

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. 100009-EI  
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

MARCH 1, 2010  
(REVISED)

IN RE: NUCLEAR POWER PLANT COST RECOVERY  
FOR THE YEAR ENDING  
DECEMBER 2009

TESTIMONY & EXHIBITS OF:

WINNIE POWERS

ADM	5
FAPA	1
ECR	6
GCL	1
RAD	1
SSC	---
ADM	---
OPC	---
CLK	CF.RPR

DOCUMENT # 100009-EI  
6748 AUG 10 9  
FPSC-001-001-001

1                   **BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

2                   **FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY**

3                   **DIRECT TESTIMONY OF WINNIE POWERS**

4                   **DOCKET NO. 100009-EI**

5                   **MAY 3, 2010**

6  
7   **Q.    Please state your name and business address.**

8    A.    My name is Winnie Powers. My business address is 9250 W. Flagler St,  
9           Miami, Florida 33174.

10 **Q.    By whom are you employed and what is your position?**

11 A.    I am employed by Florida Power & Light Company (FPL or the Company) as  
12       New Nuclear Accounting Project Manager.

13 **Q.    Have you previously filed testimony in this docket?**

14 A.    Yes.

15 **Q.    Are you sponsoring any exhibits in this case?**

16 A.    Yes. I am sponsoring or co-sponsoring the following exhibits:

- 17       ● Exhibit WP-5 summarizes the costs, carrying charges, carrying charges on  
18       the deferred tax asset/(liability), recoverable operations & maintenance  
19       costs (recoverable O&M), and base rate revenue requirements for which  
20       FPL requests a prudence/reasonableness determination from this  
21       Commission.

- 1           ● Exhibit WP-6 details the estimated in-service dates and amounts of plant  
2           going into service in 2010 and 2011, the reasonableness, necessity and  
3           timing of which is discussed in the testimony of FPL Witness Jones.
- 4           ● Exhibit TOJ-14, sponsored by FPL Witness Jones, consists of Appendix I  
5           containing the Nuclear Filing Requirements Schedules (NFR) for the St.  
6           Lucie Unit 1 & 2 and Turkey Point Unit 3 & 4 Uprate Project (Uprate  
7           Project). Appendix I contains a table of contents listing the NFR  
8           Schedules that are sponsored and co-sponsored by FPL Witness Jones,  
9           FPL Witness Sim and me, respectively.
- 10          ● Exhibit SDS-9, sponsored by FPL Witness Scroggs, consists of Appendix  
11          II containing the NFR Schedules for Turkey Point 6 & 7 Preconstruction  
12          costs. Appendix II contains a table of contents listing the NFRs that are  
13          sponsored and co-sponsored by FPL Witness Scroggs, FPL Witness Sim  
14          and me, respectively.
- 15          ● Exhibit SDS-10, sponsored by FPL Witness Scroggs, consists of  
16          Appendix III containing the NFR Schedules for Turkey Point 6 & 7 Site  
17          Selection costs. Appendix III contains a table of contents listing the NFRs  
18          sponsored and co-sponsored by FPL Witness Scroggs and me,  
19          respectively.

20   **Q.    What is the purpose of your testimony?**

21    A.    The purpose of my testimony is to provide an overview of FPL's filing and  
22    demonstrate the filing complies with the Florida Public Service Commission  
23    (FPSC or Commission) Rule No. 25-6.0423, Nuclear or Integrated

1 Gasification Combined Cycle Power Plant Cost Recovery (Nuclear Cost  
2 Recovery Rule). Consistent with the Nuclear Cost Recovery Rule, FPL  
3 requests that the Commission:

- 4 • Determine as reasonable and approve for recovery a Nuclear Power Plant  
5 Cost Recovery (NPPCR) amount of ~~\$28,754,660~~ \$31,288,445, on a  
6 jurisdictional adjusted basis to be recovered through the 2011 Capacity  
7 Cost Recovery Clause (CCRC);

8 **Uprate Project:**

- 9 • Determine as reasonable 2010 Actual/Estimated and 2011 Projected  
10 construction expenditures and approve for recovery the related carrying  
11 charges;
- 12 • Determine as reasonable the 2010 Actual/Estimated and 2011 Projected  
13 recoverable O&M and approve for recovery;
- 14 • Determine as reasonable the 2010 and 2011 base rate revenue  
15 requirements related to plant going into service in 2010 and 2011 and  
16 approve for recovery.

17 **Turkey Point 6 & 7:**

- 18 • Determine as reasonable the Preconstruction 2010 Actual/Estimated and  
19 2011 Projected expenditures and related carrying charges and approve for  
20 recovery;
- 21 • Determine as reasonable the Site Selection 2010 Actual/Estimated and  
22 2011 Projected carrying charges and approve for recovery.

23



1 provide an overview of the financial and construction aspects of nuclear plant  
2 projects, outline the categories of costs represented, and provide a roadmap to  
3 the calculation of detailed project revenue requirements.

4 **Q. Does the Nuclear Cost Recovery Rule describe the annual filing**  
5 **requirements that a utility is to make in support of its current year**  
6 **expenditures for Commission review and approval?**

7 A. Yes. The Nuclear Cost Recovery Rule states:

8 “ 1. Each year, a utility shall submit, for Commission review and approval, as  
9 part of its Capacity Cost Recovery Clause filings: ...

10 b. True-Up and Projections for Current Year. By May 1, a utility shall  
11 submit for Commission review and approval its Actual/Estimated true-up of  
12 Projected pre-construction expenditures based on a comparison of current year  
13 Actual/Estimated expenditures and the previously-filed estimated  
14 expenditures for such current year and a description of the pre-construction  
15 work projected to be performed during such year; or, once construction  
16 begins, its Actual/Estimated true-up of Projected carrying costs on  
17 construction expenditures based on a comparison of current year  
18 Actual/Estimated carrying costs on construction expenditures and the  
19 previously filed estimated carrying costs on construction expenditures for  
20 such current year and a description of the construction work projected to be  
21 performed during such year.”

22 **Q. Is FPL complying with these requirements with respect to its 2010**  
23 **Actual/Estimated Uprate Project and Turkey Point 6 & 7 Project costs?**

1 A. Yes. FPL has included the AE Schedules in Exhibit TOJ-14, Appendix I for  
2 the Uprate Project, Exhibit SDS-9, Appendix II for Turkey Point 6 & 7  
3 Preconstruction costs and Exhibit SDS-10, Appendix III for Turkey Point 6 &  
4 7 Site Selection carrying charges in this filing. Included in these schedules is  
5 the impact of the 2009 T Schedule true-up amounts as reflected in FPL's  
6 March 1, 2010 NFR filing. As contemplated by the Nuclear Cost Recovery  
7 Rule, these AE schedules provide the basis for determining the reasonableness  
8 of FPL's 2010 Actual/Estimated costs. In their testimony, FPL Witness Jones  
9 for the Uprate Project and FPL Witness Scroggs for the Turkey Point 6 & 7  
10 Project provide the reasons why these Actual/Estimated costs are reasonable.

11 **Q. Does the Nuclear Cost Recovery Rule describe the annual filing**  
12 **requirements that a utility is to make for the projected year expenditures**  
13 **for Commission review and approval?**

14 A. Yes. The Nuclear Cost Recovery Rule states:

15 " 1. Each year, a utility shall submit, for Commission review and approval, as  
16 part of its Capacity Cost Recovery Clause filings: ...

17 c. Projected Costs for Subsequent Years. By May 1, a utility shall  
18 submit, for Commission review and approval, its Projected pre-construction  
19 expenditures for the subsequent year and a description of the pre-construction  
20 work projected to be performed during such year; or, once construction  
21 begins, its Projected construction expenditures for the subsequent year and a  
22 description of the construction work projected to be performed during such  
23 year."

1 **Q. Is FPL complying with these requirements with respect to its 2011**  
2 **Projected Uprate Project and Turkey Point 6 & 7 Project costs?**

3 A. Yes. FPL has included the Projected (P) Schedules in Exhibit TOJ-14,  
4 Appendix I for the Uprate Project, Exhibit SDS-9, Appendix II for Turkey  
5 Point 6 & 7 Preconstruction costs and Exhibit SDS\_10, Appendix III for  
6 Turkey Point 6 & 7 Site Selection carrying charges in this filing. As  
7 contemplated by the Nuclear Cost Recovery Rule, these P schedules provide  
8 the basis for determining the reasonableness of FPL's 2011 Projections. Any  
9 (over)/under recovery of 2009 actual costs also flow through these schedules,  
10 as shown in Exhibit WP-5, and 2010 Actual/Estimated costs, as shown in  
11 Exhibit WP-5, compared to costs that FPL previously projected. In their  
12 testimony, FPL Witness Jones for the Uprate Project and FPL Witness  
13 Scroggs for the Turkey Point 6 & 7 Project, provide the reasons why the 2011  
14 Projected costs are reasonable.

15 **Q. Please explain the costs that FPL is requesting to include for recovery**  
16 **effective January 1, 2011.**

17 A. The total amount FPL is requesting to recover in 2011 is ~~\$28,754,660~~  
18 **\$31,288,445**. This amount reflects the true-up of 2009 Actual costs as filed  
19 on March 1, 2010 of ~~(\$14,623,840)~~ **(\$14,619,975)**, the true-up of 2010  
20 Actual/Estimated costs of ~~(\$67,433,574)~~ **(\$66,890,360)**, and the recovery of  
21 2011 Projected costs of ~~\$140,812,074~~ **\$112,798,780** presented in this May 3,  
22 2010 filing as shown on Exhibit WP-5.



