

Theresa McClenaghan

From: "Dan McDermott" <dmcd@sierraclub.ca>
To: "Theresa McClenaghan" <mcclenaghan@execulink.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 12:36 PM
Subject: Re: Decisions required Re: media advisory

Hi Theresa,

How's this, "Premier McGuinty should break free of the nuclear cult that has invaded his office and engage in a meaningful energy dialog with real Ontarians".

Re timing, I've been on the side of sooner and I still am. I think that we are on the cusp of gaining traction for our position based on the Saturday Star piece and Barber's comments on conservation today. My odd thought, and I consciously decided not to throw this out to the list, is that a press conference is usually held to announce something. What do we announce that is new after we send this out?

I know, I ask too many questions.

Truly, Dan

Theresa McClenaghan wrote:

> It seems that maybe this draft did not go when I thought I sent it out.
 > Please look at this and let me know if you want to add a quote and sign on
 > to a joint media release. Next question do we send it today as we planned
 > or for Monday? Theresa
 > ----- Original Message -----
 > From: "Dan McDermott" <dmcd@sierraclub.ca>
 > To: <mcclenaghan@execulink.com>
 > Cc: <dmartin@yto.greenpeace.org>; <dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org>;
 > <kim@torontoenvironment.org>; <markw@pembina.org>; <muldoonp@lao.on.ca>;
 > "Rick Lindgren" <r.lindgren@sympatico.ca>; <kcooper@cela.ca>
 > Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 11:36 AM
 > Subject: Re: Decisions required Re: media advisory

>
 >
 >> Hi Theresa,

>>
 >> I didn't get the email with the draft release. My last one from you
 >> indicated that it would be circulated.

>>
 >> Truly, Dan
 >>

>> Theresa McClenaghan wrote:

>>> I AM still doing a boilerplate release for the cities where
 > consultations see happening but this woUld be different than a release
 > criticizing the consultations in support of our press conference on 13th.
 > Should I scrap the draft I sent all of you yesterday or do you want to still

> work on that as a joint release everyone for the 13th? I only have limited
> time. Theresa

>>> -----Original Message-----

>>> From: dmartin@yto.greenpeace.org

>>> Date: Tue, 7 Feb 2006 04:02:51

>>> To: Dan McDermott <dmcd@sierraclub.ca>

>>> Cc: Theresa McClenaghan <mcclenaghan@execulink.com>,
> dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org, kim@torontoenvironment.org, mark

> winfield <markw@pembina.org>, muldoonp@lao.on.ca,

> r.lindgren@sympatico.ca, kcooper@cela.ca

>>> Subject: Re: Decisions required Re: media advisory

>>>

>>> Hi All,

>>>

>>> This was probably not a huge news story anyway, so I think doing it on

> Monday

>>> will get us into the story a bit more as the meetings actually start that

> day.

>>> I say let's proceed with the news conference at QP at 11:00 Theresa, I

> assume

>>> that you are still going ahead with a draft release that can be used

> elsewhere

>>> as well. SP and I will be back in town on Friday.

>>>

>>> Cheers,

>>> Dave M.

>>>

>>>

>>> Quoting Dan McDermott <dmcd@sierraclub.ca>:

>>>

>>>> This was a lot easier on Friday. We had a press conference set up and
>>>> were ready to roll. I do wish we had stuck with Plan A. The theoretical
>>>> advantage of doing this Mon. is to get it in the same newscycle as the
>>>> coverage of the first meetings. The problem we have discovered is that
>>>> the Leg resumes that day. I don't see the logic for a later date.

>>>>

>>>> This is always a guessing game. The press conference may or may not
>>>> work. I'm disappointed that may be losing the moment on this. I may get
>>>> out an SCC release on specifically the Toronto meeting in the next few
> days.

>>>> I don't have a problem with saying that this is a phony consultation
>>>> process and we had best show up to complain about that and the OPA
>>>> recommendations.

>>>>

>>>> Truly, Dan

>>>>

>>>> Theresa McClenaghan wrote:

>>>>> So what does everyone think re Mark's question whether we need both
> the

>>>>> media release and the press conference. Seems that we are doing the

>>>>> press conference in any event. Theresa

>>>>>
>>>>> ----- Original Message -----
>>>>> *From:* mark winfield <<mailto:markw@pembina.org>>
>>>>> *To:* Theresa McClenaghan <<mailto:mcclenaghan@execulink.com>> ;
>>>>> dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org
>>>>> <<mailto:dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org>> ;
> kim@torontoenvironment.org
>>>>> <<mailto:kim@torontoenvironment.org>> ; dmcd@sierraclub.ca
>>>>> <<mailto:dmcd@sierraclub.ca>>
>>>>> *Cc:* muldoonp@lao.on.ca <<mailto:muldoonp@lao.on.ca>> ;
>>>>> r.lindgren@sympatico.ca <<mailto:r.lindgren@sympatico.ca>> ;
>>>>> kcooper@cela.ca <<mailto:kcooper@cela.ca>>
>>>>> *Sent:* Monday, February 06, 2006 4:10 PM
>>>>> *Subject:* Re: Decisions required Re: media advisory
>>>>>
>>>>> Do we need a release and a press conference.
>>>>>
>>>>> I'd be inclined to go with the 13th anyway for a PC, as energy is
>>>>> likely to be on the policy agenda. 14th would be another option.
>>>>> Need to think about messaging we're trashing the process while
>>>>> encouraging people to participate.
>>>>>
>>>>> Mark.
>>>>>
>>>>> At 03:18 PM 2/6/2006, Theresa McClenaghan wrote:
>>>>>> OK all, after discussions on this side of the ocean and the
> other,
>>>>>> consensus is:
>>>>>> 1. Media conference for Monday February 13th, 2005 - can we say
>>>>>> 11 am?
>>>>>> This will be the day that the consultations in the 12 cities
> start
>>>>>> and provides a better hook along the lines of "mcguinty's
>>>>>> conversation with Ontarians starts today and what a joke it is
>>>>>> (but much better framed for media)
>>>>>> BUT Dan just found out that the provincial legislature resumes
>>>>>> Monday so we can anticipate provincial announcements and a
> crowded
>>>>>> provincial news day - what do people think in light of that? Go
>>>>>> ahead anyway???

- >>>>>> 2. Participants to include: TEA, Sierra Club, CELA, Greenpeace
>>>>>> and maybe Pembina; Mark to confirm.
- >>>>>> 3. We will do a JOINT PRESS RELEASE, aiming to get it out by
>>>>>> TOMORROW afternoon. I am going to send you a skeleton of it
>>>>>> shortly with a request that you each add your quotes and return
> to

>>>>>> me by 2 pm tomorrow, so you can start to think about a quote
>>>>>> already and send to me as soon as you have it. Press release
>>>>>> won't mention the press conference. CELA can get the press
>>>>>> release out to the major news outlets.
>>>>>>

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

From: mark winfield <<mailto:markw@pembina.org>>

To: Theresa McClenaghan <<mailto:mcclenaghan@execulink.com>> ;

dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org

<<mailto:dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org>> ;

kim@torontoenvironment.org

> <<mailto:kim@torontoenvironment.org>>

; dmcd@sierraclub.ca <<mailto:dmcd@sierraclub.ca>>

Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 1:31 PM

Subject: Re: media advisory

Even if a press conference is not possible I think that a
press release at least needs to go out for the record
indicating that what the government is doing is a complete

> joke.

Mark.

At 10:04 AM 2/6/2006, Theresa McClenaghan wrote:

Here is a very rough draft at a media advisory. Just
talking to Dave Martin calling from Europe; looking for
something newsworthy and I realize we did not yet
publicize the joint letter re process demands and terms
of reference so we can build around that. Theresa

Theresa McClenaghan, Counsel,

Canadian Environmental Law Association

130 Spadina Ave. Unit 301, Toronto, ON M5V 2L4

T:416-960-2284 ext.218 F:416-960-9392

mcclenaghan@execulink.com

> <<mailto:mcclenaghan@execulink.com>>

Home office email mcclenaghan@execulink.com

<<mailto:mcclenaghan@execulink.com>>

Cell phone: 519-755-7579

CELA's Library website: www.ecolawinfo.org

<<http://www.ecolawinfo.org>> <<http://www.ecolawinfo.org>>

<<http://www.ecolawinfo.org>>>

Confidentiality Note: This message may
be subject to solicitor - client privilege.
If you have received this message in error,
please let me know by reply email, and
delete your copy. Thank you.

>>>>> No virus found in this incoming message.

>>>>> Checked by AVG Free Edition.
>>>>> Version: 7.1.375 / Virus Database: 267.15.2/251 - Release Date:
> 04/02/2006
>>>
>>>
>>> Theresa McClenaghan
>>> Counsel
>>> Canadian Environmental Law Association
>>> Suite 301 130 Spadina Ave. Toronto
>>> 416-960-2284 ext. 218
>>> cell phone 519-755-7579
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> -----
>>>
>>> No virus found in this incoming message.
>>> Checked by AVG Free Edition.
>>> Version: 7.1.375 / Virus Database: 267.15.2/252 - Release Date: 06/02/2006

Theresa McClenaghan

From: "Rick Lindgren" <r.lindgren@sympatico.ca>
To: "mark winfield" <markw@pembina.org>
Cc: "Theresa McClenaghan" <mcclenaghan@execulink.com>; "Dan McDermott" <dmcd@sierraclub.ca>; <dmartin@yto.greenpeace.org>; <dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org>; <kim@torontoenvironment.org>; <muldoonp@lao.on.ca>; <kcooper@cela.ca>
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 12:09 PM
Subject: Re: Decisions required Re: media advisory

The "public consultation" is especially inadequate because certain decisions (i.e. nuclear) that may be made under the plan could have consequences lasting hundreds if not thousands of years -- and we get 4 whole days to debate this?!

