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Introduction

The fact that Tennis Yukon Association is undertaking a feasibility study into an indoor tennis facility in 2014 signals how far the organization has come in the 7 years since it formed. At that time, it had been four years since any kind of tennis programming had been offered in Whitehorse, despite the construction of outdoor courts at the Mount McIntyre Recreation Centre in 2001. Tennis was most definitely “off the radar” for most Whitehorse residents.

Now, Tennis Yukon delivers programming to an estimated 450-500 adults and youth on an annual basis, the four outdoor courts have been refurbished under a new co-management agreement with the City of Whitehorse, and a range of partnerships have been developed both in the capital and other Yukon communities to foster participation in the sport.

Tennis Yukon’s first programming was based indoors at Yukon College during the fall of 2007 and subsequently expanded to include the Canada Games Centre (CGC) early in 2008. Much of Tennis Yukon’s program growth has occurred indoors, including its “Tennis in the Schools” and Skookum Jim After School programs and winter tournaments. However, winter programming has been significantly curtailed over the past several years due to restricted access to the Yukon College gymnasium and high costs and poor time slots associated with the CGC.

With the prospect of a free building site at Mountain View Golf Club, the timing is opportune to investigate whether Tennis Yukon could develop a viable indoor facility to help grow the sport locally and potentially leverage opportunities for other groups and/or events. This report constitutes the first step in that investigation.

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The primary purpose of this report is to highlight the spectrum of issues, opportunities, and challenges influencing the potential construction of an indoor tennis facility, based on a detailed consideration of a suite of working facility options. The report seeks to answer the following questions:

- What are the key success criteria for an indoor facility from the perspective of Tennis Yukon’s Board of Directors?
- What organizational capacity does Tennis Yukon have in regards to an indoor facility and the programming necessary to sustain it?
- What insights or best practices can we draw from the experiences of other indoor tennis facilities in similar-sized markets and/or climates?
- What are the potential capital and operational funding opportunities?
- What technical considerations are associated with the proposed site at the Mountain View Golf Course?
- Are there groups with operational needs congruent with the defined potential of an indoor tennis facility and – if so - what is their level of interest and readiness with regards to a partnership?
- What are the projected costs and potential revenues associated with potentially feasible indoor tennis facility options?
- Is the concept of an indoor court sufficiently supported by the current tennis community in Whitehorse? What is the latent potential for new tennis players if an indoor court were to exist?
- Is there a facility option (or options) that could potentially meet Tennis Yukon’s success criteria, and if so – how could the organization initiate and stage implementation most strategically?
Cross-Market Facility Review

No non-profit organization with limited time and resources wants to “reinvent the wheel.” Tennis Yukon can benefit from the experiences of other communities and organizations that have built and operated indoor tennis facilities in assessing the possibilities and challenges that may apply in a Whitehorse context.

A cross-market review of 10 tennis facilities was conducted by the Project Team, focusing on three key markets/facility types: similar-sized communities, “model” facilities, and cold climate communities (with overlap in some cases). More detailed background information about each of the facilities reviewed is featured in the following sections and highlighted in Appendix A.

SIMILAR-SIZED COMMUNITIES

The primary focus for the cross-market review was facilities operating in similar-sized communities, specifically Sechelt, BC, Kimberley, BC, Whistler, BC, Fairbanks, AK, Juneau, AK, and Saltspring Island, BC. In addition to these six existing facilities, feasibility studies prepared for the communities of Salmon Arm, BC and Sydney, NS were reviewed. Table 1 provides a summary of the Project Team’s findings.

FACILITY DESIGN & AMENITIES

The facilities reviewed ranged from one court (Salt Spring) to four court (Whistler) structures. With the exception of the Whistler Racquet Club, all of the facilities profiled– both existing and prospective – are pre-engineered rigid steel structures. The Cromarty feasibility study recommends a steel structure on the basis of their Club’s desire for a building that is “permanent in nature (20-40 years), generally maintenance-free, fire-proof, economical, easily accessible, and usable year-round.” Interestingly, three of the six existing steel structures (Sechelt, Saltspring and Kimberley) replaced “bubbles” (or air-supported domes).

Facility amenities ranged from washrooms only (Kimberley) to full fitness club features (Whistler, Juneau, and Fairbanks). The Salt Spring tennis centre design stood out as a particularly economical, inventive use of limited space with its 10x40 foot glassed-in lounge located beneath a 10x40 open viewing area/mezzanine.

GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT

Five of the eight facilities profiled are operated by non-profit organizations, with the remainder (Juneau, Fairbanks, and Whistler) privately owned. Virtually all of the public/non-profit facilities rely on Board and volunteer assistance to operate and maintain their facilities. For example, the Sechelt club’s nine Board members commit 16 hours/year (or an equivalent cash donation) towards facility management tasks – including building and grounds maintenance, publicity, events, and administration. None of the non-profit facilities directly employ a Tennis Director or other staff; however, most have arrangements in place with local coaches to provide private lessons on commission. Only one of the private facilities (Whistler) had a Tennis Director and full suite of staff coaches. (The Fairbanks club had a Tennis Director in the past but the position wasn’t revenue positive or even neutral, despite the increased programming and participation).

CAPITAL COST & FUNDING

Capital costs were available for only a few facilities. The Kimberley society estimates the replacement cost of their facility at $800,000 – $1 million dollars (including foundations and HVAC.) Sechelt’s two
### Table 1. Cross-Market Facility Overview: Summarized Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Non-Profit Private</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th># of Years</th>
<th># of Courts</th>
<th># of Members</th>
<th>Rig/Steel</th>
<th>Fabric Frame</th>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Capital Cost (1000s)</th>
<th>Fee Structure</th>
<th>Drop-In Play Lessons</th>
<th>League Play</th>
<th>Gamps</th>
<th>Tournament Operating Costs</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Winter Use</th>
<th>Summer Use</th>
<th>Paid Staff</th>
<th>Rest Room/Lessons Learned</th>
<th>Growth Trend</th>
<th>Best Practice Lessons Learned</th>
<th>Lessons Learned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Club (Valley)</td>
<td>&lt;ul&gt;&lt;li&gt;Juneau, AK&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;100-300&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;3&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;130-140&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;0&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;Full fitness club amenities&lt;/li&gt;&lt;/ul&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Club (North)</td>
<td>&lt;ul&gt;&lt;li&gt;Fairbanks, AK&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;100-300&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;3&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;2&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;180&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;35-40%&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;Fairbanks, AK&lt;/li&gt;&lt;/ul&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberley Indoor Sports Centre</td>
<td>&lt;ul&gt;&lt;li&gt;Kimberley, BC&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;100-300&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;3&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;2&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;20&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;80&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;Washrooms&lt;/li&gt;&lt;/ul&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre Court Indoor Tennis Centre</td>
<td>&lt;ul&gt;&lt;li&gt;Salmon Arm, BC&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;100-300&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;3&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;1&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;1&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;00&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;Washrooms, viewing area, lounge&lt;/li&gt;&lt;/ul&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suncoast Racquet Club</td>
<td>&lt;ul&gt;&lt;li&gt;Sechelt, BC&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;100-300&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;3&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;2&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;100&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;3400&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;Front desk, spa, change rooms, showers&lt;/li&gt;&lt;/ul&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whistler Racquet Club</td>
<td>&lt;ul&gt;&lt;li&gt;Whistler, BC&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;100-300&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;3&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;2&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;21&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;4&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;3400&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;Front desk, spa, change rooms, showers&lt;/li&gt;&lt;/ul&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruxity Indoor Tennis Centre</td>
<td>&lt;ul&gt;&lt;li&gt;Sydney, NS&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;100-300&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;1&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;0&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;-&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;Perimeter walking track&lt;/li&gt;&lt;/ul&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon Arm Indoor Tennis Centre</td>
<td>&lt;ul&gt;&lt;li&gt;Salmon Arm, BC&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;100-300&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;1&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;0&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;3&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;228&lt;/li&gt;&lt;li&gt;Washrooms, showers, kitchen, meeting space&lt;/li&gt;&lt;/ul&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Model** Facilities

| Abony Family Tennis Centre | <ul><li>Fredericton, NB</li><li>100-300</li><li>1</li><li>6</li><li>450</li><li>Shower, change rooms, viewing area, storage, high energy efficiency</li></ul> | -        | -          | -           | -            | -         | -           | -          | -                   | -             | -                   | -           | -     | -                  | -        | -          | -           | -       | -                       | -            | -                       | -               |
| Grant Connell Tennis Centre | <ul><li>North Vancouver, BC</li><li>100-300</li><li>15</li><li>9</li><li>750 cards issued</li><li>Reception area, offices, washrooms and showers, kitchenette, meeting room, storage</li></ul> | -        | -          | -           | -            | -         | -           | -          | -                   | -             | -                   | -           | -     | -                  | -        | -          | -           | -       | -                       | -            | -                       | -               |

* Fee Structure Coding:  A – adult; C – couple; F – family; J – junior; S – senior; I – intermediate (19-23)

- **Cost of operating in the North** and low revenue generating capacity/square foot make cost recovery challenging
- **Lack of tennis "culture" in the North**
- **Install indoor turf to generate revenue**
- **Online booking**
- **Be cautious with partnerships and alternate uses**
- **Good online booking system (Acebook)**
- **Members feel ownership of facility**
- **Great lighting is critical**
- **Hand-free access (electronic key lock)**
- **Social events**
- **Cluster bookings in winter to reduce costs**
- **Coaches need to be ambassadors/sales people**
- **Give coaches responsibility for growing programs**
court facility cost about $900,000 in 2007. Both the Kimberley and Sechelt facilities used pre-engineered structure suppliers located in Seattle. The one court Saltspring Island centre cost about $600,000, with the building supplier providing a significant discount. The cost of the three court Salmon Arm facility was projected at $979,000.

Both of the non-profit groups that built a new facility from the ground-up (Sechelt and Salt Spring) received very little public sector support, instead relying heavily on Board and member donations and private financing. Salt Spring and Sechelt had some seed capital to leverage ($120,000 and $45,000, respectively) and both Sechelt and Kimberley obtained mortgages to finance the balance ($100,000 and $50,000, respectively). Salt Spring relied entirely on private financing, 85% of which originated from four club members. Both Kimberley and Sechelt facilities were able to secure funding support from the local municipalities. However, Kimberley was the only facility that received substantial private sector support.

The Salmon Arm study anticipates a $362,000 loan from the Salmon Arm Savings and Credit Union and assumes the remainder of construction funding will come from the province and Tennis Canada support.

PARTICIPATION RATES

The facilities reviewed catered to a wide range of player and member populations, from the mid-80s (Fairbanks and Sechelt) to the mid-3000s (Whistler). Excluding Whistler (which creates an outlier due to its resort destination location), the average player population for these facilities was around 115.

The planning team behind the Sechelt facility estimated that a population of 10,000 people was required to support one court, assuming 50-60 “willing to pay” players per 1000 people. The Salmon Arm facility study based its three court projections around a regional population of 130,914 and membership of 228. The Salt Spring Island centre has a membership of 180 with one court, but about 30% of membership are community supporters versus active players.

Of the six facilities in operation, three are experiencing negative growth in participation (Sechelt, Fairbanks, Juneau) and another has flat-lined (Kimberley). Both Fairbanks and Juneau cited a lack of local tennis culture and aging user base as factors, while Sechelt noted age, injury, and emigration. Only Whistler and Salt Spring reported positive growth; however, Salt Spring’s recent membership increase is attributed in part to community support of the new facility versus new players.

With the exception of Whistler, facilities reported an average 43% usage of playing capacity in the winter and 22% average usage in summer. Facilities in rainier, temperate climates like Sechelt and Juneau reported little to no difference between winter and summer participation; however, indoor courts are virtually deserted in summertime in interior/mountain climate communities like Fairbanks and Kimberley. Whistler reported 80-100% usage of court capacity in winter (partly due to restricted hours and clustered bookings) and 50-100% in summer, with courts fully utilized for camps and morning drop-in play but otherwise empty.

Interestingly, school tennis programs do not appear to be an accurate predictor of facility membership or independent playing for the youth demographic. Sechelt, Kimberley, Fairbanks, and Juneau have public school tennis programs – either within or outside of the facilities – but all noted an aging user base and/or low youth participation.
PROGRAMMING

The facility review revealed a relatively limited range of programming in place in smaller community facilities. All had drop-in and league play and tournaments available and on-demand private lessons (Kimberley being the exception), and Sechelt offers summer camps, but only Whistler had a wide variety of all-ages year-round programming, including camps and clinics.

The Whistler facility actively develops sport leadership and coaching capacity through Tennis Canada channels. Kimberley completed the 3-year Building Tennis Communities initiative. Otherwise, the facilities reviewed are not actively engaging in sport development and capacity building.

FEE STRUCTURE

All of the non-profit facilities profiled cater to both members and non-members. The two private Alaska facilities require membership to play, whereas the Whistler facility is open to non-members (who account for 97% of their customer base).

Facility fee structures ranged from simple to rather complex. Salt Spring has an hourly booking fee in place, and players can also support the society by purchasing a $25 annual membership. Kimberley offers both an hourly booking rate and adult, family, and junior annual passes that cover unlimited play. Sechelt has similar fee options (public drop-in booking fees and annual passes), but also levies a one-time initiation fee for all levels of membership. The Alaska facilities have an annual membership (billed monthly) that provide for unlimited play with a 4-day advance booking. Whistler’s fee structure was unique among these facilities: a season’s pass provides members with priority booking and a 50% discount on court bookings, but it doesn’t include unlimited play.

Annual adult memberships for the non-profit facilities were $350 (Kimberley) and $963 (Sechelt), with Sechelt members restricted to two bookings per week. A bundled fitness club/tennis adult membership at the Alaska facilities costs about $1920 per year. Whistler’s annual adult membership fee is $350 and allows for a $19/hr booking fee.

PARTNERSHIPS & ALTERNATE USES

School groups utilize the Kimberley and Sechelt facilities during off-peak hours: Kimberley is located on a school property and is utilized frequently during the winter, while the Sechelt club averages 350 students per year in its school program.

Most facilities are not open to non-tennis uses, with some exceptions. One of the tennis courts at the Fairbanks facility was converted to an indoor turf field several years ago to generate much needed revenue. Whistler makes its facility available to youth soccer during the winter. Kimberley has provided occasional access for indoor archery and seniors’ groups in the past; however, they noted that soccer had been tried unsuccessfully (damage to floors and lighting ensued) and cautioned about alternate uses.

FINANCIALS

Operating costs were difficult to obtain from the private facilities due to their high level of integration with other activities and services. Annual operating costs for the unstaffed, non-profit facilities ranged from $2400 (Salt Spring) to $25,000 (Sechelt). The most significant operating cost for Sechelt is facility lighting, which uses approximately $1800/month in electricity. The Salmon Arm club was projecting $80,000 in annual operating expenses for three courts, with almost 25% allocated to loan repayment and only $8820/year projected for utilities.
Operating revenues for non-profit facilities ranged from $13,600 (Kimberley) to $85,000 - $95,000 (Sechelt). Salt Spring raises about $45,000 annually from its one court, while the Salmon Arm study predicts a “best case scenario” annual revenue of $184,000 and “worst case” of $129,750 from three courts. Juneau’s actual revenues from its three courts are about $28,000 per year. Whistler generates just under $300,000 in annual revenues.

BEST PRACTICES

The non-profit run facilities – namely Sechelt, SaltSpring, and Kimberley – pointed to various time and energy-saving strategies as their best practices (not surprising given their lack of staff and reliance on volunteers). Kimberley and Salt Spring said that online booking is essential to their success, and Sechelt pointed to its pending conversion to an electronically keyed system (in addition to creating numerous social events). Salt Spring also shared a facility planning “fear” that has yet to be validated in the operations phase: specifically, that players wouldn’t like the colder interior temperature and/or lower ceiling height.

Whistler highlighted its varied programming and staff/coach development initiatives as its key to success. The remaining two private facilities (Juneau and Fairbanks) had little to offer in the way of best practices, instead sharing their “lesson learned”: specifically, that the high operating costs for tennis facilities, coupled with a lack of grassroots tennis culture driving participation, renders tennis a largely unviable proposition in the North. As the manager for the Fairbanks club shared, “Not to throw cold water on your program, but no one…would build an indoor tennis facility in Fairbanks today and expect to make money or break even.”

SELECTED “MODEL” FACILITIES

Two “model” facilities located in larger communities were profiled: the Abony Family Tennis Centre in Fredericton, NB and Grant Connell Tennis Centre in North Vancouver, BC. In addition to their positive growth and impact on local tennis participation, they stand out as model facilities for Whitehorse in several other respects: inventive use of partnerships to raise capital, emphasis on programming, and fee structure. These aspects are briefly highlighted below.

GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT

Grant Connell is a public facility managed directly by District of North Vancouver staff and overseen by a community advisory group. Abony functions as a non-profit facility overseen by a Board of Directors and staffed with several employees, including a Tennis Director and marketing specialist.

CAPITAL COST AND FUNDING

Both facilities started as grassroots initiatives that strategically leveraged partnerships to realize their objectives. The non-profit driving force behind Abony managed to secure a number of founding partners to cover about one half of the capital costs, including land and access to regional economic development funding from the City, $275,000 in Tennis Canada funding, and ongoing in-kind support from partners such as the University of New Brunswick.

PROGRAMMING

Abony and Grant Connell have adopted a progressive, “something for everyone” program mix that emphasizes learning (clinics), drills, competition, and meeting (social events, tournaments, etc.). Neither facility relies on drop-in play to generate revenues; instead, the emphasis is on providing
appealing programs to convert occasional players to frequent players and create a passionate tennis community.

FEE STRUCTURE

Both Abony and Grant Connell utilize a booking card system (adult card costs $195 and $113 respectively) that provides priority booking and discounted hourly rates ($29/hr and $22.86 for prime-time). The public can also access the facility but with a two-day booking window. The Tennis Director at Abony noted that they are currently reviewing the booking card system after declining sales in the second year; apparently players aren’t playing enough to “pay off their card”.

FINANCIALS

Grant Connell and Abony operate with 11% and 18% profit margins, respectively. Abony’s operating costs ran at about 27% of Grant Connell’s ($188,000 vs. $678,000) for the same number of courts. Abony’s revenues were $231,000 versus $767,000 for Grant Connell.

COLD-CLIMATE COMMUNITIES

The Project Team undertook a brief review of cold-climate facilities to gather information relevant to Whitehorse, contacting six facilities in Calgary, Edmonton, Winnipeg, and Saskatoon and receiving information back from the following three:

- Calgary Tennis Academy
- Winnipeg Winter Club
- Lakewood Indoor Tennis Centre (Saskatoon)

The Fairbanks (and to a lesser extent, Kimberley) facility profiled as part of the small community review also provided valuable insight. Where provided, the Project Team converted the volume of natural gas utilized by a facility to its #2 heating oil energy using British Thermal Units (BTU) equivalencies, adjusting for the difference in Heating Degree Days between the facility’s host community and Whitehorse. The detailed calculations can be obtained from Tennis Yukon.

For the most part, facility managers and/or owners were only able to provide cost information. The Project Team formulated assumptions about the cost of the heating source to arrive at an estimated volume, and then approached the “Whitehorse equivalent” cost estimates as described above.