1 **Q. How is FPL providing an update to the original Uprate Project and**  
2 **Turkey Point Unit 6 & 7 Project costs, respectively?**

3 A. FPL has included the True up to Original (TOR) Schedules in Exhibit TOJ-14,  
4 Appendix I for the Uprate Project, Exhibit SDS-9, Appendix II for Turkey  
5 Point 6 & 7 Preconstruction costs and Exhibit SDS-10, Appendix III for  
6 Turkey Point 6 & 7 Site Selection carrying charges in this filing. The TOR  
7 schedules follow the format of the T, AE, and P schedules but also detail the  
8 actual to date project costs and projected total retail revenue requirements for  
9 the duration of the project based on the best available information at the time  
10 of filing.

11

- 12 ● Schedule TOR-1 - Reflects the jurisdictional amounts used to calculate the  
13 final true-up, estimated true-up, projection, deferrals, and recovery of  
14 deferrals for each project included in the Nuclear Cost Recovery Clause  
15 (NCRC). The sum of the amounts should be the total amount requested  
16 for recovery in the projected period through the NCRC.
- 17 ● Schedule TOR-2 – Reports the budgeted and actual costs as compared to  
18 the estimated in-service costs of the proposed power plant as provided in  
19 the petition for need determination or revised estimate as necessary.
- 20 ● Schedule TOR-3 - Provides a summary of the actual to date and projected  
21 total amounts for the project.

- 1           • Schedule TOR-4 - Provides the Annual Construction O&M expenditures  
2           by function as reported for all historical years, for the current year, and for  
3           the projected year.
- 4           • Schedule TOR-6 - Provides the actual to date and projected annual  
5           expenditures by major tasks performed within Site Selection, Pre-  
6           Construction, and Construction for the project.
- 7           • Schedule TOR-6a - Provides a description of the major tasks performed  
8           within the Site Selection, Pre-construction, and Construction category for  
9           the years filed.
- 10          • Schedule TOR-7 reflects initial project milestones in terms of costs,  
11          budget levels, initiation dates, and completion dates as well as all revised  
12          milestones and reasons for each revision.

13   **Q.   Does the Nuclear Cost Recovery Rule address FPL's annual feasibility**  
14   **analysis?**

15   A.   Yes. The annual feasibility analyses are presented to satisfy the requirements  
16   of Subsection 5(c)5 of the Florida Administrative Code Rule 25-6.0423,  
17   Nuclear Power Plant Cost Recovery, which states "By May 1 of each year,  
18   along with the filings required by this paragraph, a utility shall submit for  
19   Commission review and approval a detailed analysis of the long-term  
20   feasibility of completing the power plant."

21   **Q.   Is there any other guidance as to what should be included in this**  
22   **feasibility analysis?**

1 A. Yes. The Commission determined in Docket No. 080009-EI in Order No.  
2 PSC-08-0237-FOF-EI that, "FPL shall provide a long-term feasibility analysis  
3 as part of its annual cost recovery process which, in this case, shall also  
4 include updated fuel forecasts, environmental forecasts, break-even costs, and  
5 capital cost estimates. In addition, FPL should account for sunk costs.  
6 Providing this information on an annual basis will allow us to monitor the  
7 feasibility regarding the continued construction of Turkey Point 6 and 7."

8 **Q. Is FPL complying with these requirements as noted in the Rule and**  
9 **Order No. PSC-08-0237-FOF-EI?**

10 A. Yes. As described in FPL Witness Sim's testimony, FPL is providing its  
11 annual feasibility analysis, the assumptions used and the results of the  
12 analysis. Witness Sim also addresses in his testimony the items mentioned  
13 above from Order No. PSC-08-0237-FOF-EI.

14 **Q. What are the sunk costs that FPL is accounting for in the feasibility**  
15 **analysis?**

16 A. For the Uprate Project, FPL is excluding a total of approximately \$346 million  
17 of sunk costs as of December 31, 2009. For Turkey Point 6&7, FPL is  
18 excluding a total of approximately \$99 million of sunk costs as of December  
19 31, 2009. As explained in Witnesses Reed's testimony, sunk costs should not  
20 impact the decision as to whether a project is still feasible; that is, the "to-go"  
21 costs are the total cost of the project less those costs which have already been  
22 incurred. Accordingly, the sunk costs have been excluded from the feasibility  
23 analysis.

1  
2  
3 **UPRATES**

4 **Q. What are FPL's 2010 Actual/Estimated Uprate Project expenditures**  
5 **compared to costs previously projected?**

6 A. As presented in FPL Witness Jones' testimony and shown on Exhibit TOJ-14,  
7 Appendix I, Schedule AE-6, FPL's Actual/Estimated Uprate generation and  
8 transmission expenditures for the period January through December 2010 are  
9 \$318,166,769, total company. Schedule AE-6 of Appendix I deducts the  
10 portion of this total for which the St. Lucie Unit 2 participants are responsible  
11 and then applies the retail jurisdictional factor to the remainder. This results  
12 in jurisdictional, net of participants Uprate generation and transmission  
13 expenditures of \$302,009,710.

14 For actuals, further adjustments are made to present the expenditures on a  
15 cash basis (i.e., excluding accruals and pension and welfare benefit credits) for  
16 the calculation of carrying charges. These adjustments are necessary in order  
17 to comply with the Commission's current practice regarding AFUDC  
18 accruals. Since the estimated costs are on a cash basis, it is not necessary to  
19 project any non-cash accruals for the remainder of the year. After making  
20 these additional adjustments for calculating carrying charges, the  
21 jurisdictional, net of participants 2010 Actual/Estimated Uprate Project  
22 expenditures are \$305,809,823, as noted on AE-6. FPL's previously Projected  
23 2010 Uprate Project expenditures as filed in Docket No. 090009-EI as noted

1 on P-6 were \$391,614,248, (\$376,703,895 on a jurisdictional, net of  
2 participants basis).

3 **Q. What are FPL's 2010 Actual/Estimated Uprate Project carrying charges,**  
4 **recoverable O&M, and base rate revenue requirements for plant placed**  
5 **into service in 2010 compared to costs previously projected and any**  
6 **resulting (over)/under recoveries of costs?**

7 A. FPL's 2010 Actual/Estimated Uprate Project carrying charges, recoverable  
8 O&M, and base rate revenue requirements for plant placed into service in  
9 2010 are ~~\$46,510,726~~ **\$47,053,850**. FPL's previously projected costs were  
10 \$59,620,247, resulting in an overrecovery of ~~(\$13,109,520)~~ **(\$12,566,397)**,  
11 which will reduce the CCRC charge paid by customers when the CCRC is  
12 reset in 2011. The details of these jurisdictional costs (carrying charges,  
13 recoverable O&M and base rate revenue requirements) are summarized on  
14 Exhibit WP-5.

15 **Q. Where can the calculation of FPL's Uprate Project 2010**  
16 **Actual/Estimated carrying charges be found?**

17 A. The calculation of the Uprate Project 2010 Actual/Estimated carrying charges  
18 of ~~\$42,352,262~~ **\$42,352,323** are shown on Exhibit TOJ-14, Appendix I,  
19 Schedules AE-3 and AE-3A. FPL's previously projected 2010 Uprate  
20 carrying charges of \$41,594,586 were filed in Docket No. 090009-EI. As a  
21 result of the Actual/Estimated True-up of 2010 carrying charges in this May 3,  
22 2010 filing, there is an underrecovery of ~~\$757,675~~ **\$757,736** in 2010.

1 **Q. Where can FPL's Uprate Project 2010 Actual/Estimated recoverable**  
2 **O&M costs be found?**

3 A. Exhibit TOJ-14, Appendix I, Schedule AE-4, in this filing shows there is  
4 \$3,210,753 (~~\$3,139,397~~ \$3,140,969 jurisdictional, net of participants) of  
5 recoverable O&M. FPL previously projected 2010 recoverable O&M on  
6 Schedule P-4 in Docket No. 090009-EI, in the amount of \$2,209,376  
7 (\$2,147,983 jurisdictional, net of participants). As a result of the  
8 Actual/Estimated True-up of 2010 Uprate Project recoverable O&M, there is  
9 an underrecovery of ~~\$991,413~~ \$992,986 in 2010. As explained in Schedule  
10 AE-4, over/under recoveries of recoverable O&M ~~are reflected in the CCRC~~  
11 ~~calculation and~~ incur carrying charges at the commercial paper rate.

12 **Q. Where can the calculations of the base rate revenue requirements for**  
13 **plant being placed into service in 2010 for the Uprate Project be found?**

14 A. Exhibit WP-6 presents the calculations of the ~~\$1,481,719~~ \$2,018,321 of 2010  
15 Uprate Project Actual/Estimated base rate revenue requirements for plant  
16 going into service in 2010. FPL previously projected base rate revenue  
17 requirements in the amount of \$15,877,677 as filed in Docket No. 090009-EI.  
18 As a result of the Actual/Estimated True-up of 2010 Uprate Project base rate  
19 revenue requirements, there is a net true-up amount of ~~(\$14,858,609)~~  
20 (\$14,317,118) in 2010 which includes carrying charges on the overrecovery  
21 of ~~(\$462,654)~~ (\$457,762). This is further explained by Exhibit TOJ-14,  
22 Appendix C.

1 **Q. What is the 2010 amount FPL is requesting to true-up for the Uprate**  
2 **Project?**

3 A. FPL is requesting to true-up Uprate project costs by ~~(\$13,109,520)~~  
4 (\$12,566,397), representing a true-up of carrying charges of ~~\$757,675~~  
5 \$757,736, recoverable O&M of ~~\$991,413~~ \$992,986, and base rate revenue  
6 requirements of ~~(\$14,858,609)~~ (\$14,317,118). The ~~(\$13,109,520)~~  
7 (\$12,566,397) will reduce the CCRC charge paid by customers when the  
8 CCRC is reset in 2011.

