

-----Message d'origine-----

De : John Burcombe [mailto:aucourant@sympatico.ca]
Envoyé : 2 janvier 2009 19:58
À : Gélinas, Monique (BAPE); romaine@bape.gouv.qc.ca
Objet : Re: Romaine HQ demande de permis DC-9

256

Projet d'aménagement d'un complexe hydroélectrique sur la rivière Romaine par Hydro-Québec

DC9.1

Basse-Côte-Nord

6211-03-005

Note sur DC-9

Demande de permis d'exportation d'électricité de Marketing d'énergie HQ inc.

Étant le prolongement dès avril 2009 de permis existants pour l'exportation d'électricité aux États-Unis en utilisant des lignes de transport internationales autres que des lignes au Québec, il est probable que peu de l'éventuelle électricité de La Romaine serait visé par ces permis.

Il est plus probable qu'Hydro-Québec s'intéresse plutôt dans un nouveau lien avec le New Hampshire qui est maintenant le sujet d'un "Petition for Declaratory Order" (demande de décret) auprès du *Federal Energy Regulatory Commission* (FERC) aux États Unis (ci-joint et disponible à http://elibrary.ferc.gov/idmws/docket_search.asp "Docket Number" EL09-20)

Pour ce projet d'aller de l'avant on présume qu'Hydro-Québec serait obligée d'obtenir des autorisations de l'Office national de l'énergie pour la construction de la ligne et pour les contrats de vente d'électricité. De plus, la ligne serait assujettie aux audiences du BAPE.

Voir l'article en bas et ci-joint.

John Burcombe
tél: (514) 937-8283
aucourant@sympatico.ca

Presse Canadienne

Hydro et deux firmes américaines veulent construire une ligne de transport

Il y a 2 heures [18-12-2008,17:27 ET]

[Sylvain Laroque]

MONTREAL — Hydro-Québec et deux fournisseurs d'électricité de la Nouvelle-Angleterre projettent d'ériger une ligne de transport de plus de 700 millions \$ US entre le Québec et le New Hampshire, que la société d'Etat utiliserait pour exporter 1200 mégawatts (MW) d'énergie.

H.Q. Energy Services US, la filiale américaine d'Hydro, a signé un protocole d'entente avec la Northeast Utilities, du Connecticut, et NStar, du Massachusetts, visant le développement de cette nouvelle ligne qui relierait le poste des Cantons, en Estrie, à un autre situé dans le sud du New Hampshire.

Le protocole prévoit la conclusion avec Hydro-Québec d'un accord d'approvisionnement d'au moins 20 ans pour 1200 MW, soit suffisamment d'électricité pour alimenter environ un million de foyers américains.

Northeast financerait la construction de la ligne à hauteur de quelque 500 millions \$ US, Nstar fournissant quant à lui 200 millions \$ US. Pour sa part, Hydro-Québec s'engagerait à payer pour l'utilisation de la ligne, en plus d'assumer les coûts de l'infrastructure pour la portion québécoise, qui demeurent inconnus.

Si tout va comme prévu, la construction débutera en 2011 pour une mise en service en 2014.

Ces dernières années, le gouvernement de Jean Charest a pressé Hydro d'accélérer son développement afin d'accroître les exportations d'électricité aux Etats-Unis. La société d'Etat travaille actuellement aux projets Eastmain-1-A-Sarcelle-Rupert, qui doit entrer en service en 2011-12, et La Romaine, dont les premiers kilowatts doivent être produits en 2014.

"C'est évident qu'avec les projets à venir, il va y avoir plus d'énergie à vendre aux Etats-Unis", a relevé Pierre-Olivier Pineau, professeur agrégé à HEC Montréal et spécialiste des questions énergétiques.

"Les lignes de transmission actuelles ne sont pas utilisées à 100 pour cent, mais si on augmentait de beaucoup la quantité d'énergie disponible au Québec pour exportation, on aurait effectivement des problèmes d'accès au marché", a ajouté M. Pineau.

Interrogations

Il reste à voir comment Hydro-Québec financera sa part des travaux.

"Le coût (de construction) sera-t-il inclus dans le coût de tous les usagers québécois - ce qui pourrait éventuellement représenter une subvention de la part des Québécois pour ces exportations - ou le tarif négocié sera-t-il suffisant pour couvrir les coûts de la portion québécoise?" a demandé le spécialiste.

Selon Northeast et Nstar, le projet pourrait permettre aux Etats de la Nouvelle-Angleterre d'atteindre près d'un tiers de leurs objectifs en matière de réduction des émissions de gaz à effet de serre.

"Nos ressources naturelles et les marchés de l'énergie de la Nouvelle-Angleterre s'unissent pour rendre possible une transaction gagnante pour tous", a déclaré le président et chef de la direction d'Hydro-Québec, Thierry Vandal, dans le communiqué publié par les entreprises américaines.

Malgré de nombreux appels, il a été impossible d'en apprendre davantage sur le projet de la part d'Hydro.

Dans des documents déposés à la Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), Northeast et Nstar reconnaissent que leur demande déroge aux principes généraux de l'organisme réglementaire de l'énergie aux Etats-Unis, puisqu'elle prévoit que l'électricité d'Hydro ne sera pas mise à la disposition de l'ensemble des Etats américains, mais seulement à ceux de la Nouvelle-Angleterre.

"Même si ce type de coordination entre source d'approvisionnement en énergie et planification d'une ligne de transport n'est pas conforme au modèle de la FERC, qui veut la séparation des deux fonctions, cette transaction présente des avantages uniques qui justifient que la Commission accepte cette structure", écrivent Northeast et NStar dans leur requête.

"Il n'est pas du tout garanti que la FERC accepte, prévient toutefois Pierre-Olivier Pineau. Si elle refuse ce format, alors la ligne devra être plus traditionnelle (c'est-à-dire ouverte à tous)."

Le dernier accord d'approvisionnement à long terme entre Hydro-Québec et la Nouvelle-Angleterre a débuté en 1986 et s'est terminé en 2000. Depuis, les transactions se font sur les marchés à court terme ("spot"), d'où l'intérêt, pour les sociétés américaines, de conclure un contrat stable avec Hydro.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Northeast Utilities Service Company

Docket No. EL09-_____

NSTAR Electric Company

PETITION FOR DECLARATORY ORDER

Pursuant to Rule 207 of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure, 18 CFR §385.207, Northeast Utilities Service Company¹ and NSTAR Electric Company ("Petitioners") submit this Petition for Declaratory Order requesting that the Commission approve the transaction structure described in the body of this filing. The Petitioners respectfully request that the Commission rule on this Petition as quickly as possible so that they can move forward with the negotiation of the transaction described in this filing, which they believe offers significant benefits for New England electric consumers.²

I. QUESTION PRESENTED

This Petition asks the Commission to resolve the following issue: Whether the Petitioners may enter into a bilateral transmission services agreement with H.Q. Energy

¹ NUSCO is service company subsidiary of Northeast Utilities ("NU"), a FERC-registered public utility holding company under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 2005. NU engages primarily in the energy delivery business through its wholly-owned, regulated utility subsidiaries. NUSCO performs centralized services, such as engineering, accounting, financial, legal, and environmental services for NU's subsidiary companies.

² The Petitioners are separately submitting the filing fee required by Sections 385.207(c) and 381.302(a) of the Commission regulations.

Services (U.S.) Inc. (“HQUS”), a wholly-owned subsidiary of Hydro-Québec³, under which they will sell 1,200 MWs of firm transmission service over a new, participant-funded, Direct Current (DC) transmission tie line connecting New England with the Hydro-Québec system in order for HQUS to sell and deliver this same amount of firm power from the Hydro-Québec system to interested purchasers in New England for a term of no less than twenty years.

