

# Request for Additional Budget for Airport Dining and Retail (ADR) Program Redevelopment

ADR Infrastructure  
Modifications  
(CIP#C800638)

# Issues Impacting ADR Construction Timelines

- Commission approved original ADR capital request in October 2014. Construction anticipated to begin in May 2015
- What has happened since:
  - ADR Personnel Transitions
  - Washington State Supreme Court ruling on City of SeaTac Proposition 1
  - Revisions to ADR Lease Group packaging
- Result is that construction began in May 2016

ADR capital construction has incurred a one year delay from the original schedule

# Original Budget and Proposed Changes

Description	Original Budget	Authorization Request	Revised Budget
Construction Costs	\$ 9,046,000		\$ 9,046,000
PMG and Other Soft Costs	\$ 4,075,000		\$ 4,075,000
Other Project Costs	\$ 832,000	\$ -	\$ 832,000
Infrastructure Validation		\$ 2,100,000	\$ 2,100,000
Level of Service Changes		\$ 1,300,000	\$ 1,300,000
"Program" Soft Costs		\$ 3,925,000	\$ 3,925,000
<b>Total Construction Cost</b>	<b>\$ 13,953,000</b>	<b>\$ 7,325,000</b>	<b>\$ 21,278,000</b>

Requested Increase		
Budget Increase		\$ 5,825,000
Budget Transfer		\$ 1,500,000
	<b>Total Authorization</b>	<b>\$ 7,325,000</b>

Schedule delays and scope changes have driven project costs up.

# ADR Scope Changes

- Infrastructure Validation and Facility Constraints (\$2,100,000)
  - Program Redevelopment Infrastructure Validation
    - Initial scope assumptions were inadequate
      - Cut and cap
      - Re-use of existing redundant utilities
    - Detailed Program validation confirmed existing and new utility requirements
    - Delay in schedule added escalation costs
  - Facility Constraint Driven Scope
    - Reconfiguring of Concourse “C” bar due to costly grease interceptor (CC-13)
    - Concourse D location expansion into TSA area requires raising the floor for two locations (CT-6 and CT-27)

Program validation and schedule delays have impacted the budget.

# ADR Scope Changes

- Scope changes due to level of service responses to increased passenger activity (\$1,300,000)
  - Relocating Children's Play Area on Concourse D to create more leasable ADR space (Created CD-8 available)
  - Adding infrastructure to two new food and beverage locations to address food and beverage shortfall on Concourse D (CD-8/CT-27)
  - Adding new location for Ken's Baggage buildout to facilitate a seamless turnover (BC-3A)

Scope has been added to respond to increased passenger levels.

## ADR Soft Cost Increases

- Increasing Soft Cost and Consultant Support (\$3,925,000)
  - Schedule delays
  - ADR infrastructure project is not a traditional construction “Project,” but more of a “Program”
  - Additional staff time to support increased scope
  - ADR staffing gaps
  - Additional design to support Level of Service and scope validation changes

Leasing delays and the prolonged nature of the “Program” have increased soft costs.

# How Capital Work Fits Into Entire ADR Program

\$21 Million: Cost for Port to provide infrastructure and redevelop the Program

\$60-\$65 Million: Cost for Tenants to design and build out their spaces

\$10 million: Expense Projects for Port to support Tenant Design and Construction

Program \$90-\$95 Million

Soft cost increases should be considered in light of the full ADR program oversight.

# ADR Program Benefits and Costs

- Despite increased spending, revised IRR/NPV of 12.3%/ \$15.5 million is still strong.  
(Based on original IRR/NPV capital data. This IRR/NPV is on the conservative side considering the passenger growth the airport has seen).
- Creates level playing field for large and small businesses.
- Maintains a level of service for our customers.

ADR program still showing strong financial performance with increased costs.



# Alternatives Comparison

Alternative	Budget Increase	Effect on ADR Job Creation	Effect on ADR Revenue	Comments
1 – Status Quo	Remains unchanged (\$15.3 Million)	Delay in adding additional jobs the lease packages create	Revenues reduced by \$6 Million to \$64 Million	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall project length extended</li> <li>• High cost to tenants</li> <li>• Not a level playing field</li> </ul>
2 – Add Infrastructure only	Increase by \$2.9 Million (\$18.2 Million)	Delay in adding additional jobs the lease packages create	Revenues reduced by \$3 Million to \$67 Million	Overall project length extended
3 – Add Infrastructure and Soft Costs	Increase by \$5.9 Million (\$21.2 Million)	No delay in additional jobs creation	Maximizes Revenues to \$70 Million	Recommended Alternative

## Alternatives Comparison