

## Recent Legislative and Regulatory Developments of Interest to Energy Lawyers

**Authors: Marian Yuzda, Canada Energy Regulator, Marianne (Chuck) Davies, Pembina Pipeline Corporation, and Jeremy Barretto, Liv Desaulniers, Viviana Berkman and Dana Poscente with Cassels Brock & Blackwell LLP<sup>1</sup>**

### Table of Contents

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Climate Change and Decarbonization.....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1.	Federal Emissions Reduction Plan 2030.....	3
2.2.	Clean Electricity Regulations .....	3
2.3.	Federal Clean Fuel Regulation.....	4
2.4.	Alberta Technology Innovation and Emissions Reduction Regulation .....	4
2.5.	British Columbia Low Carbon Fuels Act.....	5
2.6.	Federal Canadian Greenhouse Gas Offset Credit System Regulations .....	5
2.7.	Long-term Outlook on Electricity Supply .....	5
<b>3.</b>	<b>Power .....</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1.	Nuclear .....	6
3.2.	Geothermal .....	6
3.3.	Transmission .....	7
3.4.	Mines and Minerals.....	8
3.5.	Virtual Power Purchase Agreement .....	9
3.6.	Power Project and the Interests of Indigenous Peoples .....	9
3.7.	Amendment to Alberta’s Electricity Legislation Introduced by Bill 22: Electricity Statutes (Modernizing Alberta’s Electricity Grid) Amendment Act, 2022.....	11
<b>4.</b>	<b>Hydrogen .....</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1.	Federal Strategy .....	12
4.2.	Provincial Strategies .....	12
<b>5.</b>	<b>Cumulative Effects .....</b>	<b>13</b>
5.1.	Yahey and B.C. – Blueberry First Nations Agreement.....	14
5.2.	Treaty 8 First Nations’ Consensus Document .....	16
5.3.	Cumulative Effects Claims Following Yahey .....	16
<b>6.</b>	<b>Aboriginal Law.....</b>	<b>18</b>
6.1.	UNDRIP Legislation (B.C. and Federal).....	18

---

<sup>1</sup> The authors thank Selwynne Hawkins, Rayna Middleton and Kelsey Snodgrass for their significant assistance with this paper.

6.2.	Tahltan Central Government – B.C. Agreement.....	19
6.3.	Projects Owned by Indigenous Peoples.....	20
	In 2023 we saw an increase in large-scale Indigenous-owned energy projects. The three examples below illustrate the range of such projects. ....	20
6.4.	Duty to Consult and Legislative Power: Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians v. Ontario (Minister of Environment, Conservation and Parks) .....	22
6.5.	Injunctive Relief for Asserted but Unproven Aboriginal Title Claims: Reece v Canada (Attorney General) .....	23
<b>7.</b>	<b>Oil and Gas .....</b>	<b>23</b>
7.1.	Alberta’s Liability Management Incentive Program.....	23
7.2.	AER Directives.....	24
7.3.	Foothills Pipe Lines (South B.C.) Ltd. Foothills Zone 8 West Path Delivery 2023 Project Approval .....	25
<b>8.</b>	<b>Jurisdiction.....</b>	<b>26</b>
8.1.	Alberta Sovereignty Act.....	26
8.2.	Impact Assessment Act Reference .....	27
<b>9.</b>	<b>Standard of Review .....</b>	<b>27</b>
9.1.	Judicial Review of Regulations.....	27
9.2.	Standard of review for procedural fairness .....	28
9.3.	Additional category of correctness standard.....	29
9.4.	Statutory Restrictions on Judicial Review.....	29
9.5.	Bar Against Premature Judicial Reviews.....	29
9.6.	Other Standard of Review Cases in Energy Law .....	30
<b>10.</b>	<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>31</b>

## 1. Introduction

This article provides an overview of recent regulatory and legislative developments of interest to Canadian energy lawyers from April 2022 to March 2023. It includes discussions of recent regulatory decisions and related judicial decisions, as well as changes to regulatory and legislative regimes impacting energy law. This paper will also discuss and comment on a number of ongoing regulatory and legislative developments to watch for in the coming year. Topics discussed include the opportunities and challenges posed by decarbonization and the ongoing energy transition, cumulative effects, Aboriginal law and Indigenous partnerships, and other natural resources and electricity-related developments. This article covers updates across Canada – while many of the updates are from federal or western provincial jurisdictions, it also covers decarbonization and transmission in Ontario, Quebec, and the Atlantic provinces.

## 2. Climate Change and Decarbonization

In 2022 and early 2023, federal and provincial governments have taken aggressive measures to reduce carbon emissions.<sup>2</sup> Both levels of government have taken concrete steps in an effort to expedite the deployment of emerging technologies, such as small modular reactors, and to meet Canada’s ambitious greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.<sup>3</sup> In addition to announcing several funding initiatives to incentivize the development of renewable electricity generation, new federal and provincial regulations have been issued to support a net-zero electricity grid by 2030.

### 2.1. Federal Emissions Reduction Plan 2030

On March 29, 2022, the Government of Canada released the “2030 Emissions Reduction Plan – Canada’s Next Steps for Clean Air and a Strong Economy” (the “ERP”) under the Canadian Net-Zero Emissions Accountability Act – the first of a series of greenhouse gas (“GHG”) reduction plans. It sets a target of cutting GHG by 40% to 45% below 2005 levels by 2030.<sup>4</sup> The first ERP progress report is expected to be available in late 2023.

### 2.2. Clean Electricity Regulations

The *Clean Electricity Regulations*, previously known as Clean Electricity Standard, are an integral part of Canada’s goal of cutting GHG by 40% to 45% below 2005 levels by 2030 and net-zero emissions by 2050.<sup>5</sup> Although 82% of Canada’s electricity does not emit GHG, it is still a substantial source of emissions.<sup>6</sup> To aid with the development of the *Clean Electricity Regulations*, the Minister of Environment and Climate Change released a second engagement document, “Proposed Frame for the Clean Electricity Regulations” on July 26, 2022 to invite

---

<sup>2</sup> See for example, Environment and Climate Change Canada, *2030 Emissions Reduction Plan – Canada’s Next Steps for Clean Air and a Strong Economy* (Ottawa: Environment and Climate Change Canada, 2022), online: <<https://publications.gc.ca/site/eng/9.909338/publication.html>> [ERP]; *Technology Innovation and Emissions Reduction Regulation*, Alta Reg 133/2019 [TIER].

<sup>3</sup> ERP, *ibid*.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid* at 7.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid* at 40.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid* at 82-83.

interested stakeholders and key parties to provide their feedback.<sup>7</sup> The *Clean Electricity Regulations* were expected to be published by the end of 2022; however, they are now not expected to be available until sometime in 2023.

### 2.3. Federal Clean Fuel Regulation

On June 21, 2022, the Government of Canada released the Clean Fuel Regulations (“**CFR**”), which set strict requirements on producers and importers of liquid fossil fuels, such as gasoline and diesel, to reduce the carbon intensity (“**CI**”) of these fuels.<sup>8</sup> The CFR also establish a credit market, which is intended to create a market shift towards low CI fuels and projects that fit within the CFR compliance categories.<sup>9</sup> The Government of Canada projects the CFR will help cut 26.6 million tonnes of GHG by 2030.<sup>10</sup> The compliance obligations under the CFR take effect on July 1, 2023, with the first annual CI limits being 91.5 gCO<sub>2</sub>e/MJ for gasoline and 89.5 gCO<sub>2</sub>e/MJ for diesel.<sup>11</sup> Reduction requirements will increase by 1.5 gCO<sub>2</sub>e/MJ each year until 2030, when they will reach 81 gCO<sub>2</sub>e/MJ and 79 gCO<sub>2</sub>e/MJ for gasoline and diesel respectively.<sup>12</sup>

### 2.4. Alberta Technology Innovation and Emissions Reduction Regulation

The *Technology Innovation and Emissions Reduction Regulation* (“**TIER**”) governs Alberta’s industrial GHG emissions pricing and emissions trading system.<sup>13</sup> *TIER* applies to large emitters and opt-in facilities requiring them to reduce emissions to meet facility benchmarks and find innovative ways to invest in clean technology. On December 14, 2022, Alberta’s Minister of Energy released an Order in Council to amend the *TIER*, which will bring the *TIER* regime in line with minimum federal stringency standards, ensuring the carbon pricing system receives an exemption to the federal fuel charge under the Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act.<sup>14</sup> In addition, some of the other key changes introduced in this amendment include an increase in *TIER* fund price, the creation of carbon capture, utilization and storage (“**CCUS**”) credits, credit expiration for emission performance credits and offset, a limit on emission performance credits, offsets, or sequestration credits, and a 2% annual tightening rate on facility-specific benchmarks and high-performance benchmarks.<sup>15</sup> Although the creation of the credit system under *TIER* has generally been well-received, there is an emerging concern that a significant number of credits may be generated from large emitters that will ultimately flood the market. The resulting impact will be a reduction in value of the credits to CCUS projects.

---

<sup>7</sup> Government of Canada, “Proposed Frame for the Clean Electricity Regulations” (26 July 2022), online: <<https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/canadian-environmental-protection-act-registry/publications/proposed-frame-clean-electricity-regulations.html>>.

<sup>8</sup> *Clean Fuel Regulations*, SOR/2022-140 [CFR].

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> Government of Canada, News Release, “Government of Canada supports innovation in the fuel industry with final Clean Fuel Regulations” (29 June 2022).

<sup>11</sup> CFR, *supra* note 8.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>13</sup> *TIER*, *supra* note 2.

<sup>14</sup> *Technology Innovation and Emissions Reduction Amendment Regulation*, Alta Reg 251/2022.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

## 2.5. **British Columbia Low Carbon Fuels Act**

The Government of British Columbia (“B.C.”) passed the new *Low Carbon Fuels Act*<sup>16</sup> to replace the *Greenhouse Gas Reduction (Renewable and Low Carbon Fuel Requirements) Act*.<sup>17</sup> The *Low Carbon Fuels Act* will come into force January 1, 2024 and is intended to enable more greenhouse gas reduction and make low carbon fuel standards easier to understand, administer and enforce. Proposed new regulations to align with the *Low Carbon Fuels Act* are expected to be introduced in 2023. Some of the key changes under the *Low Carbon Fuels Act* include making all fossil-derived transportation fuels supplied in B.C. subject to carbon-intensity requirements and allowing access to fuel credits and trading to persons other than fuel suppliers.

## 2.6. **Federal Canadian Greenhouse Gas Offset Credit System Regulations**

On June 8, 2022, the Government of Canada released the *Canadian Greenhouse Gas Offset Credit System Regulations*, which launched Canada’s Greenhouse Gas Offset Credit System (“**Credit System**”).<sup>18</sup> The Credit System was created to encourage businesses, communities and industries to undertake projects that promote innovative strategies to reduce GHG emissions and, ultimately, to remove GHGs from the atmosphere. Participants under the Credit System must be registered and such reductions and removals of GHGs must come from activities that do not fall under an existing law or existing carbon pricing system. Offset credits can be sold and traded on the market. The first protocol that allows for generation of offset credits is the Landfill Methane Recovery and Destruction protocol for which landfill operators can receive offset credits if they obtain landfill gas and destroy it or use it.<sup>19</sup> There are additional protocols under development for other areas including refrigeration, agricultural, forest management, direct air carbon capture and sequestration.

## 2.7. **Long-term Outlook on Electricity Supply**<sup>20</sup>

Electricity market operators and other organizations across Canada have published their long-term forecasts for electricity supply and demand. The forecasts anticipate increased electricity needs and a broader range of electricity supply options as more energy production materializes. The forecasts consider increased electricity demands from emerging areas, such as CCUS, but also an increased desire by consumers for cleaner forms of energy. The IESO’s forecast illustrates a strong and steady growth of electricity demand through the end of the 2030’s. This anticipated growth is fueled by industrial sector development in the mid-2020s in mining, steel,

---

<sup>16</sup> *Low Carbon Fuels Act*, SBC 2022, c 21. This legislation was assented to June 2, 2022 but has not yet come into force.

<sup>17</sup> *Greenhouse Gas Reduction (Renewable and Low Carbon Fuel Requirements) Act*, SBC 2008, c 16.

<sup>18</sup> *Canadian Greenhouse Gas Offset Credit System Regulations*, SOR/2022-11.

<sup>19</sup> Environment and Climate Change Canada, *Landfill methane recovery and destruction, version 1.0* (Ottawa: Environment and Climate Change Canada, June 2022), online: <[canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/climate-change/pricing-pollution-how-it-will-work/output-based-pricing-system/federal-greenhouse-gas-offset-system/compendium-protocols/landfill-methane-recovery-destruction.html](https://canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/climate-change/pricing-pollution-how-it-will-work/output-based-pricing-system/federal-greenhouse-gas-offset-system/compendium-protocols/landfill-methane-recovery-destruction.html)>.