RL

mark winfield wrote:

> I would go with getting something on the record sooner rather than
 > later. Have not been able to get a hold of Marlo so don't know if we
 > are in, but the obvious line is 4 days of public meetings is not
 > adequate for a \$83 billion plan.

>

> Mark.

>

>

>

> At 11:40 AM 2/7/2006, Theresa McClenaghan wrote:

>

>> It seems that maybe this draft did not go when I thought I sent it out.

>> Please look at this and let me know if you want to add a quote and

>> sign on

>> to a joint media release. Next question do we send it today as we

>> planned

>> or for Monday? Theresa

>> ----- Original Message -----

>> From: "Dan McDermott" <dmcd@sierraclub.ca>

>> To: <mcclenaghan@execulink.com>

>> Cc: <dmartin@yto.greenpeace.org>; <dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org>;

>> <kim@torontoenvironment.org>; <markw@pembina.org>; <muldoonp@lao.on.ca>;

>> "Rick Lindgren" <r.lindgren@sympatico.ca>; <kcooper@cela.ca>

>> Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 11:36 AM

>> Subject: Re: Decisions required Re: media advisory

>>

>>

>>> Hi Theresa,

>>>

>>> I didn't get the email with the draft release. My last one from you

>>> indicated that it would be circulated.

>>>

>>> Truly, Dan

>>>

>>> Theresa McClenaghan wrote:

>>>> I AM still doing a boilerplate release for the cities where
>> consultations see happening but this woUld be different than a release
>> criticizing the consultations in support of our press conference on
>> 13th.

>> Should I scrap the draft I sent all of you yesterday or do you want
>> to still
>> work on that as a joint release everyone for the 13th? I only have
>> limited
>> time. Theresa

>>>> -----Original Message-----

>>>> From: dmartin@yto.greenpeace.org

>>>> Date: Tue, 7 Feb 2006 04:02:51

>>>> To: Dan McDermott <dmcd@sierraclub.ca>

>>>> Cc: Theresa McClenaghan <mcclenaghan@execulink.com>,
>> dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org, kim@torontoenvironment.org, mark
>> winfield <markw@pembina.org>, muldoonp@lao.on.ca,
>> r.lindgren@sympatico.ca, kcooper@cela.ca

>>>> Subject: Re: Decisions required Re: media advisory

>>>>

>>>> Hi All,

>>>>

>>>> This was probably not a huge news story anyway, so I think doing
>> it on
>> Monday
>>>> will getus into the story a bit more as teh meetings actually
>> start that
>> day.

>>>>

>>>> I say let's proceed with the news conference at QP at 11:00

>> Theresa, I
>> assume
>>>> that you are still going ahead with a draft release that can be used
>> elsewhere
>>>> as well. SP and I will be back in town on Friday.

>>>>

>>>> Cheers,

>>>> Dave M.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Quoting Dan McDermott <dmcd@sierraclub.ca>:

>>>>

>>>>> This was a lot easier on Friday. We had a press conference set
>> up and
>>>>> were ready to roll. I do wish we had stuck with Plan A. The
>> theoretical
>>>>> advantage of doing this Mon. is to get it in the same newscycle
>> as the
>>>>> coverage of the first meetings. The problem we have discovered
>> is that
>>>>> the Leg resumes that day. I don't see the logic for a later date.

>>>>
>>>> This is always a guessing game. The press conference may or may not
>>>> work. I'm disappointed that may be losing the moment on this. I
>> may get
>>>> out an SCC release on specifically the Toronto meeting in the
>> next few
>> days.
>>>>
>>>> I don't have a problem with saying that this is a phony
>> consultation
>>>> process and we had best show up to complain about that and the OPA
>>>> recommendations.
>>>>
>>>> Truly, Dan
>>>>
>>>> Theresa McClenaghan wrote:
>>>>> So what does everyone think re Mark's question whether we need
>> both
>> the
>>>>> media release and the press conference. Seems that we are
>> doing the
>>>>> press conference in any event. Theresa
>>>>>
>>>>> ----- Original Message -----
>>>>> *From:* mark winfield <<mailto:markw@pembina.org>>
>>>>> *To:* Theresa McClenaghan <<mailto:mcclenaghan@execulink.com>>;
>>>>> dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org
>>>>> <<mailto:dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org>>;
>>>>> kim@torontoenvironment.org
>>>>> <<mailto:kim@torontoenvironment.org>>; dmcd@sierraclub.ca
>>>>> <<mailto:dmcd@sierraclub.ca>>
>>>>> *Cc:* muldoonp@lao.on.ca <<mailto:muldoonp@lao.on.ca>>;
>>>>> r.lindgren@sympatico.ca <<mailto:r.lindgren@sympatico.ca>>;
>>>>> kcooper@cela.ca <<mailto:kcooper@cela.ca>>
>>>>> *Sent:* Monday, February 06, 2006 4:10 PM
>>>>> *Subject:* Re: Decisions required Re: media advisory
>>>>>
>>>>> Do we need a release and a press conference.
>>>>>
>>>>> I'd be inclined to go with the 13th anyway for a PC, as
>> energy is
>>>>> likely to be on the policy agenda. 14th would be another
>> option.
>>>>> Need to think about messaging we're trashing the process while
>>>>> encouraging people to participate.
>>>>>
>>>>> Mark.
>>>>>
>>>>> At 03:18 PM 2/6/2006, Theresa McClenaghan wrote:
>>>>>> OK all, after discussions on this side of the ocean and the
>> other,

>>>>> consensus is:

>>>>> 1. Media conference for Monday February 13th, 2005 - can

>> we say

>>>>> 11 am?

>>>>> This will be the day that the consultations in the 12 cities

>> start

>>>>> and provides a better hook along the lines of "mcguinty's

>>>>> conversation with Ontarians starts today and what a joke

>> it is

>>>>> (but much better framed for media)

>>>>> BUT Dan just found out that the provincial legislature

>> resumes

>>>>> Monday so we can anticipate provincial announcements and a

>> crowded

>>>>> provincial news day - what do people think in light of

>> that? Go

>>>>> ahead anyway???

>>>>> 2. Participants to include: TEA, Sierra Club, CELA,

>> Greenpeace

>>>>> and maybe Pembina; Mark to confirm.

>>>>> 3. We will do a JOINT PRESS RELEASE, aiming to get it out by

>>>>> TOMORROW afternoon. I am going to send you a skeleton of it

>>>>> shortly with a request that you each add your quotes and

>> return

>> to

>>>>> me by 2 pm tomorrow, so you can start to think about a quote

>>>>> already and send to me as soon as you have it. Press release

>>>>> won't mention the press conference. CELA can get the press

>>>>> release out to the major news outlets.

>>>>>

>>>>> ----- Original Message -----

>>>>> From: mark winfield <<mailto:markw@pembina.org>>

>>>>> To: Theresa McClenaghan

>> <<mailto:mcclenaghan@execulink.com>> ;

>>>>> dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org

>>>>> <<mailto:dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org>> ;

>>>>> kim@torontoenvironment.org

>> <<mailto:kim@torontoenvironment.org>>

>>>>> ; dmcd@sierraclub.ca <<mailto:dmcd@sierraclub.ca>>

>>>>> Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 1:31 PM

>>>>> Subject: Re: media advisory

>>>>>

>>>>> Even if a press conference is not possible I think that a

>>>>> press release at least needs to go out for the record

>>>>> indicating that what the government is doing is a

>> complete

>> joke.

>>>>>

>>>>> Mark.

>>>>>

>>>>> At 10:04 AM 2/6/2006, Theresa McClenaghan wrote:

>>>>>> Here is a very rough draft at a media advisory.
>> Just
>>>>>> talking to Dave Martin calling from Europe;
>> looking for
>>>>>> something newsworthy and I realize we did not yet
>>>>>> publicize the joint letter re process demands and
>> terms
>>>>>> of reference so we can build around that. Theresa
>>>>>> Theresa McClenaghan, Counsel,
>>>>>> Canadian Environmental Law Association
>>>>>> 130 Spadina Ave. Unit 301, Toronto, ON M5V 2L4
>>>>>> T:416-960-2284 ext.218 F:416-960-9392
>>>>>> mcclenaghan@execulink.com
>> <<mailto:mcclenaghan@execulink.com>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Home office email mcclenaghan@execulink.com
>>>>>> <<mailto:mcclenaghan@execulink.com>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Cell phone: 519-755-7579
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> CELA's Library website: www.ecolawinfo.org
>>>>>> <<http://www.ecolawinfo.org>> <
>> <http://www.ecolawinfo.org>
>>>>>> <<http://www.ecolawinfo.org>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Confidentiality Note: This message may
>>>>>> be subject to solicitor - client privilege.
>>>>>> If you have received this message in error,
>>>>>> please let me know by reply email, and
>>>>>> delete your copy. Thank you.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> No virus found in this incoming message.
>>>>>> Checked by AVG Free Edition.
>>>>>> Version: 7.1.375 / Virus Database: 267.15.2/251 - Release Date:
>> 04/02/2006
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Theresa McClenaghan
>>>>>> Counsel
>>>>>> Canadian Environmental Law Association

>>>> Suite 301 130 Spadina Ave. Toronto

>>>> 416-960-2284 ext. 218

>>>> cell phone 519-755-7579

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>

>

>

>

Theresa McClenaghan

From: "mark winfield" <markw@pembina.org>
To: "Theresa McClenaghan" <mcclenaghan@execulink.com>; "Dan McDermott" <dmcd@sierraclub.ca>
Cc: <dmartin@yto.greenpeace.org>; <dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org>; <kim@torontoenvironment.org>; <muldoonp@lao.on.ca>; "Rick Lindgren" <r.lindgren@sympatico.ca>; <kcooper@cela.ca>
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 11:46 AM
Subject: Re: Decisions required Re: media advisory

I would go with getting something on the record sooner rather than later. Have not been able to get a hold of Marlo so don't know if we are in, but the obvious line is 4 days of public meetings is not adequate for a \$83 billion plan.

