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• **Strategic Planning**
  – As part of the Airport’s strategic planning process, NRAC performed an initial review of its current governance model last year
  – To explore the issue further, in December 2018, NRAC created an ad-hoc committee to serve in an advisory capacity on the Airport’s governance model

• **Airport Governance Advisory Committee (AGAC)**
  – On March 19, 2019 the AGAC was appointed by NRAC with nine total Committee members with 3 representatives each from Grand Traverse County, Leelanau County, and the NRAC
• **Purpose & Goal of the Committee (Per the AGAC’s Bylaws):**
  - Examine whether the governance model for the Cherry Capital Airport should be
    
    (1) maintained as is;
    (2) modified within the framework of the current model;
    (3) amended to an Authority under Public Act 95 of 2015; or
    (4) whether to pursue state legislation to enable an authority model tailored specifically to meet the airport’s needs.

  - If changes are determined needed, to prepare a recommendation and report to the NRAC to present to Grand Traverse and Leelanau Counties as to what changes are needed and a recommendation on the necessary documents to accomplish any changes.

• **Open Meetings and Community Inclusion**
  - 7 committee meetings were held between April 30 to October 29, 2019
  - All meetings of the AGAC were announced on the TVC website and open to the public
  - All meetings included opportunity for public comment
  - On September 24, 2019 an invitation for public comment was held with more than 60 attendees
  - All AGAC presentations were posted to the TVC website with the ability to comment via email
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• **Airport Governance - History & Background**
  – Airport Established in 1935 by Traverse City
  – Airport transferred to U.S. Government in 1942 for WWII
  – Airport transferred back to Traverse City in 1949
  – Airport identified as a regional asset & NRAC formed in 1971
    • NRAC comprised of the City of Traverse City, Grand Traverse County, and Leelanau County
  – Traverse City leaves NRAC in 1990
  – Leelanau County inquires about alternative governance in 1995
  – NRAC commissions a Strategic Planning process in 2017
  – NRAC Board forms the AGAC in 2019 to review governance
• **Conditions of the Current Joint Operating Agreement**
  – Provides the ability for NRAC to operate the Airport for Grand Traverse County and Leelanau County, the two current joint owners
  – Establishes the appointment of Commission members
    • 7 total with 5 from Grand Traverse County and 2 from Leelanau County
  – Sets the powers and limitations for operating the Airport
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• **Current Agreement Deficiencies**
  
  – **Conflicting Terms**
    • Joint Operating Agreement term ends February 17, 2049
    • Lease Agreement term ends September 30, 2040
  
  – **No Dispute Resolution**
    • While the Agreement includes language for cost sharing (i.e., 85% GTC, 15% LC), it does not contain processes for resolving disputes including means and methods for 1) getting both Counties to accept liability of the proposed dispute and associated financial payment; or 2) for any non-financial related disputes between the parties that may occur
  
  – **Property**
    • Recent review of the airport’s Exhibit A property map has found matters related to historical property transactions that need to be addressed with the FAA
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• **Current Agreement Deficiencies (continued)**
  – **Board Membership**
    • No minimum qualifications
    • No methodology for appointing or removing members from the NRAC Board
  – **Profits**
    • Agreement calls for the distribution of profits, a violation of FAA policy
  – **Zoning**
    • Property Transfer Agreement states that the Airport is subject to the City zoning ordinance; however, this provision conflicts with State law and could impact the ability of the Airport to meet Federal grant assurances
  – **Deed**
    • Currently there is a reversion of property back to the City; however, as the current property owners, the reversion clause should indicate the Counties
    • Blanket easement for the City is a violation of FAA policy
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• Airport Governance in Michigan
  – Michigan Compiled Laws re: Governance Models
    • MCL 259.101-107: State Airports
    • MCL 259.108-125c: Public Airport Authorities
    • MCL 259.126-136: Political Subdivisions of this State
    • MCL 259.137-149: Regional Airport Authorities
    • MCL 259.621-631: Community Airports
    • MCL 259.801-823: Airport Authorities
  – Michigan Commercial Service Airports
    • 17 total commercial service airports
    • 59% County-run, 29% Authority-run, 12% Commission-run
## Key Research and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Michigan Commercial Airports</th>
<th>Enplanements</th>
<th>Governance Model</th>
<th>Legislative Authority Under MCL Chapter 259</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DTW</td>
<td>Detroit Metropolitan Wayne County Airport</td>
<td>17,036,092</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Sec. 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRR</td>
<td>Gerald R. Ford International Airport</td>
<td>1,412,132</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Sec. 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNT</td>
<td>Bishop International Airport</td>
<td>393,549</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Sec. 621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVC</td>
<td>Cherry Capital Airport</td>
<td>235,137</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>Sec. 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAN</td>
<td>Capital Region International Airport</td>
<td>196,617</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Sec. 801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZO</td>
<td>Kalamazoo/Battle Creek International Airport</td>
<td>146,314</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Sec. 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBS</td>
<td>MBS International Airport</td>
<td>110,964</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>Sec. 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAW</td>
<td>Sawyer International Airport</td>
<td>50,938</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Sec. 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLN</td>
<td>Pellston Regional Airport of Emmet County</td>
<td>23,961</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Sec. 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMX</td>
<td>Houghton County Memorial Airport</td>
<td>24,843</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Sec. 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIU</td>
<td>Chippewa County International Airport</td>
<td>22,261</td>
<td>County EDC</td>
<td>Sec. 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKG</td>
<td>Muskegon County Airport</td>
<td>17,007</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Sec. 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>Delta County Airport</td>
<td>16,781</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Sec. 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMT</td>
<td>Ford Airport</td>
<td>17,707</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Sec. 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APN</td>
<td>Alpena County Regional Airport</td>
<td>11,317</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Sec. 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWD</td>
<td>Gogebic–Iron County Airport</td>
<td>5,335</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Sec. 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBL</td>
<td>Manistee County-Blacker Airport</td>
<td>4,721</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Sec. 621</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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• Airport Governance Nationally

