



MNRF – Resources Planning and Development Policy Branch  
Conservation Authorities and Natural Hazards Section  
300 Water Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, South Tower  
Peterborough, ON  
K9J 3C7

May 6<sup>th</sup>, 2024

**Re: Conservation Ontario's comments on the "Regulation detailing new Minister's Permit and Review powers under the Conservation Authorities Act" (ERO # 019-8320)**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the "Regulation detailing new Minister's Permit and Review powers under the Conservation Authorities Act". Conservation Ontario is the network of Ontario's 36 Conservation Authorities (CAs). These comments are not intended to limit comments submitted by CAs on this proposal.

On April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2024, previously unproclaimed provisions in the *Conservation Authorities Act (CA Act)* and associated regulations came into effect. Provisions under sections 28.1, 28.1.1 and 28.1.2 of the *Act* provide the Minister new powers to:

1. Make an order to prevent a CA from issuing a permit to an individual (or individuals) to engage in an activity (or class of activities), that would be prohibited under section 28 of the *Act*;
2. Where an order is made, assume the responsibility for the permitting process in the place of a CA, where the criteria under section 28.1 of the *Act* concerning natural hazards and public safety can be satisfied; and,
3. Review (and potentially alter) CA permit decisions at the request of the applicant (where the Authority has refused a permit or assigned conditions to the permit that the applicant objects to).

Through Ontario Regulation 686/21, CAs provide mandatory programs and services to manage risks related to natural hazards, including preventing or mitigating those risks. Under the *CA Act*, certain prohibited activities require permits from the CA where the activity takes place in or adjacent to specified hazardous landscapes and features. CAs work closely with partner municipalities, the development community, consultants and watershed residents to ensure the permitting process and decisions are transparent, apolitical, and technically sound to protect people and property from the impacts of

natural hazards. Permitting decisions made by CAs are consistent with the *CA Act* and regulations and CA board-approved policies. When making decisions, CAs apply an integrated watershed management perspective to consider local conditions, potential impacts to upstream and downstream communities, and future management challenges.

Conservation Authorities support the Province's objective to increase housing without jeopardizing public health and safety, or the environment. Appeals of CA permitting decisions were infrequent over the past five years; specifically, <0.5% of the approximately 11,500 permits issued annually by CAs are appealed. Existing appeal mechanisms are in place under the *CA Act* to provide applicants with process certainty and appropriate recourse. CAs are committed to positive client service when reviewing and issuing permits, demonstrated by issuing 95% of all permits within provincial timelines in 2023.

In 2019, Ontario's Special Advisor on Flooding strongly supported the coordinated, scientific, and hazard/risk-based approach integrated in the current CA permitting process. This process, above all, holds the protection of people and property in the highest regard. Conservation Ontario offers the following comments to ensure this approach is maintained and that use of the Minister's powers will not have unintended impacts and consequences to long-established working relationships and CA review and appeal processes.

**Recommendation #1: THAT MNRF pause implementing the regulation and engage with Conservation Ontario and CAs to discuss proposed requirements, implementation details, and public guidance.**

The proposed regulation currently scopes the Minister's ability to intervene in the CA permitting process where the development activity pertains to a "specified provincial interest". Conservation Ontario notes the list of provincial interests is extensive, and captures too broad a scope of development applications submitted to CAs.

To ensure appropriate and efficient use of these powers, Conservation Ontario recommends MNRF pause finalization of the regulation and meet with Conservation Ontario, CAs, and municipal representatives to discuss the circumstances for use of the new Minister's powers as well as implementation / procedural details (i.e., how the Minister will consider requests / petitions and make decisions). Appropriate scoping of these details will ensure the process remains transparent and procedurally fair, extinguishes requests / petitions made to circumvent locally established processes, and continues to apply a watershed lens to natural hazard management.

Conservation Ontario offers the following initial comments to refine the proposed regulatory requirements:

- Certain provincial interests (e.g., community services) are defined as "Institutional use" in the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and are not permitted in/on hazardous lands and sites. Permitting these types of development activities in hazard lands

must not be considered by the Minister, and due care applied to ensure vulnerable populations or sensitive uses are not located in areas that pose an increased risk to life and property. Decisions by the Province must be consistent with the *CA Act*, Ontario Regulation 41/24, and policies in the PPS.