Although the Commission has endorsed participant funding of electric transmission lines in appropriate circumstances,⁴ the Commission has not addressed the rights that accrue to parties that accept responsibility for funding a new line. The Petitioners believe that, despite the general requirement in Order No. 890 that all new transmission services be provided pursuant to the Order No. 890 Open Access Transmission Tariff (“OATT”), the bilateral transaction described in this Petition, in which HQUS will assume responsibility for the costs of a new Extra-High Voltage (“EHV”) transmission line and in return will be entitled to capacity on the Line, is in the public interest and should be approved. The Petitioners are not asking the Commission to approve the specific rates, terms and conditions of any agreement at this time. Instead, the Petitioners seek approval from the Commission of the *structure* of the transaction described in this filing. If the Commission approves this transaction structure, the

³Hydro-Québec is a Crown corporation and is wholly-owned by the Government of Québec, established under its constitutive law (Hydro-Québec Act, R.S.Q., c. H-5).

⁴ See, e.g., *New England Power Pool*, 109 FERC ¶61,252 at P2 (2004) (stating “If, on the other hand, new transmission facilities are built to benefit particular participants or groups of participants, participant funding – i.e., allocation of the costs to that participant or participants - is appropriate for those projects.”).

Petitioners will move forward to finalize the agreements necessary to accomplish this transaction and all necessary Section 205 filings will be made when such negotiations are completed.

II. DESCRIPTION OF TRANSACTION

Hydro-Québec is currently developing over 4,000 MWs of new hydro-electric generation in the Province of Québec, which will supplement its existing vast system of hydro-electric power. As a result of this expansion, Hydro-Québec expects to have significant amounts of surplus power available for export to the United States for at least the next two decades. Because over 95 percent of the energy generated on the Hydro-Québec system is from hydro-electric resources, system power exported to the United States will be produced with very limited emissions of greenhouse gases.

The instant transaction is designed to make a significant quantity of Hydro-Québec's surplus power available to New England electric consumers by combining the construction of a new EHV transmission tie line from Québec to New Hampshire ("HQ-New Hampshire Line" or "Line") with a long-term Power Purchase Agreement ("HQ PPA") under which HQUS will sell 1,200 MWs of firm system power to New England for a term of no less than twenty years. In order to accomplish this transaction, the Petitioners are negotiating three core agreements at this time:

1. The Petitioners and Hydro-Québec TransÉnergie ("HQ TransÉnergie") are negotiating a joint development agreement for the design and construction of the HQ-New Hampshire Line and are performing joint planning studies for the Line. The Line

will be designed to have a firm transfer capacity of at least 1,200 MWs.⁵ The northern terminus of the Line is currently expected to be at the Des Cantons substation in Québec. The southern terminus of the Line will be at a substation still to be determined in southern New Hampshire. The parties will choose a location for the southern terminus that permits power to be delivered into the New England backbone 345kV transmission system so that it can be reliably delivered to load. The Line will be a DC line and converter stations will be constructed at the northern and southern termini in order to allow for the synchronization of the Line with the systems in Québec and New England. HQ TransÉnergie will finance and own the portion of the HQ-New Hampshire Line located in the Province of Québec. The Petitioners will finance and own the portion of the Line located in New Hampshire.

2. The Petitioners and HQUS are negotiating a long-term, bilateral transmission service agreement (“HQ TSA”) under which HQUS will acquire 1,200 MWs of firm transmission rights over the United States portion of the Line and in return will compensate the Petitioners for constructing, operating and maintaining the Line. The HQ-New Hampshire Line will be “participant funded” by HQUS and will not be included in the rates for transmission services under the ISO New England Inc. (“ISO-NE”) Open Access Transmission Tariff (“ISO-NE OATT”). The charges for transmission service under the HQ TSA will be negotiated rates based on the cost of the line, including a reasonable return on the Petitioners’ invested capital. The HQ TSA will be filed with the

⁵ The issue of the appropriate size of the Line is discussed further in Part III below.

Commission pursuant to Section 205 of the Federal Power Act after it is signed, and the rates therein will be subject to a Commission-approved cost-based ceiling.⁶ The HQ-New Hampshire Line is not intended to be a “merchant” transmission line, and the Petitioners will not seek market-based pricing for service over the Line.⁷

The HQ TSA may embody rates, terms and conditions that differ from those set forth in the Commission’s *pro forma* OATT. The parties may include terms in the HQ TSA that provide for some form of risk sharing between the parties relating to completion of the Line and may include unique provisions governing scheduling rights over the Line. The parties need to retain the flexibility to negotiate these kinds of deviations from the OATT in order to facilitate completion of the transaction on mutually beneficial terms.

3. The Petitioners and HQUS are negotiating the HQ PPA. The HQ PPA will provide for HQUS to sell 1,200 MWs of firm power to NU, NSTAR and other interested New England entities for a period of no less than twenty years at negotiated, market-based rates under HQUS’s market-based rate tariff on file at the Commission.⁸ HQ

⁶ The Petitioners are not asking the Commission to approve the specific terms and conditions of the HQ TSA at this time. Rather, they are requesting authorization to enter into this bilateral agreement in lieu of making transmission service over the Line available on an open access basis pursuant to the *pro forma* OATT.

⁷ The Commission has required the developers of merchant transmission facilities, defined as transmission facilities whose capacity will be sold at market-based rates, to hold an open season for capacity rights on the merchant line in order to establish a market price. *E.g., Neptune Regional Transmission System, LLC*, 96 FERC ¶ 61,147 at 61,633 (2001). Because the Petitioners do not intend to sell transmission rights at market-based rates, these precedents do not apply here.

⁸ HQUS was authorized by the Commission to make market-based sales in Docket Nos. ER97-851-000 and ER97-851-001. *H.Q. Energy Servs. (U.S.) Inc.*, 81 FERC ¶ 61,184 (1997), *reh'g denied*, 82 FERC ¶ 61,234 (1998); *H.Q. Energy Servs. (U.S.) Inc.*, 79 FERC ¶ 61,152 (1997).

Production will acquire 1,200 MWs of firm transmission service from HQ TransÉnergie over the Québec portion of the Line² and HQUS will use the HQ TSA to deliver the power from the U.S.-Canadian border to the ultimate point of delivery at the southern terminus of the Line. The HQ PPA will establish a price for delivered power at the southern terminus of the Line, and HQUS will recover the cost of transmission rights it acquires under the HQ TSA through the price for power under the HQ PPA. For this reason, the two agreements (the HQ TSA and HQ PPA) are related and should be considered as parts of a combined energy and transmission transaction.

The Petitioners and HQUS intend that the power sold under the PPA will be made broadly available to load in New England, which would include customers of investor-owned and publicly-owned distribution utilities. Buyers under the HQ PPA will be required to meet requirements appropriate for a twenty-year purchase commitment, including reasonable credit requirements. The Petitioners have been meeting with state regulators in New England to discuss the benefits of the transaction and intend to broaden this discussion to enable the transaction to gain broad support in the region. The mechanism by which power would be made available to load is still under consideration. At the end of the day, the Petitioners recognize that they will have to demonstrate to New England regulatory authorities that the HQ PPA represents a fair deal for New England electric consumers in order for the transaction to go forward.

² As discussed below, Hydro-Québec has reserved 1,200 MWs of transmission service over the Québec portion of the Line on HQ TransÉnergie's OASIS.

III. OTHER RELEVANT ASPECTS OF THE TRANSACTION

There are several other aspects of the instant transaction that the Commission may find relevant to the relief requested in this Petition.

