



RE: Propose Changes to the Conservation Authorities Act: Schedule 6 of Bill 229

Please be advised that Township of Puslinch Council, at its meeting held on December 2, 2020 considered the aforementioned topic and subsequent to discussion, the following was resolved:

Resolution No. 2020-362: Moved by Councillor Sepulis and
Seconded by Councillor Goyda

That Council receive Correspondence items 10.5, 10.6, 10.7, and 10.8 and Consent Agenda item 6.4 regarding the Proposed Amendments to the Conservation Authorities Act through Bill 229 be received; and

Whereas the Township of Puslinch Council has been copied on the following correspondence related to proposed amendments to the Conservation Authorities Act (CA Act), contained in Schedule 6, Bill 229

- (a) Conservation Halton Letter to Ontario Premier dated Nov. 17, 2020**
- (b) Hamilton Conservation Authority to Ontario Premier and Ministers dated Nov. 23, 2020**
- (c) Grand River Conservation Authority to Ontario Premier dated Nov. 24, 2020; and**

Whereas Council at it's meeting of Nov. 18 passed the following motion:

GIVEN THAT The Township of Puslinch does not want to see an increased risk to public safety, or increased liabilities to the Province, municipalities, and conservation authorities. Nor does the Township of Puslinch want more red tape, disruption and ultimately delays in helping the government achieve its goal of economic recovery; and

GIVEN the time sensitive nature of this Bill, we encourage the Province to consult with Municipalities and Conservation Authorities in an expedient manner; and

GIVEN that the Township of Puslinch feels that there are better solutions to deal with actual and perceived issues.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT The Township of Puslinch respectfully requests the Province to



withdraw Schedule 6 from Bill 229 until a more thorough analysis of the appropriate solutions can take place, with more clarity on what problems were identified through the consultation process. The Township of Puslinch also encourage the Province to engage with municipalities and Conservation Authorities as the Province works on regulations that will eventually define the various Conservation Authorities Act clauses. The Township of Puslinch feels this is critical to ensure that the focus and performance of Conservation Authorities is actually improved where required.

FURTHER that this resolution be forwarded to the Premier, the Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry, Minister of Finance, Conservation Ontario, MPP Ted Arnott, and all Ontario Municipalities.

Be it resolved that the Township of Puslinch Council supports the views expressed in the above noted letters from Conservation Halton, the Hamilton Conservation Authority and the Grand River Conservation Authority who provide vital services to the Township of Puslinch; and

FURTHER that this resolution be forwarded to the Premier, the Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry, Minister of Finance, Conservation Ontario, MPP Ted Arnott, AMO, ROMA and all Ontario Municipalities.

CARRIED

As per the above resolution, please accept a copy of this correspondence for your information and consideration.

Sincerely,
Courtenay Hoytfox
Deputy Clerk

Grand River Conservation Authority

Report number: GM-11-20-85

Date: November 23, 2020

To: Members of the Grand River Conservation Authority

Subject: Proposed Amendments to the Conservation Authorities Act through Bill 229

Recommendation:

THAT Report Number GM-11-20-85 – Proposed Amendments to the Conservation Authorities Act through Bill 229 be approved as amended;

AND THAT Grand River Conservation Authority Report GM-11-20-85 be submitted to the Premier, Ministers of Environment, Conservation and Parks, Natural Resources, Municipal Housing and Affairs and Finance, watershed MPPs, Association of Municipalities of Ontario, Rural Ontario Municipalities Association, and circulated to watershed municipalities;

AND THAT staff be directed to draft a cover letter which highlights the GRCA's key concerns with the proposed changes to the Conservation Authorities Act which will accompany the report to be distributed.

Summary:

On November 5, 2020, through Bill 229 Protect, Support and Recover from COVID-19 Act (Budget Measures), the province introduced amendments to the *Conservation Authorities Act* (Schedule 6) and the *Planning Act*. If enacted, some changes will significantly impact the role of a conservation authority board to establish programs and services. As well, the proposed amendments will enable Regulations that will either limit or completely change the role of conservation authorities to protect Ontario's environment and ensure people and property are safe from natural hazards.

Report:

Background:

A provincial review of the *Conservation Authorities Act* has been ongoing since 2015. Amendments were approved in 2017, a minor change in 2018 and these were followed by further amendments in 2019. In 2019, the province indicated the proposed amendments were to help conservation authorities focus and deliver on the core mandate and to improve governance. The Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) provided comments on the Environmental Registry Posting through GM-04-19-41- Environmental Registry Posting 013-5018- Modernizing Conservation Authority Operations. The amendments were later passed through Bill 108, More Homes, More Choice Act. At that time, the scope of the changes to conservation authority board

governance and composition; mandatory, municipal and other programs and services; natural hazard permits and other areas were to come out through various regulations.

In the fall of 2019, the Minister of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) hosted meetings with each individual conservation authority (CA) to gain a better understanding of the programs and services provided by each Authority. In the early winter of 2020, the MECP also hosted stakeholder consultation sessions across the province to gain feedback from the various groups, agencies and organizations who deal with, or work with CAs. The Vice-Chair and senior staff attended the South-western session and submitted formal written comments in response to questions posed by the MECP. MECP has confirmed that they received over 2,500 submissions in response to these consultation sessions; however, the results of these sessions have not been publicly shared.

Bill 229

On November 5, 2020, the province introduced Bill 229 Protect, Support and Recover from COVID-19 Act which includes amendments to the *Conservation Authorities Act* (Schedule 6). The province identified these changes as necessary to improve transparency and consistency in conservation authority operations, strengthen municipal and provincial oversight and streamline conservation authority roles in permitting and land use planning.

While previously proposed changes to the Act have been posted to the Environmental Registry of Ontario (ERO) for a period of public comment; these new changes are posted on the ERO for information only. Under Section 33 of the Environmental Bill of Rights (1993), public consultation is not required if the proposal forms part of or gives effect to a budget or economic statement that is presented to the Legislative Assembly. It is anticipated that Bill 229 will be passed in the next few weeks as the legislature is due to rise on December 10th.

On November 9, 2020, MECP hosted an information session with all 36 Conservation Authority General Managers to provide additional information on the proposed amendments and timelines. MECP has indicated that regulations to implement the Act will be released for public comment in the coming weeks and a second set of regulations will be released for public comment in early 2021.

Proposed Amendments:

Attached as appendix 1 is a summary chart of the proposed amendments to the *Conservation Authorities Act* and comments on the effects of those changes. This document was prepared by Conservation Ontario and circulated to the Board on November 13, 2020.

The changes to *Conservation Authorities Act* can be categorized into 5 sections:

- 1. Objects, Powers and Duties**
- 2. Regulatory**
- 3. Enforcement**
- 4. Governance**
- 5. Other**

Key changes to the Act under each of these categories are discussed below:

1. **Objects, Powers and Duties**

- Narrows the objects of a conservation authority from providing “programs and services designated to further conservation, restoration, development and management of natural resources other than gas, oil, coal and minerals” (*Conservation Authorities Act*, s20(1)) to: (i) mandatory programs and services, (ii) municipal programs and services, and (iii) other program and services.
- A number of proposed clauses that would enable the Minister to make regulations that would prescribe standards and requirements for Municipal Programs and Services (i.e. Service agreements between municipalities and CAs) and Other Programs and Services (i.e. as determined by the Board and if municipal levy is used would require municipal agreements)
- Proposed amendment of the *Planning Act* to include conservation authorities to subsection 1(2) which would remove CAs as a public body and name CAs under the one window approach of MMAH for the purposes of appeals only. This may remove conservation authorities, who are private landowners, from the right of appeal.
- Removal of power for CAs to expropriate lands for existing and future projects

GRCA Comments:

The purpose of the *Conservation Authorities Act* remains the same. “The purpose of the Act is to provide for the organisation and delivery of programs and services that further the conservation, restoration, development and management of natural resources in watershed in Ontario.” 2017, c.23. Sched. 4, s.1. The objects within the *Conservation Authorities Act* have been amended to reflect the mandatory program and services that will be prescribed by regulations. At this time, it is anticipated that the changes to the objects would not impact the way in which the organization operates. In the next few weeks, the province has indicated that it will be releasing regulations that will further define the mandatory programs and services which could potentially have an impact on the scope and scale of current programs.