<sup>20</sup> Ontario, Independent Electricity System Operator, *Annual Planning Outlook, Ontario’s electricity system needs: 2024-2043* (Toronto: Independent Electricity System Operator, December 2022) at 16 and 48, online (pdf): <<https://www.ieso.ca/en/Sector-Participants/Planning-and-Forecasting/Annual-Planning-Outlook>>; Alberta Electric System Operator, *AESO Net-Zero Emissions Pathways Report* (Calgary: Alberta Electric System Operator, June 2022) at 6, online: <<https://www.aeso.ca/assets/AESO-Net-Zero-Emissions-Pathways-Report-July7.pdf>>. We anticipate that the Canada Energy Regulator will soon issue Canada’ Energy Future 2023, a report that analyzes and provides data on all energy commodities for all Canadian provinces and territories.

EV battery and hydrogen production. The AESO's forecast emphasized the need for a robust transmission system and highlighted the critical role of energy storage to ensure supply adequacy given the high penetration of renewables into the grid. The AESO anticipates that transitioning to a net-zero future will require an additional \$44 to \$52 billion in generation capital investments (including a return on investment), generation operating costs and in transmission system revenue requirements from 2022–2041.

### **3. Power**

Driven by Canada's commitment to achieve net-zero electricity by 2035, Canadian provinces are interested in diversifying their electricity portfolio and are looking into all potential alternatives to reduce carbon emissions. Areas of great interest in 2022 include Alberta's large geothermal resource potential and opportunities for regional transmission initiatives, such as the Atlantic Loop, to maximize the flow of clean electricity between provinces. The interest in energy storage and CCUS technologies grew considerably in 2022 and remains a topic of high interest in 2023. Although in 2022 several proposed electricity transmission projects were approved, provinces continue to grapple with the ever-growing concern of meeting future electricity capacity needs while ensuring electricity affordability.

#### **3.1. Nuclear**

Nuclear power is considered a large potential source of clean power. In 2022, small modular reactors ("**SMRs**") continued to attract the interest of industry and provincial governments given its desirable attributes, e.g., clean, easy to deploy and scalable to suit specific needs. The Government of Alberta, particularly, views SMR as a viable technology to decarbonize its oil and gas industry. On March 28, 2022, the governments of Ontario, Saskatchewan, New Brunswick and Alberta agreed to a joint strategic plan outlining the path forward on SMRs.<sup>21</sup> The provinces' strategic plan identified five key priority areas for SMR development and deployment, including positioning Canada as an exporter of SMR technology and creating opportunities for participation from Indigenous communities and public engagement. Significantly, 2022 was also marked by several funding commitments and development announcements in this area, including the federal government announcement of \$9.1 billion in new investments as part of the ERP. The growing interest for this technology has, not surprisingly, increased the pressure posed by stakeholders on the applicable regulator, the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, to streamline the approval and construction process for SMRs, which currently can take up to 10 or more years.<sup>22</sup>

#### **3.2. Geothermal**

Geothermal energy is heat originating from below the Earth's surface that can be used for generating clean electricity. Geothermal represents a reliable source of electricity that complements wind and solar electricity generation.

---

<sup>21</sup> Governments of Ontario, New Brunswick, Alberta, and Saskatchewan, *A Strategic Plan for the Deployment of Small Modular Reactors* (March 2022), online: <<https://open.alberta.ca/dataset/de9ebaba-81a7-456e-81a2-2c57cb11412e/resource/62319fa5-aa5a-4329-b980-5c85a924c7c7/download/energy-interprovincial-strategic-plan-deployment-of-smrs-2022.pdf>>.

<sup>22</sup> Government of Ontario, "A strategic plan for the deployment of small modular reactors" (modified 25 January 2023), online: <<https://www.ontario.ca/page/strategic-plan-deployment-small-modular-reactors>>.

On August 15, 2022, the Geothermal Resource Development Rules (“**Geothermal Rules**”) and Directive 089: *Requirements for Geothermal Resource Development* (“**Directive 089**”) came into effect to complete the regulatory framework for geothermal resource development in Alberta.<sup>23</sup> The Geothermal Rules introduce obligations and processes for geothermal energy development, including licence eligibility requirements.<sup>24</sup> Directive 089 specifically provides that i) Alberta Energy Regulator (“**AER**”) approval is required for all geothermal development activities (except site surveying); ii) geothermal licence holders are subject to the AER’s comprehensive liability assessment regime; iii) geothermal developments must be reclaimed prior to closure pursuant to AER’s Directive 020: *Well Abandonment*;<sup>25</sup> and iv) the *Surface Rights Act*<sup>26</sup> does not apply to geothermal resource development, imposing on project proponents the requirement to enter into an agreement directly with landowners whose property is impacted by the geothermal development. Geothermal energy is seen as an alternative to conventional fossil fuels to provide heat and energy and is another key aspect of the Province of Alberta’s net-zero goals.

### 3.3. Transmission

The Atlantic Loop is a proposed multi-billion-dollar project that would connect the four Atlantic Provinces – Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland & Labrador – to hydroelectricity from Quebec and Newfoundland & Labrador.<sup>27</sup> The proposal includes 800 kilometres of overhead power lines (mostly through New Brunswick) with capacity to carry 1,150 MWh. This project is a key component for Nova Scotia to phase out coal fired generation and reach its 2030 clean energy targets. Conversations are still underway for the Atlantic Loop with funding under dispute between the provinces and the Government of Canada. In the 2023 Federal Budget, the federal government committed to advancing the Atlantic Loop and indicated being in negotiations with provinces and utilities to identify a clear path to deliver it by 2030.<sup>28</sup>

On September 30, 2019, Hydro-Québec TransÉnergie (“**HQT**”) applied to the Canada Energy Regulator (“**CER**”) to construct and operate a 103 kilometre power line between the Appalaches Substation and a crossing point on the Canada-United States border – the Appalaches–Maine Interconnection Line Project (“**HQT Project**”).<sup>29</sup> The CER issued a permit for the HQT Project, subject to several conditions to ensure protection of the environment.<sup>30</sup> Once the HQT Project is

---

<sup>23</sup> The Government of Alberta had previously proclaimed, on December 7, 2021, the *Geothermal Resource Development Act*, SA 2020, c G-5.5

<sup>24</sup> *Geothermal Resources Development Rules*, Alta Reg 116/2022; Alberta Energy Regulator, *Directive 089: Requirements for Geothermal Resource Development* (Calgary: Alberta Energy Regulator, August 2022) [Directive 089].

<sup>25</sup> Alberta Energy Regulator, *Directive 020: Well Abandonment* (Calgary: Alberta Energy Regulator, October 2022).  
<sup>26</sup> RSA 2000, c S-24.

<sup>27</sup> See overview of prospects for the Atlantic Loop in Section 2 of Natural Resources Canada, Clean Power Planning Committee, *Clean Roadmap for Atlantic Canada – Final Report*, M4-220/2022E-PDF — 978-0-660-42096-7 (Ottawa: Clean Power Planning Committee) at 9-12, online (pdf): <<https://natural-resources.canada.ca/sites/nrcan/files/energy/images/publications/2022/A%20CLEAN%20POWER%20ROADMAP%20FOR%20ATLANTIC%20CANADA-ACC.pdf>>.

<sup>28</sup> Canada, Department of Finance, *Budget 2023, A Made-In-Canada Plan: Affordable Energy, Good Jobs, and a Growing Clean Economy*, Cat. No. 1719-7740 (Ottawa: Department of Finance Canada, 2023) Chapter 3 at 81.

<sup>29</sup> Canada Energy Regulator, *Letter Decision*, Doc. No. C13193-1 (Calgary: Canada Energy Regulator, May 2021), online: <[docs2.cer-rec.gc.ca/ll-eng/llisapi.dll/fetch/2000/90464/90548/3119846/3828338/4097651/C13193-1\\_Commission\\_Letter\\_Decision\\_-\\_HQT\\_-\\_Appalaches-Maine\\_Interconnection\\_Power\\_Line\\_-\\_A7T7Y8.pdf?nodeid=4097880&vernum=-2](https://docs2.cer-rec.gc.ca/ll-eng/llisapi.dll/fetch/2000/90464/90548/3119846/3828338/4097651/C13193-1_Commission_Letter_Decision_-_HQT_-_Appalaches-Maine_Interconnection_Power_Line_-_A7T7Y8.pdf?nodeid=4097880&vernum=-2)>.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*

completed it will increase the exchange capacity between Québec and New England by 1,200 megawatts and supply Massachusetts with 9.45 terawatt hours of clean hydropower annually for 20 years. Additionally, the HQT Project is expected to cut 3 million metric tonnes of GHGs (the equivalent of taking 700,000 cars off the road).

The Hydro One Project in Ontario consists of a new, approximately 49-kilometre long, 230 kilovolt (kV) double-circuit transmission line.<sup>31</sup> It had been designated as a priority project by an Provincial Order in Council, and therefore, the Ontario Energy Board ("**OEB**") was to accept it was needed when considering whether to grant Hydro One Networks Inc.'s ("**Hydro One**") leave for construction. On November 24, 2022, the OEB issued a decision granting Hydro One's request for leave to construct a double-circuit transmission line and associated station facilities in the municipalities of Chatham-Kent and Lakeshore and the County of Essex (the "**Hydro One Project**"). The Hydro One Project is one of several projects intended to accommodate growing demand in southwestern Ontario and to improve the power supply reliability for customers in the Windsor-Essex region.

Hydro One plans to develop four new transmission line projects, two of which will be single-circuit 500 kilovolt transmission lines from Longwood Transformer Station to Lakeshore Transformer Station. The first line is anticipated to be completed by 2030, while the second line will be determined upon further planning by the Independent Electricity System Operator ("**IESO**"). Engagement with Indigenous peoples and members of the public, stakeholders and other interested parties is stated to be underway in an effort for Hydro One to consider the needs and interests of those potentially impacted by the development of the planned projects.

### **3.4. Mines and Minerals**

The Canadian Critical Minerals Strategy ("**Strategy**") was released in December 2022 to boost the production and processing of Canada's critical minerals, including lithium, graphite, copper, nickel, cobalt, and rare earth metals, given their potential to promote significant economic growth in the country. Critical minerals are key to the development of electric vehicle batteries and contribute to the global transition towards sustainability and clean technology. Following the release of the Strategy, the Government of Canada is seeking long-term, multi-stakeholder partnerships from industry, provincial, territorial, Indigenous and international partners to promote critical mineral development.

On November 30, 2022, the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and the Minister responsible for the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada approved the Marathon Palladium Project ("**Marathon Project**") – a palladium mine located 10 kilometres from Marathon, Ontario for the production of critical minerals, specifically platinum group metals used in the manufacturing of automotive catalytic converters and copper for the development of electric vehicles. The Marathon Project is consistent with the Strategy. The Joint Review Panel ("**Panel**") completed an environmental assessment for the Marathon Project dated August 2, 2022, which included consideration of cumulative effects for each valued ecosystem component

---

<sup>31</sup> See Hydro One Networks Inc.'s Application for leave to construct a double-circuit transmission line between Chatham Switching Station and Lakeshore Transformer Station and associated station facilities in the municipalities of Chatham-Kent and Lakeshore and the County of Essex: *Decision and Order EB-2022-0140* (24 November 2022), online: Ontario Energy Board <<https://www.rds.oeb.ca/CMWebDrawer/Record/762287/File/document>>.



that may be impacted by the Marathon Project.<sup>32</sup> For instance, the Panel concluded that the Marathon Project is not likely to result in a cumulative effect on ground and surface water quantity or quality but is likely to cause an adverse cumulative effect on critical habitat for caribou.<sup>33</sup> However, the Government of Canada ultimately approved the Marathon Project with 269 legally binding conditions to protect the environment throughout the life of the project.<sup>34</sup>

### **3.5. Virtual Power Purchase Agreement**

A virtual power purchase agreement (“**VPPA**”) is a financial agreement between a seller and a purchaser where there is no physical exchange of energy. Rather, the seller sells the electricity to the local wholesale electricity market at market price and the buyer continues to get their electricity from the utility regulator at the utility rate. As a result, it creates more certainty regarding electricity costs and protects from market price volatility. Over the last decade, VPPAs have seen a growing demand by corporations in order to meet their performance goals. For example, Campbell Soup Co. entered into a 12-year VPPA with Enel North America to purchase electricity from Enel North America’s wind farm in November 2022.<sup>35</sup> In 2022, the market for corporate renewable energy procurement in Canada bounded over 2 gigawatt.<sup>36</sup>

### **3.6. Power Project and the Interests of Indigenous Peoples**

#### **3.6.1. The Lake Erie Connector Project – Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity**

In 2015, ITC Lake Erie Connector LLC (“**ITC**”) applied for a certificate of public convenience and necessity with the National Energy Board, the predecessor to the CER, to construct and operate an international power line called the Lake Erie Connector Project (“**Lake Erie Project**”). The Lake Erie Project was a proposed 117-kilometre high-voltage power line to transfer electricity between Ontario, Canada and Pennsylvania, in the United States, crossing Lake Erie.<sup>37</sup> The project was found to be in the public interest and a certificate was issued with various conditions with respect to the project in 2017.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Joint Review Panel Established by the Federal Minister of the Environment and Climate Change and the Ontario Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks, *Report of the Joint Review Panel: Marathon Palladium Project* (2 August 2022), online (pdf): <<https://iaac-aeic.gc.ca/050/documents/p54755/144649E.pdf>>.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid* at 124, 204.

