

Love Field Concessions May 27 Meeting Question Responses

Briefing for the
Love Field Concession Committee

Department of Aviation
June 2, 2010

Objectives

- Respond to Committee Member questions and requests for information from May 27, 2010 meeting
- Receive further direction from the committee

Question 1

- Does the proposed program include a bidding component?
 - Yes. Information from the May 27 meeting is contained in the Appendix, and is summarized as follows:
 - Overall, 25 of 43 (58%) spaces, and 46% of square footage would be solicited for proposals through an RFP process
 - F&B 48% of spaces; 43% of sf
 - Retail 70% of spaces; 54% of sf
 - See Appendix for further breakdown

Question 2

- How is the Council involved in the RFP selection process?
 - At the May 27 meeting, the typical selection process was discussed including how selection panels might be created (see information on pages 34 and 35 of the May 27th presentation).
 - The Council role is to provide direction to staff relative to the basic framework of the process and decide on recommended proposers.

Question 3

- Did Southwest participate in the contract negotiation?
- Not in direct negotiations. However, Southwest has been involved through coordination between the LFMP Design Team, Aviation Department staff and consultants in determining the facility needs of the concession plan as well as updates with staff.
- While the concession contracts are exclusive to the City, there are opportunities for airline involvement, including Southwest, included in the proposed concession contract as well as other agreements, such as:
 - Review of the RFP's Development Plan
 - Review of the Incumbents' Development Plan
 - Review input on the Concession performance (through the Use and Lease Agreement)
 - Design review

Question 4



- Can the consultants add a column to the comparable airport concessions charts to include information on Street Pricing at those airports?
- Please see next 2 pages
- Of medium hub airports:
 - 59% of airports add some percentage
 - 38% of airports do not add percentage
 - 3% of airports do not have written pricing policy