Although clauses related to non-mandatory programs already exist in the previously amended Act through Bill 108, the province has proposed additional wording that allows the Minister to dictate the standards and requirements for municipal or other programs and services agreed upon through service level agreements (non-mandatory programs). Historically, GRCA has negotiated directly with municipalities to tailor agreements to the need of the service for that specific municipality. Local autonomy in these program and services could be compromised with prescribed provincial standards and requirements. The non-mandatory, municipal and other local programs, do not receive funding from the province and through agreement, may be funded by municipal levy or other sources.

The proposed consequential changes to the *Planning Act* are still being clarified with the Ministry, however it is anticipated that it would remove conservation authorities ability to appeal a municipal planning decision to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT), unless it is through the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. It is unclear if a conservation authority can participate in an appeal to support a municipality upon request or when this is included in an agreement between the conservation authority and municipality.

The ability to appeal is a tool that is a necessary but seldom used tool in our toolbox. The Ministry staff stated that this change only affects the role of the conservation authority in an appeal process and that participation in reviewing land use planning applications would still be occurring. Conservation Authorities participation in land use

planning and the ability to appeal a decision ensures that key issues are identified and addressed early in the approval process so the landowner may proceed with other approvals such as the conservation authority permit in an efficient manner. It also ensures that the watershed lens is being applied to planning and land use decisions and that people and their property in or near new development or redevelopment are protected from natural hazards such as flooding.

When necessary GRCA attends LPAT hearings to support the municipality and to ensure that policies and development conditions are imposed to reduce flood risks and to ensure mitigation and setbacks are in place to address other natural hazards such as erosion hazards or along the Lake Erie shoreline. Extreme weather events and changing climate increase the importance of our role in the planning process.

The 2019 Provincial Flood Advisor's report notes the important role that conservation authorities play in the land use planning process. The main legislative tools used to manage flood risk, the report states, include the *Planning Act* together with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and the *Conservation Authorities Act*. As a result of the Flood Advisor's recommendations, the 2020 PPS was revised to state that mitigating natural hazard risks, including those associated with climate change, will require the province, planning authorities, and conservation authorities to work together. Similarly, the Made-in-Ontario Environment Plan asserts that within the context of environmental planning, conservation authorities' core mandate is protection from natural hazards and conserving natural resources.

Another significant concern is that this change may also remove our right to appeal planning decisions as a landowner. This is of significant concern as GRCA owns and manages over 48,000 acres of property throughout the watershed to support flood hazard management, to maintain a reliable water supply, to protect natural areas and biodiversity, to provide community recreation/education and to manage other environmentally sensitive natural lands. Conservation authorities are considered private landowners (not public lands) and the potential removal of the right to appeal a land use planning decision is a significant concern.

The amendments to the Act also removes the ability to utilize the *Expropriation Act* for existing and future projects. MECP has recommended that should this be required for a CA project that the municipality or the province could expropriate the lands necessary.

2. Regulatory

- Allow an applicant, within 120 days of a conservation authority receiving a permit application, to appeal to the LPAT if no decisions by the conservation authority has been made.
- Authorize the Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry to issue an order to take over and decide an application for a permit under section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act in place of the conservation authority (i.e. before the conservation authority has made a decision on the application).
- Allows an applicant, within 30 days of a conservation authority issuing a permit, with or without conditions, or denying a permit, to request the minister to review the conservation authority's decision.
- Where the minister has taken over a permit application or is reviewing a permit decision by a conservation authority, allow an applicant to appeal

directly to LPAT where the minister fails to make a decision within 90 days.

- In addition to the provision to seek a minister's review, provide the applicant with the ability to appeal a permit decision to LPAT within 90 days after the conservation authority has made a decision.

GRCA Comments:

The proposed 120 day timeline for a CA to make a decision on permit applications may be problematic since there is no indication from the province when the 120 day timeline is triggered (submission of application) or if there will be a requirement for complete applications. There is a broad spectrum and complexity of applications that CAs deal with and the majority of permits that are submitted with satisfactory construction or development plans and technical reports can be reviewed in a timely manner. For complex files, there may be additional time required for the applicant and/or their consultants to address GRCA technical comments on the proposal e.g. floodplain mapping analysis. The proposed timeline of 120 days for a decision oversimplifies the permitting process.

Over the past several years, and again in 2019 Conservation Ontario and CAs have worked with the province, AMO, landowners groups and the building industry to develop the recently CA wide adopted 'Client Service Standards for Conservation Authority Plan and Permit Review'. This document sets forth industry standards and procedures to ensure CA plan and permit review process are transparent, predictable and fair. GRCA permit application decisions are consistently made within the current client service standards. The current standards exclude the time period the applicant or their consultants are preparing responses to GRCA technical or policy comments which can take several weeks or in limited cases a few months.

The current appeal process for permits has been administered through the Mining and Lands Tribunal. With these proposed amendments, all permit appeals will be processed through LPAT. There is concern regarding the change in tribunals; the Mining and Lands Tribunal has the history and natural hazard technical experience in adjudicating *Conservation Authorities Act* cases for decades. Due to the volume of appeals at LPAT, it is anticipated that there could be lengthy delays for hearings and inconsistent decisions across the province. This also has the potential to redirect staffs' time to focus more on managing the appeal process for permit applications than what was previously required.

Under these proposed amendments, the Minister will be able to step in and take over the issuance or denial of a permit under Section 28 without consultation with the CA. A significant concern with this is a decision is made without watershed specific technical information required to make the decisions and the precedent that could be set for future application similar in nature.

Many of the amendments to this section of the legislation provide the Minister with significant additional powers to intervene in the permit process.

3. Enforcement

- Eliminated the (not yet proclaimed) powers for officers appointed by conservation authorities to issue stop orders (*Conservation Authorities Act* provision 30.4)

- Clarified conditions for officers appointed by conservation authorities to enter lands without a warrant for the purposes of:
 - determining whether to issue a permit (amendment to unproclaimed *Conservation Authorities Act* provision 30.2(1))
 - ensuring compliance with the prohibitions, regulations, or permit conditions, only when the officer has “reasonable grounds to believe that a contravention of a provision of the Act or a regulation...is causing or likely to have significant effects...” (*Conservation Authorities Act* provision 30.2(1.1))

GRCA Comments:

In previous updates to the Act, the province recognized that many compliance tools were outdated. The legislation prior to 2017 was not a deterrent for illegal activities and rapid response tools were not available to stop ongoing illegal activities. Although the fines have been substantially increased in 2017 (not yet enacted), the current proposal would remove a much needed compliance tool – the Stop (work) Order. The Made-In-Ontario Plan also recognized the role of conservation authorities in enforcement and it includes the provincial action “Work with municipalities, conservation authorities, other law enforcement agencies and stakeholders to increase enforcement on illegal dumping of excess soil.” Although not yet enacted, the Stop Order provision would have provided another tool to use when managing enforcement challenges and could have helped to avoid a time consuming and costly injunction process.

Obtaining injunctions takes further staff time and conservation authorities will incur significant costs for legal and court fees. Given the lack of provincial funding this cost will continue to be borne by municipalities and ultimately the taxpayers. The time needed to obtain such an order can be lengthy resulting in unnecessary and significant damage to the environment, impacts to natural hazard areas such as development in a floodplain which then puts people and property at risk.

Removing an officer's ability to enter lands (s. 30.2) within the authority's jurisdiction is inconsistent with similar municipal and provincial legislation. Coupled with the removal of a Stop Order provision (s. 30.4), these amendments do not afford officers an ability to “prevent or reduce the effects or risks” associated with illegal and egregious activities. Examples of other provincial legislation with Stop Orders include *Building Code Act* S.14, *Environmental Protection Act* S.8, *Planning Act* S. 49.

