

84784



Order 2000-6-14

Served: June 22, 2000

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

Issued by the Department of Transportation  
on the 19th day of June, 2000

Essential air service at

**DODGE CITY, KANSAS  
GARDEN CITY, KANSAS  
GREAT BEND, KANSAS  
HAYS, KANSAS  
LIBERAL, KANSAS  
GOODLAND, KANSAS, and  
LAMAR, COLORADO**

under 49 U.S.C. 41731 *et seq.*

Docket OST-1998-3502 - 8  
Docket OST-1998-3503 - 6  
Docket OST-1998-3496 - 6  
Docket OST-1998-3497 - 6  
Docket OST-1998-3498 - 6  
  
Docket OST-1995-934 - 26

**FINAL ORDER**

**Background**

By Order 2000-2-18, February 14, 2000, the Department tentatively reselected Great Lakes Aviation, Ltd., d/b/a United Express, to provide subsidized essential air service from Dodge City, Garden City, Goodland, Great Bend, Hays and Liberal, Kansas, and Lamar, Colorado, to Denver for the two-year period beginning October 1, 1999, but tentatively decided to terminate subsidy for Great Lakes' services to Denver from three of those communities -- Goodland, Great Bend and Lamar -- and to allow the carrier to suspend service at those three on or after April 1, 2000. The order provided for the filing of objections to the tentative decision before the Department would issue a final decision.

Great Lakes' services from Goodland and Lamar to Denver represent the only scheduled services at the two communities. The Department's tentative decision to discontinue subsidy for their services was based on a statutory eligibility criterion that prohibits the Department from subsidizing service at communities where the subsidy amounts to more than \$200 per passenger unless they are more than 210 highway miles from the nearest large or medium hub. Continued subsidy for Great Lakes' services at Goodland and Lamar would amount to \$457 and \$265 per passenger, respectively.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Goodland is 189 highway miles from Denver International Airport, a large hub, and Lamar is 203 highway miles from DIA. For a full discussion, see Order 2000-2-18 at 4-5.

In the case of Great Bend, Great Lakes' service to Denver represents "second-hub" service; the community also receives service to Kansas City.<sup>2</sup> The Department's tentative decision to discontinue subsidy for Great Bend's second-hub service was based on the historically low traffic results for that service and the high cost of continuing to maintain it. In fact, continued support for Great Bend-Denver service would amount to \$247 per passenger -- above the statutory ceiling for supporting *any* service at most communities, and therefore not justifiable in the case of second-hub service where a community would continue to receive service to its primary hub.<sup>3</sup>

### **Community Objections**

The communities of Goodland, Lamar and Great Bend have filed objections in response to Order 2000-2-18, and request that the Department continue to subsidize Great Lakes' services to Denver. In addition, Dodge City has filed an objection requesting the Department to authorize a higher level of service between Dodge City and Denver than that contained in the order.<sup>4</sup>

Goodland contends that the traffic data used by the Department to calculate the community's subsidy per passenger were understated.<sup>5</sup> In addition, the community believes that factors relating to the quality of its service -- such as cancellations, overflights, and seat preemption -- should be considered in evaluating the legitimacy of traffic data, and that Great Lakes' undependable service has had a negative impact on its traffic levels.

Lamar does not dispute that its subsidy per passenger exceeds the statutory ceiling. Instead, Lamar states that its traffic levels are depressed as a result of a high number of flight cancellations "for a wide variety of [unspecified] reasons." The community therefore requests that the Department continue subsidizing its service until civic officials can work with Great Lakes to improve the reliability of the service.

Great Bend also argues that the low traffic figures for its service to Denver have been affected by undependable service, and reports that Great Lakes' completion performance was 89.5 percent in 1998 and 91.5 percent in 1999. The community also takes exception to the Department's use

---

<sup>2</sup> Great Bend-Kansas City service, which is also subsidized by the Department, is operated by Air Midwest, Inc., d/b/a US Airways Express. Air Midwest is a subsidiary of Mesa Air Group, Inc.

<sup>3</sup> Order 2000-2-18 at 5-6.

<sup>4</sup> Dodge City's objection is actually twofold: in addition to the service issue, the community raises concerns about the Department's procedures for handling rate renewal cases. Department staff has spoken with the community regarding the latter issue, and the community agrees that the present order should focus on the service issue. We will therefore consider Dodge City's procedural concerns in another forum.

