



8 CONCLUSIONS

8.1 CONCLUSIONS

The analyses completed to support the FLL Master Plan Update indicate the following:

1. Broward County has the capacity to finance improvements at FLL to accommodate forecast demand while maintaining reasonable user costs as measured by broad industry standards for large-hub airports, although these costs would, in all cases, be higher than today's airline costs at FLL.
2. If the County elects to do so, a set of Airport improvement projects can be identified to accommodate the traffic growth expected in the near-term (e.g., within a 10-year timeframe), and these projects could be initiated without having to resolve all of the issues related to FLL's long-term development. This ability to advance near-term projects while FLL's future size and mission in the long-term are being decided by the Board is available principally because a set of improvement projects that would accommodate forecast demand are common to both future configurations of the Airport.
3. A decision by the FAA regarding the airfield configuration at FLL was critical to making non-airfield development decisions. In particular, the disposition of the Crosswind Runway, the location of a new South Runway, and the potential dislocations caused by a potential north parallel runway had a direct effect on the amount and location of land that could be made available for the development of other facilities. Master Plan Update decisions were informed by the expected results of the Proposed South Runway Extension EIS process, and confirmed by the selection of the B1c runway Alternative.
4. Once FLL's airfield alternative was defined through the FAA's EIS process and associated County decisions, facility development options that allow the County to continuously manage impacts related to Airport growth were confirmed. Given the availability of these

“flexible” options for non-airfield facilities, the County can manage Airport growth and impacts in the context of an established and approved airfield configuration while preserving the potential to maximize FLL's ultimate capacity in the future.

5. The County's choices among development options to accommodate near-term demand will affect FLL's potential to accommodate traffic when full build-out is achieved. Certain lower-cost options to accommodate near-term requirements are likely, in the long-term to: (a) limit FLL's potential to accommodate traffic, and (b) provide lower levels of user service, convenience, and efficiency. Decisions about the next phase of Airport expansion will directly affect the ultimate potential of the Airport to serve the County's needs, both in terms of capacity and service.
6. Consultation with stakeholders, including airlines, other Airport users, and nearby Broward County residents, was an important aspect of the information gathering and decision-making process of this Master Plan Update. The multiple development options presented during the course of the Master Plan Update and in this report were designed to elicit comment, criticism, and input from stakeholders. From these inputs, (a) stakeholder values, particularly regarding the trade-off between costs and level of service, were revealed, (b) views on the limits of FLL's potential to accommodate traffic were debated, and (c) other options, in addition to those presented in this report, were discussed in detail.

8.2 PHASED APPROACH

Key initiatives that facilitated the completion of the Master Plan Update in a phased approach included:

- Stakeholder Outreach
- Board Decision-making Process
- Plan Implementation

8.2.1 Stakeholder Outreach

As noted earlier, the Master Plan Update process was structured to identify facility requirements and options in relation to the FAA's unconstrained TAF for 2020 (2025),

consistent with the Proposed South Runway Extension EIS process. The “menu” of options was developed during Phase 1 with input from stakeholders. The two-phase Master Plan Update process (Phase 1 and Phase 2/3) was designed to provide stakeholders with well-defined, optional visions of FLL's future to elicit constructive input to the Board's decision-making process. In Phase 2/3, a series of forums were conducted to brief stakeholders on the development options and the complex trade-offs facing decision-makers regarding the final build-out and configuration of the Airport. Stakeholders include Airport users, the airlines, Airport neighbors, and other interest groups affected by Airport development and operation.

8.2.2 Board Decision-making Process

The Board's deliberations regarding the designation of a preferred development plan focused on, among other things, user costs, levels of service, capacity of the Airport to accommodate future traffic, and the effects of growth, both positive and negative. During both phases of the Master Plan Update development options were continually refined to respond to input from stakeholders and the Board and any new findings that emerged from the Proposed South Runway Extension EIS process.

Underlying the decision-making process were several important linkages and relationships between and among various plan elements and development options that were analyzed. Linkages and relationships considered in the Board's decision-making process included the following:

- **Airside Terminal/Interface** – Once the ultimate runway configuration for the Airport was established, the final terminal layout was modified as necessary to provide for the efficient movement of aircraft on the ground between the gates and apron areas in the terminal complex and the runway and taxiway system on the airfield.
- **Passenger Terminal Elements** – Future terminal development needs to anticipate the requirements for passenger processing in the ticket lobby, baggage handling and baggage claim, security checkpoints, holdrooms, federal inspections for international arriving passengers, cruise passengers, and concession services. The requirements for these elements were

refined based on input from stakeholders and the Board.

- **Passenger Access, Roadways, and Parking** – While vehicular elements can be defined and developed as independent facilities, issues such as roadway configuration, parking, curbside access, and pedestrian interface are critical, interdependent components of the terminal area development plan. To a significant extent, these facilities currently lack integration and continuity with the Airport's passenger terminals, and a series of bottlenecks constrain system performance and reduce level-of-service. Correcting these shortfalls in the context of increased traffic will require optimizing curb frontage and width, as well as terminal roadway capacity and bypass systems; improving roadway geometry between terminals and parking access; and separating pedestrians and vehicles by eliminating crosswalks to the extent possible, and providing alternate means for passengers to move between terminals and the garages. To a significant extent, finalizing these elements of the Master Plan Update was a function of the ultimate plan for the passenger terminals. These elements were optimized and their cost implications assessed once the passenger terminal options were established.
- **Trade-Offs between Level-of-Service and Cost** – The trade-offs between level-of-service and cost will, in the future, become increasingly complex and challenging. For example, two different terminal area configurations and roadway scenarios could theoretically accommodate the same level of passenger demand. However, a lower cost scenario with a less efficient terminal configuration and fewer travel lanes would offer Airport users an inferior level-of-service in terms of travel time through the system during peak periods versus a higher cost solution that provides more capacity and therefore a higher level of service. Other examples of tradeoffs between facility development costs and level-of-service assessed included the following:
 - a. Provision of close-in structured parking versus lower-cost remote surface parking

- b. Allowances for terminal circulation space per passenger
- c. Maximum walking distances versus provision for people mover systems, such as moving walkways
- d. Passenger wait times for movement systems, such as elevators, buses, and other people movers
- e. Passenger wait times versus the number of ticketing, federal inspection, or security checkpoint facilities

Inherently, FLL is at a point where many facility development options are likely to include both higher costs and perceived reductions in level-of-service, at least in some elements of the Airport’s operation. Additionally, given that FLL has only a few “green field” sites left for facility development, an important aspect in evaluating level-of-service is the “inconvenience factor” associated with construction and construction phasing simply because obsolete facilities must be demolished to provide the opportunity for redevelopment of facilities with greater capacity and higher levels of service in the long term.

8.2.3 Plan Implementation

Following the Airport’s acceptance of the Draft Master Plan Update, steps will be taken to secure government agency approvals needed to facilitate subsequent implementation of elements of the plan. These steps will include obtaining FAA approval of the updated Airport Layout Plan and coordinating with State, County, and local officials, as required, to amend the County’s Comprehensive Plan so that it reflects the Airport Master Plan Update adopted by the Board.