Comparative Medium Hub Airports Food & Beverage Programs



Airport	Code	Total EPs	SF	Gross Sales	Sales/EP	Sales/SF	Gross Rent	Rent/EP	Rent/SF	SUF (SF/1,000 EP)	Concession Pricing Policy
Dallas Love Field	DAL	4,028,686	16,514	\$ 15,105,957	\$3.75	\$ 915	\$ 2,300,996	\$0.57	\$ 139	4.1	Street +10-20%
Lambert-St. Louis	STL	7,207,890	45,743	\$ 34,110,614	\$4.73	\$ 746	\$ 3,950,892	\$0.55	\$ 86	6.3	Street +10%
Memphis	MEM	4,999,849	44,059	\$ 29,194,529	\$5.84	\$ 663	\$ 3,900,338	\$0.78	\$ 89	8.8	Street +10%
Nashville	BNA	4,692,566	25,169	\$ 20,777,612	\$4.43	\$ 826	N/A			5.4	Street
Houston Hobby	HOU	4,560,485	15,406	\$ 16,701,133	\$3.66	\$ 1,084	\$ 2,338,159	\$0.51	\$ 152	3.4	Street
Austin-Bergstrom	AUS	4,473,001	24,015	\$ 20,552,830	\$4.59	\$ 856	\$ 2,376,747	\$0.53	\$ 99	5.4	Street
Portland	PDX	7,150,857	50,953	\$ 40,365,740	\$5.64	\$ 792	\$ 4,319,779	\$0.60	\$ 85	7.1	Street
Cincinnati	CVG	6,801,611	67,917	\$ 29,940,863	\$4.40	\$ 441	\$ 3,482,838	\$0.51	\$ 51	10.0	Street +10%
Oakland	OAK	5,668,196	10,333	\$ 23,200,333	\$4.09	\$ 2,245	\$ 3,633,597	\$0.64	\$ 352	1.8	Street +15%
Cleveland	CLE	5,545,205	26,172	\$ 22,834,682	\$4.12	\$ 872	\$ 2,740,162	\$0.49	\$ 105	4.7	Street
Kansas City	MCI	5,527,549	44,691	\$ 20,487,721	\$3.71	\$ 458	\$ 1,881,654	\$0.34	\$ 42	8.1	Street +10%
Raleigh-Durham	RDU	4,850,533	38,997	\$ 19,108,386	\$3.94	\$ 490	\$ 2,162,773	\$0.45	\$ 55	8.0	Street +10%
Sacramento	SMF	4,846,025	24,508	\$ 23,563,914	\$4.86	\$ 961	\$ 5,868,084	\$1.21	\$ 239	5.1	Street +10%
San Jose	SJC	4,840,942	8,984	\$ 18,671,315	\$3.86	\$ 2,078	\$ 2,094,232	\$0.43	\$ 233	1.9	Street +10%
Orange County (CA)	SNA	4,492,626	14,460	\$ 24,704,816	\$5.50	\$ 1,708	\$ 4,025,782	\$0.90	\$ 278	3.2	Street +10%
Pittsburgh	PIT	4,354,992	31,012	\$ 22,552,000	\$5.18	\$ 727	N/A			7.1	Street
