

1 Introduction

The transition of the Hamilton Harbour Commissioners into the Hamilton Port Authority (HPA) as of May 1st, 2001 includes the legislated requirement that the HPA prepare a Land Use Plan that contains objectives and policies for the development of the property that it manages, holds or occupies. Further, the Plan must take into account relevant social, economic and environmental matters and city planning regulations that apply to neighbouring lands. The process of preparing the Land Use Plan, as required by the Canada Marine Act, must also include a component of public consultation.

This report is designed to consolidate the results of the work completed in Phase 1 of the HPA Land Use Plan preparation process. As such it is a compendium of documents that have been produced to inform the further preparation of the Land Use Plan. Taken together, these documents both present some key outstanding issues and point towards opportunities and constraints for the HPA. A synopsis of the implications of this contextual information and background research is provided in Section 7 of this report.

1.1 Preparation of the Land Use Plan: Scope and Process

1.1.1 Plan Objectives

The objective of this process is to meet the requirements of the Canada Marine Act (see Section 1.2) and to provide a Land Use Plan within 12 months of becoming a Port Authority by:

- generating a Strategic Vision for the future of the Port;
- creating a framework for land use planning that will guide current and future decision-making; and
- providing a detailed design concept for Fisherman's Pier.

1.1.2 A New Vision for the Hamilton Port Authority

Having a clear vision for the HPA's future is an essential precondition to creating a valid Land Use Plan that has relevance and longevity, matching desired Port functions to available Port facilities.

This vision will build on the Port's existing strengths and will seek to orient the energies of the Port in a common direction, opening up opportunities and serving as a catalyst for the changes needed to ensure long term success.

1.1.3 Process

The Land Use Plan preparation process has been divided into four phases:

- *Phase One:* Understanding the Context: Existing Conditions, Opportunities and Constraints
- *Phase Two:* Developing the Vision for the Future of the HPA
- *Phase Three:* Options for the Land Use Plan
- *Phase Four:* Recommended Land Use Plan

Key staff and board members met for a day-long Visioning Workshop on November 2nd, 2001 to move towards the goal of generating a strategic vision for the HPA. A summary of these proceedings is included as Section 6 of this report.

A diverse group of stakeholders, most of whom had already been interviewed by the consultant team, assisted in developing preliminary physical visions for the Port and its harbour-area context at a Community Workshop on December 11th, 2001. (For a summary of the interviews, see Section 5 of this report.)

Based on the discussion and input received from the workshop participants, the consultant team will prepare options for the Land Use Plan. This will involve exploring the concepts in a greater level of detail and preparing a preferred option that is consistent with the vision of the HPA as articulated in the Visioning Workshop.

The Land Use Plan alternatives and preferred option will be presented to the public at Open Houses in March and April 2002.

1.2 Canada Marine Act and Letters Patent

The Canada Marine Act (CMA) provides a legislative framework that is designed to improve the effectiveness of Canada's major ports by creating a National Ports System (NPS) made up of independently managed Canada Port Authority's (CPA's) and by streamlining the regulatory regime for the new CPA's and other ports currently administered by Transport Canada. Approximately 19 Ports of national significance are now governed by this one legislation that is intended to make Canadian Ports more efficient, viable and competitive with Canada's major trading partners.

The Letters Patent of the HPA elaborate the regulatory framework within which the Port Authority is required to operate. Activities and powers of the Authority are detailed in these Letters Patent.

The Letters Patent provide the Port with a significant level of latitude to carry on many activities as a Port Authority, although the scope of its powers have been reduced from those that it held as the Hamilton Harbour Commissioners (HHC). Some of these changes include:

- Land Transactions: Under the HHC Act, the Commission could buy and sell land in its own name without approval from Ottawa; the Canada Marine Act requires the issuance of Supplementary Letters Patent for land transactions (Ministerial approval).
- Borrowing: The HHC had full authority to borrow any moneys in its own right; the Letters Patent places a ceiling on the amount of borrowing that the HPA can undertake. Any amount over this limit requires a change in its Letters Patent by way of Supplementary Letters Patent (Ministerial approval).
- Special Examination: This is a new requirement under the CMA which has cost implications for the HPA.
- Land Use Plan: This is a new requirement under the CMA which has cost implications for the HPA.
- Annual Meeting: The public annual meeting is also a new requirement under the CMA.
- The Gross Revenue Charge: The CMA requires the HPA to pay a stipend to the Government of Canada to maintain the status of its Letters Patent and is based on the gross revenues of the Port. This is a costly new requirement for the HPA that did not exist under the HHC. It is estimated to be an expense of approximately \$400,000 per year (based on current revenues).

- Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT): This is a new requirement for the HPA. Under the HHC, it did not pay any property taxes to the City for vacant land held by the HHC, although tenants did pay on leased property. Now under the CMA and the Payment in Lieu of Taxes Act, the HPA must make payment in lieu of taxes on all unleased property. In addition, tenants continue to pay taxes. This is another area that has added new costs to the operations of the HPA. The HPA is currently negotiating its PILT obligation to the City of Hamilton.
- Official Languages Act, Access to Information Act: The HPA is now required to operate under these Acts of Parliament. These Acts did not apply to the HHC.
- Board of Directors: The CMA provides for a Board of 7 members whereas the HHC had a Board of 3 members.

Although many of these changes have negative financial implications and generate additional work and responsibilities for the HPA, it has also accrued some significant benefits.

1.3 Minutes of Settlement

In October, 2000, the City of Hamilton, the Federal Government and the HHC approved an agreement that settled a number of outstanding issues amongst the parties. This agreement has direct implications for land use planning at the HPA. It affirms that the success of the city and the port are intricately linked, and that consideration ought therefore be given to the impacts and benefits of land use decisions for the City of Hamilton.

The following changes to land holdings were an outcome of the Minutes of Settlement and have relevance for HPA planning.

- A significant majority of the lands and lands under water encompassing the area of Windermere Basin (except 9 acres) have been conveyed to the City of Hamilton;
- Waterlots in Pier Sites 1,2, 3 and 4 have been conveyed to the City of Hamilton;
- Lands, piers and waterlots in the vicinity of Piers 5, 6, 7 and part of Pier 8 have been conveyed to the City of Hamilton;
- The westernly 8.25 acres of Pier 8 have been conveyed to Parks Canada for the purpose of developing a marine interpretive centre; the City has right of first refusal if the project is not complete within 36 months, and commercial vessels using the Hamilton Harbour will be allowed to tie-up along berths 83 and 84 for the purpose of loading and unloading, if no other place along the northern face is available. If the land is conveyed back to the City of Hamilton, the City shall lease back the land to the HPA for the remainder of the term. The remaining lands and facilities on the easternly portion of Pier

8 were also conveyed to the City, subject to a 25 year lease back to the HPA, conditional upon the continued use of these lands for shipping and navigation purposes.

The following outstanding commitments of the HPA that arise from the Minutes of Settlement need to be considered in the context of the Land Use Plan.

EASTPORT

The HPA agrees to create a Master Development Plan for Eastport that contains the following elements: a site plan approval process, as detailed in the Minutes of Settlement will be established; a second parkette will be developed; view protection guidelines will be established in keeping with best practices in other jurisdictions in Canada; \$50,000 will be spent annually, over and above current capital budget, on berming, vegetation and quality landscaping; \$15 million will be committed for the construction of enhanced port facilities.

WEST HARBOUR

The HPA will collaborate with the City of Hamilton to beautify Guise Street, removing sheds 1 and 2 backing on Marina Dr., and undertaking reasonable expense to enhance the public view.

HARBOUR DEVELOPMENT TRUST

An amount of \$6.3 million has been transferred to the Hamilton Harbour Development Trust, with the stipulation that the Trust shall be bound to use (i) \$5 million of the Trust Fund solely for land assembly, improvements and development costs related to the East End Gateway or West Harbour Development Plan and for the Waterfront Trail and (ii) \$1.3 million of the Trust Fund solely for the Waterfront Trail.

2 Context

2.1 Regional Context: the Golden Horseshoe

2.1.1 Demographic Projections

Over the course of the next 30 years, it is anticipated that the population of the Golden Horseshoe will increase by approximately 37%. Hamilton's population itself grew by nearly 10 % in the last decade, and its growth is anticipated to climb by 35% over the next 30 years to a population of nearly one million people. This will present significant infrastructure demands, challenge existing levels of housing and employment stock, and generate transportation capacity issues in an already dense corridor centred on the Queen Elizabeth Highway, from Buffalo N.Y. to Oshawa, Ont. At the same time, it will result in increased demand for the

provision of goods and services, for goods movement and for access to recreational facilities, putting more and more pressure on the transportation network. The impacts will be greatest on the capacity of roads and highways, suggesting that there may be potential to increase the level of goods moved on water through the HPA.

2.1.2 Regional and Local Infrastructure – Drawing 1

Although the true costs of congestion in the GTA are difficult to assess ...delays caused by congestion add 30% to the cost of moving goods in Canada...

Moving Goods in the New Economy

The HPA is served by an extensive network of transportation corridors. It is at the confluence of the Detroit-Toronto corridor and the Toronto-Buffalo corridor. Key regional infrastructure to these primary North American Free Trade Agreement routes includes access from the HPA to:

- Detroit, Michigan, along Highways 401, 402 and 403;
- Buffalo, N.Y., along the QEW;
- Greater Toronto, along Highways 401, 403, 407 and the QEW.

Burlington Street is the main industrial artery servicing the Port, providing direct access to and from the QEW, and indirect access to Highway 403 at York Boulevard and Main Street. It is a key connecting street for industrial traffic moving goods from Hamilton into and out of the region and provides indirect access to and from Highway 403 at Main Street (from both directions), and King Street (to both directions), and York Boulevard (to and from the east only).

Various strategies have been presented to alleviate the pressure of truck traffic in residential neighbourhoods and in the downtown core, including the proposition of a Perimeter Road that would re-route traffic in the west end of the Port to a new road that would follow the rail corridor and link to Highway 403. This road would allow trucks to bypass the neighbourhoods and downtown core. This road remains logistically difficult to achieve, and its development appears, at this point in time, to be unlikely.

The proposed Red Hill Creek Expressway would connect the Lincoln M. Alexander Parkway to the QEW east of the Burlington Skyway. This would add an additional access point and gateway to the Port on the eastern side of the Harbour, with the potential to decrease the flow of industrial traffic through residential streets and the downtown core as well.

In relation to downtown Hamilton, the existing corridors that have the potential to facilitate mutually beneficial connections with the Port are Bay, James, and Ferguson Streets, as well as Wellington St./Victoria Ave.

The John C. Munro Hamilton Airport is engaged in an aggressive marketing campaign to become Canada's premier intermodal cargo facility, and the link between it and the Port would be further increased as a result of the development of the Red Hill Expressway. The Hamilton Airport has experienced rapid growth as a courier hub as a result of its proximity to the major markets of Toronto, southwestern Ontario, and the northeastern United States, along with its unrestricted 24-hour operation. Operational flexibility on the aprons -- trucks can load and unload directly onto the aircraft -- is one of its many unique characteristics that make it a desirable intermodal facility. Recently, UPS moved into its new \$18 million sortation complex, and Purolator Courier's \$5 million, 100,000 square foot sorting facility is currently under construction and will be ready in 2002. If the HPA were to pursue a greater role as an intermodal facility, the Hamilton Airport could become a valuable ally.

2.1.3 The St. Lawrence Seaway Regional Ports – Drawing 2

The Saint Lawrence Seaway is one of the major transportation routes into the heart of North America. The Seaway includes 15 substantial ports and more than 50 other regional-scale ports in both Canada and the United States. With a length of approximately 1,700 km, more than 110 million tonnes of cargo transit the Seaway each year. The Port of Hamilton is one of the most significant ports in the system, receiving 19% of the inbound tonnage that travels the Seaway. Last year, the Port of Hamilton handled approximately 13 million metric tonnes of cargo, making it much larger than most of the other ports in the Great Lakes.

Other Great Lakes ports that handle a roughly comparable amount of cargo per year include Thunder Bay, Detroit, and Toledo. The Ports of Montreal, Quebec, and Duluth-Superior are significantly larger, in some cases handling twice as much cargo as Hamilton per year.

Tonnage at Selected Ontario Ports

	Domestic	International	Total
1. Thunder Bay	8,342,453	4,506,630	12,849,083
2. Hamilton	4,875,236	6,540,868	11,416,104
3. Nanticoke	1,214,639	7,086,209	8,300,848
4. Windsor	2,804,908	2,826,845	5,631,753
5. Sault Ste Marie	84,745	4,316,897	4,401,642
6. Goderich	1,214,758	2,714,679	3,929,437
7. Meldrum Bay	1,633,223	1,788,720	3,421,943
8. Clarkson	2,031,952	555,773	2,587,725
9. Sarnia	1,377,883	798,212	2,176,095
10. Toronto	924,089	602,098	1,526,187

Source: Shipping in Canada, 1997. Statistics Canada.

In spite of its demonstrated economic significance, the St. Lawrence Seaway faces a number of challenges to its competitiveness. The Seaway must compete with other routes of marine transportation, as well as with companies shipping cargos by rail and truck. Unless steps are taken to address these challenges, the Seaway and the ports that depend on it will see their competitive position eroded in the future.

