



Review of DAA/CIP03 (May 2005)
On behalf of the
Dublin Airport Operators Committee

06 July 2005

International Air Transport Association

800 Place Victoria, B.P. 113
Montreal, Quebec
Canada H4Z 1M1
Tel: +1 (514) 874 0202
Fax: +1 (514) 874 2662
www.iata.org/ics

Introduction

On 20 June 2005, Therese JAGER/US Airways and Chair of the DUB AOC, contacted IATA (Thomas LONERGAN – Mgr. Ireland / Colin SPEAR – Ass. Director Airport Development) and asked that IATA provide comment on the recently released Dublin Airport Capital Investment Programme (DAA/CIP03, May 2005).

The CAR had requested comments before 30 June 2005.

Due to the limited time available, a detailed line-by-line analysis has not undertaken. The following therefore represents IATA's views on the CIP as proposed by the Dublin Airport Authority. Comments are therefore not intended to be exhaustive.

Comments/Questions:

General

- Copy of the existing airport site plan showing the position of the airport in its local context should be inserted in the CIP Doc. – for ref. purposes;
- Copy of the airport's current Master Plan should be inserted in the CIP Doc. so that individual projects can be linked in/cross referenced. Similarly phased plans showing completed developments over 5 yr. periods should also be included – to explain how each project builds towards the future;
- Consideration should be given to list projects under the titles "Capacity Enhancement Projects" and/or "Efficiency Improvement Projects" in future issues of the CIP, as airlines would more readily relate to projects where clear benefits could be demonstrated;
- Airlines should be provided with regular opportunity to review CIP. Sufficient time, at least one month, should be allowed in order for airlines to review and prepare responses;
- CAPEX plans should not contain blanked out text (e.g. see CIP pages 7, 15, 22, 23 & 28);
- Short to medium term (5 to 10 years) development programmes should be presented to airlines on a regular basis. Development concepts should be presented whilst these are in the conceptual stage, when alterations and the opinions of the airlines can be incorporated into the airport authorities plans;
- The assumed impact of proposed CAPEX on Airport Charges should be clearly highlighted to member airlines annually. Local airline representatives should in turn ensure that their HQ specialists in the disciplines of Airport Charges and Airport Development are notified of CAPEX and Airport Charges proposals;
- A clear strategy for transfer passengers should be fully explained and agreed. Projects relating to this process should be identified separately within the CIP;
- Estimate of consultant fees should be noted & also recorded as a percentage of project CAPEX;
- An explanation of the term "soft costs" should be provided;
- Should projects CIP 3.21 – CIP 3.26 (inclusive) be listed under "Key Infrastructure" – perhaps "Surface Access Systems" might be more appropriate;
- Have DAA Plc's auditors confirmed that the following projects (CIP 4.3, 4.4, 4.10, 4.11, 4.13, 4.14, 4.15 & 4.16) can be included or listed as CAPEX?

Car Parking

CIP 1.8 / Project No. EDAD05009 – MSCP Upgrade Phase 1 (Remove/replace expansion joints)

Total CAPEX - € 1,155,000

- Expenditure of this nature will need to be consistently noted by the authority as CAPEX. In later stages it should not be inserted as OPEX.

Commercial Property

CIP 2.1 / Project No. (None) – Car Hire Facilities (Decking)

Total CAPEX - € 2,145,000

- Will CAPEX be retrieved from car-hire operators over a set period with income fed back into the single till?

CIP 2.5 / Project No. (None) – Windows Refurb. Aer Lingus Cargo (Replacement Windows)

Total CAPEX - € 1,000,000

- Ditto comment under CIP 1.8.

Key Infrastructure

CIP 3.1 / Project No. (None) – T2 Master Plan Enabling Works

Total CAPEX - € 26,000,000

- Does demolition of these facilities indicate that Option 1 for T2 is now being pursued (see CIP 7.4)?

CIP 3.5 / Project No. EDAD05011 – Bus Park Entrance & Exit Road

Total CAPEX - € 2,332,000

- The money allocated for 2005 is to engage consultants to develop a robust proposal for approval. € 300,000 is set-aside for 2005 from a provisional total of € 2,332,000. This represents approx. 12.86% of the total allocated – a disproportionately high percentage considering the relative simplicity of the design task required.

CIP 3.12 / Project No. (EDAD05012) – New Taxi Holding Area**Total CAPEX - € 300,000**

- Should this project not be better placed under the “Car Parking” section of the CIP.

CIP 3.21 / Project No. (None) – Upgrade C_Moate Road (Surface Repairs – in part)**Total CAPEX - € 1,275,000**

- Is this road within the airport’s boundary?
- Ditto comment under CIP 1.8.

CIP 3.22 / Project No. (None) – Upgrade C_Moate House (Essential Maintenance)**Total CAPEX - € 660,000**

- Ditto comment under CIP 1.8.

CIP 3.23 / Project No. (None) – Upgrade Collinstown Lane (Resurfacing)**Total CAPEX - € 440,000**

- Is this lane the responsibility of Fingal County Council (DTO funding)?
- Ditto comment under CIP 1.8.

CIP 3.24 / Project No. (None) – Upgrade Forest Little Road (Resurfacing)**Total CAPEX - € 660,000**

- Who paid for construction of the road in 1989?
- Why should roads within the Airport’s boundary be “taken-in-charge” by Fingal County Council?
- Is there not a need to re-align the road to take account of the proposed new parallel runway (CIP 6.19)?
- Ditto comment under CIP 1.8.

CIP 3.25 / Project No. (None) – Upgrade North Div. Road (Resurfacing)**Total CAPEX - € 1,000,000**

- Who paid for construction of the road in 1989?
- Why should roads within the Airport’s boundary be “taken-in-charge” by Fingal County Council?
- Ditto comment under CIP 1.8.

