

ORIGINAL

STEEL
HECTOR
& DAVIS

RECEIVED-FPSC

00 JAN -7 PM 3:41

RECORDS AND
REPORTING

Steel Hector & Davis LLP
215 South Monroe, Suite 601
Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1804
850.222.2300
850.222.8410 Fax
www.steelhector.com

January 7, 2000

Charles A. Guyton
850.222.3423

Blanca S. Bayó, Director
Records and Reporting
Florida Public Service Commission
4075 Esplanade Way, Room 110
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

By Hand Delivery

Re: **Green Pricing**
Docket No. 960624-EG

000000

Dear Ms. Bayó:

Enclosed for filing on behalf of Florida Power & Light Company (FPL) are the original and fifteen (15) copies of Evaluation of FPL's Green Pricing Research and Development Project Findings. Also enclosed is an additional copy of the Evaluation which we request that you stamp and return to our runner.

If you or your Staff have any questions regarding this filing, please contact me at 222-2300.

Very truly yours,

Charles A. Guyton

Charles A. Guyton

- AFA _____
- APP _____
- CAF _____
- CMU _____
- CTR _____
- EAG _____ cc: Lee Colson
- LEG _____ 1 encs.
- MAS _____ TAL 1998/33118-1
- OPC _____
- RRR _____
- SEC _____
- WAW _____
- OTH _____

RECEIVED & FILED

[Signature]
FPSC-BUREAU OF RECORDS

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

00316 JAN-7 00

ORIGINAL



FPL

Evaluation of FPL's Green Pricing Research and Development Project Findings

**Florida Power and Light Company
December 1999**

DOCUMENT NUMBER - DATE

00316 JAN-78

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

CONTENTS

	PAGE NUMBER
Overview	1
Project Description	2
Project Budget	3
Project Activities - Customer Focus Beginnings	4
Project Activities - Customer Focus Follow up	5
Project Activities - Marketing and Education	6
Project Activities – Contributions	8
Project Activities – Design Build	9
Cost Effectiveness	11
Conclusions	12
Recommendations	13

EXHIBITS AND TABLES

APPENDIX

Contributions analysis	A
Cost effectiveness analysis	B
Bid selection matrix	C

OVERVIEW

The results of the evaluation of FPL's Green Pricing Research and Development Project (GPRDP) are presented in this report. The overall objective of this evaluation is to summarize the findings of this multi-year effort.

- Customer focus groups were held to gather understanding of customer needs and interests.
- The project was advertised and contributions were solicited to build the Photovoltaic system.
- Contributions were received from 11,223 customers which total \$89,562.
- A 10.1 kW (DC) Photovoltaic system was installed at FPL's Martin Plant Site in Indiantown, Fl.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The overall objective of the project was to test FPL's customer's response to a green pricing initiative. Under the GPRDP, FPL was to "... solicit contributions from its customers to be used to purchase, install, maintain, and operate photovoltaic (PV) modules on FPL's system."

- The research plan specifically called for solicitation of contributions from all classes of customers. However, research conducted during the project indicated a customer preference for purchasing a product instead of making contributions to a "for-profit" utility.
- The plan allowed for the recovery of administrative, research and marketing costs through the ECCR clause. A two year budget of \$475,000 was established.
- The PSC Order directed the photovoltaic system be installed at the Martin Plant and connected to FPL's grid.
- FPL developed success criteria which were defined as: 1) marketing and administrative costs could be covered by the avoided fuel cost, and 2) the program would be sustainable based on continued contributions.

**GPRDP
PROJECT BUDGET**

	AUTHORIZED BUDGET	TOTALS	CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED
MARKETING COSTS	\$250,000	\$236,221	
ADMIN COSTS	\$189,000	\$ 58,460	
RESEARCH COST	\$ 36,000	\$ 32,857	
TOTALS	\$475,000	\$327,538	\$ 89,562

PROJECT ACTIVITIES – CUSTOMER FOCUS BEGINNING

Focus group research was conducted prior to solicitations to understand customer interest in a contribution program in support of a utility owned photovoltaic system and to develop a concept for solicitation. Some key findings from these focus groups were:

- Customers across the board stated that they were enthusiastic about green power.
- Customers also indicated that they did not support ongoing contributions, but instead stated a preference for a one-time contribution program instead.
- Customers wanted the convenience of including their contribution in the same check in which they paid their monthly bill.
- The contribution approach did receive some negative reaction. This reaction appeared to be based on FPL's status as a "for-profit" company. This was stated during the focus group and reinforced later by a small number of press items which also questioned the validity of a "for profit" company asking for contributions.

