneous general demolition	work	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000	
New						
Mass excavation		5,597	CY	8.00	44,776	
Extra for rock excavation		56	CY	45.00	2,519	
Remove excavated material and s	tockpile on site	5,597	CY	4.00	22,388	
Rough grading and compaction		5,833	SY	0.50	2,917	

	-,			_,• · ·
Erosion & sedimentary control	5,833	SY	0.65	3,791
Imported select compact Sub-base	1,944	CY	18.00	34,992
Geotech fabric	5,556	SY	1.50	8,334
Crushed aggregate base	1,303	CY	34.00	44,302
Concrete paving 16 1/2" thick	5,556	SY	80.00	444,480
Sealer coat concrete	5,556	SY	0.25	1,389
Pavement marking	5,556	SY	0.50	2,778
Allowance for general repair to existing and connect	ing 1	LS	10,000.00	10,000
Utilities				
Drainage to taxi area	5,556	SY	15.00	83,340
Electrical including lighting and power	5,556	SY	7.00	38,892
Guidance and general signage	1	LS	20000.00	20,000
Landscaping				
Hydro-seeding and landscaping	1	LS	10000.00	10,000
	Sub-Total			921,177
				-)
General Contractors General Conditions		12.50%		115,147
	Out Tatal			1 000 004
	Sub-Totai			1,036,324
General Contractors Fee		6.00%		62,179
	Sub-Total			1,098,503
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		164,775
Total for Taxi	way Connection Fro	m RON	_	1,263,279
Passenger Security Screening				
Screening Lanes				
Unclear how screen walls will be added	No cost estir	nated		
Queue Area Document Check				
Temporary Work				

Temporary Work				
Temporary screening and protection to construction area	169	SF	1.00	169
Demolition				
Interior demolition work	169	SF	2.00	338
New				

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN <u>PAL-4 2027</u> BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMAT	TE	F	Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 20 DN	09
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals	
Interior construction Floor wall and ceiling finishes [mainly using existing] New queue barrier Specialties and signage HVAC [minor alteration] Electrical lighting changes Casework and furniture Miscellaneous work	169 169 169 169 169 169 169 169	SF SF SF SF SF SF LS	2.00 1.00 3.00 2.00 2.00 1.50 4.00 1,000.00	338 169 507 338 338 254 676 1,000	
	Sub-Total		-	4,127	
Extra for shift and out of normal hours working		30.00%	,	1,238	
	Sub-Total		-	5,364	
General Contractors General Conditions		30.00%		1,238	
	Sub-Total		-	6,602	
General Contractors Fee		10.00%		660	
	Sub-Total		-	7,263	
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		1,089	
Total for Queue Ar	ea Documer	t Check	-	8,352	
Queue Area Primary Check Temporary Work	100	05			
l emporary screening and protection to construction area	468	SF	1.00	468	
Interior demolition work New	468	SF	1.50	702	
Interior construction Floor wall and ceiling finishes [mainly using existing] New queue barrier Specialties and signage HVAC [alteration and additional hvac at examination area] Electrical [power supply to examination machines] Electrical lighting changes Casework and furniture	468 468 468 468 468 468 468 468 468	SF SF SF SF SF SF SF	2.00 1.00 3.00 2.00 5.00 5.00 1.50 5.00	936 468 1,404 936 2,340 2,340 702 2,340	
Miscellaneous work	1 Sub-Total	LS	2,000.00	2,000	
Extra for shift and out of normal hours working		30.00%	,	4,391	
	Sub-Total		-	19,027	
General Contractors General Conditions		30.00%		4,391	

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN <u>PAL-4 2027</u>		P	Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 2009 DN
BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMA	.TE Quantity	Llnit	Unit Cost	Totals
	Quantity	Offic	Incl.	Totals
	Sub-Total		-	23,418
General Contractors Fee		10.00%		2,342
	Sub-Total		-	25,759
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		3,864
Total for Queue	Area Primar	y Check	-	29,623
GROUND TRANSPORTATION & PARKING Public Parking Close in Parking New Close-in Parking Structure Garage located P3 site. Cost of \$28,000 per space obtained from Port Multi-story parking structure including all construction cost [average cost for parking structure \$22,500 per space]	3,240 Sub-Total	Space	28,000.00	90,720,000
General Contractors General Conditions		incl in ab	ove	
	Cub Tatal		-	00 700 000
	Sub-Tolai			90,720,000
General Contractors Fee		incl in ab	ove	
	Sub-Total		-	90,720,000
Design & Estimating Contingency		10.00%		9,072,000
Total for New Close	in Parking S	tructure	-	99,792,000
Employee Parking Employee Lot Parking [256 Spaces] Temporary Work				
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc Demolition work associated with removal of existing facility of Demolition	9,244 n new site	SY	2.00	18,488
Demolition Demolition of existing buildings Remove slab on grade and foundation to buildings Site Preparation	1 1	LS LS	20,000.00 10,000.00	20,000 10,000
Allowance for pavement and other demolition work Allowance for miscellaneous demolition work Erosion & sedimentary control Site Work	6,101 1 9,244	SY LS SY	10.00 5,000.00 2.25	61,010 5,000 20,799
3" asphalt on 4" crushed rock base including excavation Pavement marking and signage Concrete curb and gutter Storm drainage Oil/water separator	9,244 9,244 1,109 9,244 1	SY SY LF SY LS	37.50 2.50 24.00 8.50 10,000.00	346,650 23,110 26,623 78,574 10,000