<sup>34</sup> Impact Assessment Agency of Canada, News Release, “Government of Canada Approves the Marathon Palladium Project” (30 November 2022).

<sup>35</sup> Campbell Soup Company, News Release, “Campbell Enters Into Renewable Energy Agreement With Enel North America to Advance Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets” (21 November 2022), online: <[campbellsoupcompany.com/newsroom/press-releases/campbell-enters-into-renewable-energy-agreement-with-enel-north-america-to-advance-greenhouse-gas-reduction-targets/](http://campbellsoupcompany.com/newsroom/press-releases/campbell-enters-into-renewable-energy-agreement-with-enel-north-america-to-advance-greenhouse-gas-reduction-targets/)>.

<sup>36</sup> Nagwan Al-Guneid, “Renewable Energy Target Raised to Match Corporate Purchasing Enthusiasm” (23 November 2022), online: *Business Renewables Centre* <<https://businessrenewables.ca/news/renewable-energy-target-raised-match-corporate-purchasing-enthusiasm>>.

<sup>37</sup> ITC Lake Erie Connector, Project Description (Parts 1, 2 and 3) filed with the National Energy Board on January 30, 2015, (Doc. IDs. A4G9Y1, A4G9Y2, A4G9Y3).

<sup>38</sup> Canada Energy Regulator, *Letter Decision – ITC Lake Erie Connector LLC* (Calgary: Canada Energy Regulator, 25 August 2022) at 2, online: <[docs2.cer-rec.gc.ca/eng/llisapi.dll/fetch/2000/90464/90548/2680096/2785333/3300238/4261671/C20667-1\\_Commission\\_%E2%80%93\\_Letter\\_Decision\\_%E2%80%93\\_ITC\\_Lake\\_Erie\\_Connector\\_LLC\\_%E2%80%93\\_ITC\\_International\\_Power\\_Line\\_%E2%80%93\\_2021\\_Variance\\_Request\\_to\\_Conditions\\_2\\_and\\_5\\_of\\_Certificate\\_EC-056\\_-\\_A8G1D0.pdf?nodeid=4261672&vernum=-2](https://docs2.cer-rec.gc.ca/eng/llisapi.dll/fetch/2000/90464/90548/2680096/2785333/3300238/4261671/C20667-1_Commission_%E2%80%93_Letter_Decision_%E2%80%93_ITC_Lake_Erie_Connector_LLC_%E2%80%93_ITC_International_Power_Line_%E2%80%93_2021_Variance_Request_to_Conditions_2_and_5_of_Certificate_EC-056_-_A8G1D0.pdf?nodeid=4261672&vernum=-2)>.

### 3.6.2. *The Lake Erie Connector Project – Variance Application*

On September 29, 2021, ITC filed the 2021 Variance Application requesting that the CER extend the time for the commencement of construction of the project to June 26, 2024, replace ITC to LEC GP Inc. on behalf of Lake Erie LP, and to amend the Certificate accordingly.<sup>39</sup> The Haudenosaunee Development Institute (“**HDI**”) on behalf of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy Chiefs Council and the Haudenosaunee made submissions regarding the 2021 Variance Application indicating the Project will seriously impair the exercise of their rights.<sup>40</sup> Additionally, the HDI submitted that the Crown and ITC failed to obtain the consent of the Haudenosaunee, as required by the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and had failed to meaningfully engage with the Haudenosaunee.<sup>41</sup> ITC, on the other hand, argued that the CER’s assessment is limited to considering the impact of the specific variances being the request to extend the commencement of project and to transfer the Certificate.<sup>42</sup> The CER determined that considering HDI’s submissions, the broader project impacts were not properly within the CER’s mandate in the context of the 2021 Variance Application.<sup>43</sup> The requested variances were found to be in the public interest and the 2021 Variance Application was approved and the Amending Order was issued.<sup>44</sup>

### 3.6.3. *The Manitoba-Minnesota Transmission Project – Appeal to the Federal Court of Appeal*

The Federal Court of Appeal (“**FCA**”) upheld a CER decision concerning the implementation and tracking of commitments made to the Manitoba Metis Federation (“**MMF**”) with respect to the Manitoba-Minnesota Transmission Project (“**MMT Project**”),<sup>45</sup> an international power line between Winnipeg and the Manitoba-Minnesota border. The CER decision had found Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board (“**Manitoba Hydro**”) to be compliant with Condition 3 of its Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity issued for the MMT Project. MMF asserted that Manitoba Hydro was not in compliance with its commitments made to Indigenous groups captured by Condition 3, as modified by the Governor in Council, and failed to track those commitments as required by Condition 15.<sup>46</sup> The CER determined that the major-agreed upon points that were reduced to writing on June 29, 2017 (the “**MAP**”), which provided for the payment by Manitoba Hydro to the MMF of \$1.5 million annually for 20 years and a one-time lump sum payment of \$37,500,00 to be held in a legacy fund for the benefit of MMF, was not a commitment made to MMF.<sup>47</sup> The CER concluded that only formal commitments need to be tracked for compliance. The FCA found that although the MAP may have been put on the record by MMF in the proceedings, Manitoba Hydro must formally agree to the commitments for the CER to be in a position to enforce them as regulatory conditions.<sup>48</sup> Since Manitoba Hydro objected to the MAP forming part of the record of the proceedings leading to the CER’s decision, it is not a

---

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid* at 1.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid* at 9.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid* at 10.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid* at 11.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid* at 13.

<sup>45</sup> *Manitoba Métis Federation Inc v Canada (Energy Regulator)*, 2023 FCA 24.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid* at paras 20-21.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid* at para 47.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid* at para 168.

commitment captured by Condition 3 and therefore, not required to be tracked under Condition 15.<sup>49</sup>

We note that the Governor in Council released an Order in Council, directing the National Energy Board to issue the Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for the MMT Project. The Peguis First Nation, the Roseau River Anishinabe First Nation, the Long Plain First Nation and the Animakee Wa Zhing #37 First Nation filed a judicial review of the Order in Council for the MMP Project.<sup>50</sup> The applicants claimed that Canada failed to properly assess the scope of its duty to consult and accommodate them. The Federal Court found that Canada did not adequately discharge its duty to consult the Peguis First Nation because although the framework established for consultation was sufficiently robust to satisfy the duty to consult, in execution it did not because there was no effort by Canada to ascertain Peguis' outstanding concerns. In contrast, the Federal Court found that Canada met its duty to consult and accommodate the Roseau River Anishinabe First Nation, the Long Plain First Nation and the Animakee Wa Zhing #37 First Nation, concluding that there was substantive dialogue between Canada and the three First Nations.<sup>51</sup>

### **3.7. Amendment to Alberta's Electricity Legislation Introduced by Bill 22: Electricity Statutes (Modernizing Alberta's Electricity Grid) Amendment Act, 2022**

On May 31, 2022, *the Electricity Statutes (Modernizing Alberta's Electricity Grid) Amendment Act* ("Bill 22") received Royal Assent and was passed by the Legislative Assembly of Alberta. The legislative amendments introduced by Bill 22 will come into force on proclamation, at the same time as related regulations are brought into force. Bill 22 introduces amendments to the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act*,<sup>52</sup> the *Electric Utilities Act*,<sup>53</sup> and the *Alberta Utilities Commission Act*.<sup>54</sup> Some of the most anticipated amendments relate to the implementation of definitions of "energy storage" and "energy storage facility" into the existing regulatory framework, and the introduction of a new exemption under the *Electric Utilities Act*, allowing owners of generation units to both self-supply and sell excess power to the electricity grid.

## **4. Hydrogen**

In this section we provide updates on progress towards implementing the federal and provincial hydrogen strategies.

---

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid* at paras 130, 168, 181, 185.

<sup>50</sup> *Peguis First Nation v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2021 FC 990.

<sup>51</sup> The Roseau River Anishinabe First Nation, the Long Plain First Nation and the Animakee Wa Zhing #37 First Nation appealed the Federal Court's decision to the Federal Court of Appeal (Filing Nos. A-280-21, A-281-21, and A284-21).

<sup>52</sup> RSA 2000, c H-16.

<sup>53</sup> SA 2003, c E-5.1.

<sup>54</sup> SA 2007, c A-37.2.

## 4.1. Federal Strategy

In December 2020, the Government of Canada published its “Hydrogen Strategy for Canada” (the “**Federal Hydrogen Strategy**”).<sup>55</sup> The Federal Hydrogen Strategy identifies the need for new hydrogen supply and distribution infrastructure and to promote uptake in various end-uses. The Federal Hydrogen Strategy is comprised of eight pillars and 32 recommendations for the near-, medium-, and long-term development of the hydrogen industry in Canada.<sup>56</sup>

We are now over halfway through the first phase of the Federal Hydrogen Strategy, which was slated for 2020-2025. One notable recent development was the announcement of almost \$10 million of federal investment to advance Alberta’s hydrogen economy.<sup>57</sup> The federal investment is meant to improve access to hydrogen fuels, support product testing, attract investment to Alberta’s hydrogen industry, and increase the availability of training opportunities to commercialize new technologies, while supporting jobs for Albertan workers.

## 4.2. Provincial Strategies

### 4.2.1. B.C. Energy Statutes Amendment Act, 2022

B.C. revealed the B.C. Hydrogen Strategy in 2021.<sup>58</sup> In November 2022, the B.C. legislature passed the *Energy Statutes Amendment Act, 2022* (“**ESAA 2022**”).<sup>59</sup> The *ESAA 2022* replaces the *Oil and Gas Activities Act*<sup>60</sup> and makes changes to the *Petroleum and Natural Gas Act*.<sup>61</sup> The *ESAA 2022* renames B.C.’s Oil and Gas Commission the B.C. Energy Regulator (“**BCER**”), and gives the BCER jurisdiction over hydrogen, as well as oil, gas, ammonia, and methanol. Many of the sections of the *ESAA 2022* that affect hydrogen will not come into force until subsequent regulations are enacted.

### 4.2.2. Alberta Hydrogen Roadmap

The Alberta Ministry of Energy published the Alberta Hydrogen Roadmap in November 2021.<sup>62</sup> In March 2022 the Government of Alberta issued an Order-in-Council directing the Alberta

---

<sup>55</sup> Natural Resources Canada, *Hydrogen Strategy for Canada: Seizing the Opportunities for Hydrogen – A Call to Action*, Cat. No. M134-65/2020E-PDF (Ottawa: Natural Resources Canada, December 2020), online (pdf): <[https://natural-resources.canada.ca/sites/nrcan/files/environment/hydrogen/NRCan\\_Hydrogen-Strategy-Canada-na-en-v3.pdf](https://natural-resources.canada.ca/sites/nrcan/files/environment/hydrogen/NRCan_Hydrogen-Strategy-Canada-na-en-v3.pdf)> [Federal Hydrogen Strategy].

<sup>56</sup> See summary and discussion in Gavin Fitch KC, Michael Barbero & Kimberly Wasylenchuk, “Hydrogen Roadmap: Policy, Regulation, and Prospect for Future Developments in Alberta” (2022) 60:2 *Alta L Rev* 435 at 445.

<sup>57</sup> Government of Canada, News Release “Minister Vandal announces federal investment to advance Alberta’s hydrogen economy” (17 January 2023), online: <<https://www.canada.ca/en/prairies-economic-development/news/2023/01/minister-vandal-announces-federal-investment-to-advance-albertas-hydrogen-economy.html>>.