PROJECT ACTIVITIES – CUSTOMER FOCUS FOLLOWUP

As stated earlier, FPL determined that a program based on ongoing contribution would not be popular with our customers. Interviews were conducted with companies involved with green pricing programs to better understand why contributions worked to varying degrees elsewhere. It was discovered that the most successful contributions programs were conducted by “not for profit” utilities. These are mainly municipal electric utilities such as Sacramento Utility Management District (SMUD) and Gainesville Regional Utilities. Also as part of the follow-up research, FPL conducted customer focus groups to determine any potential alternatives that might be acceptable. The results/findings were as follows:

- Customers in the follow-up focus groups clearly indicated that they would rather purchase green power than contribute to a fund to build PV systems. Customers also indicated that, while a few customers are interested in roof-top PV, the cost is a major barrier. Other customers indicated they would be more willing to purchase green power directly from FPL on a grid delivered system, mainly favoring the convenience of this approach over having contractors impacting their personal schedules to install them.
- Customer perception is that renewables, especially solar, should be much cheaper than conventional generation. Only after they understood that the cost of equipment is much higher, were they willing to discuss paying more for green power. The indication is that a small percentage of customers would be willing to pay between \$5-\$10 more per month for green power.
- Customers willing to pay more for green power considered wind, hydroelectric, solar, landfill gas and biomass “green environmental” sources.

PROJECT ACTIVITIES – MARKETING AND EDUCATION

Marketing and educational activities were driven by customer input. Customer focus groups were held to develop an understanding of customer interest and needs about contributing to a building fund for a PV system. Further, this input directed FPL's development of a marketing approach and the associated collateral materials.

- Bill inserts were developed and mailed to all residential customers in the May and July 1998 bills.
- A bill insert was sent in July 1998 to all General Service (Small Commercial customers).
- Direct mail was used to send brochures to all of FPL's National Account customers in June 1998 and all Large Commercial/Industrial customers in April 1998.
- A Green Pricing section was added to the FPL Website.
- Three mass media advertisements were placed in area-wide newspapers in May and June 1998.
- "In-bound" telemarketing procedures were established, using the 1-800 Dial FPL number.
- The Green Pricing Research and Development Project was promoted at four Home Shows.
- Attempts were made to enlist the support of the Legal Environmental Assistance Foundation (LEAF) to provide mailing lists for members of various environmental groups. However, this support was not forthcoming.

- FPL did not pursue targeted solicitation to environmental groups because they had been previously solicited through the bill insert mailings and this marketing strategy would only serve to increase the program cost without adding sufficient benefits.

CONTRIBUTIONS

A minimum goal of \$70,000 in contributions was established based on estimated costs to install a 10.1 kW (DC) PV system. Contributions in the amount of \$89,562 from 11,223 customers were received. Although, solicitations included all classes of customers, the only responses were from residential customers. The number of customers contributing to the program constituted about 0.35% of FPL customers.

- The minimum \$70,000 goal, based on the estimated cost of installation of a 10.1 kW (DC) system, was exceeded, with collections totaling \$89,562.
- The contribution processing system developed for this project was responsive to customer needs and allowed customers to include the payments as part of their bill payment check.

PROJECT ACTIVITIES – DESIGN/BUILD

The system was designed and specified by a team of FPL construction engineering professionals with expert help and input from PV professionals on the staff of the Florida Solar Energy Center. The team also developed a PV Contractor Pre-Qualification Questionnaire which was widely sent to area contractors with interest in the project. An RFP, based on the specifications and design, was sent to contractors on the pre-qualified list. A successful contractor was selected to provide and install the equipment.

- Five bids were received for the 10.1 kW (DC⁽¹⁾) project ranging in price from \$92,000 to \$163,000.
- To determine the best value, bidders were evaluated against pre-established criteria.
- In this case the lowest bidder was also the best value. The cost of the 10.1 kW (DC) system was \$92,000. The system was installed at the Martin PV Farm, which had useable existing slabs, PV racks and an enclosed building. FPL was able to negotiate the contract and contain the project cost within the contribution amount. The cost was about 28% higher than the \$7000/Kw original project estimate.
- FPL was surprised by and concerned over the higher than planned cost/kW. FPL conducted interviews with other contractors and suppliers to gain additional understanding. As a result, information from upstream suppliers indicated that additional costs could have come from two areas. First, contracting with a local supplier instead of a national, first tier supplier could increase supplier fees due to added layers of the distribution chain. Further, open field installations, like the Martin Plant, could require long runs of expensive cables which could increase costs.

- To enhance public awareness of the PV program, FPL is also installing a PV exhibit at its Port St Lucie's Energy Encounter. The exhibit will be viewed by an expected 50,000 Florida residents each year.

(1) Note: the DC or direct current basis is the common way to state the size of the system based on the output at the panels. In the cost effectiveness analysis the system was converted to its AC or alternating current, rating which is the level of power placed on the grid system.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

As indicated in the original order, PV projects are not cost effective, and this project confirms that fact. The cost comparisons for this system were intended solely to lower fossil fuel use (i.e., as a “fuel replacement” option). Capacity deferral cost was not considered due to the fact that the system does not reduce peak requirements. If the system were to be configured for peak deferral, the kWh output would be considerable less, reducing the value of fuel cost avoidance. The cost of photovoltaic systems was significantly higher than projected, exceeding the estimates by about 28%. Further, administrative and marketing costs are more than twice the cost of the system itself. Even allowing for future economies of scale in soliciting and processing contributions, fuel savings and reduced O&M costs do not cover the extra costs of marketing and administration.

- The system cost was \$9200/kW, about 28% higher than the estimated \$7000/kW.
- Administrative and marketing costs exceeded \$200,000, or about \$20,000 per installed kW. This cost might be less for a large-scale project.
- The projected net present value for fuel savings for a 20-year system life is \$679.60 per installed kW (AC).

