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## AGENDA

1. Forecast Review (with 14 MAP High Case)
2. Gate Requirements and Aircraft Parking Analysis
3. Terminal Capacity Enhancement
4. Landside Capacity Enhancement
5. Going Forward

# 14 MAP BASE AND HIGH CASE FORECAST 

Summary

## INCREASE IN DESIGN DAY OPERATIONS

- In order to reach 14 MAP, there will need to be between 88 and 106 operations added in the design day from 2016.



## BANKING STRUCTURE 14 MAP VS HIGH CASE

NORMAN Y. MINETA

DEPARTURES


ARRIVALS


| Year/Scenario | Morning Departures <br> $(06: 00-07: 59)$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2016 | 26 |
| 2017 | 35 |
| 14 MAP | 38 |
| 14 MAP High Case | 46 |

## PEAK HOUR DOMESTIC PASSENGERS

NORMAN Y. MINETA

- Terminal B has a higher increase in domestic passenger peaks (14 MAP vs High Case) due to Alaska and Southwest operations

Terminal A Peaks
14 MAP = 1,361 ARR; 1,604 DEP
High Case $=1,458$ ARR; 1,808 DEP

Terminal B Peaks
14 MAP = 1,450 ARR; 1,637 DEP
High Case $=1,718$ ARR; 2,247 DEP

## GATE REQUIREMENTS AND AIRCRAFT PARKING ANALYSIS

## METHODOLOGY

NORMAN Y. MINETA

- Developed gate requirements for three demand levels - 2017, 14MAP, 14MAP High
- Chart presents rolling-hour comparison
- Multiple airline-to-gate allocation scenarios were considered for each demand level
- Each scenario gated 100 times with scheduled time variation
- Planning based on $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile to provide robust solution



## GATE REQUIREMENT RESULTS

NORMAN Y. MINETA

- Examined 8 scenarios (2017 thru 14 MAP High) with various airline gate assignments
- Determined number of remote operations and RON requirements for each demand level
- Only minor variations between scenarios

|  |  | 2017 | 14MAP | 14MAP High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Remote Bus Gate | North | $2 N B$ | 2NB | 2NB |
| Requirements | South | - | $2 N B$ | $4 N B+2 R J$ |
| RON Requirements | $1 \mathrm{WB}+11 \mathrm{NB}+3 R J$ | $1 \mathrm{WB}+15 \mathrm{NB}+4 \mathrm{RJ}$ | 1WB + 25NB + 4RJ |  |
| (Existing RON positions $=12)$ | 15 | 20 | 30 |  |

WB = Widebody; NB = Narrowbody; RJ = Regional Jet

- In most cases, remote bussing gates only have 1-3 operations per day
- Arrivals and departures counted separately
- Bussing gate requirements may be reduced by adjusting scheduled arrival/departure times of new flights, but could increase number of remote operations on some remote gates


## REQUIREMENT VS. CAPACITY

NORMAN Y. MINETA

- Even with conversion of car parking lot to aircraft parking, still short up to 4 RON positions at 14 Map High Scenario



## GAP ANALYSIS

- 14 MAP High Demand indicates gap of 4 RON positions
- RON requirement could be accommodated using a combination of:
- Parking in the west airfield
- Demand management
- Operational strategies
- Most RON positions only used for 1 turn flight a day
- Inability to provide 4 RON positions could result in the loss of about 4 turn flight operations per day