1. ISO-NE Approval: The Petitioners will submit the Line for approval by ISO-NE. The Petitioners will discuss with ISO-NE whether the Project should be designated as an Elective Upgrade under Section II.47.5 of the ISO-NE OATT, or whether some other designation is appropriate in light of the unique nature of this transaction. An “Elective Upgrade” is defined in the ISO-NE OATT as a “Transmission Upgrade that is participant-funded (i.e., voluntarily funded by an entity or entities that have agreed to pay for all of the costs of such Transmission Upgrade)....” ISO-NE OATT at II.1.21. All Elective Upgrades are subject to review by ISO-NE pursuant to Section I.3.9 of the ISO-NE Transmission, Markets and Services Tariff, which requires that ISO-NE find that the Line will not adversely affect the reliability or use of the New England transmission system. The Petitioners will submit the Line to the I.3.9 process regardless of how ISO-NE chooses to characterize it, but because the Line will be fully participant funded, ISO-NE will not have to review the “need” for the project or its economic benefits as it would for typical reliability or economic projects the costs of which are included in regional transmission rates.¹⁰

¹⁰ The costs of Reliability and Economic Upgrades (as defined in the ISO-NE OATT) are recovered in the rates for transmission services under the ISO-NE OATT. Accordingly, ISO-NE’s review of these categories of upgrades in the Regional System Plan includes a demonstration of need, or in the case of economic upgrades, that the benefits of the project exceed their costs.

2. Transfer of Operating Control: The Petitioners intend to transfer “operating control” over the U.S. portion of the Line to ISO-NE pursuant to a Transmission Operating Agreement (“TOA”) to be negotiated with ISO-NE.¹¹ Under this TOA, all transactions over the Line will be scheduled with ISO-NE in accordance with the applicable New England market rules and ISO-NE will have final approval authority over planned line outages. ISO-NE will also establish, in consultation with HQ TransÉnergie, the firm rating and transfer capability of the Line.

3. Size of Line: At the present time, the Petitioners and HQ TransÉnergie believe that the maximum firm north-south available transfer capability (“ATC”) for the Line will be 1,200 MWs. This expected maximum firm ATC is based on studies that have been performed by ISO-NE for the existing HQ-New England HVDC tie-line, which also would apply to the new HQ-New Hampshire Line. These studies have shown that a contingency causing the outage of the HQ-New England HVDC tie-line, when there is more than 1,200 MWs of power being transferred from HQ into New England over a single interconnection, can result in voltage instability in PJM and New York. Therefore, the limiting transmission elements for purposes of required single contingency analysis are in western New York and PJM. In order to increase the firm ATC over the existing HQ-New England HVDC tie, upgrades to the New York and/or PJM

¹¹ The Petitioners anticipate that this TOA will be modeled after TOAs that are in place for other transmission facilities such as the Phase I and II Hydro-Québec lines and the Cross-Sound Cable, although some of the terms of this TOA may be unique to this facility.

transmission systems would be required. This contingency analysis also applies to the proposed Line.

However, ISO-NE has informed stakeholders in New England that it is currently reviewing operating changes that can be coordinated with the New York ISO that could permit the firm ATC of the existing Hydro-Québec HVDC ties to be increased to 1,400 MWs without upgrades and that it anticipates being able to implement this increase in the near future. The Petitioners believe that this increase will apply to the new Line, as well.¹²

4. Open Season Proposal: The Petitioners and HQ TransÉnergie are prepared to size the Line so that it can physically accommodate either 1,200 MWs or the higher 1,400 MWs based on whether there is market interest in an additional 200 MWs.¹³ The largest cost associated with such an increase would be the requirement to size the DC-AC converter stations at the northern and/or southern ends of the Line to reliably handle the higher levels of transfers. Preliminary studies indicate that the average incremental cost of the United States portion of the Line would be slightly lower overall if the Line were sized to be able to accommodate 1,400 MWs of transfers. Therefore, assuming there is market interest in acquiring the last 200 MWs of incremental capacity, it appears that it would be economically beneficial to both HQUS and other potential

¹² The firm ATC of the Line will be established by ISO-NE, and will be confirmed in connection with the Section I.3.9 process in New England for the Line.

¹³ Although this is not expected to occur, if ISO-NE were to determine that the firm ATC of the Line could be higher than 1,400 MWs, the Petitioners and HQ TransÉnergie would size the Line at the maximum firm ATC that is supported by the marketplace as determined by the open season.

participants to size the Line to accommodate 1,400 MWs of transfers. However, the Petitioners must emphasize that these estimates are preliminary and may change.

Assuming that ISO-NE confirms that the additional 200 MWs of firm ATC will be available, the Petitioners intend to hold an open season on the U.S. portion of the Line for the final 200 MW increment. Under the open season, the Petitioners will request expressions of interest in participant funding of up to the 200 MWs of additional capacity under the same service terms and at the same per unit cost as the charges set forth in the HQ TSA (*i.e.*, the average incremental cost of the Line) in return for equivalent firm transmission rights over the Line. The Petitioners wish to make clear that they are not interested in building this incremental transmission on a “speculative” basis based on interests in paying for transmission service over a limited term, such as three or five years.¹⁴ The Line is not being constructed as a merchant transmission line and the open season will be designed to solicit interest in participant funding the Line at cost-based rates that amortize the incremental cost associated with purchasing the 200 MW increment over the operating life of the Line, which is the basis that will be used for pricing HQUS’s transmission rights under the HQ TSA.

If the demand for service under the open season exceeds 200 MWs, the Petitioners would pro rate the 200 MWs among the conforming bids. If the demand is less than

¹⁴ One of the Petitioners has received an expression of interest in acquiring capacity rights on the Line from another supplier for a period of five years. This proposal would leave the Petitioners with responsibility for obtaining replacement buyers of capacity at the end of the five year period, transforming the proposal into a speculative investment in a merchant transmission project. That is not the structure the Petitioners are proposing and the Petitioners are not willing to go forward with the transaction on this basis.

200 MWs, the Petitioners would determine whether there is sufficient interest to warrant the additional investment required to increase the capacity of the Line above 1,200 MWs. If there is not sufficient interest in the final 200 MWs to justify the incremental cost of increasing the size of the Line, the Petitioners will size the Line at the 1,200 MW level to support the HQ PPA.

The Petitioners will file the details of the proposed open season process for Commission review and approval simultaneous with the filing of the HQ TSA. Prior to making such filing, the Petitioners will solicit comments from interested parties so that the open season can be structured to facilitate participation in the last 200 MW increment.

5. Secondary Sales of Unused Capacity: The Petitioners and HQUS intend that any transmission capacity on the Line not being used by HQUS will be made available to the public in accordance with Commission open access policies. The HQ TSA will therefore include a mandatory obligation for HQUS to make transmission service available, at rates, terms and conditions consistent with Order No. 890, to the extent that HQUS is not using any of the transmission rights it acquires under the HQ TSA to schedule energy to New England. In addition, the HQ TSA will establish a requirement for the sale of transmission service on an open access basis to the extent ISO-NE determines that non-firm ATC above the level acquired on a long-term, firm basis by HQUS and others that participant fund the Line is available for third party use.

6. Transmission Rights After PPA Terminates: The Petitioners anticipate that the term of the HQ PPA will be between 20 and 25 years. However, the rates that HQUS will pay for transmission rights will likely be based on a longer amortization

period, up to forty years, reflecting the anticipated operating life of the Line. Because it will continue to participant fund the Line after the HQ PPA terminates, HQUS will continue to have the same rights to schedule power over the Line after the HQ PPA terminates. To the extent that HQUS is not using its rights over the Line, the HQ TSA will include a mandatory obligation for HQUS to make transmission service available at rates, terms and conditions consistent with Order No. 890.

IV. THE PROPOSED TRANSACTION IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

A. The Proposed Transaction Offers Numerous Benefits to New England

Electric power from the Hydro-Québec system offers substantial benefits to New England at this time for several reasons. First, the size of the potential surplus on the Hydro-Québec system makes this system a unique resource for the New England region. It is in the public interest for the United States to support the development of new hydro-electric generation in Québec because this generation can provide a competitively priced, reliable supply of large quantities of energy from a resource that does not burn fossil fuels, does not expand the requirement to import oil or natural gas, and is a low greenhouse gas emitting source of energy. At the same time, New England is a favorable market from Hydro-Québec's perspective because of the region's long-term need for power and high forecast market prices.