4. Governance

- Removing the power to define in regulation the composition, appointment or minimum qualifications for a Board member (S.40 (1)(a) and replaced it with:
 - Mandate that the municipal councillors appointed by a particular municipalities as members of a conservation authority be selected from that municipality's own councillors only S.14 (1.1)
 - Enabling the Minister to appoint an additional member to the Board to represent the agricultural sector (new *Conservation Authorities Act* provision 14(4)).
- Limit the term of the Chair and Vice-Chair to one year and to no more than two consecutive terms (new *Conservation Authorities Act* provision 17 (1.1))

- Amending the duties of members to act on behalf of their respective municipalities rather than the Conservation Authority

GRCA Comments:

As previously mentioned in formal comments provided to the province in April 2019 and comments provided to the province during stakeholder consultation in 2020, the GRCA is supportive of changes that increase transparency and accountability of conservation authorities. GRCA is also supportive of the province's intent to clearly define mandatory programs and services provided by the conservation authorities and we look forward to the opportunity to provide input on the regulations that will be posted for public input.

There are a number of proposed amendments that require the posting of documents, board agendas and minutes, financial audits and standard accounting practices that are already undertaken by the GRCA.

Municipalities will no longer be able to appoint a member of the public to the Board. Over the years, the GRCA has benefited from having citizen appointments to the Board. This has helped to incorporate a diverse perspectives for watershed decision making. In order to ensure that a municipal Mayor may participate on a conservation authority board it is recommended that the specification of 'municipal councillor' in the proposed amendments be changed to "municipally elected official".

In the event that the Minister appoints a member to represent the agricultural sector, the appointment process has not been specified, and it is assumed that these appointments would have the same voting privileges as all members and would be entitled to receive per diems and to be appointed as the chair or vice-chair. It is unclear how the change to fiduciary duty would affect this member.

The current legislation deferred board composition to a future Regulation. The proposed amendment removed this clause and replaced it with clauses that specify who can be a members of the board so there will be no opportunity for further input on determining who is eligible to be a member of the Board.

The proposed amendments have set a limit to the Chair and Vice-chair to hold office for one year term and no more than two consecutive terms. Under GRCA By-law 3-2020, the by-law states, "The individuals elected shall hold office until their successors are elected and will be eligible for re-election to the same office for up to a maximum of five one-year terms."

Conservation Authorities are corporate entities. Good governance dictates that the Board acts on behalf of the organization and in the public interest. By changing the duty of members to act on behalf of their respective municipalities, it contradicts the concept of fiduciary duty of a Board Member to represent the best interests of the corporation they are overseeing. It puts an individual municipal interest above the broader watershed interests further to the purpose of the Act. The standards of care for directors are set out under the *Business Corporations Act*.

'Every director and officer of a corporation in exercising his or her powers and discharging his or her duties to the corporation shall, (a) act honestly and in good faith with a view to the best interests of the corporation...; and (b) exercise the care, diligence and skill that a responsible prudent person would exercise in comparable circumstances'

Additionally, the Auditor General of Ontario recommended in their report on the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority that, "to ensure effective oversight of conservation authorities' activities through boards of directors, we recommend that the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks clarify board members' accountability to the conservation authority" to which the ministry response was in agreement.

5. Other

The amendments to the Act also include the requirement for a transition plan to be developed and implemented to ensure compliance with the regulations for mandatory programs and services and agreements or MOUs with municipal partners. Through discussions with MECP staff, it has been stated that the transition plan should be completed and implemented in time to support the 2022 budget process.

It has been GRCA's experience that it can take one to two years to negotiating and finalizing a municipal agreement or MOU given the complexity of the agreement and the number of stakeholders involved (municipal and CAs).

The development and implementation of the transition plan will require a change to GRCA's budget model, an assessment of all programs and services to ensure compliance with the regulations and development and negotiation with municipalities for MOU for non-mandatory programs and services (up to 26).

It is unknown when regulations will be posted for public input and approved.

Summary of GRCA's Response to Proposed Amendments to the Conservation Authorities Act:

- GRCA requests that the clause be edited to remove the ability for the Minister to prescribe standards and requirements for non-mandatory, municipal and local programs and services.
- GRCA requests that the amendment to the *Planning Act* be removed from Schedule 6 of Bill 229.
- GRCA requests that Bill 229 Schedule 6 clauses in S.28 be amended by removing references to LPAT and replacing it with the Mining and Lands Tribunal.
- GRCA requests that the existing unproclaimed clauses in the *Conservation Authorities Act* 2019 related to Powers of Entry (30.2) and Stop Order (30.4) remain in the *Conservation Authorities Act* and proposed amendments related to these clauses be removed from Bill 229 Schedule 6.
- GRCA requests that the wording for fiduciary responsibilities in the *Conservation Authorities Act* be amended back to: "Every member of an authority shall act honestly and in good faith with a view to furthering the objects of the authority."
- GRCA requests that a future regulation regarding the transition plan have an implementation date that is 18-24 months after the regulation is approved.

Most of the amendments proposed would be implemented through new or amended legal instruments or policies. The GRCA will contact MECP and MNRF to offer assistance and technical expertise on any working groups/technical committees

established to review future changes to the regulations, policy and/or provincial standards related to the implementation of the *Conservation Authorities Act*.

Financial implications:

Without the details of the proposed regulations, it is difficult to determine the financial implications for the amendments to the *Conservation Authorities Act*. Additional reports will come to the Board regarding updates to the program and services of the GRCA as they are posted to the Environmental Bill of Rights.

Other department considerations:

Operations, Administration, Resource Management and Engineering Divisions were consulted on the preparation of this report.

Prepared by:

Samantha Lawson
Chief Administrative Officer



November 24, 2020

BY EMAIL

To: Grand River Watershed Member Municipalities

Re: Bill 229: Protect, Support and Recover from COVID-19 Act (Budget Measures)

I am writing on behalf of the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) to provide you with an update on our concerns regarding the Province's proposed changes to the Conservation Authorities Act and the Planning Act under Bill 229: Protect, Support and Recover from COVID-19 Act (Budget Measures).

On Monday, November 23, 2020, the GRCA General Membership held a special board meeting to review and discuss the Province's proposed changes to the Conservation Authorities Act and the Planning Act through Schedule 6 in Bill 229.

While the GRCA board expressed support for the Province's stated objectives to modernize the Conservation Authorities Act, and enhance transparency and accountability, the board also voiced deep concern that some of the proposed changes may have a considerable impact on conservation authorities, their watershed management responsibilities, and consequently, on the health and wellness of the Grand River watershed and its residents.

At the meeting, board members passed a motion requesting staff to send *GRCA Report GM-11-20-85 Proposed Amendments to the Conservation Authorities Act through Bill 229* to the Premier of Ontario, the Ministers of Environment, Conservation and Parks, Natural Resources and Forestry, Municipal Affairs and Housing, and Finance, as well as all watershed MPPs, watershed municipalities, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario and the Rural Ontario Municipal Association. The report outlines the proposed changes in five key areas of concern for the GRCA: Objects, Powers and Duties; Regulatory; Enforcement; Governance and Other.

Please find attached the GRCA board report, as well as a letter that has been sent to the Province detailing our concerns. The GRCA is requesting that:

- the clause in S.21.1.2 of Bill 229 be edited to remove the ability for the Minister to prescribe standards and requirements for non-mandatory, municipal and local programs and services;
- the amendment to the Planning Act be removed from Schedule 6 of Bill 229;
- Bill 229 Schedule 6 clauses in S.28 be amended by removing references to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal and replacing it with the Mining and Lands Tribunal;
- the existing un-proclaimed clauses in the Conservation Authorities Act 2019 related to Powers of entry (30.2) and Stop Order (30.4) remain in the Conservation Authorities Act and proposed amendments related to these clauses be removed from Bill 229 Schedule 6;

- the wording for fiduciary responsibilities in the CA Act be amended back to: “Every member of an authority shall act honestly and in good faith with a view to furthering the objects of the authority”; and that
- a future regulation regarding the transition plan have an implementation date that is 18-24 months after the regulation is approved.