9 **Q. What are FPL's Projected Uprate Project expenditures for the period**  
10 **January through December 2011?**

11 A. As presented in FPL Witness Jones' testimony and provided on Exhibit TOJ-  
12 14, Appendix I, Schedule P-6, FPL's Projected Uprate generation and  
13 transmission expenditures for the period January through December 2011 are  
14 \$547,756,895, total company. Schedule P-6 of Appendix I deducts the  
15 portion of this total for which the St. Lucie Unit 2 participants are responsible  
16 and then applies the retail jurisdictional factor to the remainder. Since FPL's  
17 projections are on a cash basis, it is not necessary to project any non-cash  
18 accruals. After making the above two adjustments, the jurisdictional, net of  
19 participants, 2011 Projected Uprate Project expenditures are \$521,701,593.

20 **Q. What are FPL's 2011 Projected Uprate Project carrying charges,**  
21 **recoverable O&M, and base rate revenue requirements for plant placed**  
22 **into service in 2011?**

1 A. FPL's 2011 Projected Uprate Project carrying charges, recoverable O&M, and  
2 base rate revenue requirements for plant placed into service in 2011, are  
3 ~~\$79,330,675~~ \$81,317,333. The jurisdictional, net of participants costs  
4 (carrying charges, recoverable O&M, and base rate revenue requirements) are  
5 shown on Exhibit WP-5.

6 **Q. Where can the calculation of FPL's Uprate Project 2011 Projected**  
7 **carrying charges be found?**

8 A. The calculation of the Uprate Project 2011 carrying charges of ~~\$49,101,231~~  
9 \$49,129,740 are shown on Exhibit TOJ-14, Appendix I, Schedules P-3 and P-  
10 3A.

11 **Q. Where can FPL's Uprate Project 2011 Projected recoverable O&M costs**  
12 **be found?**

13 A. Exhibit TOJ-14, Appendix I, Schedule P-4, in this filing shows there is  
14 \$4,161,728 (~~\$3,916,249~~ \$3,917,202, jurisdictional, net of participants) of  
15 projected recoverable O&M. As explained in Schedule P-4, over/under  
16 recoveries of recoverable O&M ~~are reflected in the CCRC calculation and~~  
17 incur carrying charges at the commercial paper rate.

18 **Q. Where can the calculations of the base rate revenue requirements for**  
19 **plant being placed into service in 2011 for the Uprate Project be found?**

20 A. Exhibit WP-6 presents the calculations of the ~~\$26,313,195~~ \$28,270,391 of  
21 projected base rate revenue requirements for plant going into service in 2011.

22 **Q. What is the amount FPL is requesting to recover in 2011 for the Uprate**  
23 **Project?**



1 A. The costs, carrying charges, and base rate revenue requirements FPL is  
2 requesting to recover in 2011 for the Uprate Project is ~~\$62,246,419~~  
3 \$64,779,238. This amount consists of the 2011 Projected Uprate costs to be  
4 recovered of ~~\$79,330,675~~ \$81,317,333, the true-up of 2009 Actual Uprate  
5 Project costs of ~~(\$3,974,736)~~ (\$3,971,698) described in my March 1, 2010  
6 testimony, and the true-up of 2010 Actual/Estimated Uprate Project costs of  
7 ~~(\$13,109,520)~~ (\$12,566,397) as shown on Exhibit WP-5.

8  
9 For the reasons stated in FPL Witness Jones' testimony, FPL respectfully  
10 requests that the Commission approve FPL's 2010 Actual/Estimated and 2011  
11 Projected Uprate expenditures as reasonable. FPL also requests the  
12 Commission approve the Uprate Project costs of ~~\$62,246,419~~ \$64,779,238  
13 described in my testimony for recovery in FPL's 2011 CCRC charge.

14 **Q. How is FPL treating O&M for NCRC purposes?**

15 A. Prior to 2010, FPL deferred recoverable O&M as a regulatory asset.  
16 Beginning January 1, 2010, FPL began ~~expensing~~ recovering the prior  
17 amount deferred and current month ~~actual~~ projected O&M ~~incurred~~ through  
18 the CCRC. Any resulting (over)/under recovery ~~will remain in the CCRC and~~  
19 incur interest at the commercial paper rate (as required in Order No. PSC-09-  
20 0783-FOF-EI).

21 **Q. Please describe the transfers to plant in-service for the Uprate Project in**  
22 **2010.**

1 A. As shown on Exhibit WP-6, in 2010 FPL will transfer to plant in service plant  
2 related to an outage at Turkey Point Unit 3, the turbine gantry crane at St.  
3 Lucie Unit 1, the turbine gantry crane at Turkey Point, and transmission  
4 assets. The total company plant to be placed into service in 2010 is  
5 \$139,345,988 (\$137,479,791 jurisdictional, net of participants). The details of  
6 the plant to be placed into service and the work expected to be performed are  
7 explained in witness Jones' testimony and exhibits. As described in Order  
8 No. PSC-08-0749-FOF-EI in Docket No. 080009-EI, FPL "shall be allowed to  
9 recover through the NCRC associated revenue requirements for a phase or  
10 portion of a system placed into commercial service during a projected  
11 recovery period. The revenue requirement shall be removed from the NCRC  
12 at the end of the period. Any difference in recoverable costs due to timing  
13 (projected versus actual placement in service) shall be reconciled through the  
14 true-up provision". Until the plant goes into service, FPL will continue to  
15 recover the carrying charges on the construction costs. Effective in the month  
16 each transfer to plant in-service is made, FPL will transfer the related costs  
17 from CWIP to plant in-service and the carrying charges will cease.  
18 Subsequent to the month the plant is placed into service, inclusion of the 2010  
19 base rate revenue requirements related to the plant going into service is  
20 included for recovery through the NCRC. Included in the base rate revenue  
21 requirement impact is any non-incremental labor related to the Uprate Project.  
22 Non-incremental labor is due to the fact that the labor was included in base  
23 rates. While FPL is not requesting recovery of carrying charges on this

1 amount through the NCRC, these capital costs should be included in our base  
2 rate calculation. As shown in Exhibit WP-6, the total base rate revenue  
3 requirements related to plant going into service for the Uprate Projects in 2010  
4 is ~~\$1,481,719~~ \$2,018,321. Base rate recovery of the annualized revenue  
5 requirements subsequent to the year the plant is placed into service will be  
6 requested in a separate petition outside of the NCRC as required by the  
7 Nuclear Cost Recovery Rule.

8 **Q. Please describe the transfers to plant in-service for the Uprate Project in**  
9 **2011.**

10 A. As shown on Exhibit WP-6, in 2011 FPL will transfer to plant in service plant  
11 related to outages for St. Lucie Units 1 and 2, an outage at Turkey Point Unit  
12 4, simulator modifications for Turkey Point, and transmission assets. The  
13 total company plant to be placed into service in 2011 is \$701,683,862  
14 (\$667,295,960 jurisdictional, net of participants). The details of the plant to  
15 be placed into service and the work expected to be performed are explained in  
16 Witness Jones' testimony and exhibits. As shown in Exhibit WP-6, the total  
17 base rate revenue requirements related to plant going into service for the  
18 Uprate Projects in 2011 is ~~\$26,313,195~~ \$28,270,391. Included in the base  
19 rate revenue requirement impact is any non-incremental labor related to the  
20 Uprate Project. Non-incremental labor is due to the fact that the labor was  
21 included in base rates. While FPL is not requesting recovery of carrying  
22 charges on this amount through the Clause, these capital costs should be  
23 included in our base rate calculation. The total amount of the base rate

1 revenue requirements for the true-up of 2009 and 2010, and for 2011  
2 projections are shown on Exhibit WP-5.

3  
4

### **COST RECOVERY FOR TURKEY POINT 6 & 7**

5

6

#### **Turkey Point 6 & 7 Preconstruction costs**

7

8 **Q. What are FPL's 2010 Actual/Estimated Turkey Point 6 & 7**  
9 **Preconstruction expenditures compared to costs previously projected and**  
10 **any resulting (over)/under recoveries of costs?**

11 A. FPL's Actual/Estimated Turkey Point 6 & 7 Preconstruction expenditures for  
12 the period January through December 2010 are \$42,629,655 (\$42,125,853 on  
13 a jurisdictional basis) as presented in FPL Witness Scroggs' testimony and  
14 provided on SDS-9, Appendix II, Schedule AE-6.

15

16 FPL's previously projected 2010 jurisdictional Preconstruction expenditures  
17 were \$90,654,124 as filed in Docket No. 090009-EI. As a result of the  
18 Actual/Estimated True-up of 2010, as filed in this May 3, 2010 filing, there is  
19 an overrecovery of Preconstruction costs of (\$48,528,272) in 2010 which will  
20 reduce the CCRC charge paid by customers when the CCRC is reset in 2011.

21 **Q. What are FPL's 2010 Actual/Estimated Turkey Point 6 & 7**  
22 **Preconstruction carrying charges compared to carrying charges**  
23 **previously projected and any resulting (over)/under recoveries of costs?**

1 A. FPL's 2010 Actual/Estimated Turkey Point 6 & 7 Preconstruction carrying  
2 charges as filed in this docket are ~~(\$4,734,838)~~ **(\$4,734,785)**. FPL's  
3 previously projected carrying costs were \$973,735, resulting in an  
4 overrecovery of ~~(\$5,708,573)~~ **(\$5,708,520)**, as shown on Exhibit WP-5. This  
5 amount will reduce the CCRC charge paid by customers when the CCRC is  
6 reset in 2011. The calculations of the carrying charges can be found in  
7 Exhibit SDS-9, Appendix II, Schedules AE-2 and AE-3A.