<sup>58</sup> Government of British Columbia, *BC Hydrogen Strategy: A Sustainable Pathway for BC’s Energy Transition* (Victoria: Government of British Columbia, 2021), online: <[https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/farming-natural-resources-and-industry/electricity-alternative-energy/electricity/bc-hydro-review/bc\\_hydrogen\\_strategy\\_final.pdf](https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/farming-natural-resources-and-industry/electricity-alternative-energy/electricity/bc-hydro-review/bc_hydrogen_strategy_final.pdf)>. Discussed thoroughly in Fitch et al, *supra* note 56.

<sup>59</sup> Bill 37, *Energy Statutes Amendment Act, 2022*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Sess, 42<sup>nd</sup> Parl, 2022 (as passed by the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia 24 November 2022) [*ESAA 2022*].

<sup>60</sup> SBC 2008, c 36.

<sup>61</sup> RSBC 1996, c 361.

<sup>62</sup> Government of Alberta Ministry of Energy, *Alberta Hydrogen Roadmap* (November 2021), online (pdf): <<https://open.alberta.ca/dataset/d7749512-25dc-43a5-86f1-e8b5aaec7db4/resource/538a7827-9d13-4b06-9d1d-d52b851c8a2a/download/energy-alberta-hydrogen-roadmap-2021.pdf>>.

Utilities Commission (“**AUC**”) to inquire and report to the Minister of Energy on the viability and impacts of hydrogen blending into natural gas distribution systems in Alberta, resulting in a June 2022 report.<sup>63</sup>

The AUC found that the current allocation of responsibilities between relevant Alberta agencies is capable of regulating hydrogen development and integration into the low-pressure distribution system. In the report the AUC recommended updating the definition of “gas” in the *Gas Utilities Act* and *Gas Distribution Act* to include “up to 20 per cent hydrogen by volume” as the most efficient way to enable hydrogen blending in Alberta. The AUC’s view was that, pending further study, competitive retailers should be responsible for procuring hydrogen unless a competitive market does not exist in which case distributors should perform procurement. Other matters considered in the report included safety issues, harmonizing regulations with federal and provincial governments, delivery to rural consumers, and issues around blending. The AUC noted it is too early to consider allocation of capital and commodity costs, and suggested the Alberta Government may need to establish a clear policy to balance the social and environmental factors of blending hydrogen with the affordability of utility services for customers. Overall, the report represents a thorough analysis of potential issues with integrating hydrogen into Alberta’s natural gas system, and is a strong step in line with the Alberta Hydrogen Roadmap.

#### **4.2.3. Ontario’s Low Carbon Hydrogen Strategy<sup>64</sup>**

Ontario’s hydrogen strategy was issued in April 2022. At the same time, the Ontario Ministry of Energy directed the IESO to investigate and propose program options to integrate low-carbon hydrogen technologies into Ontario’s electricity grid. The IESO’s final report to the Ministry highlighted hydrogen storage and generation, and potentially blending hydrogen in natural gas-fired turbines.<sup>65</sup> In January 2023, the Ministry of Energy further directed the IESO to develop and implement a Hydrogen Innovation Fund to integrate hydrogen technologies into Ontario’s electricity grid. Engagement on the fund is ongoing at the time of writing.<sup>66</sup>

## **5. Cumulative Effects**

The law on cumulative effects continues to evolve following the 2021 B.C. Supreme Court (“**BCSC**”) decision in *Yahey v. British Columbia* (“**Yahey**”).<sup>67</sup> While there has yet to be a pronouncement at appeal-court level of the *Yahey* analysis, precedents on how to practically address cumulative effects with adverse impacts on the exercise of Aboriginal and treaty rights continue to develop. These precedents, as well as other cumulative effect claims brought by Indigenous peoples following *Yahey*, indicate a trend towards regulatory cooperation in acknowledgment of Indigenous self-governance.

---

<sup>63</sup> Alberta Utilities Commission, *Hydrogen Inquiry Report*, Proceeding 27256 (Calgary: Alberta Utilities Commission, June 30, 2022), online (pdf): <[https://media.www.auc.ab.ca/prd-wp-uploads/regulatory\\_documents/Reference/HydrogenInquiryReport.pdf](https://media.www.auc.ab.ca/prd-wp-uploads/regulatory_documents/Reference/HydrogenInquiryReport.pdf)>.

<sup>64</sup> Government of Ontario, *Ontario’s Low Carbon Hydrogen Strategy: A Path Forward* (Toronto: Government of Ontario, 7 April 2022), online: <[www.ontario.ca/page/ontarios-low-carbon-hydrogen-strategy](http://www.ontario.ca/page/ontarios-low-carbon-hydrogen-strategy)>. Discussed in Fitch et al, *supra* note 56.

<sup>65</sup> Ontario Independent Electric System Operator, “Hydrogen Innovation Fund: Request for Proposals”, online: <<https://www.ieso.ca/en/Sector-Participants/Engagement-Initiatives/Engagements/Low-Carbon-Hydrogen-Strategy>>.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>67</sup> 2021 BCSC 1287 [*Yahey*].

These developments contribute to a better understanding—and, accordingly, greater certainty for industry—of regulators’ expectations in relation to a project’s cumulative effects. However, the developing case law and regulatory decisions dealing with cumulative effects fail to provide a conceptual analysis of cumulative effects separate and distinct from impacts of project development on Indigenous interests. With growing governmental efforts in the realm of conservation,<sup>68</sup> it remains unclear how regulators will assess statutory cumulative effects requirements in the context of broader environmental goals.<sup>69</sup>

## **5.1. Yahey and B.C. – Blueberry First Nations Agreement**

### **5.1.1. Blueberry River First Nations Implementation Agreement**

On January 18, 2023, in response to the BCSC decision in *Yahey*, the Government of B.C. and the Blueberry River First Nations (“**BRFN**”) entered into the Blueberry River First Nations Implementation Agreement (“**Implementation Agreement**”).<sup>70</sup>

In *Yahey*, the BCSC found that the cumulative effects of industrial development permitted by B.C. within BRFN’s traditional territory (“**Claim Area**”) unjustifiably infringed the ability of BRFN to meaningfully exercise rights guaranteed to BRFN under Treaty 8.<sup>71</sup> The BCSC ordered that: (i) B.C. was not entitled to continue authorizing activities in breach of the promises in Treaty 8, including B.C.’s honorable and fiduciary obligations associated with Treaty 8, or activities that unjustifiably infringed BRFN’s exercise of its treaty rights; and (ii) B.C. and BRFN were required to act with diligence to consult and negotiate for the purpose of establishing timely enforceable mechanisms to assess and manage the cumulative impact of industrial development on BRFN’s treaty rights.<sup>72</sup>

Following the decision, the parties entered into negotiations to develop processes for addressing cumulative effects within the Claim Area and entered into an interim agreement on October 7, 2021 (“**Interim Agreement**”).<sup>73</sup> Considering the BCSC’s orders in *Yahey*, the decision had significant impacts on project activities proposed to occur in the Claim Area, most significantly in respect of regulatory approvals. As part of the measures in the Interim Agreement, B.C. and BRFN agreed to allow 195 authorizations for projects granted prior to

---

<sup>68</sup> In recent years, the Government of Canada has issued plans and messaging indicating that cumulative effects, conservation, and climate change are priorities. See e.g. Environment and Climate Change Canada, *2022-2023 Departmental Plan* (Ottawa: Environment and Climate Change Canada, 2022), online (pdf): <[https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection\\_2022/eccc/En1-65-2022-eng.pdf](https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2022/eccc/En1-65-2022-eng.pdf)>; Government of Canada, News Release, “Delivering clean air and a strong economy for Canadians” (29 March 2022); Environment and Climate Change Canada, “Government of Canada interim message on cumulative effects” (24 August 2022), online: <<https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/cumulative-effects/interim-messaging.html>>; Fisheries and Oceans Canada, “Reaching Canada’s marine conservation targets” (8 February 2023), online: <<https://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/oceans/conservation/plan/index-eng.html>>.

<sup>69</sup> See for example Section 22(1)(a) and 22(1)(c) of the *Impact Assessment Act*, SC 2019, c 28, s 1.

<sup>70</sup> *Blueberry River First Nations Implementation Agreement*, 18 January 2023, online: *Government of British Columbia* <[https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/natural-resource-stewardship/consulting-with-first-nations/agreements/blueberry\\_river\\_implementation\\_agreement.pdf](https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/natural-resource-stewardship/consulting-with-first-nations/agreements/blueberry_river_implementation_agreement.pdf)> [*Implementation Agreement*].

<sup>71</sup> *Yahey*, *supra* note 67 at paras 1116, 1132 and 1881.

<sup>72</sup> *Yahey*, *supra* note 67 at para 1888.

<sup>73</sup> British Columbia, News Release, “B.C., Blueberry River First Nations reach agreement on existing permits, restoration funding” (7 October 2021), online: <<https://news.gov.bc.ca/releases/2021IRR0063-001940>>.

*Yahey* to proceed immediately and prioritized the review of permit applications based on emergency, environmental protection and public safety reasons.<sup>74</sup>

BC and BRFN entered into the Implementation Agreement to cooperate in the management of land, water, wildlife and resource development in the Claim Area so that BRFN members can meaningfully exercise their Treaty 8 rights.<sup>75</sup> The Implementation Agreement contemplates a Cumulative Effects Management Regime, aimed at the following goals: (i) enhancing restoration of previously disturbed areas; (ii) creating new areas protected from industrial disturbance; and (iii) supporting and constraining certain development activities while the parties develop permanent measures.<sup>76</sup>

The Implementation Agreement includes the following measures:

- \* Designation of high-value areas (“**HV1**”) within the Claim Area where certain industrial activities will be prohibited or limited.<sup>77</sup> The parties will agree on the form of legislative or regulatory protection for HV1 areas.<sup>78</sup>
- \* Development of a potential carbon offset project within the Claim Area, whereby BRFN will accrue the economic benefits as follows: (i) 100% ownership for HV1 areas; and (ii) substantive ownership for other areas within the Claim Area.<sup>79</sup>
- \* Joint decision-making for future industrial development and, in some defined circumstances, requirements of consent by BRFN.<sup>80</sup>
- \* Expedited consideration of existing priority natural resource applications<sup>81</sup> and processes for new natural resource applications to be reviewed “in a timely manner”.<sup>82</sup>
- \* Creation and funding of a \$200-million restoration fund by B.C. and third parties by June 2025 in support of restoration efforts within the Claim Area.<sup>83</sup>
- \* Establishment of new-disturbance caps ranging from 200 to 550 hectares per calendar year depending on the area in question, a disturbance fee payable by applicants and disturbance reporting obligations by regulators to BRFN and B.C..<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> BC Energy Regulator, News Release, “The Province and Blueberry River First Nations are working together on a path forward in the Claim Area, following the June 2021 B.C. Supreme Court decision” (7 October 2021), online: <<https://www.bc-er.ca/news/b-c-blueberry-river-first-nations-reach-agreement-on-existing-permits-restoration-funding-in-db-2021-28/>>.

<sup>75</sup> British Columbia, News Release, “Province, Blueberry River First Nations reach agreement” (18 January 2023), online: <<https://news.gov.bc.ca/releases/2023WLR0004-000043>>.

<sup>76</sup> *Implementation Agreement*, *supra* note 70, art 2.2.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid*, arts 5-7.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid*, art 5.3.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid*, art 5.4.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid*, arts 6.4, 6.5, 6.9, 7.3, 15.3.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid*, art 9.5.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid*, art 9.2.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid*, arts 10.1, 10.3 and 10.4.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid*, arts 14.1, 14.2 and 14.7.

## 5.2. *Treaty 8 First Nations' Consensus Document*

As another implication of *Yahey*, on January 20, 2023, B.C. and four Treaty 8 First Nations—i.e., Fort Nelson, Saulteau, Halfway River and Doig River First Nations (“**Treaty 8 First Nations**”)—co-developed a set of initiatives for land and resource planning (“**Consensus Document**”).<sup>85</sup>

The goal of the Consensus Document is to address the cumulative impacts of industrial development on the meaningful exercise of Treaty 8 rights in the territory, restore the land, and provide stability and predictability for industry in the region. The proposed initiatives in the Consensus Document include shared decision-making, a cumulative-effects management system, as well as a shared restoration fund and a new revenue-sharing approach.

## 5.3. *Cumulative Effects Claims Following Yahey*

### 5.3.1. *Duncan's First Nation Claim*

On July 18, 2022, Duncan's First Nation (“**DFN**”) filed a claim against the Government of Alberta similar to *Yahey* on the basis that Alberta breached its obligations under Treaty 8 by authorizing development within DFN's traditional territory without regard to cumulative effects and consequent adverse cumulative impacts on DFN's exercise of their treaty rights.<sup>86</sup> DFN claims that Alberta has deficient mechanisms for assessing cumulative effects<sup>87</sup> and, as a result, has issued (and continues to issue) authorizations for projects related to agriculture, energy, forestry, mining, transportation and other developments within DFN's traditional territory.

