

BSRA Questions to Bluewater Candidates 2018 Municipal Election

	Mayoral Candidates		Deputy Mayor Candidates		Councillor Stanley Wes Candidates		Councillor Hay West Candidates	
Question	Paul Klopp	Tyler Hessel	Bill Dowson	Jim Ferguson	George Irvin	Taylor Van Aaken	John Gillespie	Alwyn Vanden Berg
1. The current council's platform includes 1 Committee of the Whole meeting and 1 Council meeting each month. It has been suggested that council should return to a previous platform of 3 meetings each month. Which do you see as being the most effective and why? What change to the number of meetings each month will increase or decrease the cost to the municipality?	I would keep to the two meetings, but I would get rid of the committee of the whole meeting, because 90% of the time decisions have already been made. If you cannot make a decision then put it off to another meeting. Sometimes you can send the individuals to the corner of the room and they can work out the issue and then come back to us at the same meeting and a decision is made. If you ever need to, you could always have another meeting, you just have to give notice.	I was the advocate for the changes. I would stick to what we started. You have two opportunities to vote on something. We have voted at one meeting and then more information has come to light and we have reversed that original vote. We could make changes that would speed up the appeal process, but we would not change from the current two meetings each month	They all cost. We have to have staff there and they get paid. I prefer daytime meetings. We always had three meetings in the past, I prefer the two meetings and could have third if needed. I'm not sure about the names, whether we need a committee of the whole or just two council meetings.	I don't think the two meetings a month are not getting things done. We can always have a special council meeting after the committee of the whole meeting. The first council meeting you would do your business and at the second you would approve what you did at the first if no further information had become available to change the decision. This speeds up the process.	When it was originally proposed I did not think it would work, but over the last term it is working. It is efficient. I see three meetings as being a greater expenditure	I haven't sat on council yet, but if two meetings work then leave it as is. I see issues if you have three meetings as costs will go up the most. If you are time constricted with these meetings and you make poor decisions then the cost will go up.	In terms of cost, more meetings mean greater cost. The current structure with two meetings is okay. I don't think going back to three meetings is a good idea, but I think we can look at the current two meetings and perhaps restructure them. Sometimes they can be repetitive. With the new council they will be reviewed.	I have no issue with holding just two meetings. I don't believe in three for the sake of three. If we could do it in one, on occasions, then I am good with that. More meetings means more cost.
	Paul Klopp	Tyler Hessel	Bill Dowson	Jim Ferguson	George Irvin	Taylor Van Aaken	John Gillespie	Alwyn Vanden Berg
2. Do you feel that the hiring of consultants by the municipality is an effective way of moving forward on projects that are outside of the expertise of the municipality? And if you don't, then how should the municipality deal with similar issues?	If it is outside the expertise of the council then that is probably what you would do. But what I have seen is that the staff that have not been used enough. First thing you ask staff is if they can do it, if not hire outside staff. Sometimes other people have done what you want to do, so just check with other municipalities in the province. We don't always need to hire people, just roll up your sleeves and get on with it.	I think in the past our staff has made some great recommendations, but sometimes you need that third party. I don't think it is a bad process to engage a third party when you get the right information in front of you to make educated decisions. Staff sometimes needs that additional support. With our strategic plan it was important to engage a third party.	We brought in consultants to deal with issues staff was not comfortable with and we also need to look at the costs. If we need them, then we should use them. We are not professional people in the world of building and need assistance	Many of the projects we look at have a long service life, so you want to make sure you get them right. I don't think our staff always has the time or the expertise to interpret the information or data to make a decision.	They are all different. We are now doing our third feasibility study on the ice. I have faith in our CAO to deal with some. But we also have the issue of transparency. Each one has to stand on its own	I think in certain instances we need them. If we need to build a road, a councillor cannot make that decision. I don't think in all instances it is necessary to hire consultants. In some cases I think the staff are more than capable of looking at some of the issues.	I'm quite comfortable in bringing in consultants but not in all cases. If the issue is complex such as the Bayfield Ice, or with development charges, we used consultants.	We are in an environment where we need consultants on occasions. Yes they can be good for public input. You just have to be careful you are not always hand delivering issues to consultants. We can talk to public groups as well