San Antonio	SAT	4,160,437	19,230	\$ 16,248,682	\$3.91	\$ 845	\$ 2,345,326	\$0.56	\$ 122	4.6	Street
Indianapolis	IND	4,080,231	30,967	\$ 19,851,419	\$4.87	\$ 641	\$ 2,325,291	\$0.57	\$ 75	7.6	Street
Milwaukee General Mitchell	MKE	4,000,765	25,957	\$ 15,852,868	\$3.96	\$ 611	\$ 1,995,011	\$0.50	\$ 77	6.5	Street +10%
New Orleans	MSY	3,973,167	30,164	\$ 16,745,829	\$4.21	\$ 555	\$ 1,572,342	\$0.40	\$ 52	7.6	Street +15%
Southwest Florida	RSW	3,868,588	21,307	\$ 18,542,910	\$4.79	\$ 870	\$ 2,325,699	\$0.60	\$ 109	5.5	Street +10%
Port Columbus	CMH	3,459,434	25,059	\$ 15,916,735	\$4.60	\$ 635	N/A			7.2	Street +10%
Palm Beach	PBI	3,330,820	25,649	\$ 14,777,822	\$4.44	\$ 576	\$ 1,775,863	\$0.53	\$ 69	7.7	Street
Albuquerque	ABQ	3,256,793	12,121	\$ 15,489,067	\$4.76	\$ 1,278	\$ 2,168,976	\$0.67	\$ 179	3.7	Street +10%
Ontario	ONT	3,107,044	26,589	\$ 8,542,098	\$2.75	\$ 321	\$ 1,228,305	\$0.40	\$ 46	8.6	Street
Jacksonville	JAX	2,998,472	19,361	\$ 14,255,440	\$4.75	\$ 736	\$ 1,879,856	\$0.63	\$ 97	6.5	Street +10%
Anchorage	ANC	2,834,976	16,236	\$ 13,093,574	\$4.62	\$ 806	\$ 1,554,825	\$0.55	\$ 96	5.7	Street
Buffalo	BUF	2,762,401	21,764	\$ 11,147,647	\$4.04	\$ 512	\$ 1,522,401	\$0.55	\$ 70	7.9	Street +10%
Providence	PVD	2,353,715	11,604	\$ 11,200,555	\$4.76	\$ 965	\$ 1,656,385	\$0.70	\$ 143	4.9	Street +5%
Reno-Tahoe	RNO	2,323,681	8,447	\$ 9,219,953	\$3.97	\$ 1,092	\$ 995,219	\$0.43	\$ 118	3.6	Street +10%
Omaha	OMA	2,193,292	39,192	\$ 7,788,166	\$3.55	\$ 199	\$ 1,012,447	\$0.46	\$ 26	17.9	No stated policy
Tucson	TUS	2,116,694	16,322	\$ 8,656,723	\$4.09	\$ 530	\$ 1,211,941	\$0.57	\$ 74	7.7	Street
Louisville	SDF	1,843,133	18,100	\$ 8,863,865	\$4.81	\$ 490	\$ 996,013	\$0.54	\$ 55	9.8	Street +10%
MEDIAN W/O DAL		4,120,334	24,784	\$ 17,644,370	\$4.43	\$ 741	\$ 2,162,773	\$0.55	\$ 89	6.5	

Note: Gross rent for Memphis and Cleveland estimated by Unison.

