



## **Correspondence Items Presented for Information April 27, 2026**

---

- 1) Correspondence from AMCTO Re: Advocacy Update – Follow-Up to Budget Update on Proposed MFIPPA Changes.
- 2) Correspondence from the Deputy Clerk, City of Owen Sound Re: Regional Governance Changes.
- 3) Correspondence from the Intermediate Planner, Grey County Re: Age-Friendly Action Plan Progress Report.
- 4) Correspondence from the Director, Environmental Assessment Modernization Branch, Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks Re: Proposed *Environmental Assessment Act* Amendments to Improve the Comprehensive Environmental Assessment Process.
- 5) Correspondence from the Registrar, Ontario Energy Board Re: 2026 Generic Proceeding to Review the Model Franchise Agreement Extension of Intervention Deadline.
- 6) Correspondence from the Acting Chair, Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Committee Re: Possible Implications to the *Clean Water Act*.
- 7) Correspondence from the Chair, Western Ontario Wardens' Caucus Re: Support of Finlay's Law on Emergency Room Reform.



[About AMCTO](#) | [Professional Growth](#) | [Advocacy & Policy](#) | [Network & Community](#)



## Advocacy Update

Learn more about our work as we advocate on behalf of AMCTO members

April 10, 2026

### **Advocacy Update: Follow-Up to Budget Update on Proposed MFIPPA Changes**

As a follow-up to our previous [advocacy update](#) outlining proposed changes to the *Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 1990* (MFIPPA) made through the budget bill, we want to highlight our concerns regarding the scope and depth of proposed changes on the privacy side. These changes align the Act with similar changes made previously to the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 1989* (FIPPA), but do not consider municipal staff capacity or financial constraints.

Privacy-related changes include:

- Requiring that the head of an institution ensure that a written assessment is prepared and contains certain information respecting any Personal Information (PI) that is to be collected. This includes but is not limited to:

- The purpose, intended use, and explanation for collection
- Who will have access to the PI
- Limitations or restrictions on collection, use or disclosure
- Safeguard practices to protect the PI
- Steps taken to prevent the likelihood of theft, loss, unauthorized use, or disclosure of the PI
- Requiring that risks are mitigated by ensuring the above steps are implemented before collecting PI
- Requiring that institutions provide access to the written assessment to the Information and Privacy Commissioner (IPC)
- Reporting any breach of privacy safeguards to the IPC and notifying affected individuals
- Outlining factors to determine the real risk of significant harm
- Removing the definition of personal information bank
- Imposing a right of access to PI
- Authorizing the IPC to review information practices of an institution where the IPC has received a complaint, with authorization to resolve the matter through mediation, conciliation, and other informal means.
- Requiring an institution to assist the IPC in conducting a review

While we acknowledge that many of these proposals are important best practices moving forward, we would like to offer the following recommendations to the Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery for consideration:

- Over 80% of Ontario municipalities have populations under 50,000. In many municipalities, the administrative function is performed by a single employee, often the municipal clerk, who manages FOI and privacy programs along with 80 other [statutory responsibilities](#),

which can include council governance, bylaw enforcement, and elections.

- As 2026 is a municipal and school board election year, wherein municipal budget processes are disrupted with councils inaugurated in November, requests for resources to support new requirements may not be contemplated until 2027. This timing makes it extremely challenging to transition to new rules that are proposed to be in effect by January 1, 2027.
- The January 1 deadline for privacy impact assessments is too short a timeframe for municipalities to address new requirements and seek new resources, including staff and funding support to action the new requirements.
- The scope of the privacy impact assessments is exceptionally broad. It is not clear whether these would apply to information collected going forward or would also retroactively apply, which would be an insurmountable task for already overburdened municipal staff.
  - If retroactively applied, this will likely result in substantial costs for institutions and take years for many municipalities to come into compliance, given the above-noted limitations.

Given the varying levels of capacity and maturity across MFIPPA institutions, we want to understand what resources the Ministry and the Information and Privacy Commissioner are developing to support municipalities in this transition and when they will be made available.

In the meantime, we have prepared the following redline version of the Act, which shows the amendments Bill 97 proposes. We hope this makes it easier for members to see the exact changes that are being proposed.

### **REVIEW REDLINE VERSION OF THE ACT**

We also invite you to send us your templates, policies, procedures, and other relevant resources related to:

- Privacy impact assessments

- Information management best practices
- Risk and breach management
- Job advertisement requirements for staffing
- Budget/business cases for more resources

Over the coming weeks, we will be reviewing materials to determine the best next steps for how to support members, municipal clerks, and their staff with implementing the proposed new requirements.