	Paul Klopp	Tyler Hessel	Bill Dowson	Jim Ferguson	George Irvin	Taylor Van Aaken	John Gillespie	Alwyn Vanden Berg
3. We learned during public meetings regarding the Strategic Plan, that the path to sustainability requires growth. Recently we	Growth would be where ever companies want to be. If it's industrial you don't want it in a suburb, if it's an electronics industry it	For the demand in a work force we have to look at immigration. We have done a lot of work to bring the current immigrants together to	Growth in Hensall, Zurich or Bayfield depends on what the growth is. Hensall is an agricultural/elevator town so they need extra	We have a variety of communities, each community has a little different potential for growth. Hensall would have the most potential	I am not in favor of us having our own economic development officer, I think the county has the expertise. Some say we	We have a strong Internet base, we have natural gas. These help encourage business growth. Bayfield is the tourism location and	Promotion of industrial growth is important. We also pay the county to do this, although they look at it from a county level. Some of council	You always want industrial and residential growth that always helps with the tax burden. You have the three areas -

<p>heard of the major business expansion in Hensall and the difficulties of hiring staff. In your vision for Bluewater, where would growth be the most beneficial? What ideas do you have to promote growth?</p>	<p>could be anywhere. As a council what we should be is as fiscally responsible as you can. We need a zero based tax increase and then go from there and then go line by line. I support keeping the ice in Bayfield and all our community centers. SWIFT fiber program is in place in Huron county, which is to make sure fiber gets to the last mile. This could all be done by Tuckersmith and Hay Communications. What they are doing is laying fiber right next to ours. This is a total waste of money in Huron County.</p>	<p>create a community. As for Hensall specifically we have an employment issue, a lack of a workforce. At the moment we have an opportunity for growth somewhat, with affordable housing, We are also going to have to promote Zurich as an affordable place to live. For Bayfield and surrounding, it is about growth and trying to ease the planning process through. Hopefully we can help that, with more sewer capacity in the near future.</p>	<p>expertise to handle that. Zurich a bedroom community with a panel truck in every drive, we had some building permit issues in Zurich, which we sorted out. Bayfield is another issue - a tourist town. We will have to prioritize. What is the most important?</p>	<p>for industrial growth due to natural gas and heavy hydro suitable for industry. No other community has it. Bayfield for residential growth and Zurich, the same as it still has a school. We have made changes to our official plan to help with growth in Zurich. An area on the north side of Hensall has been designated for industrial growth. We have designated areas in Bayfield for growth, but cannot move forward with the current sewage capacity. That has to be looked at in the future. In Hensall we have addressed the water issue.</p>	<p>need to get development charges in place and some say it will inhibit growth. I think people will see the affordability of Hensall and Zurich. I'm not sure a municipality of our size can push economic development without help from above.</p>	<p>should be promoted and Hensall has the industrial capabilities to grow</p>	<p>feel we should leave it to the county and not duplicate the effort. When we have population growth, this will help industrial growth. We talk about population growth in our strategic plan, which I encourage. Make Bluewater a great place to live, improve our assets.</p>	<p>Bayfield Hensall and Zurich which would be the primary areas as you have the infrastructure there. If you have the growth specifically in Hensall and Zurich it might revitalize the down town core. We can see a little bit of growth in the south of Bayfield. Look to the planners and see where specific growth can be. Personally I want to see growth in those two places.</p>