FACILITY DESIGN

With the exception of Lakewood Indoor Tennis Centre in Saskatoon and Tennis Academy in Calgary – both of which utilize air-supported domes - all of the indoor tennis facilities are housed within pre-engineered steel structure buildings of unknown R-value (note: Calgary Tennis Academy has both a six court bubble and four court building). According to the Cromarty feasibility study, pre-engineered structures can be insulated to R-30. A local building contractor who specializes in highly energy efficient residential construction noted that a pre-engineered structure’s R-value could be enhanced either by adding bat (or cellulose) insulation to a framed internal wall system or using blow-in insulation.

While bubble dome fabric has a significantly lower R-value than a steel structure, they can be insulated. Canada’s major air dome supplier, the Farley Group, has an insulation kit rated to R-10. Its competitor, Yeadon, rates its kit to R-14.
OPERATING CONDITIONS

Aside from building size and R-value (which was unknown for all pre-engineered structures), heating fuel source and interior temperature are the two variables with the greatest potential impact on heating/cooling-related energy costs. The Tennis Academy reported heating its tennis halls to a maximum of 15°C during the winter, and not using air conditioning in the summer. Kimberley reported maintaining their two courts at a cool 10°C throughout the operating season. Interestingly, Saskatoon heats their bubble to a balmy 18°C; the owner reported that the energy usage required to reheat the building after lowering the temperature significantly at night negates the potential cost savings.

With the exception of Fairbanks, all the tennis facilities interviewed had access to relatively inexpensive natural gas as their primary heating source. None of these facilities used air conditioning in their tennis halls during the summer season. Calgary and Saskatoon reported that their bubbles can be uncomfortable during very hot days as a result, but are otherwise fine.

OPERATING COSTS

The most accurate information came from the Lakewood centre in Saskatoon, which added the R-10 manufacturer’s insulation kit to their dome and reduced their heating costs by 50%. Winter heating costs average about $6000/month for their six court facility to maintain a consistent 18°C temperature using natural gas. Lakewood’s natural gas consumption from March of 2014, converted to #2 heating oil, translates to a $26,392 bill in Whitehorse. Its heating expenses decrease to a nominal $100 per month in the summer (or $450 or so in Whitehorse).

The pre-engineered three court sized facility in Fairbanks estimated heating costs at $70,000-$100,000 per year (their exact cost is difficult to determine due to the tennis hall’s integration with the larger facility complex). The Winnipeg Winter Club is 120,000 ft² in total size, of which approximately 17% is the tennis courts and lounge area. The annual gas and hydro bill run between $42,500-$46,750 for the tennis portion of the facility. The January 2014 gas bill to heat three courts and a 2000 ft² lounge space converts to a $6,150 bill using heating oil in Whitehorse.

Calgary reported a $28,000 annual natural gas bill for its 6 bubble and 4 steel courts, which translates roughly to a $133,952 oil bill in Whitehorse.
Organizational Assessment

A planning workshop was held with the Board of Directors of Tennis Yukon on April 15, 2014 to explore the parameters around a potential indoor tennis facility and to construct a shared understanding of both the internal (i.e. organizational) and external (i.e. environmental) landscape for such a venture. The following section is a compilation of Board discussion from that workshop, a subsequent interview with Tennis Yukon’s coach, and the Project Team’s independent review of annual reporting produced by the organization.

STRENGTHS

Tennis Yukon’s annual reports and high level of engagement during the April workshop speak to a highly committed, community-minded Board with a sincere passion for the sport. This dedication and passion have produced an impressive number of partnerships and new programs in a relatively short period of time under the skilful leadership of the President, who is universally regarded as a tennis “champion” in Whitehorse. The Board is prudent and mindful of both short and long-term needs in its planning and decision-making processes, as evidenced by the background study that preceded its decision to co-manage the Mount McIntyre courts with the City and the $3000 annual savings earmarked for future court resurfacing.

This resourcefulness, community leadership, and proven ability to partner suggest an inherent suitability for spearheading an indoor facility initiative. Furthermore, the significant increase in local tennis participation under Tennis Yukon’s programming bodes well for the future success of expanded programming in an indoor facility. Please refer to Table 2 for an overview of the Board’s assessment of organizational strengths.

In a subsequent discussion with Tennis Yukon’s staff coach, many of these strengths were expanded upon. The Juniors program was highlighted as an example of very successful programming that could benefit enormously from a future indoor facility.

Photo above: Tennis Yukon Board members prepare for the “Human Likert Scale” exercise during the April 2014 facility planning workshop.
### Table 2. Tennis Yukon Board SWOT Analysis - April 15, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERNAL ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>STRNGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Board committed to growth of tennis in Whitehorse</td>
<td>• A few Board members shouldering many tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Passion for sport</td>
<td>• Lack of clarity around roles/responsibilities of Board members – general Directors versus specialized Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teamwork in some areas of Board business</td>
<td>• Lack of Board planning time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strong leadership</td>
<td>• Less engagement of general membership in simple tasks and planning vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organizational financial management tools</td>
<td>• Less ownership of all Board members in some decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ability to be forward looking – vision, growing the tennis community</td>
<td>• Fickle membership – “spoiled for choice”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Membership increasing</td>
<td>• No clubhouse or “hub” of member activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Breadth of community partnerships created and maintained</td>
<td>• No online hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professional coaches</td>
<td>• Lacking technological solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proven experience assuming responsibility for both operating and increasing use of Mount Mac courts</td>
<td>• Strong reliance on current coaching staff – no succession planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prudent decision making record</td>
<td>• Low profile &amp; social media engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stability and continuity of Board</td>
<td>• Immature Whitehorse tennis culture and Board identity amongst tennis players</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Hands on” Board</td>
<td>• Need Board capacity to lobby government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Board places value in community vs. self interest</td>
<td>• Need more committed volunteers for operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proven ability to implement quality programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Program planning - thinking through all aspects i.e. media, timelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEAKNESSES**

In considering its organizational weaknesses, the Tennis Yukon Board demonstrated a high level of self and group awareness (along with senses of humour!) The Board pointed to the organization’s heavy reliance on a few highly dedicated individuals – in particular the President and Treasurer - to carry the majority of the workload as a significant weakness. Lack of clarity around Board roles and responsibilities and varying levels of ownership in Board decision-making were also highlighted. The Board also spoke to a need to engage its general membership more in a stewardship and operations role at Mount Mac. The relatively low adoption of technology (i.e., online bookings, social media, etc.) was also cited as a weakness.

Tennis Yukon’s coach further substantiated some of the weaknesses the Board raised. He spoke to the “spoiled for choice” Whitehorse recreationalist and shared his perception that the tennis community – while growing – is fledgling and somewhat non-committal. He pointed to the low interest in league play, the minimal uptake in women’s drop-in and mixed doubles nights, and the higher average age of new players (40-50 years) as potential indicators of a tennis community that may not yet have sufficient demand to make a facility viable. He further spoke to a limited local coaching capacity upon which future expansion would be based.
Facility Success Criteria

“Success” is by definition the accomplishment of a goal or purpose. Given the significant costs and financial risk associated with an indoor facility, it may be tempting for an organization to frame success strictly in financial terms. In doing so, it may start to view a facility as an end unto itself, versus the means to achieving a greater objective. Tennis Yukon must attempt to stay grounded in its broader facility objectives – or “success criteria” - and use these as the benchmarks against which a decision to proceed (or not) would theoretically be made.

The following section is a compilation of Board discussion from the April 15, 2014 workshop and Project Team recommendations around the topic of success criteria as it relates to facility design, partnerships, programming, and financials. Based on the success criteria articulated out by the Board and/or elaborated upon by the Project Team, three working facility options were developed for more detailed investigation in the final feasibility phase.

FACILITY DESIGN

TENNIS-SPECIFIC

Board members agreed on many design criteria for a potential indoor facility. Criteria that were not explicitly articulated by the Board but were implied and/or are deemed important have been added by the Project Team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Optimal Design Criteria: Tennis-Specific</th>
<th>Working Options Should:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Courts sized to competitive level – 21 ft baseline, 12 ft sideline (e.g., Western Canada Summer Games standard)</td>
<td>● Incorporate competitive court sizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Small (20 people) court level viewing area for pre- and post-game socializing, game viewing, etc. At a minimum, there should be a perimeter/barrier for viewing (if feasible, a noise barrier too).</td>
<td>● Incorporate a court level viewing area with barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Adaptable heating system that focuses heat where needed vs. overall hall heating</td>
<td>● Incorporate a radiant heating system focused on service lines of courts, viewing/social area, changing cubicles, access control/office area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Small courtside unisex change cubicles (i.e., change rooms in clothing retail stores)</td>
<td>● Incorporate courtside change cubicles, men’s/women’s washrooms (without showers), a small office space, and tennis equipment storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Men’s/women’s washrooms (no showers)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Small secure office space interdependent from access control, retail sales, etc.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Separate and adequate equipment storage (ball machine, nets, etc.)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Additional Design Criteria</th>
<th>Working Options Should:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Ability to support a Western Canada Summer Games bid</td>
<td>● Assume a minimum of two courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Sufficient parking space for 20 cars*</td>
<td>● Ensure sufficient parking space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Operations and maintenance costs are minimized over the facility lifecycle</td>
<td>● Incorporate a well-insulated pre-engineered steel structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates amenities that could be shared with other facility partners
PARTNER-RELATED

While the Board agreed on many tennis-specific design parameters, there was greater divergence of opinion with respect to accommodating partners. In some cases, the Board outlined partner-related design criteria indirectly by articulating the compromises they would not be willing to make in order to accommodate other users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Optimal Partner Criteria</th>
<th>Working Options Should:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Partner will not use 3:30-5:30pm time slots (key to tennis youth programs). Possible sharing of 2 prime-time days/week.</td>
<td>• Explore options for a sufficient number of courts or compatible infrastructure to simultaneously support tennis and other uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Partner wants weekend and daytime slots</td>
<td>• Prioritize alternate facility uses that use off-peak hours, maximum 2 prime-time days, and are low-impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Partner sport won’t threaten court surface with excessive wear and tear</td>
<td>• Assume removable tennis posts and nets and synthetic caps on postholes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Partner doesn’t require postholes in tennis playing surface</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Additional Criteria</th>
<th>Working Options Should:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Partner doesn’t require large storage areas and can quickly set up/take down equipment</td>
<td>• Assume minimal additional storage is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facility generates as much as revenue as possible during non-peak hours from alternate sources</td>
<td>• Explore multi-sport flooring options that could allow rental/sharing of courts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PARTNERSHIPS, PROGRAMMING & FINANCIALS

The Board articulated a number of other success criteria that relate to the non design-specific aspects of partnerships and financials. Additional programming-related criteria that were not explicitly articulated but indirectly implied and/or supportive of other criteria were added by the Project Team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Optimal Criteria</th>
<th>Working Options Should:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Partner will not use 3:30-5:30pm time slots (key to tennis youth programs). Possible sharing of 2 prime-time days/week if financials are positive.</td>
<td>• Assume tennis programming is the primary revenue source in prime-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• $50,000 in fundraising (from 200-250 individual pledges)</td>
<td>• Explore costs/revenues from simultaneous facility use and/or 2 nights/week rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• $50,000 maximum loan from a financial institution using fundraised amount as leverage (no member/Director guarantees)</td>
<td>• Factor in outcome of market assessment survey to predict likelihood of fundraising success and ability to leverage private financing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Additional Criteria</th>
<th>Working Options Should:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Facility minimizes O&amp;M costs</td>
<td>• Explore cost implications of volunteer-driven versus paid maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facility generates as much as revenue as possible during non-peak hours from alternate sources</td>
<td>• Assume a mix of off-peak tennis programming i.e., seniors lessons, school programs, alternate compatible uses, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facility adopts best programming practices (i.e., Whistler, Grant Connell and Abony) to maximize tennis participation and growth</td>
<td>• Explore the costs of staffing the facility to provide this level of programming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT “READINESS” CRITERIA/PRECONDITIONS

At the planning workshop, Board members were asked to provide the Top 3 conditions that would need to be satisfied in order for Tennis Yukon to proceed with constructing an indoor facility. These “preconditions” serve as broader facility success criteria that inform not only facility planning and design but also potential implementation. They are ordered according to their frequency of mention and/or perceived support by the Board, and have been elaborated upon by the Project Team in some cases.

1. **Increased membership to support a facility.**
   - 500 total members and/or 200 adult members set as a target by the Board

2. **Committed sources of non-government funding.**
   - $50,000 target ($250-$300 donations from 200-250 members and/or community donors)
   - Seed capital to be raised prior to or in conjunction with a funding request from private financial institutions and/or government
   - Maximum $50,000 bank loan (no personal loan guarantees from Directors and/or Tennis Yukon members)

3. **Partnerships with other organizations and/or ability to join a larger initiative.**
   - Facility partnership to assist with capital fundraising and share amenities is ideal
   - In addition to or lieu of a facility partnership would be a tennis hall partner (or partners) willing to rent space at a set price for set times for a specified 1-3 year contract (geared to allow for future tennis growth and development)
   - Tennis hall partners would have the resources to pay for their requisite share of operating and capital recovery costs and require no more than two prime-time weekdays

4. **Increased organizational capacity and development.**
   - More equitable distribution of workload and responsibility within the Board
   - Increased coaching capacity and community profile
   - Online registration and program planning system that integrates with its new financial software (and has been successfully tested with users)

5. **Committed funding for capital and O&M.**
   - Significant public sector support required to cover the balance between assumed $100,000 Tennis Yukon equity stake likely to require a facility partner and/or inclusion into a broader Games bid or implementation plan
Organizational capacity and readiness are essential to the success of an indoor facility, but equally important is sound strategy and good timing. These elements flow from a solid understanding of the issues, trends, and potential drivers impacting possible and plausible future facility operating scenarios for Tennis Yukon. Scanning the external environment ensures that Tennis Yukon can identify opportunities and threats that could help and/or hinder it in realizing its goal.

**BOARD PERSPECTIVE**

During the April planning workshop, Tennis Yukon Board members were asked to identify the external opportunities and threats impacting either the organization and/or its potential development of an indoor tennis facility. The Board highlighted a broad spectrum of programming, partnership and funding opportunities, including the potential for 200-250 members with good programming and niche market development. On the threats/challenges side, the Board identified a risk-averse climate with regards to non-profit recreation facilities and the many groups putting pressure on public governments for support for their initiatives. Many of these themes are further explored in the following sections. Please refer to Table 3.

### Table 3. Tennis Yukon Board SWOT Analysis - April 15, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>THREATS/CHALLENGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use social media and technology better</td>
<td>• Decreasing College access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build on potential of Western Canada Summer Games</td>
<td>• Canada Games Centre has limited space and is expensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tennis Yukon will have detailed feasibility plan and operating plan for facility when it approaches government for capital funding</td>
<td>• Reliance on a few coaches who have full-time jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explore opportunity with Mountain View Golf Club</td>
<td>• The &quot;Sima effect&quot; – low threshold for risk of non-profit run facilities by local government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explore opportunity with Yukon Outdoor Sports Complex</td>
<td>• Potential for facility to price tennis out of reach and create perception of private and exclusive sport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explore opportunity with Sima location</td>
<td>• Limited school access due to high demand for gym space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support for programming ($$)</td>
<td>• Uncertainty around fundraising capacity and willingness of membership to contribute to stakeholder tennis portion of capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential to mobilize membership to support indoor tennis (Sima example)</td>
<td>• Government under pressure from many groups to build facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to capital $$ from government sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advice from Tennis Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential for private sponsorship (e.g. Yukon Electric)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seniors are staying more active than ever</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Great local athletes attracting Outside notice, including tennis players</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Room to grow tennis in the communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong senior high school sport programming in Whitehorse, includes tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential for 200-250 members (with good programming, growing strong niche groups, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAPITAL FUNDING

PUBLIC SECTOR

Yukon Sport & Recreation Branch
The Yukon Community Sport and Recreation Branch’s mandate is to provide recreation funding programs, resources, advocacy and advisory services to Yukon communities and sport and recreation organizations. The Branch assists municipalities with recreation infrastructure planning and assessments, but generally focuses any capital investments on unincorporated communities.

There is no discrete fund for Whitehorse-based recreational facilities – municipal or non-profit – administered by the Branch. Major facility investments in Whitehorse are typically directed towards large-scale legacy projects such as the Canada Games Centre (CGC), which are subsequently managed by the City of Whitehorse without direct territorial support. Such investments are often tied to a bid to host major sporting events such as the Arctic Winter Games and Canada Winter Games on the basis of the economic activity and tourism they generate. There have been a few deviations from that pattern in recent years, including the debt relief and operational funding the Yukon government provided to the Great Northern Ski Society (GNSS) and its successor organization, Friends of Mount Sima Society.

Community Development Fund
The Community Development Fund (CDF) is administered by the Yukon Department of Economic Development and is a mainstay of funding for a wide range of projects initiated by non-profit groups, municipalities, and First Nation governments in the territory. Funding is applied for and allocated under 3 separate tiers: Tier 1 (up to $20,000), Tier 2 ($20,001-$75,000) and Tier 3 ($75,001 and over). The fund’s primary objectives are to support community well being, create jobs, and generate spending on Yukon goods and services.

There are several key things to note about CDF. First, applications for all three tiers are reviewed and recommended (or not) for funding by departmental staff; however, recommendations for Tier 2 and 3 projects (particularly Tier 3) are carefully reviewed by the Deputy Ministers from all departments. Broad-based community buy-in (as demonstrated by letters of support) is critical to building support for a project at the political level. Second, there are no explicit guidelines around the number of times an organization can successfully apply: numerous groups have received funding 2-3 times in a fiscal year, or in back-to-back years. Third, contributions in excess of $150,000 do happen but are relatively uncommon. Lastly, projects that are clearly broken out in multiple, discrete phases are better positioned to receive successive funding. CDF covers a maximum of 90% of total project costs but specifically excludes land development, administration, and/or operations and maintenance.

Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency
The Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency (or CanNor) is the primary vehicle for federal investment in territorial recreational infrastructure. CanNor funding to non-profits and/or recreational infrastructure initiatives can be significant. These investments range from $110,000 for the expansion of the Montana Mountain trail network to the $1.5 million dollars allocated to GNSS for a zipline and WildPlay park.

Strategic Investments in Northern Economic Development and the Northern Aboriginal Economic Development Program are the two major programs administered by CanNor, with numerous funds housed within each. One such fund - the two-year Community Infrastructure Improvement Fund - was geared towards improvements (including expansions) to existing recreation facilities. That fund recently concluded, but there is a possibility it could be reinstated. In the meantime, CanNor funding is limited primarily to background studies, planning, and feasibility work.
LOTTERIES YUKON

Lotteries Yukon administers funding for recreational initiatives through the Recreational Projects Program. The program’s objective is to provide funding assistance to projects that sustain and contribute to the growth of amateur level sports, physical fitness activities, and recreation. Projects exceeding $50,000 in value are considered “major” and are funded only once every two years, with priority given to those organizations that have not recently received funding and projects that provide the broadest benefits. Lotteries will share up to 40% of total eligible costs for major projects. Ongoing, multi-year costs and O&M are not included. Applications for equipment must be accompanied by a Maintenance and Replacement Plan and major capital project applicants must submit an Operating and Maintenance Plan. Over the past four years, only a handful of projects have received over $50,000 in funding, the largest allocations being $125,000 to Softball Yukon for building upgrades and $100,000 to Mount Sima for a new chairlift.