<sup>5</sup> Goodland supplies data of its own indicating that the community registered 2,493 origin-and-destination passengers during calendar year 1999, whereas Order 2000-2-18 relied on a figure of 1,913. Goodland's data, however, contain numerous inconsistencies; to cite just one, the community reports a total of 2,097 on-time arrivals and departures during 1999 out of a total of 1,504 completed flights. Insofar as Goodland's traffic statistics are concerned, they may be inflated by the inclusion of nonrevenue passengers, who contribute nothing in support of the service and are thus not a legitimate measure for calculating subsidy per passenger.

of a 1999 traffic figure of 2,238 origin-and-destination passengers, and instead reports 2,462.<sup>6</sup> It disagrees with the Department's "imposition" of the subsidy-per-passenger ceiling of \$200 in its case, since Great Bend is more than 210 highway miles from DIA, and implies that the Department's decision was influenced by Great Lakes' reluctance to continue serving the Great Bend-Denver market -- in fact, the carrier's "intentionally neglecting" the market -- and that the Department is consequently allowing Great Lakes to pick and choose which communities it will serve.

Dodge City requests that the Department authorize subsidy for three rather than two weekday round trips to Denver, and thus a total of 18 round trips a week.<sup>7</sup> The community states that, over the years, it has consistently received only two round trips -- the minimum required under the program -- on weekdays to Denver, whereas the other western Kansas communities still receiving subsidized service to Denver -- Garden City, Hays and Liberal -- all receive three. The community maintains that it needs a midday round trip as well; that the Department cannot realistically assess the community's need for such service if the community has never had the opportunity to utilize it; and that the Department itself has recognized that three round trips present the opportunity for more accurately assessing a community's actual service needs.<sup>8</sup> The community suggests that a third weekday round trip for Dodge City could be added in conjunction with additional service at either Liberal, Garden City or Great Bend.

### **Final Decision**

After giving careful consideration to the communities' objections and all other relevant circumstances, we have decided to finalize our tentative decision in Order 2000-2-18 to discontinue subsidy for Great Lakes' services from Goodland, Great Bend and Lamar to Denver, and to allow the carrier to suspend service at the communities on or after April 1, 2000. We have also decided to affirm our tentative decision to authorize 13 round trips a week between Dodge City and Denver. Each of the communities' objections is separately considered below.

### **Goodland**

We should first point out that our calculation of Goodland's subsidy per passenger of \$473 was skewed in the community's favor, since we used Great Lakes' annual subsidy requirement for 12 round trips a week (\$873,410) and divided it by actual traffic (1,943 origin-and-destination passengers) for calendar year 1999, during the first nine months of which the community received 18 round trips a week. Goodland states that our traffic figures are erroneous, but it avoids noting that its own data lead to the same conclusion: the community's subsidy per

---

<sup>6</sup> Great Bend misstates some of its data. For instance, the community counts passengers in both directions but flights in just one direction. As a result, it cites passenger-per-flight figures that are about double the actual levels.

<sup>7</sup> Order 2000-2-18 authorized 13 Dodge City-Denver round trips a week via Liberal -- *i.e.*, two round trips each weekday and three each weekend.

<sup>8</sup> Dodge City cites the Department's willingness to subsidize three round trips a day (18 a week) at Goodland and Lamar for two years, from August 1997 through September 1999, in an effort to improve ridership. See Order 97-3-37, March 26, 1997, as well as the discussion in Order 2000-2-18 at 4-5 previously noted.

passenger is still well above the statutory \$200 ceiling. Specifically, use of the community's traffic data results in a subsidy-per-passenger figure of \$350 -- still nearly double the ceiling.<sup>9</sup>

In practice, we do not apply the \$200 ceiling lightly, or at the first opportunity. Where extenuating circumstances exist, we prefer to give communities a reasonable chance to improve their standing. In this case, we might very well have been inclined to continue subsidy at Goodland for a while longer if, in fact, the historical record showed that the community was capable of registering substantially higher traffic results, and that its ridership during 1999 represented a significant decline from historical levels as a result of unreliable service.