Governance Forms:
- Authority
- State
- City
- Commission
- Corporation
- County
- District
- Native American
- Military
- Port Authority
- Private
- University
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- Airport Governance Nationally (continued)

![Pie chart showing airport governance types with percentages: Authority 30%, Port Authority 7%, City 7%, County 9%, Commission 15%, State 1%, Privatized 7%, Other 7%, Total 37%, and 24%.]
Key Research and Findings

• **Advantages and Disadvantages of Commission – from Airport’s Perspective**
  
  – *Please note that various stakeholders could interpret advantages and disadvantages differently*

  **Commission Advantages**
  - Liability shared with Counties
  - Legal/professional services could be supplied by Counties
  - Can more easily rely on Counties for financial support
  - Political connections and support
  - Provides direct oversight & accountability by Counties

  **Commission Disadvantages/Limitations**
  - Cannot buy and sell property on its own
  - Cannot enter leases past term of Operating Agreement
  - No direct control of Airport zoning
  - Potential political influence
  - Less efficient
  - Sponsors required to choose between competing priorities
  - Legislation & Agreements not as clear
  - Lack of dispute resolution
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• Advantages and Disadvantages of Authority – from Airport’s Perspective

  – Please note that various stakeholders could interpret advantages and disadvantages differently

Authority Advantages
• Airport business focus
• Zoning control
• Buy & sell property
• Clear legislation
• Regional representation requirement
• Efficient & effective actions
• Reduces political influence & conflicts of interest
• Industry best practices
• Expertise criteria for Board members
• Limit of 45% of elected officials on Board
• More transparent, more public accountability
• Strengthens Airport to promote more services/better fares for the community

Authority Disadvantages/Limitations
• Liability held by Authority
• Cannot impose a millage
• Financial & operational support from Counties is harder to gain
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- General Benefits of a Regional Authority
  - Provides a singular Airport enterprise focus
  - Enhances decision making
  - Lowers operating costs
  - Strengthens regional coordination and economic contribution
  - Creates a stronger platform for economic development
  - Better supports Air Service Development
  - Facilitates coordination with local governments and community bodies on a broad basis
  - Fosters a business & customer service driven focus
  - Upholds leadership standards
  - Provides checks and balances, and community accountability
  - Helps protect the Airport from being politicized
• **Stakeholder Outreach/Input/Feedback**
  
  – AGAC stakeholders completed values-based survey initiative
  
  – Stakeholders were engaged in each public meeting of the AGAC and NRAC including:
    • 7 AGAC meetings
    • 1 Public Invitation to Comment in September with more than 60 attendees
    • 1 NRAC Study Session
    • 1 NRAC Board Meeting
  
  – Business leaders, community advocates, and concerned citizens all contributed to the dialogue and offered input
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- **Stakeholder Key Concerns**
  - Reduced liability for Counties, both short term and long term
  - Public transparency, accountability, and mechanisms for input
  - Greater regional perspective
  - Greater business focus and efficient operations
  - Clear and modernized legislation, including Airport zoning
  - Safety mechanisms to protect the Airport for the community
  - Promotion of Airport as a regional economic asset
  - Provide excellent service to community (e.g., fares, flights, destinations, customer service, community partnership, etc.)
Final Recommendation

• In its final report, the AGAC presented its research and findings, and unanimously recommended that:
  – Grand Traverse County and Leelanau County join together and pass a resolution indicating their intent to **form a regional Airport Authority** under Michigan Compiled Laws Chapter 259 Sections 137 through 149, otherwise known as the Regional Airport Authority Act.

• The NRAC unanimously recommends and submits the AGAC report to Grand Traverse County and Leelanau County and requests that the Counties:
  – Designate County administrators, the NRAC (i.e., the Airport Director and legal counsel), to develop governing documents for consideration by full Commission(s)
  – Provide an opportunity for public input into governing documents in December, taking all comments received into consideration in developing documents.
  – Bring recommendations to full Commission(s) for consideration.
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