PRIVATE FINANCING

The topic of private financing was discussed at the Board workshop, and Board members agreed to a maximum $50,000 limit for private financing through a banking institution. They also stressed an unwillingness to provide personal loan guarantees (as was done in the case of Sechelt). With no physical assets to offer as collateral, the assumption at this point is that a bank would consider a mortgage on the basis of a well-substantiated business plan and a substantial amount of seed capital.

FUNDRAISING & SPONSORSHIPS

Board members agreed that a minimum of $50,000 should be fundraised by the organization as a contribution towards a facility. The $50,000 target was tied specifically to individual contributions i.e. $200-$250 donations from 200-250 members/supporters. The fundraising drive would further serve to galvanize the tennis community in support of such an initiative, as was recently proven possible by last fall’s highly successful Mount Sima membership pledge.

Tennis Yukon can also look to other successful Whitehorse-based and tennis facility fundraising initiatives for inspiration. Both the Rotary Centennial Bridge and Yukon Arts Centre used place-based individual donor recognition to great effect. Sechelt, Kimberley, and Salt Spring Island were highly successful in generating significant private donations.

Corporate sponsorship may be another critical fundraising strategy both in the capital and operations and maintenance phases of a facility. One seasoned Whitehorse sponsorship expert cautioned that the climate is generally poor with the downturn in the mining industry; however, there are opportunities if an organization can tell a compelling, community-based story. Another local resource with significant sporting event sponsorship experience reported that large corporate funders are transitioning away from funding infrastructure and more towards shorter-term commitments to athletes and teams who serve effectively as vehicles to “humanize” a corporate brand.

Nonetheless, a well-resourced and executed sponsorship strategy can yield impressive results, as evidenced by the Abony Centre in Fredericton. Three local car dealerships each contributed $25,000 ($5000 over 5 years) for court naming rights. Abony partners with local businesses to give away hundreds of tennis rackets to youth in promotional events, in so doing increasing the visibility of tennis in Fredericton households and fueling interest in the sport in the all-important pre-teen demographic.
STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS

WESTERN CANADA SUMMER GAMES

The Western Canada Summer Games (WCSG), or “Westerns”, is an amateur multi-sport event held every four years for competitors from the four western provinces and three territories. The Games encompass over 30 sporting disciplines and attract 2300 participants, 400 coaching staff, and 300 officials. Westerns have been hosted in smaller communities in the past, including Kamloops, BC, Prince Albert, SK, and Strathcona County, AB. The technical standard for the 2015 Western Canada Games based in Wood Buffalo was 21-foot baselines with 12-foot sidelines (between courts).

Yukon government and NGO sporting circles were abuzz this past spring with the prospect of bidding for Westerns in the medium term. The Minister responsible specifically referred to “exploring opportunities for hosting athletic events in the summer months” during a recent funding announcement. In reality, the next two hosting rotations in 2015 and 2019 are confirmed (Alberta and Saskatchewan, respectively); however, the Yukon representative on the WCSG Council says that there is a possibility of Yukon being granted Manitoba’s 2023 spot.

One government sport and recreation insider commented that numerous recreational groups have been paying visits to the City and Yukon government this past spring/summer to “drum up” support for their capital infrastructure plans. His recommendation was for these groups to unite under a broader vision to bring the Westerns to the territory and advocate with one voice.

YUKON OUTDOOR SPORTS COMPLEX

The Yukon Outdoor Sports Complex (YOSC) initiative originated with the Yukon Soccer Association (YSA) about five years ago, and has recently gained some serious momentum. A conceptual design report completed for YSA sets out the general facility and management parameters for three separate phases of development:

**Phase 1**  Construction of two artificial turf outdoor soccer fields and an eight-lane rubber running track at an estimated cost of $5.8 million dollars

**Phase 2**  Construction of three permanent buildings: two small buildings for change and washrooms and a larger, two-storey building (with an estimated 2000 ft² footprint) including office space, equipment storage rooms, field viewing area, 750-1000 ft² multi-purpose room and washrooms at an estimated cost of $1.2 million dollars

**Phase 3**  Future site expansion to incorporate a third soccer field, outdoor tennis courts, basketball and volleyball courts, and permanent target archery and lawn bowling facilities, with the possibility of incorporating a dome and/or permanent structure

Based on preliminary revenue and operating cost calculations, YSA is predicting that the facility can be 100% user supported. The Complex would theoretically be managed by a non-profit umbrella with representatives of facility user groups and staffed with an Executive Director and facility maintenance person.

YSA Technical Director Tony Gaw has been championing the project in both sporting and political circles for months and his efforts were rewarded with a vote of $250,000 in capital funding in the 2014 Yukon territorial budget for preliminary design work on Phase 1. Tony has recently formed a non-profit to oversee this first phase of work, and is working with the City of Whitehorse to identify a suitable parcel of land that could accommodate all three phases. Tony has incorporated Tennis Yukon’s
potential needs for a three court indoor facility and four outdoor courts (estimated to be 0.5 hectares) into his discussions with the City.

Numerous discussions were held with Tony over the course of the study to explore possible synergies between the YOSC and a prospective indoor tennis facility. Even though the current conceptual plan does not factor tennis in until Phase 3 – and even then, only outdoor – Tony has demonstrated a willingness to adapt YOSC’s plan to incorporate TY’s interest in an indoor facility. Based on those discussions, the two projects could potentially intersect via two main scenarios:

**Scenario 1**  
Tennis Yukon builds an indoor facility at MVGC in conjunction with the YOSC and the facility is incorporated under the YOSC management umbrella. Additional outdoor courts could be built in the future either at MVGC (if sufficient space) or in the YOSC parcel.

**Scenario 2**  
Tennis Yukon builds an indoor facility on the YOSC parcel and is incorporated under the YOSC management umbrella. Additional outdoor courts could be built in the future on the YOSC parcel. Ideally, this scenario would see YOSC and Tennis Yukon as full facility partners, sharing the amenities proposed for Phase 2.

The first scenario is dependent on the Whistle Bend location for YOSC, whereas the second scenario is not. There are various permutations that could be envisioned – including shared use of the facility with other groups under Scenario 1, access to the Phase 2 amenities under Scenario 2, and/or a re-configured, larger multi-use space and/or building that accommodates tennis under Phase 2. At one point, Tony indicated a willingness to expedite Scenario 2 by allocating some of the 2014 budget to geotechnical investigation and preliminary site design for an indoor tennis facility.

![Conceptual drawing of the Yukon Outdoor Sports Complex (Phase 2 field house and washrooms located to the left of fields)](image)
The YOSC initiative has definitely altered the landscape in which Tennis Yukon could pursue an indoor facility in the future. There are both positive and negative implications to carefully consider. On the negative side, the most direct impact will be on Tennis Yukon’s ability to raise the capital needed to construct. YOSC appears to have captured strong political support at both territorial and federal levels, likely because it helps mitigate the pending loss of the track and field at FH Collins, benefits a broad range of user groups, and facilitates a desired Westerns bid. (Its potential to stimulate residential lot sales in the Whistle Bend neighbourhood is not to be overlooked, either). On the operations side, Tennis Yukon could experience an indirect negative impact from YOSC if it ends up competing for revenues and partner groups.

On the positive side, the initiative creates new possibilities for Tennis Yukon, irrespective of a direct partnership with YOSC. The construction of a large multi-sport facility close to the MVGC site could bolster tennis participation and facilitate cross programming. Partnering with the YOSC initiative – on or off the MVGC site – could lend external organizational capacity, funding and political support to an indoor facility. The challenge will be ensuring that the foreseeable trade-offs – facility sharing and the growing pains of a multi-user group management structure - do not undermine Tennis Yukon’s mandate and/or vision.

Senior staff at the Yukon Sport and Recreation Branch expressed support for Tennis Yukon’s initiative, particularly as it ties in with a potential Westerns bid. However, they advised that YOSC puts Tennis Yukon in a “precarious” position should it decide to proceed with an indoor facility on its own. Their informal advice was to “get on board” with YOSC.

OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE FUNDING

PUBLIC SECTOR

City of Whitehorse

As recreational facilities located within the City of Whitehorse are not the jurisdiction of either territorial or federal governments, the only government potentially able to partner in ongoing operations and maintenance of an indoor tennis facility is the City of Whitehorse – specifically the Community and Recreation Services Department.

Mayor and Council passed an Indoor Facilities Cost Recovery Policy in 2011 that sets a 60% overall facility cost recovery target, including revenues and direct program subsidies. The 60% overall target is achieved by requiring 100% cost recovery for any facility rentals for adults and 50% cost recovery for rentals for youth, senior citizens, disabled individuals, and sport leadership/development programs.

The prospect of a new non-profit managed recreational facility in Whitehorse may be met with some skepticism in 2014. The dissolution of GNSS in June 2013 due to mounting debts and the near closure of the Mount Sima alpine facility in the fall served to illustrate that the “fall-out” from one society’s organizational and financial struggles can be significant in a small community like Whitehorse. City Council’s decision to decline a $70,000 request from Friends of Mount Sima to open this past season also highlighted the current Council’s aversion to assuming the financial risk for third party-run facilities.

While the timing may not be ideal for a municipal partnership, City administration commented that the City’s cost recovery policy need not preclude the fair consideration of a well supported and articulated business and operations plan that clearly outlines realistic costs, revenues, and anticipated contributions from the municipality.
Irrespective of a formal facility partnership, the City’s Recreation Grant program could be an important source of O&M funding for Tennis Yukon. Recreation Facilities and Parks are evaluated under Category 2 funding, which supports organizations requiring assistance with capital improvements and O&M. Projects that demonstrate a direct benefit to the community and a significant contribution from the applicant organization are prioritized for funding.

Yukon Recreation Advisory Committee
The Yukon Sport and Recreation Branch administers the Yukon Recreation Advisory Committee (YRAC) funding to all Special Recreation Groups. YRAC is oversubscribed in general and highly competitive, and its use for facility funding would likely divert financial resources away from Tennis Yukon sport development and programming.

PARTNERSHIPS

Partnerships must be viewed through the multiple dimensions they bring to the concept of an indoor tennis facility – financial, organizational, and strategic. The financial dimension is self-explanatory: a partner could share risk and help offset operating costs. The organizational demands of managing a facility could be reduced by pooling the capacity of numerous individual organizations into a well-resourced collective. The strategic dimension is less obvious but equally important: an organization’s ability to demonstrate broad community benefits could be the key to unlocking the political and community support required to raise the necessary capital to build.

In all three dimensions, partnerships should be viewed as a potential tool for Tennis Yukon to utilize to reach its own programming and facility goals, not the goal in and of itself. Maintaining clarity around partnerships as a means, versus an end, will allow Tennis Yukon to navigate the larger partnership question with a finely tuned internal compass that steers towards only those prospective partners who are aligned with the organization.

Alignment with Tennis Yukon should be evaluated on a number of levels - organizational, financial, philosophical – and of course the prospective partner’s space requirements and the potential impacts of their proposed use on both the facility itself as well as its ability to facilitate tennis programming.

This report looks at partners under two broad categories:

- *Facility partner*: A partner who could share building amenities such as washrooms, parking space, offices, etc. and contribute to capital fundraising and ongoing O&M costs for amenities
- *Tennis hall partner*: A partner who could share use of the tennis-specific space, most likely on a cost-recovery rental or lease basis, and may or may not contribute to capital fundraising

MOUNTAINVIEW GOLF CLUB

Mountain View Golf Club (MVGC) operates an 18-hole golf course in the Whistle Bend area on a long-term Yukon Government lease (annual fee of $125). MVGC has about 300 full members plus an additional 100 non-members that participate in league play. MVGC employs about 35 seasonal staff and two year-round staff: a Director of Golf and Site Superintendent. 50% of the approximate $1.1 million dollars in annual revenues are from memberships and green fees, with the remainder...
comprised of sales from food and beverage, tournaments, etc. The Club runs on a very tight budget, with operating costs coming within 0.1% of revenues.

In addition to the golf course, MVGC has two main buildings on site, the “pro shop” (complete with an attached deck space/lounge where food/beverage is available) and an older two-storey building that sees little use. There are washrooms located in both buildings but neither is winterized. The site has no fiber optic cable and Internet is accessed via cellular broadband (e.g. Rocket stick technology) which has limitations for online booking and payments technology.

Water for irrigation is pumped from the nearby Yukon River, and potable water is delivered to the site (apparently the capital costs of drilling a well were deemed too high in the past). Both the pro shop and older clubhouse buildings have septic tanks and fields and are pumped out on an annual basis. Power lines come into the MVGC property between Holes 3 and 11 and follow a maintenance road to the front end of the property near Hole 1’s tee box, after which they run underground for about 30 metres to the old building and across to the pro shop.

The City ploughs snow up to the entrance gate to MVGC by the City. About 40 members currently use the pro shop in winter for swing practice and analysis (and there is sufficient demand to expand this).

MVGC would be interested in forming a partnership with Tennis Yukon to achieve the following:

- Increased participation and opportunities in each sport;
- Joint membership and programming opportunities;
- Year-round use of both facilities;
- Better utilization of MVGC seasonal staff who could potentially manage/maintain a tennis facility in winter;
- Access to a heated indoor space to expand winter golf swing practice and fitness training; and,
- Access to better funding and grant opportunities via demonstration of broader benefit for needed facility improvements i.e., parking lot expansion/resurfacing, etc.

This arrangement would fall significantly short of a true facility partnership. The proposed building site for an indoor tennis facility is located approximately 160 metres from the pro shop at the south end of the main parking lot, requiring the tennis facility to be a stand-alone structure with its own amenity
space (although tennis players could theoretically utilize the pro shop and lounge during the summer season).

There are other challenges. Indoor golf instruction would require a ½ court sized space and the set-up/take-down time of the practice cages is about 4 hours. Lastly, the potential utilization of MVGC staff for tennis facility purposes may conflict with a potential volunteer-driven management/maintenance model for Tennis Yukon, as well as optimization of its own paid staff person.

OTHER RECREATIONAL GROUPS

A select number of recreational groups whose facility needs were viewed as potentially compatible with tennis were contacted during the spring to explore the potential for tennis hall partnerships (and/or facility partnerships if possible).

Alpine Club of Canada (Yukon Chapter)
The Alpine Club of Canada (ACC) - Yukon Chapter formed in 2012 and has about 150 members. ACC Yukon is the de-facto voice for a climbing community that is estimated to be in the 200-300-person range. (A predecessor organization, Climb Yukon Association, still exists but only as a funding vehicle for the school age Yukon Youth Climbing Team).

The idea of an indoor climbing facility has been high on the “wish list” of local climbers for over a decade. There are climbing walls at four local schools but none provide regular access to the public due to the Department of Education’s liability and insurance concerns. An exception was made this past year for the Team to open up the FH Collins wall to the public one night per week for fundraising purposes. The climbing community approached the City of Whitehorse about a wall at the CGC several times, but there was no progress made (apparently the proposed location next to an ice rink complex was deemed unsuitable).

With the pending reconstruction of FH Collins and a 2-3 year loss of access to its climbing wall, there may be renewed interest in this idea. ACC has seen participation in climbing grow steadily under its watch, with 20+ people showing up regularly for summer club nights at the Rock Gardens and winter ice tower practice at Takhini. ACC predicts that an indoor climbing wall could attract at least 100 dedicated users/members. The ideal minimum height for a climbing wall is 50 feet, but even a 38-foot high wall (the International Tennis Federation competitive facility standard) would be considerably higher than any of the existing walls in Whitehorse.

While the vertical space needs of this activity renders it a highly compatible – even simultaneous – use of an indoor facility, there are some limitations. ACC insurance allows for the local chapter to run activities such as climbing wall access, but it must be volunteer-supervised with no payment received. This requirement on volunteers sets up two likely scenarios: either the Club is limited to two volunteer-run climbing nights per week or it could potentially contract out climbing wall operation to a private operator. Given the individualistic nature of climbing, it may be difficult to organize this group around...
a capital fundraising campaign; however, the rapid growth of the ACC locally would indicate the potential to mobilize behind strong leadership.

**Badminton Yukon**
Badminton Yukon runs recreational badminton programming 3 nights per week out of the Takhini Elementary School gymnasium for about 100 adult and up to 20 youth members. They can set up 3 courts at a time in the gymnasium. The group has been successful in securing prime-time slots through the City school facility booking system and indicated very low interest in moving to a different facility, particularly if a rental fee was involved.

**ElderActive Recreation Association**
ElderActive Recreation Association (ERA) is a non-profit society dedicated to promoting active living for individuals ages 55 and over. ERA facilitates Yukon participation in the biannual Canada 55+ Games and hosts a variety of other events throughout the year, including a wintertime “Senior's Day” every Wednesday at the CGC featuring activities such as shuffleboard, carpet bowling, and table tennis. ERA reported that building and transit accessibility is very important to their members, they are adequately served by their existing venue/s, and they have little to no interest in relocating.

**Equinox Rox Adventure Camps**
Equinox has been operating a zipline, 30-foot high climbing wall, and ice climbing tower at the Takhini Hot Springs Resort for the past 11 years. The owners of the resort have chosen to not renew the lease this upcoming summer in favour of developing the site as a spa. A smaller zipline is being installed for Equinox camp use at the “Copper Canyon” crag (located near the McLean Road and TransCanada Trail intersection) and the camps will run on a mobile basis with drop-off and pick-up at Shipyards Park as in previous years.

Owner Chris Gishler believes that Whitehorse is too small a market to make a private climbing wall operation financially viable. Equinox would be interested in utilizing an indoor climbing wall facility but is not in a position to lead such an initiative; rather, it views itself as a potential lessee that could utilize the space for a variety of programming (camps, birthday parties, etc.) on an intermittent or part-time basis.

**Martial Arts**
A number of Whitehorse-area martial arts groups were contacted to explore facility needs and levels of interest. The outcome of these discussions is summarized below:

**Aikido**
Aikido Yukon has about 75 members and offers programming four days per week at a rented ($1800/month) facility on Baxter Street where it has a dojo set up. Their 4-6 pm weekday children’s programming is very popular. There is one lunch class per week and some high level training use in non-prime time hours but otherwise the facility sits empty. Aikido is very interested in a multi-use facility but it would need access to prime time slots and the set up/take down of dojo mats would be a serious disincentive. Its ideal space would feature 3 smaller spaces separated by folding walls (2 spaces with mats and one with hardwood floor).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Facility Use/Revenue Stream</th>
<th>Activity Compatibility</th>
<th>Scheduling Needs</th>
<th>Issues/Challenges</th>
<th>Level of Interest</th>
<th>Overall Potential Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Profit Sport Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Aikido                               | Moderate               | 4 nights/wk prime time | • Scheduling conflict  
•Preference for semi-permanent dojo | Moderate | Low-moderate |
| Alpine Club of Canada (Yukon Chapter)| High                   |                  | • Insurance creates limitations due to volunteer-only stipulation | Moderate-high | Moderate-high |
| Badminton Yukon                      | Moderate               | 3 nights/wk prime time | • Scheduling conflict  
•Rental fee | Low | Low |
| ElderActive Recreation Association   | High                   | Non prime-time    | • Accessibility for seniors  
•Non-central location | Low | Low |
| Judo Yukon                           | Moderate               | 5 nights/wk prime time | • Scheduling conflict  
•Preference for semi-permanent dojo to warrant move/rental fee | Low-moderate | Low-moderate |
| Karate Club                          | Moderate               | 2 nights/wk prime time, 1 weekend day | • Prefer central location | Low | Low |
| Mountain View Golf Club (swing practice) | Low-moderate          | 2 nights/wk prime time | • Significant set-up/take down time  
•Requirement for ½ court | High | Low |
| Yukon Aboriginal Sport Circle (Whitehorse Archery Club) | Moderate-high | 2 nights/wk | • Need storage for targets | Moderate | High |
| **Private Sector Users**             |                        |                  |                   |                  |                          |
| Equinox Rox                          | High                   | Variable; weekends & summer | • Interested in a lease but not initiating/building  
•Storage likely required | Moderate | Moderate |
| **Schools (tennis instruction)**     |                        |                  |                   |                  |                          |
| Public schools                       | High                   | Weekdays         | • Need City transit and/or school bus access | Low-high | Moderate |
| Independent/home schools             | Moderate               | Weekdays         | • Scheduling issues/limited transportation time for public schools | Undetermined | Moderate |
| Preschool-age programs               | Moderate               | Weekdays         |                   | Undetermined | Low-moderate |
| **Other**                            |                        |                  |                   |                  |                          |
| Event rentals                        | Low-moderate           | Variable depending on type of event | • Need central location and/or City transit access  
•Washroom requirements for large assembly occupancy increase capital costs | N/A | Low-moderate |
Judo  Judo Yukon has five clubs operating out of four Whitehorse schools and Carcross six nights per week. The clubs store mats under the stage in most of the schools they utilize, the exception being the mezzanine space at Vanier where the dojo is semi-permanent (and team competitions are staged). Judo Yukon is currently looking into investing in rolling mats to make set up/take down easier. Judo and Aikido have had previous discussions about developing a joint use facility.