Please provide any resources you'd like to share with our [policy and advocacy team](#) by **Monday, April 20**.

Our team will be continuing to evaluate the proposals to determine the full impacts on municipal administration and service delivery, and welcomes feedback from members with expertise in FOI and privacy.

We will also be applying to speak at Standing Committee where your feedback will help inform our submission. Please [provide your feedback](#) as soon as possible.

We will be seeking clarity with the Ministry over the coming days and will provide updates as appropriate.

---

**Staci Landry, Deputy Clerk**  
City of Owen Sound  
808 2nd Avenue East  
Owen Sound, ON N4K 2H4



Phone: 519-376-4440 ext. 1235  
Facsimile: 519-371-0511  
Email: [slandry@owensound.ca](mailto:slandry@owensound.ca)  
Website: [www.owensound.ca](http://www.owensound.ca)

---

April 16, 2026

Via Email

Paul Vickers, MPP  
Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound  
[paul.vickers@pc.ola.org](mailto:paul.vickers@pc.ola.org)

Dear Mr. Vickers:

**Re: Regional Governance Changes**

City Council, at its meeting held on April 13, 2026, considered the above-noted matter, and passed Resolution No. R-260413-012 as follows:

**"THAT in consideration of items 1.c and 2.b on the correspondence package (Item 11.I) listed on the April 13, 2026 Consent Agenda respecting Regional Governance Changes, City Council directs staff to send a letter to Paul Vickers, MPP for Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound expressing concerns with the proposed changes to the *Regional Governance Act*."**

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Staci Landry".

---

Staci Landry  
Deputy Clerk



# Committee Report

<b>To:</b>	Warden Matrosovs and Members of Grey County Council
<b>Committee Date:</b>	March 26, 2026
<b>Subject / Report No:</b>	PDR-CW-11-26
<b>Title:</b>	Progress Report – Age-Friendly Action Plan
<b>Prepared by:</b>	Cassandra Dillman, Intermediate Planner
<b>Reviewed by:</b>	Scott Taylor, Director of Planning
<b>Lower Tier(s) Affected:</b>	All member municipalities in Grey County

## Recommendation

1. That report PDR-CW-11-26 regarding the County's Age-Friendly Action Plan progress be received for information; and
2. That staff be authorized to make minor amendments to the County's Age-Friendly Action Plan, without impacting the intent of the Plan, to enable plan implementation; and
3. That staff be directed to share the Progress Report with all member municipalities for information.

## Executive Summary

Grey County is advancing its Age-Friendly Community vision to ensure residents of all ages can live, work, and participate fully in safe and accessible environments. With the County population aging rapidly, projected to have more than one-third of residents over 65 by 2035, it is important to prioritize planning for inclusive and Age-Friendly housing, transportation, and community services.

Supported by a 2021 provincial grant, Grey County developed its Age-Friendly Community Strategy and Action Plan, endorsed in 2022. The Plan outlines over 100 recommended actions based on the World Health Organization's eight Age-Friendly community dimensions and relies on collaboration across County departments, municipalities, and over 20 community partners.

The progress report, linked in the attachment section below, identifies that half of the action items have been completed, are underway, or are embedded in ongoing County

operations, and items from all eight dimensions have been initiated. A four-page Progress Snapshot is also linked below to provide a high-level overview.

Staff are recommending minor updates to some action items to streamline actions, update leads, and better align responsibilities, strengthening the County's ability to support residents of all ages and maintain momentum toward building an Age-Friendly Grey County.

## Background and Discussion

An Age-Friendly Community is designed so everyone, including children, youth, adults, and older residents, can live, work, and play in safe, accessible, and welcoming spaces. Creating an Age-Friendly community begins by examining all parts of community life, including land development, transportation, parks, social services through an Age-Friendly lens. Committing to seeing and addressing projects, issues, and policies through this Age-Friendly lens is how we create Age-Friendly communities.

As Grey County grows and ages, the case for Age-Friendly planning only strengthens. By 2035, more than 1 in 3 Grey residents will be over 65. By planning for Age-Friendly housing, transportation, and community services, the County can support older adults to maintain independence and thrive in their communities, as well as their caregivers and their families. By focusing on the needs of the most vulnerable, from seniors to young children, our communities become places where everyone can thrive no matter their age, ability, or background.

