

Fwd: Concurrent Review: TB Submission

From: "Calwell, Carolyn (ENERGY/MEDEI/MRI)" <carolyn.calwell@ontario.ca>
To: "Schlaepfer, Martin (ENERGY)" <martin.schlaepfer@ontario.ca>, "Imbrogno, Serge (ENERGY)" <serge.imbrogno@ontario.ca>
Date: Sat, 06 May 2017 19:17:31 -0400

I'm not sure what to do about this. I am worried about going back to MAG for more approvals and I can't take the bullet out without doing that. I am worried about both the advice and timing of approvals. I'm in your hands, Deputy.

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Teliszewsky, Andrew (ENERGY)" <Andrew.Teliszewsky@ontario.ca>
Date: May 6, 2017 at 6:54:59 PM EDT
To: "Schlaepfer, Martin (ENERGY)" <Martin.Schlaepfer@ontario.ca>, "Calwell, Carolyn (ENERGY/MEDEI/MRI)" <Carolyn.Calwell@ontario.ca>
Cc: "Imbrogno, Serge (ENERGY)" <Serge.Imbrogno@ontario.ca>, "Whittington, Matt (ENERGY)" <Matt.Whittington@ontario.ca>, "Baker, Carys (ENERGY)" <Carys.Baker@ontario.ca>
Subject: Re: Concurrent Review: TB Submission

Good Evening:

That doesn't make any sense.
Delete the bullet.

Many thanks, in advance.

Andrew Teliszewsky
416-327-3550

From: Schlaepfer, Martin (ENERGY)
Sent: Saturday, May 6, 2017 6:39 PM
To: Teliszewsky, Andrew (ENERGY); Calwell, Carolyn (ENERGY/MEDEI/MRI)
Cc: Imbrogno, Serge (ENERGY); Whittington, Matt (ENERGY); Baker, Carys (ENERGY)
Subject: RE: Concurrent Review: TB Submission

Hi Andrew,

#2 is MAG approved and we would recommend that it should be retained. In order to take it out, we would need to run all of the legal considerations slides up back through approvals up through the DAG. This raises the very real possibility that MAG will decide to change other wording that will emphasize the risk even more. At least as written, it is nothing new and we can respond to anyone who asks that this is nothing new and they have seen it all before.

Thanks,
Martin

From: Teliszewsky, Andrew (ENERGY)

Sent: Saturday, May 06, 2017 4:33 PM
To: Schlaepfer, Martin (ENERGY); Calwell, Carolyn (ENERGY/MEDEI/MRI)
Cc: Imbrogno, Serge (ENERGY); Whittington, Matt (ENERGY); Baker, Carys (ENERGY)
Subject: Re: Concurrent Review: TB Submission

Good Afternoon:

Re: #1 - happy to keep it. Just was added without much context. But probably makes sense.

Re: #2 - Appreciate these points; but I'm now asking for the bullet to just be removed, please.

Re: #3 - Excellent. That's an important framing point. Thank you.

Many thanks, in advance.

Andrew Teliszewsky
416-327-3550

From: Schlaepfer, Martin (ENERGY)
Sent: Saturday, May 6, 2017 11:09 AM
To: Teliszewsky, Andrew (ENERGY); Calwell, Carolyn (ENERGY/MEDEI/MRI)
Cc: Imbrogno, Serge (ENERGY); Whittington, Matt (ENERGY); Baker, Carys (ENERGY)
Subject: RE: Concurrent Review: TB Submission

Thanks for feedback, Andrew.

On 1., the purpose for this is to provide the Ministry an appropriate transfer payment line to support potential future activities and initiatives around electricity price mitigation for Ontarians. This new line is not absolutely necessary at this time and can be removed from the submission, if preferred, but it provides flexibility for the future. If it were needed in the future, it would require a return to TB.

On 2., this is a line directly out of the Binnie opinion and is part of the MAG approved advice, which we can't change. It was used in the March Cab sub as well.

On 3., We can update the TB sub to read "opinion".

Please let us know how you would like to proceed regarding #1.

Thanks,
Martin

From: Teliszewsky, Andrew (ENERGY)
Sent: Friday, May 05, 2017 9:58 PM
To: Schlaepfer, Martin (ENERGY); Calwell, Carolyn (ENERGY/MEDEI/MRI)
Cc: Imbrogno, Serge (ENERGY); Whittington, Matt (ENERGY); Baker, Carys (ENERGY)
Subject: Re: Concurrent Review: TB Submission

Good Evening:

Comments / Edits:

1. I don't understand the need for the new "placeholder" Vote/Item. Can someone explain for me please? (Item #5 in the proposed Minute).

2. Legal section still includes that bullet about judges being political that really stands out as an editorial comment. Does MAG / LSB really worry about judicial branch of government over-reaching during the (and attempting to influence outcome of) 2018 electoral cycle? That's how this reads. Strongly consider

revising this bullet, please.

3. Appendix should read KPMG "Opinion" and E&Y "Opinion". Is this not the case?

Many thanks, in advance.

Atel/

Andrew Teliszewsky

Chief of Staff | Office of Hon. Glenn Thibeault
Ministry of Energy
andrew.teliszewsky@ontario.ca
416-327-3550 (o)
416-436-6370 (m)

On May 5, 2017, at 5:07 PM, Schlaepfer, Martin (ENERGY) <Martin.Schlaepfer@ontario.ca> wrote:

Hi Andrew,

Please find attached the next turn of the TB Submission. Clean and tracked versions attached (new content and edited content is highlighted in yellow).

We would also propose to include the E&Y/OPG and KPMG work in the appendix of both the TB and Cabinet submissions (also attached).

Thanks,
Martin

<GA Consolidated Memo_May 2_FINAL.PDF>

<OPG - EY Letter on Fair Hydro Act May 5_FINAL.PDF>

<IESO Final Draft.pdf>

<OFHP TB sub - 20170418_May5_500_Tracked.docx>

<OFHP TB sub - 20170418_May5_500_Clean.docx>