Mark.

At 11:40 AM 2/7/2006, Theresa McClenaghan wrote:

>It seems that maybe this draft did not go when I thought I sent it out.
 >Please look at this and let me know if you want to add a quote and sign on
 >to a joint media release. Next question do we send it today as we planned
 >or for Monday? Theresa
 >----- Original Message -----
 >From: "Dan McDermott" <dmcd@sierraclub.ca>
 >To: <mcclenaghan@execulink.com>
 >Cc: <dmartin@yto.greenpeace.org>; <dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org>;
 ><kim@torontoenvironment.org>; <markw@pembina.org>; <muldoonp@lao.on.ca>;
 >"Rick Lindgren" <r.lindgren@sympatico.ca>; <kcooper@cela.ca>
 >Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 11:36 AM
 >Subject: Re: Decisions required Re: media advisory
 >
 >
 >> Hi Theresa,
 >>
 >> I didn't get the email with the draft release. My last one from you
 >> indicated that it would be circulated.
 >>
 >> Truly, Dan
 >>
 >> Theresa McClenaghan wrote:
 >>> I AM still doing a boilerplate release for the cities where
 >consultations see happening but this woUld be different than a release
 >criticizing the consultations in support of our press conference on 13th.
 >Should I scrap the draft I sent all of you yesterday or do you want to still
 >work on that as a joint release everyone for the 13th? I only have limited
 >time. Theresa
 >>> -----Original Message-----
 >>> From: dmartin@yto.greenpeace.org

>>> Date: Tue, 7 Feb 2006 04:02:51
>>> To: Dan McDermott <dmcd@sierraclub.ca>
>>> Cc: Theresa McClenaghan <mcclenaghan@execulink.com>, mark
>dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org, kim@torontoenvironment.org,
>winfield <markw@pembina.org>, muldoonp@lao.on.ca,
>r.lindgren@sympatico.ca, kcooper@cela.ca
>>> Subject: Re: Decisions required Re: media advisory
>>>
>>> Hi All,
>>>
>>> This was probably not a huge news story anyway, so I think doing it on
>Monday
>>> will get us into the story a bit more as the meetings actually start that
>day.
>>>
>>> I say let's proceed with the news conference at QP at 11:00 Theresa, I
>assume
>>> that you are still going ahead with a draft release that can be used
>elsewhere
>>> as well. SP and I will be back in town on Friday.
>>>
>>> Cheers,
>>> Dave M.
>>>
>>>
>>> Quoting Dan McDermott <dmcd@sierraclub.ca>:
>>>
>>>> This was a lot easier on Friday. We had a press conference set up and
>>>> were ready to roll. I do wish we had stuck with Plan A. The theoretical
>>>> advantage of doing this Mon. is to get it in the same newscycle as the
>>>> coverage of the first meetings. The problem we have discovered is that
>>>> the Leg resumes that day. I don't see the logic for a later date.
>>>>
>>>> This is always a guessing game. The press conference may or may not
>>>> work. I'm disappointed that may be losing the moment on this. I may get
>>>> out an SCC release on specifically the Toronto meeting in the next few
>days.
>>>>
>>>> I don't have a problem with saying that this is a phony consultation
>>>> process and we had best show up to complain about that and the OPA
>>>> recommendations.
>>>>
>>>> Truly, Dan
>>>>
>>>> Theresa McClenaghan wrote:
>>>>> So what does everyone think re Mark's question whether we need both
>the
>>>>> media release and the press conference. Seems that we are doing the
>>>>> press conference in any event. Theresa
>>>>>
>>>>> ----- Original Message -----

>>>> *From:* mark winfield <<mailto:markw@pembina.org>>
 >>>> *To:* Theresa McClenaghan <<mailto:mcclenaghan@execulink.com>>;
 >>>> dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org
 >>>> <<mailto:dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org>>;
 >kim@torontoenvironment.org
 >>>> <<mailto:kim@torontoenvironment.org>>; dmcd@sierraclub.ca
 >>>> <<mailto:dmcd@sierraclub.ca>>
 >>>> *Cc:* muldoonp@lao.on.ca <<mailto:muldoonp@lao.on.ca>>;
 >>>> r.lindgren@sympatico.ca <<mailto:r.lindgren@sympatico.ca>>;
 >>>> kcooper@cela.ca <<mailto:kcooper@cela.ca>>
 >>>> *Sent:* Monday, February 06, 2006 4:10 PM
 >>>> *Subject:* Re: Decisions required Re: media advisory

>>>> Do we need a release and a press conference.

>>>> I'd be inclined to go with the 13th anyway for a PC, as energy is
 >>>> likely to be on the policy agenda. 14th would be another option.
 >>>> Need to think about messaging we're trashing the process while
 >>>> encouraging people to participate.

>>>> Mark.

>>>> At 03:18 PM 2/6/2006, Theresa McClenaghan wrote:

>>>>> OK all, after discussions on this side of the ocean and the
 >other,

>>>>> consensus is:

>>>>> 1. Media conference for Monday February 13th, 2005 - can we say
 >>>>> 11 am?

>>>>> This will be the day that the consultations in the 12 cities

>start

>>>>> and provides a better hook along the lines of "mcguinty's
 >>>>> conversation with Ontarians starts today and what a joke it is
 >>>>> (but much better framed for media)

>>>>> BUT Dan just found out that the provincial legislature resumes
 >>>>> Monday so we can anticipate provincial announcements and a

>crowded

>>>>> provincial news day - what do people think in light of that? Go
 >>>>> ahead anyway???

>>>>> 2. Participants to include: TEA, Sierra Club, CELA, Greenpeace
 >>>>> and maybe Pembina; Mark to confirm.

>>>>> 3. We will do a JOINT PRESS RELEASE, aiming to get it out by
 >>>>> TOMORROW afternoon. I am going to send you a skeleton of it
 >>>>> shortly with a request that you each add your quotes and return

>to

>>>>> me by 2 pm tomorrow, so you can start to think about a quote
 >>>>> already and send to me as soon as you have it. Press release
 >>>>> won't mention the press conference. CELA can get the press
 >>>>> release out to the major news outlets.

>>>>> ----- Original Message -----

>>>>> From: mark winfield <<mailto:markw@pembina.org>>

>>>>> To: Theresa McClenaghan <<mailto:mcclenaghan@execulink.com>>;
 >>>>> dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org
 >>>>> <<mailto:dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org>>;
 >>>>> kim@torontoenvironment.org
 ><<mailto:kim@torontoenvironment.org>>
 >>>>> ; dmcd@sierraclub.ca <<mailto:dmcd@sierraclub.ca>>
 >>>>> Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 1:31 PM
 >>>>> Subject: Re: media advisory

>>>>> Even if a press conference is not possible I think that a
 >>>>> press release at least needs to go out for the record
 >>>>> indicating that what the government is doing is a complete
 >joke.

>>>>> Mark.

>>>>> At 10:04 AM 2/6/2006, Theresa McClenaghan wrote:
 >>>>>> Here is a very rough draft at a media advisory. Just
 >>>>>> talking to Dave Martin calling from Europe; looking for
 >>>>>> something newsworthy and I realize we did not yet
 >>>>>> publicize the joint letter re process demands and terms
 >>>>>> of reference so we can build around that. Theresa
 >>>>>> Theresa McClenaghan, Counsel,
 >>>>>> Canadian Environmental Law Association
 >>>>>> 130 Spadina Ave. Unit 301, Toronto, ON M5V 2L4
 >>>>>> T:416-960-2284 ext.218 F:416-960-9392
 >>>>>> mcclenaghan@execulink.com
 ><<mailto:mcclenaghan@execulink.com>>

>>>>>> Home office email mcclenaghan@execulink.com
 >>>>>> <<mailto:mcclenaghan@execulink.com>>

>>>>>> Cell phone: 519-755-7579

>>>>>> CELA's Library website: www.ecolawinfo.org
 >>>>>> <<http://www.ecolawinfo.org>> <<http://www.ecolawinfo.org>>
 >>>>>> <<http://www.ecolawinfo.org/>>

>>>>>> Confidentiality Note: This message may
 >>>>>> be subject to solicitor - client privilege.
 >>>>>> If you have received this message in error,
 >>>>>> please let me know by reply email, and
 >>>>>> delete your copy. Thank you.