Some of the factors contributing to the reduced competitiveness of the Seaway include:

- the limited physical size of the Seaway and its locks, which prevent newer types of ships from using the Seaway;
- the limited depth of parts of the Seaway, and the substantial costs of dredging the system to maintain navigability;
- an unlevel playing field for Canadian ports with respect to their American competitors, and government policies which favour other modes of transportation (such as subsidies for grain shipment by rail);
- fees for the use of the Seaway which are seen as too high by users;
- the need to attract and retain talented people to the marine sector;
- unbalanced cargo flows through the Seaway with ships being operated at less than full capacity;
- the limited length of the shipping season through the Seaway;
- a pilotage system that can be inefficient and expensive.

Some initiatives are currently underway to address these issues. For instance, the US Army Corps of Engineers is studying the feasibility of expanding the locks in the Seaway to accommodate larger ships. There has been increased cooperation between the various governmental jurisdictions that have an interest in the Seaway. A good example has been the joint website (www.greatlakes-seaway.com) for the Seaway. Further initiatives like these are required.

Particularly because the Seaway is an international waterway, there is an unusually complex set of regulations that apply to shippers using the Seaway. Simplifying the required paperwork and streamlining regulations would make the Seaway more competitive. These changes could be understood within the context of a larger mandate to decrease the costs of using the Seaway.

The Seaway is more than just a waterway, however. The physical infrastructure of the Seaway is ageing and will have to be replaced. Seaway ships are increasingly out of date and in need of renewal. Competitors are investing millions of dollars in building ultra-modern systems for handling intermodal traffic; the ports of the Seaway need to make similar investments to remain competitive. Recent initiatives like the automated ship identification system are a step in the right direction for the Seaway. Governments in both Canada and the United States could do more to raise the profile of the Seaway, and to promote it as an important transportation option. Overall, it will take action on more than one front to ensure the long-term viability and success of the Seaway.

2.1.4 Existing Market Conditions

According to an analysis of the economic significance of the Hamilton Harbour by Stamm Research Associates, Ontario's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) was \$313.5 billion in 1999. Of that, the manufacturing sector accounted for \$74.7 billion, or 23.8%. Metal manufacturing industries accounted for \$40.9 billion, or 13% of the total economy of Ontario, and over half of the manufacturing sector.

Hamilton's GDP in 1999 was estimated at \$17.8 billion. Moreover, Hamilton's economy was disproportionately concentrated on manufacturing industries compared to the rest of the province, particularly in metals and related products. In 1999 manufacturing accounted for more than 27% of Hamilton's economy, significantly more than the comparable figure for Ontario. Although Hamilton's economy grew through the 1990s, that growth trailed the even stronger growth recorded by the province as a whole. In 1996, the size of the labour force in Hamilton-Wentworth region was 619,475, with an unemployment rate of 9.1%.

Given the volume of metal manufacturing in Ontario generally, and in Hamilton in particular, the economic health of the city and the port are closely tied to the health of this industry. The steel industry has been in a state of turmoil in recent years, with the bankruptcy of a number of high profile producers, and dramatically increased competition from low cost steel makers overseas. Furthermore, the production of the steel industry is itself closely tied to the health of other parts of the economy, notably the automotive industry. These complex linkages, and the uncertain state of the North American economy today, confound efforts to develop accurate forecasts of future economic activity in Hamilton. Nevertheless, the economic activity of the Port of Hamilton will remain closely linked to the fortunes of the local steel industry.

Levels of demand for other industrial materials handled by the Port are also difficult to ascertain. For example, since the terror event of September 11th 2001, activity in the airline industry has declined dramatically, and this has had a direct impact on the amount of jet fuel handled by the Port. On the other hand, agri-food industries, for example, continue to experience sustainable growth, with forecast increases in the coming years. The HPA has recognized these difficulties in its own forecasts of cargos in the future. Part of the difficulty is the potential variability of the amount of shipping that goes through the port each year, in part because of the fact that there are no regularly scheduled liner services to Great Lake ports. The Port has also had to rely on estimates from its terminal operators in developing its forecasts. Notwithstanding the reservations noted above, cargo forecasts show a small increase for most types of cargo handled by the Port in the next four to five years.

2.2 City and Community Context

2.2.1 The City of Hamilton Official Plan and Zoning

Council recognizes that the Port and harbour are integral and important elements of the social and economic fabric of the City of Hamilton and its surrounding region...

Section A.2.11

Official Plan

The Official Plan recognizes the importance of industrial activity within the City of Hamilton and affirms that Hamilton intends to remain a major industrial centre in the region and in the Province. To facilitate this, the Plan is designed to both retain existing industries and to stimulate new industrial growth. The Plan recognizes the existing inventory of industrial uses and identifies a reserve of lands suitable for the expansion of existing industry and for the attraction of new firms.

According to the Land Use Concept produced by the City of Hamilton as the basis for the Official Plan, Piers 10-15 and 23-27 are designated for *Shipping and Navigation Uses* (Section A.2.11). These uses include, but are not limited to:

- Those uses which relate to the movement, management, safety and convenience of ships;
- Uses involving the carriage of goods or passengers to other modes of transportation;
- Related storage and processing;
- Vessel and barge docks;
- Industry and commerce related to, or incidental to or necessary to the port;
- Recreation boat facilities;
- The provision of services such as security, employment, immigration, labour administration, technical, food, fuel and maintenance.

The City of Hamilton agrees to ensure that the uses abutting the Port Authority lands are compatible with Port uses (Section 2.11.2), and the HPA agrees to develop Piers 25 and 27 in an aesthetically pleasing manner (Section 2.11.4).

On Pier 8 it is the intent of the Plan that heavy industry and open bulk storage will be prohibited and the focus will be on uses that are compatible with the uses on Piers 5, 6, and 7. Further, it is recognized that Pier 8 acts as a transition area between the recreational and open space uses of the west harbour and the intense *Shipping and Navigation Uses* in the central and east harbour. On this basis, in addition to the *Shipping and Navigation Uses* permitted for Pier 8, water oriented commercial activities are also permitted (Section 2.11.5.iii).

The area around Windermere Basin is identified as a *Special Policy Area*, as well as an *Environmentally Sensitive Area*, which means that it shall be preserved in its natural state, although limited development may be permissible, contingent on the use and design proposed. This area is also identified as *Hazard Lands*, meaning that they shall be preserved, since development would present environmental hazards such as flood susceptibility, erosion susceptibility, instability, and other physical conditions that pose risks. The prepared dredgeate cell owned by the HPA is governed by these constraints.

Significant *Land Fill Constraint Areas* exist at Eastwood Park, at the intersection between Burlington, Victoria and Wentworth Streets, at Burlington and Birch Streets, and at Brampton and Wellington Streets. *Land Fill Constraint Areas* are sites that are known for former municipal or industrial waste disposal. Given concerns regarding methane gas and leachate, specific policies within the Plan govern the development/redevelopment of these lands.

The HPA land holdings are contained within a *Community Improvement Project Area*, as designated by the City of Hamilton. The municipality may, as a result of this designation, engage in the following activities:

- Acquire, hold, clear grade or otherwise prepare land for community improvement;
- Construct, repair, rehabilitate or improve buildings on land acquired or held by it in conformity with the Community Improvement Plan;
- Sell, lease or otherwise dispose of any land and buildings acquired or held by it in conformity with the Community Improvement Plan;
- Make grants or loans to the registered owners, assessed owners, (and in the case of the City of Hamilton also tenants), to pay for the whole or any part of the cost of rehabilitating such lands and buildings in conformity with the Community Improvement Plan.

The Economic Development Department of the City of Hamilton has prepared a Community Improvement Plan in compliance with the designation of this community improvement area, known as *Environmental Remediation and Site Enhancement (ERASE)*. Further explanation of the ERASE plan is detailed in section 2.2.7 of this report.

Zoning – Drawing 3a

The HPA lands and adjacent properties are subject to municipal zoning, as per the City of Hamilton and the City of Burlington Zoning by-laws. These lands are regulated by a variety of designations, including the following City of Hamilton designations: *K-Heavy Industry, J-Light and Limited Heavy Industry, F-2a-Harbour District, F-2-Open Space Harbour District, D-Urban Protected Residential, F-4-*

Waterfront Services, Modified F-4 and the following City of Burlington designations: *PC-166-Community Park, S-Service, BC1-Buisness Corridor*. Zoning by-laws regulate uses, built form and other development criteria. This map identifies both HPA zoning and adjacent uses.

Within these provisions, a large portion of the lands owned by the Hamilton Port Authority (Piers 11-15, 23 and 24; the northwest section of Windermere Basin, as outlined in the Minutes of Settlement) are zoned *K, Heavy Industry*. Stelco and Dofasco, as well as a substantial area south of Burlington Street, are also zoned *K, Heavy Industry*.

The following provisions apply to a *K* district:

Use. A broad range of intense industrial uses that are not permitted in other industrial districts are permitted on these sites. In addition to these industrial uses, the following institutional, public and commercial uses, are also permitted: any institutional use for detentional, emergency or surgical purposes, as well as a day nursery; a broad range of public uses, including a garbage dump and public incinerator; a broad range of commercial uses, including a lumber, salvage or stock yard, fuel storage tank, and spray paint shop.

Height. The maximum allowable height is 10 storeys, and no structure shall exceed 37 metres in height, except a blast furnace or other industrial structure.

Coverage. The maximum amount of land area on any single property that may be covered by buildings and/or structures is 85% of the area of the lot.

Density. In terms of the allowable intensity of use, it appears that no density restrictions apply.

Setbacks. The only setback provisions apply where an industrial zone abuts a residential zone. In this case, no industrial building or structure may be located nearer to any side lot line or rear lot line than 4.5 metres.

Pier 10 is zoned *J, Light and Limited Heavy Industry*. The height, coverage, density and setback provisions are the same as a *K* district, as outlined above. All shipping related uses are permitted. Some restrictions apply to commercial and industrial uses. For example, a blast furnace is not permissible.

The lands to the west of Pier 8, west and north of Guise Street and owned by the City of Hamilton, are zoned *F-1, Waterfront Recreational District*. Bayfront Park is zoned *L-f-1, Planned Development, Waterfront Recreation*, which is an interim zoning category. The intent is to zone Bayfront Park as *F-1* in the future.

The following provisions apply to a *F-1* zone:

Use. A limited range of waterfront recreational uses are permitted on the site, as they relate to residential, public and commercial uses, including: a hotel or summer camp with tents; a picnic ground, tennis court, private club, conservatory, aquarium, library, museum, swimming pool, or fairground; commercial uses that relate to a marina, retail stores, restaurants and coffee shops, a bank, sailing and boating schools, an amusement park, and an establishment for the rental of recreational equipment, such as bikes, canoes and boats, but not motorcycles and snowmobiles.

Height. The maximum allowable height is 11 metres.

Coverage. The maximum amount of land area that may be covered by buildings and/or structures is not specified, but at least 40% of the land area on any single property must be landscaped.

Density. In terms of the allowable intensity of use, every lot or tract of land must have a width of at least 15 metres and a lot area of at least 450 square metres.

Setbacks. There are no setback requirements.

Signs. The total area of any given sign must not exceed .5 square metres for every .5 square metres of street frontage of the lot, and it may not exceed 2 metres in height. Every wall sign must be parallel to the wall to which it is affixed. Further, illumination must be carefully controlled to ensure that it only illuminates the sign, and does not flicker.

The Hamilton Port Authority waterlots in the west harbour are zoned *F-2A, Harbour District*. Uses related to shipping and navigation purposes are permitted in this zone. The Hamilton Port Authority waterlots that follow the southern shoreline of Bayfront Park and extend towards Cootes Paradise are zoned *F-2, Open Space Harbour District*. This area is designated for recreational open space uses.

The lands west of Pier 8, south of Guise Street, are zoned *D, Urban Protected Residential – One and Two Family Dwellings, Etc.* These lands are primarily occupied by family dwellings, although a broad array of residential related uses are permitted, including: daycares, group homes for not more than 6 people, homes for elderly persons, a district yard of a municipal corporation, and a college or university. The offices of the Hamilton Port Authority are within this zone, recognized as legal non-conforming.

At the corner of James Street North and Burlington Street, several sites exist adjacent to the Hamilton Port Authority building that are regulated by site specific zoning by-laws. The land on 600 Burlington Street and 574 James Street North is regulated by amendments that change the existing *D, Urban Protected Residential* zoning to commercial designations (*H/S-182 and G/S-902* respectively). The land

on 587 James Street North is regulated by amendments that change the existing *D, Urban Protected Residential* zoning to allow for an auto service centre (*H/S-818*).

The lands in the residential enclave between Pier 14 and Burlington Street are zoned *K/S-727*, a site specific designation which allows existing dwellings to remain, and amends the regulation to permit a reduced side yard, as well as alterations and extensions to existing dwellings.

Piers 25, 26, 27 and 28 are zoned *F-4, Waterfront Services*. The allowable uses within this district are divided into two areas: those that pertain to Shipping and Navigation Uses and others. Under the Shipping and Navigation category, a wide range of marine services, including freight and passenger water transport industry and other industries relating to ships, such as ship building and boat building, are allowable. In the second category, a much wider range of industries are permitted, including those that relate to storage, transport and cargo, but also including restaurants and night clubs. The only public uses specifically permitted in this district are offices of the HPA or labour organizations. The height and lot coverage requirements for purposes that are not Shipping and Navigation (the second of the two categories within the district) are the same as those for *K* districts, outlined above. Ground, wall and roof signs must also be in compliance with specific dimensions, as outlined in the by-law.

