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Major Renovation Evaluation for
Kansas City International Airport

February 2, 2016
Agenda

• Briefly review Exhibit K
• Process to establish Program Requirements
• Review Major Renovation concepts
• Review Evaluation criteria
• Explain why Airlines decided to table Major Renovations
• Review Crawford Concept
• Questions & Discussion
Airline Perspective - Major Events

• April 2013 – KCAD unveils Advanced Planning Document

• May 2013 – Mayor creates Terminal Advisory Group

• September 2013 – Airlines enter into lease extension negotiations with KCAD

• March 2014 – City approves Lease Extension through April 2016 which incorporates Exhibit K – Terminal Project Procedures
Exhibit K - Purpose

• Developed a non-political and methodical process to evaluate both Major Renovation and New Terminal options

• Established Leadership Committee made up of KCAD and Airline representatives

• Revisited future Aviation Demand for the Kansas City market

• Established facility requirements based on that future demand

• Requires Airport/Airline agreement on Terminal Development
Exhibit K - Planning Team

Leadership Committee

City of Kansas City
Mayor/City Council

Kansas City International Airport
Director of Aviation

Deputy Director
Engineering Program Director

Deputy Director
Commercial Development

Deputy Director
Finance

Deputy Director
Commercial Development

AAAC Chairperson or Designee

Airport & Airline Affairs Committee (AAAC)

TERMINAL PLANNING TEAM L&B

TERMINAL PROGRAMMING L&B

CONCEPTUAL DESIGN

MAJOR RENOVATION PGAL WA

NEW TERMINAL PGAL

LANDSIDE HNTB

UTILITIES & CUP SKDesign HNTB

MEPFP Ross & Baruzzini PGAL/WA

Bag Handling Systems VTC

AIRSIDE L&B

FUELING HNTB

DEICING L&B HNTB

CONCESSIONS AirProjects Inc.

Terminal Planning Team
Establishing Requirements
3Q2014 to 4Q2014
Program Objectives

Improving KCI

- Customer Convenience
- Affordability
- Construct-ability
- Efficiency
- Flexibility
- Right-Sized
- Technology
Establishing Requirements - Approach

Workshops

• Established formal workshops and schedules

• Workshops included Airlines, KCAD staff, airline and airport subject matter experts, and planning team consultants

• Workshops established requirements and reviewed alternative approaches

• Held 15 formal workshops supplemented by additional clarifying discussions and conference calls
Establishing Requirements

Workshops

• Aviation Demand Forecasting
• Airside Programming
  • Aircraft Movement
  • Aircraft Parking
  • Remain Overnight (RON) Aircraft Parking
  • Deicing
Establishing Requirements

Workshops

• Terminal Programming
  • Passenger Flows
  • Passenger Amenities
  • Airline Operations
  • Airport Operations

• Baggage System Programming
  • Number of Bags
  • Latest TSA security requirements
  • Movement to/from terminal/aircraft

• Landside Programming including Parking
  • Traffic volumes, movements, and modes
Aviation Forecast Approach

**Airline input**
Proprietary airline forecasts were collected in confidential conference calls, correspondence and in-person interviews.

**City-pairs**
Analyzed city-pair markets based on airline input on service to existing and new destinations to prepare forecasted schedules.

**Operations**
Derived Avg. Day Peak Month (ADPM) passenger airline aircraft operations based on forecasted schedules and aircraft fleets.

**Passengers**
Derived Avg. Day Peak Month (ADPM) passengers based on forecasted schedules and load factors.

**Annual Demand**
Derived annual passenger airline activity in 2025 and 2030 based on forecasted schedules.
Resultant Forecast

General Forecast Requirements

• Design Day Flight Schedules for 2025 & 2030
• Enplanements grow at 1.9%
• 2013 Enplanements were 4.9M
  2030 Enplanements projected for 6.9M
• Enplanement growth will come through existing airlines utilizing larger airplanes
KCI needs 35 gates in 2030. (29 currently leased)

Aircraft Operations (Arrivals and Departures) in 2030
Resultant Airside Program Highlights

Airside Program Requirements

• These Criteria were developed from the 2025/2030 Flight Schedules

• 35 Gates (Design Aircraft B737-900/A321)
  • 31 Airline Gates
  • 4 City Gates (internationally capable allowing for two dependent widebodies)

• 7 Gates and core processors for future expansion (Total of 42 gates)

• Requirement for 19 remain overnight aircraft parking positions

• Eliminate aircraft movement conflicts

• Defrosting at gates/taxilanes and deicing at pads
Resultant Terminal Program Highlights