CONCLUSIONS

Based on focus groups before and after project execution, customers indicate a preference to purchase green energy instead of contributing to a building fund program, but their willingness to pay is far short of the cost of PV systems. Customers state that they are enthusiastic about green power options, but they believe these technologies should be cheaper than conventional generation.

- Customer's stated willingness to pay the incremental cost for green power, \$5-\$10 per month, is not sufficient to pay for PV systems.
- Other, less costly options for securing green power should be explored to develop a green power price option for which some customers might choose to pay the extra cost.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Research findings indicate and FPL recommends that alternate green power pricing options be investigated to determine their availability and cost and understand the customer's willingness to pay the incremental cost.

- FPL is proposing to the PSC a Green Pricing Project as part of FPL's up-coming 2000-2009 DSM Program Plan. The program will examine a variety of renewable generating sources. It will also determine if customers are willing to pay the difference between a standard energy option and an option for energy generated by renewable energy sources.
- A PV R&D project involving rooftop installations for single family homes is also being proposed as part of the Plan.
- FPL recommends that the Public Service Commissioners adopt these projects as part of the plan.

APPENDIX A

GREEN PRICING R&D PROJECT CONTRIBUTIONS MATRIX

DISTRICT LOCATION	WHO CONTRIBUTED NO. OF CUSTOMERS	CONTRIBUTED TOTAL AMOUNT	CONTRIBUTED AVERAGE AMOUNT
DAYTONA(11)	651	5250	7.53
PALATKA(12)	51	497.78	10.2
ST. AUGUSTINE(13)	152	1197.11	8.4
COCOA(21)	371	3212.52	9.37
MELBOURNE(22)	501	3804.97	8.18
SANFORD(23)	85	606.24	7.81
LAKE CITY(32)	38	238.78	7.12
MACCLENNY(34)	55	489.85	8.91
DELRAY BEACH(41)	846	6341.84	8.88
BELLE GLADE(42)	384	3009.62	8.29
OKEECHOBEE(43)	40	320.36	7.74
STUART(44)	477	4376.23	10.92
WEST PALM BEACH(45)	392	3337.98	8.74
ST.LUCIE(46)	201	1612.53	8.23
ARCADIA(51)	35	218.9	5.47
BRADENTON(52)	481	3612.23	9.16
FT. MYERS(53)	411	3654.17	8.88
NAPLES(54)	527	5065.78	9.11
PUNTA GORDA(55)	344	2619.2	8.89
SARASOTA(56)	469	3766.54	7.84
VENICE(57)	385	3081.14	9.5
FT.LAUDERDALE(71)	324	2745.9	7.13
HOLLYWOOD(72)	465	3281.95	7.88
NORTH BROWARD(73)	674	4889.41	11.09
CENTRAL BROWARD(74)	378	2812.96	6.67
CORAL GABLES(81)	570	4199.37	9.23
DADE SOUTH(82)	378	3082.8	8.69
HIALEAH(83)	534	3763.38	8.14
MIAMI BEACH(84)	172	2201.09	7.91
MIAMI(85)	505	3780.06	7.32
DADE NORTH(86)	327	2491.25	7.86
TOTAL(AS OF 11/10/98)	11223	89561.94	7.98

GREEN PRICING R&D PROJECT CONTRIBUTIONS MATRIX

DISTRICT LOCATION	WHO CONTRIBUTED NO. OF CUSTOMERS	CONTRIBUTED TOTAL AMOUNT	CONTRIBUTED AVERAGE AMOUNT
NORTHEAST AREA	1904	\$15,297.25	\$8.03
PALM BEACH AREA	2340	\$18,998.56	\$8.12
WEST COAST AREA	2652	\$22,017.96	\$8.30
BROWARD AREA	1841	\$13,730.22	\$7.46
DADE AREA	2486	\$19,517.95	\$7.85
	11223	\$89,561.94	\$7.98

APPENDIX B

INPUT DATA -- PART 1 CONTINUED
PROGRAM METHOD SELECTED: REV_REQ
PROGRAM NAME: 9 KW (AC) of PV installed on FPL system as fuel substitute in 1999, assume 20% capacity factor for PV

I. PROGRAM DEMAND SAVINGS & LINE LOSSES

(1) CUSTOMER kW REDUCTION AT METER	7.00 kW
(2) GENERATOR kW REDUCTION PER CUSTOMER	9.00 kW
(3) kW LINE LOSS PERCENTAGE	9.01 %
(4) GENERATOR kWh REDUCTION PER CUSTOMER	16,958.5 kWh
(5) kWh LINE LOSS PERCENTAGE	7.02 %
(6) GROUP LINE LOSS MULTIPLIER	1.0000
(7) CUSTOMER kWh INCREASE AT METER	0.0 kWh

II. ECONOMIC LIFE & K FACTORS

(1) STUDY PERIOD FOR THE CONSERVATION PROGRAM	22 YEARS
(2) GENERATOR ECONOMIC LIFE	30 YEARS
(3) T&D ECONOMIC LIFE	35 YEARS
(4) K FACTOR FOR GENERATION	Not Applicable
(5) K FACTOR FOR T & D	Not Applicable