Source for comparative statistics: ARN Fact Book 2009

Source for pricing policy: 2009 ACI Benchmark Study, internal data, and Airport staff.

Comparative Medium Hub Airports Retail Concessions Programs



Airport	Code	Total EPs	SF	Gross Sales	Sales/EP	Sales/SF	Gross Rent	Rent/EP	Rent/SF	SUF (SF/1,000 EP)	Concession Pricing Policy
Dallas Love 2008	DAL 08	4,028,686	6,779	\$ 6,886,573	\$1.71	\$ 1,016	\$ 1,045,363	\$0.26	\$ 154	1.7	Street +10-20%
Lambert-St. Louis	STL	7,207,890	26,236	\$ 21,359,716	\$2.96	\$ 814	\$ 2,727,522	\$0.38	\$ 104	3.6	Street +10%
Memphis	MEM	4,999,849	23,987	\$ 11,676,036	\$2.34	\$ 487	\$ 1,380,600	\$0.28	\$ 58	4.8	Street +10%
Nashville	BNA	4,692,566	18,167	\$ 14,465,750	\$3.08	\$ 796				3.9	Street
Houston Hobby	HOU	4,560,485	10,565	\$ 11,019,711	\$2.42	\$ 1,043	\$ 2,314,139	\$0.51	\$ 219	2.3	Street
Austin-Bergstrom	AUS	4,473,001	13,961	\$ 18,457,045	\$4.13	\$ 1,322	\$ 2,399,415	\$0.54	\$ 172	3.1	Street
Portland	PDX	7,150,857	25,956	\$ 34,303,710	\$4.80	\$ 1,322	\$ 4,323,467	\$0.60	\$ 167	3.6	Street
Cincinnati	CVG	6,801,611	41,283	\$ 19,576,294	\$2.88	\$ 474	\$ 2,639,392	\$0.39	\$ 64	6.1	Street +10%
Oakland	OAK	5,668,196	7,737	\$ 12,793,123	\$2.26	\$ 1,653	\$ 2,294,920	\$0.40	\$ 297	1.4	Street +15%
Cleveland	CLE	5,545,205	13,852							2.5	Street
Kansas City	MCI	5,527,549	16,495	\$ 6,971,787	\$1.26	\$ 423	\$ 1,031,707	\$0.19	\$ 63	3.0	Street +10%
Raleigh-Durham	RDU	4,850,533	17,468	\$ 13,557,134	\$2.79	\$ 776	\$ 1,660,745	\$0.34	\$ 95	3.6	Street +10%
Sacramento	SMF	4,846,025	18,377	\$ 12,726,830	\$2.63	\$ 693	\$ 1,800,499	\$0.37	\$ 98	3.8	Street +10%
San Jose	SJC	4,840,942	3,800	\$ 7,706,344	\$1.59	\$ 2,028	\$ 1,227,541	\$0.25	\$ 323	0.8	Street +10%
Orange County (CA)	SNA	4,492,626	6,196	\$ 12,357,299	\$2.75	\$ 1,994	\$ 2,291,337	\$0.51	\$ 370	1.4	Street +10%
Pittsburgh	PIT	4,354,992	49,591	\$ 37,003,000	\$8.50	\$ 746				11.4	Street
San Antonio	SAT	4,160,437	12,759	\$ 11,288,807	\$2.71	\$ 885	\$ 1,974,393	\$0.47	\$ 155	3.1	Street
Indianapolis	IND	4,080,231	28,771	\$ 12,760,102	\$3.13	\$ 444	\$ 2,095,459	\$0.51	\$ 73	7.1	Street
Milwaukee General Mitchell	MKE	4,000,765	9,939	\$ 10,899,030	\$2.72	\$ 1,097	\$ 1,506,740	\$0.38	\$ 152	2.5	Street +10%
New Orleans	MSY	3,973,167	13,641	\$ 13,391,679	\$3.37	\$ 982	\$ 1,956,139	\$0.49	\$ 143	3.4	Street +15%
Southwest Florida	RSW	3,868,588	16,633	\$ 15,579,354	\$4.03	\$ 937	\$ 2,727,728	\$0.71	\$ 164	4.3	Street +10%
Port Columbus	CMH	3,459,434	15,565	\$ 8,639,456	\$2.50	\$ 555				4.5	Street +10%
Palm Beach	PBI	3,330,820	13,790	\$ 10,883,970	\$3.27	\$ 789	\$ 2,179,639	\$0.65	\$ 158	4.1	Street
Albuquerque	ABQ	3,256,793	4,310	\$ 12,420,780	\$3.81	\$ 2,882	\$ 1,849,422	\$0.57	\$ 429	1.3	Street +10%
Ontario	ONT	3,107,044	12,597	\$ 8,737,656	\$2.81	\$ 694	\$ 769,367	\$0.25	\$ 61	4.1	Street
Jacksonville	JAX	2,998,472	22,314	\$ 9,142,488	\$3.05	\$ 410	\$ 1,412,439	\$0.47	\$ 63	7.4	Street +10%
Anchorage	ANC	2,834,976	11,611	\$ 11,233,183	\$3.96	\$ 967	\$ 1,284,142	\$0.45	\$ 111	4.1	Street
Buffalo	BUF	2,762,401	3,885	\$ 4,525,866	\$1.64	\$ 1,165	\$ 644,570	\$0.23	\$ 166	1.4	Street +10%
Providence	PVD	2,353,715	8,296	\$ 5,184,340	\$2.20	\$ 625	\$ 943,082	\$0.40	\$ 114	3.5	Street +5%
Reno-Tahoe	RNO	2,323,681	10,879	\$ 14,513,291	\$6.25	\$ 1,334	\$ 4,846,396	\$2.09	\$ 445	4.7	Street +10%
Omaha	OMA	2,193,292	6,902	\$ 3,605,699	\$1.64	\$ 522	\$ 660,348	\$0.30	\$ 96	3.1	No stated policy
Tucson	TUS	2,116,694	7,294	\$ 7,000,732	\$3.31	\$ 960	\$ 875,092	\$0.41	\$ 120	3.4	Street
Louisville	SDF	1,843,133	8,256	\$ 6,003,613	\$3.26	\$ 727	\$ 705,470	\$0.38	\$ 85	4.5	Street +10%
MEDIAN W/O DAL		4,120,334	13,716	\$ 11,676,036	\$2.88	\$ 814	\$ 1,824,961	\$0.41	\$ 132	3.6	