Pier 8 and of that is retained by the HPA are *modified F-4* zones, as outlined in the Ontario Municipal Board Decision dated February 20th, 1998, referenced as Order Number 0464 and the Minutes of Settlement, respectively. The *Modified F-4* zoning allows for a full range of marine uses, including freight, passenger and other water transport, harbour and port operations, commercial uses (restaurants, clothing stores, boat rental and marinas), industrial uses (concrete industry, trade contracting, textiles, millwork, furniture, glass products), educational uses (research establishment), uses oriented towards tourists (ferry terminal, retail stores and craft showrooms, heliports and seaplane operations), and public uses (labour organizations, artist and photography studios). *Modified F-4* provides for more extensive uses (banks, amusement parks, boat rental and marinas) than permitted in *F-4, Waterfront Services*.

The lands in the Hamilton Beach community, east of the QEW, are zoned *C, Urban Protected Residential*. Single family dwellings, as well as foster homes, residential care facilities, and daycares for not more than 25 children are permitted. In addition, a wide array of cultural and educational facilities are permitted, including seminaries, libraries and museums.

Some of the land north and east of Windermere Basin is zoned *AA, Agricultural District*. In addition to agricultural uses, a public hospital, a children's residence, a private stable, and a district yard of the City are included as permitted uses.

2.2.2 The City of Burlington Official Plan and Zoning

Some of the land holdings of the Hamilton Port Authority are within the municipal jurisdiction of the City of Burlington. As such, they are regulated by the City of Burlington Official Plan and Zoning by-laws.

Official Plan

The City of Burlington Official Plan (1994) details three key principles that shape its planning policies: sustainable development, that is, development that meets people's needs in the present without making it harder for future generations to meet their own needs; healthy communities, that is, communities in which the physical conditions of the community support the health of its residents; and an ecosystem approach, that is, an approach that considers the interactions among people, their social and economic activities, and the natural environment.

Further, there is distinct recognition within the Official Plan of the role that the waterfront setting plays in shaping the character of the City. The Official Plan seeks to protect the shoreline, including fish and wildlife habitat, and promotes the waterfront as a valuable resource, by encouraging more public access to the lake. These values are consistent with the HPA's planning approach, and as such joint ventures between the City and Port have been successful in the past (i.e. fish and wildlife protection in the vicinity of LaSalle Park).

Parks and open space lands are identified as valuable resources to the community that play an important role in defining the character and lifestyle of the City's residents. As such, the design, development and use of LaSalle Park, Spencer Smith (which includes some of the HPA lands: north of the Burlington Canal, east of the Burlington Skyway Bridge) and the Burlington Beach Waterfront Park are subject to Park Master Plans. Both LaSalle Park and Spencer Smith Park are designated as *Major Parks and Open Space*, and as such policies within the Official Plan pertaining to environmental protection, rights-of-way, connections to neighborhoods, permitted uses and adjacent facilities apply.

The HPA owned lands near the Canada Centre for Inland Waters (Pier 29, West of the QEW) are designated within the Official Plan as an *Employment Area: General Industrial, Business Corridor and Office/Business Park*. This designation is based on a range of permitted office, retail and industrial uses, the scale and intensity of the development allowed is specified, design standards apply, and the potential effect of these uses on adjacent uses must be considered.

Within the context of the Official Plan, there is some uncertainty pertaining to the designation of the small portion of land to the west of Eastport Drive on the Hamilton Harbour shoreline (Pier 31). Review of the Official Plan

and further discussions with Burlington planning staff suggest that it is designated *Residential*, although it is zoned *S, Service* (see below).

Zoning

LaSalle Park is zoned *PC-166, Community Park*, and the portion of the Port's land north of the Burlington Canal and east of the Skyway Bridge is zoned *PC-165, Community Park*.

The following provisions apply to a *PC* zone:

Use. A range of community uses are allowed in this zone, including parks, recreation facilities, cultural and heritage facilities, and uses related to ceremonial, festive and cultural activities. An exception (166) exists for LaSalle Park that also permits a banquet hall. An exception (165) exists for the portion of land north of the Burlington Canal and east of the Skyway Bridge that permits retail and service commercial, entertainment, recreational and hospitality uses.

Landscaping and Setbacks. Specific setback and landscaping requirements detailed in the by-law ensure appropriate relationships to abutting streets, and also ensure that green buffers facilitate the transition between buildings and/or structures and other uses, such as streets, creeks and residential zones.

The small portion of land to the west of Eastport Drive on the Hamilton Harbour shoreline is zoned *S, Service*. In this area, two categories of use exist: any transportation, communication or utility use; open space and outdoor recreation uses, such as those typically associated with a park (playfields, bike paths, trails). Use, height, coverage, and density provisions do not apply, but are assessed by the City when a development or redevelopment is proposed.

The portion of land between the Canada Centre for Inland Waters and the Skyway Bridge is zoned *BC1, Business Corridor*. The Canada Centre for Inland Waters is also zoned *BC1, Business Corridor*.

The following provisions apply to a *BC1* zone:

Use. Allowable uses are not specifically detailed, although the regulation assumes restaurants, office buildings, and retail sales as expected uses. Outdoor manufacturing is not a permitted use.

Height. There is no maximum building height restriction.

Landscaped Area. Specific landscape buffering requirements are indicated, with details relating to streets, creeks, heritage roads, areas abutting the QEW and residential zones.

Parking. Specific parking regulations apply in accordance with “*Off Street Parking and Loading Requirements.*”

Outdoor Storage. The by-law details specific regulations that are designed to ensure that outdoor storage is not unsightly for residential communities, nor visible from any street.

The lands around LaSalle Park, and the lands adjacent to the small portion of land to the west of Eastport Drive on the Hamilton Harbour shoreline are zoned *R2, Residential*. As such, specific regulations exist pertaining to lot width, area, front yard, rear yard, side yard and street side yard requirements. In addition, building heights are restricted, and lot coverage for one storey residences range from 40% of the property if a dwelling has an attached garage, to 32% of the property if the dwelling does not.

2.2.3 Neighbourhoods adjacent to the Port Lands

If the lighthouse complex could be developed as a marine heritage site, combined with other improvements, such as landscaping/walking and cycling trails, docking and washroom facilities, the canal area could once again become a popular recreation area and tourist destination. The lighthouse and keeper's dwelling could be restored and made accessible to the public.

Hamilton Beach Preservation Society

Many active and engaged neighbourhoods surround the Hamilton Harbour. They are directly impacted by industrial uses, traffic flows and a certain lack of amenities. The City of Hamilton is currently engaged in a process to develop a Master Plan for the North West Neighbourhood that pays particular attention to the development of Guise Street. The Hamilton Beach Preservation Society continues to advocate on quality of life issues, including increased access to recreational spaces, such as Fisherman's Pier and the extension of the Harbour Front Trail, the limiting and management of industrial use impacts on residential properties, and the preservation of both the residential community and the Burlington Canal Lighthouse and the Keeper's Dwelling. The Central Area Planning Committee is a City of Hamilton committee that is well represented by neighbourhood advocates. Although its role is currently being reviewed following the amalgamation of the City of Hamilton, members will continue to advocate for appropriate development within the core of the city, including transportation corridors that sufficiently connect the downtown to the harbour and to Bayfront Park.

Some of the City's north end neighbourhoods have experienced a significant increase in truck traffic over the last five years, and have particular concerns regarding deliveries which now occur throughout the night. Residents of the residential enclave north of Burlington and south of Pier 14 have significant concerns about continued and increasing use of residential streets by transport trucks. During the daytime this traffic is believed to pose a threat to pedestrians, many of whom are children, and at night residents are disturbed by the high noise levels that this traffic generates. This is a new problem that has emerged now that the gates at the end of Hillyard Street are left open at night.

2.2.4 Open Space and Trails – Drawing 3b

Bayfront Park and the redeveloped Pier 4 Park are the result of the successful remediation of a former industrial landfill site. These 47 acres of parkland combine environmental initiatives, pedestrian linkages, and recreational spaces, and have provided the space and opportunity for citizens to reengage with the Hamilton Harbour. Further, these initiatives have inspired a broader vision for the generation of a critical mass of recreational activity in the west harbour.

Although extensive trails already exist, they have been designed as part of a larger system that will continue to be implemented incrementally. As a result, some trails remain disconnected from others. The Bayfront Park trail, for example, although in close proximity to the Harbourfront Trail, does not connect to it. The City is also investigating opportunities to extend the Bayfront Park trail to the east, to connect through to Pier 8.

On the east side of the harbour, the Confederation Park Waterfront Trail could be extended north-westwards along the rail bed through the Hamilton Beach community to adjoin with the Burlington Waterfront Trail. Although trail advocates recognize that it would be desirable to complete the circuit of trails around the full perimeter of the harbour, the safety and liability concerns in allowing public access across the active Port lands present a significant constraint. One alternative includes designating Burlington Street as part of the pedestrian trail system; another approach includes creating strategic access /viewing points to observe Port activities, much like the existing parkette at Eastport.

2.2.5 Key Connections to Downtown – Drawing 4

Current initiatives by the City of Hamilton include the development of north/south corridors that provide connections between the downtown core and the harbour. Ferguson Street is a key corridor that is undergoing significant streetscaping improvements, and plans are underway to continue these designs along James, Guise and Bay Streets.

Both James Street and Ferguson Avenue at Burlington Street present opportunities for creating gateways that facilitate and celebrate the transition between the downtown and the Port. The development of these gateways offers an

opportunity to both acknowledge the relationship between the City and the Port, and to recognize and define the unique nature of the Port.

2.2.6 Related Initiatives

CANADIAN DISCOVERY CENTRE

The Discovery Centre will help Canadians learn more about the significance of Canada's vast water resources and marine ecosystems, and will encourage Canadians to work together in their own communities to safeguard this vital natural heritage.

Canada

Parks

As part of the Minutes of Settlement, an 8.25 acre site on the west side of Pier 8 was transferred to Parks Canada for the development of a Canadian Discovery Centre. It will tell the story of national protected heritage areas in Canada, promote marine conservation, and focus on the history, development and existing conditions of the Great Lakes, with particular emphasis on Lake Ontario and Hamilton Harbour.

The \$10 million project is planned to open by the summer of 2003.

REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN FOR HAMILTON HARBOUR

While the initial focus was on the harbour itself, and rather specifically on water quality, I was pleased to see the development of a broader, more-inclusive view that draws together the concerns for the whole watershed...

Keith Rodgers, Past Hamilton Harbour RAP Co-ordinator

The Remedial Action Plan has been an extensive and exemplary planning process designed to bring sustainable natural ecosystems to the Hamilton Harbour, and to improve the potential for more extensive recreation uses while maintaining the Harbour's and the watershed's essential economic function. A key objective of this process has been to ensure broad coalitions and extensive public support, in order to facilitate successful implementation. The RAP has over 175 member organizations, including the HPA.

The RAP is a detailed plan that outlines specific objectives and initiatives that have already and will continue to improve the sustainability of Hamilton Harbour's ecosystem. Estimated costs for implementing the RAP are in the order of \$800 –900 million, and since 1970 approximately \$700 million has been spent, with exceptional results. Initiatives, as outlined in a recent *RAP Office Update* have included:

- Habitat restoration and the creation of new habitat islands;
- Combined sewer overflows have been reduced;

- Beaches have been reopened for the first time since the 1950's as a result of improved water quality;
- Funding has been spent on experimental sediment remediation technologies and preparatory work for a sediment removal and treatment project;
- Industries have, as a result of the RAP, invested in technologies that reduce contaminant inputs into the Hamilton harbour;
- Watershed management plans have been produced by Conservation Authorities;
- Public Access to the Harbour has increased significantly;
- Monitoring, research and management in support of all harbour-related issues by all parties can be estimated at roughly \$1 million a year.

Outstanding challenges include total discharges of phosphorus, ammonia and suspended solids that remain above RAP targets; financial and technical issues that impede sediment remediation; and the remediation of the coal tar deposit at Randle Reef.

BARC/BAIT

Hamilton Harbour is linked to the economic prosperity of the entire region. It supports major industries and links them with the Great Lakes and the oceans of the world. The Harbour also provides recreational opportunities. The mix of industries, residences, parks, and natural areas along its shores create a community identity.

Bringing Back the Bay, BARC

The Bay Area Restoration Council (BARC) is a non-profit organization established in 1991 as a successor for the stakeholders group of the Hamilton Harbour Remedial Action Plan. BARC's mandate is to promote, monitor and assess the implementation of the Hamilton Harbour Remedial Action Plan (RAP). BARC works closely with other local groups, such as the Bay Area Implementation Team (BAIT), which also formed when the original stakeholders split, providing leadership and support of environmental protection and restoration efforts.

To heighten public awareness and provide opportunity for community involvement, BARC offers several programs and coordinates many activities with other organizations with complementary objectives. Many of BARC's activities are facilitated through one or more of the BARC committees.

ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION AND SITE ENHANCEMENT (ERASE)

The City of Hamilton is one of the oldest and most heavily industrialised cities in Canada. The physical legacy of this rich industrial heritage includes a large number of abandoned, idled or underused industrial properties...