We have carefully examined the issues raised by Goodland regarding the quality of Great Lakes' service. According to the community's data, Great Lakes completed 1,504 out of 1,791 scheduled flights during 1999 -- a completion factor of 84 percent.<sup>10</sup> On the other hand, Great Lakes has supplied data showing a 94 percent completion factor at the community. While there is thus some disagreement regarding the carrier's completion performance, we can find no basis for Goodland's further claim that frequent seat preemption has discouraged Goodland travelers from using Great Lakes' service. Specifically, the community contends that the carrier's operation of a Salina-Goodland-Denver routing has often resulted in Salina passengers filling all (or nearly all) the seats and Goodland passengers thus being denied boarding. Our own review of data supplied by the carrier indicates that, during 1999, Salina boarded 6,100 Denver-bound passengers on 706 flights stopping at Goodland -- an average of 8.6 passengers per flight, leaving 10.4 seats for Goodland passengers on Great Lakes' 19-seat Beech 1900 aircraft. In the opposite direction, 6,513 Salina-bound passengers boarded in Denver on 726 flights stopping at Goodland -- an average of 9.0 passengers per flight, leaving 10.0 seats for Goodland passengers. Even using Goodland's higher traffic statistics and assuming that *every* Goodland passenger was on a flight that came from or continued on to Salina, there could be no more than 1.7 Goodland passengers per flight.<sup>11</sup> In view of the data, we cannot conclude that seat preemption played any role in Goodland's low usage of Great Lakes' service.

In any case, Goodland does not attempt to show that Great Lakes' performance -- whatever its shortcomings -- has been responsible for eroding traffic. In fact, Goodland's traffic has been chronically low for many years. We have reviewed the historical record since 1978, when the domestic airline industry was deregulated. Even with our generous method of calculation, Goodland would need to generate 4,368 origin-and-destination passengers -- about 7.0

---

<sup>9</sup> \$873,410 annual subsidy divided by 2,493 origin-and-destination passengers during 1999. Although Goodland's statistics are suspect, we are using its passenger figures here to illustrate that the community's traffic is so low that our doing so does not come close to making a difference in the outcome.

<sup>10</sup> We assume that the community's figures reflect subsidized flights to/from Denver, rather than *all* flights operated at Goodland, including those to/from Salina that form part of the carrier's Salina-Goodland-Denver route. Goodland reports 167 cancellations and 80 overflights during 1999, but does not account for 40 other flights that it says were not completed.

<sup>11</sup> 2,493 passengers divided by a total of 1,432 flights.

enplanements a day -- for its subsidy per passenger to be below the \$200 ceiling.<sup>12</sup> But the community has not registered that much traffic in twenty years, since 1980.<sup>13</sup> More recently, since 1992 Goodland has received service from two different carriers -- Mesa and Great Lakes -- with code-share partnerships with United Airlines, the dominant carrier at Denver, which have been able to offer on-line connecting service throughout United's system. But neither carrier has been able to generate even as many as 4.0 enplanements a day.

In view of Goodland's traffic history, we are unable to conclude that the community's 1999 traffic experience was anomalous, or that traffic is likely to improve substantially. We will therefore affirm our tentative decision to discontinue subsidy for Great Lakes' service at Denver in conformance with the statutory \$200 ceiling.

### **Lamar**

Lamar's objection is essentially similar to Goodland's: poor service has eroded traffic to the extent that the community should not be subject to the \$200 ceiling. As in the case of Goodland, we would again begin by noting that our calculation of Lamar's subsidy per passenger of \$265 was skewed in the community's favor, since we used Great Lakes' annual subsidy requirement for 12 round trips a week (\$779,299) and divided it by actual traffic (2,941 origin-and-destination passengers) for calendar year 1999, during the first nine months of which the community received 18 round trips a week.

As in Goodland's case, we might have been willing to continue subsidizing Lamar's service for a while longer if the historical record showed that Lamar was capable of higher passenger levels and that its 1999 traffic represented an anomaly attributable to unreliable service. The Lamar community's objection suggests that its subsidy per passenger exceeds \$200 because frequent flight cancellations have discouraged passengers from using the service. However, Lamar presents no data regarding the extent of the cancellations or any evidence that traffic was indeed affected, does not discuss the causes or possible cures for those cancellations in any detail, and does not attempt to demonstrate that traffic could substantially improve.<sup>14</sup>

Lamar's traffic, like Goodland's, has been consistently low for many years. Even with our generous method of calculation, Lamar would need to generate 3,897 origin-and-destination passengers -- about 6.2 enplanements a day -- for its subsidy per passenger to be below the \$200 ceiling. The community has not registered that much traffic since 1979. Like Goodland, since 1992 Lamar has received service from both Mesa and Great Lakes, operating as United Express into Denver, yet neither carrier has been able to generate even as many as 5.0 enplanements a day.