8 **Q. What is the amount FPL is requesting to true-up in 2010 for Turkey  
9 Point 6 & 7 Preconstruction Costs?**

10 A. FPL is requesting to true-up 2010 Preconstruction Costs by ~~(\$54,236,845)~~  
11 **(\$54,236,792)**, representing an overrecovery of Preconstruction costs of  
12 ~~(\$48,528,272)~~, and carrying charges of ~~(\$5,708,573)~~ **(\$5,708,520)**. This  
13 amount will reduce the CCRC charge paid by customers when the CCRC is  
14 reset in 2011.

15  
16 For reasons stated in FPL Witness Scroggs' testimony, FPL respectfully  
17 requests that the Commission approve FPL's 2010 Actual/Estimated  
18 Preconstruction costs as reasonable and the true-up of costs and related  
19 carrying charges to be included for recovery in FPL's 2011 revenue  
20 requirements request as shown on Exhibit WP-5.

21 **Q. What are FPL's 2011 Projected Turkey Point 6 & 7 Preconstruction  
22 expenditures?**

1 A. FPL's 2011 Projected Turkey Point 6 & 7 Preconstruction expenditures are  
2 \$29,469,475 (\$29,121,201 on a jurisdictional basis) as presented in FPL  
3 Witness Scroggs' testimony and provided in Exhibit SDS-9, Appendix II,  
4 Schedule P-6.

5 **Q. What are FPL's 2011 Projected Turkey Point 6 & 7 Preconstruction**  
6 **carrying charges?**

7 A. FPL's 2011 Projected Turkey Point 6 & 7 Preconstruction carrying charges  
8 are ~~\$2,189,166~~ **\$2,189,194**, as shown on Exhibit SDS-9, Appendix II,  
9 Schedules P-2 and P-3A.

10 **Q. What is FPL's 2011 Projected Turkey Point 6 & 7 Preconstruction costs**  
11 **and carrying charges FPL is requesting to recover?**

12 A. FPL's 2011 Projected Turkey Point 6 & 7 Preconstruction costs and carrying  
13 charges FPL is requesting to recover is ~~\$31,310,367~~ **\$31,310,395** as shown on  
14 Exhibit WP-5.

15 **Q. What is the amount FPL is requesting to include in FPL's 2011 NCRC**  
16 **recovery request for the Turkey Point 6 & 7 Preconstruction costs?**

17 A. FPL is requesting to include a true-up amount of ~~(\$33,475,461)~~ **(\$33,474,898)**  
18 in 2011 for Turkey Point 6 & 7 Preconstruction costs which will reduce the  
19 CCRC paid by customers when the CCRC is reset in 2011.

20  
21 This amount consists of the 2011 Projected Turkey Point 6 & 7  
22 Preconstruction costs to be recovered of ~~\$31,310,367~~ **\$31,310,395**, the true-  
23 up of 2009 Actual Turkey Point 6 & 7 Preconstruction costs of ~~(\$10,548,983)~~

1 (\$10,548,501), described in my March 1, 2010 testimony, and the true-up of  
2 2010 Actual/Estimated Turkey Point 6 & 7 Preconstruction costs of  
3 ~~(\$54,236,845)~~ (\$54,236,792), as shown on Exhibit WP-5.

4  
5 For the reasons stated in FPL Witness Scroggs' testimony, FPL respectfully  
6 requests the Commission approve as reasonable FPL's Actual/Estimated 2010  
7 and 2011 Projected Turkey Point 6 & 7 expenditures as shown on AE-6 and  
8 P-6 of this filing.

9  
10 **Turkey Point 6 & 7 Site Selection costs**

11  
12 **Q. What are FPL's 2010 Actual/Estimated Turkey Point 6 & 7 Site Selection**  
13 **expenditures compared to costs previously projected?**

14 A. FPL's Turkey Point 6 & 7 Site Selection expenditures ceased with the filing  
15 of our need petition on October 16, 2007. All Site Selection expenditures  
16 were determined prudent by this Commission as of Order No. PSC-09-0783-  
17 FOF-EI and all recoveries of costs with resulting true-ups have been reflected  
18 in nuclear cost recovery filings.

19 **Q. Is FPL filing any NFRs related to Turkey Point 6 & 7 Project Site**  
20 **Selection costs?**

21 A. Yes. FPL is filing NFRs for Turkey Point 6 & 7 Site Selection costs related to  
22 carrying charges, primarily on the deferred tax asset. The deferred tax asset is

1 created by the recovery of Site Selection costs and the payment of income  
2 taxes before a deduction for the costs is allowed for income tax purposes.

3 **Q. What are FPL's 2010 Turkey Point 6 & 7 Project Site Selection**  
4 **Actual/Estimated carrying charges compared to carrying charges**  
5 **previously projected and any resulting (over)/under recoveries of costs?**

6 A. FPL's 2010 Actual/Estimated Turkey Point 6 & 7 Site Selection carrying  
7 charges as filed in this docket are ~~\$145,927~~ \$145,965 as shown in Exhibit  
8 SDS-10, Appendix III, Schedules AE-2 and AE-3A.

9  
10 FPL is currently collecting \$233,136 in Site Selection carrying charges, as  
11 filed in Docket No. 090009-EI, through the CCRC in 2010 resulting in an  
12 overrecovery amount of ~~(\$87,209)~~ (\$87,171) which will reduce the CCRC  
13 charge paid by customer when the CCRC is reset in 2011.

14 **Q. What are FPL's 2011 Projected Turkey Point 6 & 7 Project Site Selection**  
15 **carrying charges?**

16 A. FPL's 2011 Projected Turkey Point 6 & 7 Project Site Selection carrying  
17 charges are ~~\$171,032~~ \$171,052 as reflected on Witness Scroggs' Exhibit  
18 SDS-10, Appendix III, Schedules P-2 and P-3A.

19 **Q. What is the amount FPL is requesting to include in FPL's 2011 NCRC**  
20 **recovery request for the Turkey Point 6 & 7 Site Selection carrying**  
21 **charges?**

22 A. FPL is requesting to include a true-up amount of ~~(\$16,297)~~ (\$15,895) in 2011  
23 for Turkey Point 6 & 7 Site Selection carrying charges. This amount consists



1 of the 2011 Projected Turkey Point 6 & 7 Site Selection carrying charges of  
2 ~~\$171,032~~ **\$171,052**, the true-up of 2009 Turkey Point 6 & 7 Site Selection  
3 carrying charges of ~~(\$100,120)~~ **(\$99,776)** as described in my March 1, 2010  
4 testimony, and the true-up of 2010 Actual/Estimated Turkey Point 6 & 7 Site  
5 Selection carrying charges of ~~(\$87,209)~~ **(\$87,171)** as shown on Exhibit WP-5.

## 6 7 **ACCOUNTING CONTROLS**

8  
9 **Q. Please describe the accounting controls that provide you reasonable**  
10 **assurance that the costs included in the filing are correct.**

11 **A.** FPL has a robust system of corporate accounting controls. The Company  
12 relies on its comprehensive corporate and overlapping business unit controls  
13 for recording and reporting transactions associated with any of its capital  
14 projects including the Uprate Project and Turkey Point 6 & 7 Project. The  
15 system is described in detail in the March 1, 2010 testimony filed by me in  
16 this docket. Highlights of the Company's comprehensive and overlapping  
17 controls include:

- 18 • FPL's Accounting Policies and Procedures;
- 19 • Financial systems and related controls including FPL's general ledger  
20 and construction asset tracking system (CATS);
- 21 • FPL's annual budgeting and planning process;
- 22 • Reporting and monitoring of plan costs to actual costs incurred; and
- 23 • Business Unit specific controls and processes.

1           These accounting controls and project controls are further discussed in the  
2           testimony of FPL Witnesses Jones and Scroggs.

3   **Q.   Are these controls documented, assessed and audited and/or tested on an**  
4   **ongoing basis?**

5   A.   Yes. The FPL corporate accounting policies and procedures are documented  
6   and published on the Company's internal website, INFPL. Included in the  
7   Company's internal website are the corporate procedures regarding cash  
8   disbursements, accounts payable, contract administration, and financial  
9   closing schedules, which provide the business units guidance as to the  
10   processing and recording of transactions. The business units then build their  
11   more specific procedures around these corporate procedures. FPL's internal  
12   audit department continues to audit the Uprate and Turkey Point 6 & 7  
13   Projects, and Witness Reed from Concentric provides testimony regarding his  
14   Company's review of FPL's system of internal controls. The FPSC staff also  
15   is continuing its audits. Additionally, by virtue of the schedules themselves, a  
16   high level of transparency allows all parties to review and determine the  
17   prudence and reasonableness of our filing. On pages 17 – 32 of the March 1,  
18   2010 testimony filed by me in this docket, is a more detailed discussion of  
19   these interrelated controls.

20   **Q.   How does FPL ensure only incremental payroll is charged to the**  
21   **projects?**

22   A.   The Company has issued specific guidelines for charging labor costs to the  
23   project work orders. These guidelines emphasize the need for particular care

1 in charging only incremental labor to the project work orders included for  
2 nuclear cost recovery and ensuring consistent application of the Company's  
3 capitalization policy. These guidelines describe the process for the exclusion  
4 of non-incremental labor from current NCRC recovery while providing full  
5 capitalization of all appropriate labor costs through the implementation of  
6 separate project capital work orders that will be included in future base rate  
7 recoveries.