Community Improvement Plan

ERASE is a Community Improvement Plan that has been advanced by the Economic Development Department of the City of Hamilton for its core industrial areas, which includes most of the Hamilton Port Authority land holdings (excluding Fisherman's Pier and LaSalle Park). A toolkit of incentives has been designed to encourage both private and public investment and reinvestment, redevelopment and construction activity in the Project Area. The objectives of the plan that relate directly to the Port lands include:

- Retaining and facilitating the expansion of existing industrial and commercial uses;
- Attracting new industrial uses;
- Improving the physical and visual quality of the area;
- Improving environmental health and safety;
- Increasing the provision of city core housing opportunities;
- Increasing the provision of waterfront access and recreational opportunities;
- Stimulating private investment activity and private property maintenance.

The programs that are designed to further these objectives include:

- Grants to property owners who undertake redevelopment;
- Grants for 50% of cost of Phase II and III environmental site assessments;
- Rebates of specific planning application and development fees;
- Opportunities Marketing and Data Base Program to identify, describe and market high priority redevelopment opportunities to the development and real estate industry;
- Acquisition and redevelopment of key strategic properties by the City.

WINDERMERE BASIN

The City of Hamilton, in conjunction with the Waterfront Regeneration Trust, is in the process of preparing a Vision Strategy for the Windermere Basin area. The intent is to restore the Basin as an estuarine landscape and natural habitat at the mouth of Red Hill Creek, and as a passive recreational open space. The City is also examining \$600 million worth of improvements to sewage treatment plants to improve the quality of the effluent flowing into Red Hill Creek, thereby improving the water quality of the basin and the harbour. A longer-term goal includes the separation of combined sewer outflow. Together these initiatives will reimagine this important gateway to the City and the harbour.

WEST HARBOURFRONT DEVELOPMENT STUDY

Completed in 1995, this extensive and detailed development plan promotes a vision of the West Harbour as a key node within the City of Hamilton for mixed uses. Public enjoyment and maximizing access to the shoreline, environmental protection and the establishment of live, work and play environments integrated with existing neighbourhoods are all key components of this plan. Aspects of this

plan, such as the Development of Bayfront Park and Pier 4, have been completed. Some controversy exists regarding the entire vision, however, and City Council has not endorsed it as policy.

2.2.7 Relationships and Connections - Drawing 5

In the west harbour area, the lands utilized for active port functions today are clearly defined, bounded by Burlington Street on the south (with the exception of the small residential enclave between Burlington Street and Pier 14) and Pier 8 on the west. Pier 9 is expected to continue to be occupied by the Department of National Defence HMCS Star operation for the long term.

Harbour West has emerged as an important recreational area with the development of Bayfront Park and Pier 4 Park. In the next few years, following in particular the development of the Marine Discovery Centre, the uses on Pier 8 will be expected to successfully marry the recreational uses to the west with active Port functions to the east. Careful planning can ensure that both of these uses - recreational and industrial - are respected and maintained.

The main industrial lands of the Port, as owned by Stelco and Dofasco on Piers 16 through 22, are extensive and considered stable. They are clearly an important part of the Port's future. Pier 24, although a stable port area, will be affected by the emerging passive public open space at Windermere Basin. Eastport is strongly positioned to become a vital industrial area. It is currently primarily vacant or hosting transitional uses, excepting James Richardson International and Agrico Canada Ltd.

As the main arterial road access for the Hamilton Harbour, Burlington St offers opportunities for civic improvements that provide opportunities to define HPA holdings. Eastwood Park, Windermere Basin, Fisherman's Pier and potentially the Sherman Inlet all stand out as such spaces. Bayfront Park, the future Marine Discovery Centre, and Windermere Basin are emerging public anchors that will ensure the further integration of industrial and recreational uses.

3 The Hamilton Port Authority

3.1 History of the Port of Hamilton

Hamilton Harbour is a naturally protected body of water that was created during the last glaciation period. Strategically located at the western tip of Lake Ontario, its watershed comprises an area of 500 square kilometres which is encompassed by a shore-line measuring 45 kilometres in length. The Port of Hamilton, now considered perhaps the finest inland seaport in North America, is accessible from Lake Ontario through a short channel known as the Burlington Shipping Canal.

When Hamilton became a city in 1846, control of the harbour area, then known as Burlington Bay, was vested with the City by the Crown. By the early 20th century, City Council recognized that harbour property could no longer be effectively administered by its own Harbour and Beach Committee and the Bay Front Improvement Committee. Rapid commercial and industrial expansion had over-taxed the limits of this cooperative, and clearly dictated the need for a separate governing body to handle the increasing complexities of Harbour management.

In 1911, at the prompting of the Hamilton Manufacturers Association, City Council petitioned the Federal Government to fund an independent agency which would assume executive administration of harbourfront activity. On April 1st, 1912, an Act of Parliament created the Hamilton Harbour Commissioners (HHC).

Following much preparation by the Commissioners and its engineers, the first official Harbour Development Plan was adopted by both the Commissioners and the City of Hamilton in December 1919. Covering all aspects of commercial, industrial and recreational development, the Commissioners' visionary plan was highly regarded. Although the original plan has been revised many times over the years, it remains the basis for all Harbour development. With the opening of the Welland Canal in 1932 and the St. Lawrence Seaway in 1959, commercial shipping activity in the Hamilton Harbour increased significantly.

In 1944, the HHC fulfilled the dreams of many downtown dwellers when it purchased the SS Hamiltonian and began as a pedestrian ferry service to a beach strip and picnic grounds it had acquired (and continue to own) on the north shore, known as LaSalle Park. Up until the middle of the twentieth century, the HHC offices were located in the downtown core. In 1951, the HHC purchased property near the foot of James Street, and constructed the landmark headquarters building they continue to occupy. On May 1, 2001, the 89-year history of the HHC came to a conclusion with the creation of the new Hamilton Port Authority.

3.2 Facts and Descriptions

The Port of Hamilton is one of the largest commercial ports in Canada. With approximately 8,950 metres of docking facilities, some 700 ships call at the harbour each year. During the 2000 shipping season – which usually lasts approximately nine months – 509 domestic vessels called at the port, as did 192 foreign vessels. Although there is some variation from year to year depending on economic conditions and the operations of various port tenants, the port handles an average of 12 million metric tonnes of cargo annually, a figure which has been relatively stable over the past 20 years, recognizing shifts in cargo trends. In 1999 the port handled 21 percent of all cargo destined for Canadian Great Lake ports via the Saint Lawrence Seaway.

Most of the cargo throughput at the Port of Hamilton is bulk goods, particularly those related to the steel industry such as iron ore and coal. However, other significant commodities include salt, petroleum products, and bulk agri products. Inbound cargos consistently account for more than 90 percent of the total tonnage handled at the port each year. Cargo revenues fell slightly from 1998 to 1999, but the port maintained revenues of \$12.9 million in 1999. As a diversified and significant operation, the port offers a full suite of facilities to shippers, including terminals for dry and liquid bulk cargos, inside and outside warehousing, heavy lift cargo cranes, ro-ro berths, and container handling. The port also offers a complete set of support services including customs, dry docking, tugboats, and ship chandlery. The port spends significantly on its maintenance activities, particularly dredging and dock wall maintenance, both activities which ensure the on-going functionality of all of the port's piers.

More than 100 tenants operate on lands owned by the Port Authority in a diverse set of industries including metals, brewing, food processing, fertilizers and environmental services. Some of these have been at the port for many years, but the port also continues to attract new users and tenants to its piers. The HPA operates or maintains a marina complex with fully serviced slips for 240 boats and a boating school which taught more than 2,100 people in the safe operation of both sail and power craft in 1999. It owns a portion of the pier at LaSalle Park, which is leased to the City of Burlington for the purposes of the LaSalle Park Marina and the Burlington Boating and Sailing Club. Boat launch areas give people a chance to enjoy the harbour's increasingly diverse fishing opportunities. In addition to these recreational activities, the Port Authority has actively participated in cleaning up Hamilton harbour and enhancing its environmental value by undertaking aquatic habitat improvements and shoreline restoration efforts.

3.2.1 Existing Uses - Drawing 6

Extensive green space frames the western edge of the Hamilton Harbour, including the Royal Botanical Gardens, Cootes Paradise, Dundurn Park, Bayfront Park and the Woodland, Holy Sepulchre and Hamilton Cemeteries. Residential

neighbourhoods, interrupted only by LaSalle Park and the Burlington Golf and Country Club, characterize the Burlington shoreline. The eastern edge of Hamilton Harbour is dominated by the Burlington Skyway bridge, and also contains the residential community to the east of Eastport Drive fronting Lake Ontario known as Hamilton Beach. A series of north end Hamilton neighbourhoods directly abut the western portion of the Port, south of Burlington Street.

Southern Ontario Rail services the entire southern portion of the HPA lands, and extends westward towards Highway 403. Also providing extensive short line services is CP Rail, although they primarily service Stelco and Dofasco. Rail Link provides extensive short run services to Eastport, Stelco and Dofasco, and throughout Piers 10-15.

3.2.2 Port Occupancy - Drawing 7

The HPA has close to 100 different tenants, with industries ranging from small-scale repair operations to extensive bulk storage services. Some of the tenants with large operations include Vopak, CanAmera Foods, Shell Canada, Federal Marine Terminals, Poscor Mill Services, Steelcare, James Richardson International, Agrico, and Newcastle Logistics. The industries of these tenants include liquid bulk, dry bulk, salt, steel storage, scrap metal, warehousing and distribution.

3.2.3 Water Uses – Drawing 8

The Hamilton Harbour enjoys a high level of industrial and recreational activity in a unique ecological environment. The Burlington shoreline is characterized by residential neighbourhoods and, in terms of water activity, LaSalle Park Marina and Burlington Boating and Sailing Club. A boardsailing launching area near the Canada Centre for Inland Waters ensures that boardsailing remains a key recreational activity in this area. Slightly farther South is the Burlington Ship Canal, a key entry point for pleasure boats and commercial ships entering the harbour from Lake Ontario.

The west harbour is primarily a recreational area. Leander Boating uses the shoreline from Bayfront Park to the Royal Botanical Gardens as a training and racing route. Sailboat racing takes place throughout the bay. An ice boating launching facility is located at the Hamiltonian Pier, Pier 4 Park.

Protected fish and wildlife habitats exist at LaSalle Park, near the Centre for Inland Waters and in the West Harbour.

3.2.4 Lease Length - Drawing 9

A review of existing tenant lease lengths identifies areas within which the HPA has planning flexibility, and areas that need to be considered in terms of a longer-term plan. In general, the pursuit of long-term leases in the core of the HPA land holdings serves to stabilize industrial functions. Piers 11, 12, and portions of 14

and 15 are committed to leases of 11 years or longer. Piers 24 and 25 are likewise stable and determined as industrial uses for the long-term.

Pier 8 and 10 contain more possibilities for the short term since lease commitments are, in many cases, month to month. Given the growing demand for recreational uses along the waterfront and the interest in access to it that the Canadian Marine Discovery Centre is likely to inspire, the apparent flexibility of these piers also presents a threat to the industrial uses of the Port. Port uses on Pier 10 in particular require specific investment and reinforcement through the Land Use Plan.

3.2.5 Water Access - Drawing 10

Good port planning suggests that industries most in need of water access be located at the water's edge. With the exception of the eastern side of Pier 14, a good portion of Pier 15, and Pier 24, this is entirely the case. Small opportunities exist to reconfigure industries to better accommodate water access needs, primarily on Pier 10 and Pier 15. The resolution of the contamination at Randle Reef has the potential to generate improved water access for Pier 15.

3.2.6 Levels of Investment - Drawing 11

On HPA lands, there is a combination of arrangements – in some instances the HPA has invested heavily in capital assets; in other instances the tenant is the main investor. As might be expected, tenants are more likely to invest in capital improvements when they are assured of a long-term lease arrangement. Some operators are interested in longer-term leases so that they can confidently invest in facilities and infrastructure.

The areas of high investment in the HPA include the northeastern corner of Pier 8, the majority of Piers 10, 11 and 12, the southeastern corner of Pier 15, the southern portion of Pier 23, and portions of Pier 25. The HPA has invested most heavily in Piers 8, 10 and 15, whereas the investments made on Piers 11, 12, 23 and 25 have been initiated by tenants, including Federal Marine Terminals and James Richardson International. Considerable tenant investment also exists at LaSalle Park, and on Pier 14. The HPA has also made substantial investments in Pier 24.

3.2.7 Optimizing Port Functions - Drawing 12

The key opportunity sites for the HPA include:

- Pier 15;
- Eastport, primarily at Piers 26 and 27; and
- Fisherman's Pier.

Consolidated industrial uses exist on Piers 10,11,12,14,23,24 and 25. These areas are stable and unlikely to be affected by outside pressures to extend recreational uses within the Port. Mixed uses will begin to exist on Pier 8 with the building of the Marine Discovery Centre. This will present logistical challenges in terms of access for the public, and the HPA functions in this context should respond to the synergistic possibilities that a critical mass of civic activity will generate.

Four readily identifiable Port gateway sites are apparent, and ripe for development that emphasizes the relationship between the Port and the City. These sites include Eastwood Park, the Sherman Inlet, Eastport at Windermere Basin and Fisherman's Pier.

The opportunity to create new dockwall and better access to existing dockwall at Randle Reef should be explored. This would significantly increase the shipping capacity of the Port.

Preliminary conversations regarding the purchase of portions of Pier 22 are underway with Stelco. The extension of land holdings in this area of the Port would directly benefit existing tenants who are interested in expanding their operations.