III. UTILITY & CUSTOMER COSTS

(1) UTILITY NON RECURRING COST PER CUSTOMER	*** \$/CUST
(2) UTILITY RECURRING COST PER CUSTOMER	*** \$/CUST
(3) UTILITY COST ESCALATION RATE	*** %**
(4) CUSTOMER EQUIPMENT COST	*** \$/CUST
(5) CUSTOMER EQUIPMENT ESCALATION RATE	*** %**
(6) CUSTOMER O & M COST	*** \$/CUST/YR
(7) CUSTOMER O & M COST ESCALATION RATE	*** %**
(8) INCREASED SUPPLY COSTS	*** \$/CUST/YR
(9) SUPPLY COSTS ESCALATION RATES	*** %**
(10) UTILITY DISCOUNT RATE	8.98 %
(11) UTILITY AFUDC RATE	10.30 %
(12) UTILITY NON RECURRING REBATE/INCENTIVE	*** \$/CUST
(13) UTILITY RECURRING REBATE/INCENTIVE	*** \$/CUST
(14) UTILITY REBATE/INCENTIVE ESCALATION RATE	*** %

IV. AVOIDED GENERATOR AND T&D COSTS

(1) BASE YEAR	1998
(2) IN-SERVICE YEAR FOR AVOIDED GENERATING UNIT	2000
(3) IN-SERVICE YEAR FOR AVOIDED T&D	2001-2000
(4) BASE YEAR AVOIDED GENERATING COST	0 \$/kW
(5) BASE YEAR AVOIDED TRANSMISSION COST	0 \$/kW
(6) BASE YEAR DISTRIBUTION COST	0 \$/kW
(7) GEN. TRAN & DIST COST ESCALATION RATE	1.78 %**
(8) GENERATOR FIXED O & M COST	-6 \$/kW/YR
(9) GENERATOR FIXED O&M ESCALATION RATE	4.10 %**
(10) TRANSMISSION FIXED O & M COST	0.00 \$/kW
(11) DISTRIBUTION FIXED O & M COST	0.00 \$/kW
(12) T&D FIXED O&M ESCALATION RATE	4.10 %**
(13) AVOIDED GEN UNIT VARIABLE O & M COSTS	0.000 CENTS/kWh
(14) GENERATOR VARIABLE O&M COST ESCALATION RATE	2.70 %**
(15) GENERATOR CAPACITY FACTOR	0% ** (In-service year)
(16) AVOIDED GENERATING UNIT FUEL COST	2.93 CENTS PER kWh** (In-service y
(17) AVOIDED GEN UNIT FUEL COST ESCALATION RATE	5.30 %**

V. NON-FUEL ENERGY AND DEMAND CHARGES

(1) NON FUEL COST IN CUSTOMER BILL	*** CENTS/kWh
(2) NON-FUEL COST ESCALATION RATE	*** %
(3) DEMAND CHARGE IN CUSTOMER BILL	*** \$/kW/MO
(4) DEMAND CHARGE ESCALATION RATE	*** %

* SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION NOT SPECIFIED IN WORKBOOK
** VALUE SHOWN IS FOR FIRST YEAR ONLY (VALUE VARIES OVER TIME)
*** PROGRAM COST CALCULATION VALUES ARE SHOWN ON PAGE 2

* INPUT DATA – PART 1 CONTINUED
 PROGRAM METHOD SELECTED: REV_REQ
 PROGRAM NAME: 9 KW (AC) of PV installed on FPL system as fuel substitute in 1999, assume 20% capacity factor for PV

YEAR	(1) UTILITY PROGRAM COSTS WITHOUT INCENTIVES \$(000)	(2) UTILITY INCENTIVES \$(000)	(3) OTHER UTILITY COSTS \$(000)	(4) TOTAL UTILITY PROGRAM COSTS \$(000)	(5) ENERGY CHARGE REVENUE LOSSES \$(000)	(6) DEMAND CHARGE REVENUE LOSSES \$(000)	(7) PARTICIPANT EQUIPMENT COSTS \$(000)	(8) PARTICIPANT O&M COSTS \$(000)	(9) OTHER PARTICIPANT COSTS \$(000)	(10) TOTAL PARTICIPANT COSTS \$(000)
1998	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1999	215	0	0	215	0	0	89	0	0	89
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2001	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2002	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2003	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2004	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2005	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2006	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2008	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2009	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2010	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2011	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2012	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2013	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2014	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2015	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2016	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2017	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2018	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2019	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NOM	215	0	0	215	0	0	89	0	0	89
NPV	197	0	0	197	0	0	82	0	0	82

* SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION NOT SPECIFIED IN WORKBOOK
 ** NEGATIVE COSTS WILL BE CALCULATED AS POSITIVE BENEFITS FOR TRC AND RIM TESTS

CALCULATION OF GEN K-FACTOR
PROGRAM METHOD SELECTED REV_REQ
PROGRAM NAME: 9 KW (AC) of PV installed on FPL system as fuel substitute in 1999, assume 20% capacity factor for PV

