

ORIGINAL

060658-EI

EXHIBIT B

CMP _____
COM _____
CTR _____
ECR _____
GCL _____
OPC _____
RCA _____
SCR _____
SGA _____
SEC 1
JTH _____

DOCKET NO. 060658-EI

DOCUMENT NUMBER - DATE

11521 DEC 18 8

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re: Petition on behalf of Citizens of)
the State of Florida to require) DOCKET NO. 060658-EI
Progress Energy Florida, Inc. to)
refund to customers \$143 million)
_____)

**PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA'S RESPONSES TO
OPC'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES (Nos. 1-18)**

Progress Energy Florida, Inc., ("PEF" or "Company"), responds to OPC's First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-18), as follows:

GENERAL RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS

PEF incorporates and restates its General Responses and Objections to OPC's First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-18), served on November 20, 2006, as if those responses and objections were fully set forth herein.

INTERROGATORIES

1. (a) At OPC's request, PEF provided information relating to synfuel deliveries to PEF during 2000-2005 in a document captioned, "Annual Synfuel Delivered to Crystal River." Provide the ownership interests (by year if there were changes) of PE, PEF or affiliate thereof in the following entities shown in that document. In the same answer, identify all other entities who held ownership interests in these synfuel producers and marketing agents and quantify the extent of their interests.

Synfuel Producers

New River SynFuel LLC

Sandy River Synfuel LLC

Calla Synfuel

Imperial Synfuel

RC Synfuel

Marketing Agents

Black Hawk Synfuel

Kanawha River Terminal

Riverside Synfuel

Progress Fuels

Marmet Synfuel

ANSWER: PEF restates and incorporates its objections to this request filed on November 20, 2006. Subject to and without waiving any of these objections or any of PEF's general objections, the requested data is as follows:

<u>Synthetic Fuel Producer</u>	<u>Affiliate %</u>	<u>Marketing Agents</u>	<u>Affiliate%</u>
New River Synfuel LLC	10%	Black Hawk Synfuel	100%
Sandy River Synfuel LLC	**	Kanawha River Terminal	100%
Calla Synfuel	0%	Riverside Synfuel	100%
Imperial Synfuel	0%	Progress Fuels	100%
RC Synfuel	0%	Marmet Synfuel	100%

** Up to May 22, 2000 100% affiliate; from May 22, 2000 to November 30, 2000 10% affiliate; and from November 30, 2000 100% affiliate.

1. (b) With respect to each of the synfuel producers listed in (a) above, provide the following information:

1. For each year during the period 2000-2005, the total tax credits claimed by each synfuel producer and the allocation of those tax credits among the owners.

ANSWER: PEF restates and incorporates its objections to this request filed on November 20, 2006. Subject to and without waiving any of these objections or any of PEF's general objections, the requested data is as follows:

PEF does not know the tax credits claimed by the synfuel producers listed in interrogatory 1(a) above with the exception of the New River Synfuel, LLC, in which there was an affiliate ownership interest of 10%, for the period 2000-2005 and Sandy River Synfuel LLC, in which there was an affiliate ownership interest of 10% for the period between May 22, 2000 and November 30, 2000 (this is the only time period in which synfuel was sold from Sandy River Synfuel LLC to Crystal River as indicated in the chart identified in Interrogatory Number 1). PEF is providing the information for these time periods because these are the relevant time periods for synfuel sales to Crystal River indicated in interrogatory number 1. With respect to New River Synfuel LLC, the total tax credits claimed for the period 2000-2005 for all synfuel sales to all utilities were \$ [REDACTED]. However, the total tax credits claimed for the period 2000-2005 for synfuel sales to Crystal River was \$ [REDACTED], with operating losses of \$ [REDACTED], for a net total credit claim of \$ [REDACTED]. With respect to Sandy River Synfuel LLC the synfuel tons sold during the relevant period were so small ([REDACTED]) that a detailed calculation of the tax credits claimed for those sales to Crystal River has not been done because any credits claimed would have been nominal.

1. (b)2. For each year during the period 2000-2005, any and all payments made by

owners (other than PEF or PEF affiliates) that held an ownership interest in the synfuel producer to PEF or its affiliate, together with an explanation of the reason for such payments (including but not limited to transactions, services provided, royalties, contract governing tax credits).