The instant transaction will also align with environmental policies in the region. To the extent that power purchased from HQUS under the HQ PPA displaces gas-fired generation in New England, greenhouse gas emissions associated with the production of electricity will be reduced by approximately 4-6 Million tons of CO₂ per year during the

term of the transaction. This will assist New England in meeting its targets under the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (“RGGI”), which all of the New England states have signed, and under any future cap and trade program or carbon tax adopted at the federal level.

The HQ PPA also offers fuel diversity benefits that ISO-NE has determined to be essential at this time. ISO-NE’s 2008 Regional System Plan concludes that New England’s “heavy reliance on natural gas as the dominant generator fuel type has left the region vulnerable to fuel-supply risks, which can have an adverse impact on system reliability and lead to volatile and high electric energy costs associated with variations in natural gas prices.”¹⁵ ISO-NE notes that 42 percent of New England’s energy was generated by natural gas in 2007, and that natural gas constitutes 38 percent of the installed capacity in the region.¹⁶ In addition, ISO-NE reports that 75 percent of the proposed generation in New England’s interconnection queue is natural gas fired, which means that natural gas can be expected to provide an even greater percentage of New England’s power supply in the future.¹⁷ The instant transaction will offset this adverse trend.

Hydro-electric power is also beneficial as a complement to the other renewable resources that are being considered or are under development in New England, such as

¹⁵ ISO-NE 2008 Regional System Plan at 3.

¹⁶ ISO-NE 2008 Regional System Plan at 7, 51.

¹⁷ *Id.*

wind and solar power, which are intermittent. The HQ PPA will make available to New England a substantial source of reliable baseload energy.

Hydro-Québec offers unique benefits not only because of the size of its surplus and the environmentally favorable source of its power supply, but also because of its financial strength. Concerns over the credit quality of counter-parties are pervasive in the electric industry at this time and are particularly challenging for transactions that require large investments with long-term cost recovery horizons. Hydro-Québec's credit quality is excellent. It is a Crown corporation¹⁸ and therefore has the financial strength and resources that will allow the Petitioners to enter into a long-term transaction for repayment of the cost of the Line with HQUS, which is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Hydro-Québec.

New England also has among the highest electricity prices in the United States. The Petitioners believe that the HQ PPA, like the firm energy contract that expired in 2000, can provide a competitive source of power at a price that is favorable in comparison with alternatives, and it is anticipated that it will lower the LMPs of energy in New England at a time when consumers and regulators are frustrated by the high and rising cost of electricity in the region.¹⁹ Participant funding of the Line under the proposed HQ TSA will also allow for the expansion of the New England transmission

¹⁸ See footnote 2, *infra*.

¹⁹ Of course, other suppliers in New England may balk at having to compete with this new supply of power. This transaction will be pro-competitive because it will expand the supply of energy in the market by bringing into New England another source of generation to compete with existing supplies.

system without raising regional transmission rates under the ISO-NE OATT or creating disputes over cost allocation for the new Line.

All of these factors combine to create a unique opportunity for both New England and HQUS; a classic win-win. No other supplier offers what HQUS can sell in these quantities and with these favorable characteristics, together with the financial resources to complete a transaction of this scale in this economic environment. On the other side, New England is an especially attractive market opportunity for HQUS because of its high forecast market prices and need to diversify its generation resources. Moreover, as discussed below, the parties have a history of successful and mutually beneficial transactions of this type.

B. The Instant Transaction Follows A Model Used Successfully For Firm Energy Sales From Hydro-Québec to New England Utilities That Expired in 2000

The Petitioners are asking the Commission to approve a transaction structure that generally follows a prior combined energy and transmission transaction with Hydro-Québec that produced substantial benefits for New England and Hydro-Québec. In the 1980s, most of New England's utilities entered into two long-term firm energy transactions with Hydro-Québec in connection with the development of the existing Hydro-Québec Phase I and II HVDC tie lines. These firm energy sales provided for the sale and delivery into New England of up to 2,000 MWs of low cost, hydro-electric power from Québec. The second of these transactions expired at the end of 2000. The Phase I and Phase II HVDC tie lines continue to provide significant benefits by virtue of additional short-term power sales into New England.

As is contemplated in the instant transaction, the Phase I and Phase II HVDC tie lines were developed in conjunction with the firm energy sales from Hydro-Québec. The Phase I and II HVDC tie lines are owned by single purpose entities formed for this purpose (except for the Vermont portion of Phase I, which was owned by Vermont Electric Transmission Company). Rights to import power over the lines (together with participation in the firm energy contract) were offered to all New England utilities that were interested in sharing in the costs of the transmission and power. Almost all of New England's utilities chose to participate. Those New England utilities that chose to participate in the transaction entered into support agreements with the owners of the lines and acquired firm use rights over the lines. These use rights were used by the participating New England utilities to obtain delivery of energy from Hydro-Québec between 1986 and 2000, at which time the last of the firm energy contracts expired. The participating supporting companies now offer transmission service over the Phase I and Phase II HVDC tie lines pursuant to rate schedules in the ISO-NE OATT.

The transaction proposed here similarly combines the benefits of a long-term sale of firm energy from Hydro-Québec to New England and the construction of an EHV transmission tie line for the delivery of the power. The proposed transaction will go forward only if, following negotiation of the HQ PPA, state regulators in New England and potential buyers of power under the HQ PPA determine that the transaction offers benefits to consumers like the prior HQ firm energy sale. Unlike the prior transaction, this transaction is structured so that the cost of the United States portion of the Line will be participant funded by the power seller, HQUS. The HQ PPA will therefore include a

delivered price of power that can be compared directly with potential alternatives in the New England marketplace.²⁰

C. The Proposed Transaction Conforms With Commission Policy and Precedent

Of course, the difference between the time when the prior Hydro-Québec transaction was negotiated and now is that the Commission has enacted Order Nos. 888 and 890 requiring the functional unbundling of transmission and merchant interests, and five of the six New England states have adopted retail choice. Since the issuance of Order No. 888, the Commission has generally favored separating the development of new generating resources from the planning of the transmission system, with the former occurring in a competitive market while the latter occurs under the Commission's "functional unbundling" of transmission from merchant activities.

However, the Commission has recognized that the public interest may benefit from the coordinated development of power supply and transmission planning, such as through state-regulated integrated resource planning. For example, the Commission's new Standards of Conduct allow for integrated resource and other long-term planning among transmission and merchant functions that involves the coordination of power supply, demand-side and transmission planning to enable utilities to produce a lowest overall cost solution to supplying and delivering reliable electric power. In the Standards

²⁰ In the prior transaction, the cost of the Phase I and II HVDC tie lines was borne by participating (supporting) New England utilities, and the price of energy did not include this transmission cost.

order,²¹ the Commission noted that “one of the principal concerns the Commission had with the current Standards was the barriers they appear to have erected to coordinated resource planning.”²² Further, the Commission observed that the “critical importance” of coordinated resource planning was also stressed in Order Nos. 890 and 890-A.²³ Thus, Petitioners’ request embodies the most current views of the Commission with respect to coordination of long-term power supply planning, and perpetuates them in a manner that benefits the public interest.

In this case, the New England region will benefit from the Petitioners’ ability to negotiate with HQUS a combined transmission investment and wholesale power transaction. Although this type of coordination between power supply and transmission planning does not conform to the FERC model of separate transmission and power functions, there are unique benefits to this transaction that warrant Commission acceptance of this combined transaction structure. The Commission has recognized in the past that deviations from its standard transmission policies are appropriate where the factual circumstances warrant them. For example, in *California Independent System Operator Corporation*, 120 FERC ¶ 61,244 (2007), the Commission permitted the California ISO to implement a rate plan for the integration of location-constrained renewable generation resources that was inconsistent with its normal pricing policies for interconnecting new generation in light of the unique circumstances surrounding the

²¹ *Standards of Conduct for Transmission Providers*, Order No. 717, 125 FERC P.61,064 (2008).