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN <u>PAL-4 2027</u> BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMA	TF	F	Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 2009 DN
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Totals
Lighting poles Allowance for landscaping Miscellaneous parking equipment including barriers Electrical supply Fire hydrant and water main Fencing Vehicle entry gates electronically controlled Miscellaneous site work	14 1 1 1 1,166 1 1	EA LS LS LS LS LF EA LS	3,500.00 20,000.00 12,500.00 20,000.00 20,000.00 33.00 8,500.00 20,000.00	49,000 20,000 12,500 20,000 20,000 38,465 8,500 20,000
	Sub-Total		-	808,719
General Contractors General Conditions		12.00%		97,046
	Sub-Total		-	905,765
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		58,875
	Sub-Total		-	964,640
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		144,696
Total for E	mployee Lot	Parking	-	1,109,336
Curbside Loading & Unloading Deplaning curbside [Moving Taxis into Garage] Temporary Work	1 396	SV	5 00	6 980
Traffic control Protection to pedestrians Demolition & Site Preparation	1,000 1	LS LS	20,000.00 10,000.00	20,000 10,000
Remove existing garage signage and parking striping Demolition work associated with new entry and exist Allowance for miscellaneous demolition work	1,396 1 1	SY LS LS	1.50 10,000.00 3,000.00	2,094 10,000 3,000
New Work Alteration work to existing parking area to accommodate new road and parking use	1,396	SY	10.00	13,960
New entry and exist New stripping and traffic direction pavement marking Extra for pedestrian walkways crossing New signage Bollards Lighting	2 1,396 2 1,396 8 12,560	EA SY EA SY EA SF	10,000.00 2.50 1,000.00 5.00 450.00 1.50	20,000 3,490 2,000 6,980 3,600 18,840
Allowance for landscaping Miscellaneous parking equipment Miscellaneous site work	1 1 1	LS LS LS	10,000.00 2,500.00 10,000.00	10,000 2,500 10,000
	Sub-Total		-	143,444
Overtime night working and working restrictions		30.00%		43,033
	Sub-Total		-	186,477

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON		Р	Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 2009 DN
PAL-4 2027				
BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMA		Unit	Unit Cost	Totals
	Quantity	Onit	Incl.	Totals
General Contractors General Conditions		15.00%		21,517
	Sub-Total		-	207,994
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		13,520
	Sub-Total		-	221,513
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		33,227
Total for	Deplaning C	urbside	-	254,740
Curbside Roadway Lanes Enplaning roadway curbside Meet requirements by adjusting operations Rental Car Facility Ready/Return Parking [New Facility 2,700 spaces] Allowing 325 SF per space all in Multi-story Parking Structure	No Cost			
Garage located P3 site. Cost of \$28,000 per space obtained from Port Multi-story parking structure including all construction cost [average cost for parking structure \$22,500 per space] Rental Car Concession Building	2,700	Space	28,000.00	75,600,000
Allow for utilities to rental concession buildings	1	LS	100,000.00	100,000
	Sub-Total		-	75,700,000
General Contractors General Conditions		12.00%		9,084,000
	Sub-Total		-	84,784,000
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		5,510,960
	Sub-Total		-	90,294,960
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		13,544,244
Total for Re	eady/Return	Parking	-	103,839,204
Service Facility Rental Car Wash [18 No] [New Facility] Temporary Work				
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc	3,600	SY	1.00	3,600
Demolition and preparation Erosion & sedimentary control	35,640 35,640	SF SF	2.50 0.20	89,100 7,128
Foundations & Slab Foundations Concrete slab on grade Superstructure	32,400 32,400	SF SF	3.00 6.50	97,200 210,600

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT Date: October 21, 2009 PORTLAND, OREGON Prepared By: DN CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN PAL-4 2027 **BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMATE** Unit Cost Item Description Quantity Unit Totals Incl SF Pre-engineered building 32,400 30.00 972,000 Interior Construction Partition interior doors 32,400 SF 1.50 48.600 Specialties bollards ΕA 450.00 32.400 72 Signs and pavement marking 18 EΑ 600.00 10,800 Interior Finishes Wall floor and ceiling finishes 32,400 SF 2.00 64,800 Plumbing ΕA Sump pit 18 1,250.00 22,500 Drainage ΕA 4,500.00 81,000 18 HVAC Ventilation and radiant heating 32,400 SF 1.50 48,600 Electrical Electrical supply and distribution ΕA 6.000.00 18 108,000 Lighting and power 32,400 SF 3.00 97,200 Low voltage and communication, fire alarm 32,400 SF 1.65 53,460 Equipment ΕA Vehicle washing equipment 18 110,000 1,980,000 Height barrier 18 ΕA 2,500.00 45,000 200,000 Water reclamation system LS 200,000 1 Steel guard rails 18 4,000.00 72,000 ΕA Allow for testing 1,250.00 22,500 18 EA Site Improvement Asphalt paving associated with new washing facility 360 SY 35.00 12,600 Site Mechanical Utilities LS 1 New sewer system 26,730.00 26,730 New stormwater system LS 20,000 1 20,000.00 Oil/water separator ΕA 10,500.00 10,500 1 New water supply LS 1 25,000.00 25,000 New fire hydrants 2 ΕA 4,000.00 8,000 Site Electrical Utilities 120,000 Electrical supply to facility 1 LS 120,000 Demolition of Existing Car Wash Facility Demolition Removal of existing car washing facilities 11 EA 4,500 49,500 Allowance for removing utilizes to facility 1 LS 5,000 5,000 500 Allow for clean-up 11 ΕA 5,500 Sub-Total 4,549,318 General Contractors General Conditions 13.00% 591,411 Sub-Total 5,140,729 **General Contractors Fee** 6.50% 334,147 Sub-Total 5,474,877 **Design & Estimating Contingency** 15.00% 821,232 Total for Car Wash [18 No] 6,296,108

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN			Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 2009 DN		
PAL-4 2027 BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMATE						
Item Description	_ Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Totals		
			Incl.			
Fuel Positions [70] [New fuel station facility] Allowing 40 gasoline fueling position and 30 charging stations Temporary Work						
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc Site Preparation & Demolition	42,000	SF	0.80	33,600		
Allowance for pavement and other demolition work	4,900	SY	8.00	39,200		
Allowance for miscellaneous demolition work	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000		
Erosion & sedimentary control	4,900	SY	3.00	14,700		
Site Work						
3" asphalt on 4" crushed rock base including excavation	3,967	SY	37.50	148,763		
Allow for curb and gutter	820	LF	28.00	22,960		
Reinforced concrete island	8,400	SF	10.00	84,000		
Pavement marking and signage	4,667	SY	2.50	11,668		
Bollards	140	EA	465.00	65,100		
Canopy	55,860	SF	30.00	1,675,800		
Miscellaneous painting	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000		
Fencing	1,000	LF	38.00	38,000		
Vehicle entry gate	2	LS	10,000.00	20,000		
Security Booth	1	EA	20,000.00	20,000		
Lighting to canopy	55,860	SF	2.50	139,650		
Security system	1	LS	20,000.00	20,000		
Building		05				
Control Building and office	3,000	SF	230.00	690,000		
General signage	1	LS	20,000.00	20,000		
	4 0 0 7	0)/	00.00	00.040		
Storm drainage including connecting to existing	4,667	SY	20.00	93,340		
Sanitary drainage	1	LS	20,000.00	20,000		
Oil/water separator	3	EA	10,000.00	30,000		
Water and fire	1	LS	25,000.00	25,000		
Fire hydrants	4	EA	4,000.00	16,000		
Electrical supply	1	L5	100,000.00	100,000		
Fuel & Charging Stations	2 2 2 7	ov	10.00	50.000		
Excavation for new storage tanks	3,207	CY	16.00	00,000 11,720		
Remove excavated material	102		15.00	11,730		
Concrete have for storage tanks	2,400		10.00	39,760		
12 000 gallon capacity fiberalass underground double wall	10		365.00	44,000		
fuel storage tenk	10	EA	35,000.00	350,000		
	10		800.00	۹ <u>۵</u> ۵۵		
Ventilation avetem to tanka	10		2 000 00	0,000 20,000		
	10		3,000.00	30,000		
Fuel dispensel	40		3,350.00	134,000		
New dispenser sump to match existing	40		800.00	44,000		
Extra for connection to tanke	40			32,000 10 000		
	1	19	40 000 00	10,000		
Electrical supply to dispenser	1		+0,000.00 650.00	40,000 26,000		
Licultural supply to dispenser	40		400.00	20,000		
Electrical charging station	40		3 000 00	00,000		
Electrical supply to charging station	30		3,000.00	30,000		
Control oquipment	30			33,000		
Control equipment Miscollapoous work associate with new fuel facility	1		20,000.00	20,000		
Demolition work associated with removal of existing Fueling F	acility	19	20,000.00	20,000		

	MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN		F	Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 20 DN	09
	<u>PAL-4 2027</u> BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMAT	E				
	Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Totals	
				inoi.		
	Remove existing fuel dispensers and associated piping and electrical controls	43	EA	300.00	12,900	
	Removal all connecting piping	1	LS	2,000.00	2,000	
	Removal of electrical equipment cables and supply Cleaning tanks of sludge and remaining products before removal	1 5	LS EA	1,000.00 500.00	1,000 2,500	
	Remove of existing 12,000 gallon underground storage tanks	5	EA	2,000.00	10,000	
	Remove tanks fro site to disposal tip Allow for clean-up after tanks have been removed	5 1	EA LS	1,500.00 25,000.00	7,500 25,000	
		Sub-Total		-	4,421,636	
	General Contractors General Conditions		12.50%		552,705	
		Sub-Total		-	4 974 341	
	Constractors Eee		6 50%		323 332	
			0.0078	-	5 007 070	
		Sub-lotal			5,297,673	
	Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		794,651	
	Total fo	r New Fuel I	Position	-	6,092,324	
Rental	Car Stack Spaces [For 540 cars]					
	l emporary Work	40.000	01/	0.00	04.000	
	Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc Demolition work associated with removal of existing facility on Demolition	new site	SY	2.00	24,000	
	Demolition of existing USPS building	662,400	CF	0.25	165,600	
	Remove slab on grade and foundation to building Site Preparation	41,400	SF	2.00	82,800	
	Allowance for pavement and other demolition work	4,884	SY	10.00	48,840	
	Allowance for miscellaneous demolition work	1	LS	5,000.00	5,000	
	Erosion & sedimentary control Site Work	12,000	SY	2.25	27,000	
	3" asphalt on 4" crushed rock base including excavation	12,000	SY	37.50	450,000	
	Pavement marking and signage	12,000	SY	2.50	30,000	
	Concrete curb and gutter	1,440	LF	24.00	34,560	
	Storm drainage	12,000	SY	8.50	102,000	
	Oil/water separator	1	LS	20,000.00	20,000	
	Lighting poles	22	EA	3,500.00	77,000	
	Allowance for landscaping	1	LS	25,000.00	25,000	
	Miscellaneous parking equipment including barriers	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000	
	Electrical supply	1	LS	25,000.00	25,000	
	Fire hydrant and water main	1	LS	25,000.00	25,000	
	⊢encing Miscellaneous site work	1,500 1		33.00	49,500	
			10	25,000.00	25,000	
		Sub-Total			1,226,300	

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN		P	Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 200 DN	9
PAL-4 2027 BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIM	ΔΤΕ				
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Totals	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,		Incl.		
General Contractors General Conditions		12.00%		147,156	
	Sub-Total		-	1,373,456	
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		89,275	
	Sub-Total		-	1,462,731	
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		219,410	
Total for	Rental Stack	Parking	-	1,682,140	
Rental Car Circulation Area					
Temporary Work Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc Demolition	4,053	SY	3.00	12,159	
Allowance for pavement and other demolition work	2,716	SY	10.00	27,155	
Allowance for miscellaneous demolition work Site Work	1	LS	3,000.00	3,000	
Erosion & sedimentary control	4,053	SY	2.25	9,119	
3" asphalt on 4" crushed rock base including excavation	4,053	SY	37.50	151,988	
Pavement marking and signage	4,053	SY	2.65	10,740	
Concrete curb and gutter	608	LF	24.00	14,591	
Storm drainage	4,053	SY	8.50	34,451	
Lighting poles	9	EA	3,500.00	31,500	
Allowance for landscaping	1	LS	20.000.00	20.000	
Miscellaneous parking equipment including barriers	1	LS	20.000.00	20.000	
Control booth	1	IS	15,000,00	15,000	
	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000	
Fire bydrant and water main	2	ΕΔ	4 500 00	9,000	
Fencing	500		33.00	16 500	
Vehicle entry gates electronically controlled	2	FΔ	8 500 00	17,000	
Main area signage	1		5,000,00	5 000	
Miscellaneous site work	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000	
	Sub-Total		-	417,203	
General Contractors General Conditions		12.50%		52,150	
	Sub-Total		-	469,353	
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		30,508	
	Sub-Total		-	499,861	
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		74,979	
Total for Rental C	ar Parking Cir	culation	-	574,840	

