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Executive Summary

Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport (ANC) is a medium hub airport undergoing terminal expansion and organizational changes. The Facilities section is responsible for all maintenance, custodial, electrical, and administrative services to maintain the day to day operations of airport terminals, buildings, and vertical structures. Over the past ten years, personnel and operating budgets have remained the same, while the square footage, demand for services, and technology have grown significantly. To compare the airport terminal facilities operations and maintenance with those of other airports, a simple benchmarking survey was developed. The benchmarking effort was undertaken to assess the state of ANC Facilities staffing and budgets with respect to other airports around the United States. The goal was to compare employee functions, numbers, organization, contracted services, building square footage, and other information at a variety of airports. The information provided a benchmarking of ANC’s operation with other airports in order to make appropriate changes if necessary.

The benchmarking survey was generated in-house based upon management concerns and questions. Parameters surveyed included: Facility square footage, number of airlines and passengers served, average age of buildings, number of maintenance staff, maintenance budget, contracted services, number of custodial staff, custodial budget, administrative staff, and general organization structure. A total of 21 airports were randomly selected and sent an “Airport Facility Operations Questionnaire” in June 2000. Of those airports contacted, 13 responded with complete information. The return rate for the survey effort was 61.9%, an excellent return rate in statistical samples.

The “Benchmarking Survey Results of Airport Terminal Facility Operations” identified a great deal of information that has proven valuable in planning and budgeting. A matrix tabulating results of the completed surveys for each airport has been compiled and follows this summary. In addition, numerous graphs were generated for our use and analysis of employee numbers and square footage responsibilities. These have also been included for data illustration. The actual survey response data should be closely reviewed for each airport’s own needs and analysis. In general the following information was found. Total numbers of facility personnel range greatly by airport, with 1,152 employees at San Francisco and 26 employees at Fort Wayne Airport. To standardize comparisons, the total terminal and building square footage (ft²) for each airport was divided by the number of employees in order to provide a total ft² workload per person. This provided airports’ workload range, with San Francisco at 25,323 ft² of responsibility for each employee, and Philadelphia at other end of the range with 3,000 ft² per person. The median airport was Salt Lake City with 8,943 ft² of responsibility per person for its 246 employees.

In the area of custodial services, the survey indicates the number of custodial personnel based on facility size ranges from 56 to 350 employees. The surveyed airport median was 100 custodians. The janitorial service was found to be a contracted service at 7 of the airports surveyed or 53.9% of the time. Based on a building square footag
comparison, the range of coverage per employee identified San Francisco with 83,348 ft\textsuperscript{2} and Tucson Airport Authority with 7,143 ft\textsuperscript{2} workload per custodian. The median ft\textsuperscript{2} workload airport was found to be Minneapolis Saint Paul International Airport with 20,000 ft\textsuperscript{2} of workload per custodian.

Survey results indicated that the number of maintenance personnel based on facility size also varies greatly airport to airport. Terminal maintenance was found to be handled in house in nearly all skills, trades, and crafts areas, except for jet or loading bridge and bag belts. Those were contracted out approximately 50% of the time. Escalator and elevator services were also contracted out at all airports. The number of maintenance employees at the airports surveyed ranged from 9 to 802 at Tucson and San Francisco respectively. The median was at Salt Lake City International Airport with 75 employees. Based on an airport building square footage comparison of coverage per employee in the maintenance area, the range was found to be 4,615 ft\textsuperscript{2} to 44,444 ft\textsuperscript{2} at Philadelphia International Airport and Tucson Airport respectively. The median airport was Dallas Fort Worth International with 18,369 ft\textsuperscript{2} workload area responsibility for each maintenance employee.

In summary, the “Benchmarking Survey Results of Airport Terminal Facility Operations Around the United States” provided a great deal of useful information. Personnel, budget, and services were found to range greatly airport to airport. Airport responses submitted have been helpful to refine planning, budgeting, and employee programming. The information is being used to assess the adequacy and potential changes necessary to continue and improve existing levels of service with planned expansion demands. Actual survey response data should be carefully reviewed and the individual airport’s manager contacted directly for particular questions and specific analysis.
Numbers of Maintenance Staff

San Francisco International: 802
Chicago O'Hare International: 529
Metropolitan Washington Airport (Dulles L): 325
Seattle-Tacoma International Airport: 237
Salt Lake City International Airport: 206
Minneapolis-Saint Paul International Airport: 94
Rhode Island TF Green: 75
Anchorage International Airport: 70
Dallas Fort Worth International: 48
Tucson Airport Authority: 36
Fort Wayne-Allen County Airport Authority: 36
Rhode Island TF Green: 19

Mean = 405.5
Median = 75