## Developing the County's Age-Friendly Initiative

In 2021, Grey County successfully obtained a \$60,000 Inclusive Community Grant, from the Government of Ontario, to develop an Age-Friendly Community Strategy and Action Plan. The project was highly collaborative with contributions from a stakeholder committee, community organizations, member municipalities, County staff and over 700 residents. The completed Action Plan was endorsed by County Council in March 2022 and shared with all member municipalities.

Through this process, two important items emerged: a community vision focused on all ages and an understanding of the Age-Friendly community building that is already occurring throughout the County. As a result, the Action Plan emphasizes collaboration, outlining over 100 recommended actions to address and advance key Age-Friendly priorities regardless of age.

## Action Plan Implementation

Grey County's Age-Friendly Strategy and Action Plan are built around the World Health Organization's (WHO) eight community dimensions, ranging from physical infrastructure (outdoor spaces and buildings, transportation, housing) to soft infrastructure (respect and social inclusion, civic participation and employment, community and information, community support and health services, and social participation).

Since 2022, County staff have been working on plan implementation. While accountability for the Plan lies with Grey County's Planning department, successful implementation requires efforts from all County departments and a wide range of community partners. The Grey County Age-Friendly Communities Committee supports this work and serves as a cross-sector network sharing resources and fostering collaboration among those involved in Age-Friendly initiatives across the County.

The Action Plan also recommends regular progress reviews to help identify successes, address gaps, and guide resources effectively. As Grey County is a two-tier government, the Action Plan naturally connects and interacts with many existing municipal services and community initiatives. The Plan provides a framework for Age-Friendly community planning. Building an Age-Friendly community is an iterative planning process: revisions signal growth and strengthen the community's Age-Friendly vision. The detailed Progress Report and Progress Snapshot are linked in the attachments section below.

## What We've Learned

The following insights have emerged during the implementation and review of the Age-Friendly Action Plan:

<b>Theme</b>	<b>Summary</b>
<b>Organizational Age-Friendly lens</b>	Many County staff and departments apply an Age-Friendly lens in their daily work, making it part of our organizational culture.
<b>Broad range of Age-Friendly initiatives underway</b>	There are many projects and day-to-day activities across County departments that aid Age-Friendly community planning goals, some of which are above and beyond those identified in the Action Plan.
<b>Growing community engagement and participation</b>	Community interest in Age-Friendly initiatives continues to grow.

<b>Local Age-Friendly leadership</b>	Age-Friendly fairs were hosted by both Grey Highlands and Blue Mountains this past year. Grey County was recognized by the province as an Age-Friendly Community in 2026, alongside the Town of Hanover who has been a provincial leader in Age-Friendly planning since 2017.
<b>The importance of partnerships</b>	Partnerships are essential for addressing complex societal issues, such as mental health, addictions, health care and homelessness. These issues are beyond the capacity of one organization alone.
<b>The COVID-19 pandemic</b>	The pandemic changed how residents participate, communicate, and engage with their communities, while exposing the digital divide, disrupted volunteer networks, and increased risk of social isolation among older adults.
<b>Staffing Resources</b>	The absence of a dedicated Age-Friendly Community Coordinator has added some complexity to managing the plan and coordinating partners.
<b>Evaluation</b>	Although each action item included performance indicators and a project lead, much of the data was not easily available, the indicators did not always reflect meaningful outcomes, and some identified leads are no longer suitable.

These insights highlight that Grey County cannot achieve this vision alone. Partnerships with municipalities, volunteer groups, and not-for-profits are essential to advancing Age-Friendly community planning goals. Grey County’s continued leadership, collaboration, and commitment to learning will ensure a strong foundation for ongoing progress.

## Next Steps

Grey County has made meaningful steps forward in implementing the Age-Friendly Action Plan and important work remains ahead. The review identified opportunities to strengthen community partnerships, improve outcome tracking, and identified initiatives that require additional resources or collaboration.

Moving forward, staff will continue to implement and advance the Action Plan and support the Age-Friendly Communities Committee. The progress review has also identified some action items that would benefit from reassessment. Several action items were identified for consolidation, division, retirement or shifted to a more appropriate lead. Through this report staff are seeking Council’s support for making minor tweaks to the Action Plan, without changing the intent of the Plan. The changes would aid in the

implementation of the Plan to streamline actions, update leads, and to better align responsibilities. For example:

- Action Item 4.5 - regarding the creation of a Grey County Accessibility Group - is no longer necessary due to continued success of the Joint Accessibility Advisory Committee. The review also identified four duplicate items in the original Plan.
- In addition, staff separated nine action items within the report card into smaller, more specific components to improve clarity and tracking.
- The Action Plan assigns a lead and partner organization for each action; however, many of these leads are no longer suitable because the corresponding organizations or positions no longer exist.