Karate  Karate currently utilizes Selkirk Street school two evening and one weekend daytime sessions per week. They set up and take down mats but this doesn’t pose an issue. They have little to no interest in relocating to a different facility.

TaeKwanDo  TaeKwanDo is currently housed out of the Yukon Academy of Martial Arts in the Rendezvous Plaza in Riverdale. There is a dojo permanently set up for classes. There is no interest from this business in moving to a separate facility without sprung wooden floors and a permanently set up dojo.

Yukon Aboriginal Sport Circle/Whitehorse Archery Club  The Yukon Aboriginal Sport Circle (YASC) advances traditional indigenous sports and aboriginal sport participation in the territory. YASC delivers archery practice and instruction at Takhini Elementary from 4-7 pm two nights a week during the winter. They need a minimum 30 metres for indoor archery practice (18 metres competition distance plus staging room). There is insufficient space at Takhini for proper 1-metre diameter competition targets so YASC uses modified folding targets instead. Arctic sports require very little equipment and the YASC stages practice out of Whitehorse schools as availability permits.

YASC moves outdoors during the summer for field and 3D archery practice at the Biathlon Yukon facility on Grey Mountain. If it had access to an 80-90 metre long shooting range it could provide outdoor archery practice in the winter. YASC works closely with the Whitehorse Archery Club, which utilizes Takhini after YASC. The groups have about 120 active participants combined (80-90 of which are Club members). With a more suitable space available and the possibility of longer distance archery practice, these groups could potentially expand to 3 nights of programming per week.

ALTERNATIVE FACILITY USES

EVENT RENTALS

Event rentals could be a logical revenue generator for a tennis facility; accordingly, the Yukon Convention Bureau (YCB) was contacted for its insight. YCB commented that an additional 20,000 ft² building would be a strategic addition to Whitehorse’s event bid/hosting capabilities; however, the MVGC location is not ideal. The current large venues located downtown (Yukon Convention Centre, for example) work well for conventions because they offer rooms, catering and the meeting facility in a combined package. According to YCB, the Canada Games Centre, Takhini Arena, and Mount McIntyre Recreation Centre are more central and attractive for non-convention event rentals.

The prospect of hosting events at MVGC holds other challenges. There is already a well-utilized tent frame venue that relies on external catering and other services, eliminating potential operational efficiencies. Outside traffic imposes wear and tear on floors, particularly in winter, and a temporary floor surface may need to be invested in and stored onsite. Lastly, there would be a need for a minimum number of washrooms onsite to host a large event (according to applicable bylaws, a 300-person event would require a minimum of 5 men’s toilets and 10 women’s).
PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Tennis Yukon has already proven that there is interest in tennis programming in the public school system through its six years of partnerships with seven Whitehorse schools. The question is: how does that support potentially translate to non-prime time use of an indoor facility? Physical education administrators for both Porter Creek/Whistle Bend area schools and schools that are currently receiving or had previously received tennis instruction were polled via a quick survey delivered at the Yukon Schools Athletic Administrators annual general meeting in April.

Two nearby schools (Holy Family and Jack Hulland) indicated interest in both receiving tennis programming and traveling to Whistle Bend, while the other two (Porter Creek and Takhini), were interested in programming but were neutral or negative about the Whistle Bend location, citing transportation costs and time as impediments. Both École Whitehorse and Christ the King elementary schools showed strong interest in tennis but low interest in transporting students to Whistle Bend for instruction. Hidden Valley shared the following comment:

“Unless there are courts in or near the neighbourhoods, kids will not play. Went to school in California..courts all over... kids played. Tennis up here? Would be for the rich and famous.”

Interestingly, Golden Horn indicated interest in both tennis programming in general and the Whistle Bend location.

INDEPENDENT/HOME SCHOOL PROGRAMS

The Yukon Montessori School (YMS) and Yukon Home Education Society (YHES) were polled on their interest in both daytime tennis programming and access to a large multi-purpose space for other activities (neither group currently has access to a school gymnasium for programming). YHES reported that they have booked facilities such as the Canada Games Centre in the past but it happens infrequently due to the costs involved and challenges of programming for such a wide range of ages and abilities. The Society’s relationship with the Department of Education is evolving and there is uncertainty about extra-curricular activity funding; however, YHES’ decision to contract Tennis Yukon this past spring bodes well should funding continue. YMS is entering its second year of operation and offers physical activity to its students, primarily cross-country skiing and spontaneous leisure such as skating and tobogganing. YMS expressed interest in tennis programming, but stressed the need for access from the City transit system.

PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS

The Tennis Director of the Abony Family Tennis Centre identified preschool-age programming as a potential market niche. This type of programming could focus on skill development in young children, parent play and skill development and/or both. Several parents of children registered in the Purple Stew preschool program based out of the Mount McIntyre Recreation Centre reported that the co-location of programming with a workout for parents is a bonus selling feature, and predicted this could be a viable strategy for Tennis Yukon.
RECREATION TRENDS

The potential viability of an indoor tennis facility in Whitehorse will be influenced not only by tennis-specific trends, but also by the broader trends shaping how, why, and where people recreate. Some of the predominant and emerging trends impacting sport and recreation participation in Canada include:

- **Our population is aging.** These new “seniors”, however, are quite different than preceding older generations in their leisure choices. They will be more active and will likely continue to recreate in mainstream facilities rather than designated seniors’ centres.

- There has been a clear shift from formal and organized activities to more individualized and informal recreation choices. People are increasingly choosing activities that can be done individually or in small groups, at a time of their choosing, and often near or at home. In fact, in Canada, registered sport participation levels fell to 28% in 2005, as compared to 34% in 1998 and 45% in 1992. Young families are also looking for inexpensive, informal activities that can be enjoyed as a family unit.

- Another clear trend is the shift toward the experiential aspect of activities. People are seeking personal growth and meaning in the activities they choose. Registration in classes has increased as people seek lifestyle-oriented skills. People not only have high expectations for achieving personal benefits, but also that there will be a high quality of service in terms of quality of instruction, customer service, and facility cleanliness and appearance.

- Geoff Godbey and others have documented that people’s discretionary time is available in smaller chunks. This is reflected not only in the shift to more individual activities, but also shorter periods of “time deepening” activity where people multi-task during both work and leisure activities, (e.g., reading a report while on a treadmill). While many individuals report that they value their leisure time more than work, they may still be challenged to integrate

---

**Implications for Whitehorse indoor tennis**

Almost 15% of Yukon residents will be 65+ in 2021. With the emergence of the more active senior demographic, as evidenced by statistics and direct observation of participation trends at Mount Mac, there will likely be increased demand for tennis from this cohort in future years – especially in the winter indoor tennis season.

---

**Implications for Whitehorse indoor tennis**

Tennis qualifies as a more individualized and informal sport, and outdoor tennis is often a short drive from home. The minimal time and effort required to book a court time with a friend at a time and place of choosing is congruent with this trend.

---

1 See Sport Participation in Canada, 2005 by Fidelis Ifedi Culture, Tourism and the Centre for Education Statistics Division, Stats Canada, from [www.statcan.gc.ca](http://www.statcan.gc.ca), 2010

leisure into their lifestyles by finding or creating time.

- **Levels of inactivity among youth are increasing.** Higher inactivity and obesity levels in children and youth are resulting in the increasing early diagnosis of chronic diseases such as Type II diabetes. Tennis is one more accessible and affordable recreation option for the percentage of youth who might be inspired to play.

### TENNIS PARTICIPATION TRENDS

In 2009 and 2010, Tennis Canada conducted detailed national market research into past and current tennis playing habits by season and region, measuring frequency and investigating why players stop playing. Insight gleaned from the research includes:

- The fastest growing tennis player cohort is the 18-24 yr age range, which has doubled the number of people who report ever playing tennis since 2008.
- Health and exercise benefits are the main reasons for participation overall (and increases with age), but simply ‘having fun’ is an important reason for 12-24 year-olds, and for those 55+ Socialization is an increasingly important aspect of tennis play.
- The two most common reasons people gave for not participating in tennis (in all seasons) were Family commitments/not enough time, followed by Prefer to play other sports. Ranking third (just above Don’t have access to tennis courts) was Don’t have a partner to play with.

The barriers to participation from this national study are fairly consistent with what we learned from the Whitehorse market survey, suggesting that the motivations for participation may be similar as well.

### LISTENING TO THE WHITEHORSE MARKET: SURVEY RESULTS

A survey of Whitehorse area tennis players was undertaken over a six-week period from May 17 to July 15, 2014. The survey was available both online in FluidSurvey™ format and in hard copy at the tennis courts. The source of the 158 survey responses was twofold: people on Tennis Yukon’s mailing list who received a direct e-mail invitation with survey URL address (N=113 or 71.5%) and players who attended an Open House registration night at the Mount Mac courts and received the survey onsite via laptop or iPad (N=45 or 28.5%). Of the 158 respondents, two did not answer any questions, and an additional 18 only partially completed the survey, resulting in an 87.34% completion rate (a relatively high figure for this type of survey).

### MEMBERSHIP & PARTICIPATION

Approximately half of all survey respondents were Mount Mac shoe tag pass holders, whereas over 95% respondents who self-identified as frequent players were pass holders. From an analysis of the data, we can infer that the 19 shoe tag pass holders who were not frequent players were primarily Juniors whose parents answered the survey and are not frequent players themselves.

---

3 Canadian Tennis Participation Study - 2010, Final Report, researched by Charlton Strategic Research Inc., for Tennis Canada, provided by Hatem Mcdadi
Do you, or anyone in your household, have a Mount Mac Shoe Tag Pass?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage (all Respondents)</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage (Frequent Players)</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>152</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost 40% of survey respondents self-identified as frequent players, followed by lapsed and occasional players.

What Type of Player Would You Describe Yourself As?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Chart</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have never played tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a lapsed player (I used to play tennis but have not for at least a year)</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am an occasional tennis player (I played at least once in the past year)</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a frequent tennis player (I play at least once every 2 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>156</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BARRIERS & INCENTIVES TO PARTICIPATION

Survey respondents were queried in regards to their motivations, barriers to participation, willingness to play, and frequency of play, as well as other key questions that directly relate to the feasibility of an indoor tennis facility.

As evidenced by the Grant Connell and Abony centres, one of the key indicators of facility success is its ability to convert occasional players into frequent players. The primary barriers to participation (shown in italics) indicated by occasional players in Whitehorse included lack of year-round court access, lack of skill, lack of suitable partners, and competing activities. The results indicate that **between 25-40% of Whitehorse's occasional players could become frequent players with sophisticated programming in place**. They further indicate that **roughly half of Whitehorse's occasional players are oversubscribed** and not looking for more activities in their lives.

Similarly, the potential to convert lapsed players into occasional or frequent players is a key indicator of facility success. The primary barriers to participation (shown in italics) indicated by lapsed players in Whitehorse included lack of year-round court access, lack of suitable partners, and competing activities. The responses indicate that **20-30% of lapsed players might play again with the right programming** in place. However, **roughly half of lapsed players are too busy with other activities** to find time for tennis.
Why Do You Only Play Tennis Occasionally?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Chart</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I'm not a very skilled player</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have enough partners to play with at my skill level</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no court booking system so I can’t be certain of getting a court when I have free time available</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t enjoy tennis enough</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have too many other activities keeping me busy</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My age and/or health prevents me from playing more</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can’t play during the winter so it’s hard to maintain interest/motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify...</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why are you a lapsed tennis player?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Chart</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not enjoy tennis anymore</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could not find suitable players to play with</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age and/or health and/or fitness level prevent me from playing</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I participate in too many other activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can’t play during the winter so it’s hard to maintain interest/motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If affordable courts were available in non-summer months, I would consider playing tennis again</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify...</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The key to supporting an indoor facility is the number and motivation level of frequent players. This “passion to play” was explored by asking frequent players what types of tennis participation they would be interested in. 9 out of 10 would support an indoor facility if affordable. Furthermore, almost 4 in 10 would take advanced lessons, and 6 in 10 would participate in league play. These results indicate a high level of passion to play tennis in the core group that would potentially support a Whitehorse facility. Also interesting is that 50% of these frequent players indicated they knew someone who would enjoy winter indoor tennis (perhaps including occasional or lapsed players who took the survey).
As a frequent player, which of the following statements apply to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Chart</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If affordable indoor tennis courts were available, I would continue</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>playing frequently during the non-summer months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would participate in lessons to improve my skills in the non-summer</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would participate in weekly league play in the non-summer months</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a friend who, with some instruction, would enjoy playing indoor</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tennis at a fun, social tennis centre during the non-summer months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify...</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses 61

In a further probe of the potential indoor tennis market, respondents were asked to indicate the tennis playing status of other members of their household. Only 1 in 4 frequent players have at least one other adult living with them who has never played tennis. This indicates a market niche, and if the barriers to participation indicated by lapsed and occasional players in Whitehorse were applied to this group, some could theoretically be attracted to an indoor facility (note: some of these partner frequent players could have answered their own survey). The results also showed that about 1 in 4 children and youth currently playing tennis will play in an indoor tennis facility, and of these, 80% now play frequently.

WILLINGNESS-TO-PAY, PLAYING FREQUENCY & FACILITY PREFERENCES

Understanding the willingness-to-pay (WTP) for indoor tennis is essential to an informed assessment of feasibility. Of the 140 respondents who answered, about 3 out of 4 expressed a willingness to pay a minimum of $25 per hour (some respondents answered for their children and/or youth). When WTP responses are broken down by player sub-group, they show that 82% of frequent players are willing to pay $25 per hour for indoor tennis, and almost 4 in 10 would pay the higher fees of $30 or $35. However, the survey also indicates that almost 1 in 5 frequent players would not pay these fees for tennis.

What is the maximum amount you would be willing to pay for a 1-hour “prime time” booking in a heated, lit, and quality surfaced indoor tennis facility during the winter?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage (all Respondents)</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage (Frequent Players)</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$25 ($12.50 per singles player, $6.25 per doubles) player</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30 ($15.00 per singles player, $7.50 per doubles)</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35 ($17.50 per singles player, $8.75 per doubles)</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not pay these prices for tennis</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses 139

The survey provided an opportunity to test Tennis Yukon’s success criteria of generating 200 $250 pledges before committing to building a facility. Whereas 3 out of 10 in the entire survey sample would not pledge this amount, this number was reduced to 3 in 20 for frequent players. Almost 6 in 10 frequent players agreed they would pledge this amount. Data analysis also showed that 2 in 5 respondents indicating they
were occasional players, and 1 in 4 lapsed player respondents, indicated that their household would pledge to this initiative.

### Would your household be willing to pledge $250 as a one-time tax-deductible donation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage (all Respondents)</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage (Frequent Players)</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, our household would pledge</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, our household would not pledge</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We would consider pledging</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>138</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other survey findings included:

- Frequent players would play an average of 12 times per quarter (adjusting for vacations, sick days, injuries, and different playing habits).

- About 1 in 4 respondents think it is Important or Very Important that an indoor tennis facility is co-located with other recreation facilities. A similar number think it is Not at all Important. There is a stronger support for co-location by those households with families.

- 4 out of 10 respondents think it is Important or Very Important that a facility includes a space to socialize before and after tennis. Only 1 in five think it is Not at all Important.

- Almost half of respondents think that location within a 10-minute drive was Important or Very Important.

- A strong majority of respondents (4 out of 5) believe that a proper tennis surface is Important or Very Important.

### WHITEHORSE MARKET SIZE & POTENTIAL

**CURRENT MARKET**

A successful indoor tennis operation requires a foundation market of frequent tennis players who will invest in tennis because they are passionate about playing. The ability to maintain and grow this market after initially attracting them to try indoor tennis depends primarily on the quality of the experience – including the social environment, the quality and enjoyment level of lessons and learning, the availability of league play and partners tailored to an individual’s skill level, and the comfort and location of the indoor tennis centre itself. Assuming that these factors would apply to a Whitehorse facility, the question then becomes whether or not that market of frequent tennis players is sufficient to support a facility in the initial years of operation.

The 2009/10 Tennis Canada research is one source of data from which a frequent player estimate can be derived. The latter, and likely more reliable and rational in this context, is the results of the survey developed for this study and informed by Whitehorse tennis players in May and June of 2014.

The Tennis Canada research is slightly dated as of 2014, and did not incorporate any information from the Yukon and/or Northwest Territories, limiting its application to the Whitehorse scenario. It indicated that
turf tennis play was most popular in B.C., followed by Ontario and Quebec, and that participation rates were higher and growing faster in urban centres. However, if we were to assume that Whitehorse’s participation rates are on par with Alberta’s, the research would point to an approximate 1% of the population as being frequent tennis players in summer (play 2 times per month from May to September) and approximately half of this figure in winter (due to opportunity, cost, and other recreational activities). In Whitehorse (population 28,000), this translates into approximately 280 frequent tennis players in summer, and 140 in the winter months. This latter figure is highly speculative: ultimately it depends on the opportunity for indoor play.

The Mount Mac court shoe tag sales are likely a more accurate indicator of the Whitehorse summer frequent tennis player population (being the only active tennis venue in the city). At a price of $80 for unlimited summer access versus a $10 drop-in fee, it can be assumed that most players in possession of a shoe tag play frequently enough to “pay it off.”# Tag sales also provide an indirect measure of tennis participation growth in Whitehorse. Shoe tag sales indicate a 23% growth in tennis participation from 2012 to 2013, and 11% from 2013 to 2014. This positive growth curve can likely be attributed to the strong Yukon Tennis school programs and the suite of tennis programming available for adults and youth in summer. Please refer to Table 5 for more detailed information on shoe tag sales.

Table 5. Shoe Tag Sales: 2011-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Member</th>
<th>Total Shoe-Tag Sales</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Junior/Seniors</th>
<th>Family/Couples (Multiple tags)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Tennis Yukon

The survey results suggest that about 20% of frequent players in summer would not be willing to pay for winter indoor tennis. A solid percentage of shoe tag sales in 2014 were for families, where some, but not necessarily all, family members could be considered frequent players. Given these factors, we estimate that the current “core” frequent player market in Whitehorse is comprised of about 100-120 players.