>>>>>
 >>>>>

>>>> -----
>>>>
>>>> No virus found in this incoming message.
>>>> Checked by AVG Free Edition.
>>>> Version: 7.1.375 / Virus Database: 267.15.2/251 - Release Date:
>04/02/2006
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Theresa McClenaghan
>>> Counsel
>>> Canadian Environmental Law Association
>>> Suite 301 130 Spadina Ave. Toronto
>>> 416-960-2284 ext. 218
>>> cell phone 519-755-7579
>>>
>>>
>>>
>

Reply-To: mcclenaghan@execulink.com
Sensitivity: Normal
Importance: Normal
To: "charlene@lao.on.ca" <charlene@lao.on.ca>
Subject: Fw: Someone from CELA should go to this
From: "Theresa McClenaghan" <mcclenaghan@execulink.com>
Date: Wed, 15 Feb 2006 15:42:58 +0000 GMT
Return-Path: mcclenaghan@rogers.blackberry.net

Please print for me and for Rick. Theresa

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

From: shawn.patrick.stensil@yto.greenpeace.org
Date: Tue, 14 Feb 2006 19:47:27
To:theresa McClenaghan <mcclenaghan@execulink.com>
Subject: Someone from CELA should go to this

Hey Theresa,

We're all busy, but someone from CELA should really attend this info session on new nuclear build that the CNSC is holding. I'm going, but we need good legal minds to have their heads around this.

Ok. It's late.

February 13, 2006

La version française suit.

Dear Mr. Shawn Patrick Stensil,

We would like to remind you of our invitation to our information session that was sent to you on February 3, 2006. We note that you have not yet registered, but urge you to do so by February 17, 2006.

There has been much discussion over the last 12 months on the need for new nuclear power plants in Canada to meet the growing demand for electricity. Governments, Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) licensees and stakeholders have requested information from the CNSC on the regulatory requirements and process for licensing such facilities. The Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission has created an information document on the licensing process for new nuclear power plants in Canada.

The document describes the licensing process for new nuclear power plants in Canada, taking into consideration the requirements of the Nuclear Safety and Control Act (NSCA) and its associated regulations. The information document is the precursor to a series of regulatory documents for the licensing of new nuclear power plants. These documents will be developed over the next few years.

The CNSC has not yet received an application from any operator to start the licensing process for the construction of any new nuclear power plants. The information document has been prepared as part of the CNSCs due diligence and as such, ensures stakeholders have a well-informed understanding of the licensing process.

The CNSC is holding an information session on the licensing process for new nuclear power plants as discussed in the information document. While the presentation will be conducted primarily in English, simultaneous translation will be provided along with French spokespeople to respond to questions. This document will be released by the CNSC in full on February 23, 2006. The session will be held at the Government Conference Centre in downtown Ottawa on February 24, 2006 from 9:30 to 11:30 am.

Please enter the Government Conference Centre through the entrance on Colonel By Drive. Registration will be in the Main Lounge, just beyond the Commissionaires desk. Photo ID may be required as this is a government building.

If you are able to attend the session, please RSVP by [clicking here](#) and registering electronically.
If you are unable to attend the session but would like to view the document, it will be available on the CNSC web site after noon on February 23, 2006, www.nuclearsafety.gc.ca. Sincerely, Ken Pereira Executive Vice-President,
Operations Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission
13 février 2006

Mr. Shawn Patrick Stensil,

Nous aimerions vous rappeler notre invitation du 3 février la session d'information de la CCSN. Nous avons remarqué que vous n'êtes pas encore inscrit et nous vous saurions gr de le faire avant le 17 février 2006.

Au cours des 12 derniers mois, de nombreuses discussions ont eu lieu sur la nécessité d'implanter de nouvelles centrales nucléaires au Canada en vue de répondre la demande croissante en électricité. Les gouvernements, les titulaires de permis de la Commission canadienne de sûreté nucléaire (CCSN) et les parties intéressées ont demandé de l'information la CCSN au sujet des exigences réglementaires et du processus d'autorisation de telles installations.

La CCSN a rédigé un document d'information sur le processus d'autorisation des nouvelles centrales nucléaires au Canada. Le document décrit le processus d'autorisation des nouvelles centrales nucléaires au Canada, en tenant compte des exigences de la Loi sur la sûreté et la réglementation nucléaires (LSRN) et de ses règlements d'application. Le document d'information est le premier d'une série de documents d'application de la réglementation concernant l'autorisation de nouvelles centrales nucléaires. Ces documents seront publiés au cours des prochaines années.

Pour l'instant, la CCSN n'a pas encore reçu de demande de permis de la part d'exploitants afin d'entamer le processus d'autorisation pour la construction d'une nouvelle centrale nucléaire. Le document d'information a été rédigé par la CCSN au titre de la diligence raisonnable et vise ainsi à assurer que les parties intéressées comprennent bien le processus d'autorisation. La CCSN tiendra une séance d'information sur le processus d'autorisation des nouvelles centrales nucléaires, tel que discuté dans le document d'information. La présentation sera principalement donnée en anglais, mais une traduction simultanée sera offerte, de même que les services d'un porte-parole francophone afin de répondre aux questions soulevées. Ce document sera diffusé en entier par la CCSN le 23 février 2006. La séance d'information aura lieu au Centre de conférences du gouvernement (centre ville d'Ottawa) le 24 février 2006, de 9 h 30 à 11 h 30.

Pour avoir accès au Centre des conférences du gouvernement, veuillez utiliser l'entrée de la promenade du Colonel By. Les inscriptions prendront place dans le hall principal, derrière le bureau du commissionnaire. D'autre part, tant donné qu'il s'agit d'un édifice gouvernemental, assurez-vous d'avoir sur vous une pièce d'identité avec photo.

Si vous désirez assister cette séance, veuillez si vous préférez répondre en cliquant ici pour vous inscrire.

Si vous ne pouvez pas assister la séance, mais désirez tout de même consulter le document, celui-ci sera accessible sur le site Web de la CCSN compter de midi, le 23 février 2006 l'adresse www.suretenucleaire.gc.ca.

Veuillez agréer, Madame, Monsieur, l'expression de mes sentiments les meilleurs. Ken Pereira Premier vice-président,
Direction générale des opérations Commission canadienne de sûreté nucléaire

Official Event Planner for the information session/Organisateur officiel de la séance d'information
registration@brentmoore.com

Forward email

This email was sent to shawn.patrick.stensil@yto.greenpeace.org, by info@cnsccsn.gc.ca

Instant removal with [SafeUnsubscribe](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

Powered by

Brent Moore & Associates Inc. | 915 St. Joseph Blvd. | Gatineau | J8Z 1S8 | Canada

The following section of this message contains a file attachment prepared for transmission using the Internet MIME message format. If you are using Pegasus Mail, or any other MIME-compliant system, you should be able to save it or view it from within your mailer. If you cannot, please ask your system administrator for assistance.

----- File information -----

File: DEFAULT.BMP

Date: 22 Feb 2005, 17:09

Size: 358 bytes.

Type: Unknown

Theresa McClenaghan

Counsel

Canadian Environmental Law Association

Suite 301 130 Spadina Ave. Toronto

416-960-2284 ext. 218

cell phone 519-755-7579

Theresa McClenaghan

From: "Shawn-Patrick Stensil" <shawn.patrick.stensil@yto.greenpeace.org>
To: "eENERGY VISION GROUP" <energy-vision@list.web.net>
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 9:07 AM
Subject: [Energy-vision] One bad energy plan

One bad energy plan
The Peterborough Examiner
Wednesday, February 8, 2006
Page: A4
Section: Opinion
Byline: Miriam Stucky
Source: The Examiner

This Sunday is the final day for public comment on the Ontario Power Authority (OPA) recommendations for the next 20 years of power supply in Ontario, the toxic waste of which could last, well, forever.

The contentious OPA report short-sightedly suggests that Ontario needs to increase the supply of energy and proposes nuclear power should provide half the province's energy by 2025 at a cost of \$30 to \$40 billion. Think how many effective conservation programs and renewable power systems could be installed for a fraction of that sum.

The Dalton McGuinty government appears to be ramming ahead with the ill-conceived OPA document.

The "energy crisis" in Ontario is not a supply problem. It is a problem of profligate demand. We abuse cheap energy. How many people use air conditioners when a simple fan would suffice? How many businesses have the air conditioner running and the door open? How many buildings are heated to the point where occupants wear undershirts mid-winter?

The OPA report pays lip service to conservation, but exaggerates future demand. We have not fully explored (let alone exploited) the potential for conservation and energy efficiencies in appliances, building codes and co-generation. Decisive advances in education, incentives and regulations are desperately needed to transform our consumption patterns.

We need to think differently about energy. Forget the mega-project. It takes more than 10 years to build one big nuclear station, but smaller decentralized energy options, like renewables (solar, wind, etc.) and district heating systems (geothermal), can quickly and more reliably be deployed in the short and mid-term.

Maintaining the current level of nuclear in our supply mix (about 50 per cent) will stifle the development of the burgeoning renewables sector. We have the financial backing and the scientific know-how to develop safe, affordable,

forward-thinking power in Ontario - where is the visionary leadership to match?

The McGuinty government has been dodging meaningful public engagement on this issue. Sixty days "consultation" during winter holidays and a federal election and then "full steam ahead" is not enough to make sound long-term decisions. We need a truly transparent and participatory process.

The continued dependence on nuclear energy advocated in the OPA report is a threat to the fiscal and environmental security of Ontario.

Anyone who wants to do something about it should write Premier McGuinty

Miriam Stucky

Hunter Street East

Energy-vision mailing list

Energy-vision@list.web.net

<http://list.web.net/lists/listinfo/energy-vision>

Theresa McClenaghan

From: "Kathleen Cooper" <kcooper@cela.ca>
To: "Kim Fry" <kim@torontoenvironment.org>; "Theresa McClenaghan" <mcclenaghan@execulink.com>
Cc: "mark winfield" <markw@pembina.org>; "Rick Lindgren" <r.lindgren@sympatico.ca>; "Dan McDermott" <dmcd@sierraclub.ca>; <dmartin@yto.greenpeace.org>; <dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org>; <muldoonp@lao.on.ca>
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 12:21 PM
Subject: Re: Here it is

We refuse to recognize the input from these meetings as proper public consultation

I think this statement will make people not bother to show up

I think the point is more about slamming the premier's actions and focusing on what the public should do not what TEA recognizes or not from a "proper public consultation"

I would also remove the edit that adds in the "or an environmental assessment" clause. Syntax is problematic too. As written, "environmental assessment" could be referred by some back to being a "safer sustainable solution"

We should avoid trying to make every point in every sentence

Keep it simple. Use short sentences.