3.2.8 Fisherman's Pier – Drawing 13

Fisherman's Pier has historically been a key location for public access to the Hamilton Harbour. Its location offers a clear vista of both the industrial aspects of the harbour as well as the significant green spaces along the Burlington shoreline and farther west. It offers a protected space for boat launching, and it also offers an excellent location to view ships as they enter the harbour at the Burlington Canal. The lighthouse and keeper's dwelling, owned by Parks Canada, are noteworthy historical artefacts that should be celebrated. Development of a clear public realm focusing on the canal and harbour edges, with the continuation of a beach trail circuit, should be a priority for Fisherman's Pier.

A clear public road and access point could be developed from Eastport Drive into the site in order to encourage bypassing traffic to stop at the site.

Fisherman's Pier has unique microclimatic challenges created by the high winds in the harbour, its location below the Burlington Skyway, and the ship traffic through the Burlington Canal. This environment could be improved using the highly successful model of fish and wildlife protection islands used elsewhere in the Harbour.

The relationship between Fisherman's Pier and the Canada Centre for Inland Waters presents a unique opportunity for collaboration on public realm initiatives.

4 Background Research: Highlights

The challenges facing Ports in North America are, in many ways, consistent with the challenges facing the HPA. Lessons exist that are relevant to the HPA as it engages in strategic visioning, corporate planning and this land use planning process. This broad examination reveals a diversity of operations, activities, and plans.

A number of findings emerged which have clear relevance to Hamilton's strategic and land use planning initiatives. This section presents some of the highlights of those findings. A more complete discussion can be found in the Appendix to this report.

One of the clearest lessons to emerge is that the Port of Hamilton will have to work hard to make sure that it continues to be successful in the future. Although global shipping markets may be growing, the outlook for the shipping of bulk cargos in the Great Lakes is one of slow growth at best. Within the North American continent the maritime sector has a very difficult time competing with rail and with trucks, except for the traditional industry of bulk cargo shipping. The bottom line is that it is unlikely that the port will be able to gain market share in the shipping of high-value goods.

Therefore, in addition to pursuing its traditional business strategy, if the port does want to continue to grow, it will have to be creative and active in its approach to business development. A number of techniques may be appropriate here. These include:

- on-going capital investment in modern facilities and infrastructure
- developing strategic alliances with other ports
- improving the marketing of the port
- developing new relationships with shipping lines, railroads, and trucking companies
- conducting more detailed research into the feasibility of an inter-modal terminal at the port
- finding users who would want to use the tremendous amount of outbound cargo capacity that the port presently has
- monitoring changes to the Canada Marine Act and exploring sections of the Act that allow for flexibility, creativity, and an entrepreneurial approach to business development

4.1 Lessons From Canadian Ports

The Land Use Plans that have been prepared by other Canadian Ports in response to the Canada Marine Act (CMA) requirements represent a broad spectrum of planning approaches. The following points represent some of the key lessons that can be

learned from the experience of other port authorities in Canada as they relate to the content and preparation of Land Use Plans.

- The CMA requires public consultation as a part of the plan preparation process. Port authorities in Canada have involved the public to differing degrees. Some did the minimum to meet the requirements of the legislation (providing a review period and one public meeting). Others, like the Vancouver Port Authority, followed an extensive process, involved a variety of stakeholder groups and had multiple public meetings to discuss the contents of the plan.
- One of the key lessons to draw from the experience of other ports is the importance of involving external stakeholder groups in the planning process in a meaningful way. Doing so helps to generate new ideas, improves the quality of the final plan, and builds the foundation for better relationships between the port and stakeholder groups in the future. Sometimes it is even the simple matter of learning more about the port that fosters greater understanding and cooperation in the future.
- In some cases, port authorities have met with a considerable degree of opposition from the public when they introduced their Land Use Plans. The Port of Toronto is one example where public opposition to the Land Use Plan has been quite strong. In cases where critical comments emerged during the land use planning process, the focus of those criticisms was often more on the process through which the plan was being prepared rather than the contents of the plan itself. This was a situation which the Fraser River Port Authority had to confront.
- The CMA states that port authorities must “develop” a Land Use Plan within 12 months of the issuance of their letters patent. But, although some did, not all port authorities have adopted a complete plan within this 12 month window. It appears that Transport Canada is not interpreting this requirement very strictly. In situations where the plan preparation process took more than 12 months – as it did at the Fraser River Port Authority – the reason was the time that it took to receive, consider, and incorporate comments and suggestions from the public and stakeholder groups. Other port authorities simply took longer to go through the planning process.
- The more thorough Land Use Plans are those that extensively discuss the context and history of the port, review existing conditions, provide explicit forecasts of activity, discuss trends, and set out specific ideas to guide the management of both new and existing facilities in the ports. The Halifax Port Authority included much of this background information, as did the Port of Vancouver. Vancouver also incorporated parts of their strategic business planning processes in their Land Use Plan.
- Port authorities like the Port of Montreal have used their Land Use Plans and their plan preparation processes to explicitly address the question of land acquisition and disposition. Obviously, some ports are more land constrained than others,

and therefore need to undertake this planning exercise more urgently. Moreover, some ports can very easily identify users with specific kinds of land needs or lands that are particularly suited to certain types of uses. However, in general, many ports have found that the preparation of their Land Use Plans presented an ideal opportunity to consider their current and anticipated land acquisition and disposition needs. Ports which are expanding are not revealing their specific land acquisition strategies to the public in order to discourage speculation.

- Ports that are land constrained are beginning to consider how they might specialize their operations in order to continue growing in the future. Vancouver is certainly a port in this situation, and they are considering whether to develop more of a focus on higher-value container shipping. But even Vancouver, along with other ports around the country, recognize the value of diversity and accordingly hesitate to become too specialized so that their fortunes are not tied too closely to any one economic sector or industry.
- A further lesson which emerges is that the Canada Marine Act can actually be construed in a very liberal way with respect to the uses and activities that are permitted at Canadian ports. Some ports, notably the Port of Vancouver, have been very active in pursuing innovative types of activities. Most port authorities are not yet, however, “pushing the envelope” in terms of the activities and uses that they are willing to consider on their property.
- A good Land Use Plan will consider not just the port itself, but the regional context in which the port operates, as well as the physical connections (road, rail, etc.) within and around the port area. The plan should consider opportunities and threats at a strategic level. For example, most ports in Canada have had to consider the extent to which environmentally sensitive areas could constrain their development plans. But, many have also looked at opportunities for environmental enhancement as a part of their Land Use Plans. The plan prepared by the Fraser River Port Authority is a good example here. Similarly, that port authority worked with neighbouring municipalities to coordinate the zoning of adjacent properties, even though there was no legal requirement to do so. Ports like Vancouver and Halifax have to deal with issues of urban encroachment on port lands and operations. Both ports have incorporated thinking about these potential land use conflicts into their planning processes. Some Land Use Plans explicitly consider the impacts of the port’s activities on the surrounding area (e.g. noise, smell, etc.). However, techniques to actively address these land use impacts are few, with the exception of siting the most noxious land uses far away from occupied areas.
- Many of the Land Use Plans examined in the course of preparing this report have only three or four broad land use categories. Some ports in Canada do have land use designations that incorporate non-maritime uses, including residential and commercial uses. For instance, the plan for the Windsor Port Authority has three land use categories, but one of these categories explicitly envisions the possibility of waterfront residential uses. Many port areas in Canada (although not

necessarily port authorities), such as Vancouver or Halifax, are developing new commercial areas that incorporate offices, residential, restaurants, retail, and entertainment uses. Along with improvements in public access to the waterfront, these initiatives appear to be popular, and Hamilton might consider what it could do in this regard.

- It seems that many ports in Canada have struggled with the question of how detailed their Land Use Plans should be. In order to be useful on an operational basis, the plan must have a certain degree of detail. But, in many cases that level of detail isn't there. Often the reason for this is that the port authority wanted to leave itself a certain amount of flexibility in adapting to changing conditions in the years to come. In order to manage these changes some of the plans examined, such as the one for the Fraser River Port Authority, have explicit policies to guide the evaluation of development proposals on port lands.

Many of the port authorities in Canada have taken particular steps as a part of their land use or strategic business plans to develop unique solutions to the problems and issues that they face. Some of these approaches, which the HPA could usefully study, include:

- Within their Land Use Plan, the Port of Montreal discusses a "land bank" that the port keeps so that they have a secure supply of land to meet their future operational needs.
- The port authority at Port Alberni maintains and operates a waterside campground, which is well-used by visitors to the region.
- The Port of Vancouver took a very comprehensive approach to their Land Use Plan. They conducted a number of background studies, and prepared separate forecasts for all of the commodities that are shipped through the port. They also looked at trends in the larger regional and global economies. They studied all of the modes in the local transportation network, and assessed their condition and capacity for future growth.
- Vancouver also had a very broad public consultation process. In addition to holding multiple meetings with a wide variety of stakeholder groups, the port authority went so far as to present their draft plans at the local shopping mall so that the public could find out about what the port was doing.
- The Port of Montreal has put a diversification strategy into place in order to ensure their financial viability. In fact, the port is already quite diversified, but they intend to continue investing in all of their operational areas so that, for example, the port can remain competitive not just in bulk cargo handling, but also in containers. They have also developed state of the art facilities for handling breakbulk cargos – including computerized cranes, temperature-controlled warehouses, and high-capacity machines for rapid cargo transfer – and have reduced wharfage charges on selected commodities where there is intense price competition.

- The Fraser River Port Authority makes a continuous effort to find ways to add value to the shipping and goods handling process. For instance, they have facilities at the port to actually process steel or to do detailing for automobiles shipped through the port.
- Some of the other atypical services or land uses that can be found in ports around Canada include casinos, and ferry services.

4.2 Lessons from American Ports

It is easy to overstate the differences between port authorities in Canada and the United States. No matter the competitive strategies that they are pursuing, all of the ports in the Great Lakes face the same constraints in terms of the size of the vessels that can transit the Saint Lawrence Seaway, the length of the shipping season, or the competitive position of maritime shipping compared to other modes of transport. Given these similarities, the HPA should not restrict its look at other ports to those in Canada, precisely because American ports face the same challenges as Hamilton does. However, many American ports have developed quite a different set of solutions or approaches which the HPA could learn from. Some of these comparisons and lessons include:

- While Canadian and American ports compete in many of the same markets, it is clear that the playing field is not really level. For example, American ports receive substantial direct subsidies from governments at the local, state, and federal levels. American ports also have significantly more options in terms of the ways in which they can finance new development. One example is the ability of American port authorities to take on debt, something which gives them a distinct advantage in making new capital-intensive investments. Ports like Cleveland have been able to access the national bond markets, which provide a tremendous degree of liquidity and the lowest possible rates for financing. Other types of financing options available to American ports include direct taxation, revenue bonds, general obligation bonds, and tax increment financing districts. For instance, in 1997 revenue bonds accounted for 47% of all US port authority revenue. American ports also use the income generated by new developments to subsidize their operations, as well as to finance improvements to their public facilities.
- Laws and regulations do change over time, and ports can play a leading role in creating those changes. For example, in Ohio the state regulations governing port authorities used to be relatively restrictive in terms of the activities that were allowed. But, after years of lobbying by port authorities the law was changed in 1988 to permit a much broader array of activities and uses, such as housing, education, and entertainment functions.
- To the extent that port authorities in the United States have Land Use Plans, in states like Ohio these have a strictly advisory status, so the port is not really bound by the terms of the plan in a strict legal sense. Port authorities in the US are chiefly regulated according to state and local regulations, rather than federal ones, so their regulatory environments can differ in significant ways.
- American ports have creatively operated within the tax code to attract and support their tenants. For instance, they are now using off-balance sheet financing for new development projects (where equipment or facilities do not show up as assets on an operators balance sheet), and they are using synthetic leases (where the operator

leases real estate but doesn't have to show it as an asset on their balance sheet and therefore gains a tax advantage) to be able to offer their tenants an advantageous tax position.

- Many American ports have explicitly considered their public image and have taken steps to improve that image. For example, many ports have developed explicit media relations strategies, and have built up relationships with local newspapers and other media outlets with regular meetings or contact. Ports have also successfully demonstrated their beneficial economic impact for the cities and regions where they are located. Apart from attracting attention, this helps them to argue for increased government funding and support.
- Ports in the United States regularly use public-private partnerships, or outright privatization, to some degree. There are even cases where the port authority was created and is run by a private-sector consortium.
- The big American ports that are currently the leaders in cargo handling, such as New York/New Jersey and Los Angeles/Long Beach are consolidating their leading position by investing heavily in new facilities and hard infrastructure. This could mean the latest in cargo handling equipment, or in the case of LA/Long Beach, a US\$2 billion rail corridor that will alleviate severe congestion on the tracks in the region.
- Innovative American ports are using a variety of technologies to improve their efficiency and profitability. These technologies include: automation, integrated terminal management systems, computerized systems governing ship and truck movements through the port, etc.
- Some ports in the US have pursued aggressive redevelopment strategies. For instance, the Port of Tampa took a 70-acre site that had been used for bulk and general cargo, demolished the existing structures on the site, and built a new cruise ship terminal that formed the foundation for an increasing concentration at the port on cruise ship business. In doing so, the port also undertook some land assembly, and created a new facility that incorporated a mix of uses. In New Orleans, their planning process envisioned the consolidation of port facilities, and they demolished and redeveloped the land that was created by doing so. They also worked on improving truck access to the port's facilities, thereby reducing the negative impacts on surrounding communities.
- Some American ports like Toledo and Detroit have areas within their boundaries which qualify under foreign trade zone regulations. These regulations allow domestic activity involving foreign items to take place as if it were outside of U.S. Customs territory, thereby offsetting Customs advantages available to overseas producers who export in competition with products made in the United States. These areas offer businesses an incentive to locate there, and have helped ports like Detroit to attract more operators than would have been the case otherwise.