On January 30, 2023, Alberta filed a Statement of Defence and, on February 9, 2023, the plaintiffs filed a reply to the Crown's Statement of Defence. The proceedings are currently ongoing.

### 5.3.2. *Missanabie Cree First Nation, Brunswick House First Nation and Chapleau Cree First Nation Claim*

On September 30, 2022, Missanabie Cree First Nation, Brunswick House First Nation and Chapleau Cree First Nation (“**Treaty 9 First Nations**”) launched a claim against the Government of Ontario for Ontario's management of boreal forests within the Treaty 9 First Nations' traditional territories.<sup>88</sup> The Treaty 9 First Nations claim that Ontario has breached its obligations under Treaty 9 by authorizing significant development the cumulative effects of which have adversely impacted the health of boreal forests within their traditional territories and,

---

<sup>85</sup> British Columbia, Office of the Premier, News Release “B.C., Treaty 8 first Nations build path forward together” (20 January 2023), online: <<https://news.gov.bc.ca/releases/2023PREM0005-000060>>.

<sup>86</sup> *Gladue et al v Her Majesty the Queen in Right of The Province of Alberta* (18 July 2022), (Statement of Claim), online (pdf): *JFK Law* <<http://jfkllaw.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/DFN-%E2%80%93-Statement-of-Claim-%E2%80%93-18-July-2022.pdf>> [Statement of Claim].

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid* at 15.

<sup>88</sup> Brunswick House First Nation, Chapleau Cree First Nation & Missanabie Cree First Nation, Media Release, “Treaty 9 First Nations bring legal action to stop degradation of the boreal forest in their traditional territories” (4 October 2022) [Treaty 9 Press Release]; Lynette Fortune and Stephanie Matteis, News Release “Canada, home to a massive boreal forest, lobbied to limit U.S., EU anti-deforestation bills” (10 March 2023), online: <<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/canada-boreal-deforestation-lobbying-1.6773789>>; “3 northern First Nations take Ontario to court over environmental protection, treaty rights” *CBC News* (6 October 2022), online: <<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/sudbury/first-nations-ontario-court-1.6608276>>.



as a result, the Treaty 9 First Nations' livelihoods and way of life.<sup>89</sup> In addition to declarations similar to those ordered in *Yahey*, the Treaty 9 First Nations are seeking compensation for past damages.<sup>90</sup>

On October 17, 2022, Ontario filed a notice of intent to defend the claim. Under Rule 18.02 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*, RRO 1990, Reg 194, a notice of intent to defend provides a defendant an additional 10 days to serve and file a Statement of Defence. However, counsel may agree to defer the deadline to file the Statement of Defence indefinitely. According to information obtained from the Ontario courts, various case conferences have been scheduled on this matter.<sup>91</sup>

### **5.3.3. NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd. West Path Delivery 2023 Project Approval**

On May 24, 2022, the Commission of the CER ("**Commission**") issued its report ("**CER Report**") on an application by NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd. ("**NGTL**") to construct and operate the West Path Delivery 2023 Project ("**NGTL Project**").<sup>92</sup> The NGTL Project is an extension of approximately 39 kilometres of new natural gas pipeline in southwestern Alberta to the existing 25,000-kilometre NGTL system.

As part of the CER Report, the Commission considered the NGTL Project's cumulative effects, understood as the impacts of residual effects associated with the NGTL Project in combination with the residual effects from other projects and activities that have been or are reasonably foreseeable to be carried out within the appropriate temporal and spatial boundaries and ecological context.<sup>93</sup> The Commission explained that its approach for cumulative effects assessments is to consider not only total cumulative effects but also a project's relative contribution to total cumulative effects: "If the total cumulative effects are considered to be high (e.g., exceed a relevant threshold for a particular [valued component]), then effects on that component will generally be found to be significant unless the NGTL Project contribution to total cumulative effects is negligible".<sup>94</sup>

As part of its cumulative effects analysis, the Commission considered cumulative effects on Traditional Land and Resource Use. The Commission found the NGTL Project's contribution to total cumulative effects on Traditional Land and Resources Use in the region to be negligible. In reaching this conclusion, the Commission characterized the effects as ranging from short-term to long-term in duration, local to regional in geographical extent, low to moderate in magnitude and of low to medium significance depending on the NGTL Project area.<sup>95</sup> The Commission

---

<sup>89</sup> Treaty 9 Press Release, *supra* note 88; Isaac Phan Nay, "Three First Nations have filed for legal action against Ontario over boreal forests", *Toronto Star* (4 October 2022), online: <<https://www.thestar.com/news/ontario/2022/10/04/three-first-nations-have-begun-legal-action-against-ontario-over-damage-to-boreal-forests.html>>.

<sup>90</sup> Phan Nay, Oct 2022 *supra* note 89.

<sup>91</sup> The authors contacted counsel to request an update on this matter but, at the time of publication, had not received a response.

<sup>92</sup> Commission of the Canada Energy Regulator, *Report GH-002-2020, NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd. - West Path Delivery 2023 Project*, Doc. No C19299 (24 May 2022) [*CER Report*].

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid*, PDF 41.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid*, PDF 92.

highlighted that NGTL chose to locate the NGTL Project almost entirely on private land and paralleling existing rights of way.

In response to concerns from Indigenous peoples, the Commission imposed various conditions on the NGTL Project, including requiring updates to Traditional Land and Resource Use investigations and other plans and engagement with affected Indigenous peoples.<sup>96</sup>

The Commission stated:

The Commission heard the concerns raised by Indigenous peoples about the impact of cumulative effects on Traditional Land and Resource Use in the areas affected by the Project. The Commission is aware that existing cumulative effects in the area of the Project (e.g., agricultural conversion, private land conversion, forest harvesting, oil and gas production, and linear development) create challenges relative to the ability of Indigenous peoples to continue to use the lands and resources for traditional purposes. Cognizant of the existing total cumulative effects in which the Project is proposed, the Commission has assessed NGTL's mitigation measures such as restricting all construction activities to the Project footprint, implementing the Cultural Resource Discovery Contingency plan (if any unanticipated Traditional Land and Resource sites are encountered), and ongoing engagement with Indigenous peoples. These mitigation measures are intended to address effects on both the biophysical resources that support Traditional Land and Resource Use activities and the effects on Traditional Land and Resource Use activities themselves. The Commission finds NGTL's mitigation measures to be appropriate given the scope, scale and nature of the Project effects.<sup>97</sup>

## 6. Aboriginal Law

The overall themes in Aboriginal law this year were: continued progress in implementing the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (“**UNDRIP**”) in B.C.; an increase in large-scale Indigenous-owned energy projects; and litigation re-confirming both that the duty to consult does not apply to the legislative process<sup>98</sup> and that injunctive relief remains available for protecting asserted yet unproven Aboriginal title claims.<sup>99</sup>

### 6.1. **UNDRIP Legislation (B.C. and Federal)**

In November 2019, B.C. enacted the *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act* (“**DRIPA**”).<sup>100</sup> This was the first UNDRIP implementation legislation in Canada. *DRIPA* operates by setting out a process for the B.C. government to bring provincial laws into alignment with UNDRIP. In 2022 we saw *DRIPA* begin to be put into action through the Tahltan Central Government – B.C. Agreement, discussed more below.

In June 2021, the Government of Canada enacted the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act* (“**UNDRIP Act**”).<sup>101</sup> Similar to *DRIPA*, the *UNDRIP Act* does not make UNDRIP binding law in Canada, but creates a process for assessing whether Canadian laws are consistent with UNDRIP. The Government of Canada has stated that the current phase

---

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid*, PDF 93.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid*, PDF 94.

<sup>98</sup> *Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians v Ontario (Minister of Environment, Conservation and Parks)*, 2022 ONSC 5161 [*Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians*].

<sup>99</sup> *Reece v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2022 BCSC 865.

<sup>100</sup> SBC 2019, c 44 [*DRIPA*].

<sup>101</sup> SC 2021, c 14 [*UNDRIP Act*].

of this process focuses on working with Indigenous peoples to better understand their priorities, and that an action plan will be completed by June 2023.<sup>102</sup> The 2022 report on progress of implementing the *UNDRIP Act* appears to be forward-looking, without tangible results to report yet.<sup>103</sup>

Since the enactment of *DRIPA* and the *UNDRIP Act* there has been a limited amount of caselaw interpreting these pieces of legislation.<sup>104</sup> For example the B.C. Court of Appeal (“**BCCA**”) noted that *UNDRIP*, *DRIPA*, and the *UNDRIP Act* are relevant to section 25 of the Charter.<sup>105</sup> However, the BCCA also noted that courts in B.C. have not decided on the extent to which *UNDRIP* creates substantive rights under section 25 of the Charter, and did not do so in this case.<sup>106</sup>

## 6.2. Tahltan Central Government – B.C. Agreement

In June 2022, as an example of B.C.’s efforts to integrate free, prior and informed consent (“**FPIC**”) into the environmental assessment process, the Tahltan Central Government and Province of B.C. signed the Declaration Act Consent Decision-Making Agreement for Eskay Creek Project.<sup>107</sup> This agreement was negotiated pursuant to B.C.’s *Environmental Assessment Act*,<sup>108</sup> which requires consent for certain reviewable projects<sup>109</sup> and enables the Minister to enter into an agreement with an Indigenous Nation with respect to a Provincial environmental assessment,<sup>110</sup> and *DRIPA*, the Executive Council, on behalf of the government, to negotiate an agreement and enter into an agreement with an Indigenous governing body relating to consent.<sup>111</sup>

The agreement pertains to the Eskay Creek Revitalization Project, proposed by Skeena in Tahltan territory, and which will be subject to provincial environmental assessment under the *Environmental Assessment Act* and federal impact assessment under the *Impact Assessment Act* (“**IAA**”). The preamble to the agreement states that it represents an “incremental step in the

---

<sup>102</sup> Government of Canada, “Statement on the 15th anniversary of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples” (13 September 2022), online: <<https://www.canada.ca/en/department-justice/news/2022/09/statement-on-the-15th-anniversary-of-the-united-nations-declaration-on-the-rights-of-indigenous-peoples.html>>.

<sup>103</sup> Government of Canada, “Annual progress report on the implementation of the *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act*” (June 2022), online: <<https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/declaration/report-rapport/2022/index.html>>.

<sup>104</sup> The 2022 version of this paper cites *Saik’uz First Nation v Rio Tinto Alcan Inc.*, 2022 BCSC 15. That case was appealed in *Thomas v Rio Tinto Alcan Inc.*, 2022 BCCA 415, but the Court of Appeal did not discuss *UNDRIP* or either piece of implementation legislation.

<sup>105</sup> *Servatius v Alberni School District No 70*, 2022 BCCA 421 at paras 42-45. That section states that the guarantee of rights and freedoms shall not be construed to abrogate or derogate from aboriginal, treaty, or other rights or freedoms that pertain to the aboriginal peoples of Canada.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid* at para 46.

<sup>107</sup> *Declaration Act Consent Decision-Making Agreement for Eskay Creek Project*, June 2022, online: *Province of British Columbia* <[https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/natural-resource-stewardship/consulting-with-first-nations/agreements/declaration\\_act\\_consent\\_decision-making\\_agreement\\_for\\_eskay\\_creek\\_project.pdf](https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/natural-resource-stewardship/consulting-with-first-nations/agreements/declaration_act_consent_decision-making_agreement_for_eskay_creek_project.pdf)> [Tahltan-BC Agreement].

<sup>108</sup> SBC 2018, c 51 [EAA].

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid*, s 7

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid*, s 41

<sup>111</sup> *DRIPA*, *supra* note 100, s 7. See also *Required Consent (Eskay Creek Project) Regulation*, BC Reg 139/2022.

process of reconciliation” and that it will inform future consent-based decision-making processes for other proposed projects in Tahltan territory.<sup>112</sup>

The consent-based decision-making framework set out in the agreement expressly modifies the provincial environmental assessment process for the purposes of the Eskay Creek Revitalization Project. It provides for the creation of a Collaboration Team, tasked with ensuring that: regular meetings are held between provincial and Tahltan Officials; the parties are seeking to achieve consensus at various stages of the process; a Consensus Tracking Tool is created and maintained; appropriate resolution mechanisms are followed when consensus cannot be reached; the parties have the support they need to make decisions regarding the project; Tahltan knowledge and values are reflected in the assessments; and public and community engagement is undertaken in relation to the assessments.<sup>113</sup> Stages where consensus is required include: deciding whether the Project should proceed to Process Planning; determining the informational and assessment requirements necessary to support the parties’ decision-making; and assessing the draft Environmental Assessment Report and draft Assessment Certificate, including any associated conditions. Alongside the provincial environmental assessment, the agreement provides for an independent Tahltan Central Government risk assessment which will inform its decision on whether to give consent. That Tahltan Central Government will decide whether to provide FPIC to the project once the provincial assessment is complete. Without FPIC from Tahltan, the Project cannot proceed.

