

Airport Capacity Benchmarks *Trends and Issues in Airport Utilization*

William J. Swedish Thomas P. Berry, Jr. 18 March 2003

Presentation to the Annual Energy Outlook 2003 Conference



© 2003 The MITRE Corporation. All Rights Reserved. F063-B03-020

Objectives of Benchmarks

- "We need a set of capacity benchmarks to understand the impact of airline scheduling and what relief can realistically be provided by the ATC modernization effort, new controller procedures and new ground infrastructure in the near and longer term."
 - Kenneth Mead, DOT Inspector General
 - Hearing of the Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee, 14 September 2000



Capacity Benchmark Report



Airport Capacity Benchmark Report 2001

FLIGHT	DESTINATION	TIME	
117	BOSTON	0935	2
4916	NEWARK	0935	Summer and
377	PHILADLLPHIA	0935	-
576 213	CHICAGO	0940	-
385	SAN FRANCISCO	0940	



Executive Summary

Setting the Framework for Benchmarks

The benchmarks in this report are a relatively simple expression of a complex quantity, airport capacity, They serve primarily as a reference point on the state of the airport system at a specific time. They can be updated in the future to mark progress. They can also be used to identify and compare specific types of airports, for instance to determine which airports are most severely affected by adverse weather or to compare the prospects for airports that plan to build new runways to those that do not. The benchmarks also provide a starting point for public policy discussions, because they give a succinct report on the current and future state of major airport capacity.

Benchmarks are useful data that help frame discussions. However, they are not a substitute for the more detailed analysis that should precede major investment and policy decisions. In this sense they might be compared to a vital sign of human health, such as blood pressure. That simple indicator might be the starting point for a diagnosis, but more information would be wanted before recommending surgery. Similarly, capacity benchmarks help identify problem areas but are not, in themselves, an adequate basis for selecting remedies.

This issue is apparent in the case of Atlanta Hartsfield International Airport. The scheduled operations exceed the benchmarks several times daily in optimum weather and frequently under reduced rate conditions. The simple comparison of schedule to benchmarks suggests that some action is needed to curtail the schedule. However, air traffic controllers, airlines, and the airport operator have indicated in discussions that they are relatively comfortable with the current schedule and believe that it makes efficient use of the airport. Their judgment is based on vast experience and a broad understanding of air transportation. Some of the considerations are specific to Atlanta (favorable runway configuration, weather patterns, and airsnare structure) some are anolicable to transfer tub airports in general (the

Methodology

 Between October 2000 and April 2001, the FAA and MITRE/CAASD developed capacity benchmarks for 31 airports.

> conditions, runway configurations, and the mix of aircraft types. Capacity benchmarks assume there are no constraints in the en route system or the airport terminal area. They are useful for broad policy discussions and the development of long-term strategies.

Methodology

- Between October 2000 and April 2001, the FAA and MITRE/CAASD developed capacity benchmarks for 31 airports.
- There are two rates for each airport an optimum rate based on good weather conditions and a
 reduced rate based on adverse weather conditions, which may include poor visibility, unfavorable
 winds, or heavy precipitation.



Description of Benchmarks

- Benchmarks are a starting point for public policy discussions
- Benchmarks are a *sustainable* level of operations for the given conditions
 - Can be exceeded occasionally
 - Lower rates can be expected if conditions are worse
- Two Benchmark rates per airport
 - Optimum Rate best weather and runway configuration
 - Reduced Rate most commonly used configuration in adverse weather
- Capacity benchmarks combined actual data and computer models



Step 1. Use operational counts (FAA data) to determine actual hourly throughputs



F063-B03-020



Step 2. Compare to rates reported by facility

6





F063-B03-020

7

Step 4. Use calibrated model to develop future capacities for new runways, procedures, technology



ATL Benchmark Summary



• New runways and other improvements will increase capacity

Scenario	Optimum Rate	Reduced Rate
Today	185-200	167-174
New Runway	243-258	212-219
Plus planned improvements	254-269	224-231





Benefit of a New Runway Depends on Current Configuration, Use of New Runway



Technology and Procedural Improvements Provide Benefit of 0–17 Percent



ATL: Friday, Feb 28, 2003 Delays Departure Arrival TMS 18 0 15 3



Actual operations are limited by airport capacity





Airlines are Adjusting Schedules in Response *American's DFW Rolling Hub*

AA DFW OAG Scheduled Arrivals



© 2003 The MITRE Corporation. All Rights Reserved.

Changes in Demand

Network carriers have lost a record \$15 billion in the past 24 months, while the low cost carriers remained profitable



Low Cost Carriers Frequently Use Secondary Airports in Major Markets



Metropolitan Areas Continue to Grow



Expect Traffic to Change in the Following Ways

- More flights by low cost carriers as they leverage their cost advantages
- More flights by regional jets operated by regional airlines as network carrier transfer routes
- Some business jets and fractional or on-demand traffic increases

A more diverse set of users with more evenly distributed influence





Volume Will Return but with Changes in its Distribution

- Airports
 - Major airports may reach capacity limits
 - Even though planned improvements will increase capacity
 - New runways, where possible, provide largest increase
 - Secondary airport growth in major metropolitan areas
 - Fewer hubs as airlines restructure
 - Rolling, less peaky hubs will become standard practice