We would encourage our watershed municipalities to contact their local MPPs and ask that the Province of Ontario work with conservation authorities to address these concerns, before the changes are enacted.

We look forward to continuing our productive partnership with our watershed municipalities, as we work together to address local issues and opportunities that benefit the entire watershed.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Helen Jowett', with a stylized, cursive script.

Helen Jowett, Chair
Grand River Conservation Authority

cc Association of Municipalities of Ontario, Rural Ontario Municipalities Association



November 24, 2020

BY EMAIL

The Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario
Office of the Premier
Legislative Building, Queens Park
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1

Dear Premier Ford,

Re: Bill 229: Protect, Support and Recover from COVID-19 Act (Budget Measures)

I am writing on behalf of the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) to express our concerns regarding the Province's proposed changes to the Conservation Authorities Act and the Planning Act under Bill 229: Protect, Support and Recover from COVID-19 Act (Budget Measures).

The GRCA is governed through a partnership of 38 watershed municipalities, which work together to address local issues and opportunities that benefit the entire watershed. Elected or appointed representatives from these municipalities form the membership of the GRCA board, making us directly accountable to our member municipalities and the people that live in the watershed. We work closely with our municipal partners to deliver programs and services that mitigate flood damage, provide access to outdoor spaces, share information about the natural environment and make the watershed more resilient to climate change.

For example, through the Rural Water Quality Program, the GRCA has built strong relationships with the farming community. The GRCA delivers this voluntary program on behalf of 6 Upper Tier municipalities in the watershed to help farmers implement best practices to improve and protect surface and groundwater quality. Since 1998, more than \$56 million has been invested by municipalities and landowners – an investment that supports the rural economy and source water protection, builds green infrastructure and climate change resiliency on the landscape, and helps to improve the quality of the Grand River.

While we support the Province's stated objectives to modernize the Conservation Authorities Act, and enhance transparency and accountability, we are also concerned that some of the proposed changes will have a considerable impact on conservation authorities, their watershed management responsibilities, and consequently, on the health and wellness of the Grand River watershed and its residents.

The GRCA is requesting that:

- the clause in S.21.1.2 of Bill 229 be edited to remove the ability for the Minister to prescribe standards and requirements for non-mandatory, municipal and local programs and services;
- the amendment to the Planning Act be removed from Schedule 6 of Bill 229;
- Bill 229 Schedule 6 clauses in S.28 be amended by removing references to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal and replacing it with the Mining and Lands Tribunal;

- the existing un-proclaimed clauses in the Conservation Authorities Act 2019 related to Powers of entry (30.2) and Stop Order (30.4) remain in the Conservation Authorities Act and proposed amendments related to these clauses be removed from Bill 229 Schedule 6;
- the wording for fiduciary responsibilities in the CA Act be amended back to: "Every member of an authority shall act honestly and in good faith with a view to furthering the objects of the authority"; and that
- a future regulation regarding the transition plan have an implementation date that is 18-24 months after the regulation is approved.

Please find attached *GRCA Report GM-11-20-85 Proposed Amendments to the Conservation Authorities Act through Bill 229*, which outlines our key areas of concern. We are asking that the Province work with conservation authorities to address these concerns before Bill 229 is passed. We would also like to offer our assistance and technical expertise to the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry on any working groups or technical committees established to review future changes to the regulations, policies or provincial standards related to the implementation of the Conservation Authorities Act.

We look forward to continuing our productive relationship with the Province, and supporting your government's effort to improve the governance and accountability of conservation authorities.

Yours sincerely,



Helen Jowett, Chair
Grand River Conservation Authority

- c. Hon. Jeff Yurek, Minister of Environment, Conservation and Parks; Hon. John Yakabuski, Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry; Hon. Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Housing and Affairs, Hon. Rod Phillips, Minister of Finance; Grand River watershed Members of Provincial Parliament

Grand River Conservation Authority

Report number: GM-11-20-85

Date: November 23, 2020

To: Members of the Grand River Conservation Authority

Subject: Proposed Amendments to the Conservation Authorities Act through Bill 229

Recommendation:

THAT Report Number GM-11-20-85 – Proposed Amendments to the Conservation Authorities Act through Bill 229 be approved as amended;

AND THAT Grand River Conservation Authority Report GM-11-20-85 be submitted to the Premier, Ministers of Environment, Conservation and Parks, Natural Resources, Municipal Housing and Affairs and Finance, watershed MPPs, Association of Municipalities of Ontario, Rural Ontario Municipalities Association, and circulated to watershed municipalities;

AND THAT staff be directed to draft a cover letter which highlights the GRCA's key concerns with the proposed changes to the Conservation Authorities Act which will accompany the report to be distributed.

Summary:

On November 5, 2020, through Bill 229 Protect, Support and Recover from COVID-19 Act (Budget Measures), the province introduced amendments to the *Conservation Authorities Act* (Schedule 6) and the *Planning Act*. If enacted, some changes will significantly impact the role of a conservation authority board to establish programs and services. As well, the proposed amendments will enable Regulations that will either limit or completely change the role of conservation authorities to protect Ontario's environment and ensure people and property are safe from natural hazards.

Report:

Background:

A provincial review of the *Conservation Authorities Act* has been ongoing since 2015. Amendments were approved in 2017, a minor change in 2018 and these were followed by further amendments in 2019. In 2019, the province indicated the proposed amendments were to help conservation authorities focus and deliver on the core mandate and to improve governance. The Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) provided comments on the Environmental Registry Posting through GM-04-19-41- Environmental Registry Posting 013-5018- Modernizing Conservation Authority Operations. The amendments were later passed through Bill 108, More Homes, More Choice Act. At that time, the scope of the changes to conservation authority board

governance and composition; mandatory, municipal and other programs and services; natural hazard permits and other areas were to come out through various regulations.

In the fall of 2019, the Minister of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) hosted meetings with each individual conservation authority (CA) to gain a better understanding of the programs and services provided by each Authority. In the early winter of 2020, the MECP also hosted stakeholder consultation sessions across the province to gain feedback from the various groups, agencies and organizations who deal with, or work with CAs. The Vice-Chair and senior staff attended the South-western session and submitted formal written comments in response to questions posed by the MECP. MECP has confirmed that they received over 2,500 submissions in response to these consultation sessions; however, the results of these sessions have not been publicly shared.

Bill 229

On November 5, 2020, the province introduced Bill 229 Protect, Support and Recover from COVID-19 Act which includes amendments to the *Conservation Authorities Act* (Schedule 6). The province identified these changes as necessary to improve transparency and consistency in conservation authority operations, strengthen municipal and provincial oversight and streamline conservation authority roles in permitting and land use planning.

While previously proposed changes to the Act have been posted to the Environmental Registry of Ontario (ERO) for a period of public comment; these new changes are posted on the ERO for information only. Under Section 33 of the Environmental Bill of Rights (1993), public consultation is not required if the proposal forms part of or gives effect to a budget or economic statement that is presented to the Legislative Assembly. It is anticipated that Bill 229 will be passed in the next few weeks as the legislature is due to rise on December 10th.

On November 9, 2020, MECP hosted an information session with all 36 Conservation Authority General Managers to provide additional information on the proposed amendments and timelines. MECP has indicated that regulations to implement the Act will be released for public comment in the coming weeks and a second set of regulations will be released for public comment in early 2021.

Proposed Amendments:

Attached as appendix 1 is a summary chart of the proposed amendments to the *Conservation Authorities Act* and comments on the effects of those changes. This document was prepared by Conservation Ontario and circulated to the Board on November 13, 2020.