The Tahltan-B.C. agreement specifically provides that its purposes include to “provide clarity and transparency” in the assessment and decision-making process,<sup>114</sup> and the guiding principles include predictability and transparency.<sup>115</sup> Whether the agreement will support predictability for businesses, encourage investment in B.C., and whether these results can be replicated with other Indigenous governments, remains to be seen.<sup>116</sup>

### **6.3. Projects Owned by Indigenous Peoples**

In 2023 we saw an increase in large-scale Indigenous-owned energy projects. The three examples below illustrate the range of such projects.

#### **6.3.1. Tilbury Liquefied Natural Gas Expansion Project – FortisBC and Snuneymuxw First Nation Agreement**

On January 26, 2023, FortisBC Holdings Inc. and Snuneymuxw First Nation entered an agreement regarding the Tilbury LNG projects.<sup>117</sup> The agreement respects Snuneymuxw’s rights in relation to the potential project impacts and represents a commitment to share benefits related to the Tilbury projects. Snuneymuxw First Nation has committed to supporting Tilbury

---

<sup>112</sup> Tahltan-BC Agreement, *supra* note 107, Preamble, para M.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid*, s 6.4

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid*, s 2.1

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid*, s 3.1

<sup>116</sup> See Arend Hoekstra and Viviana Berkman, “Will the BC/Tahltan Project Consent Agreement Deliver on its Promises?” (21 June 2022), online: <<https://cassels.com/insights/will-the-bc-tahltan-project-consent-agreement-deliver-on-its-promises/>>.

<sup>117</sup> FortisBC, “Snuneymuxw First Nation and FortisBC Holdings Inc. sign agreement for Tilbury LNG projects, strengthening long-standing relationship” (27 January 2023), online: <<https://www.fortisbc.com/news-events/media-centre-details/2023/01/27/snuneymuxw-first-nation-and-fortisbc-holdings-inc.-sign-agreement-for-tilbury-lng-projects-strengthening-long-standing-relationship>>.

projects, including the Tilbury LNG Storage Expansion Project and the Tilbury Marine Jetty Project. FortisBC agrees to support Snuneymuxw First Nation's community through educational opportunities, training, and investments in the community.

### 6.3.2. ACFN-Concord Solar Partnership

The Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation ("**ACFN**"), through its company, ACFN Green Energy LP, has a 50 percent ownership stake with Concord Green Energy in three large merchant solar farms in Monarch, Vulcan, and Coaldale, Alberta.<sup>118</sup> Together, the three solar farms cover 480 acres and provide 106 megawatts generation capacity. The projects are not on ACFN territory in northern Alberta, but are instead located on Blood Tribe territory in southern Alberta where sunlight conditions are better suited to solar generation. The projects are close to, but not within, the Blood 148 reserve in Cardston County. Members of the Blood Tribe were employed in 50 percent of the labour for construction of the projects, and Blood Tribe members will also be employed in the work maintaining the solar farms. Several other Indigenous subcontractors were employed in relation to the project.

### 6.3.3. Cedar LNG Approval and Agreement

On March 14, 2023, the B.C. Environmental Assessment Office ("**EAO**") issued an Environmental Assessment Certificate ("**Certificate**") for the Cedar LNG Project.<sup>119</sup> The following day, the Minister of Environment and Climate Change issued a positive Decision Statement for the Cedar LNG Project.<sup>120</sup>

The Cedar LNG Project (the "**Project**"), a proposed floating liquefied natural gas ("**LNG**") facility, is Canada's first Indigenous majority-owned LNG facility to receive approval. It comprises a floating liquefied natural gas export facility and marine terminal to be located on Haisla Nation-owned land in Kitimat, B.C., proposed in partnership by Haisla Nation and Pembina Pipeline Corporation (the "**Partnership**"). The proposed facility will have an estimated exporting capacity of three million tonnes of LNG per year.<sup>121</sup>

The process for issuance of the Certificate satisfied both provincial environmental assessment requirements and federal requirements under the *IAA*, and included consultation with Indigenous peoples and engagement with the public.<sup>122</sup>

As a result of the Partnership's proposed Project design as well as conditions attached to the Certificate, the EAO found the Project would prevent or reduce potential adverse environmental,

---

<sup>118</sup> Greenplanet Energy Analytics, "ACFN – Concord Solar Partnership Launches Three Farms", online: <<https://gpenergyanalytics.ca/acfn-green-energy-announcements/>>.

<sup>119</sup> British Columbia Environmental Assessment Office, Environmental Assessment Certificate # E23-01 (14 March 2023).

<sup>120</sup> Impact Assessment Agency of Canada, *Decision Statement Issued Under Section 65 of the Impact Assessment Act* (15 March 2023), online: <<https://iaac-aeic.gc.ca/050/documents/p80208/146928E.pdf>>.

<sup>121</sup> Cedar LNG, News Release, "Cedar LNG Receives B.C. Environmental Approval and Signs Memorandum of Understanding with ARC Resources Ltd." (14 March 2023), online: <[https://www.cedarlng.com/cedar-lng-receives-b-c-environmental-approval-and-signs-memorandum-of-understanding-with-arc-resources-ltd/?utm\\_source=LI&utm\\_medium=03142023CedarOrg&utm\\_campaign=CedarAppr&utm\\_id=CedarAppr](https://www.cedarlng.com/cedar-lng-receives-b-c-environmental-approval-and-signs-memorandum-of-understanding-with-arc-resources-ltd/?utm_source=LI&utm_medium=03142023CedarOrg&utm_campaign=CedarAppr&utm_id=CedarAppr)> [Cedar LNG, March 2023].

<sup>122</sup> Minister of Environment and Climate Change Strategy and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Low Carbon Innovation, Ministers' Reasons for Decision, Cedar LNG Project (14 March 2023), p 2 [*Reasons for Decision*].

economic, social, heritage or health impacts, such that no significant effects are expected.<sup>123</sup> The Partnership has introduced several innovative design decisions, as highlighted in the approval, aimed at minimizing the Project's environmental footprint and impacts.<sup>124</sup> Some of the most significant decisions include a proposal to power the facility with renewable electricity from BC Hydro and a proposed Project location leveraging existing LNG infrastructure, a deep-water port, roads and other infrastructure.<sup>125</sup>

A key element to the Project approval is the general support and/or lack of opposition to the Project by potentially affected Indigenous communities. In particular, Haisla Nation, as majority owner of the Project, expressed that the advancement of the Project in its territory would advance reconciliation and would have positive effects for Haisla Nation by supporting self-governance and self-determination for Haisla Nation.<sup>126</sup>

#### **6.4. Duty to Consult and Legislative Power: Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians v. Ontario (Minister of Environment, Conservation and Parks)<sup>127</sup>**

This was a decision respecting the Ontario Government's duty to consult before making amendments to Ontario's *Environmental Assessment Act* and revoking Ontario's *Forestry Regulation*.<sup>128</sup> The applicants claimed, among other things, that they were entitled to be, and were not, consulted and accommodated in respect of the revocation of the *Forestry Regulation*.

The minority decision, written by DL Corbett J, found that the revocation of the *Forestry Regulation* was executive action rather than the enactment of legislation. Corbett J outlined the history of the *Forestry Regulation*, finding that the process by which the regulation was enacted was itself a consultation and accommodation process, and as such Ontario did owe the applicants consultation before revoking it.<sup>129</sup>

The majority applied *Mikisew Cree v Canada*<sup>130</sup> and found that the Crown did not have a constitutional duty to consult, and that if there was a duty to consult it would be at the low end of the spectrum and was satisfied in this case.<sup>131</sup> Further, the revocation of the *Forestry Regulation* did not make structural changes to the management of forestry resources that could trigger a duty to consult and did not remove or reduce the Crown's consultation obligations with respect to future decisions on forestry management that affect Indigenous communities.<sup>132</sup> The applicants would have "an ongoing right" to be consulted with respect to changes to decisions that may impact their Aboriginal and treaty rights.<sup>133</sup>

---

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid* at 2.

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid* at 3; Cedar LNG, March 2023, *supra* note 121.

<sup>125</sup> Cedar LNG, March 2023, *supra* note 121.

<sup>126</sup> *Reasons for Decision*, *supra* note 122 at 3.

<sup>127</sup> *Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians*, *supra* note 98.

<sup>128</sup> *Environmental assessment requirements for forest management on Crown lands in Ontario*, DO MNR-75, (2013) 14181 (*Environmental Assessment Act*).

<sup>129</sup> See Decision of DL Corbett J (dissenting in part), *Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians*, *supra* note 98 at paras 78-79.

<sup>130</sup> 2018 SCC 40.

<sup>131</sup> *Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians*, *supra* note 98, Swinton and Penny JJ at para 1. Note that majority decision comes *after* the dissenting decision.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid* at para 24.

<sup>133</sup> *Ibid* at para 31.

## 6.5. *Injunctive Relief for Asserted but Unproven Aboriginal Title Claims: Reece v Canada (Attorney General)*<sup>134</sup>

The plaintiffs in this case were a collection of Tsimshian nations who sought an injunction preventing the defendant Crown from transferring certain lands in northwestern B.C. to the defendant Nisga'a Nation, and preventing the addition of the lands to the Nisga'a Lands as defined in the Nisga'a Final Agreement. The plaintiffs claim that they exclusively used, occupied, owned and controlled the lands in question before and at contact, and as such hold Aboriginal title throughout the lands. The Aboriginal title claim has not yet been resolved. The Nisga'a sought to acquire the lands in fee simple from the Province of B.C. The Court found that seeking interlocutory injunctive relief was available to the plaintiffs,<sup>135</sup> and proceeded to apply the test for an injunction set out in *RJR-MacDonald Inc v Canada (AG)*.

In the BCSC's analysis the strength of the title claim went towards whether there was a serious issue to be tried, and the Court found the evidence of the plaintiffs was compelling and strongly supports the claim of Aboriginal title.<sup>136</sup> Under the irreparable harm assessment, the Court found that if the lands were transferred to the Nisga'a, who planned to develop them, the plaintiffs' ability to prove Aboriginal title would be irreparably harmed.<sup>137</sup> Lastly, with respect to balance of convenience, the Court found that the plaintiffs had provided sound evidence of the harm that would result to them, but that the Nisga'a's claimed economic harm was not well-supported by evidence. As such this factor weighed in favour of granting the injunction.<sup>138</sup> The injunction was granted for a period of 18 months (with the ability to be extended) during which the plaintiffs, B.C., Canada, and the Nisga'a were to enter good faith negotiations to resolve the issues.

## 7. Oil and Gas

The more significant developments in the oil and gas sector show a tension between the need for further development to meet consumer demand and the development of tools to better address reclamation liability. Recent regulatory approvals have found oil and gas projects to be justified in the need to satisfy existing and growing demand and their economic sustainability. However, governments continue to implement liability management regimes in recognition of the growing need for more stringent mechanisms to ensure the reclamation of sites.

### 7.1. *Alberta's Liability Management Incentive Program*

In February 2023, Alberta commenced engagement on a new Liability Management Incentive Program ("**Incentive Program**").<sup>139</sup> The goal for the Incentive Program is in line with previous overhauls of Alberta's liability management framework, seeking improvements in the management of site liability, including in respect of orphan sites.

---

<sup>134</sup> 2022 BCSC 865.

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid* at para 51, citing *Haida Nation v British Columbia*, 2004 SCC 73 as confirmed in *Rio Tinto Alcan Inc v Carrier Sekani Tribal Council*, 2010 SCC 43 and *Tsilhqot'in Nation v British Columbia*, 2014 SCC 44.

<sup>136</sup> *Ibid* at para 58.

<sup>137</sup> *Ibid* at paras 116-124.

<sup>138</sup> *Ibid* at 152.

<sup>139</sup> Government of Alberta, News Release, "Rehabilitating problematic oil and gas sites: statement from Premier Smith" (22 February 2023), online: <<https://www.alberta.ca/release.cfm?xID=86592CCE6B84F-A54F-4B03-DF50C50B2D90044A>> [February 22 New Release].

