

VOTE SHEET

July 18, 2006

Docket No. 060220-EC – Petition for determination of need for Seminole Generating Station Unit 3 electrical power plant in Putnam County, by Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc.

**Issue 1:** Is there a need for the proposed Seminole Generating Station Unit 3, taking into account the need for electric system reliability and integrity, as this criterion is used in Section 403.519, Florida Statutes?

**Recommendation:** Yes. Seminole has projected its future needs based upon serving seven of the ten member distribution cooperatives (members) that have signed contract extensions. Based on reasonable projected load growth and the expiration of existing power purchase contracts, Seminole has identified a need for additional capacity of approximately 1200 MW by 2012, of which at least 750 MW needs to be base load capacity.

**APPROVED**

*with oral modifications made to staff analysis at the conference.*

COMMISSIONERS ASSIGNED: All Commissioners

COMMISSIONERS' SIGNATURES

MAJORITY

DISSENTING

*Katrina J. Jew*  
*[Signature]*  
*[Signature]*  
*[Signature]*  
*[Signature]*

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

REMARKS/DISSENTING COMMENTS:

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

06318 JUL 19 06

Vote Sheet

July 18, 2006

Docket No. 060220-EC – Petition for determination of need for Seminole Generating Station Unit 3 electrical power plant in Putnam County, by Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc.

(Continued from previous page)

**Issue 2:** Is there a need for the proposed Seminole Generating Station Unit 3, taking into account the need for adequate electricity at a reasonable cost, as this criterion is used in Section 403.519, Florida Statutes?

**Recommendation:** Yes. Seminole's analyses show that at least 750 MW of Seminole's capacity need in 2012 should be base load type capacity for reasons of economics. With current projections, SGS Unit 3 is expected to provide adequate electricity at a reasonable cost. If SGS Unit 3 is not constructed, Seminole's members and their consumers will face significantly higher costs and greater price uncertainty.

**APPROVED**

**Issue 3:** Is the proposed Seminole Generating Station Unit 3 the most cost-effective alternative available, as this criterion is used in Section 403.519?

**Recommendation:** Yes. SGS Unit 3 is the most cost-effective alternative available to Seminole, its members and their consumers to meet their base load capacity needs in 2012. Seminole's comprehensive evaluation of alternatives shows that SGS Unit 3 is more cost-effective than market-based and self-build alternatives, saving almost \$500 million relative to an all gas alternative.

**APPROVED**

**Issue 4:** Are there any conservation measures taken by or reasonably available to Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc. which might mitigate the need for the proposed power plant?

**Recommendation:** No. Seminole's members currently have 237 MW of DSM in the form of load control switches, voltage control, and distributed generation. Even after consideration of such conservation and DSM efforts, Seminole has a capacity need of over 750 MW in 2012. No additional DSM and conservation measures have been identified that would cost-effectively mitigate the need for SGS Unit 3.

**APPROVED**

Vote Sheet

July 18, 2006

Docket No. 060220-EC – Petition for determination of need for Seminole Generating Station Unit 3 electrical power plant in Putnam County, by Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc.

(Continued from previous page)

**Issue 5:** Based on the resolution of the foregoing issues, should the Commission grant Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc.'s petition to determine the need for the proposed Seminole Generating Station Unit 3?

**Recommendation:** Yes. Seminole has satisfied each of the statutory criteria for a determination of need, and Seminole, its Members and their consumers would suffer significant adverse consequences if such a determination were not granted. Seminole should continue to monitor the cost-effectiveness of SGS Unit 3 prior to committing substantial capital dollars.

**APPROVED**

**Issue 6:** Should this docket be closed?

**Recommendation:** Yes. When the Commission has issued its final order in the case and the time for reconsideration has passed, this docket should be closed.

**APPROVED**