

WELCOME TO THE PIER GROUP ELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

WHERE YOUR CANDIDATE STANDS

(Well, at least most of them!)

ON THE WATERFRONT ISSUES

(Well, at least some of them!)

WE HAVE CREATED THIS SPECIAL EDITION OF THE PIER GUARDIAN to ensure readers are informed about the upcoming election. As voters, we need to know the beliefs of those who seek to represent us. We insisted that candidates seeking office express their views on the Pier and Waterfront. This is a key issue for Port Hope to address in this election. To that end, we asked all candidates a set of questions, and

now publish their replies here.

The questions were designed to inform voters about the Pier. We contacted all candidates and posed different questions to challengers than incumbents. We reasoned that past actions deserve explanation, and this provides the opportunity to the current Council and Mayor to speak to what they have done. We think these replies help inform both the decision to vote and whom to invest with

that trust. We note with concern that some incumbents did not reply. The material in this newsletter is necessarily edited for reasons of length, but well represents each respondent – the full replies are available online at thepiergroup.ca

**SEE PAGE 2
FOR BREAKING NEWS ON
ABOUT FACE BY CAMECO !!!**

GUEST EDITORIAL BY SEBASTIAN HANNA

We leave to voters the evaluation of each candidate, to judge what is said here - in light of past Council decisions. We read incumbent replies and learn of support to consider options for the Pier site. Yet Council has long been unreceptive to our concerns and ideas. We read of a financially viable Marina plan, but none has been produced in public, nor evaluated openly. We must note, all the waterfront studies have 'assumed' a marina and not proven the case for one. We read that greater transparency is needed in the Port Hope Harbour Commission, but note that Council is itself the Harbour Commission - appointed not elected, acting in secret. They have recently extended their own appointments by five years. A more open process needs to be observed in deciding what to do with the Pier buildings, their conservation and rehabilitation. Buildings should not be destroyed in haste - or in secret. Council has numerous times disallowed us to see them, and a new fence hides them. We hope that you feel as we do, and agree that the Pier buildings represent an economic opportunity for Port Hope - if options are explored openly and fairly.

On a personal note, Victoria and I moved here two years ago from Toronto. We were not born and bred here; we chose to make Port Hope our home. Two things made this possible: the train, as commuting is a fact of life for us, and also our hope for the town itself. The hope and industry we see in

beautifully restored and designated homes, streets and businesses, the House and Garden tours, and the Capitol Theatre. Seeing all this achievement, we supposed there was a common purpose within the town's elected leadership to protect its best features, a common goal that the best parts of our past can provide our brightest future.

We were naïve. We see now that what brought us here was the work of unpaid volunteers, not great works of our politicians. The best things here require the strongest effort, conserving and finding new uses for old buildings, requires hard work and many willing hands, as well as the open imagination to see in old things, new purpose. Hard work, vision - but it has been done before - all around us.

In closing I would like to express my thanks. The Pier Guardian could not be produced without the efforts and time of so many contributors and volunteers. Thank you each, and all.

Any advertising found in this issue of the Pier Guardian has been paid for by the individual candidates and has no influence on our editorial content.

A QUESTION FOR THE INCUMBENT MAYOR

The Harbour Commission of which you are currently Chair, is of the view that the buildings on the Centre Pier should be demolished without further study or investigation. Please explain why you support this position and describe your vision for the post PHAI Centre Pier.

THE MAYOR'S RESPONSE:

The redevelopment of the Port Hope waterfront is an exciting project that has been a long time coming. By coordinating with the LLRW cleanup and Cameco's Vision 2010 project, the Municipality will avoid duplication of work and incur fewer costs. With private and public partnerships to provide financing, the plan is to construct a marina in front and east of the harbour mouth. The east and west beaches will remain a sandy swimming area and a pebble beach respectively. Contamination on

the entire centre pier will be removed to the depth of 1.5 metres, and the pier will be used as a staging area throughout the full cleanup.

Cameco owns the pier buildings, not the land, and therefore holds the liability and risk for these buildings. These buildings are in very bad shape and Cameco has condemned sections of them. They have been directed to remove the buildings as part of the clean up.

If the buildings were to be left standing, the Municipality would assume responsibility for them. I believe the cost of securing, maintaining and possibly restoring these buildings would cost in the tens of millions of dollars, and I do not want to take this risk with taxpayer dollars. It is possible that some of the buildings' materials may be salvaged for use elsewhere. There are many possibilities for future use of the centre pier, to be determined through community consultation after the clean up is complete.