## GAP ANALYSIS ASSUMPTIONS / PARAMETERS

## S $\triangle$ MAN. MINETA

- IATA Optimum Level of Service (formerly LOS C) parameters used as basis for capacity analysis
- Airports operating at or slightly above capacity typically experience Suboptimum LOS during the peak periods
- Professional judgement based on L\&B experience used where passenger or operating characteristics were not available

| Terminal Component | Assumptions / Parameters | Source(s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ticketing Counters | Preferential and common-use airlines assigned counters based on lease agreement | SJC |
| Security Checkpoint | 160 passengers per hour per lane blended (standard and Pre $\checkmark$ lanes); 10.8 square feet per person in queue | L\&B experience, IATA |
| Baggage Screening | 720 bags per hour per EDS; 1 additional EDS required for $\mathrm{N}+1$ redundancy | L\&B experience, TSA |
| Baggage Make-up | 3-4 carts per NB; 7-8 carts per WB based on peak 2-hour departures; 12 feet of frontage per cart or container | L\&B experience |
| Holdrooms | Based on max aircraft capacity of gate: 3,300 SF for WB (B787-9); 2,400 SF for NB (B737-MAX9) | IATA |
| Concessions | 7.0 square feet per 1,000 enplaned passenger (primarily domestic O\&D airport) | L\&B experience |
| Baggage Claim - DOM | 1.5 linear feet of claim frontage per peak 20-minute deplaning passenger; $60 \%$ of passengers check bags | L\&B experience |
| Baggage Claim - INT | 2.0 linear feet of claim frontage per claiming passenger; $90 \%$ of passengers check bags | L\&B experience |
| CBP Processing | Based on CBP ATDS guidelines per peak hour passengers; 400 in 2017, 600 for 14 MAP | CBP ATDS |
| Arrivals Hall | . 3 meeters/greeters per passenger; 20.5 square feet per person; $20 \%$ additional area for seating | IATA, L\&B experience |

## GATE ALLOCATION ASSUMPTIONS



- Gate usage assumptions:
- Preferred-use airlines use their preferred gates
- Common-use carriers and international arrivals are given first priority on common-use gates
- Preferred-use airlines can use common-use gates if they cannot fit on their preferred gates
- Common-use gate usage based on location of airline's preferential-use gates
- Since AC does not need FIS-capable gate, always assigned to Gate 1
- 12 remote positions available - 5 in the North Apron and 7 in the South Apron


## TERMINAL CAPACITY GAP ANALYSIS SUMMARY

## KEY CAPACITY ISSUES:

- Terminal A
- Baggage Make-up
- Holdrooms
- Bag Claim Area
- Terminal B
- Ticket Counters
- Baggage Make-up
- SSCP Lanes
- Bag Claim Frontage
- Bag Claim Area

Z

TERMINAL A

| Element | Existing | 2017 | 14 MAP | HIGH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ticketing/Check-in | 60 | 56* | 60* | 64* |
| Air Canada | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Air China | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| American Airlines | 10 | 14 | 14 | 16 |
| Hawaiian Airlines | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Jet Blue | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| United Airlines | 6 | 4 | 4 | 6 |
| Volaris | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Delta Air Lines | 6 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| All Nippon Airways | 6 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Aeromexico | - | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| New INT 1 | - | - | 8 | 8 |
| New INT 2 | - | - | 8 | 8 |
| New INT 3 | - | - | 6 | 6 |
| Baggage Screening | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Baggage Make-up | 542 | 528 | 600 | 720 |
| SSCP - Lanes | 8 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| SSCP - Queue Area | 4,820 | 3,000 | 3,500 | 3,900 |
| Concessions - Secure | 17,600 | 16,800 | 21,700 | 21,700 |
| Holdrooms** | 34,060 | 45,900 | 45,900 | 45,900 |
| Bag Claim - Frontage | 460 | 410 | 460 | 500 |
| Bag Claim - Area | 14,000 | 14,300 | 16,000 | 17,500 |

TERMINAL B

| Element | Existing | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 4}$ MAP | HIGH |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ticketing/Check-in | 40 | $48^{*}$ | $48^{*}$ | $58^{*}$ |
| Alaska Airlines | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 6}$ |
| British Airways | $\mathbf{8}$ | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Lufthansa | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ |
| Southwest Airlines | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 6}$ |
| Hainan Airlines | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ |
| Baggage Screening | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | 3 | 4 |
| Baggage Make-up | 720 | 708 | 768 | 948 |
| SSCP - Lanes | $\mathbf{8}$ | 7 | 8 | 11 |
| SSCP - Queue Area | 5,500 | 3,200 | 3,500 | 5,000 |
| Concessions - Secure | 29,900 | 25,200 | 28,000 | 28,000 |
| Holdrooms** | 48,315 | 33,600 | 38,400 | 45,600 |
| Bag Claim - Frontage | 537 | 590 | 640 | 765 |
| Bag Claim - Area | 17,600 | 17,800 | 19,000 | 23,000 |