After four years of working with the Plan, staff have identified these adjustments as minor but valuable improvements. They will help strengthen implementation, enhance tracking and maintain momentum toward building an Age-Friendly Grey County.

## Financial and Resource Implications

None.

## Relevant Consultation

Internal: All County departments were consulted, including Long Term Care, Transportation Services, Human Resources, Clerks and Legislative Services, Paramedic Services, Economic Development, Tourism and Culture, Climate Change Initiatives, Provincial Offences, and Communications

External: Municipal staff and community organizations, including Grey Bruce Health Unit, Beaver Valley Outreach, Alzheimer Society Grey-Bruce, Grey Bruce Legal Clinic, Grey Bruce Elder Prevention Network, Osteoporosis Canada, Breaking Down Barriers, and Regional Geriatric Program of Southwestern Ontario

## Appendices and Attachments

[Age-Friendly Action Plan Progress Report 2026.pdf](#)

[Age-Friendly Progress Snapshot 2026.pdf](#)

Ministry of the Environment,  
Conservation and Parks

Environmental Assessment  
Modernization Branch

135 St. Clair Avenue West  
4th Floor  
Toronto ON M4V 1P5

Ministère de l'Environnement, de  
la Protection de la nature et des Parcs

Direction de la modernisation des processus  
d'évaluation environnementale

135, avenue St. Clair Ouest  
4<sup>e</sup> étage  
Toronto ON M4V 1P5



April 20, 2026

TO: Stakeholder Distribution List

RE: Proposed *Environmental Assessment Act* (EAA) amendments to improve the comprehensive environmental assessment (EA) process

---

Today, Ontario introduced the [Protecting Ontario's Workers and Economic Resilience Act, 2026 \(POWER Act\)](#) in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. If made, the changes would support a more efficient comprehensive EA process and make it easier to navigate by removing certain steps while maintaining strong environmental protections and other consultation opportunities.

The proposed legislation would, if passed, amend the *Environmental Assessment Act* (EAA) to make three key changes to the comprehensive EA process:

- Remove the requirement to publish and consult on a Ministry Review
- Remove the opportunity for the public to request a hearing before the Ontario Land Tribunal (Tribunal) while maintaining the Minister's authority to refer an application or matter related to an application to the Tribunal for a hearing and decision on their own initiative
- Remove the requirement for Cabinet approval of the Minister's decision, while providing the Minister discretion to refer an application to Cabinet for a decision

In addition, we also proposed minor updates to improve clarity and flexibility in the EAA.

If the proposed EAA amendments are made, the regulation that sets out deadlines for certain steps in the comprehensive EA process (Ontario Regulation 616/98 (Deadlines)) would be adjusted to align with the changes.

The proposal has been posted on the Environmental Registry of Ontario (ERO) for public comment. More information is available [here](#). Input is being accepted until **May 20, 2026**.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us at [EAModernization.MECP@ontario.ca](mailto:EAModernization.MECP@ontario.ca). Any comments on the proposal can be submitted through the ERO posting via the link above, or by email to us.

We are committed to keeping you apprised about EA modernization and working with you to build a strong EA program for Ontario. We value your perspectives on the EA program and look forward to your further participation. More information on our other efforts to modernize the EA program can also be found [here](#).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "A. Cross". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Annamaria Cross  
Director, Environmental Assessment Modernization Branch  
Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks



Ontario  
Energy  
Board | Commission  
de l'énergie  
de l'Ontario

**BY EMAIL**

April 17, 2026

TO: All Municipalities  
All Natural Gas Utilities  
Frequent Intervenors  
Information Session Participants

**Re: 2026 Generic Proceeding to Review the Model Franchise Agreement  
Extension of Intervention Deadline  
Ontario Energy Board File Number: EB-2026-0009**

The Ontario Energy Board (OEB) wishes to thank all municipalities, gas utilities, and other interested parties who attended the recent municipal franchise generic proceeding information session on April 15, 2026. The high level of engagement and thoughtful questions underscored the importance of this proceeding and the value of broad participation.