STOP PRESS

Cameco has recently announced that all previously proposed and agreed to, but non-mandated waterfront improvement components of its "Vision 2010" plan are to be scrapped.

Knowing this to be the case, your council has gone ahead and completed the land deal that sells the former Port Hope Waterworks site to Cameco, thus losing a major bargaining chip in these negotiations.

If the implementation of "Vision 2010" really is one of the fundamentals of Port Hope's waterfront project (as Her Worship refers to it), HOW CAN COUNCIL ACCEPT SUCH BACKSLIDING.

THE MAYORAL CHALLENGERS:

Robert Chatten, John B. Floyd, William Spotton, Davidson Tate

Question 1: At present, and it has not always been the case, all members of Port Hope council sit on the Harbour Commission with only two citizen appointments. As you know, HC as a private corporation follows different rules of openness and accountability than council even though its considerable waterfront land assets are owned by the citizens. What would you do to change the relation between HC and the citizenry?

FLOYD: Change is needed. Council has not been open or transparent and has used the HC for secrecy and deception. More private citizens are needed as commission members.

SPOTTON: The HC is a public institution, and its meetings should be open, its activities fully accessible. More non-council members will create better balance.

TATE: I do not know the bylaws governing the HC. HC's all over the province seem to be in conflict with their host towns and surely better relationships can be formed.

Question 2: As Mayor, you would be responsible for carrying forward the municipality's current plan for a 250 slip recreational marina at the foot of Mill Street. Would you make any changes to the current plan? Do you have confidence in the economic viability of the plan?

FLOYD: I absolutely oppose the current harbour marina plan, with its \$600,000 environmental assessment of the east beach. There have been no public meetings regarding public

INCUMBENTS FOR COUNCIL:

JEFF LEES, KAREN O'HARA, CALVIN M. MORGAN, DAVID TURCK, TED WATTS

Question 1: As a returning member of council and member of the Harbour Commission, would you support exploring the idea that the industrial buildings (some or all) on the Centre Pier could be redeveloped to create a zone of economic prosperity and job creation for the community?

LEES: Yes, I would explore redevelopment of some or all of the buildings. The Pier Group should provide a comprehensive business plan that includes no tax increases; our current deal with Cameco costs taxpayers nothing.

TURCK: I believe all the buildings should be removed – except if an economically viable plan were presented, with any solution not funded by taxpayers, without delaying the clean up.

WATTS: Yes, I would support that, with those goals. Remember that these lands are municipally owned, and the final decision must rest with the people. I am sure public meetings will

land divestment in the harbour, a total lack of openness and transparency, and no financial plan is in place. John Playfair, an international financier, was asked to investigate securing funds for this marina, and reported back that no funds were to be found. He then resigned the volunteer position in protest, declaring the marina proposal a “charade”.

SPOTTON: Confidence, no – the marina plan is 20 years old. Only committed funding for economically viable parts of the plan will move forward. However, our primary waterfront opportunity is our riverfront, and the development anchor is from the Pier to the File Factory. This should be our focus.

TATE: Council has spent two years fighting our neighbours when we could have been building the ideas of the entire citizenry. I will make sure of this by ensuring public meetings and the information is accessible.

Question 3: What do you think would be a good outcome for some or all of the buildings on the Centre Pier?

FLOYD: These are valuable buildings, like the demolished Post Office, and a great opportunity. There is time to develop a comprehensive plan, and we should maintain all options regarding the Pier buildings.

SPOTTON: Rehabilitation and utilization. We need an investigation of Brownfield and infrastructure funding, possibly even Rural Economic Development for a private-public community project, incorporating the current buildings.

TATE: If viable after the clean up, an educational facility, with public café, is only one part of so many creative ideas our citizens can come up with.

Robert Chatten's reply was received after the Guardian was distributed, but is included on-line.

be scheduled prior to a final decision.

Question 2: As a returning member of council explain your support for a 250 slip recreational marina at the foot of Mill Street. What do you know about the financial viability of this marina development?

LEES: I support a phased approach. I believe there would be commercial and private partnerships with shared costs available, and that we must explore all funding options.

TURCK: We need a “first class marina” to attract boaters and visitors. It should be tendered to private sector interests established in this line of business. In return, Port Hope would have reduced taxes, and more jobs.

WATTS: I am in full support of that size of recreational marina, on that site. Neighbouring municipalities are showing a shortage of marina space, and boat slips, and a past survey reported a shortage between Toronto and Kingston. Financial viability will be realized by the growth in pleasure boating, fishing, and other water sports. A marketing plan is needed.