KC

At 11:57 AM 08/02/2006, Kim Fry wrote:

Theresa McClenaghan wrote:

here is the media release as we now have it. I have only CELA, TEA and Sierra Club on it; Pembina could not be included and I've not heard back from Dave and Shawn-Patrick. We will send it today, but double check attached. We have your logos and will attach. Do I have your contact descriptions right? Theresa
 ----- Original Message -----
 From: "Kim Fry"

<kim@torontoenvironment.org>
 To: "mark winfield"
 <markw@pembina.org>
 Cc: "Rick Lindgren"

<r.lindgren@sympatico.ca>; "Dan McDermott"
 <dmcd@sierraclub.ca>;
 "Kathleen Cooper"
 <kcooper@cela.ca>;

"Theresa
McClenaghan"

<mcclenaghan@execulink.com>;

<dmartin@yto.greenpeace.org>;

<dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org>;

<muldoonp@lao.on.ca>

Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 10:14 AM

Subject: Re: please respond

Hey everyone,

I really hope the release can go out today.... Where is it at? I
can
keep working on it if CELA follks are swamped. Can we set a
deadline of
noon for getting it out?

thanks
Kim

mark winfield wrote:

I'd be inclined to leave a reference to EA in. Makes clear that
additional consultation isn't all that's needed, and heads off
arguements that consultation obviate the need for an EA.

mark.

At 08:45 AM 2/8/2006, Rick Lindgren wrote:

When I noticed the omission of EA in the press release, I a
that the EA angle would await the next press release re our
EBR submission on the Plan. As I understand it, the need f
was going to be more fully argued at that time, plus some s
generic opinion would be released, too.

So, I'd suggest that the reference to EA could be dropped f
resurrected as part of our overall submission on the Plan.
RL

Dan McDermott wrote:

Hi Everyone,

I too like Kathy's edits. I hear the points that Kim i said, I think we should stick to the Walkerton style 1 now. I think that the EA message in isolation has pro well.

Truly, Dan

Kim Fry wrote:

I like Kathy's proposed edits, I think they tight but I also wonder if we should drop the Walkerton it is confusing to people. I think we should emp want an Environmental Assessment of any plan the forward. (I already spoke to T heresa about that

I also wonder if we should send a letter to McQui this form of consulation and use the letter as th press release?

And I think we can come out strong and really sla on this. heaven knows they deserve it!

Kim

Kathleen Cooper wrote:

All,
Some editorial shortening suggestions in the attached.
KC

At 03:09 PM 07/02/2006, Theresa McClenaghan

I've done revisions adding Dan's quote, Mark based on his email and Rick's reply. I have not Shawn-Patrick yet and nothing from Kim or Keith at TEA ye me to confirm if their organization is on for is, and who their contact person is, so I can get i Greenpeace, TEA, Pembina; I know we have CELA and Sierra edits to the press release, don't be shy, it's just

2/8/2006

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

From: "Rick Lindgren"

[<r.lindgren@sympatico.ca>](mailto:r.lindgren@sympatico.ca)

To: "mark winfield"

[<markw@pembina.org>](mailto:markw@pembina.org)

Cc: "Theresa McClenaghan"

[<mcclenaghan@execulink.com>](mailto:mcclenaghan@execulink.com); "Dan McDermott"

[<dmcd@sierraclub.ca>](mailto:dmcd@sierraclub.ca);

[<dmartin@yto.greenpeace.org>](mailto:dmartin@yto.greenpeace.org);

[<dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org>](mailto:dave.martin@yto.greenpeace.org);

[<kim@torontoenvironment.org>](mailto:kim@torontoenvironment.org);

[<muldoonp@lao.on.ca>](mailto:muldoonp@lao.on.ca);

[<kcooper@cela.ca>](mailto:kcooper@cela.ca)

Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 12:09

Subject: Re: Decisions required Re: med

The "public consultation" is espec
because

certain

decisions (i.e. nuclear) that may

have

consequences lasting hundreds if n

we get 4

whole days to debate this?!

RL

mark winfield wrote:

Theresa McClenaghan

From: "Edeltraud Neal" <wiltraud@comnet.ca>
To: "Peter & Carolyn Day" <day@bmts.com>; "Theresa McClenaghan [CELA]" <mcclenaghan@execulink.com>
Cc: "Sabina2" <sabinaauburger@rogers.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 12:37 PM
Subject: Re: URGENT for you to help re response to energy plan

Hello all,

Just as the general population, members of our federation will react in different ways to the power generation issue in general and the nuclear power plant issue in particular. I had asked members just to attend the meetings and take part in the discussion and thus indicate that the public is monitoring and is interested in the issue.

In a multidisciplinary group such as ours a balance in the big picture will always have to be struck.

We endorse the Kyoto Accord but have not found one particular way of power generation particularly commendable. The big provincial expenditure on nuclear warrants critical analysis of the whole picture though. So does the application of the Ontario Power Authority to the Federal Government for a power export permit to the US.

Let's hope members will attend the meetings if only to learn more about the issue.

Regards,
 Edeltraud

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

From: Peter & Carolyn Day
To: Theresa McClenaghan [CELA] ; Wib and Edeltraud Neal
Cc: Sabina2
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 12:49 AM
Subject: Re: URGENT for you to help re response to energy plan

Hi Edeltraud & Theresa -

I am not a good person to pursue this as I'm not necessarily on-side on this issue. Did you read the Globe article quoting McGuinty saying that in a perfect world we wouldn't need the extra power - conservation and wind/solar would be enough - but that it's NOT a perfect world and we do need the power generation. I don't think nuclear is the whole answer - but I do think it is a part of where we will have to go. I think we need to use our voice as a voice of balance to work with govt. to find workable ways to minimize the amount of new nuclear that will be needed.

Nuclear isn't perfect of course with its generation of radioactive waste. But it does not pollute the air the way coal and gas fired plants do - no greenhouse gasses contributing to climate change. And from our study of the November 2005 Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO) Report to the Ontario Government "Choosing a Way Forward", (has CELA studied that yet Theresa?) we found that their proposal for "Adaptive Phased Management", while certainly not inexpensive, did answer most of our concerns about the long-term safety of dealing with nuclear waste which we had raised previously. I think I sent you a copy of our response to that report Edeltraud.

I can certainly get on the bandwagon re the need for conservation. That's a no-brainer - but it's politically very difficult because to make it happen on the scale that would be needed, it means govt. refusing to subsidize power generation - and that in turn means the resultant spike in energy bills. Neither the manufacturing industry nor the public will vote for that!! But there are ways to legislate more efficient engines, appliances etc. to help toward that goal - and we do have to get there.

They do need to investigate and invest in finding alternate sources of generation to produce a larger share of the energy we need - alongside the nuclear industry. It makes me so frustrated that they won't invest, especially for the large urban areas, in the European clean technology for incinerators which produce power without polluting the environment and get rid of garbage waste at the same time - so you have no more convoys of garbage trucks & their emissions on the highways taking our waste to Michigan. It IS expensive for municipalities to build them on their own - cheaper to send the convoys of trucks. But with the vision to see the link between the garbage and the energy plan, there could be funding support from the government to make it happen.

I have found that a number of people who self-identify as anti-nuclear do so on principle - and don't really have a sound understanding of the technology used in Canadian reactors, or of the capacity of the various alternatives to produce an equivalent amount of power for the energy plan. They need that to have credibility when they are arguing their case.

We all need to build on our strong links with government - another Advisory Committee? - and work with them to come to the least bad solution!! It's not a simple black-and-white issue.

Goodness - that's enough for tonight!!

Carolyn

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

From: Theresa McClenaghan

To: wiltraude@comnet.ca ; day@bmts.com

Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 1:50 PM

Subject: Fw: URGENT for you to help re response to energy plan

Edeltroude and Carolyn, would you be able to forward this message to CFUW lists across the province. Below is the message I sent our (CELA's) staff and board members, encouraging them to use the links to send a letter to the premier and especially to get out to the short notice consultations across the province next week on the 85 billion dollar electricity plan that is short on renewables and efficiencies and heavily reliant on a nuclear rebuild. Let me know if getting the word out to CFUW lists is a possibility for you. Also, it would be good to encourage people to resend to their lists. Especially getting women and Moms out to the public consultation meetings across the province next week on Monday, Wednesday and Friday evenings would be especially important. Thanks! Theresa

Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 3:38 PM

Subject: URGENT for you to help re response to energy plan

CELA Board and Staff:

Please help respond to the outrageous plan by the provincial government to spend 85 billion dollars on its electricity supply plan, including 45 billion dollars on new nuclear plants, up to 12 new nuclear plants in the province. The provincial government is holding a consultation - (wildly inadequate) - in 12 cities across Ontario on less than 10 days notice; two hours per evening in each of the cities; four cities at a time on the 13th, 15th and 17th of February. We need EACH of YOU to forward this message to all of your contacts, environmental or not, asking them to do two things:

1. On the Go Clean and Green link below, use the letter to the premier button to tell Premier McGuinty that we want a RENEWABLE, EFFICIENCY based approach to electricity supply in the province, NOT a rebuild of the dinosaur nuclear legacy with the economic costs, toxic nuclear waste legacy, health effects and accident risks, and

2. Look up the schedule of cities and GO to the City you live in or nearest and make your voice heard.

We think that Ontario has to send an over-whelming message to the Premier that nuclear is not the way to go; is not what we want for our grandchildren.