ANSWER: PEF restates and incorporates its objections to this request filed on November 20, 2006. Subject to and without waiving any of these objections or any of PEF's general objections, the requested data is as follows:

Please see attachment 1 to these answers to interrogatories. PEF is again providing the information for the entities and for the relevant time periods identified in the chart PEF provided in discovery regarding synfuel sales to Crystal River that is the subject of interrogatory number 1. PEF is further providing the information requested during the relevant time period in the chart that is the subject of interrogatory number 1 for only New River Synfuel, Imperial Synfuel, and Calla Synfuel because they are the only producers with synfuel sales to Crystal River significant enough to justify the effort and time invested in preparing the answers when the relative ratio of the billed payments for services for sales to Crystal River to total sales to all other utilities is taken into account. Finally, the information provided is based on the billed amounts for the services provided because cash payments were not segregated by the service provided.

2. For each Synfuel Producer listed above, provide the location of the synfuel machine and the dock of river access.

ANSWER: PEF restates and incorporates its objections to this request filed on November 20, 2006. Subject to and without waiving any of these objections or any of PEF's general objections, the requested data is as follows:

<u>Synthetic Fuel Producer</u>	<u>Terminal</u>
New River Synfuel	Quincy Dock
Calla Synfuel	Marmet Dock
Imperial Synfuel	Marmet Dock
RC Synfuel	Ceredo Dock
Sandy River Synfuel	Sandy River Dock

3. For each synfuel machine listed in interrogatory 1 above, specify by year and by contract the tonnage taken by the synfuel machine that had previously been under contract or purchase order as a coal source for the Crystal River plant, (e.g. Massey in 2002 as coal and in 2003 as synfuel).

ANSWER: PEF restates and incorporates its objections to this request filed on November 20, 2006. Subject to and without waiving any of these objections or any of PEF's general objections, the requested data is as follows:

Please see attachment 2 to the answers to these interrogatories.

4. For each contract/purchase order identified in the answer to the prior interrogatory no. 3 (above), provide the cost of the coal FOB mine, the transportation cost to the river or rail origin, the transportation cost to IMT or direct to Crystal River. Provide also any dock charges before and after the switch from a coal purchase to a synfuel purchase, the amount billed to PEF and the ratepayer for the FOB mine price and to dock or rail, transloading at dock and IMT, synfuel blending, and rail, and river and rail transport to Crystal River, before and after the switch from a coal purchase to a synfuel purchase.

ANSWER: PEF restates and incorporates its objections to this request filed on November 20, 2006. Subject to and without waiving any of these objections or any of PEF's general objections, the requested data is as follows:

All costs other than the commodity price were the same and there were no additional charges because coal was shipped to a synfuel facility and then to Crystal River. For the Pen Coal contracts, the discount was \$1.50 per ton for synthetic fuel. For all other contracts, the discount was \$2.00 per ton for synthetic fuel.

5. Referring to the document entitled "Annual Synfuel Delivered to Crystal River," provide a breakdown of tonnages by each synfuel producer for each year 2002, 2003, and 2004 by the marketing agents listed. For example, for 2002 PEF's table shows four synfuel producers shipped 501,204 tons. Break out these tons by synfuel producer.

ANSWER: PEF restates and incorporates its objections to this request filed on November 20, 2006. Subject to and without waiving any of these objections or any of PEF's general objections:

Please see attachment 3 to these answers to these interrogatories and note that after further investigation calendar year 2003 synfuel tonnage was reduced by 46,965 tons as compared to the previous tonnage provided to OPC.

6. Regarding the synfuel tons received at Crystal River Units 4 and 5 in 2004 and 2005 from Central Coal Co., was this tonnage shipped under the Central Coal Co. contract with PFC? If so, identify the synfuel machine utilized, and any change in the price FOB mine, transportation to dock, dock transloading, IMT transloading, blending and river transport to IMT, paid by PFC and PEF's ratepayers for the synfuels versus the coal sold by Central Coal Co. under its PFC contract.

ANSWER: PEF restates and incorporates its objections to this request filed on November 20, 2006. Subject to and without waiving any of these objections or any of PEF's general objections, the requested data is as follows:

There are two separate contracts with Central Coal Company in 2004. One contract is for synthetic fuel purchased FOB barge for \$ [REDACTED] per MMbtu. The other contract is for coal purchases FOB barge for \$ [REDACTED] per MMbtu. The synthetic fuel producer is not specified in the synthetic fuel contract with Central Coal Company.