Connecting Bridge [Removal] Temporary Work

MASTER PLAN				
PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT			Date:	October 21, 2009
PORTLAND, OREGON			Prepared By:	DN
CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN				
PAL-4 2027 BACK-UP DETAIL ES	ΓΙΜΑΤΕ			
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals
	105	<u></u>		
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc	405	SY	3.00	1,215
Protection to parking ramp	1		2,500	2,500
Demolition & Site Preparation	I	20	10,000	10,000
Demolition of crash barrier to bridge columns road	1	LS	500.00	500
Demolition of crash barrier	80	LF	6.00	480
Remove steel guardrails	270	LF	7.00	1,890
Storm drainage and utility demolition work	405	SY	5.00	2,025
Rermove lighting poles	4	EA	400.00	1,600
Removal of concrete bridge including support	1,215	SF	20.00	24,300
Remove asphalt concrete paving	270	SY	7.50	2,025
Remove retaining walls	810	SF	10.00	8,100
Remove retaining wall foundation	90	LF	60.00	5,400
Remove compact fill to ramp	675	CY	8.00	5,400
Miscellaneous demolition	1	LS	5,000.00	5,000
Fresion & sedimentary control	270	sv	5.00	1 350
Rough grade	270	SY	1.50	405
4" asphalt on 6" crushed rock base	270	SY	40.00	10 800
Extra for joining new road to existing	288	LF	20.00	5.760
Pavement marking and signage	270	SY	2.50	675
	Sub-Total		-	89,425
General Contractors General Conditions		12.509	%	11,178
	Sub-Total		-	100,603
General Contractors Fee		6.509	%	6,539
	Sub-Total		-	107,142
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.009	%	16,071
То	tal for Connecting	J Bridg	e _	123,214
Roadway				
NE Airport Way Eastbound [Link ID B-Fig 4-4] [One lane added Temporary Work	ed]			
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc	1,111	SY	5.00	5,555
Traffic co-ordination and control Demolition & Site Preparation	1	LS	25,000.00	25,000
Allowance for pavement and other demolition work	1,111	SY	10.00	11,110
Remove existing fencing etc	800	LF	6.00	4,800
Miscellaneous demolition	1	LS	6,000.00	6,000
Site Work		εv	2.00	0 000
ETUSION & SEQIMENTALY CONTON	1,111 1 1 1 1 1	ז כ 20	3.00 15.00	3,333 10 005
Allowance for extra fill	185	CY	22 NN	49,990 <u>4</u> 070
Extra for joining new road to existing	.00	LS	10,000.00	10.000
Pavement marking and signage	1.111	SY	2.50	2,778
Concrete curb and gutter	800	LF	30.00	24,000

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN BAL-4 2027		P	Date: repared By:	October 21, 2009 DN
BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMA	TE			
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals
Storm drainage Lighting poles Allowance for landscaping Electrical supply Fire hydrant and water main Fencing Concrete sidewalk including excavation Miscellaneous site work	1,111 8 1 1 800 4,800 1	SY EA LS LS LS LF SF LS	6.50 3,850.00 20,000.00 5,000.00 6,000.00 35.00 6.00 10,000.00	7,222 30,800 20,000 5,000 6,000 28,000 28,800 10,000
	Sub-Total			282,462
General Contractors General Conditions		13.00%		36,720
	Sub-Total		-	319,182
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		20,747
	Sub-Total		-	339,929
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		50,989
Total for NE Airport Way Eastboun	d [Link ID B-	Fig 4-4]	-	390,918
Park Entry [Link ID C-Fig 4-4] [One lane added] Temporary Work Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc Traffic co-ordination and control	731	SY	5.00	3,655
Demolition & Site Preparation Allowance for pavement and other demolition work Remove existing fencing etc Miscellaneous demolition Site Work Erosion & sedimentary control 4" asphalt on 6" crushed rock base including excavation Allowance for extra fill Extra for joining new road to existing Pavement marking and signage Concrete curb and gutter	731 526 1 731 731 122 1 731 526	SY LF LS SY CY LS SY LF	10.00 6.00 5,000.00 3.00 45.00 22.00 5,000.00 2.50 30.00	7,310 3,158 5,000 2,193 32,895 2,684 5,000 1,828 15,789
Storm drainage Lighting poles Allowance for landscaping Electrical supply Fire hydrant and water main Fencing Concrete sidewalk including excavation Miscellaneous site work	731 5 1 1 526 No sidewalk 1 Sub-Total	SY EA LS LS LS LF allowed LS	6.50 3,850.00 10,000.00 4,000.00 5,000.00 35.00 10,000.00	4,752 20,263 10,000 4,000 5,000 18,421 10,000 171,948
General Contractors General Conditions		14.00%		24,073
	Sub-Total		-	196,020

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN <u>PAL-4 2027</u>		P	Date: repared By:	October 21, 2009 DN
BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMAT	E	Ĩ		
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		12,741
	Sub-Total		-	208,762
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		31,314
Total for Parking Entry	/ [Link ID C-	Fig 4-4]	-	240,076
Deplaning Level Departure [Link ID G-Fig 4-4] [One lane added] Temporary Work				
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc Traffic co-ordination and control Demolition & Site Preparation	1,170 1	SY LS	5.00 30,000.00	5,850 30,000
Allowance for pavement and other demolition work Remove existing fencing etc Miscellaneous demolition	1,170 700 1	SY LF LS	10.00 6.00 12.000.00	11,700 4,200 12,000
Erosion & sedimentary control 4" asphalt on 6" crushed rock base including excavation Allowance for extra fill Extra for joining new road to existing Pavement marking and signage Concrete curb and gutter	1,170 1,170 195 1 1,170 842	SY SY CY LS SY LF	3.00 45.00 22.00 10,000.00 2.50 30.00	3,510 52,650 4,290 10,000 2,925 25,263
Storm drainage Lighting poles Allowance for landscaping Electrical supply Fire hydrant and water main Fencing Concrete sidewalk including excavation Miscellaneous site work	1,170 8 1 1 700 4,200 1	EA LS LS LS LF SF LS	6.50 3,850.00 20,000.00 5,000.00 6,000.00 35.00 6.00 20,000.00	7,605 32,421 20,000 5,000 6,000 24,500 25,200 20,000
	Sub-Total		-	303,114
General Contractors General Conditions		13.00%		39,405
	Sub-Total		-	342,519
General Contractors Fee	0 I T / I	6.50%	_	22,264
	Sub-Total			364,783
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		54,717
Total for Deplaning Level Departure	E [Link ID G-	Fig 4-4]	-	419,500
Park Exit [Link ID H-Fig 4-4] [One lane added] Temporary Work Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc Traffic co-ordination and control Demolition & Site Preparation	439 1	SY LS	5.00 15,000.00	2,195 15,000

