

## Kawartha Lakes Municipal Airport

- Constructed as a general aviation facility in the early 1960's
- Facility was operated under a lease agreement until 2001 when the City took back responsibility for operations
- Governed by the volunteer Kawartha Lakes Airport Board
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## LeanSigma Project Presentation

## Infrastructure

- 168 acres on Hwy. 35 N
- Primary paved runway 3500 ft long
- Secondary grass runway 2641 ft long
- Houses a 6,674 sq ft terminal with flight school and restaurant built in the 1960's
- Two 10 -unit T hangar buildings plus one 4,500 sq ft hangar
- 40 outdoor aircraft parking spots with 16 full-time occupants
- Self-serve Avgas and Jet A dispensing system


## Tenants

- 36 resident aircraft in hangars or on ramp paying monthly rent
- Restaurant
- Flight school
- Hangar tenant
- Expect to attract up to two international flight training academies
- Staying in close communication with a major prospect


## LeanSigma Project Presentation

## Operations/Management

- Airport is operational and terminal and fuel accessible 24 hours a day
- Management is contracted to The Loomex Group - operations, administration, management of airport capital projects, snow plowing, grass cutting, etc.
- Staffed 5 days per week with 1 full-time and 1 part-time employee


## Operations/Management

- Municipal Airport Board governance
- Engineering and Assets is liason department
- City provides admin supports - legal, finance, etc.


## Users

- Flight school
- Private aircraft
- Ornge
- OPP
- MNRF
- Canadian Military



## Guiding Documents

- 2002 Airport Master Plan from Marshal Macklin Monahan
- Airport Task Force Final Report 2008
- Comprehensive Airport Review 2009 with public consultation
- Business Plan - Fortin \& Associates 2011
- Updated Business Plan in 2012


## LeanSigma Project Presentation

## What is it costing us?

| Operating - Actual |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Revenue | Expenses |  |  |
| 2010 | $\$ 159,439.43$ | $\$ 221,119.50$ | $\$$ | $(61,680.07)$ |
| 2011 | $\$ 179,943.17$ | $\$ 294,233.01$ | $\$$ | $(114,289.84)$ |
| 2012 | $\$ 278,396.93$ | $\$ 308,042.60$ | $\$$ | $(29,645.67)$ |
| 2013 | $\$ 356,715.54$ | $\$ 359,386.26$ | $\$$ | $(2,670.72)$ |
| 2014 | $\$ 315,686.94$ | $\$ 360,727.44$ | $\$$ | $(45,040.50)$ |
| 2015 | $\$ 337,550.98$ | $\$ 334,653.90$ | $\$$ | $2,897.08$ |
| 2016 | $\$ 346,288.87$ | $\$ 407,541.74$ | $\$$ | $(61,252.87)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Budget 2017 | $\$ 463,175.00$ | $\$ 474,393.00$ | $\$$ | $(11,218.00)$ |

Revenue in 2016 was impacted by issues with the payment system for the fuel system. It was replaced in mid-2016 which added extra expense.

## Capital

| Year Description | Budget | Total Spending | Remaining Budget for open Projects |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 Runway Resurfacing | 200.000.00 | - | 200,000.00 |
| 2016 HVAC System for Terminal | 7.000 .00 | 7,373.54 |  |
| 2016 Parking Lot \& Apron Lighting | 15,000,00 | - | 15,000.00 |
| 2016 Airport htemal Roadway | 24,000,00 | 21,871.54 |  |
| 2016 Airport Apron Rehab | 49,000.00 | . | 49,000.00 |
| 2014 htemal Roadway \& Apron Rehab | 146,000.00 | - |  |
| 2013 Site prep to west of extended apron | 25,000,00 | - |  |
| 2013 Grass area improvement, concrete rehabilitation | 75,000.00 | 141,806.26 |  |
| 2013 Underground hydro, water, uw senvices to airport facifities | 25,000,00 | 22,548.62 |  |
| 2012 Airport movement area repairs | 80,000,00 | 2,238.72 |  |
| 2012 Site drainage plan/drainage improvements | 80.000 .00 | 313,410.91 |  |
| 2012 Apron expansion to north | 100.000 .00 | 3.461 .86 |  |
|  | $826,000.00$ | 512,711.45 | 264,000.00 |

2008 Council resolution: "That the net proceeds from the sale of the Denfield Road property be placed in the Capital Projects reserve designated for the rehabilitation of the airport infrastructure."
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## LeanSigma Project Presentation

## Municipal Airports

- Study of Municipal Airports in Ontario 2006
- 74\% Not Self-sustaining
- $21 \%$ Self-sustaining
- $2 \%$ Viable


## Options

1. Status Quo
2. Invest now for growth
3. Lease to a private company
4. Close the airport

## Status Quo - Description

- Maintain current service levels
- Continue to operate at break even
- Continue marketing to attract new businesses (very real prospect)



## Status Quo - Benefits

- Minimal impact to city resources
- Supports 3 small businesses - approx. 8 full \& part-time jobs
- Provides employment - one full-time and one part-time
- Availability of an airport is a factor in businesses evaluating locations for expansion or relocation
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## Status Quo - Risks

- May lose current tenants
- Minimal opportunity for growth
- Aging infrastructure


## Status Quo - Costs

- Difficult to stay break-even
- Capital investment is necessary to maintain assets


## LeanSigma Project Presentation

## Invest - Description

- Invest in capital upgrades to the facility as outlined in the Business Plan
- Replace aging infrastructure
- Add amenities to attract businesses


## Invest - Benefits

- Opportunity to attract new businesses and aircraft to the airport
- Economic benefit to the community
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## Invest - Risks

- ROI on capital very difficult to fund through new business
- Very limited opportunities for funding
- If we build it, will they come?


## Invest - Costs

- Capital investment of \$5-8 million over the next 5 - 10 years
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## Lease - Description

- Lease the property and buildings to a third party to maintain and operate
- Similar model used prior to 2001
- Expression of Interest to gauge interest?


## Lease - Benefits

- Eliminates City resource support
- Financial benefit to City if capital is covered by lessee
- Retains the airport within the community
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## Lease - Risks

- Difficult to find third party interested in taking on the investment in infrastructure
- May have to continue with some capital support


## Lease - Costs

- May have to continue with some support for capital depending on arrangement
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## Close - Description

- The airport could be closed
- The property repurposed or sold


## Close - Benefits

- Capital investment not required for infrastructure
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## Close - Risks

- Property not well suited for development: outside settlement area, flood plain, designated as an airport
- Would close 3 small businesses with current leases
- Impact to tourism and local business if airport was no longer accessible


## Close - Costs

- Costs to decommission buildings, well, septic or sell as is
- Realty costs if the property is sold
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## Next Steps

- Report to Council to outline options in more detail
- Provide recommended option

