| 1 | Q. | Describe the decision-making process that led to the decisions to proceed |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | | with each of the three new sources of supply. |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | Α. | In 1999, Hydro completed analysis to address projected generation |
| 6 | | requirements in the 2002 timeframe. That analysis identified Granite Canal |
| 7 | | as the most cost effective option for Island generation expansion with a |
| 8 | | recommended in-service date of fall 2002. The analysis also identified |
| 9 | | requirements beyond Granite Canal for the 2003/2004 timeframe. The |
| 10 | | results of this analysis was presented to Government and are documented in |
| 11 | | the report "Generation Expansion Study of Near Term Options for Meeting |
| 12 | | Newfoundland's Load Growth", November 1999 (refer to the response to CA- |
| 13 | | 36 NLH for a copy of this report). |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | In 2000, Government directed Hydro to proceed with the development of the |
| 16 | | Granite Canal Hydroelectric Project. |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | Also during 2000, Government directed Hydro to initiate discussions on |
| 19 | | terms and conditions for purchased power arrangements with Abitibi |
| 20 | | Consolidated Company of Canada (ACCC) and with Corner Brook Pulp and |
| 21 | | Paper (CBP&P). Having been informed of the terms and conditions for the |
| 22 | | purchase of power and energy from ACCC and CBP&P, Government |
| 23 | | directed Hydro to conclude power purchase agreements. |