Terminal Program Requirements

Departure Requirements

• Customer Convenience and Walking Distances
• Consolidated Check-in Lobby (Ticketing & SSD)
• Consolidated Baggage System (in-line security screening)
• Consolidated Security Screening Checkpoint (SSCP)
• Proper Holdroom sizes
• Concessions (public, storage, and delivery)

Support Spaces

• Building Maintenance
• Airport Operations
• Airline Operations
Resultant Terminal Program Highlights

Terminal Program Requirements

Domestic Arrivals
• Consolidated Baggage Claim
• Baggage Support Spaces

International Arrivals
• Sterile Circulation
• US Customs & Border Protection
• Isolated International Baggage Claim
• Meeter/Greeter Area
## Existing & Proposed Terminal Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>Existing* Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gates</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticketing/Check-in</td>
<td>20,879 32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Checkpoint</td>
<td>29,951 18,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departure Lounges</td>
<td>100,281 81,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Security Departure Corridor</td>
<td>0 95,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Security Restrooms</td>
<td>4,949 11,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airline Club</td>
<td>0 2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Arrivals</td>
<td>21,001 31,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessions</td>
<td>60,097 70,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Security Circulation, Restrooms, and Seating</strong></td>
<td>156,283 58,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bag Claim</td>
<td>17,745 45,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baggage Makeup</td>
<td>72,761 82,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airline Operations/ATO/BSO</td>
<td>96,591 56,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Public Spaces</td>
<td>91,955 49,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Functions (HVAC, MEP)</td>
<td>101,357 117,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>773,850</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Existing Terminals B&C

**SQUARE FEET**
Resultant Landside Program Highlights

Landside Program Requirements

• Improve Terminal Roadways

• Improve Safety and Congestion of Terminal Roadways by Separating Curbs for Arrivals and Departures and minimizing conflicts

• Parking Structure for 6,500 spaces (4,264 today)

• Close-in Surface Parking for 1,940 spaces (1,722 today)
Major Renovation
Alternatives 4Q2014 to 2Q2015
Site Alternatives
Site Alternatives

Planning Team focused on Existing Terminal Area

- Terminal A & B Site
- Terminal B & C Site
- Terminal C Site
- Terminal A, B, & C Site
Concept Development

Preliminary Concepts

Major Renovations

Site A and B
Concept Development

Preliminary Concepts

Major Renovations

Site B and C

Site C
Concept Development

Preliminary Concepts

Major Renovations

Site A, B and C
Major Renovations
The First Cut
Major Renovations - First Cut

- High level evaluation by KCAD/Airlines
  - Roadway Access
  - Parking
  - Terminal Access
  - Terminal/Concourse Configuration
  - Airside Access & Aircraft Parking

- Reduced 25 Alternatives to 11 Alternatives

- 11 Alternatives modified to conform with program requirements and consolidated

- 9 Alternatives made it through to the next level of evaluation
Concept Analysis – MR 1
Concept Analysis - MR 2
Concept Analysis - MR 3
Concept Analysis - MR 4
Concept Analysis - MR 5
Concept Analysis - MR 6
Concept Analysis - MR 7
Concept Analysis - MR 8
Concept Analysis - MR 9
Major Renovation

The Finalists
KCAD and the airlines reviewed options identified in earlier studies, ideas from the Mayor’s Terminal Advisory Group, and public comments; then generated numerous new terminal alternatives to optimize the configurations.

### Overview of Terminal Planning Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Renovation</th>
<th>New Terminal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>OPTION A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>OPTION B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### New Terminal (NT) Options
- Option A
- Option B

#### Major Renovation (MR) Options
- Option A
- Option B
Proposed MR-A Conceptual Site Plan

Major Renovation | “MR A”

- Reuses existing Terminal A & B concourses
- Builds a new, two level central processor at both Terminals A & B
- Provides separate arrivals and departures roadways, curbs and parking garages for each terminal
- Added square footage increases cost
Proposed MR-B Conceptual Site Plan

Major Renovation | “MR B”

- Reuses existing Terminal A & B concourses
- Builds a new, two level central processor between Concourses A & B
- Provides separate arrivals and departures roadways and curbs
- Builds a new central parking garage and reuses portions of existing A & B Garages
Major Renovations
Evaluation Process
Evaluation Criteria - Major Categories

- Passenger Convenience
- Safety & Security
- Sustainability – Environmental
- Landside Functionality
- Terminal Functionality
- Baggage Handling Systems
- Airside Functionality
- Future Expansion
- Construction Logistics & Phasing
- Program Costs
# Evaluation Matrices