(KAREN O'HARA AND CALVIN M. MORGAN DID NOT REPLY.)

FUNDRAISING, OUR LIFELINE

Dedicated volunteers run the Pier Group, who give of their time, experience and resources. Our social events are run as profitable fundraising events. But we do need financial support. Donations gratefully received.

A tax receipt will be issued. Make Cheques out to the ACO with “Pier Group” on the memo line.

Please mail or deliver c/o 4476 County Rd 10, Port Hope ON L1A 3V5

Our thanks go to: Moya McPhail, Elizabeth Wilson, Ian Montagnes, and Paul Clark, for their generous donations

NON-INCUMBENT CHALLENGERS FOR COUNCIL:

Rick Austin, Greg Burns, David Craig, John Deitz, Mary Lou Ellis, Jeffrey Gilmer, Bob Johnston, John Morand, Robert Polutnik, Mark C. Probert, and Patricia Sinnott

Question 1: The Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission ruled last spring that the buildings on the Centre Pier cannot be demolished as requested by the Harbour Commission until after the PHAI clean up of the harbour. The clean up will not be completed for at least five years. Do you agree that this is a golden opportunity to rethink the demolition decision currently being promoted by the HC and Council?

AUSTIN: Yes, if there is a good business plan and the financing to implement it, then Council should investigate. Without a business plan, the buildings should come down, at no cost to taxpayers.

BURNS: Yes, we have seven years to redefine their use, to explore their incredible economic and heritage potential. Rather than an open park space with no opportunity of future revenue - we need innovative thinking, to work together with a comprehensive business strategy.

CRAIG: Yes. Demolishing these historic buildings is not the answer. I will introduce a motion to rescind current HC demolition request, and to use the time to develop a meaningful use plan.

DEITZ: No response.

ELLIS: Yes, I most certainly do. Anything could happen in the five years it will take to complete the clean up of the harbour areas. If we tear down the buildings today we simply will not have them tomorrow.

GILMER: The future development of the pier buildings should carry their operational costs and not be a burden on taxpayers.

JOHNSTON: Yes. Absolutely, and I've said so in my campaign literature, and on my website.

MORAND: Yes, an "international competition" is needed to establish the best use for the Pier and buildings. Private sector financing is needed. Clean up should be substantially complete prior to a taxpayer funded Environmental Assessment.

POLUTNIK: We need to keep all our options open. We don't now have agreement as to the space's future purpose; we need to talk, everything on the table, so everyone can make a meaningful decision.

PROBERT: I have to examine the facts before arriving at any conclusions.

SINNOTT: Yes, we should rethink demolition of these historic buildings.

Question 2: Tell in your own words what you think would be the best outcome for some or all of the buildings on Centre Pier.

AUSTIN: No response.

BURNS: Comprehensive environmental and building "integrity" studies need to be completed. If the structures are safe, we should proceed with a vision that could include restaurants,

pubs, boutiques, art community exhibition space, fire museum, public access to "positive" aspects of nuclear industry, as well as high-level training.

CRAIG: Tourism – the buildings have valuable use as a symbol of municipal pride.

DEITZ: No response.

ELLIS: Determining the buildings' final use is less important to me than acknowledging that it is a wonderful space, with endless possibilities. What matters most is that we be vigilant about Council, HC and Cameco in the meantime, as the Pier Group has been.

GILMER: The Centre Pier buildings should be used as part of a waterfront initiative that helps to showcase Port Hope. This depends upon the environmental assessment results allowing an affordable clean up of these buildings; and to redevelop, a comprehensive business plan will be required, with both public and private funding for capital costs.

JOHNSTON: Employment opportunities, heritage preservation, which should attract tourists and local residents to the buildings. Revive the buildings and the surrounding harbour area, while offering space for new businesses, events and community gathering.

MORAND: The use must be beneficial to the community, once it is "remediated".

POLUTNIK: "Plan at nothing and you will hit your target with supreme accuracy each and every time". Saving our industrial heritage, a new marina, 11 acres of park in the shadow of an industrial plant – the current proposals are more questions than answers, and none addresses how the site is to be integrated to our downtown core. We have the time to create a vision for the Centre Pier.

PROBERT: I have to examine the facts before developing ways of possible use for this opportunity.

SINNOTT: It is about time we acknowledge Port Hope's industrial past, its beginnings in agriculture, manufacturing and transport. Potential uses could be a Port Hope Museum; a farmer's market; a convention centre, the only one within 50 km.; firefighter's museum; a showcase for the town's uranium industry, in partnership with government, educational institutions and Cameco.