8 **Q. Did FPL's recent base rate case affect the process for determining**  
9 **incremental payroll?**

10 A. Yes. In FPL's rate case in Docket No. 080677-EI, FPL excluded all labor  
11 costs projected to be incurred for the projects from base rate revenue  
12 requirements through Commission and company adjustments for 2010. In  
13 2010, all dedicated and support employees working on the projects will charge  
14 their time to the Nuclear Cost Recoverable incremental work orders. Actual  
15 costs charged to the NCRC, O&M or capital in 2010 will be used to set the  
16 baseline for determining whether future labor costs are incremental effective  
17 January 1, 2011, using the previously issued guidelines.

18 **Q. Are there any changes to existing controls or additional controls**  
19 **implemented and relied upon for these projects and the related**  
20 **reporting?**

21 A. Yes. There was a revision to EPU Project Invoice Process Instruction (EPPI-  
22 230) revising invoice approvers for certain dollar limits. Secondly, the  
23 Nuclear Business Operations Manager as described in my March 1, 2010

1 testimony was subsequently promoted to another position within the  
2 Company. The Nuclear Division Controller hired an internal candidate with  
3 substantial FPL experience in the regulatory and financial areas to fill the  
4 position and both the exiting and incoming Managers will work closely to  
5 ensure a seamless transition of responsibilities. Lastly, as discussed in more  
6 detail in my March 1, 2010 testimony, with the ramping up of transmission  
7 related costs in 2010, FPL is utilizing additional transmission business unit  
8 accounting controls.

9  
10 **SUMMARY**

11  
12 **Q. What is the total jurisdictional amount to be included in establishing**  
13 **FPL's 2011 Capacity Cost Recovery Clause factor?**

14 A. FPL is requesting recovery of ~~\$28,754,660~~ **\$31,288,445** over a 12 month  
15 period in 2011 as detailed in the 2009 T-Schedules filed on March 1, 2010, the  
16 2010 AE Schedules and the 2011 P Schedules filed on May 3, 2010 in this  
17 Docket No. 100009-EI. These schedules are included in Exhibit TOJ-14,  
18 Appendix I for the Uprate Project, Exhibit SDS-9, Appendix II for Turkey  
19 Point 6 & 7 Preconstruction costs and in Exhibit SDS-10, Appendix III for  
20 Turkey Point 6 & 7 Site Selection costs. A summary of these items is  
21 included in Exhibit WP-5.

22 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

23 A. Yes.

Docket No. 100009-EI  
Costs Presented in Docket No. 100009-EI  
Exhibit WP-5, Page 1 of 1

**Exhibit WP-5 is superseded by Exhibit WP-7.**



Florida Power & Light Company  
St. Lucie & Turkey Point Uprate Project  
Base Rate Revenue Requirement  
For the year plant is placed into service

October 2010 - Turbine Gantry Crane Modifications - St Lucie Unit 1

Line No.	Work Order #	Plant Account	Detail	Incremental Plant	Depreciation Rate (Annual)	Pre-Tax Rate of Return (Annual)	In-Service Amount Reconciliation to AE-3							
1	06992-070-0915-007	321	Structures & Improvements		1.80%	9.44%	Total Co. In-Service \$5,814,841							
2		322	Reactor Plant Equipment		2.00%		0.98818187							
3		323	Turbogenerator units	\$5,814,841	2.40%		\$5,746,121							
4	In-Service Date	324	Accessory Electric Equipment		1.80%		Adjustments (\$20)							
5	Oct-10	325	Miscellaneous Equipment		1.80%		0.98818187							
6		353.1	Station Equipment - Step up Transformer		2.90%		Adjustments (\$20)							
7			Total Company In-Service	\$5,814,841			AE-3 Transfer to Plant \$5,746,141							
8			Original = \$2,907,421				0.98818187							
9			See Footnote (a)				Jurisdictional Plant In-Service \$5,746,121							
11	Account	Detail	2010 October	2010 November	2010 December	2011 January	2011 February	2011 March	2011 April	2011 May	2011 June	2011 July	2011 August	2011 September
14	323	Plant in Service	\$5,814,841	\$5,814,841	\$5,814,841	\$5,814,841	\$5,814,841	\$5,814,841	\$5,814,841	\$5,814,841	\$5,814,841	\$5,814,841	\$5,814,841	\$5,814,841
15		Jurisdictional Factor	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187
16		Jurisdictional Plant	\$5,746,121	\$5,746,121	\$5,746,121	\$5,746,121	\$5,746,121	\$5,746,121	\$5,746,121	\$5,746,121	\$5,746,121	\$5,746,121	\$5,746,121	\$5,746,121
17	2.40%	Depr Rate (monthly)	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020
18		Depreciation	\$5,746	\$11,492	\$11,492	\$11,492	\$11,492	\$11,492	\$11,492	\$11,492	\$11,492	\$11,492	\$11,492	\$11,492
19		Accumulated Depreciation	\$5,746	\$17,238	\$28,731	\$40,223	\$51,715	\$63,207	\$74,700	\$86,192	\$97,684	\$109,176	\$120,669	\$132,161
20		Net Plant in Service	\$5,740,375	\$5,728,883	\$5,717,390	\$5,705,898	\$5,694,406	\$5,682,914	\$5,671,421	\$5,659,929	\$5,648,437	\$5,636,945	\$5,625,452	\$5,613,950
21		Average Plant	\$2,870,187	\$5,734,629	\$5,723,136	\$5,711,644	\$5,700,152	\$5,688,660	\$5,677,167	\$5,665,675	\$5,654,183	\$5,642,691	\$5,631,198	\$5,619,706
22		9.44% Return	\$22,590	\$45,136	\$45,045	\$44,955	\$44,864	\$44,774	\$44,683	\$44,593	\$44,502	\$44,412	\$44,322	\$44,231
24		Monthly Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement - Errata (a)	\$26,337	\$56,628	\$56,537	\$56,447	\$56,357	\$56,266	\$56,176	\$56,085	\$55,995	\$55,904	\$55,814	\$55,723
26		Total Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement - Errata			\$141,602									
28		Original Monthly Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement	\$17,030	\$45,321	\$56,537	\$56,447	\$56,357	\$56,266	\$56,176	\$56,085	\$55,995	\$55,904	\$55,814	\$55,723
30		Original Total Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement			\$118,889									
32		Monthly Difference	\$11,307	\$11,307	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
34		Total Difference			\$22,613									

Errata Notes:

(a) Original calculation used the average plant in service balance as a starting point instead of the plant in service balance. Results in an increase in the Revenue Requirement of \$22,613.

Florida Power & Light Company  
St. Lucie & Turkey Point Upgrade Project  
Base Rate Revenue Requirement  
For the year plant is placed into service