The changes to *Conservation Authorities Act* can be categorized into 5 sections:

- 1. Objects, Powers and Duties**
- 2. Regulatory**
- 3. Enforcement**
- 4. Governance**
- 5. Other**

Key changes to the Act under each of these categories are discussed below:

1. **Objects, Powers and Duties**

- Narrows the objects of a conservation authority from providing “programs and services designated to further conservation, restoration, development and management of natural resources other than gas, oil, coal and minerals” (*Conservation Authorities Act*, s20(1)) to: (i) mandatory programs and services, (ii) municipal programs and services, and (iii) other program and services.
- A number of proposed clauses that would enable the Minister to make regulations that would prescribe standards and requirements for Municipal Programs and Services (i.e. Service agreements between municipalities and CAs) and Other Programs and Services (i.e. as determined by the Board and if municipal levy is used would require municipal agreements)
- Proposed amendment of the *Planning Act* to include conservation authorities to subsection 1(2) which would remove CAs as a public body and name CAs under the one window approach of MMAH for the purposes of appeals only. This may remove conservation authorities, who are private landowners, from the right of appeal.
- Removal of power for CAs to expropriate lands for existing and future projects

GRCA Comments:

The purpose of the *Conservation Authorities Act* remains the same. “The purpose of the Act is to provide for the organisation and delivery of programs and services that further the conservation, restoration, development and management of natural resources in watershed in Ontario.” 2017, c.23. Sched. 4, s.1. The objects within the *Conservation Authorities Act* have been amended to reflect the mandatory program and services that will be prescribed by regulations. At this time, it is anticipated that the changes to the objects would not impact the way in which the organization operates. In the next few weeks, the province has indicated that it will be releasing regulations that will further define the mandatory programs and services which could potentially have an impact on the scope and scale of current programs.

Although clauses related to non-mandatory programs already exist in the previously amended Act through Bill 108, the province has proposed additional wording that allows the Minister to dictate the standards and requirements for municipal or other programs and services agreed upon through service level agreements (non-mandatory programs). Historically, GRCA has negotiated directly with municipalities to tailor agreements to the need of the service for that specific municipality. Local autonomy in these program and services could be compromised with prescribed provincial standards and requirements. The non-mandatory, municipal and other local programs, do not receive funding from the province and through agreement, may be funded by municipal levy or other sources.

The proposed consequential changes to the *Planning Act* are still being clarified with the Ministry, however it is anticipated that it would remove conservation authorities ability to appeal a municipal planning decision to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT), unless it is through the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. It is unclear if a conservation authority can participate in an appeal to support a municipality upon request or when this is included in an agreement between the conservation authority and municipality.

The ability to appeal is a tool that is a necessary but seldom used tool in our toolbox. The Ministry staff stated that this change only affects the role of the conservation authority in an appeal process and that participation in reviewing land use planning applications would still be occurring. Conservation Authorities participation in land use

planning and the ability to appeal a decision ensures that key issues are identified and addressed early in the approval process so the landowner may proceed with other approvals such as the conservation authority permit in an efficient manner. It also ensures that the watershed lens is being applied to planning and land use decisions and that people and their property in or near new development or redevelopment are protected from natural hazards such as flooding.

When necessary GRCA attends LPAT hearings to support the municipality and to ensure that policies and development conditions are imposed to reduce flood risks and to ensure mitigation and setbacks are in place to address other natural hazards such as erosion hazards or along the Lake Erie shoreline. Extreme weather events and changing climate increase the importance of our role in the planning process.

The 2019 Provincial Flood Advisor's report notes the important role that conservation authorities play in the land use planning process. The main legislative tools used to manage flood risk, the report states, include the *Planning Act* together with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and the *Conservation Authorities Act*. As a result of the Flood Advisor's recommendations, the 2020 PPS was revised to state that mitigating natural hazard risks, including those associated with climate change, will require the province, planning authorities, and conservation authorities to work together. Similarly, the Made-in-Ontario Environment Plan asserts that within the context of environmental planning, conservation authorities' core mandate is protection from natural hazards and conserving natural resources.

Another significant concern is that this change may also remove our right to appeal planning decisions as a landowner. This is of significant concern as GRCA owns and manages over 48,000 acres of property throughout the watershed to support flood hazard management, to maintain a reliable water supply, to protect natural areas and biodiversity, to provide community recreation/education and to manage other environmentally sensitive natural lands. Conservation authorities are considered private landowners (not public lands) and the potential removal of the right to appeal a land use planning decision is a significant concern.

The amendments to the Act also removes the ability to utilize the *Expropriation Act* for existing and future projects. MECP has recommended that should this be required for a CA project that the municipality or the province could expropriate the lands necessary.

2. Regulatory

- Allow an applicant, within 120 days of a conservation authority receiving a permit application, to appeal to the LPAT if no decisions by the conservation authority has been made.
- Authorize the Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry to issue an order to take over and decide an application for a permit under section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act in place of the conservation authority (i.e. before the conservation authority has made a decision on the application).
- Allows an applicant, within 30 days of a conservation authority issuing a permit, with or without conditions, or denying a permit, to request the minister to review the conservation authority's decision.
- Where the minister has taken over a permit application or is reviewing a permit decision by a conservation authority, allow an applicant to appeal

directly to LPAT where the minister fails to make a decision within 90 days.

- In addition to the provision to seek a minister's review, provide the applicant with the ability to appeal a permit decision to LPAT within 90 days after the conservation authority has made a decision.

GRCA Comments:

The proposed 120 day timeline for a CA to make a decision on permit applications may be problematic since there is no indication from the province when the 120 day timeline is triggered (submission of application) or if there will be a requirement for complete applications. There is a broad spectrum and complexity of applications that CAs deal with and the majority of permits that are submitted with satisfactory construction or development plans and technical reports can be reviewed in a timely manner. For complex files, there may be additional time required for the applicant and/or their consultants to address GRCA technical comments on the proposal e.g. floodplain mapping analysis. The proposed timeline of 120 days for a decision oversimplifies the permitting process.

Over the past several years, and again in 2019 Conservation Ontario and CAs have worked with the province, AMO, landowners groups and the building industry to develop the recently CA wide adopted 'Client Service Standards for Conservation Authority Plan and Permit Review'. This document sets forth industry standards and procedures to ensure CA plan and permit review process are transparent, predictable and fair. GRCA permit application decisions are consistently made within the current client service standards. The current standards exclude the time period the applicant or their consultants are preparing responses to GRCA technical or policy comments which can take several weeks or in limited cases a few months.

The current appeal process for permits has been administered through the Mining and Lands Tribunal. With these proposed amendments, all permit appeals will be processed through LPAT. There is concern regarding the change in tribunals; the Mining and Lands Tribunal has the history and natural hazard technical experience in adjudicating *Conservation Authorities Act* cases for decades. Due to the volume of appeals at LPAT, it is anticipated that there could be lengthy delays for hearings and inconsistent decisions across the province. This also has the potential to redirect staffs' time to focus more on managing the appeal process for permit applications then what was previously required.

Under these proposed amendments, the Minister will be able to step in and take over the issuance or denial of a permit under Section 28 without consultation with the CA. A significant concern with this is a decision is made without watershed specific technical information required to make the decisions and the precedent that could be set for future application similar in nature.

Many of the amendments to this section of the legislation provide the Minister with significant additional powers to intervene in the permit process.

3. Enforcement

- Eliminated the (not yet proclaimed) powers for officers appointed by conservation authorities to issue stop orders (*Conservation Authorities Act* provision 30.4)

- Clarified conditions for officers appointed by conservation authorities to enter lands without a warrant for the purposes of:
 - determining whether to issue a permit (amendment to unproclaimed *Conservation Authorities Act* provision 30.2(1))
 - ensuring compliance with the prohibitions, regulations, or permit conditions, only when the officer has “reasonable grounds to believe that a contravention of a provision of the Act or a regulation...is causing or likely to have significant effects...” (*Conservation Authorities Act* provision 30.2(1.1))

GRCA Comments:

In previous updates to the Act, the province recognized that many compliance tools were outdated. The legislation prior to 2017 was not a deterrent for illegal activities and rapid response tools were not available to stop ongoing illegal activities. Although the fines have been substantially increased in 2017 (not yet enacted), the current proposal would remove a much needed compliance tool – the Stop (work) Order. The Made-In-Ontario Plan also recognized the role of conservation authorities in enforcement and it includes the provincial action “Work with municipalities, conservation authorities, other law enforcement agencies and stakeholders to increase enforcement on illegal dumping of excess soil.” Although not yet enacted, the Stop Order provision would have provided another tool to use when managing enforcement challenges and could have helped to avoid a time consuming and costly injunction process.