Question 3: If elected, you will also become a member of the Harbour Commission. Would you support re-organization of the Harbour Commission to make it more accountable and transparent?

AUSTIN: I would like Council to investigate if we really need a HC when the Municipality owns the harbour. A harbour committee made up of one Councilor and four citizens could replace it.

BURNS: Yes, unless required by legislation, citizens should be a majority HC representation: 5 of 9 votes.

CRAIG: Yes, reorganization is needed. The current HC has "no idea of harbour operations". Toronto and Hamilton's HC structure should be examined, and transparency established here.

DEITZ: I support HC being more open and transparent.

ELLIS: Yes, the present HC is not transparent and needs reor-

ganizing. HC accountability to Port Hope residents should be formalized by bylaw.

GILMER: If elected, I have no problem with the HC meetings being held in public.

JOHNSTON: Nothing would be more welcome that improved accountability and transparency in Port Hope.

MORAND: Yes, the original HC concept is now abandoned: Harbour Commissioners should be community appointed, and have operational skills. Now, there is an appearance of conflict of interest. Only the Mayor should necessarily sit on the commission. HC meetings should be open, with public minutes

unless statute protected.

POLUTNIK: Yes, change is needed: Councilors should not automatically be made HC members. The commission should be staffed with our very best people, experts and those with vision.

PROBERT: Yes, I always support more transparency in our organizations.

SINNOTT: Yes, I support reorganizing HC to make it more accountable and transparent. I also support sharing with Port Hope ratepayers leases by which Cameco operates on municipally owned lands.

TIME TO MAKE BETTER DECISIONS FOR OUR WATERFRONT?

PORT HOPE CAN HAVE A GREAT WATERFRONT, so much better than the fenced off and forbidding area we see now. Visitors and residents can experience a unique, economically thriving heritage harbour. We enjoy this now in so many of our heritage designated homes, shops, the Capitol Theatre... - why not the waterfront? Think instead of clean, safe,

beautiful, green waterfront parklands, with restored buildings – dynamic, open to all. We invite you to examine the waterfront decisions that have been made by the current Council and HC, to resolve for yourself whether these decisions are justified.

For complete details, go to www.thepiergroup.ca

NEW COUNCIL PLANNING BYLAWS FAVOUR DEVELOPERS – NOT COMMUNITY!

THE PIER GROUP IS APPEALING TO THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD, AS PORT HOPE COUNCIL has recently passed two major planning bylaws to the Port Hope Official Plan: the Consolidated Zoning Bylaw, and Amendment No. 2. These should provide the direction and structure to

create a dynamic new waterfront, an economically prosperous waterfront in Port Hope; however, both fail – as each favours the private developer above community and public interest.

For complete details, go to www.thepiergroup.ca

ELECT
Patricia
SINNOTT
Ward 1 Councillor
Port Hope

I am A 5th generation Port Hoper
A pharmacist and former hospital manager
A heritage supporter

Open to exciting and innovative ideas

I will Foster an open and transparent atmosphere at Council
Support the Pier Group's approach to use of the Centre Pier
Work to minimize the negative image of the nuclear industry

www.patriciasinnott.com

To help with the campaign, call 905-885-0805

Davidson
Tate
For Mayor
GOING BEYOND

Keep the public informed; offer explanations of why decisions are being made.

Listen to all ideas brought forward.

Everything on the table is open for discussion.

Not be afraid to change course when better information comes forward.

Be respectful; bring honesty, compassion and my due diligence to all that I do.

Keep both long and short term goals in view; our grandchildren will be affected by the decisions we make today

ANNOYED? VOTE FLOYD



"It is with great interest that I am following John Floyd and his quest to become the next Mayor of Port Hope.

He expresses his insight and thoughts regarding the positive planning for the complete handling of our municipal waste in the of County of Northumberland. John also expresses keen understanding of many other important issues of the Municipality."

Carroll Nichols

*Former Reeve of Hope Township,
Waste Management Advocat*



"I am supporting John Floyd because he has always been a strong believer in not wasting money on consultants, studies and out of town lawyers. Administration is wasting hundreds of thousands of dollars on these frivolous expenditures."

G.H. Watson

Retired Pharmacist

"John is a fiscal conservative and we need that these days. In previous service as Reeve of Port Hope, John had an excellent voting record, including getting the Town Hall designated. He has a passion for the job and will make an outstanding, if somewhat controversial Mayor. Let's face it, we need that too."