- Where a request for review or petition is made, proponents must indicate if the local municipality has endorsed the project and request for Minister's involvement. Development activities in one area of the watershed have the potential to impact upstream and downstream communities. Further, political resolutions are procedurally inappropriate where the CA Board (and Members) have hearing tribunal review responsibilities.
- It is proposed proponents be required to identify the status of other required project approvals. Proponents should be specifically required to indicate whether all approvals under the *Planning Act* are in place to demonstrate land use compatibility, appropriate zoning, etc. Permitting decisions made prior to having the appropriate planning approvals in place could put municipalities in a difficult position if they cannot support the works further to a Minister's permit.
- When a Minister's review is requested, the *CA Act* requires the Minister to notify the CA and applicant within 30 days of receiving a request. Further, when making an order under section 28.1.1, the Minister gives notice of an order to every applicable CA. In either scenario, notice should be provided to the applicable CA(s) at the time the request or petition is made. Confirmation on whether the proponent has made the CA(s) aware of initiating this process should be included in the regulatory requirements.

**Recommendation #2: THAT MNRF establish a multi-disciplinary technical advisory committee to provide decision recommendations to the Minister.**

The proposal does not address how the Minister will assess requests for review and petitions for orders and, if applicable, what information and criteria will be applied to make an order or a decision on a *CA Act* permitting matter. The *CA Act* requires the applicable CA to forward relevant documents and information relating to an application to the Minister, as well as provides the Minister with the ability to confer with any other person or body they consider may have an interest in the application. The *Act* and proposed regulatory requirements do not provide details on how this information will be considered.

Recent amendments to the *CA Act* and regulations require all CAs to develop permit application policy and procedure documents and make maps of regulated areas publicly available. CA permitting decisions are undertaken consistent with these board-approved policies, and informed by natural hazard mapping, modelling, and knowledge of local watershed conditions and ongoing/planned projects affecting the watershed. These tools, experience and expertise allow CAs to assess permit applications to determine if an activity may affect the control of flooding, erosion, etc., or jeopardize the health and safety of

persons or result in property damage. It is unclear how the Minister would review and make decisions on applications in the absence of these policies and tools.

An unclear process will add costs and time delays. The existing system includes professionals with a high degree of specialized expertise. For example, existing floodlines have been well justified and peer reviewed. To go down a path of competing submissions is better reserved for the Ontario Land Tribunal with the requisite experience to appropriately weight multiple technical expert submissions.

Alternatively, Conservation Ontario recommends MNRF establish a multi-disciplinary Minister's technical advisory committee to provide recommendations to the Minister when issuing permits or reviewing CA permitting decisions. The committee should bring together technical experts from CAs, Municipalities, the private sector, and applicable provincial ministries to prepare recommendations for the Minister on permit applications. A balance of expertise is essential to ensure bias is not introduced, allowing the Minister to make decisions based on the same criteria concerning natural hazards and public safety that are considered by CAs. Careful consideration of these applications is required to avoid unintended risk to public safety, properties, or natural hazards and avoid precedent setting decisions that may not align with CA board-approved policies.

**Recommendation #3: THAT MNRF is fully responsible and accountable for losses or damages arising from Minister's decisions on permits.**

When undertaking a review of a CA permitting decision or overtaking the CA permitting process further to an order, the Minister has the power to issue permits pursuant to the *CA Act*.

Where the Minister's decisions are inconsistent with CA Board-approved policies or CA natural hazard mapping and modelling, the liability for such decisions remains with the issuing body (the Minister of MNRF). CAs are not liable for decisions made under the *CA Act* by another body that may result in losses or damages. Liabilities and risks are one of the major drivers of exponentially increasing insurance costs/premiums, and CAs cannot be the insurers of last resort.

The amended *CA Act* and regulatory proposal purports to have CAs undertake compliance and enforcement activities with permits issued by the Minister. Without CA involvement in the review and approval process, it is difficult to anticipate enforcement and compliance staff resources necessary for permits issued by the Minister. Increases in enforcement and compliance activities may require additional time and staffing resources at the CA, that may increase costs associated with this program and service area. Due care must be applied when the Minister is reviewing and issuing permits to ensure appropriate conditions are assigned to the permit to minimize potential enforcement concerns.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the "Regulation detailing new Minister's Permit and Review powers under the Conservation Authorities Act" (ERO#019-8320). The details regarding these new Minister's powers must be carefully developed to ensure Minister's decision making on permits remains technical, apolitical and integrates a watershed perspective to natural hazard management to continue protecting the public, properties and infrastructure. Conservation Ontario would be pleased to meet with Ministry staff to further discuss the regulatory requirements and implementation details.

Sincerely,



Chris White  
Chair, Conservation Ontario

c.c. All CA CAOs/GMs