

Re: Concurrent Review: TB Submission

From: "Imbrogno, Serge (ENERGY)" </o=govon/ou=ontario public sector - iserv
ems/cn=recipients/cn=imbrogno">
To: "Schlaepfer, Martin (ENERGY)" <martin.schlaepfer@ontario.ca>
Date: Sat, 06 May 2017 11:05:11 -0400

Ok. Thanks

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the Rogers network.

From: Schlaepfer, Martin (ENERGY)
Sent: Saturday, May 6, 2017 11:01 AM
To: Imbrogno, Serge (ENERGY)
Subject: FW: Concurrent Review: TB Submission

Hi Deputy,

I have worked with LSB and ESP on proposed responses. The new placeholder is for future flexibility, but is not necessary right now. The legal bullet is MAG language, which we can't change and was included in the March Cab sub. For the appendices, Steen is fine with calling them both opinions.

Below is a proposed response. OK to share with MO?

Thanks,
Martin

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.

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>