- Many ports recognize that not all of their activities will be strictly water-dependent. For example, in its Land Use Plan the Port of San Francisco sets an explicit goal that 2/3 of its land will be reserved for water-dependent users, but the rest can be devoted to uses which do not rely on access to the water.

4.3 The Future of the Port of Hamilton – Questions and Prospects

Questions about a variety of issues that are relevant to the strategic and land use planning exercises that the HPA is currently undertaking became apparent while conducting research on other Ports. Many of these questions are complex, and yet we have attempted to provide answers that are not necessarily comprehensive but that begin to address the issues raised. Sometimes the “answers” are actually questions themselves, indicating areas for further study or more in-depth consideration by the board and staff at the Port. Most of these issues were discussed at the Port’s strategic visioning session on November 2nd, 2001, and as such, they have also been included as a part of the main report above.

What is the overall outlook for the Great Lakes shipping industry?

Generally, the outlook seems fair at best. While maritime shipping is growing at a global level, most of this growth will occur in the container trade on international routes. Bulk cargo will see very little growth overall. It is worth noting that bulk cargo volumes can be very volatile from year to year given economic conditions. It is therefore very possible that the Port of Hamilton will see increased shipments of some types of commodities in the near-term future with declines in others. Most ports in the Great Lakes are already aware that most of the maritime business in the region will continue much as it has for the last hundred years – focused on the shipment of high-volume, low-value commodities.

What needs to be done to accommodate growth in the existing businesses at the Port of Hamilton?

Interviews with users at the port have revealed that a number of them would expand their operations if they had the space to do so. To the extent that these tenants are fixed in location, this means that the port does actually face land constraints even though it has vacant land in locations like Eastport. Therefore, the port should carefully consider the space needs and growth prospects of its different users, and consider whether any of these users could be moved or consolidated within the port. The port should also consider the extent and location of harbour filling activities to actually create new land and dockwall.

What other new businesses could be attracted to the port?

There seem to be two main strategies that the port could pursue here. On the one hand, the port could continue to offer itself to users who need to be near the water or who want to locate next to other users already at the port (such as the steel mills). On the other hand, the port could try to attract users who do not necessarily need a waterside location, but who value the other attributes of the port, such as its

accessibility. A key question is the extent to which the port's letters patent would permit these kinds of "non-port related" uses.

Is there potential to bring container shipping to the Port of Hamilton? Does an intermodal terminal at the port make sense?

These are actually two quite distinct questions. In terms of the maritime shipping of containers, the prospects of the port of Hamilton getting any of this business are quite small. Currently, very few containers are shipped anywhere within the Great Lakes. Ports like Hamilton operate within a very different market than do the major coastal ports like Vancouver or Halifax. Given that trains and trucks are clearly the preferred mode of shipping containers within the continent, it would be hard to see how the port of Hamilton could capture maritime container traffic. However, the question of establishing an intermodal terminal at Hamilton does merit some further exploration. The port does have excellent locational attributes and nearby road and rail connections. The port should explore this question with other operators like the shipping lines and the railways. At this point the main obstacle would seem to be that the port does not have a critical mass of existing shipping business to merit the construction of a new intermodal facility, particularly when other intermodal facilities in the region are operating at less than full capacity.

What is the potential for having cruise ship visits?

Cruising in the Great Lakes has been growing steadily in popularity in recent years. One might therefore conclude that the Port of Hamilton could encourage cruise ships to call at the port and therefore benefit from this business. The question is the extent to which any new cruise business would actually add to the port's bottom line. For a port like Hamilton, the facilities that the cruise ships would require would likely be rather rudimentary in nature, and would not likely represent much in the way of new investment. Therefore, while the port could possibly capture some of this business, the port would have to thoroughly understand the benefits that would realistically accrue to the port.

Has the port completely considered the land uses and operations permitted under the port's letters patent and the Canada Marine Act?

While the Port of Hamilton obviously has a mandate to pursue activities related to maritime shipping and other water-based uses, there may be other types of activities and land uses which would be well-suited to a port environment, and which could bring various benefits (financial or otherwise) to the port. Therefore, the port should be asking itself what activities it could pursue if the Canada Marine Act and the port's letters patent were read with a liberal interpretation. It may well be the case that the port could quite legitimately pursue activities like hotels, restaurants, and the like without requiring amendments to the letters patent. It would seem that very few ports in Canada are "pushing the envelope" in this area, and the port could investigate more specifically the activities that federal regulators would permit on the port's lands.

How could changes in the Canada Marine Act affect the Port of Hamilton?

The CMA will be reviewed by the federal government in 2003 at the latest. There has been strong pressure from the maritime sector to substantially revise the regulations in

the CMA that govern Canada Port Authorities. One of the chief complaints has been that while the purpose of the CMA was ostensibly to allow port authorities to become more competitive by operating entrepreneurially, they have not in fact been given the tools to do so. Particularly in comparison with port authorities in the United States, port authorities in Canada do not have nearly the same options in terms of the types of development that are allowed on port lands and the means available for financing infrastructure investments. These issues, coupled with the on-going government subsidies that ports in the US receive, strongly suggest that the CMA is going to be revised to give port authorities increased flexibility in what they do and how they go about doing it. Therefore, the port of Hamilton should be thinking about how it can plan for the future and retain a sufficient degree of flexibility in their plan to permit new types of operations somewhere down the line. This could mean anything from using shorter term leases to changing dredge and fill strategies. These types of changes to the CMA may in fact offer the greatest opportunity for the port to become increasingly successful in the future.

Can the port utilize joint ventures and subsidiaries to improve its business?

This is a question that merits more detailed examination. Some ports in Canada, notably the port of Vancouver, are using subsidiaries very effectively to work in an entrepreneurial fashion and to support the port's overall operations. Vancouver has three subsidiaries. One of these is in a 50-50 joint venture with a major terminal operator. Another manages the Canada Place real estate development (the site for Expo 86). Vancouver clearly believes in using subsidiaries. Other ports, however, do not. Some ports have decided that subsidiaries are not worth the additional legal, accounting, and other types of work that they require, and they feel that they can accomplish the same goals within the Port Authority structure. Either way, if it has not already done so, the Port of Hamilton should consider the ways in which it might be able to use subsidiaries to become more competitive.

Given the dependence of the port on the metals sector, how can the port prepare for gains or declines in that business?

Almost all of the shipping that goes in and out of the Port of Hamilton is related to the manufacturing of steel and related products. Therefore, the port has to watch this sector very closely. Even within the giants Stelco and Dofasco, there are some business units that are doing much better than others. Then there are other, smaller steel makers in the area that benefit from a location near the big manufacturers. Given the ever-rising demand for the products that use steel (like cars) the global steel industry should continue to grow. The question is if the big steel makers in Hamilton will be able to compete with other large and small producers around the world in the years to come.

What are the best and worst case scenarios that the Port is facing?

Whatever the answer to this question may actually be, these are questions that the port must ask itself in the context of any strategic visioning process.

To what extent can the port expand its operations in sectors other than metals? Can the port develop a specialty in food products and processing?

The port's dependence on the metals sector suggests that the port should be pursuing other types of users in order to diversify their "portfolio". For example, the port already has major users (such as CanAmera Foods) in the food sector, and the port could try to attract similar users. For instance, could the port attract bakeries that would use the grain being shipped through the St Lawrence Seaway? Even if the port ultimately decides that it should continue to focus on traditional maritime shipping serving the steel industry, it would be wise to look for ways to diversify, and prepare its Land Use Plan accordingly.

Could the port benefit by capturing the business of other ports in the region, such as Toronto's?

There is certainly the prospect that Hamilton could capture some of Toronto's business in the years to come. Notwithstanding the Port of Toronto's clear intent to continue its maritime operations, development pressures may result in some port users being able to serve the same market from the Port of Hamilton instead of Toronto. There is a precedent for this in that most of the maritime shipping operations at the Port of Chicago have been moved to the International Port at Burns Harbour, nearby in Indiana. The thing to bear in mind is that the Port of Toronto is only a tenth of the size of the Port of Hamilton and is focused on bulk cargos, so even if all of Toronto's business were to move to Hamilton, it would not add tremendously to Hamilton's bottom line.

What strategies could be used to allow the port to better compete – or cooperate – with rail and truck companies?

The biggest obstacle preventing the maritime shipping industry from capturing the transport of higher value goods is that within the Great Lakes area, ships are not able to compete with trains and trucks in terms of speed and flexibility (although ports may in fact be more competitive in terms of reliability of port to port deliveries). The result is that these other modes capture all of the high value business. This situation is unlikely to change. However, the port should be considering ways that it might be able to cooperate with these other shipping companies, identifying facilities or locations that the other shippers might find desirable. The port could take steps to improve its competitive position (by reducing costs, for example), but the port could also look for ways to cooperate with the rail and truck companies in order to develop operations that are mutually beneficial. The port should explore this area further.

Are there other types of business partnerships that the Port should be considering?

In addition to the rail and truck companies, there may be other entities that the port could consider building up partnerships with. These could be other ports with whom to share business, corporations that would consider maritime shipping of their products, and so on. At the very least, the port should keep an open mind about the types of organizations that it can work with.

Could the port exploit the current imbalance between inbound and outbound shipments to develop new types of business?

Year after year, inbound cargos account for around 90 percent of the total tonnage handled by the port of Hamilton. Finding new ways to use this excess outbound

capacity should be considered by the port. Perhaps this means attracting new users to the port who need outbound marine shipping capacity and accommodating those users within the port's Land Use Plan.

Can the port consolidate its existing facilities to improve operations?

The consolidation of facilities, infrastructure, or investment may offer the port opportunities to save money and better serve their users, creating space to pursue other types of operations. However, some users at the port have made significant investments in infrastructure and facilities that would be difficult or impossible to relocate. Therefore, any plans regarding consolidation should consider the potential mobility of the users concerned.

Are there ways that the port can employ new navigational or logistics technologies to reduce costs and improve the port's competitiveness?

Throughout the maritime transportation sector, ports and operators are studying ways that they can use information technologies to make their operations more efficient and cost-effective. This could mean using electronic platforms for business-to-business transactions, or computer technologies to facilitate navigation. Given the tight margins in the maritime shipping industry, any steps that a port can take to improve its net income position should be welcome.

Does the port need to take action in terms of land acquisition or disposition?

In the short term, probably not. But this is an issue that the port, and the Land Use Plan, will have to address.

What can the port do to raise its profile in the region and beyond? Are there business attraction and retention strategies that the port could be pursuing? Can the port work more closely with economic development agencies in the region and the province?

These questions go to the long term business strategies that the port is pursuing, more than the Land Use Plan. But, it seems to frequently be the case that the full economic value of ports is not appreciated. Similarly, many ports could benefit from better public relations. The Port of Vancouver has done an excellent job of raising its profile and demonstrating its value to the community. For instance, they have a school visit program with lesson plans and other resources so that kids (and their parents) learn more about the functions of the port. Hamilton might want to look into similar strategies.

Does the port need to undertake any market feasibility studies to assess the viability of any new lines of business?

In the short term, probably not. Out of the planning process should emerge some decisions about which strategic directions are worth pursuing. At that point the port will be able to determine where it needs to do additional market analysis.

Can the port work more closely with the City of Hamilton in order to coordinate and facilitate new development in the harbour area?

The port and the City of Hamilton have certainly had less than ideal relations in the past. However, it is clear that the interests of both the port and the city would be served if the two entities were able to work together to achieve mutual aims. The port of Hamilton has unusually extensive physical connections with the surrounding city, and the port is relatively close to the downtown. Perhaps the common work that has been done related to parks and recreational development around the harbour could form the basis for further cooperation between the two organizations in the future.

Who are the constituencies that the port is trying to serve? Tourists, area residents, existing businesses, etc.?

One of the strengths of the Port of Hamilton is that it has a diverse assortment of users which generate a substantial amount of economic activity. Physically, different parts of the port are used for different purposes. Therefore, in order to be successful in its planning efforts, the port should always keep in mind the different constituencies that it is trying to serve, whether these are tourists, local residents, local businesses, or international corporations. The port cannot be all things to all people, but it should also differentiate between and try to meet the varying needs of its different users.

Will trade patterns within the region change in the future? Will trade between Canada and the US continue to increase? Can the port capture some of this economic activity? Will Canada also put into place the funding program that the American government has to improve the infrastructure within international trade corridors?

These are big picture questions that the port needs to keep on its radar screen. There has been a consistent expansion of trade between Canada and the United States in recent years, and there is no doubt that this trend will continue. The concept of trade corridors is being discussed more and more in Canada. Already in the United States under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) there are two programs with direct relevance to ports. One is the National Corridor Planning and Border Infrastructure Program, which offers \$700 million over four years to fund infrastructure improvements in border crossing zones. The second program is a six year, \$220 million initiative to fund the construction of ferries and related terminal facilities. The port of Hamilton stands to gain from these types of investments, and even more so if the Canadian government undertakes similar initiatives.