YEAR	(2) MID-YEAR RATE BASE \$(000)	(3) DEBT \$(000)	(4) PREFERRED STOCK \$(000)	(5) COMMON EQUITY \$(000)	(6) INCOME TAXES \$(000)	(7) OTHER TAXES & INSURANCE \$(000)	(8) DEPREC. \$(000)	(9) DEFERRED TAXES \$(000)	(10) TOTAL FIXED CHARGES \$(000)	(11) PRESENT WORTH FIXED CHARGES \$(000)	(12) CUMULATIVE PW FIXED CHARGES \$(000)
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2001	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2002	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2003	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2004	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2005	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2006	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2008	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2009	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2010	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2011	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2012	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2013	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2014	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2015	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2016	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2017	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2018	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2019	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2020	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2021	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2022	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2023	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2024	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2025	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2026	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2027	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2028	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2029	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

IN SERVICE COS (\$000) 0
 IN SERVICE YEAR 2000
 BOOK LIFE (YRS) 30
 EFFEC. TAX RATE 38.575
 DISCOUNT RATE 8.98%
 OTAX & INS RATE 1.40%

CAPITAL STRUCTURE

SOURCE	WEIGHT	COST
DEBT	45%	7.60 %
P/S	0%	0.00 %
C/S	55%	12.50 %

K-FACTOR = CPWFC / IN-SVC COST = Can't Calculate

DEFERRED TAX AND MID-YEAR RATE BASE CALCULATION
 PROGRAM METHOD SELECTED: REV_REQ
 PROGRAM NAI 9 KW (AC) of PV installed on FI

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
YEAR	TAX DEPRECIATION SCHEDULE	TAX DEPRECIATION \$(000)	ACCUMULATED TAX DEPRECIATION \$(000)	BOOK DEPRECIATION \$(000)	ACCUMULATED BOOK DEPRECIATION \$(000)	BOOK DEPRECIATION DEFERRED TAX \$(000)	ACCUMULATED BOOK DEPR FOR DEFERRED TAX \$(000)	DEFERRED TAX DUE TO DEPRECIATION \$(000)	TOTAL EQUITY AFUDC \$(000)	BOOK DEPR RATE MINUS 1/LIFE	(10)*(11) TAX RATE \$(000)	SALVAGE TAX RATE \$(000)	ANNUAL DEFERRED TAX (9)-(12)+(13) \$(000)	ACCUMULATED DEFERRED TAX \$(000)
2000	3.75%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2001	7.22%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2002	6.68%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2003	6.18%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2004	5.71%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2005	5.29%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2006	4.89%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007	4.52%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2008	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2009	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2010	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2011	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2012	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2013	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2014	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2015	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2016	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2017	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2018	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2019	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2020	2.23%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2021	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2022	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2023	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2024	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2025	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2026	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2027	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2028	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2029	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

SALVAGE / REMOVAL COST	0.00
YEAR SALVAGE / COST OF REMOVAL	2029
DEFERRED TAXES DURING CONSTRUCTION (SEE PAGE 5)	0
TOTAL EQUITY AFUDC CAPITALIZED (SEE PAGE 5)	0
BOOK DEPR RATE - 1/USEFUL LIFE	3.33%

DEFERRED TAX AND MID-YEAR RATE BASE CALCULATION
 PROGRAM METHOD SELECTED: REV_REQ
 PROGRAM NAI 9 KW (AC) of PV installed on FPL system as fuel substitute in 1999, assume 20% capacity factor for PV

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(5a)*	(5b)*	(6)	(7)	(8)
YEAR	TAX DEPRECIATION SCHEDULE	TAX DEPRECIATION \$(000)	DEFERRED TAX \$(000)	END OF YEAR NET PLANT IN SERVICE \$(000)	ACCUMULATED DEPRECIATION \$(000)	ACCUMULATED DEF TAXES \$(000)	BEGINNING YEAR RATE BASE \$(000)	ENDING OF YEAR RATE BASE \$(000)	MID-YEAR RATE BASE \$(000)
2000	3.75%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2001	7.22%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2002	6.68%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2003	6.18%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2004	5.71%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2005	5.29%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2006	4.89%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007	4.52%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2008	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2009	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2010	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2011	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2012	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2013	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2014	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2015	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2016	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2017	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2018	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2019	4.46%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2020	2.23%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2021	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2022	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2023	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2024	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2025	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2026	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2027	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2028	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2029	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

* Column not specified in workbook

(1) YEAR	(2) NO. YEARS BEFORE IN-SERVICE	(3) PLANT ESCALATION RATE	(4) CUMULATIVE ESCALATION FACTOR	(5) YEARLY EXPENDITURE (%)	(6) ANNUAL SPENDING (\$/kW)	(7) CUMULATIVE AVERAGE SPENDING (\$/kW)
1998	-2	0.00%	1.000	100.00%	0.00	0.00
1999	-1	1.78%	1.018	0.00%	0.00	0.00

100.00% 0.00

(8) NO. YEARS BEFORE IN-SERVICE	(8) CUMULATIVE SPENDING WITH AFUDC (\$/kW)	(8a)* DEBT AFUDC (\$/kW)	(8b)* CUMULATIVE DEBT AFUDC (\$/kW)	(9) YEARLY TOTAL AFUDC (\$/kW)	(9a)* CUMULATIVE TOTAL AFUDC (\$/kW)	(9b)* CONSTRUCTION PERIOD INTEREST (\$/kW)	(9c)* CUMULATIVE CPI (\$/kW)	(9d)* DEFERRED TAXES (\$/kW)	(9e)* CUMULATIVE DEFERRED TAXES (\$/kW)	(10) INCREMENTAL YEAR-END BOOK VALUE (\$/kW)	(11) CUMULATIVE YEAR-END BOOK VALUE (\$/kW)
1998	-2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1999	-1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00