Notes:

* Numbers shown bold are included in peak ticket counter position requirements due to the timing of the flights.
** Includes remote bus gate holdrooms


Capacity Meets or Exceeds Demand, Optimum LOS
Demand Exceeds Capacity, Optimum/SubOptimum LOS
Demand Substantially Exceeds Capacity, SubOptimum LOS

## CAPACITY GAP ANALYSIS - CBP FACILITIES ("FIS")

- Most components of the CBP facilities are suboptimum for 2017 and 14 MAP
- Passport Check queue area is significantly undersized
- Claim devices are undersized (target: 250-300 LF each for widebody aircraft)
- Exit Control area is undersized
- Arrivals Hall is undersized for 14 MAP

| Element | Existing | 2017 | 14 MAP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Primary Processing |  |  |  |
| Officer Positions | 10 | 8 | 12 |
| Queueing | 2,450 | 3,760 | 5,640 |
| Secondary Processing <br> Secondary Queueing <br> Secondary Inspection <br> Exit Control <br> Exit Podium <br> International Bag Claim <br> Claim Devices ${ }^{1}$ | 1 |  |  |
| Claim Frontage | 2 | 500 | 750 |
| Arrivals Hall | 337 | 420 | 1 |
| Arrivals Hall |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Includes the new flat plate international bag claim device.
2. Includes new arrivals hall expansion.

## TERMINAL CAPACITY ENHANCEMENT OPTIONS

## REMOTE GATE HOLDROOMS - LOCATIONS

norman y. mineta


Terminal A FIS Building
Terminal B
Level 2 shown for reference

## REMOTE GATE HOLDROOMS - A NORTH



- Convert Support Space to Holdroom
- Public Restroom needed on Level 1
- Holdroom Area
$\sim 5,100$ s.f.
- Accommodates: 2 Narrowbodies or 1 Widebody


## A NORTH PASSENGER BUSSING OPERATION



- Passenger buses would follow the vehicle service road (VSR) from the bus loading area to the remote gates (travel distance to farthest remote gate approximately 0.35 miles)
- Additional VSR road striping to be added at the remote gates
$Z \backslash \in B$
- Vehicle ingress/egress to the aircraft fuel truck refueling facility accounted for


## REMOTE GATE HOLDROOMS - TERMINAL B

NORMAN Y. MINETA


- Convert support space into Remote Holdrooms
- Holdroom Area $\sim 5,170$ s.f.
- Accommodates: 2 NB
- Bus operations a major challenge


## TERMINAL B PASSENGER BUSSING OPERATION

NORMAN Y. MINETA
INTERNATIONAL


## REMOTE HOLDROOMS - CONVERT FIS

NORMAN Y. MINETA


- Reallocate vacated CBP area into Remote Holdrooms \& Support Space for Airport
- Hold Room Area ~12,000 s.f.
- Accommodates: 5 NB



## TERMINAL B BAG CLAIM

NORMAN Y. MINETA

- Expand existing claim devices
- 103 linear feet of additional claim frontage required
- Additional claim devices required for High Scenario
- Likely to be included in TB Phase 2


20

Terminal B
+32 LF Bag Claim Device
+20 LF Bag Claim Device

## TERMINAL CAPACITY ENHANCEMENT OPTIONS CBP Facilities

NORMAN Y. MINETA

## Key Issues:



- Insufficient capacity for 2017+
- Gate dependencies limit flexibility
- Limited expansion ability


OPTION 1 - ENHANCED APC
NORMAN Y. MINETA
SAN JOSE A I R P 0 R
A


Operation
Reduce overall queue and wait time by increasing process times with the use of new expanded APC zone.