7. Why is PEF unable to identify the synfuel producer of the synfuel shipped by Central Coal Co. in 2004 and 2005?

ANSWER: PEF restates and incorporates its objections to this request filed on November 20, 2006. Subject to and without waiving any of these objections or any of PEF's general objections, the requested data is as follows:

The synthetic fuel tons from Central Coal Company were purchased FOB barge in the Marmet Pool of the Kanawha River. The synthetic fuel producer is not specified.

8. Did Central Coal Co. obtain PEF's approval to ship synfuel to Crystal River Units 4 and 5 in 2004 and 2005? Identify all relevant documents regarding any approval of these synfuel transactions sought by Central Coal Co. or any entity on its behalf or given by PEF or PFC or any entity on their behalf.

ANSWER: PEF restates and incorporates its objections to this request filed on November 20, 2006. Subject to and without waiving any of these objections or any of PEF's general objections, the requested data is as follows:

The contract with Central Coal Company signified the contractual obligation and approval to ship synthetic fuel to Crystal River 4 and 5.

9. To your (PEF and/or PFC) knowledge, for any year during the period 2000-2006 has PFC or an affiliated PFC entity or part owned synfuel facility purchased coal, for synfuels plants affiliated with or partly owned by Progress Energy, Inc. or its affiliates, from producers that had bid coal to PFC or PEF for Crystal River in any formal or informal procurement activity? Identify each such transaction by year and provide the associated tonnages.

ANSWER: PEF restates and incorporates its objections to this request filed on November 20, 2006. Subject to and without waiving any of these objections or any of PEF's general objections, the requested data as PEF understands the question is as follows:

PEF is confused by the interrogatory because it is ambiguous. If the interrogatory is requesting whether during 2000-2006, PFC, an affiliated PFC entity, or part owned synfuel facility purchased coal for synfuel plants in which there was an affiliated ownership interest, from a producer that had ever bid coal at any time for Crystal River in any formal or informal procurement activity the answer is yes, as indicated by attachment 3 to these interrogatories, showing that coal from Massey and Panther was bought for synfuel. Massey and Panther were and are producers with substantial bituminous coal resources who have responded to numerous solicitations for coal for Crystal River 4 and 5 over the twenty plus years that those units have been operational. If the interrogatory is instead asking PEF to correlate synfuel sales to Crystal River during 2000 to 2006, coal bought for synfuel

production during 2000 to 2006, and the responses to solicitations for coal for Crystal River during the period 2000 to 2006, this information is unknown because the organization within PFC that procured fuel for Crystal River was operated separately from the organization within PFC that dealt with synthetic fuel plants, and there is no way to know the amount of coal available for any particular purpose or solicitation from producers selling coal during this time period.

10. From 2000 to 2006, what reserves and sources of coal production did PEF affiliates own that were economical supplies for Crystal River if shipped to the Quincy and Marmet docks on the Kanawha River?

ANSWER: PEF restates and incorporates its objections to this request filed on November 20, 2006. Subject to and without waiving any of these objections or any of PEF's general objections, the requested data for 2005 & 2006, based on PEF's understanding of the term "economical" and what PEF believes to be the correction of the apparent typographical error, PEF answers as follows:

- **None of the reserves and sources of coal production owned by PEF affiliates were economical supplies for Crystal River from the Quincy or Marmet docks on the Kanawha River.**

11. In Progress Energy, Inc.'s (PE) 2006 SEC filing, PE states: "through our subsidiaries, we are a majority owner in five entities and a minority owner in one entity that own facilities that produce coal based solid synthetic fuel as defined under Section 29 of the Code (Section 29)." Identify these six facilities and the PE percentage ownership in each.

ANSWER: PEF restates and incorporates its objections to this request filed on November 20, 2006. Subject to and without waiving any of these objections or any of PEF's general objections, the requested data for 2006 is as follows:

Solid Fuel	100% PE
Solid Energy	100% PE
Colona	50.2% PE
Ceredo	100% PE
Sandy River	100% PE
New River	10% PE

12. Did PE or any of its affiliates have majority ownership in Sandy River Synfuel LLC in 2000 when it shipped synfuels directly to Crystal River Units 4 and 5? Did Sandy River Synfuel LLC, PE, or its affiliates or owners claim a Section 29 tax credit on these shipments? If so, How was Sandy River Synfuel, LLC, PE, or its affiliates or owners able to claim a Section 29 tax credit on these shipments?