IN SERVICE YEAR	PLANT COSTS	AFUDC RATE	BOOK BASIS		
			BOOK BASIS	FOR DEF TAX	TAX BASIS
2000	0	10.30%	0	0	0
			0	0	0
			0	0	0
			0	0	0
			0	0	0
			0	0	0

* Column not specified in workbook

INPUT DATA – PART 2
 PROGRAM METHOD SELECTED : REV_REQ
 PROGRAM NAME 9 KW (AC) of PV installed on FPL system as fuel substitute in 1999, assume 20% capacity factor for PV

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)*	(7)	(8)	(9)
YEAR	CUMULATIVE TOTAL PARTICIPATING CUSTOMERS	ADJUSTED CUMULATIVE PARTICIPATING CUSTOMERS	UTILITY AVERAGE SYSTEM FUEL COST (C/kWh)	AVOIDED MARGINAL FUEL COST (C/kWh)	INCREASED MARGINAL FUEL COST (C/kWh)	REPLACEMENT PROGRAM kW EFFECTIVENESS FACTOR	PROGRAM kW EFFECTIVENESS FACTOR	PROGRAM kW EFFECTIVENESS FACTOR
1998	0	0	2.27	2.62	2.37	3.82	1.00	1.00
1999	1	1	2.50	2.92	2.62	3.88	1.00	1.00
2000	1	1	2.80	3.46	2.97	4.21	1.00	1.00
2001	1	1	2.68	3.17	2.85	3.62	1.00	1.00
2002	1	1	2.68	3.27	2.85	4.36	1.00	1.00
2003	1	1	2.87	3.53	3.06	4.19	1.00	1.00
2004	1	1	2.93	3.69	3.13	4.69	1.00	1.00
2005	1	1	3.04	3.80	3.23	4.64	1.00	1.00
2006	1	1	3.15	4.08	3.38	5.31	1.00	1.00
2007	1	1	3.11	4.00	3.32	4.97	1.00	1.00
2008	1	1	3.18	4.13	3.41	4.98	1.00	1.00
2009	1	1	3.17	4.24	3.40	4.62	1.00	1.00
2010	1	1	3.33	4.37	3.58	4.69	1.00	1.00
2011	1	1	3.38	4.51	3.65	4.78	1.00	1.00
2012	1	1	3.48	4.65	3.75	4.95	1.00	1.00
2013	1	1	3.55	4.76	3.82	5.18	1.00	1.00
2014	1	1	3.58	4.84	3.86	5.19	1.00	1.00
2015	1	1	3.62	4.93	3.89	5.38	1.00	1.00
2016	1	1	3.76	5.11	4.04	5.90	1.00	1.00
2017	1	1	3.94	5.39	4.24	6.06	1.00	1.00
2018	1	1	4.11	5.69	4.44	6.51	1.00	1.00
2019	1	1	4.25	5.91	4.59	7.00	1.00	1.00

* THIS COLUMN IS USED ONLY FOR LOAD SHIFTING PROGRAMS WHICH SHIFT CONSUMPTION TO OFF-PEAK PERIODS.
 THE VALUES REPRESENT THE OFF PEAK SYSTEM FUEL COSTS.

AVOIDED GENERATING BENEFITS
PROGRAM METHOD SELECTED: REV_REQ
PROGRAM NAME: 9 KW (AC) of PV installed on FPL system as fuel substitute in 1999, assume 20% capacity factor for PV

YEAR	(2) AVOIDED GEN UNIT CAPACITY COS \$(000)	(3) AVOIDED GEN UNIT FIXED O&M \$(000)	(4) AVOIDED GEN UNIT VARIABLE O&M \$(000)	(5) AVOIDED GEN UNIT FUEL COST \$(000)	(6) REPLACEMENT FUEL COST \$(000)	(7) AVOIDED GEN UNIT BENEFITS \$(000)
1998	0	0	0	0	0	0
1999	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	0	(0.055)	0	0	0	(0.055)
2001	0	(0.057)	0	0	0	(0.057)
2002	0	(0.059)	0	0	0	(0.059)
2003	0	(0.062)	0	0	0	(0.062)
2004	0	(0.064)	0	0	0	(0.064)
2005	0	(0.067)	0	0	0	(0.067)
2006	0	(0.069)	0	0	0	(0.069)
2007	0	(0.072)	0	0	0	(0.072)
2008	0	(0.075)	0	0	0	(0.075)
2009	0	(0.078)	0	0	0	(0.078)
2010	0	(0.081)	0	0	0	(0.081)
2011	0	(0.084)	0	0	0	(0.084)
2012	0	(0.088)	0	0	0	(0.088)
2013	0	(0.091)	0	0	0	(0.091)
2014	0	(0.095)	0	0	0	(0.095)
2015	0	(0.098)	0	0	0	(0.098)
2016	0	(0.102)	0	0	0	(0.102)
2017	0	(0.106)	0	0	0	(0.106)
2018	0	(0.111)	0	0	0	(0.111)
2019	0	(0.115)	0	0	0	(0.115)