²² *Id.* at Par.144.

proposed plan and the public benefits afforded by the integration of this new generation. Although the facts here are different, the ultimate objective is the same; the delivery of a substantial quantity of clean energy that will assist New England in meeting its power supply needs in an environmentally favorable manner while diversifying its generation mix.

The Commission has not directly addressed the question of what rights accrue to parties that “participant fund” a new transmission line that operates as a network upgrade. The ISO-NE OATT, while creating a category of participant funded transmission lines, which it defines as “Elective Upgrades”, is silent on the rights that accrue to the party that funds the Elective Upgrade.

However, the Commission has addressed a similar issue in an analogous context. In the context of a generator lead that is not a network upgrade (a direct assignment facility), the Commission requires the generator to fund the cost of the interconnecting lead line, and the generator typically obtains the right to deliver its power over the line that it funds. The Line at issue here is not, strictly speaking, a generator lead line because it connects New England with the Hydro-Québec system rather than a single generator. Nonetheless, the Line will act as an “extension cord” to the Hydro-Québec system that is designed to provide for the importation of power from that source of power (as well as the export of power to Hydro-Québec).

²³ *Preventing Undue Discrimination and Preference in Transmission Service*, Order No. 890, FERC Stats. & Regs. P31,241, at P 425 (2007), *subsequent history omitted*.

The Commission recently addressed the rights that accrue to a party that supports a participant funded transmission tie line in *Cross Hudson LLC et al.*, 123 FERC ¶61,001 (2008). The ruling in that case supports the Petitioners' request here. In that case, the Petitioners sought a Commission ruling that the entire capacity of a newly-constructed tie line from the Bergen Generating Station to the New York ISO system could be dedicated to an existing Power Purchase Agreement ("PPA") and that, therefore, the Petitioners could be exempted from the requirements of Order No. 888 to file an open access tariff applicable to the line. The Commission agreed with the Petitioners that the capacity of the new line could be dedicated to a single supplier, the Bergen Station, up to the capacity level of that station in order to permit the delivery of Bergen power to the New York Power Authority under an existing PPA. The Commission rejected the Petitioners' request that the capacity of the line *above* the amount committed under the PPA could be committed to the transacting parties and ordered them to file an open access tariff if they received a request for service above the amount committed to the PPA. However, it confirmed that the transacting parties had the right to assign capacity in the line to their transaction up to the full amount of the PPA since it represented a "prior contractual commitment" to the capacity in the line.

That result conforms to the proposal of the Petitioners here. HQUS will fund the Line up to at least 1,200 MWs. The Petitioners are asking the Commission to commit the first 1,200 MWs of capacity on the Line to the delivery of power pursuant to the HQ PPA, which is part of the initial plan for the project. Any capacity above this 1,200 MW committed amount will be made available to the market pursuant to an open season

process, and any capacity within the 1,200 MW not scheduled by HQUS will be made available on an open access basis to other parties.

Unlike the situation here, the transmission line at issue in *Cross Hudson* was found by the Commission to be a generator lead line since, at the time of the transaction, the line connected solely with the Bergen Generating Station, whereas in this case the Line will connect with the HQ TransÉnergie system and potentially could be used to deliver power from other suppliers who are able to get their power to the northern terminus of the Line. However, the Petitioners believe that this difference is not meaningful under the particular facts of this case for the reason set forth below.

Attachment A to this Petition is a copy of the HQ TransÉnergie transmission queue shown on its OASIS. The last page of this Attachment shows that Hydro-Québec Production (HQUS's power production affiliate²⁴) has reserved 1,200 MWs of transmission capacity on the Québec portion of the proposed Line for a 20-year term, and its reservation stands in front of later reservations made by two other potential transmission customers, Cargill and Brookfield Energy, who have requested one year of service from Ontario, Canada to New Hampshire.²⁵ HQUS therefore has a transmission priority on the HQ TransÉnergie system (*i.e.*, over the Québec portion of the HQ-New Hampshire Line) to get power delivered under the PPA to the U.S. border. Its queue

²⁴ HQUS is a wholly-owned subsidiary of HQ Production, responsible for marketing in the United States power produced by HQ Production.

²⁵ HQUS has also submitted a request for an additional 300 MWs of service over the Line for twenty years, which is behind Brookfield Energy and Cargill's requests in the queue. However, Brookfield Energy and Cargill would have to meet HQUS's 20-year request in order to retain rollover rights at the end of their one-year service terms.

position in Québec gives it a priority right in front of any other requests for service. As the Commission held in *Cross Hudson*, a future supplier seeking to use the participant funded line would be entitled to firm service under the OATT only to the extent that there is capacity available on the line in excess of the capacity covered by the existing PPA for the Bergen generator.

The Petitioners also believe that the instant transaction could be a model for the kind of transactions that the Commission is likely to face going forward and that it would be good public policy for the Commission to permit transmission developers to negotiate combined transmission/power supply deals like this one. For example, one of the principal issues that renewable power developers face is the ability to interconnect their renewable projects, often required to be at locations remote from the existing grid. One solution to this problem could be to allow renewable power developers to agree to fund the transmission lines that are required to integrate their projects with the grid in connection with a long-term power sale of renewable energy under which the renewable developer would charge the buyer a delivered price for its renewable energy that includes the cost of delivery over the participant funded portion of the transmission system. In light of the changing circumstances in the electric industry, in which the responsibilities of load-serving entities include environmental and resource diversity requirements, the Commission should acknowledge the need to adopt flexible policies that promote important public policies in addition to the policy of “functional unbundling” embedded in Order No. 890.

V. COMMUNICATIONS

The Petitioners request that the following individuals be designated on the official service list in this proceeding to receive service on behalf of the Petitioners, and respectfully request that the Commission waive its regulations to permit three individuals to be included on the official service list.

David B. Raskin
Steptoe & Johnson LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
202-429-6254
draskin@steptoe.com

Mary E. Grover
Assistant General Counsel
NSTAR Electric & Gas Corporation
800 Boylston Street, P1700
Boston, MA 02199-8003
mary.grover@nstar.com

Phyllis E. Lemell
Assistant General Counsel
Northeast Utilities Service Company
107 Selden Street
Berlin, CT 06037
860-665-5118
lemelpe@nu.com

VI. CONCLUSION

For all of the foregoing reasons, the Commission should grant this Petition for Declaratory Order and allow the Petitioners to move forward with the transaction described in the body of this filing.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

David B. Raskin
Step toe & Johnson LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
202-429-6254
draskin@step toe.com

Mary E. Grover
Assistant General Counsel
NSTAR Electric & Gas Corporation
800 Boylston Street, P1700
Boston, MA 02199-8003
(617) 424-2105
mary.grover@nstar.com

Attorneys for Petitioners

Dated: December 12, 2008

ATTACHMENT A


[HQ TransÉnergie Home Page](#)
[Français](#)
[To Reach Us](#)
[FAQs](#)
[Site Map](#)
[OASIS Home Page](#)
[Information](#)

General

[Régie decisions](#)
[Impact studies](#)
[– Process](#)
[Users' manual and guide](#)
[Power producers](#)
[Code & Standards of conduct](#)
[Tariff](#)
[– Billing](#)
[– Scheduling](#)
[– Rates](#)
[Terminology](#)

Customer relations

[Complaint procedure](#)
[List of complaints](#)