1

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN <u>PAL-4 2027</u> BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMA	TE	F	Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 2009 DN
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals
Allowance for pavement and other demolition work Remove existing fencing etc Miscellaneous demolition	439 315 1	SY LF LS	10.00 6.00 5,000.00	4,390 1,890 5,000
Erosion & sedimentary control 4" asphalt on 6" crushed rock base including excavation Allowance for extra fill Extra for joining new road to existing Pavement marking and signage Concrete curb and gutter Storm drainage Lighting poles	439 439 73 1 439 315 439 3	SY SY LS SY LF SY EA	$\begin{array}{r} 3.00 \\ 45.00 \\ 22.00 \\ 5,000.00 \\ 2.50 \\ 30.00 \\ 6.50 \\ 3,850.00 \\ 40.00 \\ 10$	1,317 19,755 1,606 5,000 1,098 9,450 2,854 10,106
Allowance for landscaping Electrical supply Fire hydrant and water main Fencing Concrete sidewalk including excavation Miscellaneous site work	1 1 315 1,890 1	LS LS LS LF SF LS	10,000.00 2,500.00 5,000.00 35.00 6.00 10,000.00	10,000 2,500 5,000 11,025 11,340 10,000
General Contractors General Conditions	Sub-Total	14.00%	-	129,525 18,134
	Sub-Total	11.0070	-	147,659
General Contractors Fee	Sub Total	6.50%	-	9,598
Design & Estimating Contingency	Sub-101ai	15.00%		23,588
Total for Parking Ex	it [Link ID H-	Fig 4-4]	-	180,845
Terminal Exit [Link ID I-Fig 4-4] [One Lane Added]				
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc Traffic co-ordination and control Demolition & Site Preparation	2,412 1	SY LS	5.00 35,000.00	12,060 35,000
Allowance for pavement and other demolition work Remove existing fencing etc Miscellaneous demolition Site Work	2,412 1,660 1	SY LF LS	10.00 6.00 12,000.00	24,120 9,960 12,000
Erosion & sedimentary control 4" asphalt on 6" crushed rock base including excavation Allowance for extra fill Extra for joining new road to existing Pavement marking and signage Concrete curb and gutter Storm drainage Lighting poles Allowance for landscaping Electrical supply	2,412 2,412 402 1 2,412 1,660 2,412 17 1 1	SY SY LS SY LF SY EA LS LS	3.00 45.00 22.00 20,000.00 2.50 30.00 6.50 3,850.00 30,000.00 10,000.00	7,236 108,540 8,844 20,000 6,030 49,800 15,678 63,910 30,000 10,000

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN <u>PAL-4 2027</u> BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMA	TE		Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 200 DN	09
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals	
Fire hydrant and water main Fencing Concrete sidewalk including excavation Miscellaneous site work	1 1,660 9,960 1	LS LF SF LS	10,000.00 35.00 6.00 25,000.00	10,000 58,100 59,760 25,000	
General Contractors General Conditions	Sub-Total	13.00%		566,038 73,585	
	Sub-Total		-	639,623	
General Contractors Fee		6.50%	D	41,575	
	Sub-Total		-	681,198	
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%	, D	102,180	
Total for Terminal E	xit [Link ID I-	Fig 4-4	ı <u>-</u>	783,378	
Return To Terminal Road [Link ID J-Fig 4-4] [One Lane Added]					
I emporary Work Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc Traffic co-ordination and control	658 1	SY LS	5.00 20,000.00	3,290 20,000	
Allowance for pavement and other demolition work Remove existing fencing etc Miscellaneous demolition Site Work	658 474 1	SY LF LS	10.00 6.00 12,000.00	6,580 2,842 12,000	
Erosion & sedimentary control 4" asphalt on 6" crushed rock base including excavation Allowance for extra fill Extra for joining new road to existing Pavement marking and signage Concrete curb and gutter	658 658 110 1 658 450	SY SY CY LS SY LF	3.00 45.00 22.00 10,000.00 2.50 30.00	1,974 29,610 2,420 10,000 1,645 13,500	
Storm drainage Lighting poles Allowance for landscaping Electrical supply Fire hydrant and water main Fencing	658 5 1 1 1 450	SY EA LS LS LS LF	6.50 3,850.00 20,000.00 5,000.00 6,000.00 35.00	4,277 17,325 20,000 5,000 6,000 15,750	
Concrete sidewalk including excavation Miscellaneous site work	2,700 1 Sub-Total	SF LS	6.00 20,000.00 _	16,200 20,000 208,413	
General Contractors General Conditions		13.50%		28,136	
	Sub-Total		-	236,549	
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		15,376	
	Sub-Total		-	251,925	

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN		P	Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 20 DN	009
PAL-4 2027 BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMAT	ГЕ				
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals	
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		37,789	
Total for Return To Terminal Roa	d [Link ID J-	Fig 4-4]	-	289,713	-
Terminal Area Exit [Link ID K-Fig 4-4] [One lane added] Temporary Work					
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc	1,374	SY	5.00	6,870	
Traffic co-ordination and control Demolition & Site Preparation	1	LS	25,000.00	25,000	
Allowance for pavement and other demolition work	1,374	SY	10.00	13,740	
Remove existing fencing etc	989	LF	6.00	5,937	
Miscellaneous demolition Site Work	1	LS	7,500.00	7,500	
Erosion & sedimentary control	1.374	SY	3.00	4,122	
4" asphalt on 6" crushed rock base including excavation	1,374	SY	45.00	61,830	
Allowance for extra fill	229	CY	22.00	5,038	
Extra for joining new road to existing	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000	
Pavement marking and signage	1,374	SY	2.50	3,435	
Concrete curb and gutter	989	LF	30.00	29,684	
Storm drainage	1,374	SY	6.50	8,931	
Lighting poles	10	EA	3,850.00	38,500	
Allowance for landscaping	1	LS	20,000.00	20,000	
Electrical supply	1	LS	5,000.00	5,000	
Fire hydrant and water main	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000	
Fencing	989	LF	35.00	34,632	
Concrete sidewalk including excavation	5,937	SF	6.00	35,621	
Miscellaneous site work	1	LS	12,000.00	12,000	
	Sub-Total		-	337,840	_
General Contractors General Conditions		13.00%		43,919	
	Sub-Total		-	381,759	-
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		24,814	
	Sub-Total		-	406,573	_
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		60,986	
Total for Terminal Ex	it [Link ID K-	Fig 4-4]	-	467,559	_
			-		-

Key Intersections

None

AIR CARGO All Cargo Warehouse Space

New warehouse area 138,000 SF Site preparation and utilities to warehouse only Temporary Work