---

<sup>12</sup> Enplanements represent one-half of total origin-and-destination passengers, and daily averages are based on 313 weekdays and weekends a year.

<sup>13</sup> Historical traffic data are drawn from Appendix A of the Department's "Study of Air Service at Small Communities: 1978-95," May 1996.

<sup>14</sup> Great Lakes' data show an 88 percent completion factor at Lamar during 1999.

In view of Lamar's traffic history, we cannot conclude that the community's 1999 traffic results were anomalous, or that traffic is likely to improve substantially. We will therefore affirm our tentative decision to discontinue subsidy for Great Lakes' service at Lamar based on the statutory \$200 ceiling.

### **Great Bend**

To begin with, we should point out that the case of Great Bend differs from Goodland and Lamar in one significant respect: Great Bend's service to Denver is not the community's *only* scheduled service. Rather, it represents service to a *second hub* -- we also subsidize Great Bend's service to Kansas City. There is no provision in the statutes governing the essential air service program that provides for service to more than a single hub for any community, and our willingness to do so in a handful of cases is utterly discretionary. But Great Bend's claim to subsidy for support of its Denver service is even more tenuous than that: as we noted in Order 2000-2-18, we have never issued a determination for Great Bend that designated more than a single hub, to the east -- initially Wichita, and later Kansas City. As we explained in Order 2000-2-18, Great Bend's service to Denver is a vestige of a time when Air Midwest operated all the subsidized service in western and central Kansas, along linear routes stretching from Denver in the west to Kansas City and Wichita in the east. Great Bend-Denver service was simply a by-product of such a routing, but it was never part of Great Bend's essential air service determination.

Nonetheless, when Mesa acquired Air Midwest in 1992, we were willing to continue to subsidize Great Bend-Denver service, despite historically low traffic figures for the route and the absence of any statutory or discretionary guarantee, in the hope that traffic would improve as a result of Mesa's code-share relationship with United.<sup>15</sup> And in 1997, when we faced a decision as to whether we should spend program funds to restore Great Bend-Denver service after a two-year hiatus, we again decided to give the route a further chance.<sup>16</sup> In view of our efforts, we are disappointed that Great Bend would now charge that the Department is bowing to Great Lakes' preference not to serve the market.

The simple fact is that we have seen very little improvement in Great Bend's traffic with either Mesa's service or Great Lakes'. The community takes exception to our 1999 traffic figures, but the difference between our figures (2,238 passengers, or 3.6 enplanements a day) and its own (2,462 passengers, or 3.9 enplanements a day) is inconsequential. Great Bend's traffic to Denver remains far too low to justify our continuing to subsidize the service.

Contrary to the community's understanding, however, our decision is not the result of any "imposition" of the statutory \$200 ceiling, as in the cases of Goodland and Lamar. In fact, that

---

<sup>15</sup> See Order 92-4-16, April 16, 1992, at 3.

<sup>16</sup> See Order 97-9-13, September 11, 1997, at 3-4.

ceiling has no legal bearing on Great Bend's service whatsoever.<sup>17</sup> Rather, we were merely pointing out the incongruity of continuing to subsidize a community's service to a *second* hub when the subsidy per passenger for that service is above a standard established for subsidizing *any* service at most other communities throughout the country. Frankly, a stricter standard should apply to second-hub service, which is not guaranteed by law and the loss of which does not sever a community's only link to the national air transportation network.

Like Goodland and Lamar, Great Bend contends that its traffic levels to Denver are low because Great Lakes' service has been unreliable. Data supplied to the Department by Great Lakes show a 1999 completion factor of 88.2 percent, which is actually somewhat below that reported by the community. Great Lakes' completion performance at Great Bend and the other communities has been mediocre, but we cannot agree that it has been so poor as to support Great Bend's charge of intentional neglect -- *i.e.*, that Great Lakes has deliberately performed erratically in order to erode traffic and get out of the market. Moreover, we are somewhat perplexed by the various communities' disparagement of Great Lakes, which has easily outperformed its predecessors in terms of attracting passengers -- one reasonable index of a service's actual value to a community.<sup>18</sup>

In view of the foregoing considerations, we will affirm our tentative decision to discontinue subsidy for Great Lakes' Great Bend-Denver service.