Études d'impact

prod

Tableau des études d'impact pour les demandes de service de transport (T) et pour les raccordements ou les modifications de centrales (R)

n°	Date demande reçue	Nom du projet / Description	Localisation	MW	Mise en service demandée	Client	Statut
1T	Mai 1997	Réception LAW-HQT Ontario Hydro Étude d'impact relativement à l'augmentation de 200 à 400 MW de la capacité de l'interconnexion Saunders-Beauharnois	Beauharnois B5D – B31L	200	Déc. 1998	Hydro-Québec - Groupe Services énergétiques	Terminée (1997-11-06)
2R	Janvier 98	Magnola-Asbestos Autoproduction Intégration de centrale	Poste Kingsey 230 kV	25	Mai 2000	Métallurgie Magnola inc.	Terminée (1998-05-14)
3R	1998-04-15	Tabaret Intégration de centrale Poste de départ	Abitibi-Témiscamingue	130 (132)	2002 (2006)	Hydro-Québec - Groupe Production	Terminée (2001-03-01)
4R	1998-04-30	Centrale Eastmain 1 Intégration de centrale Renforcement de réseau	Nord du Québec	1280	Mars 2003	Hydro-Québec - Groupe Services énergétiques	Terminée (1999-01-11)
5R	1998-04-30	Centrale Sept-Chutes Intégration de centrale	Poste Beaupré 69 kV	22	Mars 1999	SOCOM Sept-Chutes	Terminée (1998-09-28)
6R	1998-06-01	Centrale Rolls Royce Banc d'essai Intégration de centrale	Poste Atwater 120 kV	84	Déc. 1999	Hydro-Québec - Groupe Services énergétiques	Terminée (1999-12-07)
7T	1998-07-02	Indépendance des capacités d'import Ontario/New York Augmentation des capacités de réception simultanée. Volet 1 : Solution temporaire Volet 2 : Solution permanente	Beauharnois / Châteauguay		Mars 1999	Hydro-Québec - Groupe Services énergétiques	Volets 1 et 2 terminés (2002-02-04)
8T	1998-07-03 (2001-04-05)	Intégration de puissance additionnelle au Labrador	Québec / Labrador	2260 - 3000 (2000)	2007 - 2008 (2011-2012)	Hydro-Québec - Groupe Production	Terminée (2002-08-01)
9R	1998-07-22	Centrale Toulnostouc Intégration de centrale Renforcement de réseau Alimentation du chantier	Côte Nord	440	2005	Hydro-Québec - Groupe Production	Terminée (2000-05-11)
10T	1998-09-15	Augmentation de la capacité d'import globale du réseau	Réseaux Baie James Manic et Churchill	1000	Nd	Hydro-Québec - Groupe Services énergétiques	Terminée (2000-03-09)
11R	1998-10-28	Centrale Batiscan Intégration de centrale	Poste Frégeau 25 kV	10	Nd	Forces Motrices Batiscan	Terminée (1998-04-15)

12R	1998-11-02	Chute Bell Intégration de centrale	Poste Calumet 25 kV	10	Mars 1999	SOCOM Chute Bell	Terminée (1999-01-14)
13T	1998-12-15	Augmentation capacité d'exportation vers l'Ontario par la P33C	Ligne P33C vers l'Ontario 230 kV	150	Nd	Hydro-Québec - Groupe Services énergétiques	Terminée (2001-10-15)
14T	Mars 1999	Réseau LCHM	Poste Hauterive			Hydro-Québec - Groupe Services énergétiques	Terminée (2000-12-11)
15T	Mars 1999	Livraison de services complémentaires vers les réseaux voisins	Toutes les interconnexions			Hydro-Québec - Groupe Production	Terminée (1999-12-10)
16R	1999-08-30	Domtar-Windsor Autoproduction Intégration de centrale	Poste Des Cantons 120 kV	33	Avril 2001	Domtar inc.	Terminée (2000-04-06)
17R	1999-09-08	Barrage Mercier Intégration de centrale	Ouataouais	60	2004	Hydro-Québec - Groupe Production	Terminée (2000-07-03)
18R	1999-10-13	Alcan-Beauport Autoproduction Intégration de centrale	Poste Québec 2 69 kV	37	Janvier 2002	Alcan Aluminium ltée	Retirée par le client (2001-08-27)
19R	2000-04-05	La Romaine 1,2 Intégration de centrale et renforcement de réseau	Côte-Nord	800	2007	Hydro-Québec - Groupe Production	Terminée (2000-05-18)
20R	2000-05-15	SM-3 Intégration de centrale et renforcement de réseau	Côte-Nord	180 et 440	2006	Hydro-Québec - Groupe Production	Terminée (2000-08-21)
21R	2000-05-17	Sarcelle Intégration de centrale et renforcement de réseau	Nord du Québec	156 ou 208	2009	Hydro-Québec - Groupe Production	Terminée (2000-11-13)
22R	2000-05-29	Chute Allard et Rapide des Coeurs - Intégration de centrale	Mauricie	118 (149,5)	2006 (2008)	Hydro-Québec - Groupe Production	Terminée (2003-01-28)
23R	2000-06-08	La Romaine 1, 2, 3, 4 Intégration de centrale et renforcement de réseau	Côte-Nord	1360	2007	Hydro-Québec - Groupe Production	Terminée (2000-11-11)
24R	2000-09-11	De Léry Intégration de centrale	Beauharnois	320 à 600	Indéterminée	Hydro-Québec - Groupe Production	Terminée (2000-10-05)
25R	2000-10-25	Outarde - 3 Intégration de suréquipement à la centrale et renforcement de réseau	Côte-Nord	214	2003 à 2006	Hydro-Québec - Groupe Production	Terminée (2001-08-03)
26R	2000-11-15	Surpuissance - Outardes 3 et 4 Manic 5 et 5PA Renforcement de réseau	Côte-Nord	200	Indéterminée	Hydro-Québec - Groupe Production	Terminée (2001-07-18)
27R	2000-11-26	La Romaine 1 Intégration de centrale et renforcement de réseau	Côte-Nord	150 à 250	2007	Hydro-Québec - Groupe Production	Terminée (2001/06/01)
28R	2000-12-29	Centrale Les Cèdres Intégration de centrale	Poste Notre- Dame-du-Laus 120 kV	15	Déc 2003	Énergie Maclaren inc.	Terminée (2002-07-02)
29R	2001-02-20	Beauharnois	Beauharnois	800 à 1000 (750)	2006	Hydro-Québec - Groupe Production	Terminée (2001-09-05)
30T	2001-02-20	Poste Nicolet 735 kV Modification de la configuration du poste	Poste Nicolet 735 kV			Hydro-Québec - Groupe Production	Terminée (2002-02-08)