## Major Renovations

### Alternative Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternatives</th>
<th>212</th>
<th>212</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MR-A</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR-B</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Concept Evaluation Criteria

#### 1.0 Passenger Convenience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Factors</th>
<th>Weighting Factors</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Users Walking Distances &amp; Level Changes</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb to Check-in to Gate</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate to Check-in to Gate</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.0 Safety & Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Factors</th>
<th>Weighting Factors</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screening Performance &amp; Flexibility</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Screening Efficiency</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.0 Sustainability - Environmental

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Factors</th>
<th>Weighting Factors</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Review</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Potential to meet City’s Sustainability Goals</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Evaluation Matrices
## Evaluation Matrices

### Concept Evaluation Criteria

#### MAJOR RENOVATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Concept MR-A</th>
<th>Concept MR-B</th>
<th>Concept MR-C</th>
<th>Concept MR-D</th>
<th>Concept MR-E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future Expansion (Ultimate Buildout)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Logistics and Phasing</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alternatives Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customer Convenience</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Program Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>2025 (ROM) Initial Build Costs</th>
<th>2025 (ROM) Operating Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Weighting Factor: 5.0</td>
<td>Weighting Factor: 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$850M</td>
<td>$1,000M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>$950M &amp; $1,000M</td>
<td>$1,000M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>$1,000M &amp; $1,000M</td>
<td>$1,000M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Cost above $1,000M</td>
<td>$1,000M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Major Renovations
The Cost
# MR-A & Terminal Program Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Major Renovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gates</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticketing/Check-in</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>49,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Checkpoint</td>
<td>18,640</td>
<td>21,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departure Lounges</td>
<td>81,600</td>
<td>92,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Space/Departure Corridor</td>
<td>164,940</td>
<td>211,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airline Club</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>4,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Arrivals</td>
<td>31,460</td>
<td>40,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessions</td>
<td>70,660</td>
<td>73,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bag Claim</td>
<td>45,710</td>
<td>50,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baggage Makeup</td>
<td>82,080</td>
<td>127,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airline Operations/ATO/BSO</td>
<td>56,720</td>
<td>66,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Public Spaces</td>
<td>49,450</td>
<td>49,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Functions</td>
<td>117,200</td>
<td>120,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Area in Use (Square Feet)</strong></td>
<td>752,960</td>
<td>907,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassigned Space</td>
<td></td>
<td>143,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbuilt Tug Drive Through</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Gross Area (Square Feet)</strong></td>
<td>752,960</td>
<td>1,079,799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Initial Connico Cost Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NT-A</th>
<th>NT-B</th>
<th>MR-A</th>
<th>MR-B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Airside</td>
<td>$139,438,514</td>
<td>$132,728,514</td>
<td>$82,333,895</td>
<td>$79,800,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landside</td>
<td>$152,117,279</td>
<td>$150,945,861</td>
<td>$163,582,819</td>
<td>$118,371,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal</td>
<td>$376,109,025</td>
<td>$362,457,613</td>
<td>$458,147,261</td>
<td>$409,959,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEP</td>
<td>$17,596,352</td>
<td>$17,596,352</td>
<td>$17,596,352</td>
<td>$17,596,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$685,261,170</strong></td>
<td><strong>$663,728,340</strong></td>
<td><strong>$721,660,327</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Logistics</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Req’t, Phasing &amp; Temp Constr</td>
<td>$20,557,835</td>
<td>$19,911,850</td>
<td>$28,866,413</td>
<td>$31,286,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions</td>
<td>$56,465,520</td>
<td>$54,691,215</td>
<td>$60,042,139</td>
<td>$52,561,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor OHP</td>
<td>$38,114,226</td>
<td>$36,916,570</td>
<td>$40,528,444</td>
<td>$35,478,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Evolution</td>
<td>$120,059,813</td>
<td>$116,287,197</td>
<td>$170,219,465</td>
<td>$149,011,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$18,409,171</td>
<td>$17,830,703</td>
<td>$20,426,336</td>
<td>$17,881,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Bonds</td>
<td>$9,388,677</td>
<td>$9,093,659</td>
<td>$10,417,431</td>
<td>$9,119,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED Gold</td>
<td>$15,613,658</td>
<td>$15,046,939</td>
<td>$20,808,626</td>
<td>$18,880,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$278,608,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$269,778,133</strong></td>
<td><strong>$351,308,854</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$77,109,606</td>
<td>$74,680,518</td>
<td>$96,567,226</td>
<td>$84,595,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Constr Admin</td>
<td>$96,387,007</td>
<td>$93,350,647</td>
<td>$128,756,302</td>
<td>$112,793,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit/Testing/Insp/Commission’g</td>
<td>$9,638,701</td>
<td>$9,335,065</td>
<td>$21,459,384</td>
<td>$18,798,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art (Terminal Only)</td>
<td>$5,360,689</td>
<td>$5,166,116</td>
<td>$7,144,295</td>
<td>$6,482,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$188,496,003</strong></td>
<td><strong>$182,532,346</strong></td>
<td><strong>$253,927,207</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Construction Contingency</td>
<td>$115,236,607</td>
<td>$111,603,882</td>
<td>$132,689,639</td>
<td>$116,261,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$115,236,607</strong></td>
<td><strong>$111,603,882</strong></td>
<td><strong>$132,689,639</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,267,602,680</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,227,642,701</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,459,586,027</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Airline Reaction to Initial Cost Estimate