It's especially important to get this message out across the province; if you know people in those cities who are likely to go out to the meetings, please CALL them, ensure they know about it and ask them to juggle their schedules to get out to these meetings.

This is the FIRST chance people across Ontario have had a real chance to have their say on this issue and

involves the biggest infrastructure spending decision in the history of the province and a massive public response is critical.

THANKS everyone. Theresa

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

From: Ontario Clean Air Alliance

To: cleanair-l@list.web.net

Sent: Friday, February 03, 2006 12:42 PM

Subject: [cleanair-l] Help the Government decide our electricity future

The Ontario government has just announced extended public consultations on the Ontario Power Authority's (OPA) report which recommends that we meet 60 to 80% of our incremental electricity needs from high-cost and unreliable nuclear power plants.

There will be public open houses and "town hall" meetings in 12 communities across Ontario in February.

February 13th: Mississauga, Ottawa, Sarnia, Toronto;

February 15th: Thunder Bay, Kingston, Oshawa, St. Catharines; and

February 17th: Kincardine, Kitchener-Waterloo, London, Sudbury.

In March 2006, the Government is expected to issue directives to the OPA which will lead either to a major re-investment in nuclear power or set us on the path to a clean and green renewable future.

Please be sure to attend these consultations and let the Government know whether you want a nuclear or a clean and green electricity future for your grandchildren.

For more and information about the Government's consultations and town hall meetings please visit <http://www.gocleanandgreen.org>.

Please pass this message on to your friends.

Thank you.

Jessica Fracassi

Communications & Membership Manager

Ontario Clean Air Alliance

402-625 Church St, Toronto M4Y 2G1

Phone: 416-926-1907 ext. 245

Fax: 416-926-1601

Email: info@cleanair.web.ca

Website: www.cleanairalliance.org

The Ontario Clean Air Alliance is a coalition of health, environmental and consumer organizations, faith communities, unions, utilities, municipalities and individuals working for cleaner air through a coal phase-out and the shift to a renewable electricity future. Our partner organizations represent more than six million Ontarians.

[To subscribe or unsubscribe to this list please click here.](#)

For more on how you can contribute to clearing Ontario's air through your electricity purchases,

please see our consumer-advice website: www.electricitychoices.org.

Theresa McClenaghan

From: "Alexandra McKee-Bennett" <alexandra.mckee-bennett@sympatico.ca>
To: <jrjanes@sympatico.ca>; "Elizabeth May" <emay@sierraclub.ca>
Cc: <energy-vision@list.web.net>; <kathysjr@yorku.ca>
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2006 11:14 AM
Subject: Re: [Energy-vision] Kingston meeting review AND OUTLINE OF THE OSHAWAMEETING

Thanks!

This was also presented @ the Oshawa meeting. Where Tom Lawson opened the meeting stating he did not like their process and came to speak to conservation.

The facilitator asked those who attended if this was also their pleasure and we reordered their agenda.

Overwhelming support for conservation was very clear.

Shaun-Patrick presented Greenpeace's position well, Kathleen of CELA made a number of important points, I spoke to the nuclear fuel cycles effect on health.

John Morand another founding member of FARE spoke to Port Hope's nuclear industry and its environmental legacy. My friend Dan spoke about the personal health effects he deals with as a former nuclear worker. Andy John Cox spoke as a engineer who had been employed in Port Hope and Elliot Lake and spoke to the environmental effects in both communities and then raised the First Nation's community at Serpent River.

Many members of the public spoke out and stated they did not want Nuclear.

Mayor Mutton spoke to his support for Nuclear.
Followed by an articulate woman who stated she resides in Clarington and does not want nor support nuclear.

Chris Winter thanked the audience for their overwhelming support for Conservation.

A representative from Science for Peace presented their message clearly and supported my remarks once again on Tritium levels in drinking water and routine discharges being unacceptable.

No "suits" challenged any presenter.

An associate from Patrick Moore's organization read a pro nuke prepared statement at the mike to a thunderous and negative reception. The facilitator tried in vain to ask the group to allow him to be heard. While he spoke a young lady walked around the room with a sign indicating Greenspirit was paid for by CNA. This created much laughter and Boos!

Engineers employed in Clarington gave their half hearted push to support the nuclear power program and spoke to their success in China building another CANDU on time.

No one was "buying" their message.

Two nuclear engineers, one from the UK who had worked locally stated he was ashamed about the nuclear waste he was in part responsible for creating. Mentioned the Porter Commission and the most recent attempt to deal with the nuclear waste storage issues facing Canada. In going so he stated no solution has been found.

Another nuclear worker from India had been sent to Canada to gain knowledge as to how Canada will solve the nuclear waste storage issue. It had been assumed this would take 5 years he is still here and no solution. Stated they cannot design a container to last to ensure the waste is secure.

Two local business men spoke extremely well about the generation of energy from recycled corn materials, and solar energy. The solar energy professional stated the misinformation included in the OPG report was clearly misleading. He also wanted his objection to the misinformation contained in the OPG report formally recorded.

It was recommended that the OPG report be shelved for a year to allow for a meaningful and complete public hearing on the future of Ontario's energy supply. This was proposed by Tom Lawson and the group overwhelmingly supported this.

A young masters in engineering student spoke very confidently about his 20 year comparison on the costs of wind and nuclear power generation, of course nuclear won. Spoke about France and its recycling of nuclear fuel as a good example of the industry. So MOX is the solution? Later spoke to some examples of conservation.

An engineer spoke to Canada's involvement of MOLLY and its need to use to fight cancer, so we need the nuclear power cycle... it was such a silly point I did not feel it required a response.

By 9:30 the room was mostly cleared and they were still on nuclear. I had to leave at that time.

Many stated the process and the time given were not satisfactory to provide for the public input necessary to ensure the public interest was protected.

There was a camera set up recording this meeting.

I am very pleased the support from Port Hope was there. In the centre of the nuclear establishment they heard no support for this industry at this meeting.

It was important to attend. I wish to thank everyone for their time and vital messages.

Regards,

Alexandra

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

From: "Gracia Janes" <jrjanes@sympatico.ca>

To: "Elizabeth May" <emay@sierraclub.ca>

Cc: <energy-vision@list.web.net>; <kathysjr@yorku.ca>

Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2006 7:56 PM

Subject: Re: [Energy-vision] Kingston meeting review

> Here is the CAW brief the Minister asked for . It apparently went out to
> members
> in all cities. I think it is very important as it represents many workers
> across
> the province.

>
> Gracia

> Elizabeth May wrote:

>> Ted Griffith was at the Ottawa meeting, watching from the back of the
>> room. He learned something.

>> At 01:14 PM 2/16/2006, Gracia Janes wrote:

>> >Hi Kathy,

>> >How can we all get these reports that were promised?

>> >Gracia

>> >kathysjr@yorku.ca wrote:

>> > > This just bounced back to me.

>> > > The almost four hour Kingston meeting went as well as could be
>> > expected: great

>> > > number of informed people making really strong points (St.

>> > > Lawrence college put

>> > > in a good showing, Paul McKay, Bill Kemp, Cameron Smith...) It
>> > was the same

>> > > dudes and dudettes from the ministry as in Ottawa, but the

>> > > "facilitator" was

>> > > different. His name is Ted Griffith and he made two promises:

>> > > first, that he

>> > > would stay as long as we had things to say (he said this so that

>> > > we would agree

>> > > to watch the gastly video again), and secondly, that he would be

>> > > sure to provide

>> > > each and every person who had signed in a copy of his report to

>>> the ministry so
 >>>> that we have some sort of awareness of how comments are being
 >>> construed. I'll
 >>>> keep Ted's phone number, just in case it can be helpful.
 >>>> The Whig Standard had a good article this am in the local section,
 >>>> but ckws
 >>>> (Kingston tv) was horrible last night - basically just said there was
 >>>> a
 >>>> diversity of views. blah, erg!
 >>>> good luck Friday,
 >>>> Kathy
 >>>> ps.
 >>>> Homer Simpson once coined the term "crisatunity" after Lisa
 >>> reminded him that a
 >>>> crisis is an opportunity for change. Might be fun to reference him.
 >>>>
 >>>> _____
 >>>> Energy-vision mailing list
 >>>> Energy-vision@list.web.net
 >>>> <http://list.web.net/lists/listinfo/energy-vision>
 >>>>
 >>>>
 >>>> _____
 >>>> Energy-vision mailing list
 >>>> Energy-vision@list.web.net
 >>>> <http://list.web.net/lists/listinfo/energy-vision>
 >>>>
 >>>> _____
 >>>> Energy-vision mailing list
 >>>> Energy-vision@list.web.net
 >>>> <http://list.web.net/lists/listinfo/energy-vision>

 Energy-vision mailing list
Energy-vision@list.web.net
<http://list.web.net/lists/listinfo/energy-vision>

Theresa McClenaghan

From: "Tonya Surman" <tonya@commons.ca>
To: "theresa McClenaghan" <mcclenaghan@execulink.com>; "kim Fry" <kim@torontoenvironment.org>
Sent: Sunday, February 19, 2006 9:35 PM
Subject: FW: Platts Ontario Power Forum - Register by February 17th and Save \$300!

Thought that you might be interested to see this... Thought that this might be something to present on Monday in terms of what they are doing...