31R	2001-03-29	Rivière des Prairies Intégration de micro-turbine	Laval	10	indéterminée	Hydro-Québec – Groupe Production	Terminé (2001-11-20)
32R	2001-04-23	Centrale SM-1A Augmentation de puissance	Poste Laure 25 kV	22 MW	Avril 2002	Hydrowatt SM- 1 inc	Terminée (2001-08-16)
33R	2001-04-30	Centrale Angliers Intégration de centrale	Poste Rapide- des-Quinze 120 kV	25	Juillet 2004	Société Hydroélectrique Régionale inc.	Terminée (2002-07-03)
34R	2001-06-19	Rivière Ste-Anne Augmentation de puissance	Poste Alain- Grandbois 25kV	4,9 MW	Mars 2002	Société d'énergie de la rivière Ste-Anne	Terminée (2002-03-01)
35R	2001-08-16	Éoliennes Asbestos Intégration de centrale	Asbestos 25kV	9 MW	Décembre 2002	3Ci inc.	Expirée
36T	2001-08-16	Augmentation du transit à Highgate	Poste Highgate	35	Nd	VELCO	Terminée (2002-06-20)
37R	2001-09-11	Rivière Caniapiscou Intégration de centrale	Baie James Côte Nord	500-1500 MW	Nd	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminée (2002-03-19)
38R	2001-10-05	Centrale Péribonka Intégration de centrale	Saguenay	450 MW	2009	Hydro-Québec – Groupe Production	Terminée (2002-07-03)
39R	2001-11-22	Moulin Melbourne Intégration de centrale	Poste Richmond 600 V	0,15	Octobre 2002	Gestion Conseil SCP	Terminé (2002-11-27)
40R	2001-11-22	Château d'eau Intégration de centrale	Poste Val Tétreault 25 kV	0,6	Septembre 2002	Gestion Conseil SCP	Terminée (2002-08-09)
41R	2001-11-22	Hydro-Filature Ltée Intégration de centrale	Poste Trois- Pistoles 25 kV	1,0	Novembre 2002	Gestion Conseil SCP	Retirée par le client
42R	2001-12-06	Centrale La Tuque Augmentation de puissance	La Tuque	56 MW	Fin 2007	Hydro-Québec Division Production	Terminée (2002-03-07)
43R	2001-12-14	Parc éolien de Murdochville	Poste Copper Mountain 69 kV	18 MW	Décembre 2002	G3Ci inc.	Remplacé par nos 70R et 71R
44R	2001-12-20	Centrales EM-1 / EM- 1A Intégration de centrales	Nord du Québec	1280MW	2008-2010	Hydro-Québec Division Production	Terminée (2002-04-05)
45R	2001-12-20	Centrales EM-1 / EM- 1A Alimentation de chantier	Nord du Québec	1280MW	2002-2003	Hydro-Québec Division IAC	Terminée (2002-02-26)
46R	2002-01-09	Centrale Grand-Mère Maintien d'une partie	Mauricie	55 MW	2004	Hydro-Québec Division Production	Terminée (2002-03-08)
47R	2002-02-12	Place des Arts Intégration de centrale	Poste Berri 25 kV	0,06	Mai 2002	Hydro-Québec Secteur Gazier	Terminée (2002-05-09)
48R	2002-02-12	Trois-Pistoles Intégration de centrale	Poste Trois- Pistoles 25 kV	4,1	Mars 2003	Gestion Conseil SCP	Terminée (2003-02-01)
49R	2002-02-21	Appel d'offres A/O 2002-01	Réseau	1 200 MW	Mars 2007	Hydro-Québec Distribution	Terminée (2002-10-18)
50R	2002-02-27	Péribonka Alimentation de chantier	Saguenay	20 MW	2005-2009	Hydro-Québec Division IAC	En évaluation
51R	2002-03-01	Réfection de l'excitation du groupe A4	Rapide-Farmer	-	Déc. 2003	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminée (2002-11-29)
52R	2002-05-02	Uniforêt Port-Cartier Augmentation de puissance	Poste Laure 161 kV	20 MW	Oct. 2003	Uniforêt scierie pâte Inc.	Terminée (2002-08-05)
53R	2002-05-31	Centrale Outardes-4 Intégration de puissance additionnelle	Centrale Outardes-4	131	2005-2008	Hydro-Québec - Groupe Production	Terminée (2003-03-11)
54R	2002-06-06	Parc éolien du Renard Intégration de centrale	Poste Rivière- aux-Renards 25 kV	2,25 MW	Décembre 2002	9098-1689 Québec inc.	Terminée (2002-12-17)

55R	2003-03-25	Éco-Centre Rivière-des-Prairies Intégration de centrale	Poste Bourassa 600 V	1,5 kW	Juin 2003	Ville de Montréal	Terminée (2003-09-11)
56T	2003-04-07	Interconnexion X2Y		20	Juin 2003	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminée (2003-04-09)
57R	2003-04-14	Centrale Péribonka Intégration de centrale	Saguenay	385 MW	2008	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminée (2003-10-29)
58R	2003-04-15	Appel d'offres A/O 2003-01	Réseau	100 MW	2005-2008	Hydro-Québec Distribution	Terminée (2003-12-18)
59R	2003-04-25	Centrales Grand-Nord	Nord du Québec	3523 MW	2013-2018	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminée (2004-08-12)
60R	2003-04-28	Centrales Côte-Nord	Côte-Nord et Basse Côte Nord	3000 MW	2013-2018	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminée (2004-07-23)
61R	2003-05-01	Ferme-Neuve Intégration de centrale	Poste Mont- Laurier 120 ou 25 kV	21 MW	Mai 2006	Boralex	Retirée par le client
62R	2003-05-12	Appel d'offres A/O 2003-02	Gaspésie	1 000 MW	2006-2012	Hydro-Québec Distribution	Terminée (2004-10-04)
63R	2003-07-04	Puissance additionnelles centrales existantes	Baie James, Côte nord et autres	726 MW	2007-2013	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminé (2008-05-22)
64R	2003-07-07	Centrale La Tuque Rééquipement des groupes 2,4,6	La Tuque	271 MW	2007	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminée (2003-12-04)
65R	2003-07-09	Modification pour éliminer une contrainte de production	LG2A	S/O	2004	Hydro-Québec Production	En cours
66R	2003-07-09	Chute-Allard	La Tuque	70 MW	2007	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminée (2004-06-16)
67R	2003-07-09	Rapides-des-Coeurs	La Tuque	70 MW	2007	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminée (2004-06-16)
68R	2003-08-25	Matawin Intégration de centrale	Poste Provost 34,5 kV	17,4 MW	Février 2006	Innergex II Inc.	En cours
69R	2003-10-07	Puissance additionnelle	Abitibi	24 MW	2007	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminée (2004-11-16)
70R	2003-10-17	Parc éolien du Mont Copper à Murdochville Intégration de centrale	Réseau Copper Mountain 69 kV ou 161 kV	54 MW	2004	Énergie éolienne du Mont Copper inc.	Terminée (2004-12)
71R	2003-11-28	Parc éolien du Mont Miller à Murdochville Intégration de centrale	Réseau Copper Mountain 69 kV ou 161 kV	54 MW	2004	Énergie éolienne du Mont Miller inc.	Terminée (2004-12)
72R	2003-12-02	Intégration de puissance additionnelle aux centrales Robert- Bourassa (LG2), LG3 et LG4 (de 449 à 938 MW en pointe)	La Grande	489 MW	2015	Hydro-Québec Production	Annulée (2004-05-31)
73R	2003-12-11	Rapide-2	Abitibi	12 MW	2007...	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminée (2004-11-16)
74R	2003-12-11	Rapide-7	Abitibi	12 MW	2007...	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminée (2004-11-16)
75R	2003-12-15	Centrales La Romaine, Muskrat, Petit Mécatina	Basse Côte- Nord	2 300 MW	2013-2016 (demande initiale) Note : mise en service de la Romaine de 2014 à 2020 selon modification par HQP le 25 mai 2006	Hydro-Québec Production (Variante no 63)	Terminée (2004-07-23)
76R	2003-12-29	Magpie Intégration de centrale	Ligne 161 kV Arnaud- Natashquan	42 MW	Octobre 2006	Hydroméga Services inc.	Terminée (2004-11-04)