CIP 3.26 / Project No. (EDAD04019) – Upgrade Sth Parallel Road (Resurfacing)**Total CAPEX - € 1,100,000**

- Is this lane the responsibility of Fingal County Council?
- Is this road within the Airport’s boundary?
- Ditto comment under CIP 1.8.

Plant and Equipment**CIP 4.1 / Project No. (None) – 14 Bay Baggage Hall System****Total CAPEX - € 1,000,000**

- Is this project part of an overall BHS Master Plan?

CIP 4.3 / Project No. (None) – Baggage Reclaim Carousels (Phased Replacement)**Total CAPEX - € 1,100,000**

- Ditto comment under CIP 1.8.

CIP 4.9 / Project No. BDAD04009 – Reconfiguration of Baggage System**Total CAPEX - € 4,169,580**

- Is this project part of an overall BHS Master Plan?

CIP 4.17 / Project No. (None) – Upgrade HBS Dublin**Total CAPEX - € 4,000,000**

- Is this project part of an overall BHS Master Plan?

Retail**CIP 5.1 / Project No. ADAD03018 – Airside Restaurant****Total CAPEX - € 2,484,220**

- What is the total floor area? Is it 540 sqm @ €3,000 / sqm?
- If so 540 x 3,000 = € 1,620,000;
- What sum and percentage is allocated for consultant’s fees?
- €3,000 / sqm for “Shell & Core” appears high. How does this compare to other similar projects – perhaps recently completed at DUB?

Stands and Airfield

CIP 6.2 / Project No. (None) – Aircraft Stands Phase 6A (10)

Total CAPEX - € 28,500,000

- Is this project part of the Airport Master Plan?
- Are the stands set out to allow easy modification/extension to accommodate larger a/c (Code D and above) if required in future?
- Are the remote a/c stands positioned to allow the possible construction of twin parallel taxiways if required in future?
- 87,800 sqm @ €250 / sqm = €21,950,000. 5,255 sqm @ €150 / sqm = €788,250. In total € 22,738,250. This leaves € 5,761,750 – is this for design fees?

CIP 6.3 / Project No. (None) – Aircraft Stands Phase 6B (5)

Total CAPEX - € 11,300,000

- Is this project part of the Airport Master Plan?
- Are the stands set out to allow easy modification/extension to accommodate larger a/c (Code D and above) if required in future?
- Are the remote a/c stands positioned to allow the possible construction of twin parallel taxiways if required in future?
- 34,633 sqm @ €250 / sqm = €8,658,250. 6,050 sqm @ €150 / sqm = €907,500. In total € 9,565,750. This leaves € 1,734,250 – is this for design fees?

CIP 6.18 / Project No. (None) – Parallel Runway Fees

Total CAPEX - € 12,525,755

- Total CAPEX solely on fees represents approx. 9.5% of the total €132 million. This appears excessive – will the design be put out to tender?

CIP 6.19 / Project No. (None) – Parallel Runway (Code E)

Total CAPEX - € 132,000,000

- In the Capital Cost assumption € 2 million is outlined for “fencing”. If € 4.2 million is spent on the “Remaining Perimeter Fence” under CIP 3.14 in 2006 why is a further € 2 million set aside 6 yrs. later (2012)?
- € 35 million is allocated for “Risk Items”. This represents approx. 26.5% of the total and € 5 million more than the cost of the runway and taxiway pavement (€ 30 million) – this appears excessive;
- Should this option be pursued implementation of a Code F compliant runway at some later date should be safeguarded.

CIP 6.20 / Project No. (None) – Parallel Runway (Code F)

Total CAPEX - € TBA

- With no cost outlined it is impossible to determine if a Code F runway option should be pursued;
- Was the Helsinki-Vantaa example/benchmark a Code F runway?

CIP 6.22 / Project No. (None) – Rapid Exit Taxiway 10/28

Total CAPEX - € 4,100,100

- Which a/c type is this RET designed to capture?
- What is the distance from threshold to the exit point?
- What percentage of annual movements (for the design a/c) would benefit from construction of this RET?
- The project description mentions a Halcrow report and the construction of 2 suitably located 30-degree RETs. Where is the second one located? Which a/c type is this RET designed to capture? What percentage of annual movements (for the design a/c) would benefit from construction of this RET?

CIP 6.31 / Project No. (None) – 10 Taxiway Bypass and Capacity Enhancement

Total CAPEX - € 5,000,000

- 11,500 sqm @ € 250 / sqm (fig. extracted from CIP 6.30 – as no fig. given) = € 2,875,000;
- € 5,000,000 is allocated under Total Capital Expenditure – what is the remaining € 2,125,000 for?
- Should the holding bay not be designed to take account of the proposed RET under CIP 6.22? If so, is there a case for making the bypass taxiway shorter?

Terminal Complexes

CIP 7.2 / Project No. (ADAD05013) – Debottlenecking Extension North (Retail/Commercial Extension)

Total CAPEX - € 31,500,000

- Would it be possible or appropriate from a capacity enhancement point of view to provide an additional check-in island on the departures level within the 1,485 sqm of “retail space”?

CIP 7.4 / Project No. (None) – T2 Construction

Total CAPEX - € 165,200,000

- Passenger terminal facilities should not be designed specifically to suit the needs of one particular type of traffic or airline – as the airline business is continually changing and carriers are regularly going out of

business (Sabena / Swiss Air). Therefore the proposed terminal should have the flexibility to accommodate all carriers. Discriminatory practices should be avoided wherever possible.

CIP 7.14 / Project No. (None) – Pier Refurbishments

Total CAPEX - € 3,000,000

- Why spend money refurbishing Pier A when it is programmed to be demolished and replaced 5 yrs. later (see CIP 7.8)?