Tonya

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

From: Zohrab Mawani - Ventus Energy Inc. [mailto:zm@ventusenergy.ca]
Sent: February 9, 2006 1:40 PM
To: tonya@commons.ca
Subject: Fw: Platts Ontario Power Forum - Register by February 17th and Save \$300!

Tonya

Thought that you might be interested in the below event... NOT! Its begging for some activism though.

How are things going with energy vision?

ZM

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

From: christine benners <christine_benners@platts.com>
To: Zohrab Mawani - Ventus Energy Inc. <zm@ventusenergy.ca>
Sent: Thu Feb 09 09:54:58 2006
Subject: Platts Ontario Power Forum - Register by February 17th and Save \$300!

Register today for Platts 2nd Annual Nuclear Energy: Opportunities for Growth & Investment in North America

<<http://www.platts.com/images/mailshot/06-OPF-HTML-Email-Header.gif>>

"The nature of the problem is clear: a lack of investment to expand electricity capacity."

- Ontario Power Authority Supply Mix Advice Report, December 2005

Register by February 17, 2006 and SAVE \$300

Platts Ontario Power Forum is developed for the independent power developer and investor, providing opportunities to question high-level panels of industry and regulatory experts.

Learn and Interact With More Than 30 Ontario Power Leaders From:

Ministry of Energy . OPA . OEB . IESO . OWA . Brookfield Power . Sithe
Global Enbridge . Bruce Power . Fortis Properties . EPCOR Ontario . BP .
Northland Power Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro . Union Gas . Calpine Corp.
. Constellation VisionQuest Windelectric . AIM PowerGen Corp. . Creststreet
Power & Income Fund Manulife Financial . UBS SA . Scotia Capital . S&P .
Macquarie . RBC Capital . Aon Reed Stenhouse Inc. . AECL . APPrO . Navigant
. Torys

As They Debate The Future Course of Investing in Ontario Power Supply:

Standard Offer Contract . Supply Mix Advice Report . Competitive Procurement
PPA Risks . Supply Mix Options . Technology Risk . Hybrid Debt . Credit
Parameters Subordinated Debt . Contracting Gas Volatility . Construction
Risk and Insurance Permitting . Municipal Zoning . Turbine Supply Grid
Interconnection Avian Approvals . EPC Bid Management

You cannot afford to miss this event! Register today to guarantee your spot!

For a complete agenda or to register and save \$300, please click here
<<http://www.platts.com/Events/PC613/index.html>> or call us at 866-355-2930
(toll-free in the U.S.) or 781-860-6100 (direct).

Discounts are available for groups of 4 or more. Ask for details when you call.

Sponsorship and exhibit opportunities are still available! For more information, please contact Lorne Grout at (781) 860-6112 or e-mail him at lorne_grout@platts.com
<mailto:lorne_grout@platts.com?subject=Ontario%20Power%20Forum> .

Privacy Policy <<http://www.mcgraw-hill.com/privacy.html>>
Copyright C 2005 Platts, a Division of the McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
All rights reserved.

If you do not wish to receive further e-mail solicitations from Platts, please click here <<mailto:unsubscribe@platts.com?subject=UNSUBSCRIBE>> , or write to us at Platts, 3333 Walnut Street, Boulder, CO 80301, or call 720-548-5677. View our Corporate Privacy Policy at www.mcgraw-hill.com/privacy.html. To learn more about how Platts applies this policy, please contact Platts Privacy Official.

Platts

3333 Walnut Street . Boulder . Colorado . 80301

Registration Code: PC613EM

<http://public.resdata.com/htmlmail/mgh_b_fixed.gif>

Theresa McClenaghan

From: "Tonya Surman" <tonya@commons.ca>
To: "theresa McClenaghan" <mcclenaghan@execulink.com>; "Kim Tytler" <ktytler@cccf-fcsge.ca>; <shawn.patrick.stensil@yto.greenpeace.org>
Sent: Sunday, February 19, 2006 9:35 PM
Subject: FW: Nuclear energy info

Here is some more information of various other positions that might be of interest to you....

Tonya

From: Ursitti, Franca [mailto:Franca.Ursitti@peelregion.ca]
Sent: January 17, 2006 4:17 PM
To: Marshall, Lynn
Cc: Aubin, Louise; Tonya Surman
Subject: Nuclear energy info

Hi Lynn, As promised here is that info on nuclear energy

o The following two links are to the opha work. One is a resolution that highlights the importance of investing in renewable energy. The second is to the "Beyond Coal" report that was the basis of the resolution. In this paper there is a section that provides the basis for investing in renewables and there is also a section that discusses nuclear power – sections III-3 and III-4. 1) http://www.opha.on.ca/ppres/2003-01_res.pdf 2) <http://www.opha.on.ca/resources/coal.pdf>.

o Also, Louise Aubin, Research & Policy Analyst here in Peel will be developing a position for the Peel Health on this issue – she will be reviewing the recent OPA report in detail along with other relevant material. She has just gotten the go ahead to work on this so there isn't anything yet. But, please feel free to connect with Louise in future to see where things are at. She can be reached at 905-791-7800 ext 2479 (I've copied her on this so she can have your email address, if she doesn't already have it).

I've also copied Tonya on this – wasn't sure if everyone wanted to see and I am reluctant to add to everyone's inbox indiscriminately.

It was great to see you again. Take care.

Franca Ursitti, M.Sc.

Research and Policy Analyst

Environmental Health

Region of Peel Health Department

44 Peel Centre Dr.

Brampton, ON

L6T 4B5

Tel: 905-791-7800 Ext. 2712

Fax: 905-789-0398

E-mail: franca.ursitti@peelregion.ca

Web site: www.peelregion.ca

Reply-To: mcclenaghan@execulink.com
Sensitivity: Normal
Importance: Normal
To: "charlene@lao.on.ca" <charlene@lao.on.ca>
Subject: Fw: [Energy-vision] Energy meeting fuels heated debate
From: "Theresa McClenaghan" <mcclenaghan@execulink.com>
Date: Thu, 23 Feb 2006 14:25:31 +0000 GMT
Return-Path: mcclenaghan@rogers.blackberry.net

Print for file and copy to Sharon for board package. Theresa

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

From: Gracia Janes <jrjanes@sympatico.ca>
Date: Wed, 22 Feb 2006 13:29:02
To: Dorothy Goldin-Rosenberg <dgoldinrosenberg@oise.utoronto.ca>
Cc: eENERGY VISION GROUP <energy-vision@list.web.net>
Subject: Re: [Energy-vision] Energy meeting fuels heated debate

Hi Dorothy,

I'm puzzled, as I did mention, as did Dave I believe, the tritium releases. Nowhere in this article do i see myself saying there were NO releases!

Gracia

Dorothy Goldin-Rosenberg wrote:

> Hi Gracia
> I am sure that you did not say that CANDU reactors emit no emissions,
> when you well know know about routine releases of tritium, a known
> carcinogen, mutagen and teratogen in its daily operations - not to
> mention radioactive emissions at every stage of the nuclear fuel
> chain. Would it be possible for you to write a letter to the editor to
> correct the misinformation presented in the article? Ane the
> construction of reactors consumes enormous amounts of fossil fuels,
> thus contributing to cliamte change!!!
> Thanks and be well
> Dorothy
>
> Energy meeting fuels heated debate
> The Dunnville Chronicle
> Wednesday, February 22, 2006
> Page: A1 / FRONT
> Section: News
> Byline: Karen Best
> Dateline: ST. CATHARINES
> Source: The Chronicle
>
> ST. CATHARINES - Only renewable energy and conservation received
> unanimous support from citizens commenting on Ontario's future power
> sources.
>
> About 40 people attended the Ontario Ministry of Energy public
> consultation session at a St. Catharines hotel convention centre on
> Feb. 15.
>
> The session began with a video, later described as a sales tool by an

> audience member. Featuring energy minister Donna Cansfield, the
> movie's message was one of urgency. Ontario is on the brink of making
> one of its most important decisions. The need to build generating
> plants is urgent, she said.
>
> "No one solution is perfect. The challenge is to decide on the right
> mix," she said at the end of the film.
>
> Public comments were funnelled through an agenda covering natural gas,
> coal, renewables, nuclear and conservation. Greenpeace energy
> coordinator David Martin denounced the process as illegitimate with 11
> days notice of three days of meetings on the Ontario Power Authority
> energy mix report.
>
> According to a ministry power point, natural gas generation plants can
> be built quickly and cheaply but fuel is more expensive than other
> options.
>
> Because of the high rates, natural gas generation should only be used
> in peak periods.
>
> Paul Serruys, a Power Workers' Union representative and a Nanticoke
> Ontario Power Generation employee, said that the high cost of gas
> fired electricity will cut into industry profit margins. Dr. John
> Bacher suggested substituting methane for natural gas. Because there
> is only a 15 year supply of natural gas, it doesn't make sense to use
> it up for energy generation, said Daniel Robert.
>
> Coal is abundant but emissions from coal fired plants threaten health,
> according to the ministry position. Serruys pointed out Swedish
> technology has made coal plant use acceptable in densely populated
> areas. Coal fired plants provide 6,500 megawatts of power, noted Power
> Workers Union representative Bill Somerville, who suggested cleaning
> up plants. Martin of Greenpeace countered this, stating clean coal
> does not exist.
>
> Eventually nonrenewable resources will run out, pointed out Brock
> University student Tony Gervasio, who encouraged the government to
> look toward the future. Climate change is hurting a lot of people in
> the world, noted Derek Paul, a member of Science for Peace.
>
> The energy ministry considers renewable energy sources to be clean but
> unpredictable. David Griffiths and Gervasio suggested government
> incentives to promote renewable energy investment. Every year the cost
> of wind and solar generation comes down, noted Bacher.
>
> All of Ontario's energy demands can be met with a 40 per cent decrease
> in consumption, said Theresa McClenaghan of the Canadian Environmental
> Law Association.
>
> Nuclear plants produce no emissions but handling waste is a concern,
> according to the energy ministry. Gracia Janes of the Provincial
> Council of Women of Ontario noted that the OPA report does not mention
> the potential for accidents or terrorists attacks. Sue Corcoran of the
> Council of Canadians noted that uranium supplies will be depleted in
> 30 or 40 years. Because the plants take at least 15 years from
> environmental assessment to going on line, new plants would only

