

Date : 12/1/2011 9:14:16 AM
From : "Bown, Charles W."
To : "Bown, Charles W."
Subject : Fw: Meeting with PUB

-----Original Message-----

To: Don Burrage
Subject: Fw: Meeting with PUB
Sent: Nov 25, 2011 9:28 AM

Don

A summary below if my meeting with Maureen Greene yesterday. Fyi.
Charles

-----Original Message-----

To: Jerome Kennedy
Cc: Diana Dalton
Subject: Meeting with PUB
Sent: Nov 24, 2011 1:37 PM

I met with Maureen Greene this morning on the next steps and schedule for the MF Review. I was provided with a verbal summary of the schedule as is seen by PUB; as follows:

1. Release of MHI Report – before Xmas or early January (PUB will have draft in early December)
2. Public Notice requesting interested people to provide comments, questions or submissions - early January
3. Technical Conference – February (2 days). Closed session where expert interveners make presentations and ask questions of Nalcor. Participants are likely to be PUB staff, Consumer Advocate (CA) and Nalcor. PUB has not yet heard from industrial customers or NF Power. This assumes that the CA will represent all other informed parties (Vardy et al). Participation will be restricted.
4. Community Sessions – March (one week). PUB plan 3 sessions; St. John's, Central and Western. Labrador is excluded. Sessions are open to all comers to make presentations.
5. Board report – end of June

Aside from the schedule a number of issues were identified.

1. The CA plans to have his expert (Knight Pieshold) prepare a report for release.
2. CA will be seeking access to confidential information
3. Commissioners and CA inclined to seek additional info on project alternatives outside TOR scope; CA in particular. Eg. Natural Gas
4. Grand River Keepers have advised PUB that they want to participate in the review.

PUB was advised that end of June is too late and March 31 is our date for submission of Board report. Response was that March 31 is not possible given activities that must take place. The following responses were given to PUB on the other issues:

1. A report from CA was not in his TOR and will delay the process as he wants sufficient time to complete. The CA will not have access to the confidential info, therefore the report will not be based on all facts. A second report; additional to MHI, will cause some public confusion and could be contrary to MHI report. NR will meet with CA to discuss
2. CA will not have access to confidential information. NR will discuss with CA
3. A review of the alternatives is outside scope of review and Govt will be forced to confirm direction to PUB, if necessary.
4. Env issues were covered in EA. There is no scope in this process for ENV issues.

PUB was advised not to send a letter seeking an extension to their current deadline of Dec 31 without first consulting with NR. I advised that a letter from Govt setting a new deadline is possible. I will be meeting with the CA, asap.
Charles

Sent Via BlackBerry