

RE: Qs related to Rate Mitigation Submission

From: "Veinot, Cindy (TBS)" <"o=govon/ou=exchange administrative group (fydibohf23spdlt)/cn=recipients/cn=veinot, cindy (tbs)d57">
To: "Petsche, Nadine (TBS)" <nadine.petsche@ontario.ca>, "Graham, Helen (TBS)" <helen.graham@ontario.ca>
Cc: "Hosick, Sarah (TBS)" <sarah.hosick@ontario.ca>, "Tam, Nelson (TBS)" <nelson.tam@ontario.ca>
Date: Fri, 10 Feb 2017 13:54:04 -0500

Fyi -- This is an old deck – ask PEMD to get an updated deck with the feedback incorporated from yesterday's MMMP meeting – Cindy

From: Petsche, Nadine (TBS)
Sent: February-10-17 1:51 PM
To: Veinot, Cindy (TBS); Graham, Helen (TBS)
Cc: Hosick, Sarah (TBS); Tam, Nelson (TBS)
Subject: RE: Qs related to Rate Mitigation Submission

Helen/Cindy,
For the fiscal impact Q&As, please advise which items in the attached deck should be covered. The QA is intended to be high level I believe? n

From: Veinot, Cindy (TBS)
Sent: February-10-17 1:37 PM
To: Graham, Helen (TBS); Petsche, Nadine (TBS)
Cc: Hosick, Sarah (TBS)
Subject: RE: Qs related to Rate Mitigation Submission

There are many pieces to this aside from GA smoothing – should be able to deal with fiscal impact on those.

From: Graham, Helen (TBS)
Sent: February-10-17 1:29 PM
To: Petsche, Nadine (TBS); Veinot, Cindy (TBS)
Cc: Hosick, Sarah (TBS)
Subject: Re: Qs related to Rate Mitigation Submission

This is the rate mitigatn optns piece - Tbd cant really approve without fiscal impact information
Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the Rogers network.

From: Petsche, Nadine (TBS)
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 1:12 PM
To: Graham, Helen (TBS); Veinot, Cindy (TBS)
Cc: Hosick, Sarah (TBS)
Subject: RE: Qs related to Rate Mitigation Submission

Thanks Helen.
It's premature to be discussing fiscal impact at this time. N

From: Graham, Helen (TBS)
Sent: February-10-17 11:57 AM

To: Veinot, Cindy (TBS); Petsche, Nadine (TBS)
Cc: Hosick, Sarah (TBS)
Subject: Fw: Qs related to Rate Mitigation Submission

Just fyi

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the Rogers network.

From: Strang, James (TBS) <James.Strang@ontario.ca>
Sent: Thursday, February 9, 2017 4:34 PM
To: Royal, Kathryn (MEDG/MRIS)
Cc: An, Tai (ENERGY); Fung, Felix (TBS); Morgenstern, Madeleine (TBS); Liu, Sophie (TBS); Shannon, Ben (TBS); Kim, John (OFA); Kathirgamanathan, Shajee (OFA); Chochla, Megan (CAB); Graham, Helen (TBS)
Subject: Qs related to Rate Mitigation Submission

Kathryn,

As the Rate Mitigation Plan submission comes forward for the pending February 15, 2017 combined Cabinet / TB/MBC meeting, we're going to need Energy's assistance in understanding the submission – elements of the plan, assumptions built into modelling, bill impacts, fiscal plan impacts – and tables useful for the TB/MBC Assessment Note etc. Given the timelines, we've compiled a core set of questions from the various central agencies perspectives (TBS, OFA, CO, OPCD – noting OPCD is heavily engaged directly on the item particularly the GA initiative).

We're hopeful Energy is open to a meeting and providing written responses as soon as possible.

Thanks in advance,

James

Problem Definition and Outcomes

1. While it is clear that i) Ontario ratepayers' electricity bills have risen in recent years and ii) different places have seen different changes, how can the issue that is intended to be addressed by these proposals be more precisely articulated?
2. What are the metrics/indicators that best measure the scope and depth of this issue, and what change to these indicators is expected as a result of the proposed actions?

Financial and Outputs Modeling

3. For each electricity price mitigation option tracking, what inputs/parameters are used in the models, what values are used for these inputs/parameters, and how are these values validated?
4. What are the formulas through which these inputs/parameters are used to calculate the models' outputs/projections, and how are these validated?
5. How sensitive are the models' financial and output projections to changes to the key parameters?
6. What other assumptions are needed in order for this models' to be valid, and how are they validated?

Additional Risks

7. What additional risks are there that may not be included in these models? For example, how may demand change under different scenarios of reduced ratepayer cost, and what are the risks to the models' financial and output projections as a result?

Fiscal Plan

8. For each electricity price mitigation option tracking, can the bill impact be a alongside/associated with (perhaps in a table) the program's fiscal plan impact for a given year?
9. Some of the options shift program costs that were previously recovered from ratepayers to the tax base (the province's fiscal plan), for the options tracking are their implications for agencies, government business

enterprises (E.g. if a particular EPM initiative intends to go with the transfer payment delivery model used for OCEB, are there fiscal plan implications for IESO (appearing through IESO's consolidation workseet)? .

10. Is it possible to put a risk band around the fiscal plan numbers?