ANSWER: PEF restates and incorporates its objections to this request filed on November 20, 2006. Subject to and without waiving any of these objections or any of PEF's general objections, the requested data is as follows:

Neither PEF nor any of its affiliates had a majority ownership in Sandy River Synfuel LLC in 2000 when synthetic fuel was procured for Crystal River 4 and 5.

12. Did PE or any of its affiliates have majority ownership in Sandy River Synfuel LLC in 2000 when it shipped synfuels directly to Crystal River Units 4 and 5? Did Sandy River Synfuel LLC, PE, or its affiliates or owners claim a Section 29 tax credit on these shipments? If so, how was Sandy River Synfuel, LLC, PE, or its affiliates or owners able to claim a Section 29 tax credit on these shipments?

ANSWER: PEF restates and incorporates its objections to this request filed on November 20, 2006. Subject to and without waiving any of these objections or any of PEF's general objections, the requested data is as follows:

Neither PEF nor any of its affiliates had a majority ownership in Sandy River Synfuel LLC in 2000 when synthetic fuel was procured for Crystal River 4 and 5.

13. Did PE, PFC, or their affiliates (or a synfuel producer owned in part by PE or any of its affiliates) acquire coal from Infinity Coal Sales/Panther Coal in 2006, 2004 and/or 2005 for processing as synfuels or any other purpose? If so, provide the details for the contract (date, tonnages shipped by year, and price per ton in each year).

ANSWER: PEF restates and incorporates its objections to this request filed on November 20, 2006.

PEF did not have a contract with Infinity Coal Sales/Panther Coal in 2004, 2005, or 2006. However, 5,257 tons were shipped in January of 2004 from New River Synfuel that were from a 2003 contractual obligation for synthetic fuel.

14. Describe how from 2000 to 2005 PFC - purchased synfuels for Crystal River were blended and stored. Identify where blending took place and the blending ratio.

ANSWER: PEF restates and incorporates its objections to this request filed on November 20, 2006. Subject to and without waiving any of these objections or any of PEF's general objections, the requested data is as follows:

Synthetic fuel purchased for Crystal River can be stored and blended at either International Marine Terminal (IMT) or at Crystal River. The historical blending ratio of coal and synthetic fuel varied, but a target blend ratio of 60% synthetic fuel to 40% coal was typical. See Response of Progress Energy Florida to Staff's Sixth Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 86-92) Docket No. 030001-EI Question #91.

15. Identify the location of synfuels in storage (inventory) by month and their location(s).

ANSWER: PEF restates and incorporates its objections to this request filed on November 20, 2006. Subject to and without waiving any of these objections or any of PEF's general objections, the requested data for 2005 & 2006, as interpreted by PEF as asking for any synfuel in storage (inventory) that was held for the benefit of and/or use for Crystal River Units 4 and 5 for the years indicated in the document entitled "Annual Synfuel Delivered to Crystal River" previously produced to OPC in discovery by PEF, is as follows:

Please see attachment 4 to these answers to these interrogatories.

16. Identify the cost of blending synfuels shipped Crystal River by year 2000-2005.

ANSWER: PEF restates and incorporates its objections to this request filed on November 20, 2006. Subject to and without waiving any of these objections or any of PEF's general objections, the requested data is as follows:

There was no additional cost to PEF for the blending of synthetic fuel that was shipped to Crystal River in 2000-2005. The costs of blending fuels at Crystal River would vary depending upon the additional labor hours required and additional equipment operation and maintenance costs required to accommodate the required volumes for blending.

17. With regard to the (effective date) January 1, 2005 contract between PFC as purchaser and PFC, et. al. as Seller, identify the source of coal “shipped by barge form Kanawha River Terminals’ Quincy or Marmet river docks” (Section 7.02). Specify the producers of the coal, any processing (cleaning or synfuels) that occurred, and the mode and cost of shipping to the river docks.