LATENT MARKET

We define the latent indoor tennis market as those people, given the right market conditions, who would change their recreational habits to play regularly (being a core frequent player averaging once a week or 36 times per indoor season play). Tapping into the latent market requires converting occasional players into frequent players, drawing lapsed players back into the sport, and attracting newcomers with quality programming and a welcoming experience.

Indicators of the latent indoor tennis market in Whitehorse include the following:

- Survey results showed that between 25%-40% of occasional players and 20%-30% of lapsed players might become frequent players, or at least try indoor tennis, with sophisticated programming. However, about half of all occasional and lapsed players gave no indication they were motivated or had the time to participate (or participate more frequently).

- Whitehorse is growing at a rate of 1.7% per annum5, creating a larger population base and an increase in tennis players. The population in 2021 is projected to be between 30,721 and 33,179.6

---

4

5 http://www.yukoncommunities.yk.ca/whitehorse/whitehorse-population-labour-force
The survey indicated that 50% of frequent players knew someone whom they believed would be willing to play (even if occasionally) indoor tennis.

The Grant Connell Centre market achieved a 6-7% compound annual growth in core frequent players over 10 years due to their model programming. The strong school and summer camp programming developed by Tennis Yukon and the 23% and 11% growth in shoe tag sales in 2013/14 would suggest that this target is achievable.

Tennis Yukon’s coach reported that drop-in players would likely represent between 20 to 30 visits total (from an unspecified number of individuals). This fact, combined with shoe tag sales growth, indicates that occasional and latent players in Whitehorse can become frequent players.

Tennis is growing in popularity across the country as homegrown players such as Genie Bouchard and Milos Raonic put their mark on world tennis and inspire young Canadians.

While we have no reliable way of estimating the current number of occasional and/or lapsed tennis players in Whitehorse at present, we can predict a likely growth scenario for the core frequent player market that would in part rely on conversion of these subgroups.

How do we estimate the current market of “core” frequent players?

Estimating market size is an inexact science. The Project Team drew from a series of indicators and applied rationale as follows:

1. 106 of 139 (or 75%) survey respondents (including frequent, occasional and lapsed players) were willing to pay a minimum of $25/hr for indoor tennis. We can infer that approximately 75% of all types of players surveyed will pay to play in winter.

2. Nearly all frequent players were shoe tag holders, but only 4 in 5 (or 80%) said they would pay for winter play. A full 20% said they would not.

3. About half (77 of 139) of survey respondents had a household member who was a shoe tag holder.

4. There were 147 shoe tag sales in 2014; 23 were from multiple tag families/couples.

If we assume that anyone who has invested in a shoe tag plays frequently enough have the potential to be part of the “core” pool of indoor tennis players and apply “filters” of 75% (see #1 above) and 80% (see #2) plus an additional 10% to be conservative, we obtain a 100-120 person estimate.

The Project Team estimates that with the current teaching capacity and necessary programming and facility pre-requisites in place, the growth of the active frequent player market in Whitehorse can be conservatively estimated at 5-7% a year. The cap on that growth is the capacity of the facility to offer prime-time slots for those players seeking them. Using an average 6% annual growth rate, the projected population of frequent tennis players in Whitehorse in 2025 is between 190 to 228 players. Please refer to Table 6. (Note that if growth exceeds 6%, the projected pool will be achieved sooner).

Table 6. 2015-2025 Growth Projection: Whitehorse Core Frequent Player Market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected # of Frequent Players*</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106 - 127</td>
<td>119 - 143</td>
<td>134 - 161</td>
<td>150 – 180</td>
<td>169 - 203</td>
<td>190 - 228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assumes 6% average annual growth rate

Facility Options

On the basis of the facility success criteria set out by the Board and careful consideration of the Mountain View Golf Club site and capital fundraising and facility partnership environment, the Project Team narrowed its field of investigation to three options:

1. A basic, stand-alone **two court “KISS” facility**;
2. A **three Court** stand-alone facility with two courts dedicated to tennis and one court covered with multi-sport turf for partner rentals; and,
3. A **Two Court tennis combined with four court-sized indoor soccer pitch** in one building.

These three working options incorporate most, if not all, of the design-based success criteria established by the Board of Directors. The first two options were developed with Tennis Yukon needs first and foremost in mind, whereas the third was a proactive and strategic response to the possible development of a Yukon Outdoor Sports Complex (YOSC). This latter option is further substantiated by the popularity of soccer nation-wide and the fact that numerous cities have constructed indoor soccer field houses for winter use. (The reader should note that the third option was in no way solicited by the Yukon Soccer Association or anyone involved with the YOSC initiative).

The design parameters and construction considerations for each option are detailed in the following sections. The Project Team used these design and construction parameters as its starting point for investigating the capital and operations and maintenance costs. With those costs established, the Team makes its final assessment of each working option’s ability to satisfy Tennis Yukon’s other primary success criteria.

**DESIGN PARAMETERS**

**TWO COURT “KISS” OPTION**

The Project Team based this option on the Saltspring and Sechelt clubs (please refer to Appendix A), with the general design goal being a highly space-efficient facility capable of providing a quality tennis experience. The design parameters included:

- A stand-alone structure (presumably at MVGC, YOSC site or a site more proximal to downtown);
- Two tennis courts with smaller dimensions (16-foot baselines, 9-foot sidelines and 27 foot building height) than the competitive court standards specified by Tennis Canada for competitive-level play; ⁷
- A 1000 square foot amenity enclave that can serve as an administration and social centre plus equipment storage, with viewing onto the courts and heated to a warmer temperature than the tennis hall itself (the Saltspring facility design has amenity space constructed within the building envelope of the tennis hall for reduced costs and proximity to the playing surfaces);

---

⁷ “KISS” is an acronym for the “Keep it Simple, Stupid” design principle based around the theory that most systems work better when variables and complexity are minimized.

⁸ This option fails to meet some of the Board’s design-based success criteria, but its potential to better meet financial criteria and the success of Saltspring’s facility in particular led the Team to investigate this option. The KISS option provides a baseline from which the costs and viability of a two-court competitive facility can be inferred.
• Building R-value is an average of R-28, with R-60 for roof, and R-20 for foundation (as per City of Whitehorse building bylaw specifications);
• Vehicle i.e. garage door to provide access for miscellaneous equipment (such as a lift required to change lighting); and,
• Washrooms and parking as per City of Whitehorse requirements⁹.

THREE COURT RENTAL OPTION

To Project Team relied on information from the Cougar Dome in Truro, Nova Scotia, a joint tennis/soccer facility, to inform the development of this option. The design parameters for the Three Court Rental option are identical to the Two Court KISS except for the following:

• The facility houses three competitive-size courts (19-foot baselines, 12-foot sidelines and 36 foot ceiling height);
• One court is covered with multi-sport turf for partner rental/use. An additional court can be covered occasionally for rental events; alternately, the turf can be removed from the rental court occasionally for tennis tournaments (see Appendix for more detail);
• The amenity enclave for offices, viewing/visiting and storage is 1200 square feet in size; and,
• Additional storage space is required for the multi-sport turf.

TWO COURT PLUS SOCCER OPTION

The Project Team viewed this option as a “long shot”, albeit a potentially strategic one if the YOSC becomes a reality. Again, this option was developed using information from the Cougar Dome. The design parameters for the Two Court Plus Soccer option vary from the previous two options as follows:

• Co-housed with the YOSC in a suitable location identified by the City of Whitehorse;
• A capital and operating partnership with either the Yukon Soccer Association (YSA) or membership in the umbrella organization dedicated to the operation of the YOSC (as currently envisioned);
• Two tennis courts with competitive court sizing (as per Option #2);
• One 78 by 180 foot soccer pitch on multi-sport soccer-specific turf;
• A 1300 square foot amenity enclave;
• Option to remove multi-sport turf from soccer pitch to create 4 additional courts for Western Canada Summer Games and other major tennis events;
• Option to cover the two tennis courts with multi-sport turf for an additional 13,000 square feet of soccer or special event use; and,
• Additional storage for two court-sized equivalent rolls of multi-sport turf is included, but there are no washrooms or parking included (these amenities are assumed to have been built during a previous phase of YOSC).

⁹City of Whitehorse and/or National Building Code requirements include: 1 female/1 male for 1-25 person assembly occupancy up to 2 male/4 female for 76-100 person occupancy; 1 parking space per 100 square metres plus 1 space per employee
AIR SUPPORTED OPTIONS

The Project Team had initially concluded that a pre-engineered steel building was the only feasible construction type given the very high operating costs anticipated with an air supported or fabric frame structure. However, the very high capital cost estimates received for the pre-engineered steel versions of the three working options and conversation with a key contact at Tennis Canada gave the Team sufficient cause to reconsider. In the end, an air supported – or bubble – option was investigated in conjunction with the pre-engineered ones.

Each of the three bubble options is virtually identical to its pre-engineered counterpart, except as follows:

- The amenity space is housed in an exterior frame constructed building built to City building bylaw standards (R28); and,
- R-value of the tennis/sports hall space is assumed to be R-14.

SITE DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS

The following section speaks to some of the site development and construction implications of the pre-engineered and/or air supported facility options described in the previous section.

PERMITTING

Any new indoor tennis facility built within City of Whitehorse limits would require a development and building permit from the Building Inspections Department. The permit applicant would be expected to conform with City building and plumbing bylaws, including the Energy Conservation Bylaw that requires R-28 construction. Typically, any proposed building or development project that is non-conforming with the City’s Official Community Plan, zoning, and/or related bylaws is referred to the Development Review Committee (DRC) for approval.

The City’s Supervisor of Building Inspections advised that the pre-engineered facility options would (in theory) be relatively straightforward from a permitting perspective. However, he cautioned that any air supported structure option would be referred to DRC due to its non-conformance with R-28 building requirements. Tennis Yukon would need to demonstrate – most likely via energy modeling - that an air supported structure would have an equivalent energy footprint as a permanent structure and that the concept is feasible in the Whitehorse climate. Achieving a similar energy footprint would likely require the adoption of a highly efficient, “green” energy source such as a ground source heat pump.

Assuming that the MVGC property is the building site, permission would be required from the Government of Yukon Land Management Branch as well. The Director advised that they would need to seek internal approval but don’t foresee major issues. He also noted that the survey for the lease is currently underway and should be finalized shortly.
POWER, WATER AND SEWER

The proposed MVGC building site is not connected to municipal water or sewer systems at present, nor is it connected to the electrical grid. Tennis Yukon would need to run power underground from the old clubhouse to the building site (a distance of approximately 150 metres) and a service upgrade may be required to ensure there is sufficient capacity for facility lighting. A septic tank and field would need to be installed on the site and potable water accessed either via delivery (as MVGC does) or well.

The Building Inspections Department adopts the National Fire Code in determining fire suppression requirements for new buildings built within City limits. The MVGC site poses challenges in this regard. Without a connection to the City water supply, an onsite water storage reservoir (minimum 10,000 gallon) would be required to supply the sprinkler system in the event of a fire. The building would also require a turnaround for emergency access.

SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

The MVGC lease is located on an alluvial bench above the Yukon River and vegetated primarily by lodgepole pine. Soil composition varies slightly throughout the property but is predominantly silty-sand or sandy loam with 85-90% sand, 5-10% silt and up to 5% clay. These conditions are favourable to subsurface excavation, site preparation, and drilling, potentially resulting in marginal cost and/or time savings.

MISCELLANEOUS

The Project Team’s investigations into facility options and feasibility for this study uncovered a number of other considerations, as follows:

- The Whistle Bend area is prone to high wind events, and the lack of vegetation throughout much of the area results in dust storms. One local construction expert cautioned that mechanical bearings, such as those found in an air supported structure inflation/power standby system, would be vulnerable to excessive wear and tear in a Whistle Bend location.
- The secluded Mountain View location would render an air-supported facility prone to vandalism; a high chain link fence would be required around the site, with a swing gate to allow passage for vehicles and equipment.
- An undeveloped portion of the MVGC lease (even larger than the proposed building site) is located immediately adjacent to the Whistle Bend neighbourhood and could likely be connected to municipal water and sewer, fiber optic cable, and power lines at a lower lifecycle cost than servicing the undeveloped site. The MVGC Board of Directors was approached about the possibility of Tennis Yukon utilizing this alternate site, and the Board indicated that this site is being reserved as a strategic future revenue source and the likelihood of donating it was low.
- One centimeter of snowfall amounts to one foot of snow around the perimeter of a bubble dome. A concrete sidewalk should be poured around the bubble perimeter to facilitate frequent snow ploughing. These structures are also very vulnerable to high wind events (100+ km/hour).
**Facility Financials**

**CAPITAL PHASE**

**CAPITAL COST ESTIMATES**

To obtain capital cost estimates for the pre-engineered facility working options, the Project Team turned to Permasteel Corporation, the builder of the SaltSpring facility (the owner was a key champion of this initiative and quasi-sponsored it) and a company with extensive experience in the North. The company has recently completed a Whitehorse warehouse project of a similar scale to a two/three court tennis facility. They understand the Whitehorse subcontractor market, material transportation, labour costs, and permitting requirements. Capital cost estimates for the air supported facility options were provided by Yeadon, one of the leading “bubble” manufacturers in North America and supplier/installer of over 600 such structures around the world.

The Permasteel estimates were “turn-key”, including all architectural drawings, permitting, project management, site preparation and servicing, amenity space construction, lighting, court surfacing, parking, etc. The estimates also incorporated the design parameters described in the previous section (e.g., smaller court size and lower ceiling height for 2 court KISS option, no washrooms for 2 court plus soccer, etc). The Yeadon estimates included supply and shipping for the fabric and furnace/inflation/standby power unit, lighting, and on-site installation supervision. For both construction types, the Project Team developed estimates for excluded items such as septic, well, fire suppression reservoir and facility furnishings as required (please refer to Appendix E for more details).

According to the results of the capital costing exercise, the cost to build the Two Court KISS/Three Court Rental/Two Court Plus Soccer pre-engineered tennis facility options ranges from $4.4 to $10.4 million dollars. (Please note that the Project Team consulted a local construction/project management expert for third party verification). The counterpart air supported options cost between $1.2 and $2 million dollars. Please refer to Table 6 for the detailed costs. Please note that the numbers provided are considered Class C cost estimates with a 25% accuracy margin.

**Table 6. Capital Cost Estimates for Facility Options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Type</th>
<th>2 Court KISS</th>
<th>3 Court Rental</th>
<th>2 Court + Soccer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Engineered Steel</td>
<td>$4,385,000</td>
<td>$6,862,000</td>
<td>$10,397,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Supported</td>
<td>$1,212,513</td>
<td>$1,533,882</td>
<td>$1,987,803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The working options are not intended to be limiting, but rather provide a benchmark of costs for Tennis Yukon to consider. Numerous variations on the working option design parameters could help achieve cost savings. For example, if the 2 court “KISS” option was built adjacent to, or in conjunction with, another facility offering washroom and office amenities (such as the proposed YOSC), cost savings could be as high as $500,000+.

**FUNDRAISING**

The capital cost estimates provide a basis for assessing Tennis Yukon’s ability to raise the necessary funds to build an indoor tennis facility. Factoring in the potential capital funding sources and amounts outlined in the Environmental Context section and the Board’s stated private financing maximum of $50,000 and fundraising campaign target of $50,000, the Project Team estimates a funding shortfall ranging from $4 to $9.8 million dollars for a pre-engineered facility, and $0.8 to $1.4 million dollars for a bubble dome. Please refer to Table 7 for an overview.
Table 7. Overview of Potential Capital Funding Sources and Deficits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Concept</th>
<th>STANDALONE CENTRES</th>
<th>INTEGRATED FACILITY (i.e. Yukon Outdoor Sports Centre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Court KISS</td>
<td>3 Court Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View Golf Club, YOSC site or other suitable site</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon Sport &amp; Recreation Branch Fund</td>
<td>Maximum $150,000</td>
<td>Maximum $200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery Yukon (40% max.)</td>
<td>Maximum $125,000</td>
<td>Maximum $150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan by Tennis Yukon/Partner w. 4 courts</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising by Tennis Yukon</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising by Partners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>All special equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow from City, repay life of project</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorships (Tennis Canada assistance)</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Concept</td>
<td>Small, mostly volunteer run, less maintenance, fewer partner complications (and potential benefits).</td>
<td>Mostly volunteer run, rental agreements create partners to leverage funding and contribute to O&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builder</td>
<td>Tennis Yukon</td>
<td>Tennis Yukon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator</td>
<td>Tennis Yukon</td>
<td>Tennis Yukon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Fab Steel Capital Cost Estimate</td>
<td>$4,385,000</td>
<td>$6,862,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan by Tennis Yukon and partner with 4 court</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising by Tennis Yukon</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising by Partners</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Lotteries/CDF support</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance to find</td>
<td>$4,010,000</td>
<td>$6,412,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bubble Capital Cost Estimate</td>
<td>$1,212,513</td>
<td>$1,533,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan by Tennis Yukon</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising by Tennis Yukon</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising by Partners</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Lotteries/CDF support</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance to find</td>
<td>$837,513</td>
<td>$1,083,882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The size of these projected funding shortfalls underscores the importance of strategic positioning for Tennis Yukon to realize its goal of an indoor facility. Recent (and not-so-recent) history would indicate that the greatest potential for capital funding of this magnitude resides with the Government of Yukon, (possibly in conjunction with the federal government) which would likely tie such an investment to a broader legacy initiative such as the Western Canada Summer Games (WCSG).
OPERATING REVENUES AND COSTS

REVENUES

The development of a financial model to predict the operating revenues of the three facility working options upon completion of construction and active operation relies on a series of assumptions that constitute a sophisticated “crystal ball” of future facility operating conditions. The following section provides an overview of the model and its results; the detailed calculations and background information can be found in Appendix E.

The first step in formulating the model is establishing the potential revenue generating potential of the facility using the following assumptions:

- Each one-hour time slot available during operating hours generates $30 of surplus revenue in prime time and $25 in non-prime time. Revenue is generated from bookings, programs, leagues, or tournaments. If a court is leased/rented to partner groups, the minimum after cost revenue is the $30/$25 prime time/non-prime time per hour fee.

- For simplicity and bottom-line accounting, there is no estimate of direct program costs that programming (i.e., lessons, tournaments, leagues) must recover, such as instruction, equipment, supervisors, marketing, etc. The only accounting is on the revenue side (i.e., the $30/$25 surplus revenue all programs must generate per slot per hour). In reality, some programs will generate less surplus while others will be fully subscribed to and generate more.

- Courts are available and used 364 days per year. Other statutory holidays may have reduced hours but are considered prime time slots.

- There is a different percentage of use in each season, with summer use estimated at 20% of the level of use from the initial fall session. The first fall of Year One conservatively projects 50% of all prime time slots and 15% of all non-prime slots producing revenue. Each season is a progression over the previous, and there is a 5% growth in use and accompanying revenues from Year One to Year Two to Year Three. Please refer to Table 8.

Based on the total number of available playing slots per quarter, the predicted percentage usage of those available slots, and the $25/$30 surplus revenue assumption per hour per slot, revenues were estimated for each of the three working options. The total estimated revenues in Year One were $76,544 for the Two Court KISS, $114,866 for the Three Court Rental, and $229,632 for the Two Court Plus Soccer options. Please refer to Table 9.