November 2010 - Nuclear - Turkey Point Unit 3 Outage\_3\_25

Line No.	Work Order #	Plant Account	Detail	Incremental Plant	Non-incremental Payroll	Generating Step Up Unit	Total	Depreciation Rate (Annual)	Pre-Tax Rate of Return (Annual)	In-Service Amount Reconciliation to AE-3				
1	06414-070-0914-007	321	Structures & Improvements				\$0	1.80%		Total Co. In-Service				
2	07990-070-0914-007	322	Reactor Plant Equipment	\$103,582,595	\$291,807		\$103,874,402	2.00%	9.44%	\$130,498,310 (a)				
3	08103-070-0914-007	323	Turbogenerator units	\$23,294,233	\$65,623		\$23,359,856	2.40%		0.98818187				
4		324	Accessory Electric Equipment				\$0	1.80%		\$128,954,088				
5		325	Miscellaneous Equipment				\$0	1.80%		\$1,948,592				
6	In-Service Date	353.1	Station Equipment - Step up Transformer			\$3,619,483	\$3,619,483	2.90%		\$1,025,527				
7	Nov-10		Total Company In-Service	\$126,876,828	\$357,430	\$3,619,483	\$130,853,740			AE-3 Transfer to Plan				
8							\$0.98818187			\$127,028,524 (a)				
9							\$129,307,294							
10														
11	Account	Detail	2010 November	2010 December	2011 January	2011 February	2011 March	2011 April	2011 May	2011 June	2011 July	2011 August	2011 September	2011 October
14	322	Total Plant in Service	\$103,582,595	\$103,582,595	\$103,582,595	\$103,582,595	\$103,582,595	\$103,582,595	\$103,582,595	\$103,582,595	\$103,582,595	\$103,582,595	\$103,582,595	\$103,582,595
15		Non-Incremental Payroll	\$291,807	\$291,807	\$291,807	\$291,807	\$291,807	\$291,807	\$291,807	\$291,807	\$291,807	\$291,807	\$291,807	\$291,807
16		Total Plant in Service	\$103,874,402	\$103,874,402	\$103,874,402	\$103,874,402	\$103,874,402	\$103,874,402	\$103,874,402	\$103,874,402	\$103,874,402	\$103,874,402	\$103,874,402	\$103,874,402
17		Jurisdictional Factor	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187
18		Jurisdictional Plant	\$102,646,801	\$102,646,801	\$102,646,801	\$102,646,801	\$102,646,801	\$102,646,801	\$102,646,801	\$102,646,801	\$102,646,801	\$102,646,801	\$102,646,801	\$102,646,801
19	2.00%	Depr Rate (monthly)	0.0017	0.0017	0.0017	0.0017	0.0017	0.0017	0.0017	0.0017	0.0017	0.0017	0.0017	0.0017
20		Depreciation	\$85,539	\$171,078	\$171,078	\$171,078	\$171,078	\$171,078	\$171,078	\$171,078	\$171,078	\$171,078	\$171,078	\$171,078
21		Accumulated Depreciation	\$85,539	\$256,617	\$427,695	\$598,773	\$769,851	\$940,929	\$1,112,007	\$1,283,085	\$1,454,163	\$1,625,241	\$1,796,319	\$1,967,397
22		Net Plant in Service	\$102,861,282	\$102,390,184	\$102,219,106	\$102,048,028	\$101,876,950	\$101,705,872	\$101,534,794	\$101,363,716	\$101,192,638	\$101,021,560	\$100,850,482	\$100,679,404
23		Average Plant	\$51,280,631	\$102,478,723	\$102,304,645	\$102,133,567	\$101,962,489	\$101,791,411	\$101,620,333	\$101,449,255	\$101,278,177	\$101,107,099	\$100,936,021	\$100,764,943
24	0.44%	Return	\$403,616	\$806,557	\$805,211	\$803,864	\$802,518	\$801,171	\$799,825	\$798,478	\$797,132	\$795,785	\$794,439	\$793,092
25	Original = \$11,647,116 \$32,812 \$11,479,038 See Footnote (b)	323	Total Plant in Service	\$23,294,233	\$23,294,233	\$23,294,233	\$23,294,233	\$23,294,233	\$23,294,233	\$23,294,233	\$23,294,233	\$23,294,233	\$23,294,233	\$23,294,233
26		Non-Incremental Payroll	\$65,623	\$65,623	\$65,623	\$65,623	\$65,623	\$65,623	\$65,623	\$65,623	\$65,623	\$65,623	\$65,623	\$65,623
27		Total Plant in Service	\$23,359,856	\$23,359,856	\$23,359,856	\$23,359,856	\$23,359,856	\$23,359,856	\$23,359,856	\$23,359,856	\$23,359,856	\$23,359,856	\$23,359,856	\$23,359,856
28		Jurisdictional Factor	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187
29		Jurisdictional Plant	\$23,083,786	\$23,083,786	\$23,083,786	\$23,083,786	\$23,083,786	\$23,083,786	\$23,083,786	\$23,083,786	\$23,083,786	\$23,083,786	\$23,083,786	\$23,083,786
30	2.40%	Depr Rate (monthly)	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020
31		Depreciation	\$23,084	\$46,168	\$46,168	\$46,168	\$46,168	\$46,168	\$46,168	\$46,168	\$46,168	\$46,168	\$46,168	\$46,168
32		Accumulated Depreciation	\$23,084	\$69,251	\$115,419	\$161,587	\$207,754	\$253,922	\$300,089	\$346,257	\$392,424	\$438,592	\$484,760	\$530,927
33		Net Plant in Service	\$23,060,702	\$23,014,535	\$22,968,367	\$22,922,199	\$22,876,032	\$22,829,864	\$22,783,697	\$22,737,529	\$22,691,362	\$22,645,194	\$22,599,026	\$22,552,859
34		Average Plant	\$11,530,351	\$23,037,818	\$22,991,451	\$22,945,283	\$22,899,116	\$22,852,948	\$22,806,780	\$22,760,613	\$22,714,445	\$22,668,278	\$22,622,110	\$22,575,943
35	0.44%	Return	\$90,752	\$181,323	\$180,959	\$180,596	\$180,232	\$179,869	\$179,506	\$179,142	\$178,779	\$178,416	\$178,052	\$177,689
36	Original = \$1,289,741 See Footnote (b)	353.1	Plant in Service	\$3,619,483	\$3,619,483	\$3,619,483	\$3,619,483	\$3,619,483	\$3,619,483	\$3,619,483	\$3,619,483	\$3,619,483	\$3,619,483	\$3,619,483
37		Jurisdictional Factor	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187
38		Jurisdictional Plant	\$3,576,707	\$3,576,707	\$3,576,707	\$3,576,707	\$3,576,707	\$3,576,707	\$3,576,707	\$3,576,707	\$3,576,707	\$3,576,707	\$3,576,707	\$3,576,707
39	2.90%	Depr Rate (monthly)	0.0024	0.0024	0.0024	0.0024	0.0024	0.0024	0.0024	0.0024	0.0024	0.0024	0.0024	0.0024
40		Depreciation	\$4,322	\$8,644	\$8,644	\$8,644	\$8,644	\$8,644	\$8,644	\$8,644	\$8,644	\$8,644	\$8,644	\$8,644
41		Accumulated Depreciation	\$4,322	\$12,966	\$21,609	\$30,253	\$38,897	\$47,540	\$56,184	\$64,828	\$73,472	\$82,115	\$90,759	\$99,403
42		Net Plant in Service	\$3,572,385	\$3,568,741	\$3,565,098	\$3,561,454	\$3,557,810	\$3,554,166	\$3,550,522	\$3,546,878	\$3,543,234	\$3,539,590	\$3,535,946	\$3,532,302
43		Average Plant	\$1,786,193	\$3,568,083	\$3,559,420	\$3,550,756	\$3,542,132	\$3,533,508	\$3,524,884	\$3,516,260	\$3,507,636	\$3,499,012	\$3,490,388	\$3,481,764
44	0.44%	Return	\$14,059	\$28,083	\$28,015	\$27,947	\$27,879	\$27,811	\$27,743	\$27,675	\$27,607	\$27,539	\$27,471	\$27,403
45		Total Return	\$908,426	\$1,015,963	\$1,014,185	\$1,012,407	\$1,010,630	\$1,008,852	\$1,007,074	\$1,005,296	\$1,003,518	\$1,001,740	\$999,962	\$998,184
46		Total Depreciation	\$112,945	\$225,889	\$225,889	\$225,889	\$225,889	\$225,889	\$225,889	\$225,889	\$225,889	\$225,889	\$225,889	\$225,889
47		Monthly Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement - Errata (b)	\$621,371	\$1,241,853	\$1,240,075	\$1,238,297	\$1,236,519	\$1,234,741	\$1,232,963	\$1,231,185	\$1,229,407	\$1,227,629	\$1,225,851	\$1,224,073
48		Total Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement - Errata		\$1,863,223										
49		Original Monthly Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement	\$366,935	\$987,417	\$1,240,075	\$1,238,297	\$1,236,519	\$1,234,741	\$1,232,963	\$1,231,185	\$1,229,407	\$1,227,629	\$1,225,851	\$1,224,073
50		Original Total Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement		\$1,354,353										
51		Monthly Difference	\$254,435	\$254,435	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
52		Total Difference		\$508,871										

Notes:  
(a) Total Company In-Service and Jurisdictional Transfer to Plant as shown on the 2010 AE-3 & 2011 P-3 Transfer to Plant excludes the non-incremental costs that are being placed into service. While FPL is not requesting recovery of carrying charges on this amount through the NCR, these capital costs should be included in our base rate calculation.

Errata Notes:  
(b) Original calculation used the average plant in service balance as a starting point instead of the plant in service balance. Results in an increase in the Revenue Requirement of \$508,871



Florida Power & Light Company  
 St. Lucie & Turkey Point Upgrade Project  
 Base Rate Revenue Requirement  
 For the year plant is placed into service

November 2010 - Transmission

Line No.	Work Order #	Plant Account	Detail	Incremental Plant	Depreciation Rate (Annual)	Pre-Tax Rate of Return (Annual)	In-Service Amount Reconciliation to AE-3
1	01285-009-0889-000	352	Structures & Improvements		1.90%	9.44%	Total Co. In-Service \$197,292
2		353	Station Equipment		2.60%		0.88696801
3		356	OH Conductors & Devices	\$197,292	3.20%		\$174,991
4							Adjustments (\$2,097)
5							0.88696801
6							(\$1,850)
7							AE-3 Transfer to Plan \$175,851
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							
35							
36							
37							
38							

Errata Notes:

(a) Original calculation used the average plant in service balance as a starting point instead of the plant in service balance. Results in an increase in the Revenue Requirement of \$689.

Florida Power & Light Company  
St. Lucie & Turkey Point Upgrade Project  
Base Rate Revenue Requirement  
For the year plant is placed into service