ANSWER: PEF restates and incorporates its objections to this request filed on November 20, 2006. Subject to and without waiving any of these objections or any of PEF’s general objections, the requested data is as follows:

The contract is an obligation for coal delivered FOB barge and the coal was taken out of the existing inventory at the dock. As a result, it is impossible to identify the exact source of the coal.

18. To the extent not covered in your answer to the prior Interrogatory no. 17, identify the mine of origin, transportation, processing and transloading, all subsequent to FOB mine steps and pricing to IMT of coal/synfuels shipped under the 1/1/05 contract between PFC and PFC on its own be half and as agent for its subsidiary mining companies.

ANSWER: PEF restates and incorporates its objections to this request filed on November 20, 2006. Subject to and without waiving any of these objections or any of PEF's general objections, the requested data is as follows:

The contract is an obligation for coal delivered FOB barge and the coal was taken out of the existing inventory at the dock. As a result, it is impossible to identify the exact source of the coal.

CONFIDENTIAL

Blackhawk Cost Charged to New River Associated with % of CR Sales
Per the Fiscal Financial Statements

	Processing	Marketing	Procurement	Transloading	Binder	Feedstock
2000						
CR %						
CR Associated \$						
2001						
CR %						
CR Associated \$						
2002						
CR %						
CR Associated \$						
2003						
CR %						
CR Associated \$						
2004 *						
CR %						
CR Associated \$						
2005						
CR %	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR Associated \$	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

* 2004 was a 13 month year due to coming off fiscal
Does not include interest or misc. accounts payable.

CONFIDENTIAL

Marmet Cost Charged to Calla/Imperial Associated with % of CR Sales
Per the Fiscal Financial Statements

	Processing	Marketing	Procurement	Transloading	Binder	Feedstock
2002						
CR %						
CR Associated \$						
2003						
CR %						
CR Associated \$						
2004 *						
CR %						
CR Associated \$						

* 2004 was a 13 month year due to coming off fiscal
Does not include interest or misc. accounts payable.

Progress Energy Florida
Synfuel Data
Synfuel produced from PFC Coal Contracts

Synfuel Producer	2000		2001		2002		2003		2004		2005	
	Tons	Contract	Tons	Contract	Tons	Contract	Tons	Contract	Tons	Contract	Tons	Contract
Sandy River	277,289	Pen										
New River			600,234	Massey	460,923	Massey	40,715	Massey	20,912	PFC		None
New River					175,011	Panther			5,257	Panther		
Imperial, Calla					181,086	Massey			28,218	PFC		
Imperial, Calla					220,628	Panther	348,032	Panther				
Total	277,289		600,234		1,037,648		388,747		54,387		-	

Progress Energy Florida
Synfuel Data

	2000			2001			2002			2003			2004			2005		
	Tons	%	BTU's	Tons	%	BTU's	Tons	%	BTU's	Tons	%	BTU's	Tons	%	BTU's	Tons	%	BTU's
Black Hawk Synfuel LLC	790,496	66%	12,145	1,174,891	66%	12,183	543,186	34%	12,428	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	-
CR 4&5	790,496		12,145	1,174,891		12,183	543,186		12,428	-		-	-		-	-		-
New River Synfuel	77,116	6%	12,500	605,655	34%	12,205	315,815	20%	12,343	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	-
CR 4&5	77,116		12,500	605,655		12,205	315,815		12,343	-		-	-		-	-		-
Sandy River Synfuel LLC	329,390	28%	12,268	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	-
CR 4&5	329,390		12,268	-		-	-		-	-		-	-		-	-		-
Kanawha River Terminal	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	501,204	32%	12,688	40,715	10%	12,456	-	0%	-	-	0%	-
CR 4&5	-		-	-		-	501,204		12,688	40,715		12,456	-		-	-		-
Riverside Synfuel	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	20,223	5%	12,418	-	0%	-	-	0%	-
CR 4&5	-		-	-		-	-		-	20,223		12,418	-		-	-		-
Progress Fuels	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	64,382	48%	12,478	-	0%	-
CR 4&5	-		-	-		-	-		-	-		-	64,382		12,478	-		-
Marmet Synfuel	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	220,629	14%	13,127	348,032	85%	13,016	5,257	4%	12,892	-	0%	-
CR 4&5	-		-	-		-	220,629		13,127	348,032		13,016	5,257		12,892	-		-
Central Coal Co.	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	65,786	49%	12,635	12,481	100%	12,221
CR 4&5	-		-	-		-	-		-	-		-	65,786		12,635	12,481		12,221
Total / Avg. BTU	1,197,002	100%	12,202	1,780,546	100%	12,191	1,580,834	100%	12,591	408,970	100%	12,931	135,425	100%	12,570	12,481	100%	12,221
CR 4&5	<u>1,197,002</u>			<u>1,780,546</u>			<u>1,580,834</u>			<u>408,970</u>			<u>135,425</u>			<u>12,481</u>		