- Neither Major Renovation nor New Terminal were affordable
- Initial expectation was that Major Renovation would be more cost effective
- Major Renovations were larger requiring additional capital and ongoing expenses
- Implementation of Major Renovation would take longer to construct
- No reason to accept functional inferiority at equal or higher cost
Leadership Committee immediately initiated an evaluation process which included:

- Meetings between planners/designers and estimator to verify estimate scope and quantities
- Requested that Airlines hire an independent third party estimator to review estimate unit costs and assumptions
- Initiated further work sessions on scope definition
Cost Estimate Evaluation

• Planning team verified scope, quantities, and assumptions with Estimator

• Independent Estimator verified reasonableness of unit costs

• Detailed review of soft costs and contingencies initiated

• Estimators collectively concluded material cost reductions in the Major Renovations could not be achieved

• Concluded that cost of financing and operating a Major Renovation is higher than New Terminal
## Cost Estimate at MR Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NT-A</th>
<th>NT-B</th>
<th>MR-A</th>
<th>MR-B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Airside</td>
<td>$79,602,344</td>
<td>$87,778,724</td>
<td>$54,158,833</td>
<td>$50,937,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landside</td>
<td>$138,088,343</td>
<td>$138,533,343</td>
<td>$154,007,599</td>
<td>$113,600,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal</td>
<td>$368,089,294</td>
<td>$359,509,767</td>
<td>$457,220,041</td>
<td>$412,120,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEP</td>
<td>$17,597,552</td>
<td>$17,597,552</td>
<td>$17,597,552</td>
<td>$17,597,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$603,377,533</td>
<td>$603,419,386</td>
<td>$682,984,025</td>
<td>$594,255,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Logistics</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Req't, Phasing &amp; Temp Constr</td>
<td>$12,067,551</td>
<td>$12,815,789</td>
<td>$27,319,361</td>
<td>$29,712,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions</td>
<td>$49,235,607</td>
<td>$49,298,814</td>
<td>$56,824,271</td>
<td>$49,917,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor OHP</td>
<td>$19,940,421</td>
<td>$19,966,020</td>
<td>$23,013,830</td>
<td>$20,216,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Evolution</td>
<td>$102,693,167</td>
<td>$102,825,001</td>
<td>$138,274,760</td>
<td>$121,467,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$15,746,286</td>
<td>$15,766,500</td>
<td>$18,568,325</td>
<td>$16,311,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Bonds</td>
<td>$8,030,606</td>
<td>$8,040,915</td>
<td>$9,469,846</td>
<td>$8,318,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED Gold</td>
<td>$7,422,069</td>
<td>$7,249,073</td>
<td>$9,974,056</td>
<td>$8,740,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$215,135,707</td>
<td>$215,962,112</td>
<td>$283,444,449</td>
<td>$254,685,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>$16,370,265</td>
<td>$18,416,721</td>
<td>$28,992,854</td>
<td>$25,468,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Constr Admin</td>
<td>$65,481,059</td>
<td>$65,550,520</td>
<td>$96,642,847</td>
<td>$84,894,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit/Test/Insp/Commission'g</td>
<td>$12,277,699</td>
<td>$12,290,722</td>
<td>$14,496,427</td>
<td>$12,734,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art (Terminal Only)</td>
<td>$5,022,267</td>
<td>$4,905,206</td>
<td>$6,749,111</td>
<td>$5,914,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$99,151,290</td>
<td>$101,163,169</td>
<td>$146,881,239</td>
<td>$129,010,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Construction Contingency</td>
<td>$45,883,226</td>
<td>$51,784,781</td>
<td>$77,931,680</td>
<td>$68,456,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$45,883,226</td>
<td>$51,784,781</td>
<td>$77,931,680</td>
<td>$68,456,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$963,547,756</td>
<td>$972,329,448</td>
<td>$1,191,241,393</td>
<td>$1,046,407,617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Airlines unanimously recommended to the Leadership Committee that further discussions on Major Renovations should be tabled to focus on New Terminal alternatives
Crawford Concept
Review
Crawford Concept