Obtaining injunctions takes further staff time and conservation authorities will incur significant costs for legal and court fees. Given the lack of provincial funding this cost will continue to be borne by municipalities and ultimately the taxpayers. The time needed to obtain such an order can be lengthy resulting in unnecessary and significant damage to the environment, impacts to natural hazard areas such as development in a floodplain which then puts people and property at risk.

Removing an officer's ability to enter lands (s. 30.2) within the authority's jurisdiction is inconsistent with similar municipal and provincial legislation. Coupled with the removal of a Stop Order provision (s. 30.4), these amendments do not afford officers an ability to “prevent or reduce the effects or risks” associated with illegal and egregious activities. Examples of other provincial legislation with Stop Orders include *Building Code Act* S.14, *Environmental Protection Act* S.8, *Planning Act* S. 49.

4. Governance

- Removing the power to define in regulation the composition, appointment or minimum qualifications for a Board member (S.40 (1)(a) and replaced it with:
 - Mandate that the municipal councillors appointed by a particular municipalities as members of a conservation authority be selected from that municipality's own councillors only S.14 (1.1)
 - Enabling the Minister to appoint an additional member to the Board to represent the agricultural sector (new *Conservation Authorities Act* provision 14(4)).
- Limit the term of the Chair and Vice-Chair to one year and to no more than two consecutive terms (new *Conservation Authorities Act* provision 17 (1.1))

- Amending the duties of members to act on behalf of their respective municipalities rather than the Conservation Authority

GRCA Comments:

As previously mentioned in formal comments provided to the province in April 2019 and comments provided to the province during stakeholder consultation in 2020, the GRCA is supportive of changes that increase transparency and accountability of conservation authorities. GRCA is also supportive of the province's intent to clearly define mandatory programs and services provided by the conservation authorities and we look forward to the opportunity to provide input on the regulations that will be posted for public input.

There are a number of proposed amendments that require the posting of documents, board agendas and minutes, financial audits and standard accounting practices that are already undertaken by the GRCA.

Municipalities will no longer be able to appoint a member of the public to the Board. Over the years, the GRCA has benefited from having citizen appointments to the Board. This has helped to incorporate a diverse perspectives for watershed decision making. In order to ensure that a municipal Mayor may participate on a conservation authority board it is recommended that the specification of 'municipal councillor' in the proposed amendments be changed to "municipally elected official".

In the event that the Minister appoints a member to represent the agricultural sector, the appointment process has not been specified, and it is assumed that these appointments would have the same voting privileges as all members and would be entitled to receive per diems and to be appointed as the chair or vice-chair. It is unclear how the change to fiduciary duty would affect this member.

The current legislation deferred board composition to a future Regulation. The proposed amendment removed this clause and replaced it with clauses that specify who can be a members of the board so there will be no opportunity for further input on determining who is eligible to be a member of the Board.

The proposed amendments have set a limit to the Chair and Vice-chair to hold office for one year term and no more than two consecutive terms. Under GRCA By-law 3-2020, the by-law states, "The individuals elected shall hold office until their successors are elected and will be eligible for re-election to the same office for up to a maximum of five one-year terms."

Conservation Authorities are corporate entities. Good governance dictates that the Board acts on behalf of the organization and in the public interest. By changing the duty of members to act on behalf of their respective municipalities, it contradicts the concept of fiduciary duty of a Board Member to represent the best interests of the corporation they are overseeing. It puts an individual municipal interest above the broader watershed interests further to the purpose of the Act. The standards of care for directors are set out under the *Business Corporations Act*.

'Every director and officer of a corporation in exercising his or her powers and discharging his or her duties to the corporation shall, (a) act honestly and in good faith with a view to the best interests of the corporation...; and (b) exercise the care, diligence and skill that a responsible prudent person would exercise in comparable circumstances'

Additionally, the Auditor General of Ontario recommended in their report on the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority that, "to ensure effective oversight of conservation authorities' activities through boards of directors, we recommend that the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks clarify board members' accountability to the conservation authority" to which the ministry response was in agreement.

5. Other

The amendments to the Act also include the requirement for a transition plan to be developed and implemented to ensure compliance with the regulations for mandatory programs and services and agreements or MOUs with municipal partners. Through discussions with MECP staff, it has been stated that the transition plan should be completed and implemented in time to support the 2022 budget process.

It has been GRCA's experience that it can take one to two years to negotiating and finalizing a municipal agreement or MOU given the complexity of the agreement and the number of stakeholders involved (municipal and CAs).

The development and implementation of the transition plan will require a change to GRCA's budget model, an assessment of all programs and services to ensure compliance with the regulations and development and negotiation with municipalities for MOU for non-mandatory programs and services (up to 26).

It is unknown when regulations will be posted for public input and approved.

Summary of GRCA's Response to Proposed Amendments to the Conservation Authorities Act:

- GRCA requests that the clause be edited to remove the ability for the Minister to prescribe standards and requirements for non-mandatory, municipal and local programs and services.
- GRCA requests that the amendment to the *Planning Act* be removed from Schedule 6 of Bill 229.
- GRCA requests that Bill 229 Schedule 6 clauses in S.28 be amended by removing references to LPAT and replacing it with the Mining and Lands Tribunal.
- GRCA requests that the existing unproclaimed clauses in the *Conservation Authorities Act* 2019 related to Powers of Entry (30.2) and Stop Order (30.4) remain in the *Conservation Authorities Act* and proposed amendments related to these clauses be removed from Bill 229 Schedule 6.
- GRCA requests that the wording for fiduciary responsibilities in the *Conservation Authorities Act* be amended back to: "Every member of an authority shall act honestly and in good faith with a view to furthering the objects of the authority."
- GRCA requests that a future regulation regarding the transition plan have an implementation date that is 18-24 months after the regulation is approved.

Most of the amendments proposed would be implemented through new or amended legal instruments or policies. The GRCA will contact MECP and MNRF to offer assistance and technical expertise on any working groups/technical committees

established to review future changes to the regulations, policy and/or provincial standards related to the implementation of the *Conservation Authorities Act*.

Financial implications:

Without the details of the proposed regulations, it is difficult to determine the financial implications for the amendments to the *Conservation Authorities Act*. Additional reports will come to the Board regarding updates to the program and services of the GRCA as they are posted to the Environmental Bill of Rights.

Other department considerations:

Operations, Administration, Resource Management and Engineering Divisions were consulted on the preparation of this report.

Prepared by:

Samantha Lawson
Chief Administrative Officer



November 24, 2020

BY EMAIL

The Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario
Office of the Premier
Legislative Building, Queens Park
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1

Dear Premier Ford,

Re: Bill 229: Protect, Support and Recover from COVID-19 Act (Budget Measures)

I am writing on behalf of the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) to express our concerns regarding the Province's proposed changes to the Conservation Authorities Act and the Planning Act under Bill 229: Protect, Support and Recover from COVID-19 Act (Budget Measures).

The GRCA is governed through a partnership of 38 watershed municipalities, which work together to address local issues and opportunities that benefit the entire watershed. Elected or appointed representatives from these municipalities form the membership of the GRCA board, making us directly accountable to our member municipalities and the people that live in the watershed. We work closely with our municipal partners to deliver programs and services that mitigate flood damage, provide access to outdoor spaces, share information about the natural environment and make the watershed more resilient to climate change.