As explained in the [Notice of Hearing](#), municipalities, gas utilities, and other interested parties who wish to actively participate in this proceeding must apply for intervenor status and, where applicable, cost eligibility using the [OEB's online Intervention Form](#).

Following the information session, the OEB noted a common concern that some municipalities may be unable to meet the pre-established deadline for requesting intervenor status in this proceeding. In response to this concern, the OEB is extending the deadline to apply for intervenor status to **May 1, 2026**.


The OEB also acknowledges comments from various municipalities regarding potential challenges for active municipal participation in this proceeding due to the upcoming municipal election cycle. The OEB intends to consider this in designing its procedural schedule, which will be issued at a later date.

The commissioners assigned to this proceeding are: David Sword (presiding), Robert Dodds, and James Sidlofsky.

Should you have any questions regarding this proceeding, please contact Natalya Plummer at [natalya.plummer@oeb.ca](mailto:natalya.plummer@oeb.ca).

Yours truly,

Ritchie  
Murray

 Digitally signed by Ritchie  
Murray  
Date: 2026.04.17  
14:26:16 -04'00'

Ritchie Murray  
Registrar



April 13, 2026

Hon. Todd J. McCarthy  
Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks

Dear Minister McCarthy,

Upon review of the recent changes to Ontario Conservation Authorities and proposed further changes that could impact the Clean Water Act and its Regulations, our Source Protection Committee collaborated on the following response.

Over the last 25 years, protection of municipal drinking water sources in Ontario has improved dramatically. However, as the landscape and the climate changes, we must remain vigilant and continue with drinking water source protection measures to ensure that there continues to be safe water available for public consumption. Recently, the Province announced changes to boundaries for the regional consolidation of Ontario's conservation authorities. This reconfiguration must align with the fundamental basis of Justice O'Connor's Walkerton Inquiry report recommendation to maintain watershed-based drinking water source protection at the local level. As a Source Protection Committee, we strongly advocate that Justice O'Connor's recommendations are respected to ensure that source protection planning and implementation remain responsive to local issues and policy approaches.

The integrity of the drinking water source protection program is local, watershed-based committees that include members from the agriculture, business/commerce/industry, municipal, environment and health sectors. These members have a vested interest in the sources and drinking water systems that supply their families, neighbours and constituents with a safe supply of drinking water. Dilution of this oversight to the new regional conservation authority scale will not serve the recommendations made by Justice O'Connor following the tragedy that happened in Walkerton in our Source Protection Region. Our region and its residents are considerably more familiar and unwilling to waver on the core principles of the program.

Justice O'Connor's Walkerton Inquiry report recommended watershed-based drinking water source protection planning at the local level by those most directly affected. To ensure that source protection planning and implementation remain responsive to local issues and policy approaches, and to minimize the need for time consuming administrative changes and conformity exercises, the province should consider:

- Adopting the current scale of Source Protection Regions as the largest geographic extent for the proposed regional Conservation Authorities. A single regional Source Protection Authority spanning numerous municipalities risks weakening local accountability, distancing decision-making from watershed-specific realities, and diluting the local focus that is foundational to effective watershed management.



- Retaining the current geographic scale of Source Protection Areas. Ensuring that Assessment Reports (ARs) and Source Protection Plans (SPPs) would continue to be reflective of local drinking water threats, vulnerabilities, and policy approaches. While also helping ensure that conformity exercises and consequential amendments to ARs and SPPs would be minimized. Consolidation of ARs and SPPs to reflect changed Source Protection Area boundaries would be time consuming and contribute little to the outcomes of the source protection program.
- Maintaining local representation on Source Protection Committees (SPCs) to ensure that municipal, economic, public interest holders, and implementation bodies continue to have a voice in identifying needed amendments to plans and overseeing progress towards achieving the objectives of SPPs. Continued alignment of SPCs with Source Protection Region jurisdictions would help ensure local representation and accountability.

The Source Protection Committee has deep concerns about possible implications to the Clean Water Act as a result of the recent Conservation Authority Act changes. It is our intent to continue to work with the province, local municipalities and local Source Protection Authorities to protect our local sources of drinking water in the spirit of Justice O'Connor's recommendations.