Background

• Independent third party alternative
• Developed outside Exhibit K process
• Did not include Airline/KCAD participation
• Crawford Team did not have the benefit of understanding the future facility requirements identified throughout the process
Crawford Concept Walkthrough

- Passenger departure sequence
- Passenger arrival sequence
- Airline operations
  - Baggage
  - Airplanes
Crawford Concept
Crawford Concept
Crawford Concept

VEHICULAR CONFLICTS

MCI Terminal A
Conceptual Layout;
Expansion Inside the Ring

Note(*): additional concessions located throughout secure areas plus some located in the public concourse.
Crawford Concept
Crawford Concept
Crawford Concept
Crawford Concept
Crawford Concept
Crawford Concept
Crawford Concept
Major Renovation – Option A
Crawford Concept - Airline Conclusion

- Airport Roadways – do not facilitate wayfinding or decision-making
- Landside – insufficient curbfront and vehicular movement area, inadequate parking
- Terminal – lack of consolidation leads to inefficient airline/airport operations, security, concessions, and other operational issues
- Outbound Baggage – does not address current security requirements
- Inbound Baggage – leads to customer confusion
- Airside – does not address aircraft movement areas or deicing operation
- Phasing – results in prolonged construction schedule
Crawford Cost Adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crawford Cost Summary</th>
<th>Crawford Concept</th>
<th>Adjustment</th>
<th>Updated Crawford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terminal</strong></td>
<td>403.6M</td>
<td>107.0M</td>
<td>610.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation/repair existing ramp level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140,000 sqft @ $305 per sqft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New construction for BHS, FIS, and Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 sqft @ $1,000 per sqft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Airside</strong></td>
<td>62.7M</td>
<td>53.0M</td>
<td>115.7M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airside Efficiency, Environmental, Deicing, Hydrant Fueling, New Loading Bridges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landside</strong></td>
<td>$104.7M</td>
<td>28.5M</td>
<td>133.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional structured parking (1300 spaces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services/Infrastructure/Utilities/Baggage Systems</strong></td>
<td>100.4M</td>
<td></td>
<td>124.4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance (MR-A) for split baggage system/ MEP replacement chillers</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.0M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programmatic Requirements Total</strong></td>
<td>671.4M</td>
<td>312.7M</td>
<td>984.1M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Costs reflect Terminal A & Terminal B Program Inclusive of Construction & Design Contingency (15%) & Design Fees (9%)
Crawford Concept – Airline Conclusion

• Resembles Major Renovation – Option A
• Two terminals must be developed at a minimum to meet demand
• The concept does not address various critical facility and operational requirements
• Inclusion of those requirements increases the cost to that roughly equivalent to major renovations, while not achieving same level of performance
Crawford Concept confirms Airlines’ conclusion that Major Renovations are less efficient and more costly to construct, finance, operate, and maintain when compared to the New Terminal alternatives. And they provide a lower level of customer service and convenience.
Summary &
Next Steps
Summary

• Airlines actively engaged with the City to evaluate both Major Renovations and New Terminal alternatives through a formal and objective process over the last 2 years

• The Major Renovations are unable to meet the future needs of the Kansas City community related to
  • Customer convenience, future growth opportunity, and gateway to the region
  • Salvaging the “walk to gate” perception

• From an Airline perspective, Major Renovations fail to achieve objectives related to
  • Customer convenience, operational efficiency, future flexibility, constructability, completion schedule, or financial affordability

• The Airlines believe that doing nothing is not a reasonable option
Next Steps

• Airlines are prepared to make a significant investment in the future of Kansas City and its airport terminal facilities

• The goal is to establish an affordable Terminal Modernization Program that meets the future needs of the Kansas City community, achieving customer convenience and operational efficiency objectives

• The Program will be financially backed by the Airlines serving Kansas City and not City tax revenues

• A recommendation is anticipated in the near future regarding a future Terminal Modernization Program as anticipated through the Exhibit K process
Questions & Discussion