Potential revenues help to inform the “bottom line” of financial viability, but can be misleading unless accompanied by a determination of whether there is a sufficient player base to generate those revenues. Assuming that each player is generating $25/$30 per hour of play, two tennis courts require a total of 176 frequent players and 275 learning and/or occasional players to be viable in Year One. Please refer to Table 10.

Again, this represents the Project Team’s best prediction of facility operating conditions, with some flexibility incorporated into the model. (For example, the frequent player could have a mix of “pay and play” with lessons, leagues, and tournaments, and one highly motivated learning and/or frequent player could subscribe to two or more players’ worth of court time).
### Table 8. Percentage Use of Two Court Playing Capacity: Years 1-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime</th>
<th>Year One</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 Fall</td>
<td>Q2 Winter</td>
<td>Q3 Spring</td>
<td>Q4 Summer</td>
<td>Q1 Fall</td>
<td>Q2 Winter</td>
<td>Q3 Spring</td>
<td>Q4 Summer</td>
<td>Q1 Fall</td>
<td>Q2 Winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-prime</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9. Estimated Revenues for Facility Working Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Categories</th>
<th>2 Court KISS Option</th>
<th>3 Court Rental Option</th>
<th>2 Court Plus Soccer Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall/winter/spring play &amp; programs</td>
<td>$69,355</td>
<td>$78,608</td>
<td>$87,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer play &amp; programs</td>
<td>$7,189</td>
<td>$10,013</td>
<td>$12,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner group rental</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tennis Revenue for Option</td>
<td><strong>$76,544</strong></td>
<td><strong>$88,621</strong></td>
<td><strong>$100,698</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full partner programs</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue for Option</td>
<td><strong>$76,544</strong></td>
<td><strong>$88,621</strong></td>
<td><strong>$100,698</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10. Number of Players Required to Fulfill Percentage Use for Two Courts: Years 1-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1 Fall</th>
<th>Q2 Winter</th>
<th>Q3 Spring</th>
<th>Q4 Summer</th>
<th>Q1 Fall</th>
<th>Q2 Winter</th>
<th>Q3 Spring</th>
<th>Q4 Summer</th>
<th>Q1 Fall</th>
<th>Q2 Winter</th>
<th>Q3 Spring</th>
<th>Q4 Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Frequent* Players in Prime Time</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Frequent Players in Non-Prime Time</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Frequent Players Required per Quarter</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Frequent Players Required per Year</td>
<td><strong>176</strong> in Year 1</td>
<td><strong>200</strong> in Year 2</td>
<td><strong>218</strong> in Year 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Learning* Players in Prime Time</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Learning Players in Non-Prime Time</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Learning Players Required per Quarter</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Learning Players Required per Year</td>
<td><strong>275</strong> in Year 1</td>
<td><strong>331</strong> in Year 2</td>
<td><strong>406</strong> in Year 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Frequent – play an average of 36 times during winter season i.e. September – May. *Learning – participate an average of 5 times during winter season.
OPERATING PARAMETERS & COSTS

The final aspect of feasibility to be considered is the day-to-day “dollars and cents”, or operating costs. Assuming that the capital costs could be raised and the Whitehorse tennis market is large enough to generate revenues, could a facility actually cover its costs?

Heating and electricity costs are the most impactful costs in a facility’s operating budget – the “make or break” line items, if you will. This holds especially true in the North. Accessing reliable cost estimates for heating and electricity from other facilities proved to be a very challenging task for the Project Team due to a lack of facility owner knowledge and high variability between the facilities surveyed and the Team’s working options. The detailed energy consumption calculations that underpin the cost estimates can be found in Appendix F and/or obtained from Tennis Yukon.

The estimates developed for other expense categories were gleaned from case studies and/or other facilities. The operating parameters and costs established for each working option are described below. For a more complete picture of the assumptions, market requirements, and calculations underpinning this section, please refer to Appendix E.

Two Court KISS

This model assumes that facility maintenance and management duties are fulfilled by volunteers (at least in the first three years of operation until the facility has a larger customer base). This facility’s operating parameters included the following:

- The amenity space is heated to a 18°C temperature, whereas the tennis (or sports) hall is kept at a relatively cool 12°C;
- The facility is unsupervised; members use an electronic key card to gain access. A culture of ownership would have to be cultivated to ensure players don’t “cheat” the system and to minimize cleaning and maintenance requirements;
- Tennis Yukon has an online registration and payment system that allows booking of courts for “pay and play” by members, as well as lessons and league play. Online registration for programs and league play onsite would require a more expensive computer but would be optimal. Alternately, members could use an inexpensive stand-alone kiosk computer onsite if they

Comparing the Required Market with the Actual Market

The Project Team’s model predicts that a total of 176 frequent players and 275 learning players is required to fulfill its percentage use estimates for two courts. To examine these estimates from a feasibility perspective, we need to compare them to what we either know or have inferred about the Whitehorse tennis market, including the following:

- Shoe tag sales and survey results indicate a frequent player market of between 100-120 players (see Market Assessment);
- Occasional players (specifically those who don’t play frequently enough to “pay off” a $80 shoe tag) are believed to be a very small group, representing no more than 20-30 “drop-ins” per summer.
- League play has been poorly attended to date and this programming was suspended for Summer 2014.
- Approximately 25 adults participated in learning-oriented programming in Summer 2014 (a slight decrease from previous years due to reduced coaching capacity).
- Tennis participation, using shoe tag sales as a proxy, is showing year-over-year increases.
- School programming and summer camps have been successful and are creating a strong potential market. However, these markets could be viewed as “low hanging fruit” given the on-site delivery (for schools) and high demand for active summer youth programming.

The Project Team submits that Tennis Yukon’s programming fundamentals are mostly sound but that the tennis market requires further growth. Tennis Yukon will need to make a concerted effort to grow its frequent and learning player markets and cultivate a local tennis culture - the intangible “buzz” that drives participation and motivates players to progress their skills - before it is “facility ready".
have limited online access or wait to book a new court immediately after completing their play. (Note: the AceBook software assumed in the costing allows for the capture of all funds into a bank account, and does not require any front desk staff);

- Consistent with Tennis Yukon’s current operations, there is a head coach that can assess players, lead programs, and hire and train assistant coaches as required. The key to the success of any indoor facility is quality programming, which continually develops a market of new players and stimulates growth of the frequent player base;

- A minimal five hours per week for paid facility, instructor, and quality control supervision is included in the budget. (The Project Team understands that Tennis Yukon’s President volunteers to undertake all programming at present. This budget item would need to be revisited in the event that this changes);

- Loan repayment of the $50,000 capital building loan is included;

- Janitorial tasks for the washrooms and tennis hall is undertaken by volunteers (perhaps in exchange for playing time credits);

- A small budget is allocated for maintenance services that cannot realistically be undertaken by volunteers, as well as snow removal. Similarly, there is an annual budget for light replacement; and,

- With creative volunteer-based management, the facility could generate additional funds for special events, birthday parties, summer camps, etc. The Project Team considers this a built-in “safety” that in theory should balance out the omission of a miscellaneous expense line for unforeseen (and unbudgeted) costs.

Based on these parameters, the total expenses for the Two Court KISS option in Year One is $102,308 for a bubble and $73,200 for a pre-engineered steel structure. Please refer to Table 11.

Three Court Rental
This model assumes an increased level of paid/professional facility maintenance and management as compared to the previous option. The Three Court Rental facility’s operating parameters vary from the Two Court KISS as follows:

- There is a 15-hour per week manager salary to oversee the rental contracts, partner relations, multi-sport turf handling, provision of key cards to rental partners, etc. It does not include an expectation to find long-term renters;

- Paid janitorial services are included for the entire facility and grounds (with the expanded use of washrooms by renters, it isn’t realistic for tennis volunteers to undertake this task); and,

- This facility could offer tournaments (e.g. Westerns) with its competitive court standards. We have not identified these as a separate line item in the budget, as the assumption is that such events would have to generate the required $25/$30 “per time slot” revenue. This option, however, does allow for expanded programming scope.

Based on these parameters, the total expenses for the Three Court Rental option in Year One is $168,491 for a bubble and $118,110 for a pre-engineered steel structure. Please refer to Table 11.

Two Court Plus Soccer
This facility option was approached quite differently from the previous two. Those distinctions include the following:

- Tennis Yukon would form a partnership with either the YSA or non-profit organization envisioned to manage the YOSC to build and manage the
### Table 11. Operating Cost and Income/Loss Estimates for Working Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Categories</th>
<th>2 Court KISS Option</th>
<th>3 Court Rental Option</th>
<th>2 Court Plus Soccer Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Manager/Program Director</td>
<td>$4,680</td>
<td>$4,820</td>
<td>$4,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors (covered by fees and/or grants)</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front desk cashing and hall supervision</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program supplies (balls, etc.)</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone and Internet</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$158</td>
<td>$165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booking system software (Ace Book, etc.)</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>$221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and sewage</td>
<td>$880</td>
<td>$924</td>
<td>$970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow removal for parking lot/road</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>$3,780</td>
<td>$3,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director &amp; Officers/Commercial General Liability</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$525</td>
<td>$551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website/advertising/bank charges</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,050</td>
<td>$1,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitorial services (inc. washrooms)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitor supplies</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$525</td>
<td>$551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual lighting replacement (inc. lift rental)</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,050</td>
<td>$1,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor capital replacement fund (nets, etc.)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major capital replacement fund (roof, etc.)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan repayment ($50,000 for 2/3 court options, $100,000 for 2 court + soccer)</td>
<td>$8,208</td>
<td>$8,208</td>
<td>$8,208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**"Bubble" specific expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Categories</th>
<th>2 Court KISS Option</th>
<th>3 Court Rental Option</th>
<th>2 Court Plus Soccer Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building/property insurance</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>$3,780</td>
<td>$3,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow blower removal</td>
<td>$6,930</td>
<td>$7,277</td>
<td>$7,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>$53,480</td>
<td>$55,084</td>
<td>$56,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro</td>
<td>$17,180</td>
<td>$17,695</td>
<td>$18,226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Steel specific expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Categories</th>
<th>2 Court KISS Option</th>
<th>3 Court Rental Option</th>
<th>2 Court Plus Soccer Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building/property insurance</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
<td>$8,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>$32,035</td>
<td>$32,996</td>
<td>$33,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro</td>
<td>$12,047</td>
<td>$12,409</td>
<td>$12,781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Expenses for "Bubble" Options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>2 Court KISS Option</th>
<th>3 Court Rental Option</th>
<th>2 Court Plus Soccer Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses for &quot;Bubble&quot; Options</td>
<td>$102,308</td>
<td>$107,006</td>
<td>$114,819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Expenses for Steel Options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>2 Court KISS Option</th>
<th>3 Court Rental Option</th>
<th>2 Court Plus Soccer Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$73,200</td>
<td>$76,975</td>
<td>$83,833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Income/Loss for "Bubble" Options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>2 Court KISS Option</th>
<th>3 Court Rental Option</th>
<th>2 Court Plus Soccer Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$76,544</td>
<td>$88,621</td>
<td>$100,698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Income/Loss – "Bubble" Options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>2 Court KISS Option</th>
<th>3 Court Rental Option</th>
<th>2 Court Plus Soccer Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Income/Loss – Steel Options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>2 Court KISS Option</th>
<th>3 Court Rental Option</th>
<th>2 Court Plus Soccer Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income/Loss</td>
<td>$3,344</td>
<td>$11,646</td>
<td>$16,865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• facility. (Note: an alternate approach could be one organization assuming a lead role and the other leasing space on a committed long-term basis);

• No attempt is made to differentiate expenses on the tennis or the soccer side of the operation. All expenses are incurred by the joint Society operating the facility. Program expenses (e.g., instructors, equipment, etc.) are not accounted for in the budget as they are the responsibility of the individual sport groups. The soccer pitch is twice as large as the tennis-specific space and generates double the revenues.

• The facility front desk is staffed to provide admission and security;

• There is a 25 hour per week manager salary to oversee the rental contracts, partner relations, multi-sport turf handling, front desk staff hiring, training and supervision, and general scheduling and organization. This manager would be tasked with generating additional funds for special events, birthday parties, summer camps, etc. Again, this a built-in “safety” should compensate for the absence of a miscellaneous expense line for unforeseen (and unbudgeted) costs; and,

• Loan repayment of a $100,000 capital building loan (carried by the joint Society) is included in the budget.

Based on these parameters, the **total expenses for the Two Court Plus Soccer option in Year One is $304,949 for a bubble and $236,721 for a pre-engineered steel building.** Please refer to Table 11.

### FINANCIAL VIABILITY

The Project Team’s analysis of the operational budgets for the three working options substantiates some of the reporting from the case studies. The Two Court KISS option has the fewest variables to account for. Assuming there is the required core of frequent players, a coordinated volunteer effort to clean the facility, and an active Tennis Yukon Board willing to manage, market and schedule, the **Two Court KISS facility can operate with a small surplus in Year One ($3344) and increase that margin to $16,685 in Year Three.** Please refer to Table 11.

The advantage of the Three Court Rental option is the optimization of capital fundraising and broader community benefit via tennis hall partners. However, there are additional expenses, the added stress of ensuring that rental targets are met, and ongoing management of the partners (clean up, payments, scheduling). The financials show that the **Three Court Rental option achieves only a marginally larger surplus over the Two Court KISS by Year Three ($22,802).** Please refer to Table 11.

**Improving the Bottom Line**

The three working options are intended to provide a "snapshot" of the financial viability of a range of operating scenarios for an indoor facility. Variations on these options could help to improve a facility’s bottom line:

• Installing a ground source heat pump (estimated cost of $100,000) would reduce heating costs by 50-66% (compared to oil) and may help Tennis Yukon and/or its partners access “green” funding sources.

• Adding a climbing wall (estimated $50,000 - $75,000 cost) could generate an additional $30,000 per year in revenues (assuming 100 climbers purchase a $300 annual pass) with little to no impact on tennis playing capacity.

• The City of Whitehorse’s Recreation Grant Program provides operating funds for various non-profit groups. Funding of $5000-$10,000 per year is a realistic target for a facility that can demonstrate broad community benefits.

The **Two Court Plus Soccer option can operate at close to break-even in Year One**, and with 5% growth **generates a healthy surplus of $37,979 in Year Three.** The primary advantage of this option is the paid janitorial, front desk and management staff and sharing of financial and organizational risk with the facility partner.
Conclusion & Recommendations

The Project Team believes that Tennis Yukon has many of the ingredients for a successful indoor tennis operation: dynamic leadership, an excellent school-age development program, a tennis instruction culture led by quality coaching, and an active, dynamic sport-oriented community. However, at least one necessary ingredient has yet to reach fruition: a sizeable frequent player market that wants to pay and play tennis in winter.

Why is the frequent player market so critical? The high energy costs borne by facilities in the North necessitate robust market fundamentals, a fact substantiated by the two Alaska facilities reviewed during this study. Similar to the higher operating costs, the capital costs of building in Whitehorse – factoring in materials, labour and construction standards - are significant for a small market, and approximately double that of building in a larger urban centre in the south. As evidenced by several of the facilities reviewed (Kimberley and Sechelt, specifically), declining or flat-lining member growth can be absorbed with the financial buffer that access to inexpensive natural gas and lower electricity rates provides. No such buffer – either on the capital or operating side – can be realistically anticipated in Whitehorse.

The Project Team is basing its conclusions and recommendations both around the success framework established by Tennis Yukon’s Board of Directors and other aspects of Tennis Yukon operations that the Team feels could be most impactful in regards to future readiness for an indoor facility.

Criteria 1. Increased membership to support an indoor facility.

The Board specified 500 total members, or 200 adult members, as its membership target. In approaching the question of market feasibility, the Project Team has interpreted "members" to mean frequent players who will pay and use an Indoor facility for an average of once a week during its main operating seasons (fall, winter, and spring).

After analyzing the results of the survey undertaken to inform this study and the shoe tag sales for the Mount McIntyre courts, our estimate of the current frequent player market is approximately 100-120 players. Even with conservative percentage use estimates applied, we estimate that two courts require approximately 175 frequent players and 276 occasional/learning players in Year One to satisfy the first test of viability. As such, the Project Team feels that there is not yet a sufficient pool of indoor tennis players to support even a “bare bones” two court facility. However, tennis participation is growing in Whitehorse and these market targets could be achieved in approximately 5 years with focused and strategic Board management. If the Mount McIntyre courts can be maintained in good repair and well managed to welcome and encourage player skill development, tennis growth should continue.

Recommendation #1:
Tennis has developed a strong school-age, youth and teaching program as its key market growth-oriented strength. We recommend that this programming strategy continue to be developed and comprise Tennis Yukon's annual goals.

Recommendation #2:
We recommend closely tracking of Mount Mac shoe tag sales and mounting a survey every 2-3 years so that the Board of Directors can gauge when the frequent player target is achieved.

Criteria 2. Committed sources of non-government funding.

The Board specified a $50,000 fundraising target (comprised of $250-$300 donations from 200-250 members and/or community donors) and a maximum loan of $50,000 as its capital contributions to a
potential facility. In theory, the seed capital would be raised prior to or in conjunction with a funding request being made to private financial institutions and/or government.

After analyzing the Yukon Tennis survey for this project, the Project Team feels that there is a solid core of about 100 individuals and families who will make, or seriously consider making, the target contribution. A campaign also targeting local business could probably garner 150 donors at this time. The growth of this pool of donors will correlate with the growth of the frequent tennis player pool in the next five years.

Recommendation #3:
Given the preceding criteria, Tennis Yukon will not need to mount a facility fundraising campaign until it is within reach of the 175-200 frequent player threshold. In the interim, the Board of Directors can work on the building blocks for a successful future fundraising campaign (see sidebar). A Board member with sponsorship, event organization and communications expertise would be an enormous asset in this regard.

Criteria 3. Partnerships with other organizations and/or ability to join a larger initiative.

The Board envisioned a facility partner that would assist with capital fundraising and share amenities, with tenant organizations willing to pay for space at set times for a 1-3 year contract potentially in addition to or lieu of a full partnership. Tennis hall partners would have the resources to pay for their requisite share of operating and capital recovery costs and require no more than two prime-time weekdays. It should be noted that the offer of a building site by MVGC was examined by the Project Team in the context of both potential facility and tennis hall partner.

Getting “Facility Ready”: Communications & Sponsorship

A new facility may be a long-term prospect, but Tennis Yukon can do much to raise its community profile and cultivate a local tennis “culture”:

- Build an inventory of quality, attractive images of Tennis Yukon programming in action.
- Continue (and increase) print and radio media exposure.
- Design a more “polished” logo.
- Create an attractive sponsor package and cultivate a small stable of local sponsors.
- Mount a fun, interactive players’ challenge to build local tennis awareness, showcasing local player talent, and entice new people to try tennis. The challenge could be “epic” (i.e. 24 Hours of Tennis), timed around major events (i.e., “Whitehorse Wimbledon”), and/or offer incentives for current players to recruit new players.

One of the study objectives was to identify potential facility partners and/or alternate revenue sources. The Project Team identified the benefits of partnership (increased revenues and a stronger position from which to access capital funding), as well as the constraints (increased management complexity and risk variables). The facility scan showed that some tennis clubs strongly believe the negatives outweigh the positives. Nonetheless, the Project Team feels that the significant capital and operating costs that apply to a potential Yukon indoor facility necessitate a partnership-based approach, regardless of the “hassle” factor involved.

