

Summary of Comments/Questions re: ERO 019-7891 - Town of Milton – March 2024

- If the intent is to revoke the MCEA, but for the MPAP much of the “work” ahead of starting the MPAP process mirrors the current MCEA (phases 1 and 2, potentially some of phase 3), most of which would be addressed via a Master Plan (and the MCEA currently provides guidance and framework for completing Master Plans, and stipulates that Master Plans must follow, at a minimum, phase 1 and 2 of the MCEA), will additional/separate guidance be provided regarding the completion of Master Plans?
- For those projects subject to the proposed MPAP process, there is still quite a lot of work to identify alternatives, evaluate these and select a preferred alternative, ahead of the formal MPAP process starting – so overall impact on timelines, while it may appear reduced, is likely insignificant.
- For projects NOT subject to the proposed MPAP process (i.e. all municipal road projects), will guidance be provided in terms of consultation best practices (whether with Indigenous communities or other stakeholders)?
- The Provincial Policy Statement (sec. 1.6.8.3) and the Growth Plan, with respect to Transportation and Infrastructure, both have policies that have ability to prohibit development in planned corridors (i.e. whose preferred alignment was determined through processes (like the MCEA) of the EA Act) – without the MCEA to rely on/refer to, is there a plan to update these policies to ensure the municipality can instead rely on the municipality’s OP (or other municipal policy) in terms of “planned corridors”);
- Historically, MCEA studies have been relied on for “hearings of necessity” under the Expropriations Act; If an MCEA or similar study is no longer required for municipal road projects, for projects that require property and ultimately require expropriation of property, are there any planned regulation changes/amendments under the Expropriations Act to assist municipalities in defending the need for property (seems that the work required under the MCEA will still have to be completed to defend property takings, or to determine the most appropriate/best alternative for a roadway project, so while there may be some benefit to amending the MCEA for certain projects (i.e. those not expected to have significant environmental impacts), for those that are adjacent to or within environmentally sensitive areas, or where property taking is required, the work (whatever it is “called”, an MCEA or otherwise, is still required to occur). It would be beneficial for the MECP to consult with the Ministry of Infrastructure to propose amendments, if needed, to the Expropriations Act to address this;