December 2010 - Transmission

Line No.	Work Order #	Plant Account	Detail	Incremental Plant	Depreciation Rate (Annual)	Pre-Tax Rate of Return (Annual)	In-Service Amount Reconciliation to AE-3							
1	00378-009-0379-000	352	Structures & Improvements	\$1,602,985	1.90%	9.44%	Total Co. In-Service	\$1,970,271						
2	00384-009-0379-000	353	Station Equipment	\$367,286	2.60%				0,886,980					
3		356	OH Conductors & Devices		3.20%				\$1,747,567					
4	In-Service Date						Adjustments	(\$588)						
5	Dec-10							0,886,980						
6								(\$521)						
7							AE-3 Transfer to Plant	\$1,748,088						
8	Original = \$801,492 See Footnote (a)			Total Company In-Service	\$1,970,271									
9					0,886,980									
10				Jurisdictional Plant In-Service	\$1,747,567									
11	Account	Detail	2010 December	2011 January	2011 February	2011 March	2011 April	2011 May	2011 June	2011 July	2011 August	2011 September	2011 October	2011 November
14	352 Plant in Service		\$1,602,985	\$1,602,985	\$1,602,985	\$1,602,985	\$1,602,985	\$1,602,985	\$1,602,985	\$1,602,985	\$1,602,985	\$1,602,985	\$1,602,985	\$1,602,985
15	Jurisdictional Factor		0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801
16	1.90% Depr Rate (monthly)		\$1,421,796	\$1,421,796	\$1,421,796	\$1,421,796	\$1,421,796	\$1,421,796	\$1,421,796	\$1,421,796	\$1,421,796	\$1,421,796	\$1,421,796	\$1,421,796
17	Depreciation		0.0016	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016	0.0016
18	Accumulated Depreciation		\$1,126	\$2,251	\$3,377	\$4,503	\$5,628	\$6,754	\$7,879	\$9,005	\$10,130	\$11,256	\$12,381	\$13,507
19	Net Plant in Service		\$1,420,671	\$1,416,420	\$1,416,168	\$1,413,917	\$1,411,666	\$1,409,415	\$1,407,164	\$1,404,912	\$1,402,661	\$1,400,410	\$1,398,159	\$1,395,908
20	Average Plant		\$710,335	\$1,419,545	\$1,417,294	\$1,415,043	\$1,412,792	\$1,410,540	\$1,408,289	\$1,406,038	\$1,403,787	\$1,401,536	\$1,399,285	\$1,397,033
21	9.44% Return		\$6,591	\$11,173	\$11,155	\$11,137	\$11,120	\$11,102	\$11,084	\$11,067	\$11,049	\$11,031	\$11,013	\$10,996
22	Original = \$183,643 See Footnote (a)		\$367,286	\$367,286	\$367,286	\$367,286	\$367,286	\$367,286	\$367,286	\$367,286	\$367,286	\$367,286	\$367,286	\$367,286
23	Jurisdictional Factor		0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801
24	2.60% Depr Rate (monthly)		\$325,771	\$325,771	\$325,771	\$325,771	\$325,771	\$325,771	\$325,771	\$325,771	\$325,771	\$325,771	\$325,771	\$325,771
25	Depreciation		0.0022	0.0022	0.0022	0.0022	0.0022	0.0022	0.0022	0.0022	0.0022	0.0022	0.0022	0.0022
26	Accumulated Depreciation		\$353	\$706	\$1,059	\$1,412	\$1,765	\$2,118	\$2,471	\$2,824	\$3,177	\$3,530	\$3,883	\$4,236
27	Net Plant in Service		\$325,418	\$324,712	\$324,006	\$323,300	\$322,595	\$321,889	\$321,183	\$320,477	\$319,771	\$319,065	\$318,360	\$317,654
28	Average Plant		\$162,709	\$325,265	\$324,359	\$323,453	\$322,547	\$321,641	\$320,735	\$319,829	\$318,923	\$318,017	\$317,111	\$316,205
29	9.44% Return		\$1,281	\$1,558	\$2,553	\$2,547	\$2,541	\$2,535	\$2,529	\$2,523	\$2,517	\$2,511	\$2,505	\$2,499
30	Total Return		\$6,871	\$13,731	\$13,708	\$13,685	\$13,662	\$13,638	\$13,615	\$13,592	\$13,568	\$13,545	\$13,522	\$13,499
31	Total Depreciation		\$1,479	\$2,957	\$2,957	\$2,957	\$2,957	\$2,957	\$2,957	\$2,957	\$2,957	\$2,957	\$2,957	\$2,957
32	Monthly Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement - Errata (a)		\$6,350	\$16,688	\$16,665	\$16,642	\$16,619	\$16,595	\$16,572	\$16,549	\$16,525	\$16,502	\$16,479	\$16,456
33	Total Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement - Errata		\$6,350											
34	Original Monthly Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement		\$4,911	\$13,250	\$16,665	\$16,642	\$16,619	\$16,595	\$16,572	\$16,549	\$16,525	\$16,502	\$16,479	\$16,456
35	Original Total Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement		\$4,911											
36	Monthly Difference		\$1,439	\$3,439	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
37	Total Difference		\$1,439											

Errata Notes:  
(a) Original calculation used the average plant in service balance as a starting point instead of the plant in service balance. Results in an increase in the Revenue Requirement of \$3,439.

Florida Power & Light Company  
 St. Lucie & Turkey Point Upgrade Project  
 Base Rate Revenue Requirement  
 For the year plant is placed into service

December 2010 - Turbine Gantry Crane Modifications - Turkey Point

Line No.	Work Order #	Plant Account	Detail	Incremental Plant	Depreciation Rate (Annual)	Pre-Tax Rate of Return (Annual)	In-Service Amount Reconciliation to AE-3							
1	08760-070-0914-007	321	Structures & Improvements				Total Co. In-Service \$509,844							
2		322	Reactor Plant Equipment		1.80%	9.44%	0.98818187							
3		323	Turbogenerator units	\$509,844	2.00%		0.98818187							
4	In-Service Date	324	Accessory Electric Equipment		2.40%		Adjustments \$503,818							
5	Dec-10	325	Miscellaneous Equipment		1.80%		0.98818187							
6		353.1	Station Equipment - Step up Transformer		1.80%		\$0							
7			Total Company In-Service	\$509,844	2.90%		AE-3 Transfer to Plan \$503,818							
8		Original = \$254,922												
9		(See Postnote (a))												
10			Jurisdictional Plant In-Service	\$503,818										
11														
12	Account	Detail	2010 December	2011 January	2011 February	2011 March	2011 April	2011 May	2011 June	2011 July	2011 August	2011 September	2011 October	2011 November
14	323 Plant in Service		\$509,844	\$509,844	\$509,844	\$509,844	\$509,844	\$509,844	\$509,844	\$509,844	\$509,844	\$509,844	\$509,844	\$509,844
15	Jurisdictional Factor		0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187
16	Jurisdictional Plant		\$503,818	\$503,818	\$503,818	\$503,818	\$503,818	\$503,818	\$503,818	\$503,818	\$503,818	\$503,818	\$503,818	\$503,818
17	2.40% Depr Rate (monthly)		0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020	0.0020
18	Depreciation		\$504	\$1,008	\$1,008	\$1,008	\$1,008	\$1,008	\$1,008	\$1,008	\$1,008	\$1,008	\$1,008	\$1,008
19	Accumulated Depreciation		\$504	\$1,511	\$2,519	\$3,527	\$4,534	\$5,542	\$6,550	\$7,557	\$8,565	\$9,573	\$10,580	\$11,588
20	Net Plant in Service		\$503,314	\$502,307	\$501,299	\$500,292	\$499,284	\$498,276	\$497,269	\$496,261	\$495,253	\$494,246	\$493,238	\$492,230
21	Average Plant		\$251,657	\$252,811	\$251,803	\$250,795	\$249,788	\$248,780	\$247,772	\$246,765	\$245,757	\$244,750	\$243,742	\$242,734
22	9.44% Return		\$1,991	\$3,957	\$3,950	\$3,942	\$3,934	\$3,926	\$3,918	\$3,910	\$3,902	\$3,894	\$3,886	\$3,878
24	Monthly Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement - Errata (a)		\$2,485	\$4,965	\$4,957	\$4,949	\$4,941	\$4,933	\$4,925	\$4,918	\$4,910	\$4,902	\$4,894	\$4,886
26	Total Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement - Errata		\$2,485											
28	Original Monthly Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement		\$1,493	\$3,974	\$4,957	\$4,949	\$4,941	\$4,933	\$4,925	\$4,918	\$4,910	\$4,902	\$4,894	\$4,886
30	Original Total Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement		\$1,493											
32	Monthly Difference		\$991	\$991	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
34	Total Difference		\$991											

Errata Notes:

(a) Original calculation used the average plant in service balance as a starting point instead of the plant in service balance. Results in an increase in the Revenue Requirement of \$991.



Florida Power & Light Company  
 St. Lucie & Turkey Point Upgrade Project  
 Base Rate Revenue Requirement  
 For the year plant is placed into service

March 2011 - Transmission

Line No.	Work Order #	Plant Account	Detail	Incremental Plant	Depreciation Rate (Annual)	Pre-Tax Rate of Return (Annual)	In-Service Amount Reconciliation to P-3							
1	00379-009-0379-000	352	Structures & Improvements		1.00%	9.44%	Total Co. In-Service	\$364,091						
2		353	Station Equipment	\$364,091	2.80%			0.88696801						
3		356	OH Conductors & Devices		3.20%		Adjustments	\$322,937						
4	In-Service Date							(\$1)						
5	Mar-11							0.88696801						
6							P-3 Transfer to Plant	(\$1)						
7								\$322,938						
8		Original = \$182,046		Total Company In-Service	\$364,091									
9		See Footnote (a)		Jurisdictional Plant In-Service	0.88696801									
10					\$322,937									
11	Account	Detail	2011 March	2011 April	2011 May	2011 June	2011 July	2011 August	2011 September	2011 October	2011 November	2011 December	2012 January	2012 February
12	353	Total Plant in Service	\$364,091	\$364,091	\$364,091	\$364,091	\$364,091	\$364,091	\$364,091	\$364,091	\$364,091	\$364,091	\$364,091	\$364,091
13		Jurisdictional Factor	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801	0.88696801
14		Jurisdictional Plant	\$322,937	\$322,937	\$322,937	\$322,937	\$322,937	\$322,937	\$322,937	\$322,937	\$322,937	\$322,937	\$322,937	\$322,937
15	2.60%	Depr Rate (monthly)	0.0022	0.0022	0.0022	0.0022	0.0022	0.0022	0.0022	0.0022	0.0022	0.0022	0.0022	0.0022
16		Depreciation	\$350	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$700
17		Accumulated Depreciation	\$350	\$1,050	\$1,749	\$2,449	\$3,149	\$3,848	\$4,548	\$5,248	\$5,947	\$6,647	\$7,347	\$8,047
18		Net Plant in Service	\$322,588	\$321,888	\$321,188	\$320,488	\$319,789	\$319,089	\$318,389	\$317,690	\$316,990	\$316,290	\$315,591	\$314,891
19		Average Plant	\$161,294	\$322,238	\$321,538	\$320,838	\$320,139	\$319,439	\$318,739	\$318,040	\$317,340	\$316,640	\$315,940	\$315,241
20	9.44%	Return	\$1,269	\$2,538	\$2,531	\$2,525	\$2,520	\$2,514	\$2,509	\$2,503	\$2,498	\$2,492	\$2,487	\$2,481
21		Monthly Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement - Errata (a)	\$1,619	\$3,236	\$3,230	\$3,225	\$3,219	\$3,214	\$3,208	\$3,203	\$3,197	\$3,192	\$3,186	\$3,181
22		Total Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement - Errata										\$30,545		
23		Original Monthly Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement	\$984	\$2,601	\$3,230	\$3,225	\$3,219	\$3,214	\$3,208	\$3,203	\$3,197	\$3,192	\$3,186	\$3,181
24		Original Total Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement										\$29,274		
25		Monthly Difference	\$635	\$635	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
26		Total Difference										\$1,271		

Errata Notes:

(a) Original calculation used the average plant in service balance as a starting point instead of the plant in service balance. Results in an increase in the Revenue Requirement of \$1,271.