Will increasing fuel prices and increased concerns about the environment promote the increased use of marine shipping?

Although oil spills from tankers capture the attention of the media, it has been demonstrated that ships are one of the safest ways to move goods from one place to another. Similarly, studies have shown that ships are the most fuel-efficient way of moving a tonne of goods around. Although these facts are not going to cause a radical shift towards marine transportation, they could be a factor in contributing to the continued growth of maritime shipping in the future.

Are there steps that the port could be taking to expand the trade area that it serves?

Many ports in the Great Lakes serve a very small geographic area. Often, most of the cargo throughput at a Great Lakes port is going to or from a destination within 100 km of the port. Hamilton has a tremendous advantage in that its hinterland contains millions of people and a substantial portion of Canada's economic activity. The port should exploit this proximity to the maximum, and it should also look for ways to make that area larger, including the expansion of trade relationships with the United States.

Rather than thinking of itself as a maritime enterprise, what ideas would emerge if the port thought of itself as a provider of logistics and supply-chain solutions?

In the world of goods movement, the bottom line on everyone's mind is getting things from one place to another quickly, reliably, and at a reasonable cost. The port of Hamilton might be able to increase its level of business and its cash flows by thinking of itself as a provider of logistics solutions rather than maritime shipping facilities. So, this is the context in which the port could consider an intermodal terminal. Thinking entrepreneurially in this way would help to ensure the long term economic viability of the port.

How will changes in the St. Lawrence Seaway impact the business of the port? What would happen if tolls on the Seaway were reduced, or if a dredging program increased the size and types of ships that could use the Seaway?

A common complaint by shippers about the St Lawrence Seaway is that toll charges reduce the competitiveness of this route, and therefore the marine transport sector. There is no shortage of businesses that would like to see these tolls disappear, and they have been lobbying to that effect. How much would a reduction in tolls help the Port of Hamilton? With respect to dredging, this is an issue that is currently being studied. Although the Seaway will never be able to accommodate post-Panamax sized ships, each additional inch of draft added to the Seaway would permit a typical ship to carry an additional 100 tons of cargo. If three inches of depth were added to the Seaway, how much could this add to the port's business?

How would the maritime shipping industry benefit from changes in the regulatory environment for goods transportation? What if increased user fees or other charges made trucks more expensive? What if government policies subsidizing the shipping of grain by rail were changed?

Currently, the biggest problem that the port faces with respect to maritime shipping is that the marine mode is not competitive with other modes for most types of goods (although it is clearly the preferred mode for bulk commodities). Still, leaders at the port should be asking themselves how this situation might change if the regulatory environment changes in the years to come. For instance, it is clear that trucks have a high physical impact on our road infrastructure. Would trucks remain the mode of choice for goods transport if there were substantial user charges for traveling on roads? What if fuel taxes increased sharply? Given that marine transport is the most fuel efficient way of moving a tonne of cargo, how much more competitive would the marine sector become if these changes came to pass?

The Hamilton airport is emerging as a leading airport in the shipment of air cargos. Are there any ways in which the port could collaborate with the airport?

The John C. Munro Airport in Hamilton is currently a base for the four largest overnight package delivery companies operating in Canada. In addition to these users, the airport has made a concerted effort to develop its freight transportation business, and has seen sustained growth over the past decade. The port could explore ways to increase its cooperation with the airport and potentially identify physical and other linkages that may be mutually beneficial for both parties.

Is the port eligible for any project financing from the Ontario SuperBuild Corporation?

In theory, the port could apply for project financing from SuperBuild. The port would have to develop a project proposal that met all of SuperBuild's funding criteria. SuperBuild does have a mandate to fund projects on Toronto's waterfront, as well as transportation infrastructure investments. However, thus far in the realm of transportation infrastructure, most of the projects have been highway improvements. There may also be some potential for SuperBuild money to go towards highway improvements in and around the port, or for one of the port's users to get funding from SuperBuild.

As per Article 7.1 of the Hamilton Port Authority's letters patent, are there any "government sponsored economic development initiatives" that the port could pursue with the federal government?

The port should investigate whether any initiatives have been approved under this regulation at other ports. Could an “economic development initiative” consisting of a mixed-use activity centre be considered in this regard?

Are there any niche markets or premium services that the Port of Hamilton could be providing?

The port will have to examine this question in greater detail. In terms of the global shipping industry, some analysts have suggested that there is a definite potential for maritime shipping that operates fast, that is highly reliable, and that fits in the gaps that are emerging under a global shipping network that increasingly operates on a hub and spoke model. This would be a tough one, however, since these ideas have been proposed with respect to trans-oceanic shipping, whereas within the North American continent a maritime shipper offering “premium” services would still have a difficult time competing with rail and truck shipping.

Given the existing regulatory framework, what is the port’s capacity to finance new development activities from private sector sources?

Even within the constraints of the existing Canada Marine Act, ports do have the opportunity to go to the private sector for financing. Although Canadian port authorities are not allowed to offer their land and facilities as security, they can still borrow against their operating cash flows, subject to the debt limits set out in the port authority’s letters patent (in the case of the Port of Hamilton \$5 million). Therefore, while Canadian port authorities may not have the money raising capacity of their American counterparts, they do have some capacity which they may be able to exploit for the right kinds of projects.

5 Summary and Themes of the Stakeholder Interviews

A key component of Phase 1 of the Land Use Planning process, *Understanding the Context: Existing Conditions, Opportunities and Constraints*, included meeting with a broad range of stakeholders who have been associated with the development of the harbour, or who are impacted by HPA planning decisions, either directly or indirectly. Politicians from all three levels of government, representatives of neighbourhood associations and environmental groups, staff from the Planning, Parks and Economic Development Departments at the City of Hamilton and the City of Burlington, and tenants of the HPA, among others, all participated in interviews with the consultant team. Over 60 people over a four-day period shared their historical perspectives, current initiatives, and future hopes for the development of Hamilton Harbour. Distinct themes quickly emerged, some of which indicated considerable consensus among stakeholders (see “Leadership on Environmental Issues is Needed”), and others that represented competing ideas of the role of the harbour (see “Other Visions are Also on the Table”).

Following is a summary of the stakeholder interview themes, which will be used to inform the directions presented at the Community Workshop.

A STRATEGIC LOCATION FOR PROMOTING ENTERPRISE, HAMILTON'S IMAGE AND COMMUNITY ACCESS

- Stelco and Dofasco continue to be responsible for 25% of the shipping on the Great Lakes;
- Most of their raw materials come from within 500 miles of the Port;
- 58% of Canadian steel is processed in Hamilton;
- 17% of North American steel is processed in Hamilton;
- Dofasco is thriving and has strong growth potential. It provides an integrated steel mill and specialty steels;
- The Port is in a strategic location in the Great Lakes Region, the harbour is deep, and has excellent dockwall space;
- Existing transportation corridors provide strong eastern and western linkages;
- The Hamilton Airport, which is currently planning for extensive expansions, is easily accessible by roads;
- The Port is in a highly visible location that projects an image to the region;
- Close proximity to the downtown core provides opportunities for shared amenities, marketing and demands compatible uses in transition areas.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL: TRENDS

- 17,000 of 34,000 industrial acres in Hamilton are Stelco and Dofasco's land holdings;
- City of Hamilton is interested in diversifying its industrial base to include value added manufacturers and services that demand higher skilled workers;
- Large heavy industries that once had a presence in the Port have since left the City (i.e. Proctor and Gamble, Firestone, J.I. Case, other Fortune 500 companies);
- Stelco is increasingly moving its operations to Lake Erie (Nanticoke); anticipates that its tonnage may increase, but its land print will not;
- There is movement across North America towards "mini mills" which have high productivity levels, allow for flexibility and therefore are fiscally stable;
- American companies are interested in purchasing lands as opposed to leasing; HPA has lands available for leasing;
- Hamilton is a desirable location for industrial development, since it is one of the few places in Ontario with liberal zoning bylaws ("K" classifications – heavy industry);
- Opportunity exists for industrial growth, but a shortage of industrial fully serviced land near major highways is a major constraint;
- Most of the Port's current tonnage is input. Raw materials arrive by boat, are processed and leave by rail or truck. Shifting to output by boat depends on the market, destination, and the quantity of the load. Generally, processed quantities are not large enough to leave by boat;
- Trucking remains logistically easier and is less expensive than shipping for many industries;
- Increased industrial activity in the Port area is desirable due to accessibility of transportation corridors;

- Industrial users want to be in the Port, even if they are not currently using shipping services: the Port lands provide operational options;
- A focus on an intermodal function and higher valued goods could lead to diversification within the Hamilton economy;
- The Industrial Tax in Hamilton is currently higher than it is in surrounding areas (including Burlington), but the City has made a commitment to working towards dropping this rate;
- The City could work with the HPA on joint marketing campaigns.

OTHER VISIONS ARE ALSO ON THE TABLE

- The Port should support mixed uses – but not integrated uses;
- There could be a greater balance amongst a wide range of uses in the area, including hospitals, tourism, recreation and residential;
- Current recreational uses could viably expand if land was available to do so;
- “Need to find imaginative ways to think about the Port beyond the ways that we have seen it used in the past.”
- Harbour development could be linked with city/downtown uses;
- Transportation corridors, and recreational paths could provide strong linkages around the harbour and between the Port and the downtown;
- Different experiences along the shoreline can be offered; community access will generate an awareness of the value and constraints of the Port;
- Gateway perceptions, beautification, ‘greening,’ and public access ought to become priorities for the Port;
- Complementary uses will allow both industry and public amenities to share the same space.

BUT NEEDS OF EXISTING OPERATORS AFFIRM DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

- Some operators are unable to expand their capacity due to a shortage of dockwall space or a lack of available land;
- Short haul shipping is a good area for business development for some operators, again, dockwall space is needed to do so;
- Many operators are already spreading their operations out in different areas of the port in order to take advantage of available space;
- Operators need the flexibility to use land in different ways depending on the seasons and on market trends;
- Good strategic links to Ports in Chicago and Montreal exist and could be further developed;
- Many boats are currently 1/3 full.
- One more foot of depth in the seaway would allow considerable more product to be hauled;
- Dofasco docks are at capacity, and it is anticipated that they do not have sufficient land to meet future needs;
- “We have a waterway that is very valuable...how do we maximize its use?”

- Operators want to see industrial land protected from encroaching recreational uses; once land is given over to other uses, it becomes extremely difficult for industry to reclaim that land;
- “You have to affirm the role of the Port. Do you want it to look at, or do you want it to be an industrial base for the city?”
- In order to develop a container industry, a partnership would need to be established with a receiving Port; it would be difficult for the economics of a container industry to work given the constraint of seaway sized vessels;
- “Only industries that need to be on the water, ought to be on the water.”

INTERMODAL LINKS ARE KEY

- Links between shipping and rail and roads and the Hamilton Airport need to be further and better established;
- Efficient rail is key since quick turnaround times are necessary for just-in-time operations;
- 407 has increased accessibility to the area;
- Uses that require rail service currently cannot find land;
- Rail service to East Port needs to improve if it is to be used to capacity;
- Development of the Perimeter Road would enable both recreational and industrial uses.

LEADERSHIP ON ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES IS NEEDED

- Emphasis must shift from remediation to prevention;
- Port could require tenants to become ISO 14000 (international environmental standards) compliant;
- Eastport should be sheltered by a canopy of green;
- Coal tar on the Randle Reef remains a problem on two fronts. Build-up in front of the dockwall constrains industrial access and contaminants affect water quality;
- Water quality concerns need to be considered in future land use planning;
- Existing habitats need to be maintained, and therefore infill should not continue (unless there is a greater environmental benefit);
- Some small brownfields next to rail tracks are difficult to develop due to contamination;
- Attempts must be made to mitigate Port odours;
- “We trust them and we are confident in their abilities to provide spillage response, and to monitor Dofasco and Stelco spills. The HPA is one of the best in terms of their response to environmental spills.” *John Goodman, Canadian Coast Guard*
- Beautification should be a priority;
- “We should be internationally renowned for our Park features;”
- The shoreline ought to be protected;
- Important to think in terms of optimizing wildlife values within the Port while solving other problems – need a wildlife strategy for Hamilton Harbour;
- Sherman Inlet could be remediated and made a point of interest in the Port;
- Where possible, areas of the Port lands should be made more accessible to the public;
- The Hamilton Harbour RAP has been one of the great environmental successes in the Great Lakes.

INDUSTRIAL AND COMMUNITY NEEDS MUST BE BALANCED

- Amenities, such as telephones and restaurants, are absent from the Port area;
- “People don’t realize how green this city already is: Port could become more of a destination;”
- Land near the water is not valued as an asset for the residents of Hamilton, although it should be;
- Green zones are needed between residential housing and port activities;
- “Hamilton is a tale of two harbours: it looks completely different from one direction vs. another.” *Leo DeLoyde, Planner, City of Burlington*
- “Natural lines that act as boundaries need to be respected and reinforced.”
- Area needs to be promoted as beautiful...can beauty be a component of the port?
- The port needs “punctuation” points to inspire interest and public activity;
- An increase in Port activity will bring an increase in truck traffic in residential neighbourhoods; this is already the case in the enclave at the northern end of Wentworth Street;

- HSR services need to expand to service Bayfront Park, and any other proposed amenities;
- The economic value of the Port for the local and regional economy is not widely promoted, understood or valued;
- The Port should be celebrated within the City and the Region;
 - The LUP needs to formalize mechanisms for continued public consultation.