<p>4. For all communities, infrastructure projects are an ongoing issue. What large capital projects do you think are the most important over the next ten years and is there a longer-term capital plan now in place?</p>	<p>Paul Klopp When I was on council 4 years ago the roads department had a plan, I assume it is still there. Same for water and sewer. The province has made us put money away to cover rebuilding costs. My first task would be to make sure these things are in place. I don't think we don't need offices for councilors.</p>	<p>Tyler Hessel We have an asset management plan in place that guides us. It has all our roads and bridges, water and sewer infrastructure. As for infrastructure we do need to sort out the water system in Hensall. They need a higher water pressure to fight a fire on main street. I know it's a heavy burden on Hensall as they are just paying for their water and sewer upgrade. We will look for some form of grant to help. Bayfield sewer must be looked at. Bayfield and Stanley West have the fastest area growth in the community, so we must support that growth. In all our communities we must have good roads and bridges to get around</p>	<p>Bill Dowson I'm not sure what has changed in the last four years, as I haven't attended council meetings. Capital expenditures come and go and we have to look at these with staff, the roads department and others.</p>	<p>Jim Ferguson No there is not a long term capital plan in place. I'm disappointed we did not get this completed in the last term. We need it. The bigger capital plans are for the sewage treatment in Bayfield, Hensall water and also Zurich water. But everything has to be on an ability to pay</p>	<p>George Irvin To some extent we do. We know the Hensall water tower must go ahead. We have a priority list for bridges and roads. We have discussed having a five year plan. The BM Ross report tells us what is needed, but we still have to pay for it.</p>	<p>Taylor Van Aaken I'm not familiar with all the projects yet that the community may need to deal with, but certainly one will be the dump the municipality uses.</p>	<p>John Gillespie We should focus on the essentials mandated by the municipal act. We should focus on service excellence and keep our taxes in line. Focus on the basics - roads, sewers and so on.</p>	<p>Alwyn Vanden Berg I'm not well versed on the current long term capital plan. Water and long term sewage treatment facilities, including Dashwood and Turnbull's Grove area, are considerations.</p>

		and in the next council we must do the bridge on Airport Line.						
	Paul Klopp	Tyler Hessel	Bill Dowson	Jim Ferguson	George Irvin	Taylor Van Aaken	John Gillespie	Alwyn Vanden Berg
<p>5. Currently the Municipality of Bluewater residents, but especially Bayfield residents, are waiting for the results of the Feasibility Study. We do not know the outcome; however, the report may not be favourable towards the municipality continuing to keep the ice in the Bayfield facility. In a simple yes or no, would you support disregarding the results and keeping the ice anyway? There is obvious pressure to consider a community partnership. In the event that a partnership becomes possible, are you able to help our members understand where the final financial liability and risk would fall, on an ongoing basis, but also in the event of a failed partnership?</p>	<p>That's a loaded question; I will answer it this way. Every report that's ever been done on ice in every community says you cannot afford to have ice. I'm hoping this report will say, after listening to all people, that council has to make a decision. Regardless of what this report says there is a committee of local people that are working on a study and the council with an open mind should see if it would work. So that is what I am going to push for.</p>	<p>I will support whatever the consultants report says. I think the idea of a private partnership just to support the ice has some difficulties. I could see a partnership that looks at recreation differently. That would be a great idea. We could look at where we operate and cover the liability and at the same time work with them on programming. Not necessarily about the ice but the capital expenditure in the future. With the dollars they are talking about raising we could turn the facility into a better recreation center</p>	<p>That's a tough question, but at the present time Yes. We need to work with the group who have ideas for the complex and listen to what they have to say.</p>	<p>'No' Firstly I am committed to the feasibility study, I put the motion on the floor. I hope they have also looked at the long-term feasibility of the building. A public private partnership may be one of the best routes. But it is not municipal services at any cost. They have a public meeting shortly so we will see what is being proposed. We will have to look at all the financial implications of any agreement.</p>	<p>No. It is untrue we want to remove the ice, but we do want to listen to the feasibility report. There is an assumption in urban areas you can walk to the ice. That is not true. If a partnership can be worked out, then great.</p>	<p>Yes, I would keep the ice in. In October the public group who are supporting the ice remaining will be unveiling their ideas for creating a partnership with the municipality and I look forward to hearing their plans</p>	<p>It is not a simple yes or no question. I am waiting to see what the consultants say. I think a partnership is something we should look at. They have put some money in to keep the ice in for this year. They have made a presentation to the consultants. Bluewater should pay for basic services across the municipality, but that may not include recreation and other services which could be added to the taxes on a community basis</p>	<p>Yes, disregard, I would say. There is a community group that should be supported - if they can be self sufficient and come up with a good business plan. I have heard the building has a life expectancy of five years. I see demographics being an issue. What other uses can be put into the arena. Will the consultant have ideas? We shouldn't just be throwing money at it. The agreement with the group must be very strong, everything in black and white.</p>