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN <u>PAL-4 2027</u>		F	Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 200 DN)9
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Totals	
Temporary construction and work Traffic control	1	LS LS	10,000.00 7,000.00	10,000 7,000	
Miscellaneous general demolition work Miscellaneous demolition work including drainage and site utilities	1	LS LS	14,000.00 6,000.00	14,000 6,000	
Clear and prepare site for building pad Erosion & sedimentary control Grade for new building pad	15,333 15,333 15,333	SY SY SY	0.50 1.00 1.80	7,667 15,333 27,599	
All warehouse construction work to be performed at Tenant's cost Site Utilities Assuming connecting to existing utilities					
Domestic water Fire water main Fire hydrants Sanitary Storm water Gas	1 1 2 1 1 1	LS LS EA LS LS LS	5,000.00 5,000.00 4,000.00 10,000.00 10,000.00 5,000.00 12,500.00	5,000 5,000 8,000 10,000 10,000 5,000 12,500	
	Sub-Total	20	-	143,099	
General Contractors General Conditions	Sub-Total	13.00%	_	18,603	
General Contractors Fee		6.00%		9,702	
	Sub-Total		-	171,404	
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%	_	25,711	
Total for W Cargo Warehouse Ramp Area	arehouse Spa	ce Area	-	197,114	
Temporary Work Temporary construction and work Escorts Jassuming not required as new areal	1	LS	50,000.00	50,000	
Traffic control Demolition & Site Preparation [assuming non payed area]	1	LS	20,000.00	20,000	
Miscellaneous demolition work including drainage and electrical work	77,000	SY	0.30	23,100	
Miscellaneous general demolition work	00,850 1	LS	20,000.00	20,213	
Mass excavation Extra for rock excavation Remove excavated material and stockpile on site Rough grading and compaction	77,571 776 77,571 80,850	CY CY CY SY	8.00 45.00 4.00 0.70	620,568 34,907 310,284 56,595	

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN PAL-4 2027		F	Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 200 DN)9
BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMA	ATE				
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals	
Erosion & sedimentary control Imported select compact Sub-base Geotech fabric Crushed aggregate base Concrete paving 16 1/2" thick Sealer coat concrete Pavement marking Utilities Drainage to ramp area Electrical including lighting and power Guidance and general signage Landscaping Hydro-seeding and landscaping	77,000 26,950 77,000 18,057 77,000 77,000 77,000 77,000 1	SY CY SY SY SY SY LS LS	0.60 18.00 1.50 34.00 80.00 0.25 0.20 15.00 2.50 20,000.00 25,000.00	46,200 485,100 115,500 613,938 6,160,000 19,250 15,400 1,155,000 192,500 20,000 25,000	
Tyuro-security and landscaping	' Sub-Total	20		10 003 554	
General Contractors General Conditions	Oub-Total	12.50%		1,250,444	
	Sub-Total		-	11,253,999	
General Contractors Fee		6.00%		675,240	
	Sub-Total		-	11,929,239	
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		1,789,386	
Total for W	arehouse Ran	np Area	-	13,718,624	
Cargo Landside Area New landside area 138,000 SF Temporary Work Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc Traffic co-ordination and control Demolition & Site Preparation [assuming non paved area] Remove existing fencing etc Miscellaneous demolition Clear and prepare site for building pad Erosion & sedimentary control Grade for new building pad New All cargo landside construction work to be performed at Tenant's cost Site Utilities Fire water main Sanitary Storm water Electrical supply	15,333 1 460 1 15,333 15,333 15,333 15,333	SY LS LF LS SY SY LS LS LS	2.00 10,000.00 6.00 10,000.00 0.50 1.00 1.80 20,000.00 5,000.00 20,000.00 10,000.00	30,666 10,000 2,760 10,000 7,667 15,333 27,599 20,000 5,000 20,000 10,000	
	Sub-Total		-	159,025	
General Contractors General Conditions		13.00%		20,673	

1

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN <u>PAL-4 2027</u> BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMAT	ſE	P	Date: repared By:	October 21, 20 DN	09
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals	
	Sub-Total		-	179,698	
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		11,680	
	Sub-Total		-	191,379	
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		28,707	
Total for C	Total for Cargo Landside Area				

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN			Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 20 DN	09		
PAL-5 2035 BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMATE							
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals			
PASSENGER TERMINAL COMPEX							
Aircraft Gates & Parking							
Remote /RON Parking [6 No]							
Temporary Work							
Temporary construction and work	1	LS	60,000.00	60,000			
Escorts	1	LS	105,000	105,000			
I raffic control	1	LS	25,000.00	25,000			
Demolition & Site Preparation		.					
Removal of concrete or asphalt paving [I axiway]	3,500	SY	10.50	36,750			
Miscellaneous demolition work including drainage and	23,333	SY	1.25	29,166			
				40.000			
Miscellaneous general demolition work	1	LS	12,000.00	12,000			
New		0.1	0.00	400.040			
Mass excavation	23,506	CY	8.00	188,048			
Extra for rock excavation	235	CY	45.00	10,578			
Remove excavated material and stockpile on site	23,506	CY	4.00	94,024			
	24,500	SY	0.50	12,250			
Erosion & sedimentary control	24,500	SY	0.65	15,925			
Imported select compact Sub-base	8,167	CY	18.00	147,006			
Geotech fabric	23,333	SY	1.50	35,000			
Crushed aggregate base	5,472	CY	34.00	186,048			
Concrete paving 16 1/2" thick	23,333	SY	80.00	1,866,640			
Asphait paving	217		115.00	24,955			
Sealer coat concrete	23,333	SY	0.25	5,833			
Primer and tack coat	1,895	SY	1.50	2,842			
Extra for joining new paving to existing	525		15.00	7,875			
Pavement marking	23,333	SY	0.50	11,667			
	23,333	SY	0.50	11,667			
	22.222	<u>cv</u>	45.00	0.40.005			
Drainage to apron area	23,333	SI	15.00	349,995			
Electrical including lighting and power	23,333	51	3.00	69,999			
Guidance and general signage	6	EA	3500.00	21,000			
Landscaping Hydro-seeding and landscaping	1	LS	12500.00	12,500			
	Sub-Total		-	3,341,767			
General Contractors General Conditions		12.50%	6	417.721			
	Sub Total		-	2 750 499			
	Sub-Tolai			3,739,400			
General Contractors Fee		6.00%	6	225,569			
	Sub-Total		-	3,985,057			
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%	6	597,759			
Total fo	r Remote RON	Parking	g _	4,582,815			
Passenger Security Screening							