Rod Stewart

Port Hope Resident for 35 years

Call 905-885-7448 If you would like to get involved in our "Campaign for Change"

www.electjohnfloyd.ca



John Floyd for Mayor of Port Hope

It's Your Town Time to take it back!

John Morand for Port Hope Council — Ward One



John Morand has over thirty years experience as a senior executive in the private and public sectors. He wants to help you to regain control of your municipal government. With your help, he would,

- (i) Create and execute viable and measurable economic goals.
- (ii) Develop and maintain open and transparent government operations
- (iii) Reduce taxes and expenses with consideration to avoiding overpriced consultants.
- (iv) Provide consistent and well considered support to Port Hope core businesses.
- (v) Foster private and public partnerships to create substantial local developments such as the waterfront area.
- (vi) Develop centers for seniors and other age groups with the use of funding from other levels of government

I need your help!

Call me at **905-885-1405** or e-mail j.moran@sympatico.ca. For further information go to www.johnmorand.com

ROUND TABLE DISCUSSIONS

URBAN PLANNING AND DESIGN: “REVITALIZATION!”

THE FOCUS OF OUR URBAN PLANNING AND DESIGN ROUND-TABLE WAS the urgent need to revitalize our community, to enhance Port Hope’s identity as offering more than just heritage. (These days so many small communities are doing “heritage”!) Our round-table included a good community cross-section: Port Hope Councilors, designers, architects, environmentalists, and interested citizens.

We determined that the Centre Pier and Port Hope’s historic core should be redeveloped together as a catalyst for Port Hope’s reinvention and renewal. The planning tools required would be a Secondary Plan, Urban Design Guidelines, or a Community Improvement Plan. None of these is yet proposed. Lands around the viaducts are mostly privately owned, but any development should be directed by these guidelines. We envisioned mixed-use development along the linking corridors of Mill and John Streets, with second floor condo apartments, and commercial space at street level.

Port Hope is also seen as an ideal retirement community. Positively, retirees provide a pool of experience and talent within the community. This resource needs to be tapped more than it is now. But to be truly vibrant, the Municipality must engage a younger population, and provide attractive options for living and working.

The classic model of the manufacturing industry as a driving economic force is an old one and “dying”. Emerging “new economies” are creative knowledge-based businesses: research and development, design, education, marketing, recreation, entertainment, retail and hospitality.

Via Rail is another very significant town asset, given the unique geographic position of the station, within walking distance of both the waterfront and downtown. We should partner with Via to attract Toronto visitors. This requires further beautification of the streetscape approaches to downtown, which should be undertaken as an extension of the Waterfront and Pier improvements, as well as Cameco’s planned redevelopment.

We emphasized that the whole community needs to be involved in revitalization. We should entertain any and all

ideas, look ahead, not back – and take a long view, perhaps 40 years. This perspective is needed as the town has declined since the 1950’s. We need to move ahead with good ideas, even in uncertain economic times – or risk being left behind.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT “ALL WE HAVE TO DO IS CATCH TORONTO!”

WE ASKED PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY’S ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OFFICER, Dan Taylor, to advise Port Hope on how to grow a creative prosperous economy here, as they have in PEC.

His advice: “it’s all about the importance of quality of place”. He reinforced that Port Hope has significant assets: the train, water, fishing in the middle of town, heritage, the Northumberland hills, and close proximity to the huge Toronto market, an important source of tourists and creative workers. But we have to develop thematic packages to sell our unique features effectively, and promote them through various media, including social media. Advertising need not be expensive either; much better to create stories so interesting, the media will want to cover them gratis. And we don’t need agents and consultants. PEC does everything themselves.

If we have true quality of place we will attract new industries, like small software companies, and the small businesses people start from home. Port Hope needs a brand. We need to make Port Hope irresistible. We need to sell a lifestyle.

We noted that Dan always talks about “the County” and not about individual towns. Shouldn’t we, too, think regionally? Shouldn’t we think in terms of West Northumberland and work together with Hamilton Township and Cobourg?

Dan pointed out that PEC is hard to get to, relatively far, and yet people come. Through strategic advocacy marketing methods, tourism has risen from \$25,000,000 to over \$100,000,000 annually. “The County” is now a destination. Port Hope is even closer to Toronto and easier to get to. We can also be a destination, the Pier buildings the catalyst. (And if we can’t clean the Pier buildings, then we can’t clean anything.) We have time. Council and the HC must reconsider the decision to tear them down. Port Hope has a major opportunity in its pier and buildings.

