

Re: Minute

From: "Greenberg, Martha (CAB)" <"o=govon/ou=exchange administrative group (fydibohf23spdlt)/cn=recipients/cn=greenberg, martha (cab)3ff">
To: "Chochla, Megan (CAB)" <megan.chochla2@ontario.ca>
Date: Wed, 01 Mar 2017 07:41:21 -0500

But don't we have a general TB before implementation so not sure we need it? Will check redline version.

Thanks!

From: Chochla, Megan (CAB)
Sent: Wednesday, March 1, 2017 7:20 AM
To: Greenberg, Martha (CAB)
Subject: RE: Minute

One additional thought- in #3 if we change the word announcement to implementation it may work. If we went this way, TBS may want to add in the TB approvals in the GA minute as well.

1. ENERGY report back to TB/MBC, prior to ~~announcement~~ **implementation**, on:
 - A. A feasible mechanism for refinancing the Global Adjustment, per minute 1A, including completed legal, accounting, and financing risk assessments.
 - B. If a non-fiscal mechanism cannot be established for refinancing the Global Adjustment, options for achieving a comparable level of electricity rate mitigation in the most cost effective way in order to minimize the impact on the province's fiscal plan.
 - C. Additional proposed rate mitigation initiatives targeted at specific populations, per minute 2, including a proposal to move the RRRP and OESP from ratepayer funded programs to government funded programs.

From: Chochla, Megan (CAB)
Sent: March-01-17 7:13 AM
To: Greenberg, Martha (CAB)
Subject: RE: Minute

Martha,

If we remove #3 we may need one more 'subject to TB approval' for the GA minute. Here's a redline version in case we need it.

Megan

From: Greenberg, Martha (CAB)
Sent: February-28-17 8:39 PM
To: Davidson, Steven (CAB)
Cc: Foster, Robert (CAB); Chochla, Megan (CAB)
Subject: Minute

Hi,

I have been back and forth with Karen Hughes tonight to understand the requested minute change. I gather it is all of #3. Issue is that they/energy won't be able to satisfy 3A and 3B, which are supposed to be met prior to announcement. Because there won't be completed analysis (3A) and in their absence there also aren't options for comparable rate reductions (3B), request is to remove it. What is in 3C which is TB approval prior to announcement of ratebase to taxbase, is already covered by the opening statement in 2.

It makes sense to me, while we had it in their to force the point, I think we may have all moved off it by the edits made to the note today around if you communicate prior to assessment, you can't say no fiscal impact.

I know the minute has gone out so we could green folder if all agree.

Thanks,
Martha