REDACTED EXHIBIT B

CMP
COM 5

CTR DYZ

ECR

GCL L

OPC

RCA

SCR

SGA

SEC L

OTH | COMP

Vecard of

DOVIS DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

00406 JAN 16 5

PITCHENIOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

00407 JAN 16 5

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

Weintraub DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

00408 JAN 165

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

REDACTED PORTIONS OF DONNA DAVIS DIRECT TESTIMONY

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

00406 JAN 165

EPSG-COMMISSION CLERK

CONFIDENTIAL

1		by New River Synfuel LLC for the period 2000 to 2005 for all synfuel sales
2		to all utilities and other customers were . The total tax credits
3		claimed by New River Synfuel LLC for the same period for synfuel sales to
4		Crystal River were with operating losses of the first of a
5		net total tax credit claim of
6		When the net tax credit claimed on New River synfuel
7		sales to Crystal River from 2000 to 2005 is compared to the \$1.25 billion
8		value of all synfuel tax credits claimed on all synfuel sales by Progress
9		Energy over the same time period which Mr. Sansom says at page 26,
10		lines 9-10 of his testimony was reported by Argus Coal Daily the
11		insignificance of the tax credits on synfuel sales to Crystal River is self
12		evident. They account for less than percent of the total tax credits. As a
13		result, there is no basis in fact for anyone to suggest that synfuel tax credits
14		influenced in any way the purchasing decisions for CR4 and CR5.
15		
16	Q:	Are you familiar with something referred to as "twist" arrangements
17		involving synfuel?
18	A:	Yes. A "twist" arrangement is where PFC has stepped into the middle of a
19		coal contract. Someone has a contract for coal and PFC steps in the middle
20		and the coal is made into synfuel and sold to the end user as synfuel at a \$1 to
21		\$2 discount. As a result of such an arrangement, the end user, in the case of
22		Crystal River, the ratepayers, benefit as they have paid less than they would
23		have paid had PFC not done the twist deal.