

# **ACI-NA 2018-19 BUSINESS TERM SURVEY**

## **2019 BUSINESS OF AIRPORTS CONFERENCE**

Airport/Airline Business Working Group

Tatiana Starostina

Dafang Wu

Assisted by Professor Jonathan Williams, UNC

# Agenda

---

- Background
- Rates and Charges
  - Methodology Overview
  - Expenses and Recovery
  - Rate Details
- Other Contents
  - Capital Review
  - Preferential Gate
  - Miscellaneous

# The ACI-NA business term survey is one of the most valuable sources of airport ratemaking.

- History
  - Since 2003, ACI-NA has conducted several business term surveys regarding airline use agreements.
  - This working group has conducted a major revamp of the survey in 2016-17
- Since 2015, Professor Jonathan Williams has assisted ACI-NA in building a web-based survey that provides a convenient interface for responding and generating outputs.
  - The survey was moved to <https://aci-nasurvey.com/> in early 2019
  - The survey results can be exported to CSV or Excel file, and will be distributed to participating airports in June 2019



ACI-NA received 59 responses in the 2018-19 survey, compared to 60 and 61 responses in the prior year

- If you have not responded to the survey, please send your airline agreement to us; we will help populate the responses!*

FAA 2017 hub category	Complete or partially complete	Number of airports	% responded	Missing information
Large	22	30	73%	None, need airport approvals
Medium	17	31	55%	Mostly unknown
Small	20	70	29%	Mostly unknown
Total	59			

---


## Rates and Charges Overview

# We still see confusion regarding the rates and charges methodology in the 2018-19 survey


---

- Traditionally, there are only two rate methodologies:
  - Residual: airlines agree to pay any costs of running the airport that are not allocated to other users.
  - Compensatory: the airport operator assumes the major financial risk of running the airport and charges the airlines only for their fair share of costs (instead of whatever is necessary to break even).
- A third category – hybrid – was created in the most recent decade, which leads to confusion.
- The working group has further split hybrid between hybrid residual and hybrid compensatory.

# Airport-wide ratemaking may not be the same as the cost center ratemaking methodology.



# Residual protection and revenue sharing are two key issues to determine rate methodology.




- **Materiality**
  - A residual airport can have a small cost center not guaranteed by airlines.
  - A residual airport can keep a small portion of nonairline revenues (e.g., profit/loss from cargo cost center) and still be called residual instead of hybrid.



# Residual/hybrid residual slightly outnumbered compensatory and hybrid compensatory in the 2018-19 survey


- 4 large hubs and 2 medium hubs reported rate-setting under unilateral resolutions.
- 13 large-hub airports reported residual or hybrid residual.
- 8 medium-hub airports reported residual/hybrid residual.




# Long-term agreement is still popular among large hubs, likely due to capital program.

Less than 5	5-7 years	10 years	> 10 years
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Rate by resolution airports (BOS and PHX)</li><li>• Rate agreement (MCO)</li><li>• Auto-renew (HNL)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• BWI</li><li>• DEN (WN)</li><li>• PHL</li><li>• SAN</li><li>• SEA</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• CLT, DCA, DFW, IAD, LAS, LAX (rate agreement), PDX, SFO, SLC, TPA (extended)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• ATL, DTW, FLL (extended), IAH, MDW, MIA, MSP, ORD (new agreement)</li></ul>

# The ratemaking methodology is determined by capital needs, priorities, and negotiation power



# Each airport tries to prioritize objectives through different facility development stage



All the main conflicts between airports and airlines are about the capital program:

- Airports want to build facility for future needs
- Having a high cost of capital, airlines want to defer investment when possible

---

## Expenses and Recovery

# Administrative expenses are typically allocated based on direct expenses.

---

- A majority of the respondents (54 out of 59) reported that they include some kind of operating expense allocation procedure in the airline agreement.
  - This ranges from a simple statement such as “Indirect expenses shall be allocated according to the distribution of direct expenses” to very detailed exhibits showing the allocation ratios of each function.
  - Note: A different number of airports responded to each question.
- 33 out of 56 respondents reported that they allocate administrative expenses according to direct expenses, and another 15 responded that they allocate administrative expenses based on management estimates.
  - 5 airports included operating revenues as one factor to allocate administrative expenses.