The ideal partner would have a similar organizational readiness, shared motivation to fundraise and build, and fully compatible facility needs. While the partner scan did not identify a potential partner that satisfies all three criteria, it did reveal several potential partners and/or tenants that can meet the majority of them, namely the Alpine Club of Canada (ACC) – Yukon Chapter, Equinox Rox, Yukon Aboriginal Sports Circle (YASC), and Yukon Soccer Association (YSA).

With the exception of the latter group, Tennis Yukon should be prepared to assume the role of project “champion” in a potential partnership (and perform the majority of the work required to bring the project to reality). In regards to the latter group, Tennis Yukon would likely have to adapt its needs and expectations to the project phasing and objectives of a much larger and better resourced organization.
The facility financials would indicate financial viability – assuming the all-important frequent player threshold – for all three pre-engineered facility options. A determination of the optimal partner strategy must then be informed by broader strategic considerations around capital fundraising, as well as a realistic assessment of volunteer capacity once the facility is operating. We would suggest that there are two strategic avenues to pursue: first, full inclusion in the YOSC initiative as per the Two Court Plus Soccer option; and second, a “hybrid” option in which a modified volunteer run Two Court KISS option is pursued in partnership with one or two organizations, ideally co-located with YOSC infrastructure. Given the YASC’s inclusion in the current YOSC concept and competing space needs, we would recommend that the ACC be viewed as the most strategic partner should this second option be pursued.

### Recommendation #4:
The Project Team recommends that Tennis Yukon continues to liaise with the YSA around the YOSC project and register its strong interest in a joint tennis/soccer facility and/or co-location with Phase 2 amenities. Depending on how the YOSC concept evolves, Tennis Yukon could initiate discussions with the ACC Chapter around a tennis hall/climbing wall partnership.

### Criteria 4. Increased organizational capacity and development.

**Getting “Facility Ready”: Coaching Capacity**

Growing the player pool will require a parallel effort to grow the volunteer coaching pool. Remember that Year One of a facility requires 275 learners – or 50 programs attracting 5-6 participants each (or 25 programs with 10 participants, etc.).

The Board identified many organizational strengths that favour the future development of an indoor facility; however, they recognized that systemic weaknesses could undermine their goal of an indoor facility. In particular, the Board felt that a more equitable distribution of work, decision-making and responsibility was required in conjunction with an increased coaching capacity and community profile. Another developmental threshold set by the Board was an online registration and program planning system that integrates with Tennis Yukon’s new financial software and has been successfully tested with users.

This criterion is fully within the ability control of the Board to achieve. Regardless of what facility option is ultimately pursued, even the steps that precede “breaking ground” - mounting a fundraising campaign, preparing funding applications, lobbying governments, developing Memorandums of Understanding and/or contracts with partner organizations, and drafting contracts with local engineering and architectural firms, to name but a few – will require a significant increase in organizational capacity. On the operations side, the Two Court KISS option would require a united, motivated and sufficiently large pool of volunteers to run successfully.

### Recommendation #5:
Tennis Yukon should develop annual goals to address this criterion and establish benchmarks to evaluate its progress. The resulting capacity increase and organizational development will complement and support the growth of the frequent player pool to its necessary critical mass.

### Criteria 5. Committed funding for capital and O&M.

Closely related to Criteria 2 and 3, the Board identified the need for significant public sector support to cover the balance between the capital costs and assumed $100,000 equity stake that Tennis Yukon would contribute towards a facility.

The Project Team’s environmental scan revealed that the temperature for public sector financial support of this magnitude is cool at this time. It also revealed that the pool of non-profit recreation groups vying for
capital funding support to realize their programming objectives is only increasing. The Project Team’s accounting of likely funding sources and amounts revealed a minimum $4 million funding shortfall for the least expensive pre-engineered two court “KISS” option, a facility unlikely to garner government support given the very small group of beneficiaries and precedent in a community with many non-profit recreation groups. The most realistic avenue to pursue is the development of an indoor amenity, regardless of size, as part of the YOSC concept and/or inclusion into a broader Games bid or implementation plan.

**Recommendation #6:**

In conjunction with #4 above, Tennis Yukon should make an effort to “stay on the radar” of the Government of Yukon’s Sport and Recreation Branch. This could be as simple as scheduling an bi-annual meeting with the Branch Director to seek strategic advice, stay apprised of new developments on the Westerns or capital funding front, and report Tennis Yukon’s progress against the recommendations contained in this report.

**BUILDING SITE**

The Project Team was asked to explore the feasibility of building on the proposed MVGC site. The Team concludes that the disadvantages of the site – its relative remoteness, lack of access to municipal services, need for snow clearing, lack of connection to the City transit system, and lack of communications infrastructure – outweigh the cost savings on land at this time. The reality is that a MVGC partnership would be in name only: there is no opportunity for the all-important amenity sharing, a tennis hall partnership for swing practice would be highly inefficient, and cost sharing of MVGC staff could compromise Tennis Yukon’s need to maximize its own salaried position/s.

The MVGC site is likely to become more attractive as Whistle Bend populates over the next 5-10 years. For the foreseeable future, however, the prospect of driving to this location to deliver a child for a one-hour lesson in the wintertime would likely prove a disincentive to Whitehorse’s time-crunched parents, particularly given the vast array of quality recreation programming options that are more central and/or co-located with other activities.

As understood going into this study, and further verified through the case studies, the opportunity to co-locate a tennis hall with an existing full service facility is optimal. The Two Court Plus Soccer option can operate at close to break-even in Year 1, and with 5% growth, has the potential to generate a healthy surplus. The advantages of the integrated facility option include the paid janitorial, front desk and management staff - which should theoretically allow Tennis Yukon’s Board to focus on sport development – and financial and organizational risk sharing with a partner organization.

If the YSA is not interested in pursuing an indoor soccer facility, the YOSC is still the optimal location for the Two Court KISS option, and could result in $500,000+ in cost savings if it was integrated into the proposed multi-sport complex.
**Recommendation #8:**
The Project Team recommends that the MVGC site be put on the “back burner” as a building location and that a facility partnership and/or co-location with YOSC be actively pursued (as per Recommendation #4).

**SUMMER IMPROVEMENTS & EXPANSION**

The Project Team was briefed on the ongoing deterioration of the southern Mount McIntyre courts, resulting from unimpeded surficial and subsurficial drainage from the adjacent hillside. Tennis Yukon has had mixed success with the City of Whitehorse in remedying the issue, and there is uncertainty over the long-term viability of that site for tennis.

Even with four operational courts, Tennis Yukon could advocate for an additional two courts as part of a larger Westerns bid. The ideal location would be the YOSC site. Establishing courts at this location offers numerous benefits, including new players from co-location with soccer and other sports and the opportunity to build a greater sense of stewardship and ownership in the player community that will optimize the success of a future "cover our courts" campaign at that location.

At either location, the development of a strong core of frequent players, and attraction of new players, will be facilitated by a dedicated space for players to socialize and convene. This social element can evolve organically, be nurtured with organized fun events (e.g., special “watch and play” potlucks/BBQs timed with major tournaments), or a combination of both.

**Recommendation #9:**
If the Mount Mac court situation cannot be remedied to a satisfactory level and Phase 1 of the YOSC is initiated, Tennis Yukon should advocate to build new outdoor courts clustered at the YOSC location. Ideally, the courts would be sited such that they could be covered in an integrated facility at a future date.

**Recommendation #10:**
Regardless of whether the Mount Mac court situation is remedied or an alternate location is identified for outdoor courts, Tennis Yukon should make a concerted effort to provide a clubhouse amenity to support its summer tennis operation. The amenity can be small – a deck space with tables and chairs would suffice.
## Key Contacts

### Facility Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Bellm</td>
<td>Kimberley Indoor Sports Centre</td>
<td>Ralph Meyer</td>
<td>Suncoast Racquet Club</td>
<td>Wayne Elderton</td>
<td>Grant Connell Tennis Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Ganley</td>
<td>Alaska Club (Fairbanks)</td>
<td>Rufus Nels</td>
<td>Abony Family Tennis Centre</td>
<td>Jodie McCutcheon</td>
<td>Alaska Club (Juneau)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodie McCutcheon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kirk Paterson</td>
<td>Whistler Racquet Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fernando dos Santos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding, Partnerships, and Alternate Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Agar</td>
<td>Alpine Club of Canada</td>
<td>Gael Marchand</td>
<td>Yukon Aboriginal Sports Circle</td>
<td>Dominic Bradford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jody Cox</td>
<td>Yukon Home Education Society</td>
<td>Chris Milner</td>
<td>City of Whitehorse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Duomont</td>
<td>ElderActive Recreation Association</td>
<td>Michael Muller</td>
<td>Badminton Yukon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Gaw</td>
<td>Yukon Soccer Association</td>
<td>Alida Munro</td>
<td>Yukon Convention Bureau</td>
<td>Mary Gamberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Gishler</td>
<td>Equinox Rox Adventure Camps</td>
<td>Dan Poelson</td>
<td>Judo Yukon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Hill</td>
<td>Mountain View Golf Club</td>
<td>Marc Senecal</td>
<td>Yukon Schools Athletic Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Hnatiuk</td>
<td>City of Whitehorse</td>
<td>Polly Thorp</td>
<td>Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Ingram</td>
<td>Kita Kaze Karate Club</td>
<td>Trevor Twardochleb</td>
<td>Yukon Sport and Recreation Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Leslie</td>
<td>Yukon Academy of Martial Arts</td>
<td>Karen Thomson</td>
<td>Yukon Sport and Recreation Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jody MacKenzie</td>
<td>Mosaic Communications</td>
<td>Jeff Wiggins</td>
<td>Mountain View Golf Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jody Grieve</td>
<td>Yukon Horse and Rider Association</td>
<td>Derek Wirth</td>
<td>Mountain View Golf Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gord Zealand</td>
<td>Mountain View Golf Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Facility Options & Financials/Cold Climate Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1 Delivery</td>
<td>Yeadon Air Structures</td>
<td>Sean MacKinnon</td>
<td>Energy Solutions Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell Abbott</td>
<td>Hbeebink Green Construction</td>
<td>Colin McDowell</td>
<td>Yukon Department of Energy, Mines and Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meagan Christie</td>
<td>Heebink Green Construction</td>
<td>Alex Policarpo</td>
<td>Calgary Tennis Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Colbourne</td>
<td>Truro Cougar Dome</td>
<td>Peter Shoulak</td>
<td>Permasteel (Seko) Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Guthrie</td>
<td>Winnipeg Winter Club</td>
<td>Randy Shewen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianna Hayden</td>
<td>Yukon Department of Health and Social Services</td>
<td>Fraser Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bret Heebink</td>
<td>Heebink Green Construction</td>
<td>Doug Thorseth</td>
<td>City of Whitehorse Building Inspections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Humphrey</td>
<td>City of Whitehorse</td>
<td>Derek Strang</td>
<td>Tennis Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Liendo</td>
<td>Lakewood Indoor Tennis Centre</td>
<td>Jason Tsien</td>
<td>Angus Glen Tennis Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greg Woodford</td>
<td>AON Reed Stenhouse Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In progress
APPENDIX A

Facility Case Studies
The Alaska Club
Juneau, AK (pop. 32,556)
Fairbanks, AK (pop. 32,312)

Description
The Alaska Club is a statewide chain of fitness clubs with tennis courts available in the Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Juneau locations. The Fairbanks location was built by the Teamsters as a private union facility during the construction of the Alaska pipeline and originally included three courts. The Juneau facility was built in the 1970s as a racquet club including three tennis courts, with the other amenities added on over time. Both facilities boast full fitness club amenities, including a front desk, gyms, change rooms and showers. The tennis portion of each facility comprises approximately 50-55% of the total square footage. The Fairbanks facility has heating units mounted on the ceiling that blow hot air to player level, the heat generated by oil-fired furnaces (interior temperatures typically running 15-18°C). The Juneau facility has big ceiling mounted fans at one end.

Governance & Management
The Alaska Club is a privately owned corporation with full-time facility managers at each of its locations and an overarching management team overseeing statewide operations. Neither Club location has a tennis Director; rather, they work with private instructors on a demand basis. (The Fairbanks club had a tennis pro at one time but it created a conflict between prime time commission-based programs and regular bookings. They claim they lost even more money on tennis with the pro).

Participation Rates
About 3% of total membership - or 86 members - have opted in for tennis court privileges in the Fairbanks location. About 130-140 people have tennis memberships at the Juneau location. Both clubs have experienced decreasing participation rates (with a slight recovery in participation in Juneau this past year). Players are generally older. 35-40% of players at the Juneau club is utilized in both winter and summer (due to rainy climate) and Fairbanks estimates 50-60% use during the winter and significantly less in the summer due to the strong preference for outdoor courts in temperate weather.

Programming
Both facilities offer lessons, scheduled drop-in, league play, and tournaments. Juneau has fairly well attended tournaments every few months (the manager noted they “break even” on these). There are high school tennis programs in both communities but neither facility has experienced a noticeable benefit in terms of memberships (Fairbanks noted that it’s mainly the kids who already play tennis at the Club who join the high school program).

Alternate Uses
The Fairbanks club converted one of its courts to a synthetic turf field two years ago (separated by floor-to-ceiling netting and sound stage curtail to 12’ height) and uses it as a rental field for soccer, football, baseball, rugby, and private parties. The Juneau club manager is investigating the use of temporary surfacing (turf rolls, etc.) to convert courts to other uses on a non-permanent basis.

Fee Structure
Tennis is an optional membership feature at both clubs and the cost ranges from $111-$160/month depending on their family status/age. Each member can hold one active reservation at a time with a 4-day booking window.

Financials
The manager in Fairbanks estimates heating costs for the tennis hall at $70,000-$100,000 annually. Juneau noted that lighting is expensive, as is maintenance (lint buildup and court wear require 3x weekly cleanings @ 2 hours each.) Juneau’s tennis revenues run at about $28,000 per year, mostly from memberships.

www.alaskaclub.com

Operating Hours
4:45 am - 10:00 pm daily

Facility "Lessons Learned":
1. Cost of operating in a northern climate and the low revenue generating capacity per square foot makes cost recovery very challenging.
2. There is little tennis “culture” in the north to build on.
3. High school programming may not translate directly into increased memberships at a facility.
4. Installing indoor turf is a viable revenue generation strategy.

Case study information courtesy of Debbie Ganley and Jodie McCutcheon
Centre Court Indoor Tennis Centre  
Salt Spring Island, BC (pop. 10,234)  

Description  
The Centre Court Indoor Tennis Centre is a one court pre-engineered steel structure opened in 2012. The centre has one washroom, a court-level 10x40 glassed-in lounge area and an upper 10x40 viewing mezzanine. The tennis area is not heated, but the lounge area is (base boards). The average indoor playing temperature is 8°C. The height is 37 feet along the ridgeline. The building contains a 60’x120’ court with an additional 10’ for basic amenities/storage. The facility was built by Permasteel, a company based on Salt Spring with significant Northern experience. Apparently the former head of Tennis Canada has commented that it’s one of the nicest indoor facilities he’s played in anywhere!)

Governance & Management  
The Centre is administered and maintained by the Salt Spring Island Tennis Association (SSTA). When the facility was first built, SSTA initiated a facility “babysitting” program but concluded that it was it was unnecessary after 2 months. Players book court times online up to two weeks in advance (AceBook was the service they settled on and highly recommend) and are emailed the 3-digit door entry code.

Construction  
The capital cost of the building was $630,000, over 50% of which was site preparation and engineering. (Apparently the building was Permasteel owner’s “baby” and true project costs ran in the $900,000 range). SSTA had $120,000 in savings from their former “bubble” facility plus $40,000 fundraised as seed capital. 4 members financed 85% of the balance and 7 members financed the remaining 15%. The loan repayment period is 20 years but SSTA is on track to repay the loan in 10 years. The building is situated on the Salt Spring Golf and Country Club property and rent is paid to them (25% of revenues or minimum $12,000 per year). When SSTA pays off its loan, the Club will own the facility and SSTA will pay the Club 50% of revenues.

Participation Rates  
Club membership has increased to 180 from 120 prior to the opening of the indoor facility (although it was noted that about 30% of membership are “supporters” rather than frequent players). About 45-50% of playing capacity is utilized during the 6-month winter season and 20% during the 6 month-long spring/summer/fall seasons.

Programming  
The facility offers “Red Court” (1/2 court using lower nets/compression balls for 2 hours on weekends. There is scheduled “drop-in” play for men, women, and mixed three mornings a week, as well as league play. A Le Petit youth program is also run. There are several former tennis pros who provide lessons and clinics at the facility on a private basis. There are also small tournaments run on a monthly basis (non-regulation).

Partnerships & Alternate Uses  
No partnerships – SSTA felt that these were too much effort and were concerned about impacts on the court surface and lighting.

Fee Structure  
Members pay an annual $25 fee, but non-members are welcome as well. The court fee is $24/hour during the winter and $16/hour during summer months.

Financials  
Operating costs are extremely low for this facility, running between $2000-$2400 (approximately 50% of which is the cost of space heating in the lounge and hydro for the facility - $0.40/hr for state of the art lighting. Annual revenues are in the $45,000 range.

www.saltspringtennis.ca  
Operating Hours  
7:00 am - 11:00 pm daily  
Facility Best Practices:  
1. Starting with a good building site with a suitable subgrade will save significant capital costs.  
2. Great lighting is key to a great facility.  
3. 10-12°C indoor temperature is ideal; members don’t complain about 8°C but it could be a bit more comfortable.  
4. Keeping the building height low will save substantially on heating costs.  

Case study information courtesy of Fernando Dos Santos
Kimberley Indoor Sports Centre
Kimberley, BC (pop. 6100)

Description
The Kimberley Indoor Sports Centre (KISC) is a two court pre-engineered rigid steel facility manufactured by Seattle company Garco. The building is heated by overhead gas heaters and has washrooms.

Governance & Management
KISC is a non-profit group governed by a Board of Directors. There are no facility staff and/or coaches. There is a drop box for fees and the facility is run on an honour system.

Construction
A “bubble” dome originally housed indoor tennis at the Kimberley ski resort and was replaced by a pre-engineered structure. In 2001, the tennis site was sold for resort development and the tennis community began to fundraise to relocate the building to its present site on the grounds of a local secondary school. The facility reopened in 2005. The $200,000 relocation costs were raised by partnerships with the BC government, Teck Cominco, the City of Kimberley, many smaller private donations, and a $50,000 mortgage (recently paid off). The estimated replacement cost for the structure is $800,000-$1,000,000, including foundation and HVAC.

Participation Rates
The facility caters to 20 members and a local player base of around 100. Approximately 40% of available playing capacity is utilized in the winter and there is virtually no use in summer as everyone moves outdoors. Participation rates have been relatively stable since the facility opened.

Programming
Programming is limited to league and drop-in play. There are no skills clinics or camps. Kimberley did complete the 3-year Tennis Canada Building Tennis Communities program

Partnerships & Alternate Uses
The secondary school utilizes the facility during the week. The Society also provides space for dry land training and a seniors’ walking group and once accommodated BC Games archery practices. Soccer was tried at some point but there were concerns about damage to lighting from fly balls and marks left behind on the floor.

Fee Structure
A season pass costs $450 (family)/$300 (adult)/$100 (student). The hourly drop-in fee is $20.

Financials
KISC assumed over $13,200 in expenses in 2013 (over 50% of which was the mortgage principal and interest) and raised $13,600. With the mortgage now paid off – assuming participation remains steady - the Society should be operating with a surplus in future years.

www.kimberleyindoortenniscourts.com

Operating Hours
9:00 am -11:00 pm daily

Facility Best Practices:
1. Online booking is key to managing an “un-manned” facility.
2. Be very cautious about who you partner with to generate additional revenues.