### **Dodge City**

Out of more than 70 communities in the lower 48 states at which we subsidize scheduled air service, Dodge City remains one of just four where we specifically authorize subsidy to support service to two different hubs -- in Dodge City's case, both Denver and Kansas City.<sup>19</sup> Dodge

---

<sup>17</sup> Great Bend's basic eligibility is not subject to the \$200 ceiling because the nearest large or medium hub is Kansas City International Airport, 261 highway miles away. (Great Bend's distance from DIA is irrelevant, since Kansas City is the *nearest* large or medium hub.) But we must stress that the 210-mile exception applies to the issue of a community's basic subsidy eligibility, which in Great Bend's case continues to be met by our subsidizing Air Midwest's service to Kansas City; it has no legal bearing on second-hub service, which the law does not even contemplate.

<sup>18</sup> See the Appendix, which presents traffic data to/from Denver for all seven communities considered in Order 2000-2-18 for 1989 under Air Midwest, 1994 under Mesa, and 1999 under Great Lakes. Although Great Lakes did not enter five of the seven markets until April 1998, its composite traffic results in 1999 were 32 percent better than Mesa's five years earlier, which in turn were more than double Air Midwest's in 1989. Taken as a whole, traffic on the routes has increased considerably over the last ten years, due to the introduction of United Express service and, in at least some cases, community efforts to promote local service. But while ridership has improved substantially at some of the communities, it has not at others.

<sup>19</sup> The other communities are Garden City and Hays as well as Harrison, Arkansas.

City's service is thus well above the program norm of subsidizing three round trips a day to a single hub in order to maintain a community's link with the national air transportation network. Dodge City's dual-hub service is already quite exceptional, and it would take exceptional circumstances for us to begin subsidizing a third weekday round trip from Dodge City to Denver, which would represent as much (and in some cases more) service from Dodge City to *one* of its two hubs than we support from most communities to their *only* hub.

Dodge City points out that its neighbors Garden City, Hays and Liberal all receive three weekday round trips to Denver, and that it does not. In our view, the comparisons are inapposite. In fact, Liberal is far more typical of the program. Liberal's service to Denver represents its *only* scheduled service, and we cannot conclude that Dodge City's four round trips to two different hubs -- one facilitating travel to the west, the other to the east -- is somehow inferior to Liberal's three round trips to a single hub.<sup>20</sup>

On the other hand, Garden City and Hays, like Dodge City, receive subsidized service to both Denver and Kansas City.<sup>21</sup> Dodge City notes that both Garden City and Hays receive three weekday round trips to Denver compared to Dodge City's two, but we should point out that neither is guaranteed more than two. Instead, Garden City and Hays have been the incidental beneficiaries of particular circumstances that have made it possible for us, with the cooperation of the carriers involved, to provide more service at less subsidy.

Garden City has received a third round trip to Denver as an intermediate point on Liberal's midday flights since 1992, when the service involved was operated by Mesa; the same arrangement has been continued with Great Lakes. Such a routing affords Garden City additional service, and the boardings contributed by Garden City increase the revenues beyond the incremental expense incurred by stopping there, thereby reducing the subsidy necessary to support the flights.<sup>22</sup> As for Hays, Great Lakes recently proposed pairing it with Salina, an unsubsidized community, over a Salina-Hays-Denver routing. Great Lakes expects that, with three round trips a day, the revenues generated by Salina will exceed the costs of operating the

---

<sup>20</sup> Dodge City also cites the cases of Goodland and Lamar, where we subsidized three round trips a day for two years in an effort to stimulate use of the communities' local airports. Again, the services in question represented the communities' *only* service, and we were concerned about the communities' chronically low traffic levels and their precarious future in the program. Those circumstances do not apply to Dodge City.

<sup>21</sup> Like Dodge City, Garden City and Hays receive 12 subsidized round trips a week to Kansas City, operated by Air Midwest.