For example, through the Rural Water Quality Program, the GRCA has built strong relationships with the farming community. The GRCA delivers this voluntary program on behalf of 6 Upper Tier municipalities in the watershed to help farmers implement best practices to improve and protect surface and groundwater quality. Since 1998, more than \$56 million has been invested by municipalities and landowners – an investment that supports the rural economy and source water protection, builds green infrastructure and climate change resiliency on the landscape, and helps to improve the quality of the Grand River.

While we support the Province's stated objectives to modernize the Conservation Authorities Act, and enhance transparency and accountability, we are also concerned that some of the proposed changes will have a considerable impact on conservation authorities, their watershed management responsibilities, and consequently, on the health and wellness of the Grand River watershed and its residents.

The GRCA is requesting that:

- the clause in S.21.1.2 of Bill 229 be edited to remove the ability for the Minister to prescribe standards and requirements for non-mandatory, municipal and local programs and services;
- the amendment to the Planning Act be removed from Schedule 6 of Bill 229;
- Bill 229 Schedule 6 clauses in S.28 be amended by removing references to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal and replacing it with the Mining and Lands Tribunal;

- the existing un-proclaimed clauses in the Conservation Authorities Act 2019 related to Powers of entry (30.2) and Stop Order (30.4) remain in the Conservation Authorities Act and proposed amendments related to these clauses be removed from Bill 229 Schedule 6;
- the wording for fiduciary responsibilities in the CA Act be amended back to: "Every member of an authority shall act honestly and in good faith with a view to furthering the objects of the authority"; and that
- a future regulation regarding the transition plan have an implementation date that is 18-24 months after the regulation is approved.

Please find attached *GRCA Report GM-11-20-85 Proposed Amendments to the Conservation Authorities Act through Bill 229*, which outlines our key areas of concern. We are asking that the Province work with conservation authorities to address these concerns before Bill 229 is passed. We would also like to offer our assistance and technical expertise to the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry on any working groups or technical committees established to review future changes to the regulations, policies or provincial standards related to the implementation of the Conservation Authorities Act.

We look forward to continuing our productive relationship with the Province, and supporting your government's effort to improve the governance and accountability of conservation authorities.

Yours sincerely,



Helen Jowett, Chair
Grand River Conservation Authority

- c. Hon. Jeff Yurek, Minister of Environment, Conservation and Parks; Hon. John Yakabuski, Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry; Hon. Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Housing and Affairs, Hon. Rod Phillips, Minister of Finance; Grand River watershed Members of Provincial Parliament



A Healthy Watershed for Everyone

November 23, 2020

Via Email

Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario
Honourable Rod Phillips, Minister of Finance
Honourable Jeff Yurek, Minister of Environment, Conservation and Parks
Honourable John Yakabuski, Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry
Honourable Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Re: Concerns with *Bill 229: Protect, Support and Recover from COVID 19 Act (Budget Measures Act)* - Schedule 6 – *Conservation Authorities Act*

On November 5th, the Province released proposed changes to the Conservation Authorities Act as part of its omnibus bill announced with the provincial budget. The Province has stated they are amending the Act to improve transparency and consistency in conservation authority operations, strengthen municipal oversight and streamline conservation authority roles in permitting and land use planning. Additional regulations under the Act are still to be provided later this fall to provide a more complete understanding of how the changes are to be implemented and what their full impact will be.

We feel it is important to highlight that conservation authorities were originally created to address concerns regarding the poor state of the natural environment and the need to establish programs based on watershed boundaries for natural resource management. Conservation authorities bring the local watershed science and information into decision making to ensure that Ontario's communities are protected.

While we are encouraged that the purpose of the Act to provide for the organization and delivery of programs and services that further conservation, restoration, development, and management of natural resources in Ontario watersheds remains the same, Hamilton Conservation Authority (HCA) is very concerned that proposed changes to the Conservation Authorities Act and the Planning Act if passed, would reduce our ability to protect the natural environment and our watershed, and remove citizen representation and their most valuable insight and input to our Board.

The legislative changes appear to be an excessive intervention in local matters in an area where the Province makes little financial contribution. In the case of HCA, the Province contributes just 2% of the annual revenues for the operating budget. The remaining 98% of our funding comes from our municipal partners (38%) and self generated funds (60%).

Proposed changes provide new appeal avenues for permit applications to go to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT) and even the ability of the Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry to issue certain permits, in place of the conservation authority. It must be stressed that an appeal process already exists to applicants allowing them access directly to the HCA Board, a Board that is built with municipal oversight imbedded. Conservation authorities are important agencies which help protect Ontario's environment. Their science-based watershed information helps to steer development to appropriate places where it will not harm the environment or create safety risks to people. HCA already issues the vast majority of minor and major permits with efficiency and high service standards. HCA is committed to providing excellent client service, and we have a strong history of working cooperatively with our watershed municipalities, residents and businesses to ensure efficient and timely planning and regulatory review processes. Through a review of the current permit review process, Conservation Ontario estimates that the new changes to the permitting appeals process could delay development approvals by as much as 200 days. As well, costs can be expected to increase due to more staff time being required for permit appeals processes rather than time being spent on actually issuing permits.

Changes have been proposed to the Planning Act that create a gap in the land use planning system. Currently, conservation authority participation in the planning appeals process ensures that watershed science and data is being applied to planning and land use decisions. This input would be lost and it is an important tool for HCA to have when needed. Additionally, though unintentional, this change could also impact our right to appeal planning decisions as a landowner. This is a concern as our conservation lands, made up of 11,000 acres of forests, 145 km of trails, fields, streams, wildlife and plant life, are under HCA's care and protection, as they have been for over 60 years.

Conservation authorities have long requested the ability to issue stop work orders to protect environmentally sensitive areas. The proposed changes to the Act remove unproclaimed provisions for this enhanced enforcement and only retain the current tools such as prosecution, injunctions and fines; these existing tools do not provide the ability to effectively stop, on a timely basis, any significant threats and impacts and prevent damage.

As briefly mentioned, if passed, HCA would lose citizen representatives on its board who currently make up half the board of directors. The citizen members come from diverse backgrounds with experience in a number of fields, and are active members of their communities. They bring a wide array of knowledge, governance experience and expertise to their positions. These members provide valuable input on HCA programs and services from a citizen's point of view.

Of equal importance, HCA has only two participating municipalities with 10 members from Hamilton and 1 from the Township of Puslinch, which represents the unique situation of 99% of our watershed being within the City of Hamilton and the City of Hamilton being our major funder. With the new proposed requirements to rotate the Chair and Vice Chair role, there would be no democratic election process given the

representative from Puslinch would simply be appointed as the Vice Chair or Chair every 2 years. And finally, the proposed amendments would also require municipally appointed councillors to make decisions in the best interest of the municipality they represent and not the conservation authority and its watershed, the organization that they are supposed to represent when sitting as a Board member of the Authority. This is contrary to proper board governance.

In these stressful times, nature and the outdoors play an important role in people's mental and physical health. After this year, we have seen just how important these spaces - and that protection - is for our community. We will continue promoting our vision of a healthy watershed for everyone.

We do not want to see an increased risk to public safety, or increased liabilities to the Province, municipalities, and conservation authorities. Nor do we want more red tape, disruption and ultimately delays in helping the government achieve its goal of economic recovery. As such I respectfully ask that as a result of our concerns:

- the Province of Ontario withdraw Schedule 6 of the Budget Measures Act (Bill 229)
- the Province continue to work with conservation authorities to find workable solutions to reduce red tape and create conditions for growth
- the Province respect the current conservation authority/municipal relationships
- the Province embrace their long-standing partnership with the conservation authorities and provide them with the tools and financial resources they need to effectively implement their watershed management role.

If there are any actual and/or perceived issues pertaining to certain conservation authorities, they might best be addressed through area-specific solutions created to resolve them that can be identified through local analysis and consultation.