The Incentive Program would provide up to \$100 million in credits over a three-year period for qualified companies that remediate sites that have been inactive for at least 20 years.<sup>140</sup> Companies would earn credits that could be applied against royalties earned from new production and deducted by Alberta from a company to develop the associated resource.<sup>141</sup> Alberta has indicated that the Incentive Program would be applied to all well sites in the province, including the orphan well inventory.<sup>142</sup>

While Alberta has yet to release detailed information about the mechanics of the proposed Incentive Program, analysts have criticized its concept and timing, arguing that it provides taxpayer-funded benefits to oil companies that are already legally required to remediate sites at a time of high oil prices.<sup>143</sup> Some analysts further argue that the Incentive Program would fail to comply with Alberta law by deviating from the polluter-pay principle.<sup>144</sup>

Alberta has indicated that the Incentive Program is still in development, with further consultation planned in the future.<sup>145</sup>

## 7.2. AER Directives

On February 13, 2023, the AER released amendments to Directive 088: Licensee Life-Cycle Management (“**Directive 088**”).<sup>146</sup> Directive 088 provides a regulated liability management system throughout the energy development lifecycle for Alberta oil and gas licence-holders. The implementation of this new liability management framework is intended to mitigate the billions of dollars of liability associated with inactive and orphaned wells in Alberta. Directive 088 details how the AER will holistically assess each licensee to determine whether to approve license transfers or pursue specific regulatory action.<sup>147</sup>

The February 2023 revisions to Directive 088 include the introduction of a Closure Nomination Program, providing an opportunity for eligible requesters (e.g., private landowners, First Nations, and other stakeholders) to request the closure of a site in line with Alberta’s Oil & Gas Liability Management Framework, and a description of the closure plan approaches that a licensee may use when a site becomes eligible for the Program and requires a closure plan.<sup>148</sup>

---

<sup>140</sup> *Ibid.* For a more comprehensive review of Alberta’s Oil And Gas Liability Management Framework, see Jeremy Barretto et al, “Leading the Way? Liability Management for the Alberta Oil and Gas Industry” (2022) 60:2 *Alta L Rev* 487.

<sup>141</sup> February 22 New Release, *supra* note 139; Bob Weber, “Alberta to pilot oil and gas tax breaks for legally required cleanup of abandoned wells”, *Financial Post* (8 February 2023), online: <<https://financialpost.com/commodities/energy/oil-gas/alberta-pilot-oil-and-gas-tax-breaks-cleanup-abandoned-wells>> [Weber, Feb 8].

<sup>142</sup> February 22 New Release, *supra* note 139; Jordan Kanygin, “Corporate welfare and misguided’: Criticism continues about Alberta’s proposed oil well cleanup incentive”, *CTV News* (13 February 2023), online: <<https://calgary.ctvnews.ca/corporate-welfare-and-misguided-criticism-continues-about-alberta-s-proposed-oil-well-cleanup-incentive-1.6272416>> [Kanygin, Feb 13].

<sup>143</sup> Weber, Feb 8, *supra* note 141.

<sup>144</sup> Kanygin, Feb 13, *supra* note 142.

<sup>145</sup> February 22 New Release, *supra* note 139.

<sup>146</sup> Alberta Energy Regulator, News Release Bulletin 2023-04, “New Editions of Directive 088 and Manual 023” (13 February 2023), online: <<https://www.aer.ca/regulating-development/rules-and-directives/bulletins/bulletin-2023-04>>; Alberta Energy Regulator, *Directive 088: Licensee Life-Cycle Management* (December 2021), online (pdf): <<https://static.aer.ca/prd/documents/directives/Directive088.pdf>> [*Directive 088*].

<sup>147</sup> For a more detailed analysis of the AER Liability Management Regime, see Jeremy Barretto et al, *supra* note 140.

<sup>148</sup> *Directive 088*, *supra* note 146, s 4.2.



Directive 058: Oilfield Waste Management Requirements for the Upstream Petroleum Industry (“**Directive 058**”) provides for waste characterization and classification, which includes an assessment of the physical, chemical and toxicological properties of a waste as well as the dangers relating to that waste. The AER uses the terminology of non-dangerous oilfield waste (“**non-DOW**”) and dangerous oilfield waste (“**DOW**”) to classify waste. Any oilfield waste generator must classify its waste.

### **7.3. Foothills Pipe Lines (South B.C.) Ltd. Foothills Zone 8 West Path Delivery 2023 Project Approval**

On March 2, 2022, the Commission of the CER issued a decision (“**Foothills CER Letter Decision**”) approving an application by Foothills Pipe Lines (South B.C.) Ltd. (“**Foothills**”) to construct and operate the Foothills Zone 8 West Path Delivery 2023 Project (“**Foothills Project**”).<sup>149</sup> The Foothills Project includes the construction and operation of a single loop of approximately 32 kilometres of natural gas pipeline connecting to the existing B.C. Mainline and the Foothills South B.C. Pipeline.<sup>150</sup>

Following a process involving potentially affected Indigenous peoples and interested parties, the Commission granted Foothills an exemption under Section 214 of the *Canadian Regulator Act* (“**CER Act**”) from the application of paragraph 180(1)(a) of the CER Act (requiring the issuance of a certificate for operation of a pipeline) and Section 198 of the CER Act, requiring the issuance of a certificate and approval of a plan, profile and book of reference prior to construction of a pipeline, among other requirements. The effect of these exemptions was the approval of the Foothills Project.<sup>151</sup>

In the Foothills CER Letter Decision, the Commission concluded that Crown consultation on the Foothills Project was sufficient and that its decision is consistent with Section 35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982*. The Commission further found that, during construction, the Foothills Project is likely to temporarily impact Indigenous Peoples’ ability to exercise their Section 35 rights, but that Foothills adequately considered these impacts and minimized them where possible through its design for the Foothills Project. The Commission imposed conditions to address and monitor potential impacts.<sup>152</sup> The Commission considered new regulatory requirements for gender-based impacts and concluded that Foothills appropriately addressed requirements with respect to the intersection of sex and gender with other identify factors, including Indigeneity.<sup>153</sup>

The Commission determined under Section 82 of the *IAA* that, taking into consideration mitigations measures proposed by Foothills and conditions imposed by the Commission, the Project is not likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects on federal lands affected by the Foothills Project.<sup>154</sup>

---

<sup>149</sup> Commission of the Canada Energy Regulator, *Letter Decision and Order XG-002-2022 to Foothills Pipe Lines (South B.C.) Ltd. – Foothills Zone 8 West Path Delivery*, Doc No C17973 (Calgary: Canada Energy Regulator, 2023) [*CER Foothills Letter Decision*].

<sup>150</sup> *Ibid* at 2.

<sup>151</sup> *Ibid* at 2.

<sup>152</sup> *Ibid* at 9.

<sup>153</sup> *Ibid* at 18.

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid* at 23.

## 8. Jurisdiction

The Alberta government pushed back against what it sees as improper federal intrusion into provincial jurisdiction through enacting the *Alberta Sovereignty Within a United Canada Act* (“**Alberta Sovereignty Act**”)<sup>155</sup> and through the ABCA’s decision finding the *IAA* is *ultra vires* Parliament.<sup>156</sup> It remains to be seen in 2023 how the *Alberta Sovereignty Act* will be utilized in practice and how the Supreme Court of Canada (“**SCC**”) will decide as the final voice in the *IAA* reference case.

### 8.1. Alberta Sovereignty Act

Keeping a promise Premier Danielle Smith made during her June 2022 campaign for leadership of the United Conservative Party, the *Alberta Sovereignty Act* came into force in December 2022.<sup>157</sup>

The *Alberta Sovereignty Act* enables the Legislative Assembly of Alberta to approve a resolution of a member of the Executive Council that a federal initiative is unconstitutional, at which point Cabinet may make orders pursuant to that resolution.<sup>158</sup> The orders of Cabinet may direct a Minister to suspend or modify the application or operation of provisions, or supplement or replace the provisions, of a regulation authorized by the impugned federal enactment.<sup>159</sup> Cabinet may also direct a Minister to exercise a power, duty, or function of that Minister, or issue directives to a provincial entity and the Crown in respect of the federal initiative.<sup>160</sup>

The *Alberta Sovereignty Act* contains a “no cause of action” clause, which bars claims against a person or entity acting in good faith under a directive issued under the *Alberta Sovereignty Act*.<sup>161</sup> However, judicial review of decisions and actions under the *Alberta Sovereignty Act* are permitted.<sup>162</sup>

It remains to be seen how the *Alberta Sovereignty Act* will be applied in practice, whether a Court will determine the *Alberta Sovereignty Act* to be unconstitutional, and how Cabinet orders under the *Alberta Sovereignty Act* will stand up to judicial scrutiny.

---

<sup>155</sup> SA 2022 c A-33.8 [*Alberta Sovereignty Act*].

<sup>156</sup> *Reference re Impact Assessment Act*, 2022 ABCA 165 [*IAA Reference*].

<sup>157</sup> *Alberta Sovereignty Act*, *supra* note 155. In the *Alberta Sovereignty Act*’s original proposed form in November 2022, Bill 1 received widespread criticism from legal scholars for offending constitutional principles. See e.g. Martin Olszynski and Nigel Bankes, “Running Afoul the Separation, Division, and Delegation of Powers: The Alberta Sovereignty Within a United Canada Act” (6 December 2022), online: *ABlawg* <<https://ablawg.ca/2022/12/06/running-afoul-the-separation-division-and-delegation-of-powers-the-alberta-sovereignty-within-a-united-canada-act/>>; Eric Adams, “Danielle Smith didn’t give us a watered-down version of Alberta’s Sovereignty Act” (29 November 2022), online: *CBC* <<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/calgary/opinion-danielle-smith-breaking-down-alberta-sovereignty-act-1.6668760>>; Emmett Macfarlane “The most unconstitutional bill in Canada’s modern history” (30 November 2022), online: <<https://emmettmacfarlane.substack.com/p/the-most-unconstitutional-bill-in>>. Amendments to the Bill on December 7 mitigated some concerns, such as removing Cabinet’s ability to circumvent the ordinary legislative process: see *Amendments to Bill 1: Alberta Sovereignty within a United Canada Act* (Amendment A1 agreed to 7 December 2022), online: <[https://docs.assembly.ab.ca/LADDAR\\_files/docs/bills/bill/legislature\\_30/session\\_4/20221129\\_am-001-A1.pdf](https://docs.assembly.ab.ca/LADDAR_files/docs/bills/bill/legislature_30/session_4/20221129_am-001-A1.pdf)>.

<sup>158</sup> *Alberta Sovereignty Act*, *supra* note 155, ss 3 and 4.

<sup>159</sup> *Ibid*, s 4 (as amended).

<sup>160</sup> *Ibid*, s 4(1)(b)-(c) (as amended).

<sup>161</sup> *Ibid*, s 8.

<sup>162</sup> *Ibid*, s 9.

## 8.2. Impact Assessment Act Reference

In May 2022, a majority of the ABCA ruled that the *IAA* was unconstitutional.<sup>163</sup> Chief Justice Fraser and Justices Watson and McDonald, with Justice Strekaf concurring in a separate opinion, found the *IAA* and its regulations to be *ultra vires* because they interfere with provincial jurisdiction over natural resources and other matters under section 92 and 92A of the *Constitution Act, 1867*. Justice Greckol dissented, finding that the *IAA* was constitutional. The federal government appealed the decision to the SCC and, in March 2023 the highest court heard arguments as to whether the federal government overstepped its constitutional powers in enacting the *IAA*.<sup>164</sup> At the time of writing, the two-day hearing was complete but no decision had been rendered.

## 9. Standard of Review

This section highlights recent clarifications to choosing and applying the standard of review in judicial reviews and statutory appeals. It also provides an update on the more general administrative law question of whether judicial review is available, in light of statutory bars to judicial review and the common law bar against premature judicial review applications.

### 9.1. Judicial Review of Regulations

#### 9.1.1. Innovative Medicines Canada v Canada (Attorney General)<sup>165</sup>

This was an appeal of a Federal Court judicial review in which the appellants challenged portions of a regulation that amended the *Patented Medicines Regulations*.<sup>166</sup> The appellants had argued that portions of the regulation were invalid because they went beyond the scope of the regulation-making power in the enabling legislation.<sup>167</sup> On judicial review the Federal Court had concluded that the Governor in Council's decision to enact the impugned section was reasonable.<sup>168</sup> The Federal Court of Appeal ("**FCA**") dismissed the appeal, agreeing with the lower court that the decision to make the regulation was reasonable.<sup>169</sup>

In coming to its conclusion, the FCA followed *Portnov v Canada (Attorney General)* ("**Portnov**")<sup>170</sup> in assessing the validity of the regulations, rather than the methodology in *Katz Group Canada Inc. v Ontario (Health and Long-Term Care)* ("**Katz**").<sup>171</sup> *Portnov* requires a court reviewing the validity of regulations to follow *Vavilov*.<sup>172</sup> Of the difference between applying these two cases, the FCA says:

This matters. Under *Vavilov*, as suggested in *Portnov*, we conduct reasonableness review of the decision to enact the regulation to change the comparator countries. Though the challenger bears

---

<sup>163</sup> *IAA Reference*, *supra* note 156.