Note: Gross rent for Memphis estimated by Unison.

Source for comparative statistics: ARN Fact Book 2009

Source for pricing policy: 2009 ACI Benchmark Study, internal data, and Airport staff.

Question 4a



- What is the rationale for Street-Plus Pricing?
- To compensate concessionaires for the higher costs of operation which are inherent in airport contracts when compared to off-airport locations
 - Higher capital costs to amortize
 - Higher employee costs due to security requirements
 - Generally longer hours of operation
 - Greater logistical issues for receiving merchandise, stocking stores/restaurants, and clearing crews through security for cleaning, maintenance and service
- To make concession opportunities more attractive to prospective concessionaires and enhance the competitiveness of RFP responses
- To provide pricing flexibility to respond to changing conditions and better serve the traveler
 - Squeeze between higher operational costs and inflexible pricing policy can result in deterioration in customer service during difficult periods

Question 4b



- Explain the currently proposed Street Pricing policy and rationale
- Street + 10% for Casual and Full Service dining (F&B) and Retail
 - Same as current contract and
 - Most prevalent among comparable airports
- Street + 15% for Quick Serve and Walk-Away food (F&B)
 - Lower revenue per transaction, but comparable capital cost per SF
- Street + 20% for non-branded F&B items
 - Non-branded items are to be minimized or eliminated in new contract
 - Competition among RFP respondents will promote best brands
 - While it is anticipated that non-branded items will diminish, it is desirable to leave some flexibility for the development of some customer service location

Question 4c

- Is there any data on the effect of street pricing on sales volumes?
 - Unison is not aware of any large-scale, rigorous economic studies of price elasticity of concessions purchases
 - Unison survey data of 45,000 respondents at 10 airports:
 - At airports without pricing policies, 47% of passengers made F&B purchases
 - At airports with street or street-plus pricing policies, 68% of passengers made F&B purchases
 - While data exist relative to the various percentages, there were other factors involved which make a direct correlation difficult

Question 4d



- What is DFW's street pricing policy?
- They have a Street + 10%

Question 5

- Clarify the decline in customer service rankings for Love Field. Explain the 2010 results from JD Power.
- The following page shows Love Fields survey rankings since 2006
 - 2006 – 2009, Love Field's overall customer satisfaction ranking was either # 1 or # 2 during the 4 year period
 - Love Field concessions received 3 or 4 out of 5 stars during this period
 - 2010, Love Field's overall ranking dropped to 22nd and the concessions scores dropped to 2 out of 5 stars

Question 5



- **2006 JD Power**
 - Rank 1st Overall Airport Satisfaction in Small Airport Category
- **2007 JD Power**
 - Rank 2nd Overall Airport Satisfaction in Small Airport Category
 - F&B received 4 of 5 stars, Retail received 3 of 5 stars
- **2008 JD Power**
 - Rank 1st Overall Airport Satisfaction in Small Airport Category
 - F&B and Retail combined received 4 of 5 stars
- **2009 Airport Revenue News**
 - Best Customer Service in Small Airport Category
 - JD Power did not publish a report for that period
- **2009 (4th Qtr) Airport Service Quality Benchmark**
 - Overall Satisfaction Score of 3.94 out of 5.00
 - Score meanings: 1=poor; 2=fair; 3=good; 4=very good; 5=excellent
 - F&B scored 3.65; Retail scored 3.37 (same score meanings)
 - Love was among the lowest
- **2010 JD Power**
 - Rank 22nd Overall Airport Satisfaction in Small Airport Category
 - Food & Retail Services Scored 2 out of 5 stars (same as other categories)
 - Houston Hobby also fell with Love from similar high rating

Question 5



- Conditions which affected the level of service
 - During this 5-year period, the Wright Amendment Reform Act was enacted and passenger traffic increased by 1 million enplanements per year
 - At peak periods this resulted in significant congestion, lines at concessions and other passenger functions such as security screening, ticketing and baggage claim.
 - The capacity of the existing 50-year old terminal facility to adjust to these increases is limited
 - Lacks adequate space for concessions to accommodate needed variety of concepts and brands to serve the growing demand at Love Field
 - When concessionaires did expand there was good customer response (sales)
- This is one of the many reasons why the improvements to Love Field are so important
 - Complete replacement of the terminal
 - Construction of an integrated transportation system
 - Doubling the available space for concessions

Question 6

- The consultant's August 2008 report recommended 10 year terms. Why are we proposing 12 year terms now?
- The August 2008 report was the initial assessment of our concession program and looked at options for managing concessions through and after the LFMP.
 - The LFMP was 2 months into the Schematic Design Phase and was not finished until November 2008.
 - The Airport Use & Lease Agreement and LFMP PDA were being negotiated
- During the 18 months concessions negotiations, the availability of credit for concessionaire capital improvements was adversely impacted as the economy went into recession.
 - The recession has negatively impacted passenger traffic
 - Brought into question whether airline traffic would recover sufficiently to meet passenger projections for Love Field in 2015.
 - The concessionaires requested 15 year terms
 - We settled on a 12 year primary term with 3 year City option