Screening Lanes

Unclear how screen walls will be added

No cost estimated

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON		P	Date: repared By:	October 21, 20 DN	09
CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN					
<u>PAL-5 2035</u>					
BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMA	TE				
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Totals	
	-		Inci.		
Queue Area Document Check Temporary Work					
Temporary screening and protection to construction area Demolition	1,144	SF	1.00	1,144	
Interior demolition work New	1,144	SF	1.50	1,716	
Interior construction	1,144	SF	2.00	2,288	
Floor wall and ceiling finishes [mainly using existing]	1,144	SF	1.00	1,144	
New queue barrier	1,144	SF	3.00	3,432	
Specialties and signage	1,144	SF	2.00	2,288	
HVAC [minor alteration]	1,144	SF	2.00	2,288	
Electrical lighting changes	1,144	SF	1.50	1,716	
Casework and furniture	1,144	SF	4.00	4,576	
Miscellaneous work	1	LS	3,000.00	3,000	
	Sub-Total		-	23,592	
Extra for shift and out of normal hours working		30.00%		7,078	
	Sub-Total		-	30,670	•
General Contractors General Conditions		25.00%		5,898	
	Sub-Total		-	36,568	
General Contractors Fee		10.00%		3,657	
	Sub-Total		-	40,224	•
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		6,034	
Total for Queue A	Area Docume	nt Check	-	46,258	
Queue Area Primary Check					
Temporary screening and protection to construction area	1,170	SF	1.00	1,170	
Interior demolition work New	1,170	SF	1.50	1,755	
Interior construction	1,170	SF	2.00	2,340	
Floor wall and ceiling finishes [mainly using existing]	1,170	SF	1.00	1,170	
New queue barrier	1,170	SF	3.00	3,510	
Specialties and signage	1,170	SF	2.00	2,340	
μ	1,170	SF	5.00	5,850	
HVAU [alteration and additional hvac at examination area]	4 470	eг	E 00		
Electrical [power suppry to examination machines]	1,170	3F 9E	5.00	5,850	
Electrical lighting changes	1,170	3F 9E	1.50	1,755	
Miscellaneous work	1,170	LS	5.00 4,000.00	5,850 4.000	
				,	

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN				October 21, 2009 DN	
BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMA	TE				
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals	
	Sub-Total		-	35,590	
Extra for shift and out of normal hours working		30.00%		10,677	
	Sub-Total		-	46,267	
General Contractors General Conditions		30.00%		10,677	
	Sub-Total		-	56,944	
General Contractors Fee		10.00%		5,694	
	Sub-Total		-	62,638	
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		9,396	
Total for Queu	ie Area Primai	ry Check	-	72,034	
New Close-in Parking Structure Garage located P3 site. Cost of \$28,000 per space obtained from Port Multi-story parking structure including all construction cost [average cost for parking structure \$22,500 per space]	3,190	Space	28,000.00 	89,320,000	
	Sub-Total			89,320,000	
General Contractors General Conditions	incl in above				
	Sub-Total			89,320,000	
General Contractors Fee		incl in abo	ove		
	Sub-Total		-	89,320,000	
Design & Estimating Contingency		10.00%		8,932,000	
Total for New Clos	e in Parking S	Structure	-	98,252,000	
Employee Parking Employee Lot Parking [300 Spaces] Temporary Work					
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc Demolition work associated with removal of existing facility of Demolition	10,833 n new site	SY	2.00	21,666	
Demolition of existing buildings Remove slab on grade and foundation to buildings Site Preparation	1 1	LS LS	20,000.00 10,000.00	20,000 10,000	
Allowance for pavement and other demolition work Allowance for miscellaneous demolition work	7,150 1	SY LS	10.00 5,000.00	71,498 5,000	

PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN			Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 2009 DN
PAL-5 2035 BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIM	ATF			
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals
Erosion & sedimentary control Site Work	10,833	SY	2.25	24,374
3" asphalt on 4" crushed rock base including excavation Pavement marking and signage Concrete curb and gutter Storm drainage Oil/water separator Lighting poles Allowance for landscaping Miscellaneous parking equipment including barriers Electrical supply Fire hydrant and water main Fencing Vehicle entry gates electronically controlled Miscellaneous site work	10,833 10,833 1,300 10,833 1 1 6 1 1 1 1,280 1 1 Sub-Total	SY SY LF SY LS LS LS LS LS LS LS LS 12.00	37.50 2.50 24.00 8.50 10,000.00 3,500.00 22,000.00 20,000.00 20,000.00 33.00 8,500.00 24,000.00	406,238 27,083 31,199 92,081 10,000 56,000 22,000 12,500 20,000 42,240 8,500 24,000 924,378
General Contractors General Conditions	12.00% Sub-Total			110,925
General Contractors Fee	Sub-Total	6.50	-	67,295 1,102,598
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00	%	165,390
Total for <u>Curbside Loading & Unloading</u> Deplaning curbside [alteration to accommodate buses, vans etc] All cost involved have been taken care of in PAL-4 Curbside Roadway lanes	Employee Lo	t Parkir	ng _	1,267,987
Enplaning roadway curbside Roadway alteration roadwork adding traffic island has been Further work to increase enplaning will encounter major des No estimated cost included in PAL-5	included in PAI ign work	4		
Rental Car Facility No increase in this facility has been planned under PAL-5				
Roadway No roadwork changes or additions have been planned under	r PAL-5			
NE 82nd Avenue/NE Alderwood Road Signalizing existing intersection Project cost for allowance from Port \$750,000 Adjusted for construction cost				500,000