NOM	0	(1.628)	0	0	0	(1.628)
NPV	0	(0.612)	0	0	0	(0.612)

AVOIDED T&D AND PROGRAM FUEL SAVINGS
 PROGRAM METHOD SELECTED: REV_REQ
 PROGRAM NAME 9 KW (AC) of PV installed on FPL system as fuel substitute in 1999, assume 20% capacity factor for PV

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(8a)*
YEAR	AVOIDED TRANSMISSION CAP COST \$(000)	AVOIDED TRANSMISSION O&M COST \$(000)	TOTAL AVOIDED TRANSMISSION COST \$(000)	AVOIDED DISTRIBUTION CAP COST \$(000)	AVOIDED DISTRIBUTION O&M COST \$(000)	TOTAL AVOIDED DISTRIBUTION COST \$(000)	PROGRAM FUEL SAVINGS \$(000)	PROGRAM OFF-PEAK PAYBACK \$(000)
1998	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.660	0
2001	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.590	0
2002	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.819	0
2003	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.671	0
2004	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.707	0
2005	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.728	0
2006	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.793	0
2007	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.773	0
2008	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.802	0
2009	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.835	0
2010	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.855	0
2011	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.888	0
2012	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.915	0
2013	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.939	0
2014	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.957	0
2015	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.976	0
2016	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.011	0
2017	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.072	0
2018	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.137	0
2019	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.183	0

NOM.	0	0	0	0	0	0	17.384	0
NPV	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.796	0

* THESE VALUES REPRESENT THE COST OF THE INCREASED FUEL CONSUMPTION DUE TO GREATER OFF-PEAK ENERGY USAGE. USED FOR LOAD SHIFTING PROGRAMS ONLY.

TOTAL RESOURCE COST TEST
 PROGRAM METHOD SELECTED: REV_REQ
 PROGRAM NAME 9 KW (AC) of PV installed on FPL system as fuel substitute in 1999, assume 20% capacity factor for PV

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
YEAR	INCREASED SUPPLY COSTS \$(000)	UTILITY PROGRAM COSTS \$(000)	PARTICIPANT PROGRAM COSTS \$(000)	OTHER COSTS \$(000)	TOTAL COSTS \$(000)	AVOIDED GEN UNIT BENEFITS \$(000)	AVOIDED T&D BENEFITS \$(000)	PROGRAM FUEL SAVINGS \$(000)	OTHER BENEFITS \$(000)	TOTAL BENEFITS \$(000)	NET BENEFITS \$(000)	CUMULATIVE DISCOUNTED NET BENEFITS \$(000)
1998	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1999	0	215	89	0	304	0	0	0	89	89	(215)	(197)
2000	0	0	0	0	0	(0.055)	0	0.660	0	1	1	(197)
2001	0	0	0	0	0	(0.057)	0	0.590	0	1	1	(196)
2002	0	0	0	0	0	(0.059)	0	0.619	0	1	1	(196)
2003	0	0	0	0	0	(0.062)	0	0.671	0	1	1	(195)
2004	0	0	0	0	0	(0.064)	0	0.707	0	1	1	(195)
2005	0	0	0	0	0	(0.067)	0	0.728	0	1	1	(195)
2006	0	0	0	0	0	(0.069)	0	0.793	0	1	1	(194)
2007	0	0	0	0	0	(0.072)	0	0.773	0	1	1	(194)
2008	0	0	0	0	0	(0.075)	0	0.802	0	1	1	(194)
2009	0	0	0	0	0	(0.078)	0	0.835	0	1	1	(193)
2010	0	0	0	0	0	(0.081)	0	0.855	0	1	1	(193)
2011	0	0	0	0	0	(0.084)	0	0.888	0	1	1	(193)
2012	0	0	0	0	0	(0.088)	0	0.915	0	1	1	(193)
2013	0	0	0	0	0	(0.091)	0	0.939	0	1	1	(192)
2014	0	0	0	0	0	(0.095)	0	0.957	0	1	1	(192)
2015	0	0	0	0	0	(0.098)	0	0.976	0	1	1	(192)
2016	0	0	0	0	0	(0.102)	0	1.011	0	1	1	(192)
2017	0	0	0	0	0	(0.106)	0	1.072	0	1	1	(191)
2018	0	0	0	0	0	(0.111)	0	1.137	0	1	1	(191)
2019	0	0	0	0	0	(0.115)	0	1.183	0	1	1	(191)

NOM	0	215	89	0	304	(1.629)	0	17.384	89	105	(199)
NPV	0	197	82	0	279	(0.612)	0	6.796	82	88	(191)

Discount Rate: 8.98 %
 Benefit/Cost Ratio (Col(11) / Col(6)) : 0.31

PARTICIPANT COSTS AND BENEFITS
 PROGRAM METHOD SELECTED: REV_REQ
 PROGRAM NAME: 9 KW (AC) of PV installed on FPL system as fuel substitute in 1999, assume 20% capacity factor for PV