Question 7

- Please provide historical sales performance per outlet
- Please see Appendix

Question 8



- Are there any long term contracts at DFW? Can the same people make long term extensions?
- Information provided by the DFW staff indicates the following:
 - Of 120 contracts, 22 are 1-year permits
 - Of the remaining 98 contracts:
 - 21 have 10-year terms
 - 1 has a 21year term – TGIF/DFW Restaurant JV (9-5-96 – 12/31/17)
 - 1 has a 27 year term – TGIF/DFW Restaurant JV (9-5-96 – 11-16-23)
 - The remainder have less than 10-year terms
- The DFW Concession Policy indicates the following:
 - The maximum term for any concessionaire is 10 years including extensions
 - However, a concessionaire may receive successive contracts, which combined, exceed 10 years, if each awarded contract is pursuant to one of the following selection processes:
 - Direct negotiation for a contract up to 3 years term or a maximum MAG of \$100,000
 - Limited proposal to a targeted group for a contract over 3 years and up to 5 years, *AND* a MAG over \$100,000
 - RFP for a contract over 5 years term
 - Please see the Appendix for more information

Next steps

- Further Committee direction

Appendix



Space Allocation



- How many spaces are allocated for the RFP package, representing 40% of the space?

- F&B – total spaces 26
 - Incumbent – 13 (52%)
 - RFP package – 11 (40%)
 - Phase III closed RFP – 2 (8%)

- F&B – Total Footage 39,055
 - Incumbent - 22,077 (57%)
 - RFP package - 14,117 (36%)
 - Closed RFP - 2,861 (7%)

- Retail – total spaces 17
 - Incumbent – 5 (30%)
 - RFP package – 6 (35%)
 - Closed RFP – 6 (35%)

- Retail – Total Footage 15,330
 - Incumbent - 7,059 (46%)
 - RFP package - 5,069 (33%)
 - Closed RFP - 3,202 (21%)

DAL Historical Sales per Outlet Food & Beverage Program

Tenant	Square Feet	Calendar Year Gross Sales (in thousands)											
		1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	YTD 2009
McDonalds - Lobby	828	\$132	\$174	\$169	\$174	\$192	\$200	\$157	\$127	\$183	\$213	\$267	\$247
Pizza Hut - Lobby	954	\$59	\$80	\$94	\$94	\$112	\$121	\$127	\$107	\$111	\$94	\$80	\$63
Chili's - Lobby	2,628	\$297	\$388	\$423	\$526	\$740	\$720	\$693	\$696	\$1,029	\$1,168	\$1,148	\$957
Oasis	0	\$95	\$92	\$89	\$78	\$1	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
ATM Machine	0	\$0	\$14	\$14	\$14	\$14	\$14	\$14	\$1	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Business Center	3,884	\$0	\$166	\$126	\$161	\$127	\$120	\$134	\$116	\$112	\$122	\$148	\$116
Seattles Best Lobby	280	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$307	\$363	\$339	\$320	\$353	\$386	\$413	\$273
American Airlines	1,175	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$320	\$266	\$150	\$57
Seattles Best Gate 10	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$219	\$218	\$198	\$177	\$483	\$494	\$0	\$0
Seattles Best Cart	425	\$0	\$0	\$158	\$350	\$303	\$325	\$395	\$438	\$0	\$0	\$553	\$1,035
Chili's	3,084	\$2,073	\$2,194	\$2,415	\$2,373	\$2,236	\$2,261	\$2,429	\$2,524	\$3,178	\$4,697	\$5,374	\$5,019
Gate 4 Food court	1,128	\$854	\$820	\$805	\$762	\$685	\$623	\$721	\$717	\$704	\$936	\$1,152	\$976
Brew Pub	700	\$574	\$537	\$594	\$535	\$489	\$536	\$639	\$576	\$700	\$969	\$927	\$768
Dreyers Ice Cream	456	\$489	\$473	\$433	\$356	\$287	\$257	\$325	\$322	\$409	\$460	\$417	\$345
McDonalds	1,585	\$1,454	\$1,611	\$1,705	\$1,705	\$1,468	\$1,511	\$1,598	\$1,837	\$2,302	\$2,604	\$2,947	\$3,146
Gate 9 Food Court	2,162	\$927	\$927	\$1,038	\$943	\$719	\$624	\$680	\$632	\$828	\$1,270	\$1,500	\$1,358
Continental Gate	1,109	\$0	\$48	\$124	\$104	\$61	\$63	\$90	\$148	\$207	\$226	\$179	\$129
Total Food & Non-Alcohol	20,398	\$6,954	\$7,524	\$8,188	\$8,175	\$7,960	\$7,957	\$8,538	\$8,737	\$10,920	\$13,907	\$15,253	\$14,489
Alcohol Sales	2,500	\$1,565	\$1,567	\$1,785	\$1,641	\$1,513	\$1,567	\$1,759	\$1,739	\$2,174	\$2,795	\$2,980	\$2,592