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON	P	Date: repared By:	October 21, 2009 DN						
CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER FLAN PAL-5 2035									
BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMATE									
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Incl.	Totals					
			_						
Total for NE Alderwood R	oad/NE Cornf	ort Road	-	500,000					
AIR CARGO All Cargo [New Facility]									
Warehouse Space									
New warehouse area 192,000 SF Site preparation and utilities to Warehouse only									
I emporary Work	4		10 000 00	10.000					
Traffic control	1		8 500 00	10,000					
Demolition & Site Preparation	I	10	0,000.00	0,300					
Miscellaneous general demolition work	1	LS	20,000.00	20,000					
Miscellaneous demolition work including drainage and site utilities	1	LS	8,000.00	8,000					
Clear and prepare site for building pad	21,333	SY	0.50	10,667					
Erosion & sedimentary control	21,333	SY	1.00	21,333					
Grade for new building pad	21,333	SY	1.80	38,399					
All warehouse construction work to be performed at Tenant's cost									
Assuming connecting to existing utilities									
Domestic water	1	LS	6,000.00	6,000					
Fire water main	1	LS	6,000.00	6,000					
Fire hydrants	3	EA	4,500.00	13,500					
Sanitary	1	LS	13,500.00	13,500					
Gas	1		6 500 00	6 500					
Electrical supply	1	LS	15.000.00	15.000					
	Sub-Total		-	100 300					
		10 500/		100,000					
General Contractors General Conditions		12.50%	_	23,800					
	Sub-Total			214,199					
General Contractors Fee		6.00%		12,852					
	Sub-Total		-	227,051					
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		34,058					
Total for V	261,108								
Cargo Warehouse Ramp Area									
New ramp area 106,000 SY									
Temporary work	1	LS	50,000.00	50,000					
Escorts [assuming not required as new area]	4	10	20 000 00	20 000					
Demolition & Site Preparation [assuming non paved area]	I	L0	20,000.00	20,000					

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN <u>PAL-5 2035</u> BACK UR DETAIL EST	IMATE		Date: Prepared By:	October 21, 2009 DN
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Totals
		<u></u>		
Miscellaneous demolition work including drainage and electrical work	106,000	SY	0.30	31,800
Clear and prepare site preparation	111,300	SY	0.25	27,825
Miscellaneous general demolition work	1	LS	30,000.00	30,000
New				
Mass excavation	106,786	CY	8.00	854,288
Extra for rock excavation	1,068	CY	45.00	48,054
Remove excavated material and stockpile on site	106,786	CY	4.00	427,144
Frosion & sedimentary control	106,000	SV	0.70	63 600
Imported select compact Sub-base	.37 100	CY	18.00	667 800
Geotech fabric	106.000	SY	1.50	159.000
Crushed aggregate base	24,857	CY	34.00	845,138
Concrete paving 16 1/2" thick	106,000	SY	80.00	8,480,000
Sealer coat concrete	106,000	SY	0.25	26,500
Pavement marking	106,000	SY	0.20	21,200
Utilities	100.000	<u> </u>	45.00	4 500 000
Drainage to ramp area	106,000	SI	15.00	1,590,000
Guidance and general signage	100,000	1.5	25 000 00	205,000
Landscaping	•	20	20,000.00	20,000
Hydro-seeding and landscaping	1	LS	25,000.00	25,000
	Sub-Total		-	13,735,259
General Contractors General Conditions		12.509	%	1,716,907
	Sub-Total		-	15,452,166
General Contractors Fee		6.009	%	927,130
	Sub-Total		-	16,379,296
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.009	%	2,456,894
Total fo	or Warehouse Ra	mp Are	a _	18,836,190
Cargo Landside Area				
New landside area 192,000 SF				
Temporary Work				
Allowance for temporary work and fencing etc	21,333	SY	2.00	42,666
Traffic co-ordination and control	1	LS	10,000.00	10,000
Demolition & Site Preparation [assuming non paved area]	040		0.00	0.040
Remove existing tencing etc Miscellaneous demolition	640 1		0.00 12 500 00	3,840 12 500
Clear and prepare site for building pad	21 333	SY	0.50	12,500
Erosion & sedimentary control	21.333	SY	1.00	21,333
Grade for new building pad	21,333	SY	1.80	38,399
New All cargo landside construction work to be performed at Tenant's cost Site Utilities				

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN PAL-5 2035		Ρ	Date: repared By:	October 21, 20 DN	09			
BACK-UP DETAIL ESTIMATE								
Item Description	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost Incl.	Totals				
Fire water main Sanitary Storm water Electrical supply	1 1 1 1	LS LS LS LS	20,000.00 10,000.00 25,000.00 15,000.00	20,000 10,000 25,000 15,000				
	Sub-Total		-	209,405	•			
General Contractors General Conditions		13.00%		27,223				
	Sub-Total		-	236,628	•			
General Contractors Fee		6.50%		15,381				
	Sub-Total		-	252,008	•			
Design & Estimating Contingency		15.00%		37,801				
Total for	Cargo Lands	side Area	-	289,810				

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN

Project Development & Support

Information from Port of Portlan	d
Project Admin	4.00%
Design Fees	26.00%
Construction Management	18.00%
Permit	1.00%
Close-out	1.00%
_	50.0%

Poject Development Contingency

20%

MASTER PLAN PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PORTLAND, OREGON CONCEPT ESTIMATE FOR MASTER PLAN

	Escalation	Cost	escalation amount				
	Current start	May-08 December-89 over 20 years	3.3%				
	Using Escalation	Sep-09	3.33%	m annual inflatio	ionths on over 2	Year 0 years	
	Sep-09	103.3%	0.033	1.000	0.0333	1.0000	0.000/
	Sep-10	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	0.0344	3.33%
PAL-1	Sep-12	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	0.0356	10.33%
	Sep-13	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	0.0367	14.00%
	Sep-14	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	0.0380	17.80%
	Sep-15	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	0.0392	21.72%
	Sep-16	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	1.2577	25.77%
PAL-2	Sep-17	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	1.2996 0.0433	29.96%
	Sep-18	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	1.3429 0.0447	34.29%
	Sep-19	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	1.3876 0.0462	38.76%
	Sep-20	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	0.0477	48.16%
PAL-3	Sep-22	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	0.0493	53.09%
	Sep-23	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	0.0510	58.19%
	Sep-24	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	0.0527	63.45%
	Sep-25	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	1.6890 0.0562	68.90%
	Sep-26	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	1.7452 0.0581	74.52%
PAL-4	Sep-27	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	1.8033 0.0601	80.33%
	Sep-28	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	1.8634 0.0621	92 54%
	Sep-29	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	0.0641	98.96%
	Sep-31	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	0.0663	105.58%
	Aug-32	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	0.0685	112.43%
	Sep-33	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	0.0707	119.50%
	Sep-34	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	2.2681	126.81%
PAL-5	Sep-35	103.3%	0.0333	1.000	0.0333	2.3436	134.36%

8.14.3 Scope

The enplaning roadway study should consider the potential impact of construction of the additional lanes on the entire terminal area, especially the lower level roadway.

8.14.4 Timing

The enplaning roadway study should be completed within two years of the Master Plan Update to accommodate PAL 1 requirements.