Synfuel Producer	Coal Source	Coal Source	Coal Source
New River	91,124	7,890 Massey	-
New River	111,563	32,825 Massey	-
New River	340,498	-	-
New River	315,815 Massey	-	-
Total	<u>859,001</u>	<u>40,715</u>	<u>-</u>
Imperial, Calla	45,226 Massey	348,032 Panther	-
Imperial, Calla	135,860 Massey	-	-
New River	87,416 Massey	-	5,257 Panther
New River	57,692 Massey	-	-
New River	175,011 Panther	-	-
Total	<u>501,205</u>	<u>348,032</u>	<u>5,257</u>
Imperial, Calla	220,628 Panther	-	28,218 PFC
New River	-	-	20,912 PFC
RC	-	20,223	15,252
Total	<u>220,628</u>	<u>20,223</u>	<u>64,382</u>
Unknown	-	-	65,786
Grand Total	<u>1,580,834</u>	<u>408,970</u>	<u>135,425</u>

Location	Month	Tons of Synfuel in Storage	Location	Month	Tons of Synfuel in Storage	Location	Month	Tons of Synfuel in Storage	Location	Month	Tons of Synfuel in Storage	Location	Month	Tons of Synfuel in Storage	Location	Month	Tons of Synfuel in Storage
IMT	01/00	7,848.00	IMT	01/01	64,663.93	IMT	01/02	451,759.84	IMT	01/03	531,777.83	IMT	01/04	61,185.20	IMT	01/05	-
IMT	02/00	218.97	IMT	02/01	35,018.91	IMT	02/02	467,214.57	IMT	02/03	496,776.45	IMT	02/04	18,433.24	IMT	02/05	-
IMT	03/00	32,488.01	IMT	03/01	107,226.58	IMT	03/02	495,098.39	IMT	03/03	475,035.48	IMT	03/04	48,749.09	IMT	03/05	-
IMT	04/00	64,042.95	IMT	04/01	43,304.75	IMT	04/02	523,912.69	IMT	04/03	413,329.15	IMT	04/04	13,774.50	IMT	04/05	-
IMT	05/00	80,407.22	IMT	05/01	45,478.98	IMT	05/02	526,946.25	IMT	05/03	319,403.54	IMT	05/04	12,004.88	IMT	05/05	-
IMT	06/00	53,536.13	IMT	06/01	20,346.96	IMT	06/02	573,148.52	IMT	06/03	310,586.48	IMT	06/04	13,004.88	IMT	06/05	-
IMT	07/00	32,584.65	IMT	07/01	81,360.89	IMT	07/02	578,616.97	IMT	07/03	249,586.42	IMT	07/04	13,957.11	IMT	07/05	-
IMT	08/00	70,290.26	IMT	08/01	144,185.49	IMT	08/02	539,585.05	IMT	08/03	244,325.31	IMT	08/04	11,813.80	IMT	08/05	-
IMT	09/00	72,711.46	IMT	09/01	223,351.93	IMT	09/02	516,814.38	IMT	09/03	201,539.47	IMT	09/04	5,158.07	IMT	09/05	-
IMT	10/00	60,048.78	IMT	10/01	309,625.45	IMT	10/02	590,679.52	IMT	10/03	185,250.15	IMT	10/04	6,890.51	IMT	10/05	-
IMT	11/00	56,150.29	IMT	11/01	382,981.84	IMT	11/02	567,144.60	IMT	11/03	169,702.53	IMT	11/04	6,890.51	IMT	11/05	-
IMT	12/00	53,695.02	IMT	12/01	416,532.49	IMT	12/02	553,850.38	IMT	12/03	132,543.05	IMT	12/04	6,321.63	IMT	12/05	-