Sincerely,



Councillor Lloyd Ferguson
Chair, Hamilton Conservation Authority

Cc:

HCA Board of Directors

City of Hamilton Mayor and Council

Township of Puslinch Mayor and Council

Ted Arnott, MPP Wellington – Halton Hills

Andrea Horwath, MPP Hamilton Centre

Paul Miller, MPP Hamilton East – Stoney Creek

Sandy Shaw, MPP Hamilton West – Ancaster – Dundas

Donna Skelly, MPP Flamborough – Glanbrook

Monique Taylor, MPP Hamilton Mountain

The Honourable Doug Ford
Premier of Ontario

The Honourable Jeff Yurek
Minister of the Environment, Conservation, and Parks
Ministry of the Environment, Conservation, and Parks

The Honourable Rod Phillips
Minister of Finance
Ministry of Finance

November 17, 2020

Dear Premier Ford, Minister Yurek and Minister Phillips,

We are writing to you today in response to the proposed amendments to the *Conservation Authorities Act* (CA Act), contained in Schedule 6, Bill 229. **We anticipate that some of the more prescriptive changes proposed in Bill 229 will lead to the opposite of your government's stated desire to help conservation authorities (CA) modernize and operate with greater focus, transparency and efficiency.**

The Progressive Conservative Government under the leadership of George Drew passed the *Conservation Authorities Act* and the *Planning Act*. He recognized that Ontario needed to invest in a sound transformative strategy to help Ontarians recover from the devastation of World War Two, not just economically, but also emotionally, as a community. These progressive actions were further strengthened by Premier Frost. Today, as the Province faces unprecedented pressures from both, a global pandemic and climate change, we need to strengthen the cooperative role played by CAs.

For over 60 years, Conservation Halton (CH) has served the interests of its residents and stayed true to those founding principles – conserving the environment to enable watershed communities to prosper socially and economically while ensuring resilience and safety for generations to come. From planting four million trees, to managing 11,000 acres of land, teaching millions of children, ensuring people build their homes and businesses in safe places and constantly checking the pulse of our environment through monitoring and restoration, CH has been a trusted, accountable partner to the Province and our municipalities. Today, CH serves over one million residents in one of the fastest growing areas in Ontario. Our residents and municipalities depend on us to deliver cost-effective services that ensure growth and development support sustainable and vibrant communities.

CH has played a collaborative role in the previous consultations regarding the modernization of the CA Act. While it was unexpected to see further proposed changes to the Act in Bill 229, we are encouraged that the purpose of the Act to provide for the organization and delivery of programs and services that

further conservation, restoration, development, and management of natural resources in Ontario watersheds remains the same.

It is our view that several of the proposed amendments will increase the risk to life and property from natural hazards and the degradation of the environment. **We respectfully request you withdraw Schedule 6 from Bill 229 until a more thorough analysis of the appropriate solutions can take place, with more clarity on what problems were identified through the consultation process.** We also encourage you to engage with CAs as you work on regulations that will eventually define the limits of the various CA Act clauses. We feel this is critical to ensure that the focus and performance of CAs is actually improved.

Several changes, such as those related to governance, ministerial authority to issue permits, the removal of our ability to appeal decisions at LPAT, and the removal of enforcement tools will lead to increased administrative costs, red tape, delays, and above all bring into question the integrity and transparency of the permitting and planning process. **These changes will also result in a more uncertain, litigious and discordant atmosphere, which will hinder our ability to work with applicants to find practical solutions for safe development. These changes will undo the hard work CH has done over the last five years to ensure we are customer-centric, accountable, efficient and solutions oriented.** Specifically:

- **There is no duplication, red tape or going beyond our mandate**
CH and our municipal partners work in a complementary way, avoid duplication of effort and remain focused on our core responsibilities through detailed MOUs and workplans. CH worked with our partners and customers to develop clear, quantifiable service delivery targets, which we have achieved, and publicly reported on with consistency. We track all permitting and plan review metrics on a quarterly basis to ensure nothing is slipping.
- **Our permit/planning fees only cover the cost to review and we have high service standards**
CH works with the development industry to ensure there is transparency on how our fees are determined, what costs are included and what standard of service we deliver in exchange. This approach is highly appreciated by our BILD chapter and they have encouraged other agencies to adopt our approach. We will be happy to share correspondence to this effect with you. We work on a cost-recovery model to ensure we keep the cost to taxpayers as low as possible.
- **The integrity of the permitting process will be compromised – these amendments will increase risk, liability, delays, and lead to inconsistency**
CH currently issues 95% of minor permits and 98% of major permits within 30 and 90 review days respectively (not calendar days). We value the process as much as we value the output of our services in this area. It is our view that the proposed amendments that would allow the Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry jurisdiction over certain permit applications and the appeal process has the potential to allow individuals to circumvent checks and balances that exist to protect the communities in our watersheds. It is unclear whether the minister would have regard for local conditions, technical input or Board-approved policies. These proposed changes may inadvertently cause more people in the community to be at risk, rather than protected, from natural hazards.
- **The amendments introduce a “stakeholder governance model” that has no legal precedence**
The proposed changes to the composition of CA boards negatively disrupts what is currently a relatively apolitical structure. This will significantly reduce the capacity of boards to make

decisions on a watershed basis. Our Board of Directors carry out their fiduciary responsibilities, guide strategy, approve policies in support of our Provincial and municipal responsibilities and track performance. They ensure CH makes decisions with integrity, based solely on our core responsibilities. It is our view that changing the composition to reflect elected officials that represent the interests of their respective municipalities creates a setting ripe for conflict of interest. It runs counter to all governance principles.

- **These amendments compromise our ability to create jobs & deliver services without tax dollars**
Conservation Halton is focused on our core programs. We are equally competent and resourceful in providing further opportunities for Ontarians in recreation and education on our conservation lands—especially during the pandemic when the need for safe and accessible greenspace is at an all-time high—and we are even more proud that we are able to fund these opportunities 100% self-sufficiently. Our responsible monetization of assets and generation of revenue creates value for the community as well as employment opportunities. We are concerned that should the Ministry set fees or other limits on non-mandatory programs and services—particularly those that we already successfully run without the support of tax dollars—our ability to provide important recreational, educational, and employment opportunities that allow our community to interact with conservation will be significantly diminished. Our municipal levy for 2021 is under 28% and the provincial contribution is close to 2% of our total budget. We have worked hard to achieve such low reliance on taxpayer funding. At the same time, we have expanded access to our parks by 35% this season, giving Ontario families a safe place to visit during the COVID-19 pandemic.

In conclusion, we do not want to see an increased risk to public safety, or increased liabilities to the Province, municipalities, and conservation authorities. Nor do we want more red tape, disruption and ultimately delays in helping the government achieve its goal of economic recovery. Given the time sensitive nature of this Bill, we encourage the Province to consult with Conservation Halton and other CAs in an expedient manner. We have attached a more detailed (Board) report on our key concerns.

We appreciate you taking the time to consider our concerns. **We feel there are better solutions to deal with actual and perceived issues.** We would be pleased to discuss these and our desire to work with you to define the governing regulations at your earliest convenience. Please contact Conservation Halton CEO, Hassaan Basit (CEOoffice@hrca.on.ca) so we can help support your mandate while ensuring success for all stakeholders.

Regards,

Gerry Smallegange



Chair, Conservation Halton Board of Directors

Mayor Rob Burton, BA, MS




Town of Oakville

Mayor Gordon Krantz



Town of Milton

Mayor Marianne Meed Ward



City of Burlington

Mayor Rick Bonnette



Town of Halton Hills

Cc:

The Honourable John Yakabuski, Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry
Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry

The Honourable Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Ted Arnott
MPP Wellington—Halton Hills

Jane McKenna
MPP Burlington

Effie J. Triantafilopoulos
MPP Oakville North—Burlington

Stephen Crawford
MPP Oakville

Parm Gill
MPP Milton

Andrea Horwath
MPP Hamilton Centre

Sandy Shaw
MPP Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas

Rudy Cuzzetto
MPP Mississauga—Lakeshore

Donna Skelly
MPP Flamborough-Glanbrook