<sup>22</sup> We first authorized the Liberal-Garden City-Denver routing by Order 92-10-47, October 28, 1992, and discussed it specifically in Order 2000-2-18 at fn. 1. At the time, we considered the possibility of Liberal's midday flights being routed via Dodge City, but a routing via Garden City involved less circuitry, and therefore less incremental cost, as well as more boardings, and therefore more incremental revenue. The choice was clear.

Salina-Hays segment; consequently, the carrier was willing to submit a subsidy proposal for Hays's service based on the total revenues and costs of three Salina-Hays-Denver round trips rather than simply those associated with two Hays-Denver round trips; the former required nearly \$40,000 a year less in subsidy than the latter.<sup>23</sup> In the cases of both Garden City and Hays, we would have been remiss in our management of the program if we had not taken advantage of situations that made it possible to provide more service at less subsidy. Unfortunately, similar possibilities involving Dodge City have not presented themselves; if they did, we would certainly be prepared to consider them in a positive light.

We have no doubt that the Dodge City community would utilize a midday round trip to some extent. However, we have no evidence that it would be used significantly more than the flights it already receives, or that the addition of a midday round trip would increase the community's overall boardings dramatically.<sup>24</sup> During 1999, Dodge City averaged 8.5 enplanements a day to Denver, or roughly 4.3 passengers per flight, and Liberal averaged 13.1 enplanements a day, or about 4.4 passengers per flight. Combined, the two communities averaged perhaps 9.0 passengers per flight, and will shortly be sharing a route operated with 19-seat aircraft. The capacity is clearly sufficient to accommodate recent traffic levels, and we cannot find a compelling reason to spend additional program funds to support more flights from Dodge City to Denver. Dodge City contends that the Department cannot realistically assess its need for a third weekday round trip if the community has never had the opportunity to utilize it, but we might be more receptive to the community's request if it dramatically improved its use of the service it already has.

This order is issued under authority delegated in 49 CFR 1.56a(f).

**ACCORDINGLY,**

1. We finalize our tentative findings and conclusions as set forth in Order 2000-2-18, February 14, 2000;
2. These dockets will remain open until further order of the Department; and
3. We will serve copies of this order on the mayors and airport managers of Dodge City, Garden City, Goodland, Great Bend, Hays and Liberal, Kansas, and Lamar, Colorado; Mesa Air Group, Inc., d/b/a US Airways Express; Great Lakes Aviation, Ltd. d/b/a United Express; the

---

<sup>23</sup> See Order 2000-2-18, fn. 4. Of course, continuation of the arrangement depends on whether the route's revenues meet the carrier's expectations.

<sup>24</sup> Dodge City quotes Great Lakes officials as saying that Hays's third round trip "is expected to increase Hays total boardings by at least 2,500 to 3,000 per year." In comparison, the carrier's traffic projections in its subsidy proposal show a difference of 2,000 passengers: 9,000 with two round trips a day compared to 11,000 with three. But even if the difference is 3,000 passengers, that difference represents a 33 percent traffic increase resulting from a 50 percent service increase and thus a decline in the number of Hays passengers *per flight*.

Ellis County Coalition for Economic Development; the City Attorney of Great Bend; and the City Attorney of Dodge City.

By:

**A. BRADLEY MIMS**  
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Aviation  
and International Affairs

(SEAL)

*An electronic version of this document is available  
on the World Wide Web at <http://dms.dot.gov>*

## APPENDIX

## ENPLANEMENTS TO/FROM DENVER

COMMUNITY	1989		1994		1999	
	AIR MIDWEST NO.	AVG.	MESA NO.	AVG.	GREAT LAKES NO.	AVG.
DODGE CITY	842	2.7	2,475	7.9	2,661	8.5
GARDEN CITY	1,611	5.1	4,859	15.5	6,748	21.6
GOODLAND	692*	2.2	965	3.1	957	3.1
GREAT BEND	212	0.7	399	1.3	1,119	3.6
HAYS	733	2.3	2,108	6.7	3,345	10.7
LAMAR	944*	3.0	1,382	4.4	1,471	4.7
LIBERAL	2,299*	7.1	3,250	10.4	4,088	13.1
TOTAL	7,333	23.4	15,438	49.3	20,389	65.1

NOTE: Enplanements represent one-half of total origin-and-destination traffic, and averages are based on 313 weekdays and weekends a year.

\* Represents total enplanements, both westbound to Denver and eastbound to Wichita.