> supply power for 20 years. Ontarians will be still paying for the them
> when the fuel is gone, she noted.
>
> A social consensus on radioactive waste management does not exist,
> said Martin. The high level of radioactive waste has a one million
> year legacy that will require centuries of governance structures to
> safeguard, said McClenaghan. Noting that nuclear incidents happed in
> every decade, she said an accident will be an irreversible catastrophe
> for Ontario.
>
> Somerville pointed out that competent trained people work in nuclear
> plants which should be part of the province's energy mix.
>
> The Candu 6 reactor has never melted down, stated a nuclear plant
> employee who accused others of fearmongering. He noted that the
> industry returns \$160 billion to the Canadian economy and provides
> 30,000 high tech jobs.
>
>
>

> Energy-vision mailing list
> Energy-vision@list.web.net
> <http://list.web.net/lists/listinfo/energy-vision>
>
> -----
>

> Energy-vision mailing list
> Energy-vision@list.web.net
> <http://list.web.net/lists/listinfo/energy-vision>
>

Energy-vision mailing list
Energy-vision@list.web.net
<http://list.web.net/lists/listinfo/energy-vision>

Theresa McClenaghan
Counsel
Canadian Environmental Law Association
Suite 301 130 Spadina Ave. Toronto
416-960-2284 ext. 218
cell phone 519-755-7579

Theresa McClenaghan

From: "José Etcheverry" <Jose@davidsuzuki.org>
To: <energy-vision@list.web.net>
Sent: Sunday, March 05, 2006 8:55 PM
Subject: [Energy-vision] Interesting Thoughts for Strategy

Hi:

The last sentence below gives a lot of food for thought.

Cheers,

Jose

McGuinty seems plugged in to more nuclear power

Premier gives strong hint in favour of nukes

Toronto Star

Mar. 4, 2006. 01:00 AM

IAN URQUHART

The consultations have ended and now comes the time for a decision: Should Ontario turn to new nuclear plants to meet its electricity needs?

The question was raised in December in the report of the Ontario Power Authority, the government agency that recommended the building of new nuclear plants (at a staggering cost of \$35 billion) both to replace old power stations and to meet the province's growing electricity demands over the next two decades.

In the intervening three months, there have been a dozen town hall meetings (attended by about 2,000 people in all), a government brochure was mailed to every home inviting comments (about 4,000 people replied), the authority's report was posted on the environmental registry website (garnering about 1,000 responses), and Energy Minister Donna Cansfield has met with virtually anyone who wanted to meet her.

After sifting through all this feedback, the government is expected to provide an answer to the nuclear question in the last week of March or the first week of April.

Which way is the government leaning?

If the government were to rely on what it heard in the consultations, the answer would be "No more nukes."

The town hall meetings were dominated by anti-nuclear environmentalists, with the notable exception of the one in Kincardine, home to the Bruce nuclear plant.

Much of the written commentary has also had an anti-nuclear slant, including reports from the Sierra Club, the Clean Air Alliance and the Pembina Institute.

What these and other environmental groups say is that, in recommending more nuclear power, the power authority exaggerated the future growth of demand for electricity in the province and understated the potential savings from conservation.

There are two major flaws in the environmentalists' analysis, however:

The power authority projects growth in demand for electricity of 0.9 per cent annually over the next two decades.

The environmentalists, looking backward — they conveniently pick 1990 as their starting point — say demand has grown just 0.5 per cent annually over the past 16 years. But this time frame includes the deep recession of the early 1990s, when demand for electricity actually fell in Ontario.

Over the last few years, demand has grown by more than 1 per cent annually, a rate greater than the power authority's projection.

The environmentalists point to California and New York as jurisdictions that have successfully managed to cut demand for electricity with aggressive conservation programs. They ask why Ontario can't do the same.

What they don't say, or they under-emphasize, is that electricity rates in these jurisdictions are three times higher than in Ontario. And a higher price is the greatest single incentive for businesses and households to conserve electricity.

The problem is, of course, that a sharp hike in electricity rates would do enormous damage to Ontario's manufacturing

industries, which are already reeling from the impact of the higher dollar.

Besides conservation and nuclear power, there are other electricity alternatives, of course, including coal-fired plants (which the government has promised to phase out), natural gas (which is very expensive) and wind (which is not always reliable). In its report, the power authority recommended a little bit of everything, including conservation, but said nuclear reactors must be part of the mix.

And Premier Dalton McGuinty gave us a strong hint this week that the government agrees.

"Ontarians can count on us: We will do whatever it takes to keep the lights on," McGuinty told his well-heeled audience at a Liberal party fundraiser in Toronto Thursday night. "We will overcome any obstacle, meet any challenge, when it comes to doing what's necessary to provide our people, this economy, with a reliable supply of clean, affordable electricity."

Translation: The government will follow the power authority's recommendation and opt for more nuclear reactors.

Will this cost the Liberals politically? The environmentalists certainly think so. "We think the public is totally on our side," says Jack Gibbons of the Clean Air Alliance.

Jan Carr of the power authority begs to differ, although he is more cautious in his assessment. "There are signs that the public is beginning to agree that nuclear power has a role to play in meeting the supply challenges we face," he said in speech last week to the Canadian Nuclear Association. "However, this is a fragile consensus."

To a large extent, the outcome of the debate will depend on how the question is framed.

If the public sees it as a choice between more nuclear reactors and turning the lights out, the government will likely win the debate.

If, however, the choice is seen as between nuclear reactors and windmills or conservation, the anti-nuke forces will carry the day — and, perhaps, topple the government in the next election.

Jose Etcheverry
 Research and Policy Analyst
 Climate Change Program
 David Suzuki Foundation
 401 Richmond Street West Suite 401
 Toronto, Ontario
 Canada M5V 3A8
 Tel 1-416.977.7290
 Fax 1-416.977.2157
jose@davidsuzuki.org
www.davidsuzuki.org

Energy-vision mailing list
Energy-vision@list.web.net
<http://list.web.net/lists/listinfo/energy-vision>

Theresa McClenaghan

From: <shawn.patrick.stensil@yto.greenpeace.org>
To: "eENERGY VISION GROUP" <energy-vision@list.web.net>
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2006 12:31 PM
Subject: [Energy-vision] Energy plan to be unveiled March 21

The Toronto Star

Energy plan to be unveiled March 21

Price for small electricity projects to be announced
Province to set terms for selling power to the grid

Mar. 10, 2006. 01:00 AM

TYLER HAMILTON

BUSINESS REPORTER

Communities, farmers and schools will learn on March 21 how and at what price they'll be able to sell renewable energy from wind, solar, biogas and small hydro projects back to the provincial grid, the *Toronto Star* has learned.

Sources say Premier Dalton McGuinty and Energy Minister Donna Cansfield will announce at that time details of Ontario's long-awaited Standard Offer Program.

That program will establish fixed-priced contracts for small power producers that want to sell the clean electricity they generate to the province — anyone from community co-ops that want to install wind turbines to farmers that are producing energy from cow dung and crop waste.

The contracts typically last for 20 years, and give small power producers the right to interconnect to the electricity grid. Currently, small producers of renewable energy can send surplus energy to the grid but they don't get paid for it.

Experts say the program will be one of the most ambitious of its kind in North America.

There's also speculation that, shortly after, the government could announce its support for a co-operative fund that will provide low-interest loans and grants to help co-ops develop their own renewable power projects.

Officials from the energy ministry could not be reached for comment.

Farming and community groups will be watching the announcement closely to see what prices they'll get for the clean energy they produce.

The idea behind standard offer contracts, which are popular throughout Europe, is for the government to pay a high-enough fixed premium to stimulate greater development in small renewable energy projects.

OSEA advised the government last May on what it believed the pricing or "feed-in tariffs" should be,

3/10/2006

Based on comparisons with other jurisdictions such as Germany and Spain.

Sources say the government will likely be cautious with its pricing during the first two years of the program, after which it will assess the pricing model and make adjustments as necessary.

It's also expected that projects will need to be a minimum size to participate, meaning that residential solar-power installations likely wouldn't qualify for the program.

The government is committed to closing down by 2009 the province's four remaining coal-burning power plants, replacing the 6,400 megawatts that will be lost with a mix of renewable energy, nuclear and natural gas facilities.

The government's goal is to have 5 per cent of Ontario's energy capacity based on renewable systems by 2007, rising to 10 per cent by 2010.

In trying to reach that goal, the province has been focused on large-scale projects, such as massive wind-turbine farms, which are selected through a formal and expensive tendering process.

Proponents of standard offer programs say small community-based groups that don't have the funds, resources, or know-how to participate in a tendering environment will now have a chance to play a role in the province's renewable energy strategy.

Additional articles by Tyler Hamilton

Energy-vision mailing list
Energy-vision@list.web.net
<http://list.web.net/lists/listinfo/energy-vision>