FISHERMAN'S PIER: AN OPPORTUNITY FOR COMBINING NEEDED MARINE SERVICES WITH PUBLIC AMENITIES AND HISTORICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL PRESERVATION

- Consensus exists to extend the Harbourfront trail through the Beach Neighbourhood through East Port to Windermere Basin;
- The light house and keepers dwelling (designated heritage buildings) could be restored and made accessible to the public;
- Development concept must consider the relationship between this pier and the beaches and open space to the east;
- An amusement park, in keeping with the history of the area, has been proposed;
- "The Hamilton" and "The Scourge," heritage boats currently underwater but owned by the City of Hamilton, could be set up as a destination on Fisherman's Pier;
- The current proposals for Fisherman's Pier – the boat works and the aquarium concept – both have merit;
- Fish and wildlife habitat management could be a component of the development of this site.

6 Directions: the Port and its Land Use Plan

On Friday, November 2nd, the Board and management of the HPA met for a day long workshop to think broadly about the future of the Port.

The objective of the day was to elicit the perspectives and insights of each participant by considering strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats in a roundtable format. The intent was to move towards the goal of defining the potential near and long-term possibilities for Port development as a key component to setting the direction for the Land Use Plan.

Following is a summary of the ideas presented at the workshop, categorized as strengths, weaknesses and opportunities.

6.1 Port Strengths

Infrastructure

- Excellent facility conditions
- Room to grow: land base has expansion room
- Good dock facilities – have invested well in the past
- Infrastructure enables shipping growth
- Good roads and rail
- Physical containment of the Port; allows for hands-on management and control
- Full-service harbour- dry dock; winter functions could grow

Tenants

- Solid long-term client base
- Diverse industries with solid futures
- Steel industry provides solid, reliable base; that will exist for long-time

Operations

- Good financial position - historical and present
- Strong organisation- young team
- Current relationships with and within the City of Hamilton (opportunity to develop this)
- Partnerships have grown: Discovery Centre signals this
- Good relationship with 3 levels of government
- Marine Act- similar operational framework to other Ports; this has advantages
- Ability to keep proceeds from land sales: land is a capital asset
- Good time to plan: the economic slow down presents a good time to explore new options

Environment

- Strong location
- Protected water- easily accessible by/for all users
- Safe harbour allows for operational efficiency
- Interesting landscape: the escarpment, bay, and factories creates unique ambience
- Environmental gains: regeneration, RAP, return of fish and birds, considered a leader in the Great Lakes on environmental issues
- Improved water quality

6.2 Weakness of the Port of Hamilton

Partnerships

- Need more partnerships with both the city and the province
- There have been mutual concerns regarding partnering with the City on Pier 8
- City's economic development program must be more proactive and entrepreneurial (HPA can contribute also)
- Weak downtown: it may be difficult to complete linkages, this detracts from the creation of harbour destinations
- Communications with the surrounding communities need to be improved
- Randle Reef: need a leader to advocate for a solution - this will benefit the Port.

Industry Constraints

- The existence of the Maritime Employers' Association means that industries cannot control their own labour negotiations; this is comparable to a tax on growth.
- Lack of outbound shipping activity
- Heavy reliance on steel
- restricted freedom to act under the Canada Marine Act
- Risks related to the future of Stelco
- Warehousing is old technology, needs renewal

Operational Context

- Missing road links result in the loss of efficiency. Travel to west of the Port is compromised. Is the perimeter road likely to be built?
- Road links by-pass Hamilton; government indirectly subsidizes truck traffic
- Airport must be better utilized; surrounding land must be serviced
- Free-trade zone at the airport and at the Port?
- Taxation (property tax, federal stipend, occupancy costs) hampers competitiveness with U.S. ports where taxes are lower, explicitly subsidized

- Land ownership: leasing may impede private enterprise because companies cannot own their land. This a disincentive for capital improvements by tenants.
- Lift bridge: operational restrictions, strikes, repairs, winter down-time
- History: negative views of Hamilton will be hard to overcome
- Not an ocean port, with only 9-month operations

Operations

- Focus of the Port has been too narrow, only on Great Lakes. There is a need to think broader and internationally.
- The HPA has not fully utilized/explored strength of their assets.
- Organization lacks a plan and a direction.
- Port's business/revenues have been stagnant; the Port has not kept pace with growth in regional economy.
- The Port has not diversified sufficiently.

6.3 Existing Opportunities for the Port of Hamilton

Context Supports a Vibrant Port

- Capitalize on tremendous population growth in the Golden horseshoe
- Think in terms of the “new economy” for Port growth
- New technologies support new port activities

Generate City and Port Synergies

- Create a vision for Hamilton that ties the future of the city and Port together
- Add recreational components to the industrial base
- Celebrate the steel mills
- Partner with the City of Hamilton's Economic Development Department for marketing opportunities
- Grow the waterfront to the downtown rather than vice versa
- Create exciting uses here that spin back to downtown
- Pier 8 to Bayfront Park: help the city to create a critical mass of uses that will activate the park, support new destinations
- Develop relationships with city, province and federal governments; build on HPA's financial strength and capacity to be a financial partner

Community Partnerships

- Public outreach and education will inspire better understanding of the Port's functions and value
- A “school by the water” (possibility in conjunction with the Discovery Centre) would bring young people to the waterfront

Industrial Possibilities to be Considered

- Strategic alliances with rail and trucking companies
- “E” business: extend services to tenants

- Capacity exists to facilitate growth of tenant businesses (dockwall and land)
- Pier 15 could be developed as an industrial jewel; maximize dockwall use, back land potential. Needs a distinct vision
- Find new uses for under-utilized land that move beyond shipping
- Seek out partnerships
- Host a “Great Lakes Conference” on a topic that is pertinent to the HPA
- Ensure that HPA tenants are given time/opportunities to speak and share ideas
- Promotional events for the HPA
- Consider opportunities to increase land base
- East part is a clean slate: consider state of the art general cargo terminal

New Directions

- Diverse and dynamic environment at the Port
- New high quality residential, retail and arts areas at Pier 8
- Feature shipping functions at Pier 8, including a possible cruise terminal
- Emphasize the ease of connection to the airport

6.4 Key Emerging Themes for the Future of the Port of Hamilton

Exceptional Assets

The HPA enjoys exceptional assets that provide broad organizational opportunities. The Port has well maintained dockwall, good depth, and sufficient land to expand in a variety of directions.

Transition Zones

The transitions between recreational and industrial uses need to be clearly defined. The most significant transition zone is between Pier 8 and Pier 10, and the planned uses for Pier 10 should serve to protect the core industrial land for industrial uses.

Organization Direction

The corporate planning process that the HPA is currently engaged in is an important step towards establishing a shared vision for the Port that can focus decision-making and inspired approaches to future development.

Marketing

As the Port affirms its direction for growth and desired land uses, it will become possible to formulate an intentional and strategic approach to recruitment of tenants. This will need to include broader marketing of the Port to raise its profile within the St. Lawrence Seaway System, but it will also need to involve “target marketing” of specific tenants internationally.

The Success of the Port is Tied to that of the City of Hamilton, and Vice Versa

When discussing opportunities for the Port, workshop participants repeatedly returned to the City of Hamilton and its future development as potentially presenting a supportive context for Port vibrancy.

Fisherman's Pier

The workshop participants affirmed the planning principles presented for Fisherman's Pier, which included:

- Creating a holistic relationship between key public amenity destinations, with attention to ecological and microclimatic improvements;
- Developing a clear public realm, with continuation of the beach trail circuit;
- Developing towards the waters edge and skyway while creating key gateway nodes at the lift bridge and Beach Blvd;
- Celebrating the heritage of the canal, lift bridge, the light house and the keepers cottage.

7 Summary and Conclusions: Implications for the Land Use Plan

The HPA is an active, diversified port, of primary importance to the economy of the Golden Horseshoe and within the St. Lawrence Seaway system. The port's urban context is growing increasingly complex, offering exciting opportunities while posing a number of important challenges. The HPA has substantial potential for the future.

There are many past successes and ongoing initiatives in the greater harbour area to build upon and continue to coordinate with as the Land Use Plan is developed. In particular, the City of Hamilton's current focus on the revitalization of its downtown offers the potential to further enhance the vitality of the harbour, through strengthened physical connections between the waterfront and the city centre. These can be mutually beneficial for both the HPA and the City.

The Minutes of Settlement of October, 2000 have reconfirmed a supportive framework of Official Plan and zoning provisions that will support the future activities of the port. They have also laid out a number of specific requirements, in particular with regard to the development of East Port, that the Land Use Plan will address.

Significant population increases are anticipated in the City of Hamilton and across the Golden Horseshoe over the next few decades, suggesting that road, and potentially rail capacity, will become increasingly constrained in the region. This is one of the many opportunities that the HPA may be able to build upon to secure and grow its business. Others discussed in the report include on-going capital investment in modern facilities and infrastructure; developing strategic alliances with other ports; improving the marketing of the port; developing new relationships with shipping lines, railroads, and trucking companies; conducting more detailed research into the feasibility of an inter-modal terminal at the port; finding users who would want to use the tremendous amount of outbound cargo capacity that the port presently has; pursuing changes to the Canada Marine Act and exploring sections of the Act that allow for flexibility, creativity, and an entrepreneurial approach to business development. Uncertainty regarding the future of the steel industry implies that the HPA needs to continue its efforts to be further diversified. There are a number of useful lessons from the experience of other Canadian and American ports that the HPA can reference.

A number of specific opportunities and challenges will be explored in the next stages of work, as follows:

- affirm the sufficiency of the HPA's land base in relation to potential future requirements;
- focus on maximizing the efficiency and productivity of the HPA's existing land holdings;
- consolidate port functions on Pier 10;
- explore the primary opportunity areas located on Pier 15/Sherman Inlet/Randle Reef, East Port and Fisherman's Pier;

- address appropriate uses and initiatives within the areas of important land-use transition, in particular the residential neighbourhoods, the residential enclave north of Burlington Street; and at Pier 8 and Windermere Basin;
- work with the City to assess opportunities to improve road connections from the Port to Highway 403 and other opportunities to alleviate growing neighbourhood concerns regarding port-related truck traffic;
- coordinate with emerging City-led planning initiatives, including in particular the upcoming master plans for the north west end and Windermere Basin;
- partner with the Government of Canada to build critical mass in the area around Fisherman's Pier, including potential synergies with the CCIW to create more public access to its facility and its site; and Parks Canada to refurbish the lighthouse and keepers cottage;
- explore appropriate joint ventures/uses with the City/Government of Canada on Pier 8, to maintain port presence and aid public objectives;
- elaborate other appropriate partnerships between the City and the HPA;
- explore the potential to contribute to the trail network surrounding the harbour, and to provide appropriate lookout opportunities within the port; and
- advocate for resolution of the Randle Reef issue, and in particular, opportunities for mutual gain that may exist by combining rehabilitation of the Sherman Inlet with capping of the contaminated coal tar.

The next step in the study process is the preparation of the draft Land Use Plan, which will be presented to the public at a Community Open House scheduled for March 4th, 2002.

Appendix

PARTICIPANTS IN THE STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

Patrick Bermingham	Bermingham Construction Limited
David Mothersill	Dofasco
Mike Kirkpatrick	Federal Marine Terminals
Blair McKeil	McKeil Marine
Rick Heddle	Heddle Marine Service
Mark Roe	CanAmera Foods
Colleen Fenton	Rail America
Mike Seigel	Poscor Mill Services Corp.
Laurel Wilson, Steve Uhrig	Royal Hamilton Yacht Club
Sandy McDonald	McDonald Marine
George Gage	Leander Boat Club
Chad Collins	Ward Councillor
Andrea Howarth	Ward 2 Councillor
Maria Bountrogianni (telephone)	MPP Hamilton Mountain
Sheila Copps	MP Hamilton East
Tony Valeri (telephone)	MP Stoney Creek
Marion Pacey & Elizabeth Nebesny	Hamilton Beach Preservation Society
Mary Pocius	International Village BIA
Carlo Gorni	Downtown BIA
Gil Simmons	Central Area Planning Committee
Mr. Paul and Mrs. Price	Residential enclave south of Pier 14
Ben Vanderbrug	Hamilton Region Conservation Authority
John Hall	RAP Office
Joe Minor	Friends of Red Hill Valley
Mark Sproule-Jones	Professor & Copps Chair in Urban Studies at McMaster University
Marilyn Baxter	BARC
Brain McHattie	Hamilton Naturalists Club
Werner Plessl	Hamilton Harbour Trust
Neil Everson	City of Hamilton Economic Development Dept.
Mary Lou Tanner	City of Hamilton Community Planning Dept.
Al Dore	City of Hamilton Parks Dept.
Domenic Lunardo, Lawrence Stasiuk	City of Hamilton Parks Dept
Leo DeLoyde	City of Burlington, Community Planning Dept.

John Goodman
Father Hudson
John Dolbec
John Hansen
Cam McTavish
Vic Cairns

Canadian Coast Guard
Mission to Seaman
Hamilton Chamber of Commerce
LaSalle Park
Bay Boat Works
DFO