# Debt service or internal cash spent on capital projects could be included in airline rate base.

---

- About 87% of respondents reported that they allocate debt service to airline cost centers to recover debt service instead of using depreciation/amortization for bond-funded assets.
- About half of respondents responded that they depreciate airport-funded capital costs
  - This question will be clarified in future surveys – it is intended for airport internal cash funded capital costs
- For interest rates used to recover costs:
  - 29% of respondents are using average borrowing rates
  - 26% are using fixed rate
  - 17% are using projected borrowing rates
  - Other airports are primarily using certain bond index rates

# Debt service coverage requirement is typically funded by rolling coverage.

- The bond document typically requires two tests: a flow test to ensure adequate cash flow, and a coverage test to preserve a safety margin.
- Rolling coverage funds the safety margin only once.
- Of airports that charges coverage:





# Investing discretionary cash flow and recovering through amortization is a key action to improve financials

- Amortization of cash investment creates true cash flow that rating agencies value
  - Through a cash flow coverage calculation, rating agencies exclude all non-cash-flow items, such as rolling coverage, or even landing fee credit from prior year
  - Amortization, on the other hand, is a recurring revenue stream recovered from airline rates. It serves as a cushion for debt service coverage

	Pure Residual Ratemaking			
	Year 1		Year 10	
	Airport A	Airport B	Airport A	Airport B
O&M Expenses	\$ 100	\$ 100	\$ 100	\$ 100
Debt Service	20	20	25	20
Discretionary Cash	5	5	5	5
Amortization	-	-	-	5
Total Revenues	\$ 125	\$ 125	\$ 130	\$ 130
Coverage	1.25	1.25	1.20	1.50


---

## Rate Details

# Residual landing fee methodology is the norm.

- Although an airport cannot impose airport-wide residual ratemaking on airlines, the landing fee rate can be calculated using an approach similar to residual:
  - Aggregate of airfield-related direct and indirect operating expenses, debt service, and fund deposit
  - Net of general aviation-related fuel flowage fee and other revenues
  - Divided by the sum of signatory and non-signatory airline landed weight
- Comparatively, a compensatory landing fee is calculated by dividing the net requirement by the total landed weight (commercial airlines plus general aviation and other activities).
- ***Revising landing fee methodology may have tax implications – discussion with tax counsel is a must!***

# More airports are using a compensatory or commercial compensatory for terminal ratemaking.



# Airports tend to customize revenue sharing to fit their specific needs

---

- Of hybrid residual and hybrid compensatory airports, 24 airports reported revenue sharing, with many variations.
  - 12 airports share a fixed % of net remaining revenues
  - 5 airports share a variable % of net remaining revenues
  - Other airports may tie this amount to enplaned passengers or other performance metrics
- As to allocation of revenue sharing:
  - 10 airports allocate revenue sharing partly based on enplaned passengers
  - 4 airports allocate partly based on landed weight
  - 6 airports allocate partly based on rented space

# More airports are using 90/10 or 100/0 formula to allocate baggage claim expenses

---

- Historically, 80/20 has been the standard formula allocating baggage claim expenses.
  - 80% based on enplaned or deplaned passengers
  - 20% based on the number of users
- In this survey, 15 airports reported 100/0 for passenger or bag count (no fixed fee portion), 6 reported 90/10, and 21 reported 80/20.
  - Some airports exclude low-volume carriers from the allocation of the fixed fee portion.
  - 6 out of the 15 airports above allocate baggage claim costs based on bag count.
  - Other methods may be used in baggage claim allocation, such as seats or turns