DAL Historical Sales per Outlet Retail Program

Tenant	Square Feet	Calendar Year Gross Sales (in thousands)											
		1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	YTD 2009
Main Stores	5,490	\$3,359	\$3,782	\$3,714	\$3,715	\$3,407	\$3,342	\$3,225	\$3,189	\$3,822	\$4,686	\$4,949	\$4,598
Sports Shop	700	\$112	\$138	\$110	\$81	\$66	\$13	\$0	\$59	\$130	\$220	\$248	\$215
Retail (Sunglass)	191	\$254	\$338	\$334	\$396	\$385	\$326	\$334	\$393	\$444	\$600	\$658	\$617
Misc Advertising		\$627	\$775	\$814	\$830	\$601	\$655	\$724	\$802	\$850	\$572	\$518	\$491
Pagenet/\$10 Store	398	\$9	\$50	\$16	\$0	\$0	\$141	\$270	\$197	\$231	\$308	\$514	\$485
Total	6,779	\$4,360	\$5,083	\$4,987	\$5,022	\$4,460	\$4,476	\$4,553	\$4,640	\$5,477	\$6,385	\$6,887	\$6,405

DFW Concession Policy

Related to Contract Term

- The DFW Concession Policy state the following regarding term extensions:
 - Section 1.5 Term Limitation
 - Regardless of which method is used to select a concessionaire, no concessionaire shall receive a contract term longer than 10 years, including extension options. This provision does not mean that a concessionaire is prohibited from receiving successive contracts for a combined term longer than ten years. However, the manner by which a concessionaire may receive successive contracts for combined terms longer than ten years is limited below in 2.2.

DFW Concession Policy

Related to Contract Term



- DFW Concession Policy, continued
 - Section 2.2 Solicitation and Selection Processes
 - Competitive bidding processes, described below as Requests for Proposals, are used to identify and inform all potential qualified proposers about concession opportunities at DFW, and sometimes result in many proposals being submitted for the concession opportunities. Competitive processes generally ensure the greatest outreach into the business community, as well as selection of the best proposers for the opportunities. However, competitive bidding of concession contracts is not required by law, and the cost normally incurred in soliciting and reviewing large numbers of voluminous proposals sometimes outweigh the anticipated financial benefits of competitive bidding processes. Therefore, a solicitation of a limited number of proposers, or even direct negotiations with a single proposer, may be justified. The Concessions Department staff is directed to use the processes set forth in the table below under the circumstances indicated, unless in the discretion of the Vice President of Revenue Management an exception from the established process is warranted by extenuating circumstances, and notice thereof is given to the Board. These guidelines shall apply to concessions in all existing and future Airport terminals.