<sup>164</sup> *Attorney General of Canada v Attorney General of Alberta*, SCC File No 40195.

<sup>165</sup> 2022 FCA 210 [*Innovative Medicines*].

<sup>166</sup> SOR/94-688, amended by SOR/2019-298.

<sup>167</sup> *Patent Act*, RSC 1985, c P-4.

<sup>168</sup> *Innovative Medicines*, *supra* note 165 at para 6; *Innovative Medicines Canada v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2020 FC 725.

<sup>169</sup> *Innovative Medicines*, *supra* note 165 at para 63.

<sup>170</sup> 2021 FCA 171 [*Portnov*].

<sup>171</sup> 2013 SCC 64 [*Katz*].

<sup>172</sup> *Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v Vavilov*, 2019 SCC 65 [*Vavilov*].

the burden of proving that the decision is unreasonable under *Vavilov*, the challenger does not have to overcome a presumption the decision is reasonable. Under *Katz*, the challenger must overcome a presumption the regulation is valid: *Katz* at para. 25. It can be overcome only if the regulation is “irrelevant”, “extraneous” or “completely unrelated” to the “statutory purpose”: *Katz* at paras 24 and 28. Reasonableness review does not enter into the matter at all. This is a “hyperdeferential” test, one unique in all of administrative law: Daly, “Regulations and Reasonableness Review”, above.<sup>173</sup>

Until the Supreme Court brings clarity to this issue, reasonableness review applies to the validity of regulations in the federal courts (as well as in B.C.<sup>174</sup>) whereas the “hyperdeferential” approach in *Katz* applies in the Alberta courts (and Ontario<sup>175</sup>).

### **9.1.2. Auer v Auer and TransAlta Generation Partnership v Alberta (Minister of Municipal Affairs)**

In both *Auer v Auer*<sup>176</sup> and *Transalta Generation Partnership v Alberta (Minister of Municipal Affairs)*,<sup>177</sup> the ABCA rejected the applicability of *Vavilov* and *Portnov* to the review of regulations, and instead applied the hyperdeferential standard from *Katz*.<sup>178</sup>

## **9.2. Standard of review for procedural fairness**

### **9.2.1. Law Society of Saskatchewan v Abrametz<sup>179</sup>**

The appellant, the Law Society of Saskatchewan, found the respondent, Mr. Abrametz, guilty of charges of conduct unbecoming a lawyer and disbarred him without a right to apply for readmission for close to two years. During the disciplinary proceedings, Mr. Abrametz applied to the Law Society for a stay of proceedings on the basis of inordinate delay amounting to an abuse of process. The Hearing Committee for the Law Society dismissed the application; however, the Court of Appeal of Saskatchewan subsequently allowed an appeal from that decision, and the Law Society then sought leave to appeal the Court of Appeal’s decision to the SCC. The SCC dismissed the appeal, having found there had been no abuse of process.

In the SCC’s decision, the Court also clarified the standard of review applicable to questions of procedural fairness and to abuse of process in statutory appeals. Where questions of procedural fairness, including abuse of process, are dealt with through a statutory appeal

---

<sup>173</sup> *Innovative Medicines*, *supra* note 165 at para 30.

<sup>174</sup> *Pacific Wild Alliance v British Columbia (Forests, Lands, Natural Resource Operations and Rural Development)*, 2022 BCSC 904 at paras 68-76. However, in *Le v British Columbia (Attorney General)*, 2022 BCSC 1146, the BCSC differentiated between challenges to the *vires* of regulations (in which case *Katz* applies, see paras 49-50) and other forms of delegated legislation such as municipal bylaws in which case the reasonableness standard applies (paras 51- 60).

<sup>175</sup> *TransCanada Pipelines Ltd v Ontario (Minister of Finance)*, 2022 ONSC 4432 at paras 5-8.

<sup>176</sup> 2022 ABCA 375 [*Auer*].

<sup>177</sup> 2022 ABCA 381 [*TransAlta*].

<sup>178</sup> *Auer*, *supra* note 176 at para 7; *TransAlta*, *supra* note 177 at paras 46-53.

<sup>179</sup> 2022 SCC 29.

mechanism, they are subject to the appellate standards of review.<sup>180</sup> Whether there has been an abuse of process is a question of law, to which the correctness standard applies.<sup>181</sup>

### **9.3. Additional category of correctness standard**

#### **9.3.1. Society of Composers, Authors and Music Publishers of Canada v. Entertainment Software Association**

In *Society of Composers, Authors and Music Publishers of Canada v Entertainment Software Association* (“**ESA**”),<sup>182</sup> the SCC identified an additional exception to the presumption of reasonableness review set out in *Vavilov*. The SCC found that courts should apply a correctness standard of review in situations where a statute gives courts and administrative bodies concurrent first instance jurisdiction over a legal issue.<sup>183</sup> The correctness standard had previously applied in such situations pre-*Vavilov*,<sup>184</sup> and the SCC clarified in *ESA* that this “is one of those rare and exceptional circumstances where it is appropriate to recognize a new category of correctness review” post-*Vavilov*.<sup>185</sup>

### **9.4. Statutory Restrictions on Judicial Review**

The availability of judicial review in the face of statutory restrictions is not a standard of review issue, but is nonetheless relevant. In *Democracy Watch v Canada (Attorney General)*, the FCA ruled that a complete bar on the availability of judicial review would offend the rule of law.<sup>186</sup> However, only total bars against review, not partial restrictions on review, are invalid.<sup>187</sup>

### **9.5. Bar Against Premature Judicial Reviews**

The FCA confirmed in *Viaguard Accu-Metrics Laboratory v. Standards Council of Canada* that judicial review is only available after a party has exhausted all other administrative remedies.<sup>188</sup> The FCA confirmed that the bar against premature judicial reviews is “next to absolute”.<sup>189</sup>

---

<sup>180</sup> *Ibid* at para 27 (citing *Vavilov*, paras 33 and 36-52). See also para 38.

<sup>181</sup> *Ibid* at para 30. In *Manitoba Métis Federation Inc v Canada (Energy Regulator)*, 2023 FCA 24, the FCA confirmed that the standard of review applicable to questions of procedural fairness in a statutory appeal is correctness, in the context of a statutory appeal of a CER decision. As well, in a recent Saskatchewan carbon capture contracting dispute, the Court of King’s Bench applied the appellate correctness standard to an application to have an arbitration award set aside on procedural fairness grounds, despite that the application was neither a statutory appeal nor judicial review: *SNC-Lavalin Inc. v Saskatchewan Power Corporation*, 2022 SKKB 242 at paras 22-32.

<sup>182</sup> 2022 SCC 30 [*ESA*].

<sup>183</sup> *Ibid* at paras 26-28.

<sup>184</sup> *Ibid* at para 22 citing *Rogers Communications Inc v Society of Composers, Authors and Music Publishers of Canada*, 2012 SCC 35 at para 15; *Canadian Broadcasting Corp v SODRAC 2003 Inc*, 2015 SCC 57 at para 35.

<sup>185</sup> *ESA*, *supra* note 182 at para 28.

<sup>186</sup> *Democracy Watch v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2020 FCA 28 at para 31 [*Democracy Watch*], citing *Canada (Attorney General) v Best Buy*, 2021 FCA 161 at para 112. See also *Democracy Watch* at paras 42-43.

<sup>187</sup> *Democracy Watch*, *ibid* at para 35, citing *Canadian Council for Refugees*, 2021 FCA 72 at paras 102-103.

<sup>188</sup> 2023 FCA 63 at para 3.

<sup>189</sup> *Ibid* at para 4 quoting *Dugré v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2021 FCA at para 37.

## **9.6. Other Standard of Review Cases in Energy Law**

### **9.6.1. ATCO Electric Ltd v Alberta Utilities Commission<sup>190</sup>**

This was an appeal of a decision of the AUC, which denied the appellant the ability to recover costs it suffered as a result of the Fort McMurray wildfire through including those costs in its prudently incurred costs and expenses when setting its rates. The Alberta Court of Appeal allowed the appeal, and referred the matter back to the AUC, finding that the AUC had made an error of law in relation to its own discretion on what expenses can be recoverable in the case of stranded or unpredictably destroyed assets.<sup>191</sup>

In this case the Court made comments about the status of older Court of Appeal decisions post-*Vavilov*, stating that “binding precedents of this Court should presumptively be regarded as continuing to be binding, notwithstanding the change in the standard of review analysis.”<sup>192</sup> This has implications for the precedential value of statutory appeals of AUC decisions, which had previously been assessed on a reasonableness standard pre-*Vavilov* but are now assessed on the appellate standards.

### **9.6.2. Taylor Processing Inc v Alberta (Minister of Energy)**

The Alberta Court of King’s Bench conducted a reasonableness analysis on four judicial review applications arising from Alberta Energy’s calculation of royalties in respect of gas processing at the Harmattan Gas Processing Plant and applied the correctness standard to issues of procedural fairness and adequacy of reasons, ultimately quashing the impugned decisions.<sup>193</sup>

### **9.6.3. WCSB Power Alberta Limited Partnership v Alberta Utilities Commission**

In a permission to appeal decision regarding two decisions of the AUC, the ABCA noted that the reasonableness standard applies to challenges to the regulator’s discretion as to procedure, and correctness applies to the regulator’s rulings on admissibility of evidence as well as questions of procedural fairness.<sup>194</sup>

### **9.6.4. First Nation of Na-Cho Nyäk Dun v Yukon (Government of)**

The Yukon Supreme Court discussed which standard to apply to questions about the honour of the Crown and duty to consult in a case considering the processes used to resolve land use conflicts in the Yukon.<sup>195</sup> The Court applied the standard of correctness to the question of whether the honour of the Crown was engaged by the decision under review, the existence, extent, and content of the duty to consult, and the Yukon government’s interpretation of the First Nation’s constitutionally protected treaty rights. The Court applied the reasonableness standard

---

<sup>190</sup> 2023 ABCA 129.

<sup>191</sup> *Ibid* at paras 61 and 62.

<sup>192</sup> *Ibid* at para 18. This aspect of the Court’s decision has attracted some criticism, see Nigel Bankes, “Stores Block Meets *Vavilov*: The Status of Pre-*Vavilov* ABCA Decisions” (1 May 2023), online: *ABlawg* <[https://ablawg.ca/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/Blog\\_NB\\_Stores\\_Block\\_meets\\_Vavilov.pdf](https://ablawg.ca/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/Blog_NB_Stores_Block_meets_Vavilov.pdf)>.

<sup>193</sup> *Taylor Processing Inc v Alberta (Minister of Energy)*, 2023 ABKB 64.

<sup>194</sup> *WCSB Power Alberta Limited Partnership v Alberta Utilities Commission*, 2022 ABCA 177.

<sup>195</sup> *First Nation of Na-Cho Nyäk Dun v Yukon (Government of)*, 2023 YKSC 5.

to the question of whether the duty to consult was adequate and to the merits of the decision, as well as to whether or not there was a contractual duty of good faith.

**9.6.5. *Redmond v British Columbia (Forests, Lands, Natural Resources Operations and Rural Development)*, 2022 BCCA 72**

In B.C., the BCCA applied the finding from *Vavilov*, that when administrative action is alleged to limit Charter rights, a reviewing court should apply the reasonableness standard. This is different than when the applicant alleges that the enabling statute itself is unconstitutional, in which case the standard is correctness.<sup>196</sup>

## **10. Conclusion**

This paper provided an overview of regulatory and legislative developments of interest to Canadian energy lawyers over the past year. These developments include: the ongoing jurisdictional battle between provinces and the federal government, as reflected in the *Alberta Sovereignty Act* and the pending decision of the Supreme Court of Canada on the *IAA* reference case; continued federal and provincial efforts to decarbonize through policy, legislation, and regulations; progress towards UNDRIP implementation across Canada, all while Indigenous-owned energy projects continue to see expansion; a shifting landscape with respect to how cumulative effects are dealt with in duty to consult cases; developments in the regulation of oil and gas pipelines, power, and hydrogen; and continued clarification and application of the standard of review post-*Vavilov*.

---

<sup>196</sup> *Redmond v British Columbia (Forests, Lands, Natural Resources Operations and Rural Development)*, 2022 BCCA 72. In this case the BCCA applied the appellate standard to the reviewing court's decision on Charter infringement because the issue was raised first before the reviewing judge and not before the administrative decision maker.