# Baggage makeup space is not necessarily available on a common use basis.

- Many airports have common use baggage makeup of some kind, but more than 25% of airports reported that they do not offer baggage makeup on a common use basis.
- Among 41 airports with common use baggage makeup space:

14 airports	• 80/20 based on enplaned passengers
4 airports	• 90/10
8 airports	• 100/0
5 airports	• Outbound bags
11 airports	• Based on departures, seats, gate counts or ticket counter hours

# Holdroom cost allocations tend to include turns as a factor.

- Some airports reported that they do not offer common use holdrooms.
- Among 50 airports with common use holdroom space:





# A good airline ratemaking methodology encourages sound decisions

---


- In many cases, many options are acceptable to balance priorities
  - Residual vs. compensatory for risk/reward
  - Preferential vs. common use to balance utilization
  - Using flight vs. using seats to allocate costs
  - Allocating revenue sharing to incentivize service
- In some cases, there are clear preference
  - Including amortization of cash investment to encourage prudent financial planning
  - Excluding administration space from rentable space to eliminate odd incentives
  - Properly allocating expenses to airline cost centers, such as roadway costs

---

## Other Contents

# The capital review process is closely tied to ratemaking methodologies.

- Affirmative MII: an airport cannot proceed unless it receives enough airline approvals.
- Negative MII: an airport can proceed unless it receives a certain amount of airline disapprovals.



# The capital review process is also influenced by known capital needs.

---

- Other issues to consider in the capital review process:
  - Exempted projects
  - Pre-approved CIP
  - High MII threshold based on airline-paid project costs
  - Annual allowance or deposits to maintenance reserve
  - Small capital outlay or equipment purchase
  - Separate MIIs for airfield vs. terminal (how about one for int'l arriving building/FIS?)
- One-third of airports reported that they cannot proceed with a project if airlines rejected it twice under the negative MII.
  - For the remaining two-thirds, one phrase is recommended to add: “Airport can proceed with the proposed capital projects after a delay of <<>> months, ***and include the related operating expenses and capital costs in the calculation of airline rates and charges.***”

# There is a wide range of qualification criteria for preferential gates.

---

- Of 53 airports responding, 30 have not set a threshold
- Of the remaining 23 airports:
  - 13 airports selected 4-7 daily turns as the criteria
  - 5 airports selected seats as the criteria, including fixed seats per gate, or allocating based on share of schedule seat
  - Other airports use airport average or assign gate at the airport's discretion
- Some issues to consider:
  - Should the threshold be dynamically tied to seats or turns?
  - Should there be an initial threshold and a maintenance threshold, similar to equity investment?
  - Should the common use fee for an airline be capped if they qualify but can't get a gate?

# Preferential gate allocation becomes a hot topic in recent airline negotiations

---

- Key aspects of negotiation:
  - Frequency: annually vs. as-needed
  - Timing: how many months before the fiscal year?
  - Number of common use gates preserved before allocating preferential
    - Limitation
    - Incremental annual changes
  - Basis: seats, passengers or flights?
  - Evaluation period: one month or one year?
  - Data source: airline report or 3<sup>rd</sup> party sources?
  - Reasonability: how to prevent an carrier claiming unnecessary gates?
  - Financial affordability: should common use fee be capped at preferential gate costs?

---

## Next Steps

# ACI-NA plans to conduct a webinar later this year to discuss this survey and recently completed airline negotiations

---

- How can participants benefit from this survey?
  - Survey result summary, such as this presentation
  - Follow-up to confirm and revise responses
  - Experience from airports recently completing negotiations
  - Research on key topics, such as gate allocation
- This can be a good learning opportunity for your staff. Please email [dwu@dwuconsulting.com](mailto:dwu@dwuconsulting.com) if:
  - You are not certain whether your airport has responded to the survey, or
  - Your staff wants to learn more about the survey questions.
- Please feel free to send suggestions and observations!

**Thanks to everyone who has assisted with this survey!**