Florida Power & Light Company  
 St. Lucie & Turkey Point Uranium Project  
 Base Rate Revenue Requirement  
 For the year plant is placed into service

May 2011 - Nuclear - Turkey Point Unit 4 Outage 4\_26

Line No	Work Order #	Plant Account	Detail	Incremental Plant	Non-incremental Payroll	Generating Step Up	Total	Depreciation Rate (Annual)	Pre-Tax Rate of Return (Annual)	In-Service Amount Reconciliation to P-3
1	08416-070-0914-007	321	Structures & Improvements				\$0	1.80%	9.44%	Total Co. In-Service
2	07996-070-0914-007	322	Reactor Plant Equipment	\$139,439,012	\$358,239		\$139,797,251	2.00%		\$181,239,420 (a)
3	08110-070-0914-007	323	Turbogenerator units	\$38,180,926	\$98,092		\$38,279,018	2.40%		0.98818187
4		324	Accessory Electric Equipment				\$0	1.80%		\$179,097,509
5		325	Miscellaneous Equipment				\$0	1.80%		\$1,115,638
6	In-Service Date						\$0	1.80%		0.98818187
7	May-11	353.1	Station Equipment - Step up Transformer			\$3,619,483	\$3,619,483	2.90%		\$1,102,453
8			Total Company In-Service	\$177,619,938	\$456,331	\$3,619,483	\$181,695,752			P-3 Transfer to Plant
9							0.98818187			\$177,995,056 (a)
10							\$179,548,448			
11										
12										
13										
14										
15										
16										
17										
18										
19										
20										
21										
22										
23										
24										
25										
26										
27										
28										
29										
30										
31										
32										
33										
34										
35										
36										
37										
38										
39										
40										
41										
42										
43										
44										
45										
46										
47										
48										
49										
50										
51										
52										
53										
54										
55										
56										
57										
58										
59										
60										
61										
62										
63										
64										
65										
66										
67										
68										
69										

Notes:

(a) Total Company In-Service and Jurisdictional Transfer to Plant as shown on the 2010 AE-3 & 2011 P-3 Transfer to Plant excludes the non-incremental costs that are being placed into service. While FPL is not requesting recovery of carrying charges on this amount through the NCR, these capital costs should be included in our base rate calculation.

Errata Notes:

(b) Original calculation used the average plant in service balance as a starting point instead of the plant in service balance. Results in an increase in the Revenue Requirement of \$706,588.

Florida Power & Light Company  
 St. Lucie & Turkey Point Uprate Project  
 Base Rate Revenue Requirement  
 For the year plant is placed into service

December 2011 - Nuclear - St Lucie Unit 1 Outage 1\_24

Line No.	Work Order #	Plant Account	Detail	Incremental Plant	Non-Incremental Payroll	Generating Step Up Unit	Total	Depreciation Rate (Annual)	Pre-Tax Rate of Return (Annual)	In-Service Amount Reconciliation to P-3
1	06411-070-0915-007	321	Structures & Improvements				\$0	1.80%	9.44%	Total Co. In-Service
2	06002-070-0915-007	322	Reactor Plant Equipment	\$46,326,842	\$112,929		\$46,439,770	2.00%		\$340,670,260 (a)
3	06266-070-0915-007	323	Turbogenerator units	\$276,782,697	\$674,700		\$277,457,396	2.40%		\$336,653,068
4		324	Accessory Electric Equipment	\$7,449,253	\$18,159		\$7,467,411	1.80%		\$1,920,111
5	In-Service Date	325	Miscellaneous Equipment				\$0	1.80%		\$988,917
6		353.1	Station Equipment - Step up Transformer			\$10,120,469	\$10,120,469	2.90%		\$1,897,419
7			Total Company In-Service	\$330,558,791	\$605,787	\$10,120,469	\$341,485,047			\$334,755,652 (a)
8							\$988,917			
9							\$337,449,332			
10										P-3 Transfer to Plant
11										
12										
13										
14										
15										
16										
17										
18										
19										
20										
21										
22										
23										
24										
25										
26										
27										
28										
29										
30										
31										
32										
33										
34										
35										
36										
37										
38										
39										
40										
41										
42										
43										
44										
45										
46										
47										
48										
49										
50										
51										
52										
53										
54										
55										
56										
57										
58										
59										
60										
61										
62										
63										
64										
65										
66										
67										
68										
69										
70										
71										
72										
73										
74										
75										
76										
77										

Notes:

(a) Total Company In-Service and Jurisdictional Transfer to Plant as shown on the 2010 AE-3 & 2011 P-3 Transfer to Plant excludes the non-incremental costs that are being placed into service. While FPL is not requesting recovery of carrying charges on this amount through the NCR, these capital costs should be included in our base rate calculation.

Errata Notes:

(b) Original calculation used the average plant in service balance as a starting point instead of the plant in service balance. Results in an increase in the Revenue Requirement of \$663,992.

Florida Power & Light Company  
 St. Lucie & Turkey Point Upgrade Project  
 Base Rate Revenue Requirement  
 For the year plant is placed into service

December 2011 - Simulator - Turkey Point

Line No	Work Order #	Plant Account	Detail	Incremental Plant	Depreciation Rate (Annual)	Pre-Tax Rate of Return (Annual)	In-Service Amount	In-Service Amount Reconciliation to P-3						
1	TBD	321	Structures & Improvements											
2		322	Reactor Plant Equipment		1.80%			Total Co. In-Service \$2,500,000						
3		323	Turbogenerator units		2.00%	9.44%		0.98818187						
4	In-Service Date	324	Accessory Electric Equipmen		2.40%			\$2,470,455						
5	Dec-11	325	Miscellaneous Equipmen	\$2,500,000	1.80%			\$0						
6		353.1	Station Equipment - Step up Transformer		1.80%			0.98818187						
7			Total Company In-Service	\$2,500,000	2.90%			\$0						
8			Jurisdictional Plant In-Service					P-3 Transfer to Plan \$2,470,455						
9														
10														
11														
12	Account	Detail	2011 December	2012 January	2012 February	2012 March	2012 April	2012 May	2012 June	2012 July	2012 August	2012 September	2012 October	2012 November
13														
14		325 Total Plant in Service	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000
15		Jurisdictional Factor	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187
16		Jurisdictional Plant	\$2,470,455	\$2,470,455	\$2,470,455	\$2,470,455	\$2,470,455	\$2,470,455	\$2,470,455	\$2,470,455	\$2,470,455	\$2,470,455	\$2,470,455	\$2,470,455
17		1.80% Depr Rate (monthly)	0.0015	0.0015	0.0015	0.0015	0.0015	0.0015	0.0015	0.0015	0.0015	0.0015	0.0015	0.0015
18		Depreciation	\$1,853	\$3,706	\$3,706	\$3,706	\$3,706	\$3,706	\$3,706	\$3,706	\$3,706	\$3,706	\$3,706	\$3,706
19		Accumulated Depreciation	\$1,853	\$3,706	\$3,706	\$3,706	\$3,706	\$3,706	\$3,706	\$3,706	\$3,706	\$3,706	\$3,706	\$3,706
20		Net Plant in Service	\$2,468,602	\$2,464,896	\$2,461,190	\$2,457,485	\$2,453,779	\$2,450,073	\$2,446,368	\$2,442,662	\$2,438,956	\$2,435,251	\$2,431,545	\$2,427,839
21		Average Plant	\$1,234,301	\$2,466,749	\$2,463,043	\$2,459,338	\$2,455,632	\$2,451,926	\$2,448,221	\$2,444,515	\$2,440,809	\$2,437,104	\$2,433,398	\$2,429,692
22		9.44% Return	\$9,715	\$19,415	\$19,386	\$19,357	\$19,328	\$19,299	\$19,269	\$19,240	\$19,211	\$19,182	\$19,153	\$19,123
23		Monthly Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement - Errata (a)	\$11,568	\$23,121	\$23,092	\$23,062	\$23,033	\$23,004	\$22,975	\$22,946	\$22,917	\$22,887	\$22,858	\$22,829
24		Total Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement - Errata	\$11,568											
25		Original Monthly Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement	\$6,707	\$18,260	\$23,092	\$23,062	\$23,033	\$23,004	\$22,975	\$22,946	\$22,917	\$22,887	\$22,858	\$22,829
26		Original Total Jurisdictional Revenue Requirement	\$6,707											
27		Monthly Difference	\$4,861											
28		Total Difference	\$4,861											

Errata Notes:  
 (a) Original calculation used the average plant in service balance as a starting point instead of the plant in service balance. Results in an increase in the Revenue Requirement of \$4,861.