- Displaces Airport Administration offices in Terminal B

- Not a long-term solution but could be part of an interim improvement


## OPTION 2 - RELOCATE PASSPORT CHECK

norman y. mineta

New Passport Check on a I R P O

Level 3 with increased


Operation
Relocate Passport Check to Level 3 and increase queue size.

- Not a long-term solution, does not address Baggage Claim or Exit Control
- Implementation phasing likely a major challenge
- Displaces The Club at SJC (relocate to Level 2?)


## OPTION 3 - RELOCATE CBP

NORMAN Y. MINETA

A I R P O R T


Operation
Relocate all CBP to Level 1 Terminal B.

- Potential long-term solution
- Displaces nearly all Airport Administration offices
- Curbside access a major issue


## OPTION 4 - RELOCATE CBP - TB PH. 2

NORMAN Y. MINETA


Oper
Relocate all CBP to Level 1 Terminal B - Phase 2.

- Potential long-term solution

- Long-term expansion
- Implementation time a key issue


## CBP - COMPARISON OF OPTIONS

norman y.mineta

| Key Metric | Option 1 <br> Enhanced APC | Option 2 <br> Relocate Passport Check | Option 3 <br> Relocate CBP | Option 4 <br> New CBP in TB PH 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity Enhancement | Improved Passport Check Processing | Passport Check meets 14 MAP requirements | Meets 14 MAP requirements | Meets 14 MAP requirements |
| APC Zone | Yes | No (insufficient space) | Yes | Yes |
| Vertical Transitions | No change - down 1, up 1, down 1 | Up 1, down 2 | Down 1 | Down 1 |
| Implementation Considerations | Relocation of Airport Offices | Floor elevation differences between buildings, Phasing, Expanding $3^{\text {rd }}$ floor onto existing roofs | Phasing, Relocation of Airport Offices | Part of Terminal B Phase 2 |
| Benefits | Increased processing capacity without additional CBP staff, Additional queue area | Eliminate gate dependencies, Integrate ACP and Passport Check | Ideal CBP configuration | Ideal CBP configuration, Long-term expansion capability, No impact to existing space |
| Challenges | Relocating Airport Offices, Does not address Bag Claim or Exit Control | Does not address Bag Claim or Exit Control, Potential loss of revenue space (Club at SJC), Complex implementation | Relocating Airport Offices, Curbside access, Connection to TA and TB | May require interim improvements at existing CBP due to construction time for Terminal B Phase 2 |

## GAP ANALYSIS

NORMAN Y. MINETA

- Departures processing capacity at Terminals $A \& B$ is capable of accommodating 14 MAP
- Enforcement of lease agreement is required for ticket counter allocation
- Southwest and Alaska to maintain their current ticket counter allocation
- Terminal B baggage claim frontage and claim hall area is less than required but will accommodate 14 MAP at reduced levels of service during the peak periods
- CBP Passport Check and International baggage claim capacity are below the target requirements for 14 MAP
- Enlargement of the Passport Check queue area and increased processing capacity are necessary for 14 MAP


## LANDSIDE CAPACITY ENHANCEMENT <br> Gap Analysis and Capacity Enhancement Options

## LANDSIDE LOS - 2017 DESIGN DAY
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$$
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## LANDSIDE LOS - 14 MAP
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## LANDSIDE LOS - 14 MAP HIGH

NORMAN Y. MINETA
INTERNATIONAL

A I R P 0 R


## GOING FORWARD
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- Refine capacity enhancement scenario(s)
- Prepare Operational Strategy
- Prepare Capital Project Strategy


## SURFACE PARKING LOT CONVERSION

NORMAN Y. MINETA


- South Parking Lot can be converted into:
- 9 B737-MAX9 positions or 4 A330-800 NEO aircraft
- Widebody/MARS parking capability
- An estimated 800-850 surface parking positions would be lost