77R	2004-05-07	Parc éolien de Murdochville (3 ^e) Intégration de centrale	Réseau Copper Mountain 69 kV ou 161 kV	54 MW	Mars 2005 et déc. 2005	3Ci	En cours
78R	2004-08-02	Rivière-du-Loup Intégration de centrale	Rivière-du-Loup	200 MW	Sept. 2005 à sept. 2006	SkyPower Corporation	Expirée
79R	2004-09-13	Centrale des Rapides- de-la-Chaudière	La Tuque	160 ou 245 MW	2011	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminée (2005-11-22)
80R	2004-10-06	Appel d'offres A/O 2004-02	Réseau	350 MW	2008-2009	Hydro-Québec Distribution	Terminée (2005-07-18)
81R	2004-10-25	Domtar-Hull Intégration de centrale	Gatineau	24,9 MW	Août 2007	Domtar inc.	Terminée (2005-07-28)
82R	2004-12-23	Parc éolien Vents du Kempt	Causapscal	150 MW	Sept. 2007	Eolectric	Retirée par le client (2007-06-12)
83R	2005-01-31	Parc éolien Chisasibi/LG-1	Baie James	204 MW	Oct. 2006	Cree Nation of Chisasibi	Terminée (2006-11-17)
84R	2005-02-04	Réfection Hull-Eddy	Gatineau	Augmentation 3,6 MW	2008	Domtar	Terminée (2005-07-28)
85R	2005-02-15	Parc éolien Chisasibi/Radisson	Baie James	204 MW	Oct. 2008	Cree Nation of Chisasibi	Terminée (2006-11-17)
86R	2005-02-17	Parc éolien Chisasibi/Laforge- Brisay	Baie James	204 MW	Oct. 2009	Cree Nation of Chisasibi	Terminée (2006-11-17)
87R	2005-03-08	Parc éolien de Murdochville (4 ^e parc) Intégration de centrale	Réseau Copper Mountain 69 kV ou 161 kV	54 MW	Déc 2006 et mars 2007	3Ci	En cours
88R	2005-03-10	Centrale de biogaz à Lachute Intégration de centrale	Poste Lachute	10 MW	Oct. 2005	Lydia Énergie Inc.	Terminée (2005-07-14)
89T	2005-04-25	Centrales de Gull Island et Muskrat Falls - Demande de service de transport ferme de point à point	Réception : Point Labrador- Québec	2824 MW	2017-2020	Hydro-Québec Production	Retirée par le client (2006-10-10)
90T	2005-04-25	Nouvelle interconnexion de 1250 MW avec l'Ontario - Demande de service de transport ferme de point à point	Frontière Québec - Ontario	1250 MW	Mai 2009	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminée (2006-11-13)
91R	2005-06-06	Appel d'offres éolien - 2005	Réseau HQT 500 MW par zone Décision de la Régie de l'énergie D- 2006-66	2000 MW	2008-2013 (Demande initiale) Note : mise en service modifiée pour 2010-2015 par le décret 548-2007 du 27 juin 2007	Hydro-Québec Distribution	Terminée (2008-05-05)
92R	2005-06-10	Rééquipement de la centrale LG-4 Intégration de centrale	Baie James	240 MW	2012	Hydro-Québec Production	Annulée (2006-11-21)
93R	2005-06-30	Rééquipement de la centrale Manic-2	Baie-Comeau	44 MW	2010-2011	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminée (2008-06-13)
94R	2005-06-30	Rééquipement de la centrale Manic-3	Baie-Comeau	280 MW	2012-2015	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminée (2008-10-14)
95R	2005-08-02	Parc éolien Chisasibi/Laforge- Brisay - Phase 2	Baie James	450 MW	Nov. 2008	Cree Nation of Chisasibi	Terminée (2007-07-05)
96R	2005-08-19	Rivière-du-Loup - Intégration de centrale (réactivation du #78)	Rivière-du-Loup	200 MW	Juil. à sept. 2006 (demande initiale) Note : mise en service modifiée en 2006 par le promoteur : 39 MW en déc.	SkyPower Corporation	Terminée

97R	2005-08-23	SFK Pâte (Augmentation de puissance)	Saint-Félicien	4,9 MW	Octobre 2006	SFK Pâte	Terminée (2006-04-19)
98R	2005-10-26	Suréquipement de la centrale de la Sainte-Marguerite-3 Intégration de la puissance additionnelle au réseau de transport	Centrale de la Sainte-Marguerite-3	440 MW	2012	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminée (2007-12-10)
99T	2005-10-28	Rehaussement de la capacité d'exportation sur HQT-P33C (indépendance de la temp.)	Ligne P33 C	0 MW	n/d	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminée (2005-12-09)
100R	2005-12-12	Buckingham 2 Intégration de centrale	Poste Buckingham	9,5 MW	2008	Borex inc.	Terminée (2006-07-14)
101T	2006-01-19	Centrales de Gull Island et Muskrat Falls Demande de service de transport ferme de point à point	Réception : Point Labrador-Québec Livraisons : Frontière Québec-Ontario HQT-NE HQT-NB HQT-MASS	2 824 MW 1422 MW 95 MW 284 MW 190 MW	2015-2018	Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro	Terminée (2007-12-11)
102T	2006-01-20	Demande de service de transport ferme de point à point	Chemin HQT-MASS	1 200 MW	2009	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminée (2008-05-08)
103T	2006-01-20	Demande de service de transport ferme de point à point	Chemin HQT-NE	1 200 MW	2009	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminée (2008-05-08)
104R	2006-05-19	Ferme éolienne expérimentale Des Caps Intégration de centrale	Poste Saint-Tite-des-Caps	2,4 MW	2006	Borex inc.	Retirée par le client (2006-10-06)
105R	2004-04-02	Winston Intégration de centrale	Poste Grand Portage	1,65 MW	2007	Winston Hydro inc.	Terminée (2005-01-13)
106R	2006-12-11	Intégration de puissance additionnelle	Centrale de Bryson	6 MW	2011	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminée (2008-07-15)
107T	2007-02-05	Centrales de Gull Island, Muskrat Falls et Churchill Falls (Recapture) Demande de service de transport ferme de point à point additionnel au service de la demande #101	Réception : Point Labrador-Québec Livraisons : HQT-NE HQT-NB	724 MW 230 MW 456 MW	2015-01-01	Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro	En cours
108R	2007-02-27	Domtar-Ottawa Intégration de centrale (réactivation du projet no 81)	Gatineau	24,9 MW	2009	Domtar Inc.	En évaluation
109T	2007-03-22	Centrales de Gull Island, Muskrat Falls et Churchill Falls (Recall) Demande de service de transport ferme de point à point additionnel au service de la demande #101	Réception : Point Labrador-Québec Livraisons : HQT-NE HQT-NB	724 MW 230 MW 456 MW	2015-01-01	Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro	Retirée
110T	2007-04-20	Demande de service de transport ferme de point à point	Chemin HQT-HIGH	225 MW	2008	Hydro-Québec Production	Terminée (2007-09-05)
111T	2007-06-10	Demande de service de transport ferme de point à point	Chemin MASS-NE	300 MW	Juin 2009-2010	CARGILL	Retirée
112R	2007-06-29	Pont Arnaud/Chute	Ville de	14,4 MW	2009-10-30	Ville de	En cours

		Garneau Intégration de centrale	Saguenay			Saguenay	
113T	2007-07-27	Demande de service de transport ferme de point à point	Chemin Ontario-NE	3 X 100 MW	Juin 2009-2010	CARGILL	Terminée (2008-06-09)
114T	2007-08-03	Demande de service de transport ferme de point à point	Chemin Ontario-NE	2 X 100 MW	Juin 2009-2010	Brookfield	Terminée (2008-06-09)
115R	2007-11-12	Centrale hydroélectrique Franquelin (intégration de centrale)	Côte-Nord	9,9 MW	Octobre 2009	Axor	En cours
116R	2008-03-13	Barrage du Père-Tarte	Poste Acton	550 kW	Mai 2009	9193-1147 Québec inc.	Terminée (2008-05-01)
117T	2008-04-02	Demande de service de transport ferme de point à point	Nouveau chemin Québec-New Hampshire	1 200 MW	Juin 2014	Hydro-Québec Production	En cours
118T	2008-05-14	Demande de service de transport ferme de point à point	ON-New Hampshire	3 x 105 MW	Juin 2014	Cargill	En cours
119T	2008-05-14	Demande de service de transport ferme de point à point	ON-New Hampshire	2 x 105 MW	Juin 2014	Énergie Brookfield	En cours
120T	2008-05-26	Demande de service de transport ferme à long terme de point à point	HQT-New Hampshire	300 MW	Juin 2014	Hydro-Québec Production	En cours
121R	2008-07-07	Accroissement de puissance	Centrale Manic-2	76 MW	2012-2015	Hydro-Québec Production	En cours
122T	2008-07-03	Demande de service de transport ferme de point à point	ON-NE	1 x 184 MW 1 x 26 MW 1 x 53 MW 1 x 79 MW 1 x 105 MW	Juin 2009	Cargill	En cours

Pour plus d'information :

infote@hydro.qc.ca