	Paul Klopp	Tyler Hessel	Bill Dowson	Jim Ferguson	George Irvin	Taylor Van Aaken	John Gillespie	Alwyn Vanden Berg
<p>6. Choose which best describes your vision for the Municipality of Bluewater</p> <p>a) Time to spend less, cut back wherever possible, and listen to the people</p> <p>b) Time to be forward thinkers....</p>	<p>'A', that's a good starting point. That's all part of the business plan.</p>	<p>'B' I campaign on a business style structure last time and I am sticking to that. It's a business style delivery and looking at your service style delivery. Option A is a backward style</p>	<p>I think we do need a business plan. Most fall flat on their face, but we do need a road map</p>	<p>I don't think you can have a business plan without talking to the people, but I am forward thinking. I have to look at the future; an inclusive municipality is my vision.</p>	<p>I think we have to be very cautious, but then we don't want to let the bridge on airport line fall in. We have to continue to prioritize these expenditures. It is important to listen to our management team and see what rates as priorities.</p>	<p>I believe we need a business plan, but we also have to listen to the people and be prudent in our spending</p>	<p>Well both. I agree with the notion of less government as more government increases cost. I see variable tax rates, but you need a plan.</p>	<p>Forward thinking is important, but I think 'A'. Cut back if there are inefficiencies, we should always talk to people. The municipality's vision is one community. We need community involvement. The people elect us, we serve the people.</p>

with a BUSINESS PLAN in place								
	Paul Klopp	Tyler Hessel	Bill Dowson	Jim Ferguson	George Irvin	Taylor Van Aaken	John Gillespie	Alwyn Vanden Berg
<p>7. Based on what we have seen at this point for the revised Shoreline Management Plan, what concerns, if any, do you have with respect to the municipality and how will you work with the conservation authority for your residents?</p>	<p>They have not come up with a firm plan. They know the initial plans were not going to fly. The lines they had shown, you could not build there again. They should have had a plan in the beginning. I would have been pushing this a lot quicker.</p>	<p>We have worked with the conservation authority on this and I think our communications are getting better. I am supportive of where it is going. The only concern I have is I would like to see the conservation authority have an engineer on staff to review the applications, rather than a third party</p>	<p>We need the conservation authority. I think they need to change the name and get rid of authority. People don't like it. We wouldn't have the community we have without them. I'm not up today on the current plans and will have to get updated on it.</p>	<p>It is hard to see what the pitfalls for the municipality are at present. What I have seen so far I like. The use of an engineer is sensible to get the job done correctly. I'm sure we will hear from residents and we will have to work closely with the conservation authority.</p>	<p>The board (ABCA) is going to review the draft plan. The board members now have greater understanding of the issues. The bus tour I arranged really opened the eyes of the members. We must look at property rights and how it affects your neighbor. I'm not sure I agree with the idea of the coastal engineer in all cases but that will be up to staff to determine. The board will not make a decision until we have got it right.</p>	<p>I don't have a lot to say on this yet as I am not familiar with all the issues for both the residents and the conservation authority yet. A new draft plan has not been presented as yet. Both sides have an important part in the future of the lakeshore.</p>	<p>Eighty to ninety percent of what I have seen is positive. No managed retreat, no prohibition of shoreline protection, though somewhat modified. A tremendous turnaround from what was proposed previously. It is a direction I would support. The municipality has a committee to look at this. We will have a new council that will have to look at it. Some wording may need to change such as the removal of all protection, prior to repairing it. That doesn't seem to make sense.</p>	<p>I'm surprised it has taken so long to come up with the plan. What was released last year obviously hurt them. We do need to protect the properties. We need to work with those residents and ABCA. I would support the residents, working as a middle man. Council will have a member on the conservation board and we should voice concerns to that person to bring to the authority.</p>