



William P. Cox
Senior Counsel
Florida Power & Light Company
700 Universe Boulevard
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420
(561) 304-5662
(561) 691-7135 (Facsimile)
E-mail: will.p.cox@fpl.com

June 29, 2026

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Mr. Adam Teitzman
Division of the Commission Clerk and Administrative Services
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Re: Docket No. 20260020-EI
Petition for determination of Need for Andytown-Oasis Transmission Lines in
Broward and Miami-Dade Counties, by Florida Power & Light Company.

Dear Mr. Teitzman:

In accordance with directives contained in Florida Public Service Commission Order No. PSC-2026-0170-CFO-EI, Florida Power & Light Company hereby submits the attached revised public version of Document No. 01692-2026.

Please contact me if you or your Staff has any questions regarding this filing at (561) 304-5662 or will.p.cox@fpl.com.

Sincerely,

/s/ William P. Cox
William P. Cox
Florida Bar No. 0093531

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Docket No. 20260020-EI

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served by electronic mail this 29th day of June 2026 to the following:

Carlos Marquez II, Esq.
Shaw Stiller, Esq.
Office of the General Counsel
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399
cmarquez@psc.state.fl.us
sstiller@psc.state.fl.us

Office of Public Counsel
Walt Trierweiler, Esq.
Charles Rehwinkel, Esq.
c/o The Florida Legislature
111 W. Madison Street, Room 812
Tallahassee FL 32399
trierweiler.walt@leg.state.fl.us
rehwinkel.charles@leg.state.fl.us

Gardner Law Firm
Robert Scheffel Wright, Esq.
John T. LaVia, III, Esq.
1300 Thomaswood Drive
Tallahassee FL 32308
schef@gbkwlaw.com
jlavia@gbkwlaw.com

**Attorneys for Environmental Defense Fund,
Inc.**

/s/ William P. Cox
William P. Cox

QUESTION:

Refer to witness Yanes' testimony, page 8, lines 5 through 13. Did FPL consider a scenario in which a 230 kV line would connect the Quarry substation to the Levee substation, in addition to the planned Oasis substation to Quarry substation 230kV line? If so, explain why this scenario was rejected. If this scenario was not considered, explain why not.

RESPONSE:

Yes. As part of its transmission planning and alternatives evaluation, FPL considered various 230 kV configurations involving Quarry and Levee substations.

1 Both [REDACTED]
2 [REDACTED] and FPL evaluated whether additional 230 kV interconnections between
3 these substations would address the system conditions identified in the 2025 transmission
4 planning assessment. FPL did not propose a direct [REDACTED] 230 kV transmission line
5 because that configuration did not materially change system performance under the Summer
2033 peak and contingency conditions evaluated in the 2025 transmission planning assessment.
Specifically, a direct [REDACTED] 230 kV connection [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] and did not resolve the identified voltage and thermal conditions.

FPL's 2025 transmission planning assessment identified that the 230 kV transmissions lines connecting Oasis substation to both Quarry and Levee substations is the appropriate configuration as part of the identified transmission solution. This configuration is reflected in the proposed facilities described in FPL's AOP Petition for determination of need.

QUESTION:

Refer to witness Yanes' testimony, page 16, lines 3 through 7. If the proposed AOP is not completed timely, provide the number of customers that would be impacted by load shedding in each of the contingencies identified.

- a. Has any load shedding occurred within the past 10 year period? If so, for each event please provide the year, number of affected customers, and amount of load shed (in MW), as well as an explanation detailing the reason(s) for the load shedding.

RESPONSE:

1 If the AOP is not completed by the 2033 in service date identified in FPL's 2025 transmission planning assessment, certain contingency scenarios would result in the existing transmission system being unable to maintain reliable operation in the Miami Dade County area without involuntary load shedding. Under these conditions, the loss of system elements would cause transmission overloads that cannot be fully mitigated through operational actions, requiring the shedding of approximately [REDACTED] of load to preserve system integrity and prevent broader impacts.

2 FPL's transmission planning assessments do not estimate the exact number of customers affected by such load shedding, as impacts depend on real time system conditions. However, for illustrative purposes, during the high load summer period from late May through late September, a load shed of approximately [REDACTED] could correspond to impacts on the order of [REDACTED] customers based on average usage assumptions and could occur on a recurring basis. The need for involuntary load shedding of this magnitude would represent a significant degradation of transmission reliability in Miami Dade County and is an outcome FPL's planning efforts are intended to avoid.

- a. See FPL's objections served contemporaneously herewith. Subject thereto, and without waiver of any objection, FPL responds as follows:

With respect to historical operations, FPL has not implemented load shedding in Miami-Dade County within the past ten (10) years.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
1	FPL 000108														
2	20260020-EI														
3															
4															
5															
6															
7															
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															
39															
40															
41															
42															
43															
44															
45															
46															

ATTACHMENT 7

TPL-001-5.1 Transmission Planning Assessment 2025

			Without AOP (Base case)		With AOP		Alt.I		Alt.II			
TPL-001-5.1 Contingency Categories	Identified Future Contingency Scenarios	Impacted Line/Substation	Loading (%)	Voltage (P.U.)	Loading (%)	Voltage (P.U.)	Loading (%)	Voltage (P.U.)	Loading (%)	Voltage (P.U.)	Appendix	TLSA Project Benefit

Assumptions:
Numbers based on Summer 2033 cases
Loading % based on Normal Rating
P.U. = Per Unit
AOP = Andytown-Oasis Transmission Lines project

		Without AOP (Base case)	With AOP	Alt.I	Alt.II	
Contingency	Monitored Flowgate Branch (North to South Flow)	Flow (MW)	Flow (MW)	Flow (MW)	Flow (MW)	Appendix

Numbers based on Summer 2033 cases.
MW = Megawatt

[illegible]