Sincerely,



Dick Hibma  
Acting Chair, Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula  
Source Protection Committee

Cc via email: Kirsten Service, MECP  
Source Protection Authorities  
Municipal Clerks



Monday, April 20, 2026

Premier of Ontario  
Hon. Doug Ford  
Legislative Building, Queen's Park  
Toronto ON M7A 1A1  
Sent via email: premier@ontario.ca

**Re: Support of Finlay's Law on Emergency Room Reform**

At its regular meeting on April 10, 2026, the Western Ontario Wardens' Caucus adopted the following motion in support of Finlay's Law on Emergency Room Reform:

**#11 Moved by D. Bailey seconded by B. Clark:**

**WHEREAS** growing pressures across the Ontario healthcare system are increasing patient volumes in emergency rooms (ER), requiring more complex care, and contributing to longer patient wait times in ERs for residents in Ontario's largest municipalities; and

**WHEREAS** Health Quality Ontario data from October 2025 reports that patients needing admission to the hospital waited an average of 19-20 hours, with high-urgency patients waiting close to 5 hours on average to be seen by a physician; and

**WHEREAS** in December 2023, the Auditor General of Ontario reported that significant hospital staffing shortages were reducing access to timely emergency care; and

**WHEREAS** the Financial Accountability Office of Ontario reported in March 2023 that ER wait times were increasing significantly with the longest wait times recorded in over 15 years and that provincial funding was \$21.3 billion short to maintain current health programs through 2028; and

**WHEREAS** according to the Ontario Hospital Association (OHA), Ontario has had the lowest per capita hospital expenditure in Canada since 2018; and

**WHEREAS** according to the OHA, approximately 4,200 alternate level care (ALC) patients remain in acute beds (40% awaiting long term care), worsening ER delays; and

**WHEREAS** Canadian ER researchers have highlighted that between 8,000 and 15,000 Canadians die prematurely as a result of ER overcrowding; and

**WHEREAS** reports of patients dying in crowded ERs across Canada are increasing, such as 16-year-old Finlay van der Werken who waited over 8 hours in an Oakville ER without being seen by a physician and tragically passed away on February 9, 2024 from pneumonia that developed into sepsis; and

**WHEREAS** ER delays are contributing to excessive ambulance offload times, adding undue strain on response capacity of municipal paramedic services across Ontario; and

**WHEREAS** the Provincial Government has taken important steps to improve health care in Ontario, however additional funding and staffing resources for hospitals to reduce ER wait times and increase capacity to provide timely access to care for all patients in ER's remains critical; and

**WHEREAS** despite growing concerns regarding staffing shortages in and closures of ERs across Ontario, as well as failure to meet federal standards such as the Canadian Triage and Acuity Scale, the Provincial Government continues to receive full contributions of Canada Health Transfers from the federal government.

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the Western Ontario Wardens Caucus calls on the Provincial Ministry of Health to take immediate action to reduce ER wait times with consideration for the importance of enhanced ER triage protocols and increased funding to strengthen emergency readiness;

**AND THAT** the Western Ontario Wardens Caucus calls on the Provincial Ministry of Health to introduce Finlay's Law to ensure that no child in Ontario is left without timely emergency medical care in hospitals by:

- Setting legal maximum ER wait times for children under 18 (e.g., physician assessment within 2 hours, admission within 8 hours).
- Mandating safe pediatric nurse-to-patient and physician-to-patient ratios in emergency settings.
- Establish independent oversight to audit hospitals, investigate pediatric ER deaths, and enforce compliance.
- Mandate public, independent, and timely (within 1 year) inquiry by the Chief Coroner of Ontario of every pediatric death in an ER waiting area.
- Fund better pediatric emergency readiness, including staffing, training and infrastructure

**AND THAT** the Western Ontario Wardens Caucus calls on the Federal Ministry of Health to enforce the principles and requirements of the Canada Health Act through its spending power of Canada Health Transfers to Ontario by:

- monitoring compliance to national health standards, such as Canadian Triage and Acuity Scale (CTAS) in ERs;
- and establishing and ensuring compliance with a new sepsis care

**AND THAT** a copy of this resolution be sent to the Premier of Ontario, the Ontario Minister of Health, the Federal Minister of Health, the Ontario Medical Association (OMA), the Ontario Hospital Association (OHA), and the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO).

**Carried.**

Please contact the office if you require any further information.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Marcus Ryan". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Marcus Ryan  
Chair, Western Ontario Wardens' Caucus

cc.

Hon. Marjorie Michel, Federal Minister of Health

Hon. Sylvia Jones, Ontario Minister of Health

Ontario Medical Association

Ontario Hospital Association

Association of Municipalities of Ontario

Ontario Big City Mayors

Eastern Ontario Wardens' Caucus

Western Ontario Municipalities