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
YEAR	SAVINGS IN PARTICIPANTS BILLS \$(000)	TAX CREDITS \$(000)	UTILITY REBATES \$(000)	OTHER BENEFITS \$(000)	TOTAL BENEFITS \$(000)	CUSTOMER EQUIPMENT COSTS \$(000)	CUSTOMER O&M COSTS \$(000)	OTHER COSTS \$(000)	TOTAL COSTS \$(000)	NET BENEFITS \$(000)	CUMULATIVE DISCOUNTED NET BENEFITS \$(000)
1998	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1999	0	0	0	89	89	89	0	0	89	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2001	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2002	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2003	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2004	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2005	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2006	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2008	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2009	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2010	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2011	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2012	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2013	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2014	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2015	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2016	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2017	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2018	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2019	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NOM	0	0	0	89	89	89	0	0	89	0
NPV	0	0	0	82	82	82	0	0	82	0

In Service of Gen Unit: 2000
 Discount Rate : 8.98 %
 Benefit/Cost Ratio (Col(6) / Col(10)) 1.00

RATE IMPACT TEST
 PROGRAM METHOD SELECTED: REV_REQ
 PROGRAM NAME: 9 KW (AC) of PV installed on FPL system as fuel substitute in 1999, assume 20% capacity factor for PV

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
YEAR	INCREASED SUPPLY COSTS \$(000)	UTILITY PROGRAM COSTS \$(000)	INCENTIVES \$(000)	REVENUE LOSSES \$(000)	OTHER COSTS \$(000)	TOTAL COSTS \$(000)	AVOIDED GEN UNIT & FUEL BENEFITS \$(000)	AVOIDED T&D BENEFITS \$(000)	REVENUE GAINS \$(000)	OTHER BENEFITS \$(000)	TOTAL BENEFITS \$(000)	NET BENEFITS \$(000)	CUMULATIVE DISCOUNTED NET BENEFITS \$(000)
1998	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1999	0	215	0	0	0	215	0	0	0	0	0	(215)	(197)
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.605	0	0	0	0.605	0.605	(197)
2001	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.534	0	0	0	0.534	0.534	(196)
2002	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.560	0	0	0	0.560	0.560	(196)
2003	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.609	0	0	0	0.609	0.609	(195)
2004	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.643	0	0	0	0.643	0.643	(195)
2005	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.662	0	0	0	0.662	0.662	(195)
2006	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.724	0	0	0	0.724	0.724	(194)
2007	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.701	0	0	0	0.701	0.701	(194)
2008	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.727	0	0	0	0.727	0.727	(194)
2009	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.757	0	0	0	0.757	0.757	(193)
2010	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.774	0	0	0	0.774	0.774	(193)
2011	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.804	0	0	0	0.804	0.804	(193)
2012	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.829	0	0	0	0.828	0.828	(193)
2013	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.848	0	0	0	0.848	0.848	(192)
2014	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.863	0	0	0	0.863	0.863	(192)
2015	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.878	0	0	0	0.878	0.878	(192)
2016	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.909	0	0	0	0.909	0.909	(192)
2017	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.965	0	0	0	0.965	0.965	(191)
2018	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.026	0	0	0	1.026	1.026	(191)
2019	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.068	0	0	0	1.068	1.068	(191)

NOM	0	215	0	0	0	215	16	0	0	0	15.756	(199)
NPV	0	197	0	0	0	197	6	0	0	0	6.184	(191)

Discount Rate 8.98 %
 Benefit/Cost Ratio (Col(12) / Col(7)) : 0.03

APPENDIX C

PhotoVoltaic Project - Bid Evaluation

Item	Wt	Advance Solar				Energy Svcs& Products				SEPCO				Solar Energy Systems				Utility Power Group			
		Score	Wt Score	Score	Wt Score	Score	Wt Score	Score	Wt Score	Score	Wt Score	Score	Wt Score	Score	Wt Score	Score	Wt Score				
1 Experience	40%	4	1.6	3	1.2	3	1.2	4	1.6	5	2										
												-Eng/Proc/Const; Safety; Spec understanding; Previous projects; Project aesthetics; Turnkey team; Response to Spec									
2 PV Array	15%	4	0.6	4	0.6	4	0.6	4	0.6	4	0.6										
												-Manufacturer; Aesthetics; Capacity; Safety									
3 Power Conditioner	20%	3	0.6	3	0.6	5	1	5	1	3	0.6										
												-Manufacturer; Harmonics; Capacity; Power Factor; Safety; Noise; EMI									
4 Balance of System	10%	5	0.5	2	0.2	5	0.5	5	0.5	3	0.3										
												-Foundations; Wiring/Conduit/Boxes/etc.; Surge protection; Documentation(Drawings, Manuals, other); Training; Acceptance Testing									
5 Warranty and O&M	10%	1	0.1	1	0.1	5	0.5	0	0	1	0.1										
												-Responsiveness									
6 Table Top Display	5%	2	0.1	3	0.15	4	0.2	3	0.15	2	0.1										
												-Aesthetics; Mock up of original; Functionality									
Totals		100%	3.5	2.85	4	3.85	3.7														

Pricing																	
System		\$92,000		\$103,000		\$158,000		\$114,320		\$108,290							
Warranty/Maintenance		\$0		\$3,000		\$3,000		\$450		\$0							
Table Top Display		\$0		\$7,000		\$2,500		\$3,500		\$10,000							
TOTAL		\$92,000		\$113,000		\$163,500		\$118,270		\$118,290							

Options