Case study information provided by David Bellm, President
Suncoast Racquet Club
Sechelt, BC (pop. 19,291*)

Description
The Suncoast Racquet Club is a two court, pre-engineered steel indoor facility supplied by Humphries Inc. and constructed in 2008. The facility has change rooms with showers, a lounge with court views, kitchen, reception area, and meeting room. The facility has Plexipave surfacing and state-of-the-art indirect lighting.

Governance & Management
The facility is managed by the non-profit Suncoast Racquet Club. The Club’s 9 Board members donate 16 hours/year (or $12/hour x 16 hours) towards management tasks – including building/grounds maintenance, fundraising, events, publicity, membership, and administration. There is a coach affiliated with the facility but he is not an employee of the Club.

Construction
The demise of the Club’s former “bubble” facility initiated a long search for land and funding, with little to no luck. The town of Sechelt offered a $50,000 grant towards capital costs and a 20-year lease beside the Sechelt arena for a nominal $1/year. The club leveraged $45,000 in savings and the town’s loan to get an additional $100,000 loan (backed by several members’ guarantees, as well as those of the Board of Directors). The original costs escalated and the project was in some jeopardy until a club member offered to finance a substantial portion of the cost, spurring others to make smaller contributions. The entire Board of Directors paid its club dues three years in advance. The final cost was close to $900,000.

Participation Rates
Membership numbers have decreased from a high of 115 to between 85 and 95 in recent years (due to age, injury, and emigration). The original business plan for the facility assumed that one court could accommodate 60-75 players; accordingly, their membership target was 120 (out of a population base of 25,000).

Programming
There are programs for youth ages 5-18 years, adult skills, member’s leagues and drop-ins. There are summer camps for both youth and beginner/intermediate adults. The coach provides classes for the local schools (350 youth each year) and lessons for members and non-members on a demand basis.

Fee Structure
The facility is open to members and non-members. The club offers gold, silver, and family memberships. Gold provides unlimited play, 7-day advance booking, 2 bookings/week, programs and tournaments, and league play. There is an initiation fee of $560 plus an annual fee of $963 for an adult Gold membership ($57/$482 Junior). The silver membership has an initiation fee of $336 plus $578 annual fee, with 4-day advance, unlimited play in non-prime times. 3-month summer and 6-month winter memberships are also available for new members only. Public play is limited to Fridays/Saturdays – singles pay $17 each, and doubles $12.50 each.

Financials
The Suncoast Racquet Club generates $85,000 - $95,000 in revenues annually, including donations. They are obligated by the municipality to offer 15% of operating hours to the general public – time that generates very little revenue for the Club.

The most significant line item in Sechelt’s $20,000 - $25,000 operating budget is facility lighting, which uses approximately $1800/month in electricity.

www.srctennis.ca

Operating Hours
7:00 am - 11:00 pm Monday-Friday
7:00 am - 9:00 pm weekends

Facility Best Practices
1. Keep administration to a minimum – the club is converting to an electronically keyed system to help security concerns.

2. Regular tournaments and other events enhance the social benefits of membership. Mixing people up on the courts also helps.

Case study information courtesy of Ralph Meyer

*Represents Sechelt population of 9,291 and the approximate aggregated populations of Gibsons, Half Moon Bay, and Roberts Creek (all within a 20-minute drive).
Whistler Racquet Club
Whistler, BC (pop. 28,122*)

Description
The Whistler Racquet Club (WRC) has a three court indoor facility housed in a fabric frame structure (built in 1993) and located adjacent to four outdoor courts. The Club has a front desk area, exercise room, and change rooms and showers.

Governance & Management
The facility is privately owned and operated, with a full-time facility manager/director of tennis. It employs 4 front-desk staff, 2 full-time and 3 part-time year-round coaches, 5 full-time and 3+ part-time seasonal coaches.

Participation Rates
WRC focuses on customers versus members due to its destination tourism setting. There are about 100 members on average, with 3500 total unique customers using the facility on an annual basis.

WRC operates at 80-100% capacity during its limited winter hours, 100% capacity from 8:30 am - 2 pm in the summer (50% otherwise), and 100% during the fall (due to tournaments).

Programming
WRC has a full slate of programming, including the requisite drop-in and league play for members and non-members alike. The Club hosts youth summer camps for ages 4-17 and a wide range of adult camps (movement & footwork, “spa” camp, doubles, etc.). They also put on fall/winter/spring lesson sessions (5-8 weeks duration) for ages 3-17. Private, semi-private, and group lessons are offered (members get discount). Adult programming includes skills clinics, “drill & play”, round robin mixers, and competitive night.

WRC is Tennis Canada certified and rewards professional development through its payscale. It also provides training workshops on site during the year and has a staff training and youth coach mentorship program.

Partnerships & Alternate Uses
A children’s soccer club utilizes the facility during the winter months.

Fee Structure
The facility is open to members and non-members. Membership rates allow for 50% discount on indoor fees and free outdoor play, with passes available in 3 & 6-month options. Prices are as follows: family pass ($700), couple ($630), individual ($350), senior ($300), and junior ($175). They also offer special packages bundling 6-month membership plus classes & private lessons ($350/$450).

Winter court rental rates are $19/hr (member); $38/hr (visitor). Summer rental rates are $16/hr (member); $32/hr (visitor).

Financials
Heating costs for the facility run about $30,000/year and front desk staffing costs about $50,000/year. A substantial portion of its $290,000+ in annual revenues are from adult classes, junior camps, and private lessons (approximately 62%).

*Represents year-round population of 10,531 and average daily population of seasonal workers and visitors.

www.whistlertennis.com

Operating Hours
Summer
9:00 am - 8:00 pm Monday-Friday
9:00 am - 7:00 pm weekends
Fall
3:30-8 pm Monday/Wednesday/Friday
11:00 am – 8:00 pm Tuesday/Thursday
11:00 am - 5:00 pm weekends
Winter
3:30-8 pm Monday-Thursday
11:00 am - 5:00 pm weekends

Facility Best Practices
1. Cluster bookings during off-season to reduce heating costs.
2. Programming mix is essential to growing a club – don't get “stuck” trying to satisfy current members if they are not enough to sustain it.
3. Encourage cooperation between coaches and give them responsibility for growing programs.
4. Coaches need to be ambassadors for the club and have sales skills.
5. You need to assess the surrounding population, income levels, and potential visitors.
6. Target families.

Case study information pending courtesy
Kirk Paterson, manager
**Cromarty Community Indoor Tennis Centre (Feasibility Stage)**  
Sydney, NS (pop. 31,597)

**Description**  
The proposed facility is a pre-engineered steel building housing one doubles court with 60x120 dimensions, with spectator arena seating for events. The proposed building would be 80' wide x 140' long, with 26' high sidewalls and 39' high ridgeline, with a 5:12 roof pitch. Superior "green" insulation (walls R20, ceiling R40) is envisioned, with either indirect ventilation through ceiling-mounted exhaust fans or natural infiltration. A simple washroom, indirect fluorescent blue light technology (e.g., Courtlite) and a “green” infrared high-intensity radiant ceramic heating system would maintain a 12.7 degree C interior temperature during winter.

The proposed building site is at the Sydney Airport Authority, with nearby sewer and water readily available.

**Governance & Management**  
The Cromarty Community Indoor Tennis Centre (CCITC) is a non-profit organization that is fundraising and lobbying for the construction of an indoor facility. The feasibility work appears to have been undertaken by the project “champion”, and is largely focused on the technical aspects of construction.

**Construction**  
The estimated construction cost for the facility is $600,000.

**Participation Rates**  
The facility would be located within a 35-kilometre drive of 5 separate tennis clubs, a university, and public schools. The feasibility work assumes that an indoor court would generate 212 days of potential tennis whereas the outdoor courts can support 152 available days. It assumes that the public indoor facility would be a popular choice in the evenings, during rain-outs, cold days, anytime in October, as well as any other time - day or night - for older players looking for a cushioned court surface or to avoid sun-exposure. As an alternate to outdoor tournament play in bad conditions, the facility would “enhance/save the final day of any tournament if available for rent”.

**Programming**  
The facility would be available to the public on a first come, first serve basis. Tennis lessons would be provided as a component of the school curriculum and training courses would be offered to tennis coaches, officials, and instructors. The aged and disabled communities are specifically mentioned as potential beneficiaries of the facility.

**Partnerships and/or Alternate Uses**  
The feasibility plan calls for a perimeter cushioned walking track to be incorporated into the facility.

**Fee Structure**  
No pertinent information was included in the information available.

**Financials**  
No financial projections were included in the information available.
Salmon Arm Tennis Club (Feasibility Stage)
Salmon Arm, BC (pop. 17,863)

Description
Salmon Arm Tennis Club’s proposal is for three court rigid steel indoor facility housed adjacent to the four outdoor courts already in operation. The feasibility study was completed in 2011. The current outdoor courts are augmented by a two-storey clubhouse facility with a kitchen and washrooms. All are located on City-owned property with a long-term lease in place.

Salmon Arm Tennis Club (SATC) undertook a feasibility study for the project in 2011 which provided capital cost estimates and projected revenues and operating costs.

Governance & Management
An elected Board of 12 volunteer Directors oversees SATC. It is described as a “working Board” where directors sometimes perform “hands on” tasks such as maintenance activities and newsletter updates, along with governance-related duties.

Construction
The projected cost for the facility is $979,000. SATC was planning to secure a construction loan for the majority of the cost, assuming it received a municipal guarantee on the loan (as required by their financial institution). A $131,000 grant from Tennis Canada fell through (instead going to Abony) and a $400,000 grant application to the BC Community Recreation Program from the Columbia Shuswap Regional District was unsuccessful. The Club is apparently continuing to seek out funding.

Participation Rates
At the time of the feasibility study, SATC had experienced its third consecutive year of growth, reaching a membership of 228 players. Over the past ten years, membership has consistently averaged 180 individuals. SATC assumed that almost 24% of the regional population was at least an occasional tennis player, a potentially optimistic figure compounded by the inclusion of most communities located within the Columbia Shuswap and North Okanagan Regional Districts – including those up to 1 hour and 20 minutes driving time - in its catchment population of 130,914. The study assumed a 5% annual growth in membership.

Programming
SATC plans to model its programming on best practices established by the Grant Connell and UBC tennis facilities and anticipates further growth of its league play as court time became available during the winter months.

Fee Structure
Many membership options are available: family ($310), couple ($290), single ($165), and junior/student ($70). No details are provided in regards to proposed changes to membership or fees should the facility be built.

Financials
A “best case” scenario of 67% winter usage and 33% winter usage and a “worst case” scenario of 33% winter usage and 10% summer usage was developed. Both scenarios estimate annual operating costs of $80,048 (with an additional $9000/yr for capital and/or reserve funds). Year 1 revenues for the “best case” are $183,920 and $129,751 for the “worst case”.

www.salmontennis.org

Operating Hours
N/A

Facility Best Practices
N/A

Case study information from Salmon Arm Tennis Club
**Abony Family Tennis Centre ("Model" Facility)**

**Fredericton, NB (pop. 56,224)**

**Description**
The Abony Family Tennis Centre is a six court facility housed within a pre-engineered rigid steel structure building constructed in 2012. There is a welcome entrance, wheelchair accessible shower areas, viewing area, offices, and storage rooms. The building was constructed to high energy efficiency standards with a ground source heat pump system that harnesses waste heat from the adjacent arena’s ice plant. The courts meet international event standards and are surfaced with a 10 coat Flexicushion Prestige System coloured US Open Blue. The facility serves as the regional high performance centre in the Maritimes.

**Governance & Management**
The non-profit Capital Region Tennis Centre operates and oversees the facility. The Centre is staffed with a Tennis Director, 2 full-time coaches, 3 part-time (weekend) coaches, and a marketing/customer service coordinator.

**Construction**
The Centre started as a grassroots initiative led by the Capital Region Tennis Association. About one half of the capital was raised by the Centre and its’ founding partners. The City provided an annual $100 lease rate, access to over $1 million dollars in funding through the Regional Development Corporation, in-kind parking lot maintenance, and access to the arena heating system. Tennis Canada provided $25,000 in design/development assistance, $250,000 in capital funding, programming and design expertise, and tax receipts for private donations. Tennis New Brunswick provides sport development and contributes $45,000 towards the Tennis Director position, and the University of New Brunswick provides internships with a focus on marketing, sports science, etc. A large number of private donors also helped fund the facility, most notably Lorne Abony ($250,000).

**Participation Rates**
The business model was based on 40% occupancy, and this is being achieved. Drop-in play decreases by about 50-60% during the summer, but the facility is busy during the day with summer camps. The Director estimates that the center caters to about 50 dedicated, frequent adult players, 100-120 casual adult players, and 250 juniors.

**Programming**
Abony boasts a wide range of programming for ages 3 and up. The Fundamentals program caters to youth 3-5, followed by recreational Red, Orange, and Green and Competitive and Performance Academy Programs. Adult programs include the fitness/learning-oriented Tennis Xpress, Drills and Play, leagues, ladder, and Friday night social and happy hour. There is also a highly successful Cardio tennis program that caters to both adults and youth. The Tennis Director is very creative with maximizing revenues in off-peak hours, including “Moms n’ Tots” programs, daycare groups, Special Olympics programming – even getting parents who are waiting/watching their kids play out on the court for a cardio class!

**Fee Structure**
An adult user can purchase an annual player card for $195 (under-18 Juniors - $75, 19-23 year Intermediates - $95, Senior - $125, Family with one parent - $250, Family with 2 parents - $445). With a card, court rental rates are $29/hr for prime time and $24 for non-prime and 7-day advance booking and 4 guests a year are allowed. The public can book without a card for an additional $5 per hour, but only with a 2-day prior window. The player card is being revisited due to dwindling sales: players are telling management that they don’t play enough to “pay it off.”

**Financials**
The total revenue in 2010 from court fees, programming, and merchandise was $231,000 against costs of $187,682. Wintertime utilities cost $5000/month on average.
Grant Connell Tennis Centre ("Model" Facility)
North Vancouver, BC (pop. 48,196)

Description
The Grant Connell Centre Tennis Centre features nine courts and a progressive 18x36 foot "Red" practice court with hitting wall housed within a rigid steel structure building. The Centre is a public sector facility constructed in 1999, with a three court expansion in 2013, by the District of North Vancouver. GCCTC has a support amenity spine with three wings of three courts each. There is a front desk gate admission area, desks and offices, a shared coach’s office, washrooms, a small open meeting room with kitchenette, viewing and lounge area, lockers, change rooms, showers, and tennis storage.

Governance & Management
Grant Connell is a public sector facility constructed and operated by the municipality and municipal staff. The North Vancouver Tennis Society is an official community advisory group that meets monthly to advise staff on tennis issues, but not operations. The facility is administered by the North Vancouver Recreation Commission’s recreation department staff and a full-time Tennis Director oversees program operation.

Construction
The North Vancouver Tennis Society advocated for 10 years for the facility. 25% of the original construction cost of $2.6 million was a loan from the municipal Heritage Fund, re-paid by surplus facility tennis revenue in 9 years. The original loan was repaid in 2008. The 2012 expansion capital cost must be repaid in a 20 years.

Participation Rates
The GCCTC is over-subscribed, with enough latent demand to meet a fourteen court indoor operation. Programs are registered by lottery; the waitlist for Booking Cards is in the 150-range. GCCTC’s programming has converted occasional tennis players to passionate and frequent users, and seen numerous juniors maintain participation into adulthood.

Programming
A “something for everyone” programming mix optimizes facility use by the public. The four progressive programming thrusts are learn (clinics), drill (innovative practice and exercise sessions), compete (league play choice) and meet (social events, mixer play, round robins). These programs utilize 40% of court time, leaving the balance to court rental. There is a clear segmentation for skill progression, age, and preferred tennis experience (i.e. recreation versus competitive). The instructional program starts with the Tennis BC EZ Play beginner program and continues with clinics at the 2.0-3.5 levels. There is lively league action from 1.5-4.0 and a thriving wheelchair tennis program. There are no block court community club rentals; after an initial trial, the perception of entitled “favoured member” was determined to be counter-productive to the mission. It is Silver rated Tennis Canada Tennis Development Centre, focusing on Juniors.

Fee Structure
Users can purchase an annual court booking card (750 in circulation) for $113 (Junior $64). Fee court rental rates are $22.86/hr, and $20.38 for a non-prime rate. Summer fees are reduced by $5. With a card, the user has a 7-day advance booking period and can bring one guest a month for an extra $7 fee. The public can book without a booking card, but with only a 2-day prior window. The GCCTC is not rented for alternative uses.

Financials
The total revenue in 2010 from pay and play rentals, programming, and sporting good sales was $767,000 against costs of $678,000 (including overhead costs for the municipality.)
APPENDIX B

Board Workshop “Likert Scale” Results
Human Likert Scale: Tennis Yukon Board Workshop

Using the Human Likert Scale exercise, Board members can get up and moving and provide rationale for where they place themselves on a scale. The results are noted as an average numerical response, whether or not there is diversity of opinion amongst the Board, and in some cases – specific comments or insights to move forward with.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral/Not sure</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Warm up:
- Indoor Tennis will be a popular winter activity choice in Whitehorse
  4 on Agreement Scale, convergence in Board rating
- Tennis deserves a similar level of public subsidy support as ice hockey.
  4+ on Agreement Scale, convergence in Board rating

Potential Issues and Design Insights:
- Tennis Yukon can proceed with the project without substantial government capital funding
  1.5 on Agreement scale, convergence in Board rating
- We have the organizational capacity to raise capital funding from government sources
  3 (or Neutral) on Agreement scale, with Board members scattering on the continuum. One suggested solution was to build capacity because the Board needs members who have the skill set to undertake the relationship and partnership building required.
- We have the capacity to fund-raise a stake in the capital funding
  3, with similar reasons to above
- Tennis Yukon should take on a substantial loan in order to build the facility
  1.5 on Agreement scale, with convergence in Board rating. The common theme was that the organization did not have the capacity to take on a large loan.
- Tennis Yukon must have a sports partner or partners to manage the developmental and operating costs of the facility
  3.5 on Agreement scale, with diversity in Board rating
- We can share prime-time use of the facility if that’s what it takes to secure facility partners
  3 on Agreement scale, with significant diversity of opinion. Some members questioned the purpose of undertaking the process without prime-time courts.
- We can make compromises around the playing environment – surface, lighting, etc. - in order to accommodate partners
  2.5 on Agreement scale, with diversity of opinion and a strong contingent not wanting to compromise the playing surface.
- We have the volunteer capacity to manage the indoor tennis facility after it is built
  3 on Agreement scale, with diversity of opinion.
- It is important to have spectator viewing designed into on any indoor facility
  3.5 on Agreement scale, with diversity of opinion. Some members moved towards agreement when spectator viewing was defined as a small lounge, changing area that views onto the courts.
- It is important for facility users to have access to change rooms and showers
  4 on Agreement scale that small change cubicles, without showers etc., with separate accessible washrooms would be sufficient.
- It is important that the courts meet a competitive design standard for advanced players, or multi-sport Games (Western, etc.)
  4.5 on Agreement scale, convergence in Board rating.
APPENDIX C

Mountain View Golf Club Site Plans
Overview of Mountain View Golf Club property and proposed Tennis Yukon building site
Site plan sketch of proposed Tennis Yukon building site in relation to existing Mountain View Golf Club infrastructure